

handle three sheets of agenda, sometimes you have to do what's necessary to get the issues voted on. And I think that's what is intended to be done at this time. As I said, it's nothing I...it's nothing I think is the proper way to go but, given the circumstances, the fact that we had a tax debate that took up three or four weeks of the session this year and this is, in fact, a unique session, and, unfortunately, that's what it's come to. To stand up and say how much we respect the rules when it's just a matter of...it just doesn't happen to be our nongermane amendment that we're looking at, I think is a little bit hypocritical, not that I wouldn't stand up and say it if it wasn't an amendment I supported. The fact is we are all supporting nongermane amendments. What we're saying is that it's this part of the rules we don't want to offend, rather than that part of the rules, because it doesn't necessarily help us this time. The fact is if you want to vote on anything other than eight separate, seven separate questions on the cigarette tax question, then you ought to vote to overrule the Chair. If you want to end the session on LB 835A, you vote no.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Lindsay. Senator Abboud.

SENATOR ABOUD: Question.

SPEAKER BAACK: That won't be necessary, yours is the last light on. Senator Beutler, I will go to you to close on your motion to overrule the Chair.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, as I indicated earlier, I'm trying to suggest a way that there can be a debate on this issue in a reasonable framework of time. I have also talked to people about limiting the division of the question. There has not been time enough to work something like that out, so right now Humpty Dumpty just fell off the wall and with the division of the question has broken into a whole number of pieces. And I'm concerned, as I think you can see, that there is no way to put all...all the king's horses and all the king's men can't put all those pieces back together again in the time that we have. And so I'm suggesting to you an alternative which I think is a reasonable alternative in the context of the situation. Contrary to what Senator Moore has indicated, I think that the appropriation material is appropriately in that amendment although he's quite correct to point out that the white copy up front does not have the appropriation material in it. But that's a matter of...a matter for discussion with