

January 17, 1995

SENATOR BROMM: Correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It would have narrowed the application of the germaneness ruling and made it possible to have additional rulings of nongermaneness. I want the rule as wide open as possible.

SENATOR BROMM: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the rejection of his amendment would have left us with a situation where once the entire amendment was ruled germane, then all the parts are germane, which to my way of thinking broadens the sweep of the germaneness rule. I meant it makes it more liberal in its application.

SENATOR BROMM: And, on the other hand, with the Withem amendment we have much more parliamentary steps that we can take after the proposition is divided, which we wouldn't have otherwise.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It gives us more latitude and, by giving us more latitude, it may make more longitudinal in the sense of length our consideration of these issues.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. With the answer to that question, I guess for purposes of clarification, I'm going to vote for the Withem proposition as amended and urge the body to do so and we'll move onto the next rule change.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. The Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Madam President and members, again, I tried to make this point. Senator Bernard-Stevens thought it was a good point for supporting the Withem amendment but, clearly, if you now take the next step and adopt this amendment, you will, I think, slow down the process. Now maybe that's what you want to do. Maybe that's what we want to see, but come later on this session when things are really grinding down and we go through germaneness fights on subparts of amendments I think you will wonder why you adopted it. But, again, I'm going to oppose this amendment. I think it will be a mistake and urge you to consider it more carefully. Thank you.