

PRESIDENT MOUL: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: First of all, there is a need for clarification on the word "germanity". I don't know (laughter), that may, in fact, be correct. If it is, it's a departure from precedent. Yeah, just to recall, I have offered an amendment that has a number of parts to it, and I don't think anybody would argue as to whether the amendment, in its totality, is, in fact, germane to the...to the committee amendments. And it was not drafted in a manner, with any subterfuge, to make it necessarily...I mean, yeah, it was, obviously, my desire to have...have the amendment made germane because of the 25 vote versus the majority of those voting standard. But it was not a subterfuge. My amendment that I was proposing amended a section of the bill, which the committee amendments also amend. And it was drafted to do so prior to. I did ask yesterday, look at our amendment, see if it is, in fact, possible that...that it could become an amendment to the committee amendments. We looked at it, and what I wanted to amend amends a section of the bill that the committee amendments already raise. The process of dividing the amendment is also a very proper process. What I'm questioning, though, is if you take an amendment in its totality that is, in fact, germane, break it down into subpoints and then force each of those subpoints then, in fact, to be germane to the committee amendments, and, in effect, take part of an amendment that was offered as a whole, making it germane, the other part not, in effect, I think you're opening up a process by which we can...can begin this process of dividing, re...subdividing, asking for germaneness rulings on each subsection. I think it's a dangerous precedent to begin. I should say I don't fault the Chair for the ruling. Probably a very strict reading of the rule, the ruling would, in fact, be correct. I think there are times though when we, as a body, have to look at the...the totality of what we're doing on our process. And I think to sustain the Chair in this particular case would allow the opportunity for the body to do great mischief in...in its use of the divi...dividing the question. It is interesting that there tend to be ebbs and flows of parliamentary procedures that we use in here. And this process of dividing the question is one that is...has been used forever in the body, and in many cases it is appropriate when there are portions of an amendment that...that we like, and portions that we don't, allowing each to stand on their own for independent consideration is worthwhile. We have found though that I think, with a number of bills this year, this process of dividing has become less a