

only going to get one chance at the constitutional change and while you're going to make that one chance, why wouldn't you put this provision in there? Because afterwards it isn't going to have a huge impact because Senator Hall is right, somebody is going to bring a lawsuit in this case. They're going to bring it no matter which package you do and if you do nothing, they're going to bring lawsuits too. Now, and I don't buy the argument of anybody that we're going to be able to prevent lawsuits. Those are going to occur. The key here to this one is if you believe in this solution, now you may not like it but there's a solution out there, you need these provisions to cover yourself from a tax in the case of what if. And so it makes good policy to put these in. Senator Schmit, it may not work, may not work at all, I don't know, but I know that if I don't put these in here, and that's what kicks you out in a court case, we're going to be very sorry that at six forty-three on March 5th we didn't vote for an amendment like this. And so I...I think that it is a legitimate question. I think Senator Hall raises some good legitimate constitutional issues that ought to be debated on whether or not you change the Constitution. This is a phrase though that I don't think is worth the hassle over because it's one of those it doesn't hurt us to put it in at all and it might well be the saving grace at some later point. With that, I would urge the adoption of this amendment to the amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CONWAY: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Withem, you're next.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President, and members of the body, I'm somewhat confused by the opposition to the amendment. I'm looking at the original draft of the amend...of LR 219CA, on page 5, amendments to Article VIII of the Constitution shall be effective from, etcetera, etcetera...a situation attempting to deal with the retroactivity. I look at the committee amendments dated February 12, 1992, signed by Senator Hall, voted out of the Revenue Committee by an 8 to 0 vote, retroactive...retroactive language. Passage of this amendment to Article VIII of the Constitution shall be effective from and after January 1, 1992. And existing revenue laws passed in the regular legislative session of 1992 and not inconsistent with this Constitution, as amended, shall be considered ratified and confirmed by such amendment without the need for legislative reenactment of such laws. A redrafting of the language but still, in essence, a retroactive provision, redrafted, I assume,