

other bills. So if you are in the position that I am in, and it is made obvious that you are going to be treated differently than other members on the floor of the Legislature, you prepare for that contingency. When the Speaker can make a ruling for one senator of one complexion, then a senator of another complexion says will it apply to me in the same way, and an answer, yes, cannot be given, then something is wrong. Something is wrong with that ruling, and if you have never been in that position yourself, you won't understand the impact of that kind of a statement. Even though I am accustomed to it, I haven't grown to like it, and I will have to be opposed to that kind of action. I have stated several times today that whatever is allowed within the rules and the other side does that, I have no quarrel with, but when we have ordinarily intelligent people taking clear language in a rule and perverting it, then it is because of the issue and related issues that that perversion occurs. We all know good and well that if the intent of the rule was to say that once a motion is made, it cannot be made again, that means no matter what happens on that motion or if nothing happens on it. But when you put in qualifying language, that qualifying language has a meaning, and we know it, but this is viewed by some as a way to get to a desired result. And in a way, it is a tribute to me, that in order to reach a desired result, the rules have to be perverted, and I probably am the only one who will have this honor bestowed upon him on such a regular basis. So although I am flattered by this complimentary treatment, I can't say that it is a compliment which I enjoy or appreciate. Senator Hall thinks I won't make a motion to cease debate, but when principle is involved, then in order to be rigidly consistent, if a principle is involved, the rigid consistency has to be laid aside in order that the principle can be established, and the principle here is that a ruling made for one senator has to be made the same way for another. And I have got to see if I can get that ruling while we have the same person in the Chair during the same proceedings so that there is no chance to forget what the prior ruling was. So, Senator Hall, I am put in a position where I am probably going to have to do that. But what I am discussing right now is an instance where I believe the Chair was absolutely correct, and when we use our minds and analyze language, we all know the Chair was correct. Otherwise, the words in these rules have no meaning. All you have to say is, well, the rule means such-and-such, so that is the way it is going to be. It is a good thing that courts have a higher standard for construing laws than the Legislature. The court will take words in their ordinary