

January 17, 1995

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. The Chair recognizes Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise in opposition to this rule change. I believe that even though it may spell out how this is dealt with, I think the way that it is going to be dealt with could prove to be very costly in terms of time, especially at the latter stages of the session. I think that the discretion of the Chair, as the rule currently sits, is a better way to function right now. Precedent, as the session moves along, and depending on who is in the Chair, I would rather leave that in their hands, whoever that individual may be, as opposed to saying that the ability to question germaneness on each and every component is now the rule of this body. I think that to adopt those into our permanent rules would be a mistake. I think that the original proposal would have been the more proper way to go. To just argue that if an amendment has, in its totality, germane subject matter, then to tear it apart somehow and say that it is no longer germane just, I think, leaves open to this body every opportunity, at least to some of us, for each and every bill that is offered, and that's introduced in the next few days and heard in front of the committees, I don't think that there is a bill that extends beyond probably two to three pages that you could not take apart and find some component part of it that more than arguably would not be germane to the whole. I think that it becomes a very big loophole that you are adopting into the rules, and I would urge you not to do that. I trust in the discretion of the Chair to deal with this issue. I would have preferred the original Will amendment, as it was offered. That's been rejected. I think it would be in the best course to reject this one as well. Thank you, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Hall. The Chair recognizes Senator Withem.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Madam Chair and members of the body, for some of the newer members, after you have been around a few rules debate, you will recognize that we talk a lot in hypotheticals when we talk about rule changes, and the side that can create the most dastardly set of hypotheticals oftentimes wins. Right now what we are hearing are these hypothetical situations as to how this will, this rule change as amended will somehow open up the floodgates to rulings on germaneness that would not have been there before. That certainly is not the case. I mean