

now that we made the policy to reimpose the personal property to repeal the sales tax, let's do it directly. And, I mean, it makes much more sense to do that. It's a directer way of doing it. Actually, there was a concern raised in the committee hearing, yesterday I guess it was, by...or two days ago I guess it was, by Senator Warner about the concern about the liability of a seller making a determination of was that, or was that not going to be used for agriculture purposes. In talking with the Department of Revenue, and I'm not saying if they have to (inaudible) why don't they support the amendment, but in speaking with the Department of Revenue they felt the way to get around that was to, and that's why we changed the amendment, to allow the Department of Revenue to create rules and regulations. And it is their thought what they would do is they would have a triplicate form that the implement dealer would have, the triplicate form that you, the buyer, would fill out saying I am a farmer, I qualify for the sales tax exemption. The farmer keeps a copy of it, the seller keeps a copy of it. The seller sends that to the State Department of Revenue, and then that is the reporting requirement that, one, now the state knows where the personal property is; but, two, by doing it that way supposedly you could protect the seller from liability there that was raised the other day. At least in the Department of Revenue's eyes that should work, that will solve the problem. Now the reason somebody argued why not do this next year. You can do it next year, but the fact is if you do it next year you probably really can't make it go into effect until January 1, '94. So, I mean, if you're going to do it, it already is the policy. I'm not arguing...and I think it is within the call, because it's just implementing legislation that we already passed. But it's changing how to implement it. But by waiting until January, you probably have to wait until January 1, '94. Then all the problems of farmers, you know, having to pay sizeable sales tax and losing that money for a good deal of time, if you adopt Senator Coordsen's amendment you'd solve the problem of the personal property tax side, but you still would be...the state would still be paying implement dealers to collect the tax that we would pay in full, and it just doesn't make sense. I think many members of the ag community that aren't exactly happy with the whole of LB 1063 and LB 1, this would be one way to make some little more sense on the sales tax provision. I think the body would be wise to adopt this amendment. I offer it in good faith, and I offer it to actually help the administration and supporters of LB 1063 implement their bill. I think, in a way, it makes a whole lot more sense.