

but I don't think that I indicated that I was going to take five.

SPEAKER MARVEL: You have ten minutes, why don't you proceed. You have taken about six now.

SENATOR NEWELL: Thank you. Well I took about three and Senator DeCamp took three and that makes us equal. Let me get back to the rules proposal that I am talking about. Now what we are talking about here in this rule change and I hope that everybody is turned to page 21 by now, I know that you are all very interested in fairness and justice and what is right. I know that you are all very interested in keeping with our rules, and so I propose what we say here, the intent of these rules is that these bills should be considered and adopted in the same manner as bills. Now it says, rejection quite clearly, it says change quite clearly, it says alteration quite clearly, amendment or modification of the rules. Now I say that whether this is, this should be a rule change or at least a suspension of the rules before this motion could be brought up. I'll ask the President about that in a moment. Whether it is or whether it is not the issue is this: This is a momentous decision by this Legislature. It is not a small matter. It is not a matter that has no... not only has no legal ramifications and we are not really sure that it has, there has been Supreme Court decisions as the Attorney General points out in his two opinions regarding this area, that rejection has not really been ruled on by the Supreme Court. For that reason we do not know exactly what this proposal means but what we do know is this. The intent was to have a public hearing, that was our own rules, that this is not a minor matter. Any time you change the Constitution of the United States it is not a piddly little thing that you ought to do at the last minute without a public hearing, without having input, without understanding the full facts and I would also like to say, digress for a moment, that Senator Haberman's points were not at all well taken and many of them were, in fact, erroneous especially his charge that this is to give the District of Columbia statehood. It is not. The Congress of the United States has made it very clear that this was to give the District of Columbia a special status and I think that is a point, if we ever get to the true debate on this issue, which we should not, since it has not had a public hearing, we ought to dwell with certain amount of interest in. But the issue here should simply be whether or not we are going to violate our own rules, our own purposes and take up this resolution, which is a basic rejection of a constitutional convention, basically telling Congress which has already adopted it, that you know, they ought to rescind