

Senator Bernard-Stevens offered. One is that this program would go for two years, the other is that there can be a sales tax. You can move to divide the question. Those two items can be divided. And if you accept the ruling of the Chair, the effect is that a divisible question cannot be divided, because if you vote down one part of it, you, in effect, will put a matter before the body that was before it in the form of another amendment earlier. Now I'm going to say it a different way. Any amendment, in my opinion, that is put up there before the body is amendable, except when we're returning a bill from Final Reading to Select. We have a rule that won't let you amend that amendment, once the bill has been returned. But to sit here and accept these kind of rulings will cripple us. What you, in effect, will wind up doing is create a set of circumstances where a person can contrive an amendment which will carry something that was defeated prior, but add another element to it, so it's not strictly a reconsideration, and nobody can amend it. And instead of seeking a reconsideration, that person, through a nonamendable amendment, has achieved a reconsideration which he or she may not have the right to bring, because he or she could have been on the wrong side of the issue. I think the Chair has ruled in an erroneous fashion. Regardless of what effect an amendment to an amendment will have, any amendment brought before this body is amendable. What you are doing is allowing the Chair to write a new rule. I want to be shown, in the rule book, where any amendment is nonamendable. You're letting the Chair, with a ruling, write a rule, and it should not be done. Any amendment, and I'm giving my opinion, obviously, is amendable. A reconsideration is offering the same subject in the same form in which it was defeated. Senator Haberman has not offered that amendment. Senator Haberman is amending a proposition that was offered by another senator, and that is his right and it's the right of any person on this floor. On this particular question, some people may not like his amendment. They may think that it's badgering the bill, or whatever reason they have for not liking it. But we should not allow the rules to be written in an ad hoc fashion by the Chair. Excuse me. I was about to sneeze, and it didn't come.

PRESIDENT: That's okay, go ahead.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I think what Senator Withem is doing, what he's attempting to do is innovative. But I think what we have got to do as a body is protect the prerogatives that we have as a Legislature. I'm going to say it again. The proposition that