

don't think that 30 votes, requiring to get an exemption or to take it off, is a bad policy. Is it a bad precedent? I don't want to see every vote have to go to 30 votes. If we want to do some things for child care or the elderly, I don't want to see you have to get 30 votes. There are a lot of things that I don't like about the precedent. But you are faced with a most unique problem. And to solve that most unique problem we're here in special session. And I guess what I tell you to do at this point is let's put away our special interest and that desire to help it, because I have that, I think most everyone has a special interest, whether that's a large pervasive economy in this state or not, or we all may have some revenge retribution we want to invoke on a special interest to get back, or to sort of level that old playing field, because if you're on the losing side you want to level the playing field. But what I can't believe I hear is I want to stir the waters up. I want to stir the waters up. What are those waters? Those waters are people's businesses, those are people's small farms, those are people's lives and you want to stir them up for the sake of stirring them up? Wrong! People's lives, they don't need stirred up, they need stability, and they need some calm, rational tax policy instead of just having the kettle stirred. And at this point what you need is something predictable some tax policy, and I tell you we are close, we're as close as we're probably going to get on this floor to doing it. And is it involved...I'm sure Senator Lindsay isn't very happy about those 30 votes either. I'm not very happy about those 30 votes, but I think they're going to work, because we don't decide whose going to win and lose, because that's going to occur next year in 1992. The great tax exemption debates in 1992. You're going to go out to the Elks Club, and you're going to the Seratoma's in November or December and they're going to say, what are you going to do in 1992? And you're going to say, we're going to have the great tax exemption debates. And that's what's going to occur. But that's when we decide who the winners or losers are going to be. And the true purpose of a constitutional amendment is to decide the blue prints, and decide the playing rules, that's what a Constitution is for. A Constitution shouldn't be for deciding winners and losers, it's there to decide what the rules of the game are. And we're going to decide what the rules of the game are with this amendment. That's the reason I signed on to it. I don't necessarily like the precedent, I think it's bad precedent. Am I nervous about some of the things...