

And that only makes sense, since all we're talking about here is property that's being depreciated, putting a surcharge on that property. This is a completely logical amendment. I can see no reason to oppose this amendment for anyone here. What it would do, in effect, is allow us to have a lower rate of the surtax that we're putting on depreciated property, because it would broaden that base, basically, by bringing in a little more property when you use the property only formula. And, as Senator Hill explained, it would put a little more of the burden on larger entities that have more property in the State of Nebraska, a little less burden on smaller entities that don't have quite as much property and, therefore, I think it's probably more fair than the approach that is in the original amendment. I would urge your support for this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Hillman, did you wish to address this?

SENATOR HILLMAN: I just have a question for Senator Will.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Will, would you respond, please.

SENATOR WILL: Certainly.

SENATOR HILLMAN: What would be the difference in the fiscal impact with this change? You have a certain amount projected here, as it stands, would it lower it, raise it?

SENATOR WILL: As I understand the way the amendment's been drafted it would be a wash, because while the total amount of property that's being depreciated, that amount would increase, we're decreasing the rate from 1.75 percent to 1.60 percent. And, if my understanding is correct, that would be a net wash, it would not change the fiscal impact.

SENATOR HILLMAN: Okay, thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Hillman. Seeing no other lights, Senator Hall, do you wish to close?

SENATOR HALL: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. Again, I'd echo Senator Will's comments with regard to responding to the question of Senator Hillman. It is a reduction in terms of the rate, that there is no increase in terms of the amount of