

the fact that Gage County had a windfall, if you will, for many, many years by having that tax on the rolls and then when it was gone we were supposed to run in and bail it out. As you look at the property tax increases across the state that was published in the World-Herald, and immediately that leads to a question of accuracy, but the way they were listed here you can see there's quite a deviance from one end of the state to the other, from county to county to county, even in my legislative district I have counties that will have as much as a 10 percent loss and also counties that have as little as a 2.8 percent loss of that revenue. But yet, as we're going through these taxing schemes, we're going to be taxing people all across the state in order to divvy up and redistribute those people who won't have a loss, but you have to remember those people who don't have a loss also never had the benefit all those years of having these various personal property on their rolls. And so there's a question of fairness there and I do think that we ought to maybe spend a little bit more time debating the proper scheme for distribution and maybe for the short-term situation this, again, is all we can do because we have got to hold together, given the time constraints that we're under, but I do think that some of this debate shouldn't be dedicated solely to where we raise the money but also in terms of what's fair in terms of the distribution with respect to raising it and then redistributing it. Under Senator Hall's plan, like I say, it's simply a redistribution on a dollar for dollar basis for replacement of the personal property tax that these people are losing due to the court case. Under mine, like I said, it was the homestead exemption so that every...every homeowner in the State of Nebraska would get that particular benefit and, therefore, then should not have a great deal of impact with respect to what this would be. I think at a \$5,000 homestead exemption base it would typically take care of, for the homeowner, typically a \$60,000 home would probably be held harmless with respect to the tax raises across the state. People in more expensive homes wouldn't be held quite as harmless. People who were in very heavily hit areas by virtue of loss of personal property taxes might not be held harmless by virtue of how high those tax rates would go up. By the same token, they would be a full distribution across the state. They would also be maybe a little fairer had we used this technique to be in a situation where we are not having individuals who didn't have the benefit of those properties over all those years now having to pick up the tab for those who did. So, again, like I say, I will be withdrawing this amendment but, hopefully, in...in all of the emotional pressure that goes with this issue,