

January 4, 1990

on it then. So you're not precluding anyone from getting to it unless, of course, there is a rule suspension sitting there, which is a whole other issue. I think it's important to allow the introducer to have the flexibility and maintain within the introducer the ability to control his or her amendment. So, for that reason, I think it's...if you oppose Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendments, like I wish you do, then I hope in turn we will eventually pass amendment five and make it clear what it is the body's intention is on this particular rule.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lynch, followed by Senator Chambers and Senator Elmer. Senator Lynch, please.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. President and members, I rise to respectfully agree with...I would respectfully suggest that we not support the Bernard-Stevens amendment. I agree with the comments of Senator Moore. I will offer, so you understand, because I think Senator Stevens is right...Bernard-Stevens is right, we should, in fact, have a rule that does do more to clarify a procedure. The procedure recommended by Senator Bernard-Stevens, though, is different from that that some of us on the Rules Committee think would be more appropriate. So I have to mention now that the amendment I will offer, if this action on Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment is unsuccessful, would simply be in line 6 to replace the word "proposition" with "motion". I'm sure that it will not completely satisfy the concerns of Senator Chambers. However, what I think it will do though, with all due respect to the difference of opinions on the floor, is to, in fact, make it clear that the owner, in a sense, of the motion to divide the question, even though that division is made by the Chair of the body, it still belongs to the maker of that motion who should have the right to withdraw. By doing this, we can also save an awful lot of time of the body and especially when it's obvious that if a question is divided into three parts if the first part is not successful, it makes the other two parts meaningless, they should be able to be withdrawn by the maker or the makers of that motion.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, Senator Bernard-Stevens is modifying his motion so that it indicates that the remaining portions can be withdrawn with a vote. So, if I may, Mr. Speaker, may I defer to Senator Stevens so that his amendment will be in the form he wants it and then