

April 19, 1989

LB 569

SENATOR PETERSON: Well, I would think it would be germane. It deals with first responders, which are also involved with the EMTs, and falls in between the good Samaritan and EMTs part of the bill. So I would think that it would be germane.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: This bill, and his amendment caught me by surprise, deals with licensure and certification and things of that nature, and it does not go to immunity. Immunity is a separate issue. It is one that can be considered on its own merits, and this amendment will change substantially the direction that the bill is going. So despite the fact that something that may be contained in an amendment may be mentioned in the existing language of the law that is being amended by the bill, itself, that has not been enough by itself to render an amendment germane. It cannot alter substantially the direction of the bill. It deals with the technical aspects of the bill, and it does not change the direction. If that would be the case, it would be germane. I think this goes well beyond what the statement on the face of this bill would indicate to the public that the bill deals with.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Chizek, did you want to make a comment on the germaneness?

SENATOR CHIZEK: Well, I would agree with Senator Chambers on the germaneness issue, especially on the earlier rulings that we have had so far this year. I think there is a substantial difference between the amendment and the intent of the legislation, and I just don't believe it is germane.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Wesely, did you have a comment?

SENATOR WESELY: Not on that.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Carson Rogers, this is your bill, correct?

SENATOR ROGERS: Yes.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Does your bill address any question of immunity from liability?

SENATOR ROGERS: No.