

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Mr. Speaker, I'd move to overrule the Chair.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. We are to the point where debate is in order on a motion offered by Senator McFarland to overrule the Chair. I have a number of lights on from previous efforts to speak. I'd like to clear the board if I might and then put your lights back on if you'd like to speak to the challenge. Thank you. Senator Withem, followed by Senators Moore and McFarland.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I would, I guess, just like, I think this is an interesting question. I almost raised this question earlier this morning. It is not an objection to the McFarland amendment, motion as such, but when both Senators Bernard-Stevens and Senator Chambers were offering motions, I think the Speaker would be able to tell you I did have a discussion with him previous to this about whether these motions are, in fact, priority motions and ought to be brought up. I chose not to because too often parliamentary wranglings end up taking more time than do the actual disposing of motions. I probably should have brought it earlier because I don't want it to be perceived as an objection to the McFarland motion. Frankly, I don't even know what the McFarland motion involves necessarily. But I think the Speaker made a correct ruling in this case. If you would open your rule books to Section 3, Rule 7, Section 3, the fourth paragraph, when a question is under debate no motion shall be considered except one of the following, which motion shall take precedence in the order stated. Motion to adjourn has the highest priority. Motion for the previous question has the second highest priority. Motion to postpone to a time certain has the third highest priority, to recommit the committee fourth highest in amendment and to postpone indefinitely. Nowhere is the motion to overrule the Chair, excuse me, to overrule the agenda listed. The only reference in our rules to this particular motion is under Rule 1, Section 16 where there is a reference to this particular motion but it is not listed as a priority motion. So I think the Chair has ruled correctly and I think it probably is a good ruling to not allow and keep in mind that sustaining the Chair in this case I think sets a precedent. Not only is the McFarland motion out of order, but also any other motions that are just dumped on the desk to change the agenda would all likewise be out of order. Not only is the McFarland motion out of order, but any succeeding Withem, Baack, Hartnett, Schimek, Chambers, et cetera motions would also be out of order.