

don't have time to distribute those. I know this is not the first time an amendment has been offered and debated without having a copy of that on each individual's desk. I can tell you the handout that you have that says AM3117 to the committee amendments is an accurate representation of what the committee does. It's exactly, what the amendment does, excuse me. What it would do is strike the provisions in Senator Moore's amendment that were adopted. It would reenact the personal property tax system as it existed in 1990 and past and that is laid out for you in (a) through (e) there under number 2. In the third section, what it does is it would say we're going to remove an exemption as it relates to sales tax on repairs, period, for \$9 million. We're going to say that, you know, we think that as a component of this amendment, as a component of this process we're going to say that, yeah, we ought to be looking at these types of exemptions and why shouldn't repairs be in there to the point of \$9 million. And then we take the add-back that is currently in the bill and we leave it there, as it was amended both by Senator Horgan and Senator Kristensen so it would raise approximately \$27 million. And the collection fee which is also in the bill would remain. So the changes that the amendment make, or that they strike the Moore amendment, they reenact the old property tax system and they put in place the repair of personal property with regard to, other than motor vehicles, for not only individuals which is a very small portion of that, but ag which is roughly half of that \$9 million and business. So, you know, those who have argued that we need to change our system, I guess I would say why? If the system was good and I haven't heard any arguments other than the constitutional aspect, and Senator Schellepeper's question about the constitutionality of this amendment as opposed to any amendment on property taxes, taxation of personal property is a good one because none of them are constitutional right now, none of them are. And I guess if disruption or the least amount of disruption is the argument on behalf of the 3-R proposal, then this amendment is even a more in that direction because it retains the aspect of the old system with regard to the self-assessed business equipment approach to personal property. It does include a sales tax exemption that other proposals have included as they related to LB 1120 but to a very small extent, \$9 million across our entire economy. Everybody shares in that. They need to. For a constitutional amendment to be successful, every sector of the economy has to be included. And then we take and use the balance of that money to pick up a cost, the community colleges that are right now paid for by real estate