

Germaneness Requirements

Background. The word “germane” usually is defined as “in close relationship, appropriate, relative or pertinent to.” According to Tilson’s *Parliamentary Law and Procedure*, the basic principle of germaneness “lies in the need for orderly legislation.”

The principle of germaneness was relatively unknown in general parliamentary law before the late 1700s. The Congress of the Confederation—the precursor to the Congress of the United States—made an attempt to address germaneness in 1781. The first formal germaneness rule was adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives in 1789. The text of the original rule was modified in 1822 to read: “No motion or proposition, on a subject different from that under consideration, shall be admitted under color of amendment.” This wording became the basis for most modern germaneness provisions.

Current practices. Today, the principle of germaneness is well established. Forty state constitutions contain a provision that requires a bill to address or contain a single subject (see table 00-5.20). In Mississippi, germaneness is implied, but a single subject requirement is not specifically stated in the constitution. No specific single subject provision is set forth by the constitutions in Arkansas, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island and Vermont.

In addition, 80 legislative bodies reported that they have chamber rules on germaneness of amendments or motions (see table 00-5.21). The following 12 chambers do not have germaneness rules.

Alabama Senate	Oklahoma Senate
Hawaii House	Tennessee Senate and House
Iowa Senate	Virginia Senate
Michigan Senate	West Virginia Senate
Nevada House	Wyoming Senate and House

As shown in table 00-5.22, most legislative assemblies enforce germaneness provisions in committee as well as on the floor.

Tests for germaneness. Germaneness means the relevance or appropriateness of amendments or motions to the item under discussion. What does this mean? How does one decide what is germane?

Former U.S. House Speaker John G. Carlisle set this test for germaneness: “After a bill has been reported to the House, no different subject can be introduced into it by amendment whether as a substitute or otherwise. When, therefore, it is objected that a proposed amendment is not in order because it is not germane, the meaning of the objection is merely that it [the proposed amendment] is a motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration.”

Tables 00-5.23 and 00-5.24 illustrate the key language or test for germaneness that is included in chamber rules today, and table 00-5.25 provides the germaneness provisions from several parliamentary manuals.

Do legislators use germaneness rules to question the appropriateness of amendments or motions? The answer is yes. However, when asked if the number of member challenges to amendments or motions based on germaneness had changed during the past five years, most chambers reported that the number had remained the same. Only five legislative bodies—the Kansas Senate and House, Montana Senate and House and New Hampshire House—indicated that the number had decreased. Member challenges based on germaneness were reported to have increased in 19 chambers (see table 00-5.26).

As previously noted, there is no single test for determining when a proposed amendment or motion is germane. When called upon to make a ruling on germaneness, the presiding officer or parliamentarian should:

1. Look to the state constitution, chamber rules, other chamber precedents and adopted parliamentary manual for requirements on germaneness.
2. Develop a personal checklist of test ideas.
3. Use good judgment to make a fair determination.

Sample Checklist to Test Germaneness

- ✓ Does the amendment deal with a different topic or subject?
- ✓ Does the amendment unreasonably or unduly expand the subject of the bill?
- ✓ Would the amendment introduce an independent question?
- ✓ Is the amendment relevant, appropriate, and in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal?
- ✓ Would the amendment change the purpose, scope or object of the original bill?
- ✓ Would the amendment change one type of motion into another type?
- ✓ Would the amendment change a private (or local) bill into a general bill?
- ✓ Would the amendment require a change in the bill title?

The role of the courts. Most state constitutions contain single-subject provisions. As a result, the courts may be asked to review legislation enacted by the legislature to ensure that it meets the constitutional requirements. When asked if the number of court challenges of enacted legislation based on single-subject violations had changed during the past five years, most chambers indicated that the number had remained the same (see table 00-5.27). The California Assembly, Iowa Senate and House and Kansas Senate reported that the number had decreased. On the other hand, the Arizona Senate and House, Florida House, Illinois Senate, Maryland Senate and House, Minnesota House, Missouri Senate, Ohio House, Pennsylvania Senate and House, Tennessee Senate and Washington House reported an increase in court challenges.

