

I don't think it has ever been the rule that you can substitute amendments one for another with the unanimous consent of the Legislature. I think that this whole charade is to cast bad faith on those who are on the opposite side of Senator DeCamp at this particular point and time. I would ask the Chair to uphold what has always been the ruling with regard to the substitution of amendments.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Newell, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, I would ask a question of Senator DeCamp and Senator Haberman. Is this substitution, is it a clarification of the original motion? The original amendment or is it a new subject matter all together that you wish to bring up before a bunch of other issues. In other words, if it is just a rewrite or clarification I might not feel so strongly opposed to it, but if it in fact is, you are trying to put an amendment that you already have up there towards the end and you are trying to substitute it for something more earlier on, then I think my objection would not only beit would be even stronger. Could you answer that Senator DeCamp?

SENATOR DeCAMP: It is different.

SENATOR NEWELL: Thank you Senator DeCamp. With that in mind Mr. President, I not only renew my objection but I think this is highly out of order. We ought to go through these amendments, all forty some of them that are up there so we get to where they want to be. They can offer amendments like I have offered amendments towards the end, or like anyone else can offer amendments.

SENATOR CLARK: Do you remove your objection?

SENATOR NEWELL: No, I do not. In fact I more strenuously object.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Haberman or Senator DeCamp, do you want to move?

SENATOR DeCAMP: What is the ruling?

SENATOR CLARK: I rule that you will have to move to do it.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Okay, then I won't do it.