after this bill goes into effect that would still be my first offense. Is that correct?  $\sim$ 

SENATUR HABERMAN: That is correct, but if you wish to change it, I will go along with it.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Thanks, Senator Haberman.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question with you if I may. Are we dealing with Senator Haberman's amendment as an amendment to the committee amendments?

SENATOR CLARK: Yes, we are

SENATOR VICKERS: I would like a ruling from the Chair on that, Mr. Speaker, since the Haberman amendments are a complete redraft of the bill.

SENATOR GLARK: So are the committee amendments.

SENATOR VICKERS: Well, it seems to me we should deal with each of them separately instead of as an amendment to an amendment. There is nothing in the Haberman amendments that I can read that directly relate to the committee amendments.

SENATOR CLARK: They don't directly relate but they are a rewrite of the bill the same as the committee amendments are, and I would have to rule that they are germane.

SENATOR VICKERS: That it is an amendment to an amendment?

SENATOR CLARK: Yes.

SENATOR VICKERS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Haberman amendments, Request #2774, I would like to rise in opposition to them for a couple of reasons. First of all, I don't think that the Haberman amendments are doing exactly what Senator Haberman himself indicates that he wants to do. Senator Haberman sent around some letters this morning indicating that I suppose in his own writing or writing from somebody in his office pointing out that most of these letters that he has received had as a section of the letter that no work permits should be allowed, yet