

SPEAKER BARRETT: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and it is substantively changed, I think.

SPEAKER BARRETT: I have three lights on, if you would care to discuss the modified amendment. There was adequate, full and fair discussion on the initial. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, and members of the body, I don't know if this will help or not. Instead of maybe into a point where we rule and have an over...the Chair rules and maybe there'd be a decision or a motion by Senator Chambers to overrule that decision, spend more time, I guess I would ask just a point of order. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, to do what Senator Chambers actually has done and that is to modify or, in fact, change, and it is a substantial change to his amendment, which, in actuality, is allowing Senator Chambers to amend the amendment to the amendment.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Bernard-Stevens...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Does that raise a point of order.

SPEAKER BARRETT: ...the Chair has made a decision. We will go ahead and discuss the modified amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay, a point of order at this point, then, Mr. Speaker. I would challenge the ability of Senator Chambers to make an amendment to the amendment to the amendment, because that in actuality is what is happening here as a precedent, and I don't mind as long as we understand that a precedent is being made here.

SPEAKER BARRETT: That decision was made earlier, I believe, Senator, and it is in agreement with the Chair.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. We have three lights on to discuss the amendment. Senator Chambers, followed by Senators Hall and Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, and members of the Legislature, to clarify, Senator Bernard-Stevens, what happened, when a person offers an amendment, our rules allows that person to