Court rulings may affect the definition or interpretation of single-subject or germaneness provisions. Table 00-5.28 shows that most legislative bodies feel that court rulings have not made significant changes during the past five years, and that the single-subject or germaneness definition has remained approximately the same. Thirteen chambers believe that court rulings have caused stricter interpretations. No legislative body indicated that a more lenient interpretation has resulted from recent court rulings.

Table 00-5.20 Constitutional Provisions That Limit Bills to One Subject

State	Constitutional Provision
Alabama	Art. 45, Sec. 44
Alaska	Art. II, Sec. 13
Arizona	Art. II, Sec. 13
Arkansas	No specific provision
California	Art. IV, Sec. 9
Colorado	Art. V, Sec. 21
Connecticut	No specific provision
Delaware	Art. II, Sec. 16
Florida	Art. III, Sec. 6
Georgia	Art. III, Sec. 7
Hawaii	Art. III, Sec. 15
Idaho	Art. III, Sec. 16
Illinois	Art. IV, Sec. 8
Indiana	Art. 4, Sec. 19
Iowa	Art. III, Sec. 29
Kansas	Art. 2, Sec. 16
Kentucky	Sec. 51
Louisiana	Art. IV, Sec. 15
Maine	No specific provision
Maryland	Art. III, Sec. 29
Massachusetts	No specific provision
Michigan	Art. IV, Sec. 24
Minnesota	Art. IV, Sec. 27
Mississippi	Implied by Art. 4, Secs. 60 and 71
Missouri	Sec. 23
Montana	Art. V, Sec. 11
Nebraska	Art. III, Sec. 14
Nevada	Art. 4, Sec. 17
New Hampshire	No specific provision
New Jersey	Art. IV, Sec. VII, Para. 4
New Mexico	Art. IV, Sec. 16
New York	Art. III, Sec. 15
North Carolina	No specific provision
North Dakota	Art. II, Sec. 61

**Table 00-5.20 Constitutional Provisions That
Limit Bills to One Subject, cont'd.**

Ohio	No specific provision
Oklahoma	Art. V, Sec. 57
Oregon	Art. IV, Sec. 20
Pennsylvania	Art. III, Sec. 3
Rhode Island	No specific provision
South Carolina	Art. III, Sec. 17
South Dakota	Art. III, Sec. 21
Tennessee	Art. II, Sec. 17
Texas	Art. III, Sec. 35
Utah	Art. 6, Sec. 22
Vermont	No specific provision
Virginia	Art. IV, Sec. 12
Washington	Art. II, Sec. 19
West Virginia	Art. VI, Sec. 30
Wisconsin	Art. IV, Sec. 18
Wyoming	Art. 3, Sec. 24

Table 00-5.21 Chamber Rules Contain a Germaneness Provision

State (1)	Chamber rules contain a germaneness provision	Chamber rules do not address germaneness
Alabama		S
Alaska	B	
Arizona	B	
Arkansas	B	
California	B	
Colorado	B	
Connecticut	B	
Delaware	H	
Florida	B	
Georgia	B	
Hawaii	S	2
Idaho	B	
Illinois	B	
Indiana	B	
Iowa	H	S
Kansas	B	
Kentucky	B	
Louisiana	B	
Maine	B	
Maryland	B	
Massachusetts	B	
Michigan	H	S
Minnesota	B	
Mississippi	H	
Missouri	B	
Montana	B	

Table 00-5.21 Chamber Rules Contain a Germaneness Provision, cont'd.

State (1)	Chamber rules contain a germaneness provision	Chamber rules do not address germaneness
Nebraska	S	
Nevada	S	H
New Hampshire	B	
New Jersey		
New Mexico	B	
New York	H	
North Carolina	B	
North Dakota	B	
Ohio	B	
Oklahoma	H	S
Oregon	B	
Pennsylvania	B	
Rhode Island	H	
South Carolina	B	
South Dakota	B	
Tennessee		B
Texas	B	
Utah	B	
Vermont	S	
Virginia	H	S
Washington	B	
West Virginia	H	S
Wisconsin	B	
Wyoming		B
District of Columbia	S	

Table 00-5.21 Chamber Rules Contain a Germaneness Provision, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Notes:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.
2. Hawaii: The House rules do not contain a germaneness provision. However, germaneness language or tests are set forth in case law and attorney general opinion.

