

mechanism that I put into it, so that we don't take that money away from the counties, is just arbitrarily saying that the counties were supposed to bear one-third of that 80 percent refund. If they were supposed to bear the cost of one-third of that 80 percent refund, we'll simply work out an allocation, and that's the money that we'll take away from them. Further, we'll take it away from them on a county specific basis. So, if someone in your county lists a piece of personal property that is eligible for the sales tax refund, we will, at the state level, cost that against you. We'll take 80 percent of the sales tax, divide that by 3, and deduct that from your share of the state aid fund. So it goes...the cost would then go specifically to the county where the property is assessed, where they get the benefit of the valuation, and they will get the detriment of the sales tax refund, or at least one-third of it. Now, this works on the downside. And to be quite honest with you, I did not include the up side, because that's the way the bill is now. The maximum, as the bill stands now, that we would take away from the counties is 3.5 million. So, that's the maximum that's in the amendment. The most we would take away is 3.5 million. If we have sales that are 15 million, for example, then the 3.5 million that we'd take away from the counties is not enough, if you're going to continue the one-third ratio. But it isn't enough under the bill as it now stands. That excess, if we had \$15 million sales, would have to be made up from other sources. But I will reiterate, that's where it would be made up now. We are presently, as the bill now stands, capped at \$3.5 million, so I wouldn't change that. The fundamental principle of this is that I do not believe we should take money away from the counties when they have not gotten the benefit of an increase in their tax base, and really it would hurt in the years when there was the lowest levels of economic activity. Let's say you only had \$9 million, statewide, of sales of farm machinery and equipment. I would speculate that those are the years when farmers and ranchers are probably not doing too well, economically. In those years, to take away \$3.5 million worth of county aid means that they will have higher taxes. I do not see that we should put in place a principle that says in tax years when you're already in trouble we have a state policy that we're going to take away more money and we're going to arbitrarily increase your taxes. That's the gist of the amendment. I'm sorry you haven't had time to fully examine it. The concept is maybe a little bit more complex than what you want to digest in a moment, but, quite frankly, that's all the time we have. I wanted to bring the amendment at this