

is that this is the Tennessee court case. That is number one. You see, Senator DeCamp, they have a very active court in Tennessee and they do rule on one and sometimes two issues a year and in this case both of them are Tennessee court cases, Senator DeCamp. Second of all, I want to tell you, members of the Legislature, that the amendment that Senator DeCamp offers as the Revenue Department's "compromise" is not a compromise. What they said was is that Senator Beutler and Senator DeCamp drafted their bill wrong. That is what they said, not this is our compromise, this is all we ever really wanted. That is baloney or you may use the three letter word that would apply in this regard. The truth of the matter is is that the bill, that the motion that Senator DeCamp offers here is not the Revenue Department's proposal, it is the Revenue Department's correction to the mistake that was offered earlier. And the last mistake that my good friend, Senator DeCamp, made deals with the question of whether or not this restores the bill to its original form. I want to assure Senator DeCamp that as the bill came out of committee it was, in fact, in this sort of form but it was Senator DeCamp, once again, carrying water for someone who led the floor fight, arguing three different issues, any which of one you could buy and those three issues were very simply, (a) we ought to do this in one big revenue package. (b) You know, we have a difference between services and nonservices. If you don't pass my services bill then you've got to vote against everything else and, (c) Gee guys, don't you think it would be nice to give somebody a little exemption. We haven't done that this year and these folks really need it. Those are the arguments that Senator DeCamp offered and that is why we are fighting this issue on the floor today. You see, the real issue here is whether we are going to restore, as I indicated earlier, this bill to its original form, to where our tax law was before the Tennessee court decision which made the Lancaster court reconsider and suggest that maybe we ought to clarify things. It has been my argument all along and it will be my argument again that we want to do favors for somebody, we ought to at least make them hire a lobbyist from the "get go". You ought to at least make them hire a lobbyist and go to their committee hearing and make the arguments to the committee hearing. None of that was done in this regard. None of that was done. It was only later that they decided to hire the lobbyist and thereby win this great tax windfall for themselves in the legislative process. At the very least we have a responsibility to restore to what it was and force them, at least, one more good year's salary for those people in the hall that are trying to win this exemption for that special interest group. We've got to