

I've said in the past that when I think the Chair is right I will vote to uphold the Chair even if it will go against something that I have in mind to do. What Senator McFarland, as a lawyer, should be reminded of, if a matter is being presented in a trial which is not allowable and he fails to object, then it goes in and the court on appeal will say, you failed to make a timely objection. He knows that. When I was making my motions, if somebody had raised the same point and the Chair ruled that it's not a priority motion, I knew in the first place I didn't have a rule I could fall back on. Nobody raised the question. There were other questions that were discussed and it kept people from maybe thinking about that question, but the fact is the point of order has been raised. It cannot be denied that this is not a priority motion. We ought to look not just to today and not just on 854, but now we're talking about the rules themselves. Senator McFarland talks about perversion of the rules. When I offered my motions, I'm not perverting the rules to do that, they pervert the rules when they try to get the rulings that he wants to get that a nonpriority motion, in fact, is a priority motion, that if a point of order is raised, a point of order ought to be disregarded. The point of order was raised in a timely fashion. The Chair gave the ruling which is appropriate under the rules. We know that 30 votes can override the Chair, but it should be clear what is being done, that the Chair is being...it's being signified by a vote like that, that the Chair is wrong when it's clear that the Chair is absolutely and positively right. Senator McFarland could have objected to the motions that I was making this morning. Senator McFarland didn't think of it because Senator McFarland had other things on his mind. Senator Landis caught this aspect of the matter for the purpose of raising a point of order and he is right. If the motion had been put on the agenda, then it's discussed like everything else and it comes up in the course of events as laid out on the agenda. There is another aspect to Senator McFarland's motion that concerns me, but in dealing with the part that is raised by Senator Landis's point of order, I think the Chair ruled correctly. If a motion is not a priority motion, how can it be put above everything else? The motion itself is an overruling of the Speaker's agenda. The Speaker's agenda states what we're going to consider when we come here. Senator McFarland's motion to overrule is a motion that in itself is overruling the Speaker's agenda. There are points when it might be appropriate to raise that motion, but the fact is that Senator McFarland, every time the ruling goes against him he wants to say, well, it's implicit in the rules that