

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Just a second. I'm not clear on the impact of two-thirds. I understand that that is probably not going to be an issue in the debate on the bill. So I'll let it go.. the sixty-six and two-thirds, 65 percent cap. The effect of this amendment. Apparently it's going to be moot as we move along so I'm willing to let it go. I was not clear on the impact of this capping it off, what...if we go back to the original bill, or if we go with this amendment out, you know, taking Section 4 out, what's the impact. I'm not 100 percent clear on it. I'll let it go. If you want to speak to that, okay, but I, I know there's lots of things moving here on other issues too, so.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Alright. Well, in...I'll try to be brief in trying to respond to the issue that Senator Wehrbein raises. The committee amendment to 349, if it was kept whole produces, and I don't know how else to say this, it produces a different set of winners and losers, if you see a printout, than if you separate the two issues and you don't do one or the other. Now who those winners and losers are and how much they win or lose and where they're located, I don't know. But I do know that when it works through the formula you would produce a different set of winners and losers if you do them in combination as opposed to doing just one or just the other. But it was with some, perhaps at that time, some naive expectation that by producing a different set of winners and losers it might turn out to be a winning combination of winners and losers. That still remains uncertain, so as we stand here today I don't think that we can intelligently debate the two together because there are some people who would want to know that before they made a decision. The policy issue that is raised in Senator Robak's bill, without consideration of the income tax rebate issue, is an important one. And perhaps if this body is able to consider that issue in isolation from the other one we will have a more comprehensive and understandable debate of that issue than if we try to combine them. That's my motivation in agreeing to Senator Robak's amendment. She may or may not agree with me that finding a different set of winners and losers in the combination of the two strengthens her concept. Apparently she does not. I am willing to agree with her on that point. And I would simply ask support for the reconsideration motion. And eventually support for Senator Robak's amendment.