

January 4, 1990

Legislature, if I were going to alter this, since people are suggesting what might be the better way to do it, Senator Warner, I would strike...here is the way I would have that sentence read, "Germane amendments must be in a natural and logical sequence to the subject matter of the original proposal" and strike this talk about details of the specific subject of the bill because there is no definition of details. If somebody is offering a bill to fund a program and they want to put \$50 million into it and I have an amendment that would reduce that to \$1 million, is that a mere detail of the bill, or is that the bill, itself, and if I succeed, would my amendment, in effect, turn the bill into something entirely different from the intention of the introducer? It certainly would. Dropping from 80 to one is as substantial a change as you can make. Or to let the program that is being discussed go through but strike out all funding, doesn't that change completely from what the introducer has in mind? It certainly does but it would be ruled germane. This is interesting. The way the bill would read with Senator Warner's amendment would be, germane amendments relate only to the details of the specific subject of the bill. What is the specific subject if there is several items, and what are the details of those items? There may not be one subject in the...now there has to be one broad subject but there might be a number of parts to it, so if we are going to take all of those parts together as being the subject, then an amendment to any one of those parts should be germane because the part is certainly lesser than the whole, and a detail has to be less than the complete subject. So you might be opening it more by what we are doing here by saying that it relates to the details of the subject, rather than to the subject, itself. So maybe what Senator Dierks is interested in, since he is a veterinarian, is the entire animal and its overall health, but I, as maybe somebody who wants to get ivory or the horn of a rhinoceros and concerned only about the horn, so I would focus all my attention on that horn and change the bill from what he is talking about to making it legal to take the horn of the animal, and he is interested in preserving the health of the animals. In other words, he says, you can't kill rhinos. I say you can kill them if you want to take the horn. The point I am trying to get to is that you can look at any proposal that we put before us and analyze it and break it down into its parts. With the amendment that Senator Warner is offering, there comes no clarification because the difficulty in the bill that I see is not in the language that follows the "and" or "or", whichever you would use, "must be in a natural and logical sequence to the