

offsetting the \$95 million we need to raise to reimburse the counties. This is just repeal the personal property tax on autos that all that personal property tax goes to the counties, you've got to replace it. The fee schedule is the way to replace it. Unfortunately, the way the fee schedule is structured, it raises more than the personal property. That additional money that it raises stays in that county, is not figured into the formula for reimbursement.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Oh, okay, thank you. I didn't understand that. Okay. Well, I rise to support the amendment at this time. I, too, think long term we ought to probably look at this and it's worthy of a study and probably a public hearing on this issue itself come next January. But, at this stage, I think we ought to continue on the format that we're using for taxing vehicles and take a little more time and effort to study this. I, as...repeating, I think long term it probably behooves us to look at this area and to come out with a realistic schedule of values on these vehicles so that it's perceived, at least, to be more fair. But, at this time, I think we might be rushing it too fast to make these changes. So, at this time, I will support Senator Hall's amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, and members of the Legislature, this is...like everyone else, this, I suspect, will be true throughout the day. There's a whole series of policy alternatives that have things we like and do not like and it's hard to sort it out. The first thought that occurs to me is that, well, this raises, as I understand it, additional 15 million that you could look at two different ways. One is that you could...well, it's not in the Governor's plan, you could offset the 90 million that's proposed to be made up. That drops that to 75. That may have some attraction. Or you can deal with it as I believe it would be in the bill itself in which it becomes additional revenue in the amount of 15 million for local governments but then you put in the lid provision and you could argue that's 15 million of property tax relief, real property, and you shift it to motor vehicles. Well, there may be some merit to that. Certainly, the concept of fees, as I understand, it's not all that unusual in other states, and may have...may have some appropriate aspects to it as far as public policy since a number of states currently do do that. The other thing that strikes me, interestingly as I hear this discussed