

will be changed, maybe he'll change it tomorrow, but that let's Enron off. The current thinking is that that amendment lets Enron off. So we're not doing all that much there. Then we've taken off the penalty for late payment. I didn't like that penalty, certainly not when it was at 50 percent. I was pleased that the Revenue Committee saw fit to reduce that to 20 percent, which I think was reasonable. But we've taken that off. So, there again we're not doing anything to alleviate the problem. So, now we are here with another amendment which will cost somewhere in the vicinity of possibly \$120 million. Are we going to now pass a third amendment which, in effect, says to all those people out there, there is no problem, folks, the Legislature is saying to you and to everybody else there is no problem, we're not going to do what we can do to correct what most people out there and most subdivisions do think is a problem. I urge you to defeat the Withem amendment.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Senator Lamb. Senator Kristensen, on the Withem amendment to the committee amendments.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair, members. Senator Byars, I want to respond just real quickly to you. I do think that we're trying to work towards a long-term solution, that truly is what we're going to have to get accomplished in this session and, if not now, as soon as we can when we meet in January. Throughout the day I've been very supportive of most of the amendments that have been offered. I think that they do look down the line, and let's don't patch it, let's try to solve it. Unfortunately, this is one of those amendments that I have to stand up and say something about because I think it perverts the process a little bit. And I don't know about the amount of dollars that are going to be lost. I don't have those figures, I don't know if they are accurate, I don't know where they've come from. But what concerns me is the system here of how we're going to do these refunds. What we're here to do is things to the future. What the amendment looks to is for refunds on past taxes. The analogy I want to use is if we have a school with asbestos and some student is injured, now he's going to go to court and he's going to sue and he's going to prove those people are negligent, they are so negligent they've got asbestos and it is causing injuries and death, in fact, their child was severely injured. So they're going to go to court. They're going to probably win, let's say, and they're going to get a judgment, and they're going to get paid for their injuries, right? Now does that mean that every other kid in the school ought to get