

of the Speaker, we started out the year and the Speaker's attitude towards germaneness I felt was very simpatico to mine, and as time has gone on, as the session gets later and the Speaker feels a great need to hurry through things, his interpretations have gotten tighter and tighter and tighter. Now I can appreciate that reasonable, rational evolution from a man whose responsibilities are to make this process work but in regards to this I just think that we have taken the germaneness rule a little too far. In fact I didn't vote for Chris' amendment because I saw a rule, earlier this year, because I saw what I thought would be the desire to constrict this very loosely or very tightly and we basically have seen that sort of evolution. We have seen it being construed more tightly as time goes on. That is the very nature, very logical, very rational sort of evolution but, frankly, it is not a proper evolution. So with that in mind I urge that we overrule the Speaker and then defeat the Chambers motion.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I would like to urge you to uphold the Speaker. You know the germaneness rule has a number of meanings and one of the obvious things that it is meant to try to curtail and control is endless repetitive debate on the same issue and one of the ways it does that is by saying, look, there are certain bills that have certain issues, that we will deal with them in certain bills, and we talk about them as much as we want to, and when we are done we are done. Now what is happening is that 617 and the court fees issue which was debated on 617, which was talked about again on 269 is now sought to be brought back to you on yet another bill and this is precisely the sort of thing that germaneness is designed to help, that is, make our method of discussing issues orderly and do that by relating the discussion of those issues to certain bills in an orderly process and in a fair manner and that has been done. Senator Chambers has had his shot two or three times now at those court fees and enough is enough. There is no logical reason to allow him to come back on an unrelated bill and argue the same thing again and again, especially this late in the session, when we have a whole bunch of issues yet to argue that haven't been argued once. He is saying Chapter 24 has to do with courts and this bill has to do with courts. Well, there are 130 pages of statutes here in Chapter 24. It is senseless to argue that you should open up all of Chapter 24, all 130 pages of statutes, simply because somehow 24 is the same number, I mean that makes a mockery of the whole germaneness rule and Senator Chambers knows that. Again I would ask you