

and I know it is difficult to do that, but I would ask you all to do that at this point. Because I think letting this particular parliamentary ruling stand, if we let it serve as a precedent, and behave consistently with that ruling really runs the risk of letting the session devolve into anarchy. Now I know Senator Moore is displeased with the original suspension. We have a very simple procedure in our rules, when you don't like a motion, Senator Moore. It is called pushing the red button, or sometimes more technically referred to as voting no or speaking no on the motion. What I have done is an appropriate motion under the rules. To circumvent the motion...the rule that says that a motion to suspend the rules is not amendable by filing another motion, and then somehow, and I just, frankly, Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand the rationale of allowing a second motion of equal rank take precedence over the motion already being discussed. I repeat, it is mind-boggling, and to allow that type of precedent to stand allows tremendous amount of mischief to be developed later on in the session. So I think it is very important for our procedures that the Chair be overruled in this instance. Whether you then vote for my motion to suspend the rules or not is a separate item, and I would urge you to make up your mind on that motion separately from allowing this parliamentary ruling to stand. As far as Senator Chambers' point on dividing the question, I think, frankly, Senator Chambers, I think that gets away from the intent of what we did when we amended this rule on not allowing amendments to motions to suspend the rules, but, technically, you are probably right. You could probably do that. Anytime you file a motion to suspend the rules, you could probably ask for a division, and that would probably be the more appropriate way to go. Now that wouldn't do what Senator Moore wants to do and that is raise his bill at the same time that we raise LB 275, but I think you probably raise a good point and it is probably a valid one. I don't think that the ruling by the Speaker is and I would urge the members to vote to not sustain the Chair and to overrule the Chair in this case. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, what the required number of votes will be? As I understand, this is one of those strange sorts of numbers, those...a majority of those present as opposed to those present and voting, is that correct?

SPEAKER BARRETT: That is correct. The question is, shall the Chair be overruled, and a majority of those present shall be required to overrule the Chair pursuant to Rule 1, Section 12. A further explanation, a green vote on this matter would mean