

25 parts, or 7 parts, or 6 parts, or however many that the persons who are asking for a division of the question are asking. It seems to me logically, if it is divisible, it would be divisible into two parts, and it would be internally consistent, it would make sense, with the reservation about Section 3, if it were divided into a two part amendment. But what are we really talking about here? Are we talking about the rules and some kind of way to improve this bill? How much integrity and sincerity is there when someone throws an amendment in like this that no one has ever seen, asks to divide it into 19 parts, then says, no, I didn't mean 19 parts, I only meant 7 parts, then files 25 more amendments that he says he's sincere about, and then says, no, I'm not really sincere about those 25, I'm only sincere about 6 of them, and I might vote for this bill anyway, and now we've got it four-parted. If there were any integrity and sincerity, this amendment would have been presented, it would have been printed in the Journal, it would have been discussed with the sponsor...the chief sponsor of the bill, it would have been brought before us, we would have known, we would have had a chance to review it, we would have looked at it and then we could have voted on it. There is no mistake that the only reason that these amendments are being added is a tactical strategy to try and delay, to waste time when we have many more other important issues to discuss. I think the Chair is correct in ruling it's not divisible into four parts. From my view, if we wanted to divide it into two parts, that would be the only consistent way to do it. I would urge you to uphold the ruling of the Chair. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hefner, did you care to discuss the motion?

SENATOR HEFNER: Mr. President, members of the body, just briefly, I'm going to support the ruling of the Chair. I think this has gone on long enough. I realize the opposition to the bill, LB 769, says, well, we really haven't discussed this. Well, we have. I think we debated it six or seven days last session, and this is the third day this session. I don't know how much more we need to discuss about the bill. I don't believe that this amendment is offered in good sincerity. I know Senator Bernard-Stevens says it is, but I can't believe that it is, because if he was sincere about it, he would have had it printed in the Journal and on our desk long before this week. So I think the Speaker has made a good ruling here, and I'm going to uphold this ruling.