

January 18, 1995

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And your language is narrower than the language of the rule. Your language talks only about an amendment. The rule talks about any question.

SENATOR ELMER: That's correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So your language is designed...

SENATOR ELMER: You are correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...to be narrower. Is that true?

SENATOR ELMER: I would assume that anytime that you are dividing a question that it would be an amendment since you cannot divide the question in a bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You're saying...

SENATOR ELMER: You're talking about dividing a committee amendment, you're talking about dividing an amendment to the bill. Any other motion doesn't have any divisions to it. You move to adjourn, you move to reconsider, you move to do these other things, those are not divisible.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, not necessarily. You're thinking of a simplistic motion that has only one part to it. Why do you think the original rule says a division of the question rather than the division of an amendment?

SENATOR ELMER: That rule was written long before I was here, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And, members, I'm not trying to change that. I want you all to go ahead and adopt this rule like you probably are going to do that Senator Elmer offered you and I think he misconstrues parliamentary rules, the language used in parliamentary rules. Because he cannot conceive of something, it, therefore, does not exist. So if you want to have it that way, fine. I'm not changing his language. Here's what I am doing. I'm saying that if you're going to deny a member the right to divide an amendment, I'm dealing only with his language, then it takes a two-thirds vote of the elected members to deny what up to this point has been an absolute right to divide any question. But what he offers does not deal with anything other than an amendment. So if a different question