

I wasn't here to vote over her proposal as well, but the issue here is one of tax policy, do you agree with the tax policy or don't you, and I agree with it to a point. And the point is, let's phase it in over three years as the bill is currently drafted. Now, Senator Wesely, if this proposal would at some future date have an amendment adopted to it that said, look, let's do this all in one year, let's just go ahead and make this change, so we don't know whether or not the impact from it is going to be the fiscal note that is currently on the bill, that you and I both stated went from, you know, approximately, well, it reduced in size by one and a half times over about a three day period because of the Revenue Department, in terms of their getting new numbers to the Legislature, but the question is, you know, if you are going to put it in place, do you sunset it or not, and I would argue that you don't. I mean a sunset provision makes sense for a program that you are going to say, okay, we are going to analyze it someplace down the road, but in terms of tax policy are you going to phase it out because you don't want to...you've only got so much money for it; in terms of tax policy, I would argue that you can implement the darn thing, then you ought to see that it is going to work, and you run with it. If not, then come in and reexamine your tax policy in this area. And for purposes of the income, as it relates to the throwback rule, it has fluctuated, the numbers have fluctuated for the last 6 years that I can think of, 6 to 7 years, from the current figure that is in the fiscal note of \$1 million to upwards of, if I am not mistaken, anywhere from 10 to 15 million dollars in any given time. Now I believe after the study that was done by the Revenue Department that the numbers are pretty solid. But I still think it should be phased in as the bill was introduced, and as it is currently proposed to do, over a three year period, but I don't have a problem saying we will tax people for sales that are made within the state, and those sales that are made outside the state are collected at the point of sale. That makes a lot of sense to me. I mean I don't have a problem with that income being taxed based on the sales within the state. To adopt the Weseley amendment says that we are going to reexamine it at some point in the future, and then I don't know why the date was picked, and I am sure it was to raise the issue that Senator Wesely rightly raises all the time when we deal with these types of issues, that we need to periodically examine our tax code, and that is really what this amendment says. And I would not disagree with it, but I think, for the most part in many cases, but I believe in this case this particular issue has been