

it says, except in the case of those people, then not knowing the age would not be a defense, if you want to keep that language because the law apparently now gives that protection to liquor dealers. And it is funny we will give it to them, but we don't want to say that other people will not have the defense if they don't know the age. But if that is what the liquor dealers have been able to get so far, I will let them keep that. But that is what the amendment will do because I am as serious as I say, Senator Schimek, no reflection, as a gallstone on this one.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Time. Senator Kristensen.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Mr. Speaker, to take the burden off of my colleague from the 36th District, I respectfully call the question.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Senator Langford (sic). The question has been posed, shall debate now cease? Do I see five hands? I do. Senator Bernard-Stevens, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Just a point of inquiry, not to hold up proceedings, but if an amendment has been modified, is that, in fact, then a changed amendment so you need to have pro and con on that debate or is that considered still the debate from the original amendment?

SPEAKER BARRETT: Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, you were about to say something? No, okay, I thought you were. The Chair is under the impression we are still debating the modified Chambers amendment. The five hands were recognized, Senator Chambers. We will call it to a vote and let the body decide.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Mike on and off.) ...challenge the Chair.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Oh, I am sorry, I didn't understand. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, since I don't think there has been enough debate on the modified amendment and it does offer a substantive element, in fairness I think there should be a chance to deal with that and I don't think there has been...in fact, there has been no discussion of that at all. I was allowed to modify the amendment through unanimous consent...