

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I think that the Chair's ruling was correct and if you turn to page 31 of LB 958, you will see that, as drafted by Senator Horgan, in subdivision 13, this bill that he has drafted is talking about amending this violation section. In this violation section it talks about violations by those driving motorcycles, so if Senator Horgan is amending this section that relates to penalties and this very penalty section talks about penalties for motorcycle violations, and Senator Moore's amendment talks about motorcycle violations, whether we like what he's trying to do with reference to the violation is irrelevant. It ties right into the section that is contained in Senator Horgan's bill, which his bill amends, so certainly that provision has to be open to amend it...amendment by anybody. If I chose to, I could offer an amendment to remove some of these exemptions contained in that section. I have not chosen to do so, but I'm saying it's not enough to say, I don't like the amendment, I don't like what is being attempted by the amendment and saying that the amendment is not germane to the bill. It definitely ties into it and if Senator Moore's amendment is not germane, Senator Horgan's attempt to amend this provision is not germane because there's nothing in this section as it exists in law now that deals with his restraints. But what he would argue is that the purpose of his bill is to include restraints in this section. If that is so, Senator Moore has him one up because motorcycles already exist in that section in the law as it's written. So, again, as I was arguing on the other matter, which we didn't bring to conclusion, this one we should look at in terms of what the rule states, what the purpose of the rule is. I think, first of all, I've always been in favor of a liberal interpretation of the germaneness rule. My feeling has always been the only thing that is not germane is something that would constitute two subjects and thereby render the bill unconstitutional. This cannot be considered adding two subjects because it's dealing with a matter that is already covered by the present law. I think that the Chair should be sustained. I just hate that at this time Senator Baack is sitting in the Chair. He is often wrong, but this time he happens to be right and I publicly have to acknowledge it, and I'm glad his attention was elsewhere because he did not hear it and if somebody tells him, I'll just deny it.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Wesely. Yours is the last light on. There are two other lights but they