

the Chair is absolutely wrong on this point and that we need to overrule. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Abboud. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam President, and I respect what Chris Abboud just said in terms of he is trying to deal with the matter straight up and I recognize that and appreciate that. That is not the question in my mind and the question is the argument raised by Senator Hall and responded to by Senator Kristensen and we have two different questions there. Senator Hall says, you know, how would you deal with it if you had a section of the committee amendments stripped out, you could never deal with it if you couldn't come back with an amendment and the remedy for that would be reconsideration and reconsideration would always be possible of the question that had been decided. That's...germaneness is not an issue in reconsideration of the vote on the committee amendment which was stripped out. That's very much in order, would always be possible. But once you've taken that out of the bill, or taken that out of the committee amendment then a new amendment could be anything and you have to look at the new amendment on its own and see if it is germane to the bill. So the only question really is, is the Abboud amendment, is it germane to the bill absent the committee amendment that was stripped out, and I guess I would have to come down on the side to say that it would be a real stretch because you do have a specific subject area of the nuclear waste and in connection with that subject area you do have a statute of limitations, a statute of repose pertaining only to nuclear waste matters, specific language dealing with nuclear waste and then we come along with an amendment which deals with a whole another subject area of other torts and statute of repose, opening up another area of debate in a different, really a different whole set of different and particular arguments. So I would urge the body not to overrule the Chair in the instance here. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I just wanted to throw in one comment for what it's worth and I guess I've got some mixed impressions, but the ruling does seem to be consistent with how we've come down in recent times on matters similar to this, it made me think back to the question of dividing the question. And you may recall the question arose, once you had a question divided into five