

made that motion, we voted and we decided it. The next motion up was the Senator Bernard-Stevens two-part amendment, which was a different question, entirely, I'll grant that. The question was, shall we have a one-year sales tax, and with that one-year sales tax then we don't have to have a one-year sunset, we can go back to a two-year sunset. That's a separate question. When Senator Haberman offers the amendment to strike the portion of the bill...of the Senator Bernard-Stevens amendment calling for the increase in the sales tax, that then becomes a reconsideration of the old motion, because all that's before us, if that motion passes, all that is before us then is, do you want to have a one-year sunset or don't you? I agree with Senator Haberman, I don't want to have a one-year sunset, I want to have a two-year sunset. But you do have the question. The question is being considered a second time in that case. I think the Chair made a very appropriate ruling, particularly because our rules, Senator Chambers, don't say the same subject in the same form. If they said that, yes, this is the same subject in a different form. So it wouldn't be a reconsideration. But it is a reconsideration. I think the Chair ruled correctly. If the body today wishes to overrule the Chair for purposes of expediting its business, you know, that is one case. But, if you do, you're setting a precedent that you believe that the Chambers interpretation of what a reconsideration should be is, in effect, a...is, in effect, the definition we'll go by. So I can change one word, I can change an "a" to an "an", I can change a "the" to an "a" in a motion and file it again and it will not be considered a reconsideration, because it will have to be in the same form. If you talk about writing rules, that's what you'll be doing in this particular case, if you adopt...if you vote to overrule the Chair you will be rewriting the rule and putting a much stricter, much looser definition of our reconsideration motion. And, again, Senator Chambers is much better at offering these warnings than I am. You will be opening yourself for much mischief as...is that the way you're supposed to say it, much mischief as the session goes on. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Haberman, you wish to speak on this.

SENATOR HABERMAN: I'll waive off.

PRESIDENT: Okay. I have many other lights. Does anyone else wish to speak on this? Senator Chambers, would you like to