

January 18, 1995

SENATOR ELMER: Of course, the intention is if a member objects to the question being divided...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, here's what I'm try to find out. The first sentence talks about a division of the question.

SENATOR ELMER: Mmm, hmm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then the first sentence of your new language says, if any member objects to the division.

SENATOR ELMER: That's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do those two words of yours "the division" refer back to the first sentence that talks about the division of the question?

SENATOR ELMER: That is affirmative.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, then the rest of your language talks about the amendment, thereby restricting what you're talking about only to an amendment and not a question. There are other questions put before us that do not involve only an amendment. So are you talking only about an amendment being subject to your new language?

SENATOR ELMER: Any question that is being divided would be apply...this would be applied to.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But it doesn't.

SENATOR ELMER: If the question is being divided, the body is deciding on whether the question should be divided or not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But your language talks about the amendment, not an amendment, but the amendment. So what is being attempted to be divided is the amendment and the motion to divide that amendment is debatable. But if there is a question other than an amendment which is to be divided, your language doesn't deal with it.

SENATOR ELMER: Senator Chambers, if any member objects to the division in this proposed rule, the decision shall be put to the body whether the amendment should be divided.