

us today. Senator Kristensen also has some guests under the north balcony. We have former ex-Senator and Mrs. Robinson from Kearney, Nebraska. Would you folks please stand. And thank you for visiting us today. Senator McFarland, please, followed by Senator Dierks and Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr President. I'd like to speak on the subject matter at hand. The rule that we're talking about on page 54 talks about a division of the question. It simply states, any member may call for a division of the question which shall be divided if it comprehends propositions in substance so distinct that one being taken away, a substantive proposition shall remain for the decision of the Legislature. In my view, if you take away section 2, or the second portion that Senator Chambers talks about, then the third and fourth sections are not substantive propositions that remain for a decision by the Legislature because the whole section 2 talks about defining what a counsellor is. Sections 3 and 4 talks about what a counsellor does. If section 2 is rejected, section 3 and 4 doesn't make sense because you don't even know what a counsellor is, what you're referring to. They are not mutually distinct. They do not, if they were passed in that manner, you would have to have further amendments to clarify and for that reason I think the Chair's ruling was exactly correct. I don't think that the amendment can be divided except into two portions and even then I question the last page of the amendment which when it talks about striking some language which, as I read it, is in the middle of a sentence and wouldn't make sense to strike the language and leave part of the sentence remaining. That's the issue. We're on a motion to reconsider a vote that has already been taken that the...to uphold the Chair's ruling. You know there is an appropriate time to discuss the merits of a bill. Supposedly when we have a debate like this, when the bill is up for advancement, then you have an appropriate time to talk about your reasons for support of the bill or against the bill or when an amendment is up you have a chance to talk about the merits of the amendment or the arguments against it. I've always thought that in the Legislature a lot of things get passed that I don't like, that I think are poor policy, that I totally disagree with and I think some of those things that have been passed that we have opposed on the floor and maybe not...my fellow senators and I, some of my fellow senators and I have not successfully opposed, now that they have been enacted, have been shown to be foolish legislation. That's unfortunate. But it seems to me that that happens. We have a system where we go by