

that have happened on the floor here. It's essentially the same, but it does increase the surcharge because the motor vehicles were taken out of the bill.

SPEAKER BAACK: Is there any objection? If not, so ordered. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment...you have...you have...on your desk, you have an explanation of this amendment. If you would care to look at the explanation on your desk, it tells what this amendment does. The main thing it does here is remove the tax on energy. This is the most objectionable part of the amendment by Senator Hall, in my opinion. It removes the tax on energy, and it increases the depreciation surcharge, and then you will see there are some other methods of raising funds included there. It retains the retail collection fee in the Governor's proposal, \$7 million. It would reinstitute the sales tax on access charges to long distance telephone carriers, which would raise about \$6.1 million, expand the definition of telecommunication services to include data and one-way, \$1.5 million; remove the sales tax exemption for repair parts on common contract carriers, 12.5 million. And then this is not in the amendment, but some people have estimated that there would be somewhere between 2 and 4 million dollars generated by the fact that businesses would not be able to deduct their property tax on business equipment. So they would be paying more income tax. So, if you add all those up, you get 87.1 million. Now, you know, I don't know if you like that list, if you have a better list, I'd certainly be willing to talk about it, but the main purpose of this is to find some manner in which we can remove the sales tax on energy, and the big number there that we are using, the 56 million, comes from the depreciation surcharge. Now I also have problems with that, but I am willing, I am willing to accept that 2 percent depreciation surcharge if we can get rid of the energy tax. And those other things that are in there, you know, I don't have a strong feeling one way or the other about them except I was looking for a method of coming up with the money we need. So that is the purpose of the amendment. I feel very strongly about removing the sales tax on energy because that would increase cost of agriculture and industry dramatically. I don't think it is...also, agriculture picks up more than its fair share of that energy cost or that tax on energy. So that is why I feel very strongly about it. Now the motion that was just defeated, I will be supportive of