

reconsider the motion to overrule the Chair.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers, you are recognized.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, I hope Senator Withem will listen to this because it goes to his comment in his close. Senator Withem said you shouldn't just take a rule and analyze it, read the whole thing altogether, which is like saying read it fast and don't pay attention to what it says. But I would ask him a question as somebody who, based on what Senator Bernard-Stevens said, is conversant with the rules. Senator Withem, is it your opinion that all the words in a rule have a meaning?

SENATOR WITHEM: Obviously.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if we mean that once a motion is offered, then it can't be offered again, why don't we just eliminate those words "being decided", so that it says what you said it means, no motion to postpone to a time certain, to commit, or to postpone indefinitely shall again be allowed on the same day at the same stage. If we mean that once it is offered, even if no action is taken, why don't we just say that and not add the words "being decided"?

SENATOR WITHEM: I would definitely support that motion to change the rules in that manner.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But do you believe the words "being decided" have a meaning in this rule as it presently is written?

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, I do.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And your interpretation of "being decided" is that if a senator decides to do something, then that is the decision that is being referred to by the language in (interruption)?

SENATOR WITHEM: In the context of this rule given what I think the full intent of this rule is, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Withem. Obviously, I disagree with Senator Withem's interpretation. Obviously, I believe there has been a perversion of the rules, but that is not unusual because it happened on LB 775, and it will happen on