

there is any rule that we used to determine germaneness which would indicate that this amendment is germane. The Speaker in this case did not rule on the germaneness because he was not asked to rule on the germaneness. I feel that perhaps I have been a little neglectful myself in that regard letting it pass, but I felt that you were probably all sick of me raising the germaneness issue at that point in time and I did let it pass. At that point in time I had not read the case that I am acquainting you with today. But, I did ask from Bruce Cutshall, our bill drafter, what section of the statutes he would put this into. He said Section 19, I have a letter to that regard, because it doesn't pertain to liquor, it has to do with cities and the law of cities so it will be in Section 19 not Section 53. So, it doesn't come in the rule that we most often use same chapter and verse with regard to, in determining the question of germaneness. Nor does it come with in any common sense rule that I can think of. As I said it has nothing to do with liquor or liquor law. So, it is not germane and therefore because of the five day rule it will be held unconstitutional, if tested. I guess the only additional remark that I wanted to make is to point out to you, and I think that this is a good illustration of it, how our haste at the end of the session is making for some bad law, some technically bad law and some unconstitutional law. I think that we are going to consume more time in the long run next year when we come back here to correct these matters than it would have taken for us to sit down and taken a little more time and go through these this year. Now just today, just today we had the sidewalk cafe law, which in my mind is clearly unconstitutional. We have the bankruptcy law which has a technical problem with regards to the insurance provision which Senator Landis tried to solve by a statement of intent but he will not solve by a statement of intent if the language of the statute is clear because the courts do not look to the statements of intent if the language of the statute is clear. It seems to me that the language of the statute is pretty clear. We had a problem with 853 that has obvious technical problems. Senator Goodrich tried to clear that up with a statement of intent and I guess he will not be successful with that. 485 has technical problems. 889 needs adjustment. 847 has some problems. All of these problems could have been cleared up by us if we had taken more time. So I'm just I guess asking you again to give some consideration at the beginning of next session to making some adjustments to our system that will allow us to take more time with bills at the end of the session and hopefully at least get through the technical problems and solve and iron out the technical problems so we have quality legislation