

still be voted down. I mean, so it's no big deal one way or another. But I do want members to think about just for a moment the strategy that we might be able to do for the session on amendments of...on bills. If I am afraid of a particular amendment, or I know a particular amendment is going to be offered by those that are opposing me, it would make ultimate sense strategywise for me to offer that amendment so that I can do both the opening and the close. I mean that's a marvelous thing for us to be able to do, to say that a person offering the amendment certainly gets the opening and the close. And Senator Withem is correct, maybe the faux pas was that he should have given it to someone who was going to support it. But the tactic is really there for any of us then to go ahead and say, on opening and closing, this is what the amendment would do, this is...I am not going to support it and why they're not going to support it. So if I'm trying to strategically take away the people who would normally push the amendment, I file their amendment first, I get to open and close on their amendment that they pose later. I'm not sure that's a good tactic for us to begin setting the precedent for here. Overriding the Chair, I think, is a reasonable thing to do. In this case it won't make any difference, Senator Withem will just have to vote green. On the other hand, he's already explained his viewpoint, so that won't make any difference either. But I do think for the precedent coming we should probably override the Chair.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you. Senator Chambers, you wish to close on your motion?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, this is one of those items which I will not lose sleep over however the vote occurs. But I just think as far as the process overruling the Chair would be the best thing. Now, in an ordinary situation where we're kind of in a lighthearted vein and nothing of much consequence is being considered, somebody might do what the Speaker mentioned, offer an amendment or something which he or she says is not going to be supported. I presume, unless somebody raised a point of order, there would be no problem. What I see happening this morning is a departure from how we generally do legislative business. A lot of time is going to be taken, even though members say the subject is very important. I'm forgetting the subject, I'm looking at the process now, and that's why I argue about the rules so much. We are spending a lot of time on a resolution that means nothing at