

not a completely accurate to say we're just doing away with townships. The second part is that when the only tax base in this state was a property tax the counties, the townships and the cities wanted to make sure that they had some way to protect their base. And so since that was the only tax in town, that was the best protection they could ever put in that constitution to protect themselves. Times have changed because now we found that the property tax doesn't grow as quickly as our sales and income taxes, that's what this whole debate is going to turn out to be at some point in time is that they were left with the less fast growing or expanding base for taxation. And so now cities and towns, school districts are going to look for other general sources of revenue. And so as they've begun over the last 20, 30 years to look for other tax bases and other sources of revenue to operate their operations, there's less of a tie and there's less of a desire, even on their part, to the property tax base that's put here in terms of if you're going to raise money on motor vehicles it's got to go back and proportionate to your levy. So by eliminating this, you're going to give more flexibility to determine things like equalization. So if...let's take, for example, we do have levy limitations coming up, and for some communities we treat them differently. If you think that I've got a mid or smaller community and they're going to lose more levy by us putting in a restriction, how do we make up some of that revenue? Motor vehicles is one of the easier ways to do that because it's already in effect a property tax base now. What's important about this is that we don't take this motor vehicle fee and make it a state General Fund revenue. We still provide and protect the integrity, but that is going to go to counties, cities, villages, and school districts. That's what's important about it, you're going to protect the tax base to those entities. What you're going to change is the ability to return it to some districts and not to others. So, for example, if you have a community who, because of a levy limit, may lose some money, you can then fashion this formula and replace it for them and treat them and help them out, pull them up. Another community that doesn't get hit as hard by levy limitations may not need this money. And so it's a good regulator, it's an easy one to do, and I think it will give us the flexibility. The policy choice we keep is we're going to make sure that money goes to the counties, cities, and villages, and school districts, we're just not going to tie our hands. It has to go back to a proportion of the old levy. And that's probably an arcane provision, one that I think we'll find