

January 4, 1990

in the rules because, on at least two occasions during this last session in 1989, there was some debate about the intent and the clarity of the rule. The recommendation by the Rules Committee was unanimous on this rules change.

PRESIDENT: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I discussed this very briefly with Senator Withem and I don't think ... does what Senator Lynch indicated. I think it really is a redundancy. The rule that allows a division of the question, once the division is allowed, that is stating that each of the divisions is a separate and distinct proposition. Otherwise, there would be no division. That which remains has to be able to stand on its own; that which is divided out has to be able to stand on its own. So the division of the question is not allowed unless you have distinct propositions. There has been no amendment to the portion of the rule which is found at the top of page 53, which says, once motions are stated, they may be withdrawn or modified by the mover before a decision, amendment or ordering of a vote has been made. If a vote has been taken... say that a motion can be divided into five parts. If one of the parts is voted on, either yea or nay, a vote has been taken and there has been a modification of that motion and it should not be possible then for the introducer to simply withdraw it as though no action had been taken. What would be a better thing to do, if it's the body's desire to allow an amendment to belong to whoever offers it, regardless of what action the Legislature takes, then the rule at the top of page 53 should be changed so that you would say that if a motion has been divided, then despite that division the offeror, nevertheless, can withdraw it at any time before a final vote on the entire motion. But to do it this way states a redundancy in the part of the rule as it exists and it does not alter the rule that has led to the difficulty that some people perceive. So, based on that, I will not vote for this rule change because it does not really change anything and it does not add anything. Without this language, you allow a division of the question. With this language, you allow a division of the question. Without this language, each division must be able to stand as a separate and distinct proposition. With this amendment, you simply say what is implicit in the rule. So I don't think it does anything, and I want that in the record because I'm going to vote against it.