

January 4, 1990

that is an area where I could possibly slip through that rule by arguing, no, this is not a nongermane issue, and not address what is left of the rule, which is the real crux, the real issue, and that is that you can only have one issue, one topic of discussion, one subject matter in any piece of legislation, and, ladies and gentlemen, that is governed by the Constitution of this state, and, really, all the change in the rule that Senator Lynch and the committee bring to you mirrors that. I don't think it hampers our procedures or the germaneness rule at all. I would urge your adoption, and if it is not adopted, to be quite honest with you, it would not impact me that greatly because it does not make a substantive change at all. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Barrett, please, followed by Senator Chambers and Senator Withem.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, Mr. President, and members. I feel compelled, perhaps, to make a comment, at least a brief comment, on this subject because I am probably involved in this as much as anyone in this body, and sometimes my interpretations are questioned and rightly so. I think I would certainly compliment Senator Lynch and the members of the Rules Committee for bringing this to our attention at this point in time. Let's get it resolved now and go forward. It has been on the minds of a lot of us for a good number of years. The proposal, as presented by the Rules Committee, as Senator Lynch explained, is simply eliminating the word "and", and inserting the word "or". At the present time, our germaneness rules set up a subject or a purpose test. It is too broad, of course, and as I understand it, Senator Lynch, now with your proposal, we will be talking about a specific subject or then the natural or logical sequence to the subject matter. Well, at best, the interpretation of the Chair is subjective. This is certainly a broadening of our present or existing germaneness rule. It is not opening the door entirely. It could have been worse, much worse. At best, some of this is going to be left to the discretion of the Chair. I guess I need to remind myself, and I need to remind the body that the interpretation of the Chair is made by the presiding officer according to the rules, as he interprets them as he sees them. This isn't going to make the job of the presiding officer any easier, as far as I am concerned, and I am really rather comfortable with the existing rules. I don't think this is any major...this isn't any major concern, perhaps, other than to say that, personally, I will probably vote no simply because as a