

judgment. I think it is clear that the same amendment, in its exact form, cannot be offered the same...at the same stage of debate more than once, that the proper method for referring to it a second time is purposes of reconsidera...is to file a motion of reconsideration. A different amendment is, in fact, authorized. The question is, is the Dierks amendment that is offered now substantively different from the Beutler amendment? And I think, Senator Dierks, I even heard in your introduction a statement that this will give the membership an opportunity to vote on this amendment again. And, given that characterization of your intent as you gave it in your introduction, I would rule that this amendment is not properly before us and that the proper form of having this amendment before us would be through the process of reconsideration.

SENATOR DIERKS: Withdraw the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have is by Senator Bohlke. Senator, yours was drafted...

SPEAKER WITHEM: And I believe, Senator Bohlke, although normally we don't preemptively make rulings on motions, I believe yours is essentially the same as an amendment you offered on Select File that had been defeated, and so, again, I think the same method of...nobody asked me on that one, but I assume Senator Dierks or somebody would, so I believe that would not properly be before us.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next amendment I have would be by Senator Withem, AM1309, that is found on page 1385 of the Journal. (Read.)

SENATOR HALL PRESIDING

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Withem, to open on the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yeah, first of all, the timing is everything, and I don't know if it is the best time to offer an amendment, after I made a controversial ruling from the Chair. I think what I will do is just explain what I wanted to do, give a little comment as to my intention. I haven't had much time to visit with people, and then we had some material we wanted to