

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, what I could say is Senator Hoagland and the rest of you, as a courtesy to me, ought to vote down his motion and let me present my amendments as other people present their amendments on bills as the time comes for the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Excuse me. The call is raised. Senator Beutler, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Point of order.

SPEAKER NICHOL: State your point, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I have looked at Senator Chambers' amendment and his amendment is substantive in nature. I don't think it is in order, under our rules, to amend a motion to suspend the rules. Otherwise, of course, we would have no means of closing debate because there could be endless motions to amend the motion to suspend the rules.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, the argument that if you don't do this then something will happen, does not deal with the issue of this motion. This motion is no more sacrosanct than any other motion that is offered. When you are trying to cease debate on an issue it is perfectly all right to suggest to the body that they not suspend the debate and the discussion until after certain amendments are heard. There is nothing in the rules that would prohibit that. For Senator Beutler, because it is lunch time, on an ad hoc basis to say, don't allow an amendment because if you do other people may offer amendments at another time, would be an argument to stop amendments around lunch time on any proposition. So I think this motion is amenable to amendment, just like any other motion.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members, I don't believe under rules of parliamentary procedure that this sort of amendment, to a procedural motion, a substantive amendment to a procedural motion is appropriate. I would like to ask