

know. But in talking about a depreciation provision that is currently allowed under the federal law, you're talking about a, I think I heard Senator Warner say a Fourteenth Amendment argument, Federal Constitution. I don't know, I guess if the issue is not a uniform issue as it relates to the federal depreciation, why isn't there a problem at the federal level with the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution, whereas in this state provision where we would basically just be mimicking the federal provision as it relates to this one \$10,000 exemption, how is it that it doesn't run afoul of the federal Fourteenth Amendment under the federal depreciation table but yet would be a problem here placed in the state table with a federal application even though it mirrors that federal provision? I don't quite understand that and I'm sure it will be clarified for me, but it doesn't quite make sense and I think it just...it shows the problems that 1063 has in terms of its application and the way we're going about this entire process, that we are crafting a bill and then based on amendments in the Journal today, crafting a constitutional amendment in the way the CA was introduced on its face that allow us to jury rig the entire operation for, again, 3 percent of the entire revenue of the state, 3 percent, and expect the voters to support that. I guess I will take another long, hard look at 1063 when it advances, if it does today, and look at what comes out of E & R in terms of a white copy just so folks understand what happens if a constitutional amendment passes and what happens if a constitutional amendment doesn't pass because I don't know that there will be arguments on what just is the tax system in the state if a constitutional amendment doesn't pass, and those need to be debated before 1063 is voted on at a final level. But I guess I'd, again, going back to the specific Coordsen amendment, I don't know why the...if it's a federal provision in a tax code now that meets the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, why is it, if we place it in the state table, why does it have all of a sudden a problem when a federal application is brought forward...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR HALL: ...on that state table? I'm not quite following that argument and I'd appreciate any clarification.

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

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature,