

will be people coming back again and again trying to hit these same, this same tax base for different reasons, for better reasons, much better reasons and I made that clear the other day and I don't think it's something that we should consider once we've reconsidered. I urge you to reconsider the amendment and then vote it down. It's not good business. There's a lot of things that can go wrong with this and anybody that knows farming can figure that out real simply and it's...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: ...it's the shift of a tax from larger operators to smaller operators and I disagree with that concept. I'd urge you to reconsider the amendment and then reconsider your original vote on it and vote it down.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Morrissey. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I would like to speak in favor of the ruling of the Chair to allow reconsideration and to allow, as I understand it, immediate consideration of the actual amendment. I believe that contrary to Senator Schmit's representations that it would not be out of line with the precedence in this Legislature to do that. And I think if you think about it, it does make sense to allow it in that Senator Lindsay's amendment did come ahead of all the amendments that were put up for purposes of filibuster and to reconsider it only allows it to come ahead of those amendments in the sense of modifying or making clear what that amendment means, so it is not an unusual procedure it seems to me. I think that in this particular context there are a number of things to think about. Obviously we are on the brink of success or we are on the brink of failure here at this point in time. And it appears that we have reached a particular ground upon which a compromise can be reached and that that ground was reached conceptually with the Lindsay amendment yesterday and although I was not on the floor, it was my understanding that the amendment was designed to create about \$7.6 million in revenue. That was the intent of all parties to the agreement, that was the intent stated on the floor. The amendment does not do that in its present form, it raises somewhere between four and \$5 million of revenue. So the point of the reconsideration is to change the definition to what it should have been in order to raise that \$7.6 million of revenue and thereby comport the actual language of the amendment to everybody's actual agreement