

January 4, 1990

Senator Moore because, depending on the issue, all the Chair has to say is, well, yes, this substantially alters the intent, so it's not germane. Somebody else in the Chair can say, no, it doesn't, so it is germane. That language serves no purpose as far as advancing coherent, consistent interpretation and construction of this rule. The other language that you want to add probably should not be placed in the rule, because there could be some cases where such a proposal added to a bill can be nongermane, under the constitutional requirements, as interpreted by the Supreme Court. So before we add things in a laundry list to our rules, we should make sure that that falls within the parameters of what the Supreme Court has said would be germane. You could not have two subject matters in a bill, as a very quick example. There could be situations where what Senator Moore is suggesting could constitute two subjects in a bill.

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: His amendment, in short, should be rejected. It does two things, it reinstates the very bad language, and then it adds some language, the total consequences and ramifications of which are not clear.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lynch, please, followed by Senator Withem and Senator Moore. Okay, Senator Withem, please.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes, Mr. President. Senator Moore, I guess, needs to be complimented for this because what he is doing is bringing out of the closet what most of us genuinely believe about the germaneness rule. And we all genuinely believe that those other amendments that those other goofy 48 members of this body want to offer, they're not germane. The ones I want to offer, of course, are germane and they ought to be considered. Senator Moore enjoys the prerogative of a lot of people that have on the Appropriations Committee, and I can sympathize with him, when bills come in spending money he wants to know where the money is coming from. So he enjoys the process. I shouldn't say enjoyed, because I don't want to demean what he's doing. But he frequently likes to point out to members of the body that a particular spending measure might in fact have some tax consequences, so he likes to offer amendments to bills that offer that. So what he is saying is that type of amendment that he likes to offer should be considered germane, but types of amendments that other people may want to offer should not be.