

January 4, 1990

that last sentence really does that. I think it is very specific direction on detailing what nongermaneness is and, in fact, makes it more clear. It is not redundant language and, in fact, while we say "or" in the first part, the last sentence that is stricken very definitively says "relates to a substantially different subject or accomplishes substantially different purpose." There is an "or" there. Can this change be a way around or an end run around introduction of legislation that accomplishes a substantially different purpose. I feel very uncomfortable with that definition that is excluded, and while we seem to have a variety of uncomfortableness with either/or, I think that in my mind because of this division of uncomfortableness with either including the "or" or excluding the last sentence, I am going to have to vote against this rule change. If, Senator Chambers, as you said, nothing of substance has occurred, then I think we should reject this amendment.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Chambers...oh, Mr. Clerk, you have an amendment.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Warner would move to amend the committee amendment number 8 by striking the word "or" and reinserting the word "and".

PRESIDENT: Senator Warner, please.

SENATOR WARNER: Well, Mr. President, I decided maybe in order to generate some discussion as to how this might be interpreted with the word "or", the proper way to do it was with the offering of the amendment. I appreciate...I certainly understand the comments where there can be the need, in fact, for some other substantive change in law that particularly when we talk about bills that may have a spending and a revenue mixture that needs to be recognized, and in many cases, I am not terribly upset about suspending that germaneness rule if it was appropriate to do it in those circumstances. I also would...we have to keep in mind, I have never been supportive of limitation on bills because I think that is the point in which the options for alternative ideas should be put into the hopper and there is no restriction there now. As we all well know, it frequently is criticized but, nevertheless, it is the option that has to be preserved if you are going to have a free discussion of ideas. But once you have a specific bill, then I think you have to begin to narrow somewhat what can be done within that piece of legislation unless you require some additional majority than