

the system that you have, raise the money, it is very simple, we don't have to change any forms, we don't have to do anything except say your rate is now, if you are over \$200,000, 8.99 instead of 7.81. You raise the 10 million, you collect it, you bring it in, it is simple. You go with the surcharge, you are calling a dog a cat and you are buying the argument that this is some kind of a placebo over here for all of these businesses that are going to come in, and the only thing you are doing is hiding the peanut under the shell so that you believe in some case that the businesses aren't going to understand what this is. You are letting them tell you that, I mean, they are feeding you this...

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Time.

SENATOR HALL: ...and they are making you expect to believe the fact that, you know, we shouldn't do a super bracket because it is, oh, so terrible, but you can tax us in any other form you want, don't call it a super bracket, it is a third bracket, it is a very minor third bracket. I would urge you oppose the Moore amendment.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you, Senator Hall. The next speaker is Senator Ashford.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Mr. President and members, first of all I would like to commend Senator Hall for the excellent job he has done in framing this bill. And, also commend him on this incredible use of metaphor; dogs and cats and peanuts and shells and placebos and all those things. It is...I love to listen to him talk because he is the best metaphorical speaker I have ever heard. I have to though oppose his position on this surcharge amendment. I think he has constructed a very finely tuned proposal which makes a lot of sense to me. Yes, I think calling this a super bracket tax or calling it a tax does probably send the wrong message. I think that is a valid argument, but it is an argument that doesn't necessarily, shouldn't necessarily sway us in this body. That is the Chamber of Commerce problem, they have to decide how to package or sell a particular tax policy that we adopt in this body, I am not particularly swayed by that argument. But, I am swayed by the argument, and I guess what tipped the scales for me, is going back to I think what Senator Hall, his basic premise for his proposal and that is that this is a one-year, stop-gap measure and that a surcharge or a charge or an additional fee, so to speak, paid by the