

eleven-twelfths of the property tax he paid since this vehicle was in his possession only one month of the 12 months of the year. So we would have to have this refund provision back to the dealer to alleviate the double taxation problem. I don't like that too well and one of the reasons I don't like it is because other dealers don't get that sort of refund. You have a farm equipment dealer that has a tractor on the lot January 1, he pays the tax. And then I come in on February 1st and buy this tractor, the dealer does not get any refund, he pays what is the, essentially the property tax for the full 12 months but he doesn't get any refund because, of course, I don't have to pay the tax because the farm tractor will not be taxed until it's in my possession on January 1st the following year. So there's no problem of double taxation. However, that dealer still has that problem because he has paid that tax for the full year. And so he is in a different position than the automobile dealer. So, under my proposal, I am suggesting that, number one, the dealer pays the property tax on the auto because it's in his possession on January 1st, just as Senator Warner has in his, but, number two, this is where it differs, the purchaser, the person that comes in and buys that car on February 1st would pay no property tax on this car because it has...the tax has already been paid by the dealer for that calendar year. So, instead of having a refund, the buyer of the car just doesn't pay the tax, so the dealer does not get a refund, just as the farm equipment dealer does not get a refund on the tractor he sells. It puts those dealers in the same sort of situation. Now, the advantages of the method I am suggesting are, number one, well, there's no necessity for a refund since you don't have double taxation in the first place, and, number two, the automobile dealer is treated exactly like the farm equipment dealer or business equipment dealer or any other dealer, so they're all the...all...or it all works out the same for all of those dealers. Now what do I see as the main disadvantage of Senator Warner's method? And that is automobile dealers are less negatively affected than other dealers if inventories are placed back on the tax roll. You see, that automobile dealer isn't going to have the problem that the other dealers are going to have because he's going to get the rebate under Senator Warner's plan. He's going to get the rebate when the customer pays the tax later in the year when the automobile is sold. So that's why I'm suggesting that this amendment be adopted. We do away with the refund and...and treat the automobile dealers just as all other dealers are treated. Sounds fair and equitable to me. I would like to hear...I have tried...tried this out on a