

January 17, 1995

longer is a part of a human being because it's been severed from the body. I think this is a very good amendment and if I were of a mind this morning to oppose amendments whose adoption would reduce the opportunities I would have to delay, should that be necessary, I would oppose this amendment, because not only does it result in absurd results, it can lead to a tremendous amount of delay. Each time you would divide the question, anybody could say that any part of that divided question is not germane. That would result in a total and thorough discussion of the germaneness issue on that particular division. If the Chair ruled this portion is germane, the Chair can then be challenged. During that challenge, there can be additional discussion as to why the Chair should be overridden or the Chair should be upheld. So, because my view of germaneness overshadows my need, on occasion, to delay in order to encourage us to have full discussion, I will support this amendment. I will listen and see if anybody can give a reason why it ought not to be supported. I doubt that they can change my mind, however, but it would be very interesting to hear any reason along that line.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. The Chair recognizes Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers, I doubt if I can change your mind also and I do think though that this is a significant enough rule change that somebody on the floor ought to at least stand up and try to explain the rationale as to why this may not be a good rules change. I may do that and then end up voting for the amendment ultimately. But this is one of those where I applaud the Rules Committee for bringing a clarification to the floor. This is one of those instances where the Chair has divided and has ruled and I think we have probably a set of counterprecedence in the precedent book where sometimes individual components of an amendment, after they've been divided, have been ruled to be germane because they were part of the original germane amendment; other times they've been ruled out of order. The argument as to why this is not a good idea would be as follows, and that is the purpose of dividing a question is to make every individual component of an amendment stand on its own. Members occasionally package things together in a single amendment, various different ideas. Members may wish to support some component parts of that total amendment but not others, so members do have the right to ask for a division. After a division is made, each component part stands alone on its own. For that...and it's treated as a separate amendment.