

things, and there's always something we don't like. But it isn't my favorite person in the lobby. It's just because I worked for so many nonprofits, and with the schools and universities, that's what I was concerned about on that particular thing. So I thank you for bringing the services thing. I think probably I'll vote for it, and then I'll see how many lawyers, and accountants, and architects, and everybody call me. Okay. Thank you. ...won't.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Crosby. The next speaker is Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, we're operating... Well, let me say first that there is not going to be a single proposal that we consider that I wouldn't like to vote no... but what I would like to vote no. And I don't think I'm any different than any of the other 49 of you, other 48 rather. (Laughter.) New math. And we're operating as a committee as a whole, which is a very difficult process also. I keep thinking back to the concept that I heard when this issue first came up. And the concept that I heard, generally speaking, was that if we're going to take everything off, then we should seek a source of revenue from those who had benefitted from the exemptions in some fashion, whether it's any of the personal property tax exemptions, the new ones proposed, or those that were... are in existence. And the second thing was that we were not going to do anything to increase property taxes. Those were the two concepts that we were supposed to be looking at. I came up, if you look at the handout on the occupation tax, whatever you want to call it, a handout Senator Hall just passed out, he points out a number of the restrictions on that which I don't disagree with, and every one of us, as I sit and listen to the discussion, we can talk about the limitations of any proposal that comes along. And somewhere along the line, before this session is over, we're going to adopt something. I still think the concept that we started out with, the two concepts that we started out with, that the funds be made up from those who benefitted, and we avoid increasing property tax was very good concepts, we ought to still keep in mind. If you don't like the concept of the employer-employee numbers, then you should vote no, obviously. If there are some refinements that should be made, then that should be the approach, we adopt it, and then we work on refinements, excluding if there are certain areas that should be excluded from being included. I don't have any problem with that. I