

parts, maybe only one of which was germane, could you divide the question and have the other four parts declared nongermane? And we've now gotten our rules, as you know, that once a division is ordered by the presiding officer, each component shall be treated as a separate and distinct proposition. Each and every component of the amendment is subject to the germaneness ruling and it seems to me that what we're doing in this case is somewhat similar in nature in the sense that we're taking one component that we relied upon for germaneness and that component has been removed from the bill and so there's nothing to which germaneness can attach now. So it would seem to me that the ruling is consistent with what we've been doing in recent times anyway. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Hall, before you close on your amendment I wanted to explain my ruling. I ruled as I did that the amendment was not germane for the reason that there is nothing in the bill that deals with product liability or product liability actions and for that reason I believe that the amendment is not germane. Senator Hall, you may close on your motion to overrule the Chair.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Madam President. I understood why you ruled the way you did and I rise in opposition to the ruling, not you yourself. The point that I raise is first of all, I firmly believe, and the argument has been made by Senator Bromm and others that Senator Kristensen, that the way you would deal with that is through a reconsideration motion. Well, not necessarily. We've never had a ruling on whether a reconsideration motion is germane or not. Maybe that's applicable, maybe it's not, but when you have a rule that says, because what you have when you stripped as you did with the Kristensen amendment, the statute of repose out of the bill, it's gone. It's not there. Even a motion to reconsider has a new amendment before you because it doesn't exist and the argument would be that it is a vote on an amendment that is not germane to the bill. And that's exactly what it is and you cannot say otherwise. What you will have before you is an amendment that you have to vote on that in and of itself would not be germane to the bill as it is before you because it is not included as a part of the bill at the time it is being moved to reconsider. That is exactly what this rule change that we adopted earlier this year has the potential depending on how the Chair rules at that time to provide for and depending on the type of the amendment in the underlying bill. It's exactly what