

here and say all he wants on how, in his mind, they're linked together but the amendments are not written as such and one is not contingent upon the other. It is a freestanding amendment by itself and it can stand by itself and it should be ruled on by itself and not linked together as Senator Warner wishes that they would be. And the major frustration of all is after two weeks of good, clean, open debate we're getting ground on into a rules and procedural sort of debate which some people find offensive and it certainly shouldn't have been that way and it wouldn't have had to have been that way. With that, I simply ask the body to overrule the Chair.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, I would like to support the Chair and maybe my reasoning is a little different than some others. Usually, I am one to argue for a strict interpretation of the germaneness rule but, in this instance, it seems to me that a liberal interpretation is in order at the least. I'm concerned about the whole process of dividing a question and then finding parts of it to be germane or not germane. I suppose and I understand that under the way the rules have worked, from time to time in here, that perhaps there is a precedent for what Senator Hall has done and I appreciate that and I'm not asserting, Senator Hall, that this particular procedure is anything other than what I might have done if I had been in your position. But the point is I think that if you make the general rule that you can divide a question and then call into question the germaneness of different parts of it, I think each and everyone of you have enough experience in this process to understand that this is a tool for very great manipu...that can be manipulated and I think it will result in considerable confusion whenever any amendment of any complexity is proposed to you. Amendments that are complex generally have interrelated parts, but those parts are sometimes distinct for purposes of the division of the question rule and you can divide the question, but that doesn't mean that you ought to be able to do that for purposes of calling into question the germaneness of what are perhaps minor aspects of it or even major aspects of the amendment that has been divided. I guess I would be interested in other people's opinion on this particular process, but I think it's not the better rule to allow germaneness to be questioned on different parts of a divided question. And if our rule allows that, maybe we should consider changing it. But, in any event, if that is being allowed in this particular instance,