Table 00-5.22 Germaneness Enforced in Committee**Germaneness provisions are enforced in committee in the following chambers.**

Alabama Senate	Missouri Senate and House
Arizona Senate and House	Montana Senate and House
Arkansas Senate and House	Nevada Senate
California Senate and Assembly	New Hampshire Senate and House
Colorado Senate and House	New Mexico Senate and House
Connecticut Senate and House	New York Assembly
Delaware House	North Carolina Senate and House
Florida Senate and House	North Dakota Senate and House
Georgia House	Ohio Senate
Hawaii Senate and House	Oregon House
Idaho Senate and House	Pennsylvania Senate and House
Illinois Senate and House	Rhode Island House
Indiana Senate and House	South Carolina House
Iowa Senate	Texas Senate
Kansas Senate	Utah Senate and House
Louisiana House	Virginia Senate
Maryland Senate and House	West Virginia Senate and House
Minnesota Senate and House	Wisconsin Senate and Assembly
Mississippi House	Wyoming Senate and House

Germaneness provisions are not enforced in committee in the following chambers.

Alaska Senate and House	Ohio House
Georgia Senate	Oklahoma House
Iowa House	Oregon Senate
Kansas House	South Dakota Senate and House
Kentucky Senate and House	Texas House
Louisiana Senate	Vermont Senate
Maine Senate and House	Virginia House
Michigan House	Washington Senate
Nebraska Senate	

Other:

Massachusetts Senate and House (up to each committee)

Table 00-5.23 Main Germaneness Language or Tests

State (1)	May pertain only to a single subject	May not be on different subject	Must be relevant, appropriate	Cannot expand bill subject	Must relate to subject of bill as introduced	Must relate to bill purpose based on total content
Alabama						
Alaska	B					
Arizona	H	H	B	B		B
Arkansas		B				
California		B	H		S	
Colorado		S		S		
Connecticut		B				
Delaware	H			H		
Florida		B	B	H		H
Georgia	B	S				S
Hawaii	B	B	H	H		
Idaho	H	S				
Illinois		B				H
Indiana	S	H				
Iowa		B	S	S		S
Kansas			H			H
Kentucky	H	B	H	H	S	S
Louisiana	S				H	
Maine		B	S			S
Maryland		B				
Massachusetts		B	H	H	H	H
Michigan	H					
Minnesota		H	H	H	S	S
Mississippi		H	H	H		H
Missouri	S	S	B	B	B	B
Montana	B	B	B	B	B	

Table 00-5.23 Main Germaneness Language or Tests, cont'd.

State (1)	May pertain only to a single subject	May not be on different subject	Must be relevant, appropriate	Cannot expand bill subject	Must relate to subject of bill as introduced	Must relate to bill purpose based on total content
Nebraska		S	S			
Nevada		S				
New Hampshire		S			H	
New Jersey						
New Mexico	S	S	H		H	
New York		H				
North Carolina		S	B			
North Dakota						
Ohio		B				
Oklahoma		H				
Oregon		H				
Pennsylvania			H			S
Rhode Island	H	H	H	H	H	
South Carolina		S	B			
South Dakota	B	B				
Tennessee						
Texas		B				
Utah		B	H	H	B	H
Vermont			S			
Virginia	H	H			H	H
Washington	S					S
West Virginia	H	H	H	H		H
Wisconsin	H	B	B	B		B
Wyoming						
District of Columbia		S				

Table 00-5.23 Main Germaneness Language or Tests, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Note:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.

