

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Preister, would you state again what your division was, please.

SENATOR PREISTER: The division would separate from line 3 on the first page, to through line 12 of the fifth page. That would be one separate section of the amendment and the rest would all be in the second part of the amendment. Is that delineation clear?

SPEAKER BAACK: Yes, thank you, Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: I think that it is clearly divisible there so we will divide this amendment at those two places and we will take up the first part of the amendment first which is Sections 1 through 5. Just one second. Senator Preister, we're going to have to do something with the orig...the first two lines of the bill are going to have to fit in someplace, where it says, strike the original sections and insert the following new sections. Do you want that to go with this first...

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable Speaker, friends all, that would go with the second part.

SPEAKER BAACK: That would go with the second part?

SENATOR PREISTER: Yes.

SPEAKER BAACK: Okay, that will...Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Just a question, Mr. Speaker. My understanding, and we're trying to find it now, that the second...and I have no problem, Senator Preister, of the division, that certainly is reasonable, but also my understanding though in the second portion of the bill there is language that reverts back to the first portion that would be divided. And I don't know if that's a problem or not but I simply wanted to bring that to the Chair's attention, that it's a clean division as far as concept per se, but there is language that reverts back to, my understanding, the original section. Now maybe that's an E & R correction if that...if that need be, but it would be page 11, line 22...21 and 22, and it reverts back to Section 4 of this act which would have been the first division. And, again, I have no difficulty but if it's a