

accomplished within the rules. Probably nobody on this floor has done more with the rules to obstruct the movement or passage of legislation with which I have disagreed than I have, but I have always done it within the rules. I don't make motions to suspend the rules so there can be no more debate or amendments, even on issues of mine. I never vote to cease debate. I would never vote for cloture. I think there should be full and complete debate. Others sometimes don't feel that way and they try to find a way to cut it off. But the rule on the issue of divisibility is so clear that a motion to overrule the Chair, in this instance, probably is out of order, strictly speaking. It would be like if I asked the Chair, Mr. Speaker, are the lights on? And he said, yes, and I said, I move to overrule the Chair. And then if we vote to overrule him, the lights are off now because we voted to say they're off even though our senses and our common sense will tell us that the lights are on. It's clear that the motion...the amendment is divisible. I support the amendment. I support gutting the bill. That tactic has been used before and the Supreme Court has said in numerous rulings that the Legislature can do this and there is no issue of two subjects in the bill. That's what the State Supreme Court has said, so the process by which an attempt is being made to put this tax material into 835A is not suspect. People opposed to the tax may not like it. That is not suspect. The attempt to change a rule by overruling the Chair is suspect. I am not a purist when it comes to the rules in the sense of saying that we have this germaneness rule and it must be narrowly construed. I don't say that. My good friend, Senator Moore, if he hadn't been looking at me, I wouldn't bring him into this, was the strongest advocate of cloture and he was the first one bitten by it. Senator Beutler, when it comes to the rules, could be called the purist, p-u-r-i-s-t, not p-u-r-e-s-t, that is me, moi, but in the sense of being for the rules applied as they're written. But when touch and go situation arises, we can find our way clear to say, well, rules are there and they're for a purpose but this goal to be achieved is so noteworthy and important that the rules should be disregarded. See, we're not suspending a rule, we're disregarding the rule. We are disregarding the plain meaning of language. This rule, unlike the language that describes that constitutional amendment 219 on the ballot, this language is so clear that a fool cannot err, if the fool can read. So we all know what the meaning and import of this rule is, the one dealing with the divisibility of a question. Our rule is also clear that to suspend the rules 30 votes will be needed. This, obviously, is an attempt to