January 4, 1990

Senator Lynch, and then Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I have some problems with the amendment as proposed. As Senator Withem has pointed out, actually I have no problem with the stricken language. I think there has been a lot of logic put to the fact that the stricken language perhaps should go. What I have a problem with is striking the word "and" and inserting "or" because I really...if you read it then, then a germane amendment must be in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original bill, and I am not at all sure what that means. It means something to me when it has the word "and" and relates back to the details of the specific subject matter of the bill, and unless someone can explain to me how a Chair would interpret what is natural and logical sequence, it seems to me it will add to the confusion. It will increase the probability of the lack of uniformity of how the rule is interpreted, and increase the lack of uniformity for how all of us would understand what would be considered germane. I would much prefer to see the word "and" remain, which at least I think has some relationship. When they have two separate standards, it seems to me it could be exceedingly confusing for those of us out here on the floor trying to anticipate what a ruling might be, but I have no problem, as I have indicated, with the language that you suggest to be stricken in the committee report.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Lynch, please.

SENATOR LYNCH: Mr. Chairman, are there any more lights?

PRESIDENT: Two.

SENATOR LYNCH: I will yield until closing, then I can say what I want.

PRESIDENT: All right, Senator Pirsch, please, then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR PIRSCH: It is interesting to note the various concerns, those who have a concern with the and/or change, and those that have a concern not with that but the definition. And I guess the "or" does not concern me as much as taking out the last sentence. Senator Chambers called it, when you define something that is not, you define everything else, and I don't think that