Table 00-5.24 More Germaneness Language or Tests

State (1)	Cannot expand sections or chapters in bill or title	Cannot change bill title	Cannot change scope	Cannot change object	Cannot change a private or local bill to general bill	Cannot change the type of motion	Other
Alabama							
Alaska		B					
Arizona			H				
Arkansas							
California							
Colorado							2
Connecticut							
Delaware	H						
Florida			S		H		3
Georgia					S		
Hawaii		H					
Idaho							
Illinois							
Indiana							
Iowa			S				
Kansas							4
Kentucky							
Louisiana				S			
Maine							
Maryland							
Massachusetts			H			H	
Michigan							
Minnesota			H				
Mississippi	H		H				5
Missouri			S				
Montana			B		B	B	

Table 00-5.24 More Germaneness Language or Tests, cont'd.

State (1)	Cannot expand sections or chapters in bill or title	Cannot change bill title	Cannot change scope	Cannot change object	Cannot change a private or local bill to general bill	Cannot change the type of motion	Other
Nebraska							
Nevada							6
New Hampshire							
New Jersey							
New Mexico				H			
New York							
North Carolina							
North Dakota							7
Ohio							
Oklahoma							
Oregon		H					8
Pennsylvania							
Rhode Island	H						
South Carolina							
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas							
Utah			H				
Vermont							
Virginia							
Washington		H	B	B			
West Virginia				H	H	H	
Wisconsin			B				
Wyoming							
District of Columbia							

Table 00-5.24 More Germaneness Language or Tests, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Notes:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.
2. Colorado: In the House, an amendment must relate to the same subject as the original bill, resolution or memorial.
3. Florida: The Senate has germaneness standards. In the House, the scope of the bill cannot be expanded.
4. Kansas: In the Senate, an amendment must be germane to the bill.
5. Mississippi: In the House, an amendment cannot change the original purpose of the bill.
6. Nevada: In the Senate, no bill or resolution may be amended by incorporating any irrelevant subject matter or by associating or annexing any other bill or resolution pending in the Senate.
7. North Dakota: In both chambers, the general subject matter cannot be changed.
8. Oregon: In the Senate, the president makes decisions based upon section 402 of *Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure*.

Table 00-5.25 Germaneness Provisions from Selected Parliamentary Manuals

Mason's Manual of Legislative Procedure

Sec. 402. Amendments Must Be Germane

1. Every amendment proposed must be germane to the subject of the proposition or to the section or paragraph to be amended.
2. To determine whether an amendment is germane, the question to be answered is whether the amendment is relevant, appropriate, and in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal.
3. To be germane, the amendment is required only to relate to the same subject. It may entirely change the effect of or be in conflict with the spirit of the original motion or measure and still be germane to the subject.
4. An entirely new proposal may be substituted by amendment as long as it is germane to the main purpose of the original proposal.
5. An amendment to an amendment must be germane to the subject of the amendment as well as to the main question.

Reed's Parliamentary Rules

Section 160. Amendments Must Be Germane.

Notwithstanding what has been said as to the wide range which amendments may take, yet there is a limitation. They must be germane or relevant to the subject matter of the original proposition. It is impossible to lay down any precise rule upon this subject, and much depends on the good sense of the presiding officer. A rule of the House of Representatives is declaratory of the general parliamentary law, and expresses it in these words, "No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment."

Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised

Section 12. Amend.

...An amendment must always be germane—that is, closely related to or having bearing on the subject of the motion to be amended. This means that no new subject can be introduced under pretext of being an amendment...

...Determining the Germaneness of an Amendment. As already stated, an amendment must be germane to be in order. To be germane, an amendment must in some way involve the same question that is raised by the motion to which it is applied. A secondary amendment must relate to the primary amendment in the same way. An amendment cannot introduce an independent question; but an amendment can be hostile to, or even defeat, the spirit of the original motion and still be germane.

Aside from these principles, there is no single, all-inclusive test for determining when a proposed amendment is germane and when it is not. A method by which the germaneness of an amendment can often be verified, however, grows out of the following general rules of parliamentary law:

Table 00-5.25 Germaneness Provisions from Selected Parliamentary Manuals, cont'd.

Robert's Rules, cont'd.

1. During the session in which the assembly has decided a question, another main motion raising the same or substantially the same question cannot be introduced.
2. While a motion has been temporarily disposed of (by being referred to a committee, postponed, or laid on the table, or by being the subject of a motion to reconsider that has not been called up), no other motion can be admitted that might conflict with one of the possible final decisions on the first motion.

