

motion...

CLERK: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...which was to reconsider.

CLERK: Yes, sir.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: How is that reconsideration going to take us off consideration of the Beutler amendment, which we were considering? I'm not aware that his motion says to reoffer his amendment too. That is putting too much, I think, into that motion. His amendment was not pending. If it was pending and he simply lost a motion to suspend the rules and take it as a whole, did he then withdraw his motion?

CLERK: May I read the suspension motion to you that would be here, the one that I have? It would read as follows: "Suspend Rule 7, Section 3(e), to permit consideration of Appropriations Committee amendment to the pending Beutler amendment to LB 722 without the question being divided."

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, but that does not put them in a position to jump over other offered amendments. It simply says that when their amendment comes up in its turn it will be considered without a division of the question being allowed. When I came down here, to get on my motion, it was to suspend...I mean to amend the Beutler amendment, which is what was before us, not Senator Warner's amendment.

CLERK: Mmm-hmm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, all that Senator Johnson can do is revive the motion to consider his amendment, Senator Warner's, when it comes up without dividing the question. It can't take us off a discussion of the Beutler amendment. That is what was before us, not Senator Warner's. His motion is not to suspend the rule that assigns amendments a certain order as they come up.

CLERK: Mmm-hmm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: To get his now, since it is not before us, but the Beutler motion would have to take a suspension of the rule to allow his amendment to be taken out of order.