

because that is a constitutional one. I will even pull off on that one. It would have been a good example if it was constitutional, though. It would have been a hell of an example. Senator Chambers is correct in his arguments and I hope the body does not overrule the Chair. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Dierks. The question has been called. Do I see five hands? I do. Shall debate now cease on the motion to overrule the Chair. All in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Shall debate cease? Record, please.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 2 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Debate ceases. Senator Withem, please, to close.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I would like to and I will do so briefly. First of all, I think Senator Bernard-Stevens says this is a gray area, and I think I indicated we were moving into a gray area when I raised the point, but I think it is a valid point, and I think if...and Senator Chambers did a good job, Senator Wesely did a good job of arguing the specific tearing the sentence apart and looking at the modifiers and the verbs and the adjectives to build their case. Sometimes you don't do that with a rule. Sometimes you read the full sentence and try to decide what it means when you read it in its totality, and I think the clear intent of the language, no motion to postpone to a time certain to commit, or to postpone indefinitely being decided shall again be allowed on the same day at the same stage of the bill or proposition, the clear intent of that is to not allow members to continue to offer the same motion over and over and over and over and over again, and over one more time, in a clear intent to delay the bill. It is obvious a motion to bracket is a priority motion. It comes up in front of everything else. To sustain the Chair establishes the precedent that will allow me or anybody else to offer a motion to bracket, to withdraw it, to offer it, to withdraw it, to offer it, to withdraw it, and develop this unending chain that will result in an individual member being able to speak and control the floor, not just delay a vote on a bill, but for to allow one individual to continue to control the flow of debate indefinitely. I think probably, no matter which way the body rules on this particular case, this is a rule the Rules Committee should take a serious look at. I would agree with that. I hope it won't be just simply a matter of which side of LB 688 has the votes, as