

January 17, 1995

For that reason, each individual component part, the logic would go, ought to stand every test. It ought to be able to...it ought to be amended, we've decided. It ought to be subject to an amendment. It ought to be subject to receiving 25 votes for its adoption and it also ought to withstand all of the other parliamentary types of attacks that it may...that it may be subject to, including being germane. I have been accused, and I think rightfully so, in the past, of fashioning amendments whereby there is one very small portion of my amendment that is arguably germane to the main question but then the rest of the amendment is filled with things that are clearly not germane. By dividing the question, you are forcing me then to make every component part of mine meet the rules that every other idea has to meet. That would be the rationale as to why this is not a good amendment. It is probably better to clarify one way or the other and have these matters that have alternative explanations with...alternative rulings from the Chair possible, to clarify in our rules so we go one way or the other. There is an argument though as to why this is not a particularly strong rule change and why, as a matter of fact, it may run counter. On the other hand, if you believe, as Senator Chambers does, that we ought to have a wide open germaneness process and which he consistently argues for on the floor then this is a way of circumventing the germaneness rule and you would probably want to vote in favor of it. Again, I say I indicated I don't know which way I'm going to vote for sure but there are arguments as to why this is not a good change and why it really does run in the face of why members may seek to have amendments divided.

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I'm really appreciative of the fact that Senator Withem did speak to this rule. I could not give the arguments that he gave because I want it adopted. I made it crystal clear and Senator Withem underlined it by his comments that I want the germaneness rule itself expanded to as great an extent as possible. Adoption of this rule change makes that possible. That's what I want. So I would like to have a rule on the books within which we can operate and by which the germaneness rule is expanded rather than go through the necessity of trying to suspend the germaneness rule itself. I will say again that under Supreme Court rulings, in construing the State Constitution, no bill offered by the Legislature can contain