

that respect Senator Coordsen is correct. There are a number of taxpayers who have paid that, and who...they paid it under a different system for a different year. They would be credited for that amount against their '92 tax bill, if LB 1 is passed and the surcharge is a component of it. There may be individuals who bought equipment that would be depreciable in 1992 tax year that would now become subject to the tax. They would make that decision prior to knowing what the status of the tax rate would be. That could be held true for proposals such as LB 5, in terms of what the income tax would be for 1992. There are a myriad of different options out there, and you try to make decisions the best you can knowing as much about what the future will hold or what the present tells you when you make business decisions, but we can't always predict what is going to happen. And we hope we get it as close as possible, but who knows. You know, if you remember the words of Senator Moore, when we started the year we were about 15 to \$17 million to the good in terms of the General Fund, in the black. Now we are far from that and it has only been...it was at that time about nine short months later when we were in here in special session cutting \$100 million out of the budget. Senator Coordsen's amendment takes \$50 million out of LB 1, and it strikes the principal funding source of the proposal, the surcharge on depreciation as it applies across the board, and I would argue that we cannot afford it, frankly, and that's really all there is to argue about it that we just flat out cannot afford it. I am starting to feel a little bit like I should sit on Appropriations, but not that much. I guess, you know, it does, and I do appreciate Senator Coordsen bringing it up in this fashion because it does strike at the heart of the issue for a number of people and I look forward to seeing what the vote and how it shakes out, but I would clearly ask you to think about what the long-term affects of pulling this funding mechanism out of the bill means. I am dusting off amendments right now for sales tax on services, as much as I hate to do that, but those are the kinds of thing we are going to have to look at, and if you remember when we had debate a couple of years ago, those were the kinds of options that were put in place to make up revenue holes, revenue shortfalls when things were added and subtracted from bills at that time. So this is the direction we are headed, ladies and gentlemen, looking at other options to plug that \$97 million hole that we have got to fill. I, again, would urge you to think long and hard about the Coordsen amendment and I would urge you to oppose it. Thank you.