

under \$2.02, then whether or not the refund would be equal to the increase in depreciable personal property tax with a seven-year depreciation schedule which would be generally what farm equipment would have, if you were under \$2, if you recognize the fact that you would have the use of the money over the period of life of that depreciation in which there would be some interest based on the refund, then maybe a slight increase that agricultural would be paying but it would not be appreciable. If you are borrowing the money, obviously, at the end of the year or, excuse me, when you got the refund, that could be applied to a note reduction and that, too, then would reduce the interest that one would be paying on the note and would help make up that difference of the 1 percent. I should comment on the amendment to the amendment as raised by Senator Moore. Obviously, I could go the route of trying to have 1063 amendment adopted and then offer this to the bill, which would then be subject to amendments. Frankly, as was pointed out with the amendment before is we have got to balance revenue and receipts, and if this balance of revenue and receipts for the General Fund is not acceptable, then another alternative can be used. But the body is entitled to know, when you vote for an exemption, how the revenue is going to be replaced. You cannot make those two separate, distinct decisions. Well, you can but the hazard is much greater, so I think it should be considered in total and not separately. The amendment for reduction in the dealers collection fee, merchants collection fee, some, I am sure, would have some concern about that. It is attempted to be somewhat progressive in that the full 2 1/2 percent, at least on the first 1,000, and then compare it to the current 3 percent on the first 5,000 is there, but it does give the smaller merchant a little help in a higher collection fee, at least from those that are smaller. It is not inconsistent with the policy we have now where the percentage is less over 5,000, it is just the dollar amount, of course, is less. And the tax on energy, again, is one that is a, in effect, is a sales tax at 1 1/4 percent instead of five, and it applies to the energy that is not otherwise taxed by excise tax for production agriculture only. It does not affect food processing or other energy use. It merely is applicable to production agriculture, and the reason again is what has been said even in response to the previous amendment we were discussing that the make-up funds would need to come at least substantially from agriculture for reduction in revenue by the exemption, not from some other source. The refund on the...rather, the change in the aid to counties and is proportionate to where the increased valuation