

April 9, 1992

LB 1019

SENATOR WARNER: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And it wouldn't be to suspend the rule...

SENATOR WARNER: Oh, absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...okay.

SENATOR WARNER: Absolutely, yeah.

SPEAKER BAACK: That is my interpretation, too, Senator Chambers, this only applies to just this bill to take up this amendment. Discussion on the suspension motion? Senator Byars. Senator Chambers, did you wish to discuss the suspension motion?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, because I know what is going to happen today, I think we just ought to go on and suspend the germaneness rule for the day, and we would then be guided by whether or not two subject matters are in the bill. That would make it unconstitutional, and it would have to be pretty blatant because there are some things that are being attempted here that might constitute more than one subject in a bill, but that I am not discussing. I have always been in favor of a liberal construction of the germaneness rule. I have not often voted to suspend the rule for any particular purpose, so I am not going to vote yea or nay because I don't want to vote to suspend the rule and I don't want to give the impression that there ought to be a narrow construction of the germaneness rule. But I am not opposed to Senator Wesely attempting to offer these amendments, but I don't know exactly how I feel on each one. And the reason I am making this comment, if the matter is going to come up more times today, we ought to take care of it now, so with that having been said, I would ask the Chair a question.

SPEAKER BAACK: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Can this motion be amended to say that the germaneness rule would be suspended for the remainder of today?

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Chambers, I think our rules are very clear saying that a motion to suspend the rules is nonamendable.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.