

it is handled otherwise, has it ever been done that way previously? I don't recall it, but I've only been here 23 years.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Yes.

PRESIDENT MOUL: If the motion to reconsider is successful, there is an amendment on the desk and we will take it up immediately thereafter. And the Clerk informs me that that has been the standard procedure in the past.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam Chairman, I would like to ask Senator Warner if he recalls that having been done in the past? I do not recall and I would like to direct a question to Senator Warner. He has been here longer than I have.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Schmit, if I understand your issue, I think the President is absolutely correct.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Senator Warner, I cannot understand you.

SENATOR WARNER: We have a motion to reconsider, then we immediately take up the...that motion as if it had never been adopted because that's what a motion to reconsider does. It places the issue right back before the body as if it had never been adopted.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Madam Chairman, I do not intend to challenge the ruling that has been made. My recollection and my understanding is this, and I want it to be on the record because it will come up again and again and again, that a motion for reconsideration, if it's successful, brings that amendment back to the body in its original form. At that point it's there and it is available for reconsideration, but it does not move ahead of the previous amendments. The priority motion is only to bring it back for reconsideration. It is not for the purpose of advancing it or jumping it ahead of the existing amendments. That is a violation of procedure. There is no rule that I can think of, and I do not think that anyone can point one out to me, that allows that to happen. Senator Landis has referred to the filibuster. I suggest, Senator Landis, it is not a filibuster, it is a debate upon amendments which have been filed properly and the procedure has been filed properly and I would