

January 18, 1995

roll call in reverse alphabetical order shall start with the member's name that begins with "Z" or the letter closest to "Z" and that is in fact the clarification that is needed. And quite honestly, at the end of the session, if the rules are not pretty clear, we can get to some difficulties. An example we had last year, some members wanted to start it out with Senator Kristensen in the middle and go inside out, or if it is worded that you have to go in alphabetical order, well, where does the alphabet start. So in order so we don't have any of that stuff going on, this is the clarification amendment and I hope it is adopted.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Any further discussion? Senator Bernard-Stevens, do you have a closing? Closing has been waived. The question is the adoption of the Bernard-Stevens rule amendment to the rules. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote nay. Record, please.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 1 nay, Mr. President, on the adoption of Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment to the rules.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The amendment is adopted. Next item.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Elmer would move to amend. (Elmer amendment appears on page 334 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Elmer.

SENATOR ELMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment that I have brought forward is very simple and very straightforward and would say that if a member would like to have the question divided when we're considering an amendment or an amendment to an amendment, then the Speaker or the Presiding Officer would determine if the question is divisible, and if it is, it would be divided. However, with this change if any member objected to dividing the question, then the division and the reasons for it would be debated and the body would vote up or down whether to divide the question or not. The second part would say that if a committee amendment is a rewrite of the bill and entirely replaces the bill, it would be nondivisible so that a bill that is put forward couldn't be cut up as an amendment could. And would ask your support. It seems like a reasonable amendment to give us a little more control over whether a question is actually divided or not. Thank you.