

this Chamber. And when I was loafing through this amendment, this morning, and it dawned on me the process of striking part of an amendment, replacing it with your amendment, and then carrying with that some other ideas, that may well be appropriate to discuss, in fact, are appropriate to discuss, but are not germane to the amendment that is...that is before us at this particular point in time, the procedural questions, I think, called for a decision on the part of this body as to what we were going to do insofar as amendments to an amendment. Because if this works in this fashion, and it may well have in the past, but it will provide all of the rest of us with a very good lesson in how to use our procedural rules in getting an idea that in other terms wouldn't be germane, attached to an amendment, simply by striking...reintroducing, with a part that is absolutely, by anybody's definition, would be germane to the amendment, and that is Section 1 in the division, and adding Section 2 and 3. So this is not an argument over the merit or the content of Senator Withem's amendment, but rather, from my perspective, an endeavor to clarify something that has a great deal of potential for us if, in fact, the rule...the Chair is overruled at this point in time and this process then goes forward into the future, because I can, in my limited amount of capacity, find very interesting conjectures out there in finding mechanisms to make germane otherwise nongermane points to whatever the motion is at that point in time. So, from my perspective, I, like Senator Vrtiska, rather prefer the strict interpretation of the rules in this case and in other cases. So I would support the ruling of the Chair.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Coordsen. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. I rise in support of the motion to overrule the Chair. I think that if you...if you uphold the Chair in this instance, we will be setting a precedent that is dangerous as you go down the line, as Senator Withem and Senator Bernard-Stevens have indicated. I also would say that...add at this point I agree that, under a strict reading of the rules, probably the ruling of the Chair was proper, and that Senator Vrtiska's interpretation of the rules could well be correct. However, I think we are in the area now of setting precedent, of establishing what amounts to common law for the body as we delve into this question. And the fact of the matter is that we deal with a number of issues that are very complex, that have multiple components to them, all the time in this body. And,