

then I think you also ought to give the Speaker the benefit of the doubt in terms of liberality of interpretation with regard to the germaneness rule. And I think what the Speaker has done in this context, at this time, is not out of order.

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

SENATOR WITHEM: Madam President, members of the body, after Senator Beutler spoke there may not be a lot of reason for me to speak other than to just reinforce what he had to say. I might comment, first of all, on I'm becoming a little concerned about the rhetoric floating around the floor today, the initial reaction maybe ought to be ignore it, but I wonder how long you can do that. I think Senator Moore's reference to how we're devolving into a rules dispute and how bad that is, his side of the issue maybe should look in the mirror. Senator Warner offered an amendment that he wanted considered as a whole, others asked to have it divided, and others raised the issue of germaneness. The devolving into a rules dispute is certainly not by supporters of Senator Warner's amendment or supporters of 1063. The point that Senator Beutler makes, I think, is a very valid one. I think the Chair has ruled properly in this case, but I follow more Senator Beutler's line of logic maybe than I do necessarily Senator Warner's, and that is that members of the body ought to have an opportunity, if they do it within the rules, to offer their suggestions as changes in a particular piece of legislation. Those changes, as a totality, ought to stand the test of germaneness. If, in their totality, they are germane, they ought to be considered. If they are not germane, they should be ruled out of order. By the same token, any member ought to be able to ask that an issue be divided because there may be some portions of it that need to be separated out for special attention. There may be some portions members can support, some that they can't. A member ought to be able to divide it. But to take an amendment, as Senator Hall indicated is truly germane in its totality, and then to separate it into distinct parts for questioning the germaneness of individual components of it, is a maneuver that threatens our ability, as legislators, to allow our changes to be considered to bills. In my opinion, and I say I've read the rules, I've read the Rule 7, Section 3, paragraph (d) and paragraph (e), (e) refers to division of the question, (d) refers to germaneness, it's a close call either way. I could understand people making arguments either way on literal interpretation of the rules as to the germaneness of this particular portion. And I think when