

either in this amendment, but I will have amendments filed, there may be others up there, I don't know, that will reestablish, Senator Schmit, the guideline of the manual or it will permit the use of a depreciation schedule by business equipment and by agriculture for equipment just so they both are the same. One of the constant complaints back in the...when we had the personal property tax was that some people used depreciation schedules, other people had to use the manual, and there was an inherent inequity no matter how you looked at it. This will provide that they will be both done the same. In the case of livestock, then there will be a manual, in this case to be developed by the Department of Revenue, Tax Commissioner. Back in those days, you recall if I remember correctly, it was committees of assessors who developed those manuals. They were guidelines. They were not mandated to use. You could use something else for the value of equipment if you chose to do so. But if you did, you had to have some basis, some way to substantiate the value that you put down on a piece of equipment was, in fact, a fair and full value for that property. I also will have amendments which, if somebody wants to check, it may or may not be within the call, I don't know, but I have amendments which, when they get here, will exempt business equipment and farm equipment, new and used, from sales tax. It will not exempt parts or repairs, but it does new equipment. The reason for that is solely going to be the basis of the Syracuse study, which indicated, and there will be a sheet handed out that summarizes those recommendations in this area, that it was grossly poor tax policy to impose a sales tax on those items, and that Syracuse, strangely enough, recommended an ad valorem tax, which, again, I would never agree with but, nevertheless, it does point out that you shouldn't have both. That will not take effect until July of 1992. It also repeals the governmental subdivision fund which was established when the personal property tax went off as a means of reimbursing local government for the loss of revenue, and has been pointed out on the floor, and by others,...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...otherwise, that those funds were never appropriated at a level that fully reimbursed local government, hence the shift to the balance of real property. But, nevertheless, there is no reason to continue that governmental subdivision fund if all this personal property tax is to go back on the floor, and that will in part, although not totally, make