

we've entered into where we were told initially this, well, the revenue loss will be negligible, it will pay for itself in a matter of years, and we found huge amounts of money that were lost in those efforts, much more, far beyond anything ever relayed to us as we were considering the bill. So having had that experience and having been burned once, I'd like not to be burned twice. Now this is nowhere near that level. We're talking here a few million dollars, not as we've now seen with 775. We're approaching a billion dollars of lost revenue under that bill. So obviously there is no comparison in the breadth of what we're talking about, but the same sort of situation exists. And when we talk about tax breaks, it's not like an appropriation, we don't control how much money is appropriated. We grant, in a sense, an entitlement to it, tax relief and however much that totals is however much people apply for and qualify for. And we've, I would hope, gotten some experience from that that would lead us to be very cautious in that. So I have probably in terms of the concept, there is some sense to it, I understand what is being argued, but again the revenue loss scares me a great deal. I would like also though on the concept thing, as Senator Warner and Senator Brashear and others who support the bill talked, you know one of the things I was looking at here somewhere, an explanation of what this whole throwback law is and it was the concept that no income for a corporation anywhere in the country would go untaxed by some entity, the idea being that you throw back, if one state isn't going to do it, then the state headquartered by the company would still be able to do it, the idea that they cannot end up not paying any tax on income they earned. And clearly not having a throwback allows for that to happen. This is back to the concept and problem with the differential between the states on taxation policy and now that some states have backed off from this where there was some agreement among the states evidently, that between us some way or another that income was taxed, now we're seeing it's harder and harder for those states that want to retain that principle to continue with it because it puts us at a disadvantage. As other states back off then it's hard for us not to back off also. But it's not the base concept of trying to make sure, between the states and the corporate income tax, that all income is eventually assessed and taxed either at the state that the sales are made or the headquarters of the state not a sound policy. I guess I'd like to hear from Senator Brashear or somebody to talk about that. Is there something that is amiss there because ultimately by doing that, the state's are able to tax and end up with a level playing field