

point in time. And I understand there may be a lot of people that want to debate. I assume what occurs here, and Senator Vrtiska was kind enough to...

SPEAKER WITHEM: Time.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...offer his bill up to do that. This is the only time I'll speak on it. I'd urge you to vote no.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Mr. President, I'd like the Chair to rule on the germaneness of the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Prior to doing that I guess I would ask, Senator Maurstad, if you have a reason for questioning the germaneness if you would bring that to my attention.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Section 48-144 talks, deals in the area of workers' compensation, only talks about the cancellation, the procedure relative to cancellation or nonrenewal of a policy. And the amendment talks about expending the benefits. And I think that they're two distinctly different subjects.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Will, would you care to address the question of germaneness?

SENATOR WILL: Yeah, very briefly. Senator Withem, because as I indicated, I don't intend to slow down the bill. But I think the fact is that it is in the area of workers' comp. This is an amendment that relates to compensable activities under workers' comp, and therefore I think it's certainly within the general area of law and falls within our germaneness rule.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Will. Having said that, both of you, let me indicate, I think this is the first germaneness question that has been brought up this session. I do have a tendency, when I am presiding, to be fairly tight on these, given the fact that the body can easily, not easily, but can overrule these. And to me being within the same section of law, dealing with the same general subject does not deal with...it does not constitute germaneness. I believe our rule talks about a different purpose behind it, and I would tend to agree with Senator Maurstad that this deals with cancellation