

January 4, 1990

money, why is it not germane to have a corresponding tax increase to raise that money? Now, I agree that maybe we need to work on the germaneness rule. I think the rule, even with the committee amendment, it is better than Senator Hall's original proposal, but I think it opens the door too wide and I urge the body to set a precedent here on the second day of this session that we are going to have a tight germaneness rule and we are going to stick with bills that have the same subject matter and not encourage the whole practice of Christmas treeing and the whole practice of circumventing the committee process.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hall, please.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President,, and members. Senator Moore, oh, ye of little faith, this amendment that is brought to you really by the Rules Committee is one that is far different from the original proposal that I brought last year to that committee that clearly probably would have applied to the speech Senator Moore just gave. If we could ask for a germaneness ruling on Senator Moore's speech as being applicable to this rule change, I think it would be proved to be nongermane. Scott, Senator Moore, this is I think just a proposal as brought by the Rules Committee that does exactly I think address the issue that you talked about toward the end of your comments, that we have had problems with whether or not the issue of a funding mechanism can be or cannot be attached to a bill. It has happened, but sometimes we have I think suspended the germaneness rule, sometimes we have not. I don't see the Rules Committee's proposal as it is presented to you, which, again, is a far cry from what I might like, or others might like, or, definitely, from what I proposed to that committee, but I think they did just what Senator Moore talked about during this discussion over the interim and in their deliberations prior to today, and that was examine the germaneness rule, allow for some flexibility with regard to the issues that would prove germane or nongermane, but not in any way, shape, or form kick down the door, or impugn the integrity of the germaneness rule as it has existed and as it has been ruled on by the Chair on a number of occasions. I don't see where...I think, if anything, you know, one could argue that the change that has been made would tighten up the rule. When you look at what the rule actually does, it strikes some, as Senator Lynch put it, some redundant language, language giving a definition of what a nongermane amendment might be. Now does that mean that one can then...I think it takes away one argument for someone like myself to argue that