

This concept was worked out. One of the things that's been disappointing to me is that some people have described this as a tax on the employee, which obviously it is not. It is a method of identifying a collection of revenue to make up for the loss because of the exemptions. It has some relationship to the fact that there is some amount of personal property that is probably involved in every occupation. The response I would have to those if someone says that somehow or other this is going to impact employees, or reduce their salaries, or be tacked on, I will...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR WARNER: ...acknowledge that argument has truth, as soon as somebody can show me one firm in this state when we exempted personal property tax that sent a notice saying, hey, employees, we just had our tax on personal property reduced, and we are now increasing your hourly pay by I'll say a cent an hour, and I'll bet there will be none. We know there are none. It was a source to try to share the cost industrywide by all those who had benefitted. And I thought the distribution as it came out was reasonably equitable. The fault with it, and this fault is going to be with any tax that we adopt before we get done, and the fault is that whatever we do in the short-run is going to have a very high percentage of also being the long term, generally because it's in existence. And you could argue that any new tax, whether it's...

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR WARNER: ...whatever we propose, that ingredient is there. But it is an option that spreads this cost across all of the industries.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Warner. Mr. Clerk, an amendment to the amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Wickersham would move to amend Senator Hail's amendment. (Wickersham amendment appears on page 2441 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment was passed out. It is AM2083. I'm not going to characterize this