

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Yeah, I'm going to ask that the Chair rule on the germaneness but before I do so, I want the body to realize this is not any parliamentary maneuvering. If we wanted to do that, we'd have roll call votes on the call of the questions and reconsidering and all that routine. It is not a parliamentary maneuver, not is it necessarily anti to what Senator Labeledz is trying to do. What I am going to suggest to the Chair in my argument for the non...that it's not germane, is that Senator Lynch's amendment deals with abuse. Senator Bernice Labeledz's amendment deals with maturity. What I would argue, and what I would like the body just to think about is, I believe Senator Labeledz's amendment to be perfectly germane to the bill and should be offered as an amendment to the bill and will be just fine. My problem comes with the policy that we set as a body when we allow an amendment to the amendment that is not germane to that particular amendment to happen and if we're not careful, the policy then will be set that even though we have two different subjects, one on maturity and one on abuse, we can go ahead and put a nongermane amendment, attach it as an amendment to the amendment with a simple majority vote. And I think that's kind of a dangerous policy for the body to get into, so I'm not arguing that Senator Labeledz's amendment is a poor, improper, in fact, it may be a very, very good amendment as itself to LB 425. So procedurally Senator Lynch should be able to offer his amendment. Procedurally then there should be another amendment filed by Senator Labeledz, they both be agreed to and we have no problem. But as an amendment to the amendment you're putting two different topics together and I would see that coming to haunt us later on as a precedent later on in the session when push gets to shove when we're all trying to get nongermane things put on. This would set the policy at a very, very liberalized germaneness rule as a simple majority could be able to do as an amendment to an amendment on another issue, say for example, taxes. And I think we should look at that as a body. That's the only reason I raise the objection.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Labeledz, would you like to respond to this germaneness question?

SENATOR LABEDZ: Of course, as usual, I disagree with Senator Bernard-Stevens. It is part of LB 425 and it is intent language and Senator Lynch himself was trying to add his amendment as part of the intent language of LB 425, so I disagree that it's not germane.