

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hannibal.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I rise to support Senator Chambers' motion to overrule the Chair. And some of my comments are going to be along the lines of Senator Warner's, and that is that I'm very concerned about that I'm going to be speaking will be perceived as furtherance of a filibuster, and because I'm perceived as being against LB 769, I haven't been supporting it, that's true. But my reason for speaking has nothing to do with the issue itself, but rather the rules, as Senator Warner has said. If I understand the situation correct, we had a ruling, I believe it was Monday or yesterday, to decide whether the Chair was correct in stating that an amendment was divisible. It probably was not divisible in 18 or 19 sections, under our rules. The Chair ruled that it was divisible, we had the motion and was ruled that it wasn't. That was a ruling, we lived with it. A second ruling, the same kind of thing, and Speaker Barrett now, today, said he is going to say this is not divisible based on our actions. Now I believe that he is wrong, and I'm going to vote that I think he is wrong. But I also understand why he would do that, and it certainly, to Senator Chambers, it wasn't for purposes of political expediency, because there is no question in anybody's mind on this floor that regardless of how Speaker Barrett had ruled it was going to be challenged. The way he ruled you're challenging. The way, if he would have ruled the other way, Senator Labedz would have challenged, there is no question in my mind, and we still would have had the issue before us. It is also clear to me that there was a real question as to what the original ruling was. Was the issue divisible, or was the issue divisible in 19 sections? If you say the ruling was it was not divisible, then Speaker Barrett is absolutely correct. If you, on the other hand, say the ruling was that it was not divisible in 18 or 19 sections, then I believe you could say he is incorrect. I am choosing to say that the ruling was that that original amendment was not divisible as it was based on our overruling the Chair. So I am defending Speaker Barrett's sincerity and his consistency. And I think I was displeased with some of your comments, Senator Chambers, and I know others were, about your interpretation as to how or why the Speaker ruled as he did. Nonetheless, I believe the issue is very forcefully in front of us, is this amendment divisible? I believe it is. I will look to Senator Chambers also to explain his rationale, because I think Senator McFarland explained it quite well. If it's not divisible, then it's a proper ruling.