

SENATOR WARNER: It is envisioned that it would be considered in the year 2001. It is my assumption it would be extended, if approved, for at least another 10 years maximum.

SENATOR BEUTLER: For a maximum of another 10 years. And would you have to put in that legislation that it is hereby extended for 10 years, or would it be just for...or would that be assumed if nothing were said?

SENATOR WARNER: I believe the Consti ..I believe the way this is written, it would be self-executing that the statutes that dealt with those exemptions, by the very fact of every January 1, 2002, 2012, 2022, on down the line, they would all automatically had to have been extended in the previous session.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so if we enacted an exemption in the year 2010, no matter what we said in the legislation, it would come to an end in the year 2012, is that correct?

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. And if we enacted an exemption in the year 2010 that we said was going to extend to the year 2022, we could not do that? It would automatically come to an end at the year 2012, is that correct?

SENATOR WARNER: That was my assumption, yes. But the purpose, if I could expand, is not to spread out review 10 years from enactment, but rather that you are looking at a total tax policy dealing with exemptions; that if it is done piecemeal, the odds of something happening is pretty slim.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, so all the renewing would be done in the legislative session preceding the termination date of that set of exemptions?

SENATOR WARNER: Obviously, it doesn't specifically state that, but that certainly would be the intent of how it should be reviewed. For one reason, we could fall back on the argument of one legislature not binding another, you would have...but as a practical matter, I think it would have to take effect in the 2001 session, and every 10 years after that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Well, let me think about that a little bit. I think I support the amendment. I certainly like the