By these rules, if a proposed amendment is related to the main motion in such a way that, after the adoption, rejection, or temporary disposal of the present main motion, the essential idea of the amendment could not be introduced as an independent resolution at least during the same session, the amendment is germane and should be admitted, since there will not, or may not, be any opportunity to present it later. This test cannot be reliably used to determine that an amendment is out of order, since it is sometimes possible for an amendment to be germane even if, regardless of action on the present main motion, the idea embodied in the amendment could be introduced independently later in the same session.

As an example of a germane amendment, assume that a motion is pending "that the Society authorize the purchase of a new desk for the Secretary." It would be germane and in order to amend by inserting after "desk" the words "and matching chair," since both relate to providing the secretary with the necessary furniture. On the other hand, an amendment to add to the motion the words "and the payment of the President's expenses to the State Convention," is not germane.

Or assume that the following is the pending motion: "that the City Council commend Officer George for his action in..." An amendment to strike out commend and insert censure, although antagonistic to the original intent, is germane and in order because both ideas deal with the Council's opinion of the officer's action. Also, since a motion to censure the officer for the same act could not be introduced independently in the same session after the adoption of a motion to commend him, the amendment to change commend to censure is germane under the rule given above. It should be noted that censure is different from commend.

There are borderline cases where a presiding officer will find it difficult to judge the germaneness of an amendment. Whenever in doubt he should admit the amendment or, in important cases, refer the decision to the assembly: "The chair is in doubt and will ask the assembly to decide whether the amendment is germane. [Debate, if any, provided that debate is in order.] The question is on whether the amendment is germane to the resolution [or "to the primary amendment"]. As many as are of the opinion that the amendment is germane, say aye...Those of the opinion that it is not germane, say no..., etc.

Table 00-5.25 Germaneness Provisions from Selected Parliamentary Manuals, cont'd.

Shattuck's The Woman's Manual of Parliamentary Law

Section 88. Amendments Must be Germane.

There is one restriction upon amendment. Any proposed change must be "germane," or relevant, to the original measure. No matter how hostile it may be; if it is germane, it is permissible. But if it is on a different subject, it is ruled out of order, either by the chair or by a point of order, as "not germane." An amendment also must not be "obviously trivial," or foolish. Illustrations: The Mendon Women's Club has under consideration a motion "That the treasurer be instructed to ascertain the price of the several halls in town, with a view to securing a permanent place of meeting for the club." Mrs. Burns moves to amend by striking out the words "the treasurer" and inserting the words "the president;" or, to amend by adding, after the word "halls," the words, "and vestries;" or, to amend by striking out all after the word "instructed" and inserting instead, the words "to hire a hall for a permanent place of meeting." All these are relevant amendments, though, as will be seen, they change the intent of the original motion. But suppose Mrs. Burns should move to amend by striking out the words: "a permanent place of meeting for the club," and inserting the words: "a place for a public entertainment;" this would be irrelevant and would be ruled out of order as "not germane," because it is an entirely different question. The chair would say: "The motion of Mrs. Burns to amend by inserting the words 'a place for a public entertainment,' instead of the words 'a permanent place of meeting' is out of order, the proposed amendment not being germane to the subject under consideration, which is the finding of a place for our regular meetings and not the holding of an entertainment."

Again, if Mrs. Burns had moved that the word "Vermont" be inserted in place of the word "town," this would be ruled out of order as "obviously trivial." The general practice in regard to this matter is thus concisely stated in the rule of the United States House of Representatives: "No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment," and Warrington adds: "A member who offers a proposition in good faith is entitled to vote upon it unembarrassed by other subjects, though he must submit to hostile amendments on the same general subject." There is no hardship in admitting amendments which change the intent of the motion, for "the assembly is supposed to know what it wants, and will reject them if it desires to do so."

Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure

Amendments Must Be Germane

The most important principle concerning amendments is that they must be germane, that is, they must be relevant to, and have direct bearing on, the subject of the pending motion that the amendment seeks to change. For example, a motion "that the association pay expenses for its two delegates to the June 4 convention in Chicago" could be amended by adding the words, "not to exceed \$500 each," because this amendment relates closely to the idea of the motion, which is to pay convention expenses.

If, however, an amendment is proposed to add the words "and that we raise the salary of the Executive Secretary," the amendment would not be germane to the subject of the motion. The presiding officer should immediately rule this amendment out of order, stating: "The amendment is out of order because it is not germane to the pending motion."

Table 00-5.25 Germaneness Provisions from Selected Parliamentary Manuals, cont'd.

Sturgis' Standard Code, cont'd.

An amendment that would change one type of motion into another type of motion is never in order. For example, if a member moves "that the pending question be referred to the Membership Committee," it would be out of order for someone to move "that the motion be amended by striking out the words 'referred to the Membership Committee' and inserting in their place the words, 'postponed until the next meeting.'" This would change the motion from a motion to refer to a motion to postpone definitely, which has a different order of precedence. It is therefore out of order. However, instead of moving to amend the motion to refer, the member could move to postpone definitely, since that motion outranks the motion to refer. (This also would be simpler than going through the amendment process.)

Tilson's Parliamentary Law and Procedure

Germane Amendments

Paragraph 7b of Rule XVI— "... and no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment."

In the last three lines of paragraph 7(b), of Rule XVI, lies more controversy than in any other provision of this or any other parliamentary procedure. More pages have been written and printed on the subject of the germaneness of amendments than upon any other subject within the domain of parliamentary law and were it possible to completely exhaust the topic, it would require a full sized Carnegie library to contain the volumes that might be written.

Let us repeat the meaningful words embodying the law of germaneness,—they should be at the tongue's end of every parliamentarian—"No motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment."

The reasons for adherence to the rule of germaneness are many and weighty. Its basic principle lies in the need for orderly legislation. If by way of amendment, all sorts of incongruous proposals may be strung together, a hodge-podge will be the result. Difficult enough under the best of circumstances to find one's way through the maze of statutes, it would become an impossible task were it permitted at the whim or caprice of a temporary majority to add at pleasure to any pending legislation without regard to its relationship to the original subject matter.

Ordinarily bills and resolutions are prepared in advance, carefully gone over by committees and, with explanatory reports, submitted for amendment and final action. Usually, the members have an opportunity to scrutinize the bills and give them some study before being called upon to take action. It would tend to destroy the changes of securing well considered legislation were the rule of germaneness to be ignored so as to permit amendments not related to the subject matter under consideration and which have not been considered by a committee to be offered and acted upon indiscriminately.

It is obvious that no hard and fast rule can be laid down to cover all cases that may arise. There is no limit to the number and variety of questions that will actually arise in an assembly transacting legislative business on any considerable scale.

Table 00-5.25 Germaneness Provisions from Selected Parliamentary Manuals, cont'd.

Tilson's Parliamentary Law, cont'd.

The application of the rule of germaneness in each particular case must be left largely to the presiding officer's knowledge of parliamentary procedure, but also much may usually be safely left to his common sense in the proper construction and application of the rule.

As in the interpretation of other instruments, some presiding officers will naturally incline to a strict construction, while others will lean toward the other side, but a reasonable observance of the principle upon which the rule rests will usually not permit a presiding officer to go far astray.

Fortunately, for any assembly adopting the rules of the House of Representatives for its guidance, there is always a well filled storehouse of precedents and carefully considered decisions available for reference on the subject of germaneness as well as on all the other questions that may arise in connection with construing the House Rules. The volume, entitled "Constitution, Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives," with copious notes and cited precedents, compiled under the direction of an able parliamentarian, can be readily obtained, and is an indispensable guide to anyone who wishes to acquaint himself with what may not be properly characterized as American parliamentary procedure. The eight large volumes of Hind's Precedents, a monumental work, covering more than a hundred years of Congressional parliamentary practice, are accessible at public libraries.

