

federal income tax only relates to purchase price and date of purchase and to do what is suggested by this amendment is going to be, I'm sure, a built in inequity that would be significant and inappropriate. So I would hope that the body would not adopt the amendment or the concept because it would be, in my opinion, could very significantly fundamentally flaw the bill. We may have to add a million and a half in order to defend all this, Senator Scott, instead of your million. But the...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

Senator Warner ...I do not believe, while you can have sympathy for the concept as it is discussed as a legal and a tax policy matter, I do not think it would be appropriate to adopt.

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

SENATOR WITHEM: I'd call the question.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Do I see sufficient seconds? I do. We'll now vote on the motion to cease debate. All those in favor please vote aye, opposed nay.

SENATOR WITHEM: (Mike not turned on immediately.) ...want to speak on it.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. I'll recognize Senator Hall. Please record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 6 ayes, 7 nays to cease debate, Madam President.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you. The motion fails. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members, I rise to support the amendment. I think that the, specifically for the arguments that the opponents put forward with regard to the attachment of the amendment, I guess the way I understand it is that if there is any amendment, any adjustment, any tinkering at all with the system as it is put in place, that it potentially runs afoul of the Constitution. And I have a difficult time with any, I guess, tax system that is put in place and is not able to be adjusted at any point in the future as it relates to the Constitution. The argument there is, I guess, that the 1063 becomes law until the Constitution is changed or 1063 is repealed or both. Maybe it would have to be both. I don't