

January 8, 1996

bill." I think mine is as reasonable as Senator Wickersham's. I don't want to have a rule in the book which, based on the way it is written, will invite chicanery, mischief, and manipulation of the process. This rule, with the word "substantially" left in it, would have no discernible or predictable meaning. Not one of us would know in advance how this rule is going to apply. The term germane has a definition. The term substantially has a definition. But the term substantially is a much looser word and is more difficult to apply based on its definition alone than the term germane. But Senator Wickersham knows, if he has paid attention at all to any of the arguments I've made when we had an issue of germaneness before us, that I am in favor of construing that word differently from the way most of the members want it construed. I want it to have the same meaning as the court gives it, meaning that if there are not two distinct subjects, then whatever the proposed amendment is would be deemed germane or associated or connected with the main subject matter to such an extent that it doesn't result in two different subject matters. When we use the term "substantially," there is nothing to guide the judgment of the person in the Chair other than what seems to be the politically popular or correct thing to do when a ruling is being made on that particular amendment. Does a bill which is going...whose contents, or whose subject is to be made the substance of an amendment, substantially the same as the bill from which it derived, if it happens to be the same subject? If the subject matter is the same, and I'll use again gay rights, if a bill related to gay rights is killed in committee, would any amendment to another bill related to civil rights or civil liberties substantially the same as that bill if it happens to attempt to include the rights of gay people? If the Chair wanted to be sure we didn't have to have a difficult discussion on that subject, then a ruling could be made, well, this is substantially the same as the bill that was killed. But on one of these popular issues with the "Repelicans," with the so-called conservatives, or with the water carriers for the Governor, then a bill that was killed could be offered with the change of...or substitution of a synonym for a word in the bill and the Chair will rule, this is substantially the same. Because the key word is no longer in the bill, there is a word that means the same thing but the key word is gone, so this is not substantially the same and it only takes 25 votes. I don't trust people in the Chair, present company excepted, and this is for the discussion in more general terms, Madam President, I