

April 6, 1982

LB 933

PRESIDENT: It would have to be taken as it is offered by the mover, that is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask again for a division of the question and I am going to ask that the Chair be overruled because I think that this is...regardless of what the precedent is, this is terrible policy as far as the Legislature is concerned, and if I may proceed to make the argument...

PRESIDENT: You may.

SENATOR BEUTLER: If we allow this kind of procedure to be established, then obviously we are setting up a tool that will be...that can be subject...the subject of great abuse, because all someone needs to do is to put into an amendment, a specific amendment to return one important item, one item that we have got to do, such as the need to change the state aid payment date. We are in an emergency cash situation and we know we have got to do that. So then you tack onto that a number of items that are debatable and you have, in my opinion, subverted the whole process. For example, in this particular amendment we have one, two...two or maybe three other bills, at least one of which is not a priority bill, all at once, all at one time being added to the bill. I see nothing wrong with a policy here that says that when there is a motion to return for a specific amendment you can ask for a division of the question and the Legislature can make a decision on that which it wants to return for a specific amendment. If the introducer once the question has been divided no longer wishes to return something for a specific amendment, that is his prerogative, or her prerogative. But it seems to me it makes...really what we are doing in this process if you allow this procedure to be established, is to subvert everything that we have set up for General File and Select File. On General File and Select File each and every one of us has the right to divide a question if a question is divisible, and we can make an individual judgment on the substance of each part of an amendment, and that is the way it should be to have good legislation. But now we are saying we can throw in all the garbage as long as there is one thing that the introducer is sure everybody wants and the result it seems to me can only be occasional if not often that we get some bad legislation along with the good. It seems to me there is no reason why we can't make a distinction now and separate

10190