

to make 1063 pure, there are a lot of things you're going to have to do to that to make it work, too. It is that simple. I oppose the amendment because of what it does. It...it...it...yes, it brings \$71 million, with the last amendment I think that number is actually going to be high, because when you exempt real property out it will not be that dollar amount, to tell you the truth. But that's what we don't know when we draft these amendments on the floor. But the fact is if you want to put some regressivity into 1120, this is the amendment that will do that. If you want to try and keep the attempt to make it progressive, try and keep the attempt to capture some of the replacement revenue from people not just centrally assessed, it includes centrally assessed in that avenue, yes. And it does make centrally assessed pay. If you adopt an amendment like this it would...it will certainly take a bigger chunk, now we're saying about \$17 million from agriculture is our quickest figure, additional money is what it's going to do. So that's what the amendment does. Obviously, as I've said time and time again, my preference has always been straight sales and income tax. I continue to say that. But once again if there's not the votes for that I certainly believe some sort of depreciation add-back (inaudible) is something I'm certainly willing to try to garner the votes in this body. And I certainly like the fact that one of the reasons you do that is to try and keep some progressivity until we get that replacement revenue. This amendment loads it on to the little, small businesses, loads it onto agriculture. If that is the desire, that's the amendment to vote for. And if the argument of the 4-R Act, as we mentioned, to date there's been no 4-R Act on income tax that's ever been won. That's never happened, it has been on the property tax side. Is this subject to a lawsuit? It probably may be, but certainly no more so, and I would argue certainly better arguments than 1063 in its present form, if that's the red herring we want to drag across. So I rise to oppose the amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Schmit, you're next.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members, when we debate this amendment, when we debate the bill, and we debate every other bill that addresses the revenue questions of the State of Nebraska, no one wants to admit that the battle was really lost as to whether or not we have a progressive or regressive tax structure in Nebraska five years ago. Our leader at that time,