Table 00-5.26 Member Challenges Based on Germaneness

State (1)	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same
Alabama			S
Alaska			B
Arizona	B		
Arkansas			B
California			H
Colorado	S		H
Connecticut			B
Delaware			H
Florida			B
Georgia	B		
Hawaii	H		S
Idaho	H		S
Illinois			B
Indiana			B
Iowa	S		H
Kansas		B	
Kentucky			B
Louisiana	H		S
Maine			B
Maryland			B
Massachusetts			B
Michigan			B
Minnesota	B		
Mississippi	H		
Missouri	B		
Montana		B	

Table 00-5.26 Member Challenges Based on Germaneness, cont'd.

State (1)	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same
Nebraska			S
Nevada			B
New Hampshire		H	S
New Jersey			
New Mexico	H		S
New York			H
North Carolina	H		S
North Dakota			B
Ohio	H		S
Oklahoma	S		H
Oregon			B
Pennsylvania			B
Rhode Island			H
South Carolina			B
South Dakota			B
Tennessee			B
Texas			B
Utah			B
Vermont			S
Virginia	H		S
Washington			B
West Virginia			B
Wisconsin			B
Wyoming			B
District of Columbia			

Table 00-5.26 Member Challenges Based on Germaneness, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Note:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.

Table 00-5.27 Number of Court Challenges

State (1)	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same
Alabama			S
Alaska			B
Arizona	B		
Arkansas			S
California		H	
Colorado			B
Connecticut			B
Delaware			H
Florida	H		S
Georgia			B
Hawaii			B
Idaho			B
Illinois	S		H
Indiana			B
Iowa		B	
Kansas		S	H
Kentucky			B
Louisiana			B
Maine			
Maryland	B		
Massachusetts			B
Michigan			B
Minnesota	H		S
Mississippi			
Missouri	S		H
Montana			B

Table 00-5.27 Number of Court Challenges, cont'd.

State (1)	Increased	Decreased	Remained the same
Nebraska			S
Nevada			B
New Hampshire			B
New Jersey			
New Mexico			B
New York			
North Carolina			S
North Dakota			B
Ohio	H		S
Oklahoma			B
Oregon			B
Pennsylvania	B		
Rhode Island			H
South Carolina			S
South Dakota			
Tennessee	S		H
Texas			B
Utah			B
Vermont			S
Virginia			B
Washington	H		S
West Virginia			B
Wisconsin			B
Wyoming			B
District of Columbia			

Table 00-5.27 Number of Court Challenges, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Note:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.

Table 00-5.28 Changes in Court Interpretations

State (1)	Stricter	More lenient	Remained the same
Alabama			S
Alaska			B
Arizona			B
Arkansas			S
California	H		S
Colorado			S
Connecticut			B
Delaware			H
Florida	H		S
Georgia			B
Hawaii			B
Idaho			B
Illinois	B		
Indiana			B
Iowa			B
Kansas			B
Kentucky			B
Louisiana			B
Maine			
Maryland	B		
Massachusetts			B
Michigan			B
Minnesota	H		S
Mississippi			
Missouri	S		
Montana			B

Table 00-5.28 Changes in Court Interpretation, cont'd.

State (1)	Stricter	More lenient	Remained the same
Nebraska			S
Nevada			B
New Hampshire			B
New Jersey			
New Mexico			B
New York			
North Carolina			B
North Dakota			B
Ohio			B
Oklahoma			B
Oregon			B
Pennsylvania	B		
Rhode Island			H
South Carolina			B
South Dakota			B
Tennessee	S		H
Texas			B
Utah			B
Vermont			S
Virginia			B
Washington	B		
West Virginia			B
Wisconsin			B
Wyoming			B
District of Columbia			

Table 00-5.28 Changes in Court Interpretations, cont'd.

Key:

S=Senate

H=House or Assembly

B=Both chambers

Note:

1. The following chambers did not return a survey: Alabama House, Delaware Senate, Mississippi Senate, New Jersey Senate and General Assembly, New York Senate, Rhode Island Senate, American Samoa Senate and House, Guam Senate, Northern Mariana Islands Senate and House, Puerto Rico Senate and House, and Virgin Islands Senate.

