

who has ruled correctly, is not unheard of. My concern is, and I'm not arguing at the moment whether the Chair is ruling right or wrong, my concern is that every time over the years I see a practice started in here that is somewhat inappropriate for orderly conduct of business, inevitably it is repeated again by someone who sees that knack. I could tell you 1961 congressional reapportionment was decided on overruling the Chair, who ruled correctly with the rule, but there were not sufficient votes to suspend the rule, but there was sufficient votes to overrule the Chair. And it is a dangerous precedence. Rules are in to protect the orderly discussion of issues. And I know they can be abused as well as used. I understand that at some point when we, as a body or majority, feel they are being abused, then we will resort to the motions that we all know are there. The issue that I hope Senator Chambers will respond to in closing, Senator McFarland framed the issue for me which is going to be the basis of my vote, it used to be that a division of the question was based upon if one part could be adopted and the balance that had been divided out not adopted and you still had a workable piece of legislation. As I read the rule now, it doesn't really say that. It says if there is one issue that can be adopted, and there still is a ruling of substance that can be considered, then it can be divided. That is somewhat different to me than whether one can be adopted and the other not adopted and still have a workable piece of legislation. It seems to imply if there are two, distinct issues that can be discussed then you can have a division of the question. You may have a problem adopting one and not the other as a result of that, but it would be helpful for me, in the closing, Senator Chambers, if you would outline the rationale for the division of the question, because my vote is going to depend on upholding the Chair or not upholding the Chair on the basis of is this, and what I prefer, is the division one in which one could be adopted and the other not. But I have lots of concern if we start a practice of suspending the rules with a simple majority of those in the room, because that is the precedent you established, and you know, you know it will be used again and again. As I've said, it has been used, and I know for a fact in '61 congressional reapportionment was decided on that basis. As I said the other day, no one talked about it at the time, but the old-timers, then they sat around and joked how they pulled a sly one (laugh), but they also were apologetic about it at the same time because they knew they had corrupted the system just a little bit, and that's my concern.