

dealing in that it deals with pregnancy, I think. So it seems to me that at this particular point in time we ought to keep our nose to the grindstone and the business at hand and not complicate things further. It seems to me it is not germane.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Okay. Senator Vard Johnson, did you wish to speak to the germaneness?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Yes. This is an issue that, in fact, I would take issue with a nongermaneness ruling because, in fact, the high risk pregnancy program deals with pregnancy which is what this committee amendment deals with. It deals with needy people which is what the committee amendment deals with. And it deals with payments which is what the committee amendment deals with. I mean, I think it is a very germane amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Does anyone else wish to speak on the germaneness issue? I have many lights on. If not, I am going to rule on it. I was somewhat anticipating this but I would rule that it is not germane and this, of course, is a narrow interpretation because I think it could be said that the sections of law would be close enough to say that it is germane. However, the subject matter certainly, in my opinion, is not germane. So for that reason, I would rule that it is not germane. Excuse me, you are not turned on.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: (Microphone not on)...Mr. Speaker, that you are wrong on that ruling. I think, however, that I will just avoid the challenge because this budget stuff is getting to be real tedious and to have it continue to go on and on and on is something else again, which means I will have to withdraw the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Thank you. I do appreciate your attitude, Senator Vard Johnson. Thank you. Where are we now, Mr. Clerk? Okay, now we are back to the committee amendments. Who is handling that? Senator Warner, are you handling the committee amendments? We are back to them.

SENATOR WARNER: The committee amendments? Well, Mr. President, I...inasmuch as I gather the two issues cannot be appropriately placed in one bill, I assume the same would hold true of 201 which I guess then gives even better reason in order for the Legislature to deal with the