

speak to the motion, Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, just very briefly, Senator Lindsay and members of the body. You know, Senator Chambers raises an interesting point. I have used this tactic in the past when it has been apparent to me, on measures I cared a great deal about, that the issues were not being crystallized and people didn't have an opportunity to make a clear distinction. I can recall Senator Warner and Senator Kristensen, back when we were debating the Kearney State, whether it ought to be part of the university system or not. The issue of...a specific issue that was floating around and coloring the rest of the debate was not before the body for discussion. I brought it forward through the purpose of an amendment, the amendment was one I did not support, but it was an issue that had to be decided. And I think that tactic of bringing issues before us for decision is what amendments are all about. I see no problem with my offering this, or any member, for that matter, offering amendments to crystallize issues to make the distinction clear, and I think in this particular case whether or not we're going to follow the route of a tax increase or a limitation on spending is the crystal decision that needs to be made. And I'm bringing that to you at this point, and I see absolutely no problem with that. Perhaps to have been proper and to use proper etiquette I should have allowed somebody who spoke in favor...who was in favor of the resolution to the amendment to do the closing. That may have been the error that was made. But the legislative tactic of being able to bring issues to the body in forms of amendments so that the body can make decisions that it needs to make is what we're all about. And I think the Chair ruled correctly, and I think it would be a limitation on individual senator's abilities to raise issues to overrule the Chair at this point. I think the Chair ruled correctly.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Just briefly, Mr. President. This issue, as far as relevance, is probably about as important as a gnat on a hippo. But nonetheless, Senator Chambers raises a point that I wanted to just...for the members to think about, just for a second. If we...the only thing is if we uphold the Chair, simply means Senator Withem will have to vote yes, and we'll still get to vote on the amendment, and the amendment will