

January 4, 1990

this way. This does solve the problem, puts some clarity in the rules, but I'm still going to oppose it and encourage the body to vote for the original proposal by the committee.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, in case I didn't make it clear, I do support the provision offered by Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Moore, you're partially correct in something you stated, but not entirely correct. And I'm not going to state what you stated and say which parts you're correct and which parts you're not correct entirely correct in but my comment might make it clear what I'm getting to. The cleanest way to offer an amendment, if there are several parts that are freestanding, is to offer each part as a separate amendment which is what I often do. Instead of listing several things in an amendment, some of which you feel you might get, others you may not, you run the risk of losing the entire amendment if there is no division of the question. If you divide the question, then it opens the way for every manner of parliamentary maneuvering. The way to do it very cleanly and precisely is to let each one of those freestanding propositions be offered as a separate amendment, then it's voted up or down. If you win it and want to press on, you can do so. If you lose it, and that was the main thing, then you can forget it. When you offer them individually you can take them in any order you choose, that which is most important or that which is least important. Take the least important and get as much as you can before you shoot your wad and then lose the others or take the most important one which, if you lose, you're not interested in the others. That can be done by offering each as a separate amendment and I don't think that's what's before us today. We are considering a situation where an individual decides to offer as one motion several different propositions and I feel that that does not constitute the number of motions as there are propositions in that one motion. It is one motion consisting of several propositions. Once that motion has been acted on by the Legislature, then all the rest of the propositions still remain the property of the Legislature which has taken it by acting on the first proposition or however many of them it acts on before the introducer decides he or she no longer wants the remainder. So I'm for Senator Stevens' offering and I don't think it creates any problem whatsoever. But what it does do is let's the Legislature stay in a position to control that business which has been presented to it and on