

bypass of the requirement to give notification. That was on Senator Lindsay's undivided motion. That was voted down and, to me, a negative vote on an issue by the Legislature is as much an action on the issue as an affirmative vote and I think that should be brought to the Chair's attention because it hadn't been earlier.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, would you like to close?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: I simply want to remind the body of what we did earlier in the session on January 23, 1989. The first Withem, et al, motion lost and we had a divided question and Mr. Withem went through his remaining portion and if you remember the discussion when it was divided, if we didn't get the first one accomplished, there was no need to go with the rest of them. So Senator Withem decided in order to save the body time we'd withdraw the remaining sections that had been divided, withdraw them. Mr. Chambers objected at that time. The Chair ruled the introducer of a motion may withdraw, as he did today, at any time unless it has been amended. Senator Chambers is stating that there already has been a previous amendment to the second part that was not agreed to. Mr. Warner...let's see, Mr. Chambers then challenged the ruling of the Chair and the question was, should the Chair be overruled? The motion prevailed with at least 25 ayes, 2 nays, 15 present and not voting, 7 excused and not voting. The Chair was overruled. The body, on a totally separate issue, the body, on a nonemotional issue, though a very important issue of property tax relief in the beginning of the session, made a statement and the body ruled that once the question has been divided and once part of that division has been voted on, which we have already done, we have voted on the first part of the second...of the two divided sections of the Lindsay amendment. The body stated that our rules and is our feeling that you should not be able to withdraw the other part. And the body then went on to systematically go through each section. We went through all the divided sections and then we moved on. What the body ruled on that day is one that needs to be consistent if the body means anything in regards to our rules and that is once you divide a question of this nature and one section has been decided. What we are basically saying is that we now have two subsections, three, four, how many times the issue is divided, those are subsections of the same amendment. They are not separate amendments. If they were separate amendments, they