

And, again, for purposes... I think we'll ultimately work our way through this and... but it's important the first time we use our cloture rule to make a determination on exactly what it means and establish a little bit of a precedent. So I think what I heard, the previous point being raised by Senator Lindsay, that I would renew is that the raising of the point of order and the motion to overrule the Chair are out of order under the cloture motion.

SENATOR HALL: There is a rule...

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Withem and Senator Lindsay, I cannot recognize a point of order before we have disposed of the previous point of order. I have made a ruling and Senator Hall now has asked that we overrule the Chair and we'll proceed with debate on that issue. I now recognize senators wishing to speak to this. I remind the senators that they can speak only once. Senator Schmit, followed by Senators Hall, Warner, Morrissey, Withem, Moore, Beutler and Abboud. Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: I yield my time to Senator Hall.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank... my light went off by accident. Thank you, Madam President, and members, Senator Schmit. The issue here is one of ceasing debate. I have always opposed the cloture rule and I was unable to be here at the time that it was voted on. I believe that there is serious discussion that needs to take place on this amendment. I understand the frustration of the folks who are supporting LB 1063. I wish I could have invoked cloture on LB 1120 but there wasn't enough funding in it either to get it over to Select File, let alone Final Reading. The fact of the matter is that clearly what you have here are two rules that are in conflict. There's no doubt about it. And the one rule, that being the reconsideration motion, takes priority over a cloture rule because the purpose of a cloture rule is to cease debate. Under Roberts, it's what's considered a subsidiary motion and it falls behind. The rules probably need to be changed in this instance in order to allow a cloture rule to do what you want it to do. But the fact of the matter is, right now, it doesn't and, I mean, it really points out to a certain extent the whole sum and substance of what we're doing in terms of personal property here. And the issue has to be addressed this session. I have probably, as someone put it, you