

in the call are within the call, but they are related to the issue. This item was never in the call and if you read the strict words of the call by no stretch of the imagination, other than saying it is related to the overall issue of cigarette taxation, to make it all balance out, to raise the same amount of revenue, then by that principle you have also adopted the standard, I think, without any question that related items, be they income taxes, other methods of raising revenue, any of these things are related items to the overall goal of what you are working on. That is all I'm telling you. You can't use the rule one way one time, and you can't use it another way another time, particularly when we are dealing with sensitive things such as the power of a legislature to deal with issues. You have to know what the rules are when you come in here. If you will take out your tablets or your call of the Legislature and read what the call was with respect to the cigarette tax, then read what the Attorney General said on all the other issues, why he ruled them out, you are going to have to say he's got two different rulings, one is special so he can keep the cigarette tax in because they muffed it when they wrote the original thing, just like they muffed the sales tax on services, and he's ruled another way on everybody else's legislation whether it be income tax increases, which I oppose, because they are all related to the idea of how you address the revenue shortfall. In addressing a revenue shortfall you may conclude you can do some increases, some taxes, some this, some that, but they are all related to the overall purpose. All I'm doing is establishing a precedent I intend to force the Attorney General, the Governor and us to live by, and it is important. That precedent is if you vote to sustain the Chair, I contend you are voting against the Attorney General on the principle that you are saying it is broader, it is broader and it is related. I want you to understand, though, I'm not objecting to his amendment. That isn't the issue. The issue is whether something is within or without the call by the standards applied by the Attorney General as the call was written. There was no mention of this particular item. Now, Senator Chambers, with respect to whether the lobbyists made the call to do this or not, let me offer my proof to the contrary. I wrote a request for an Attorney General's Opinion way last week on this. The Attorney General finally got with me. We had a verbal discussion Friday afternoon. Obviously, the Attorney General keenly appreciated my point and said, however, the overall goal is to maintain exactly the same revenue. Now I