

asked, to any particular date? No, just bracket it. And that can be done, and there is no limit in the rule of any kind any where as to how many of those motions can be made. So that is where we are. The rule by that other vote was perverted. The Chair was absolutely correct, and since the perversion of that rule is not going to achieve the desired goal, that vote ought to be reconsidered and the Chair should be sustained. Senator Withem pointed something out to me, reminded me of something, a couple of years ago or early in last session, he had offered a motion and the question was divided. One part of it was voted down. He chose to withdraw the rest of it. The rules said once there had been a decision, you couldn't withdraw and the Chair so ruled. The body voted as to whether to overrule the Chair and the Chair was sustained, that since there had been a vote on a part of the question, the rest of it could not be withdrawn. Then on this very bill, LB 769, Senator Lindsay had a motion. A division was made. Part of it was voted on. He wanted to withdraw. The Chair, following the earlier decision, said that a part of it had been voted on, it can't be withdrawn and the body voted to overrule the Chair because we were on LB 769. We are on LB 769 again, and the rules, again, are to be perverted and to be perverted by those who do so much talking about morality and righteousness, but we all know that this is the kind of issue where those things go out the window. And as I said, being in a position where I expect to be treated in this fashion, I don't cry. John Kennedy said his daddy told him, don't get mad, get even. But something better than that, don't get mad, get smart, and you have to prepare yourself so that you can survive. But in this instance, I think we ought to try, if we can, to move away from what the issue is that's before us and look at the rule. It is clear in what it states. I think the Chair was absolutely correct.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There have been issues where the Chair gave a ruling which ruling went against what I wanted but I voted to uphold the Chair because the Chair was correct. There have been votes on germaneness issues, and for a matter...for the germaneness rule to be interpreted in the way the Speaker may have interpreted it or the Chair would have been to my benefit, but because I believe in a broad interpretation or application of the germaneness rule, I'd vote against the Chair because either I believe what I say I believe or I don't. And for myself, I do believe it. In this instance, I think we ought to