

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 4, 2004 LR 14

degree it reflects the conversations that we've had over the years and certainly last year on this floor. So, Mr. President, I would argue strongly against overruling the Chair on the Chair's ruling. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Schimek. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Bromm, did you wish to address the...is Senator Bromm present? I do not see Senator Bromm. Senator Beutler, did you wish to address overruling the Chair?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes, Senator Cudaback, I would like to recommend to the body that they do not overrule your decision. The germaneness rule I think has been interpreted for a long time in a rather liberal fashion, and it's been interpreted in that liberal fashion for very practical reasons, and that is, as we go on into the session, there are just certain things that we all recognize must get done and must be attached to other bills in order to get it done. And so I don't think you would want to revert back to an extremely strict interpretation of the germaneness rule at this particular point in time, or at any particular point in time. The rule itself indicates that it must be the natural and logical sequence of the subject matter of the original proposal, and I don't think anyone in here would doubt but that the material in this amendment is natural and a logical sequence of the totality of all our discussions on the...on the casino proposal. Keep in mind, I think, the reasons for a germaneness rule. One is so that people are not caught too much off guard or by surprise, and in that regard I don't think anybody could argue that anybody is being caught off guard or by surprise by any material relating to casinos at this point in time. We have been all over this subject. The people know we're seriously considering it. They know we're considering it in a variety of different forms. There is no surprise element here. There is no reason to support some kind of strict interpretation of germaneness. And the other reason for a germaneness rule is so that you alleviate the pressure on the two subject matter or the one subject matter rule, but in this case that doesn't pertain either because she's replacing subject matter and there is one subject matter in the amendment. So I think that it's...not only would it be bad to replace a broad interpretation of the germaneness rule with a strict one,