

amendment, however, I have a lot of concern about mixing in exemptions again with the same legislation that is dealing with revenue to fill a gap. Part of the problems with past legislation is that you had two issues mixed up and the court tied them together as one. I would argue whether or not they were but nevertheless that's how it came out. I think it would be most unwise to do that again. And if you throw out what we have in the form of personal property tax, we go back to what we had and will add instead of '90 and '91 personal property tax for the assessors to go out and look, they'll be doing '92 as well. Now I don't treat this all that lightly. Again, I repeat, from my viewpoint, what we need desperately to do is to get a test case as to what we now have on the books for personal property sent through the Supreme Court and make sure that what we have will stand, that we have stability at least at that point before we start doctoring it up with other exemptions, some of which I may personally like but I do not believe that the right policy can be followed at this time for the state to add those at this point. So I would urge that we reject the amendment, that we keep this a clean bill as a revenue bill to help fill the gap in part caused by a court decision requiring some refunds and maintain a system that will be uniform as to the type of tax that is being used, apply it at a uniform rate to all those that are subject, in this case it's the surcharge on depreciation that we are specifically talking about, along with the other charges, and leave some of these other concerns that we...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...the body has or some members of the body have to another time which would be more appropriately done after we have had a Supreme Court decision accepting the state policy we now have in existence.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Warner. Senator Lamb.

SENATOR LAMB: Thank you, Madam Chair, and members. Maybe I misunderstood but I thought Senator Hall stated that if the livestock exemption was passed, it would reduce the state revenues by \$5 million. If I'm incorrect on that, Senator Hall, I think that statement was in error in that the livestock, breeding stock exemption would shift the tax within the subdivisions to the tune of \$5 million and that the state tax collection would be affected very, very...by a very, very small