

additional money out to make it balance or we...or maybe there's some A bills that we can't pass yet but the way it sits right now there is still the \$13 million...up to a \$13 million cash flow problem for this biennium. Now if nothing else happens today, another amendment I may want to introduce here is an amendment that would, on a pro-rata basis, that if this doesn't happen, if nothing happens to solve the cash flow problem, at the very least we would give the Governor some ability to either veto things we have spent money on or veto this down to a level that it does cash flow for the biennium. But, nevertheless, the amendment that I'm bringing here is the same amendment you've seen before that changes the income tax rate. I think it's, as I said in March and even in April, it was always my intention that we should try to recreate as close to as possible the status quo, that by being...trying to go back in and tax the people that are getting the benefit from exempting personal property. And the body, and particularly Senator Hall, has made some great efforts to do that and I think with the bill, as it stood on Final Reading and even with the Hall amendment now passed, I would certainly argue that those amendments do a better job of recreating who is taxed as opposed to this amendment but both of those have a problem with implementation as well as the cash flow problem I have already discussed. Now this amendment, once again does, if you look in the back, it will cash flow better for this biennium and actually there is some additional money collected in the next biennium that I don't know if you want to...it's \$6 million more than you actually need that actually comes in the next biennium. It's not my intent to collect more than we have to but unless you want to even decrease the depreciation surcharge even more, that money is there and, certainly, I don't know...it's not my intent to overtax people and that may be something else we need to deal with but that would be the next biennium as far as revenue coming in and we have to deal with it. I guess my concern is this biennium and developing a replacement revenue stream for the lost personal property tax that brings in adequate cash to pay the bill dollar for dollar for the subdivisions this biennium. And this amendment does. Obviously, the bitter pill to swallow is that it avoids the corporation surcharge, the corporation tax, the variety of items that have been attempted to try and tax the very people that are exempted. And I guess I have become more and more convinced you can't do that without developing a whole variety of new taxes that, indeed, may or may not be temporary and you can't do that, at least today we've not found a way to do that, where you can do it and generate enough