

we're going to deal with personal property on a long-term basis. I guess I would argue that this amendment in my mind should not be a long-term approach. We should always have the ability, because that argument says that in order to ask the people to vote on a constitutional amendment we're going to lock ourselves into this type of taxing system, and I don't buy that. I think we ought to review our tax system from time to time when we see it has problems, it has faults, so maybe it's long term for the near future, but it clearly ought to be something that is examined over a period of years from time to time when necessary. So I don't buy that argument that you have to give the people something that they are going to vote up or down because what that implies is that there is a promise on the part of the Legislature that we're never going to come back and look at this issue. We're never going to come back because you voted this constitutional amendment into place, and I guess if that were the case, that runs afoul of what 3-R does because of the changes in the Constitution and then the ultimate exemptions of certain types of personal property in subsequent years. Here's what the amendment does. It goes back to the old system. It says, hey, let's tax business equipment like we did before. Let's let it flow back to the local subdivision. If we can change the Constitution to allow us to handle personal property in any way we want to, let's go ahead and do it the old way. Let's use the old system, fewest amount of effects, nobody gets hurt, nobody gets helped to any great extent and things go on as they do, but we've still got that problem of taxing those centrally assessed folks and we still got a problem with underreporting and we still have a problem with potential impact on residential homeowners. So what else does the proposal do? It leaves in place the depreciation add-back as it was in the bill. The depreciation add-back after it had been amended and real estate had been taken out for fear that commercial real estate was going to go to hell in a handbag in Nebraska for some reason if that were in place, but that comes out. Okay? As it sits right now except for one thing, we reduce that threshold from 100,000 in the committee amendments down to 50. And that raises \$33.5 million so you've got your \$100 million in personal property under the old system with business equipment on. You've got 33 million in the add-back and then you've got the retailers collection fee which warms the cockles of Senator Rasmussen's heart for 6.7 million to allow for the amount to be approximately 40...a little over \$40 million and then we take over the community colleges. One of the other things that was talked about time in and time out at the 3-R meetings that were