

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise to support Senator Hall's plan. I think here we have something that's simple that can be explained to the people. Now some of you are not going to like number 3 and 4 on here which provides for the state funding of community colleges and also provides the money to do that. However, there is no reason that the one and two part of Senator Hall's explanation could not stand alone. I think we should seriously look at this. Now this is going to make the constitutional amendment easy sell. This is going to make the constitutional amendment easy to sell. There has to be a constitutional amendment, no doubt about it, but when you go to the public with a constitutional amendment which provides for an increase in the sales tax and the income tax or either one of those separately, you're going to have a problem. Here I think you can tell the people the only thing we're doing is doing what we've been doing before last year. All we're doing with a constitutional amendment is make it possible, make it legal, make it constitutional to do what we were doing before 1991. That's absolutely all we're doing with Senator Hall's amendment. I think you should look at it. I don't think very many people here are listening to what is going on. We've had amendment after amendment after amendment. Some have been serious, some have not been so serious but here is a time to look at this amendment that Senator Hall has and I'm particularly talking to my agricultural colleagues on the floor. This is doing what we've been doing, what we thought was proper tax policy for many, many years, nothing wrong with it. The only thing is the court didn't like it so we changed the Constitution to make it constitutional. It was, we thought and I think most of the people in the state thought, proper tax policy previous to 1991 and I think they will still think it's proper tax policy. All Senator Hall is basically doing is saying, yes, we're going to change the Constitution to let us do what we thought was proper tax policy before 1991. That's all it does. It's very simple. I don't know why we haven't been just discussing this before. I don't know what the...if there's a hole in it, I would like somebody to come forward. I don't know what that hole is. Admittedly, we have not seen this in detail, we have not seen the actual amendment. Admittedly, it has come upon us here as rather a surprise, a Tim Hall surprise, another Tim Hall surprise, but this I think happens to be a good Tim Hall surprise. At least it bears scrutiny, it is worth the scrutiny of the body which I don't think we're getting at this point. As I mentioned before, if you don't like number 3 and 4