

process of deciding what it is separating out matters to stand on their own, and it's being used as a parliamentary diversion. I think this one, where we divide it and then ask for germaneness rulings on each and every segment that's been divided out, opens the door for a great deal of potential mischief in the future. And I think it's important we, as a body, at least hold this process up and decide whether it is something that...that we feel is an appropriate use of the rules. Do we want to take a very literal interpretation of the rules? And, if we do, then probably the Chair ruled correctly. If we want to take an interpretation of the rules that...that allow the process to...to function, as I think the process was meant to, then you'll vote with me to overrule the Chair, and I would urge you to do so.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Withem. I'll now recognize senators wishing to speak to the motion to overrule. Senator Vrtiska.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I rise in support of the ruling of the Chair. In looking at Rule 7, where it says, no motion, proposition or subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment, if you turn over to the next page, once a division is ordered by the presiding officer, each component shall be treated as a separate and distinct proposition. Based on that ruling, I would say that the Chair ruled correctly. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Pirsch. Senator Abboud. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair, members of the body. I rise to support the motion to overrule the Chair. And I will take a little bit of a different tack from Senator Withem. Number one, I haven't decided whether or not I'm even going to vote for the Withem amendment or not, so this isn't necessarily a position I'm taking because I favor or don't favor the amendment. I do believe that this Legislature previously, and I think the Chair is aware of the rulings we've had previously up to this point, that we have decided, as a body, not to take a very strict, narrow interpretation. And I think the Chair ruled incorrectly based on the precedent we, as a body, have already set, at this particular point. I do believe that Senator Vrtiska is absolutely correct, if you take