

wouldn't...and I really believe that using the depreciation type schedules is a false way to look at raising money. And it only points out how unfair and how unjust and how uneven the application of property taxes in this manner would be and how depressing that would be for any individual that wanted to try to enter one of these businesses at this time, a cabinetry business, a metal shop, the welders and the acetylene torches. You people that have ever had acetylene torches know that you can have one for 30 years and it works just as well today as it did 30 years ago. Wouldn't be taxed. It just doesn't make sense to try to put a tax of this manner on personal property, therefore, I would certainly help support and advance and amend 1063 if the Hall amendment's adopted.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Elmer. Senator Warner, you're next.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I've been...been listening to the discussion. I'd rise to oppose the amendment. Unless I'm misreading it, at least looking at the numbers, and if I'm misreading it, I would hope Senator Hall would correct me, but as I read the amendment we are imposing 90 million of new taxes to be utilized to provide a 10,000 dollar homestead exemption and, in the process, we will be exempting roughly the 100 million. We talk about business equipment and the other personal property that has been the issue all along and that 100 million then, as I would understand it, is shifted to real property 'cause it's not being replaced. You would argue then that, and those of you in agriculture who are speaking in behalf of this, I guess you are probably willing to accept an increase in agricultural real estate which, on a statewide basis, the number that usually is used is agricultural-based, 30 percent of the property tax base, that agricultural then would have \$30 million of...or 30 percent of that 100 million, which is \$30 million of additional property tax less any amount that they might be...receive because of a homestead exemption, which would be some reduction. But as I would read the proposed amendment, those of you who are addressing this agricultural impact, you probably are adding somewhere between 20 and 25 million of real estate taxes plus whatever additional sales taxes that might be applied to agricultural production. If that's what you want to do, of course, why that's certainly the result of it, at least as I read the proposal. I don't think this is a good solution for agriculture. It will be a significantly higher cost to agriculture than any of the other proposals I believe that we