than land, in other words, classification type, soil types, those things are not the same on a car. When the committee looked at this, and I think there was a number of us who thought at least at some portion in time we could use these funds for motor vehicles because we could tax them differently as a fee that we had some discretion on where to put those fees and how to use them. It turns out we do not. The constitution kept that provision in there that you have to give them back to the cities, counties, and schools and the other subdivisions proportionately to what they use and they have for valuation in the county. As we do levy limits, as we do spending limitation, and as we try to do some restructuring, you're going to have small communities, you're going to have maybe some larger ones, but you're going to have communities who are going to get hit on these levy limits and you're going to need some way to make up the difference. This is one of those ways that you can get the flexibility to make up the difference. The key is we wanted to make sure that this money didn't go to the state and get used for General Funds. We want to make sure that the motor vehicle fees still remain with counties, cities, villages, and school districts. So that's the reason those entities are still left in the bill. All we changed was that they had to be in proportion to the total levy. And it's a good flexibility tool. Quite frankly, if we don't do anything, in later legislation it's probably going to go right back in proportionate because that's the way our statutes stand right now. But I think to take that language out of the constitution is good. It allows the Legislature more flexibility in what to do with that money. We can't give it to ourselves. It's still going to go back to those subdivisions and it's going to give us some mechanism, some other way of equalizing and making up to people who may get hit with levy limits. We may decide if we have a crisis or we have to do a shift some day you're going to wish you had these fees and that you could change them in certain ways. Particularly if some of the petitions come through, you're going to need a way to address this problem. So I...Senator Bernard-Stevens, I don't know if you're listening to this but that is the reason and I would oppose the Bernard-Stevens amendment. I think it gives us a good tool and it's one that as we put in and take away those different provisions, this is a major part if you're going to do some of these other levy limits in making other people whole. And it's very important to do, would urge that we defeat that amendment.