

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

March 8, 2004

LR 14

recognized to speak.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I guess, Mr. Speaker, I would challenge the germaneness of part number one, given the fact that it has nothing to do with AM2670. AM2670 states that the renewal vote, as I stated earlier, would occur. And Senator Schimek is trying to change that into a number of casinos. I will concede that the second part of the division is germane, and would certainly take up that one. But I do challenge the germaneness of part number one, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Schimek, a germaneness question has been raised with respect to the first part of the amendment. Is that correct, Senator Smith, the first part?

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

SPEAKER BROMM: First division. And, Senator Schimek, you're recognized to comment on that.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Yes. I'm sorry that I didn't hear Senator Smith's remarks, Mr. President, but I would make the same argument that I made on the previous amendment. This amendment is exactly the same as it was at the time that we took it up before, except for the number. And we ruled, and in fact upheld the Chair on the germaneness of that amendment. So I would argue that it is germane to the whole thing, and it has been before us as a germane amendment prior to this time. It wasn't challenged before on the division. It was challenged as a whole. And therefore, I would suggest that it is germane. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Schimek and Senator Smith. Let me look at this amendment a second. Members, in looking at Rule 7, 3(e), once a division is accomplished, each proposition is taken as a separate proposition for purposes of germaneness. And I would find that this particular division is not germane to the underlying amendment. And certainly, the decision of the Chair is open to challenge, but that is the ruling of the Chair. Senator Schimek.