

following "paid" insert, and then the following language. Is that not an amendment to the bill itself?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Barrett, just a minute. I'm trying to get two lawyers to agree. That is difficult.

SENATOR BARRETT: Mr. President, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Yes.

SENATOR BARRETT: In an effort to get an early resolution to the question, perhaps you should ask a lay person to get involved in the conversation.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Well, I'm sure we'd have more unanimity in that case, but it is permissible to, in an amendment, to refer both to an amendment and to the bill itself. There is no problem there. So, in answer to your question, if your question was does the amendment refer to the committee amendment and the bill, yes, it does refer to both.

SENATOR BARRETT: The Chair rules that it is in order?

SPEAKER NICHOL: Yes, sir, and I have two lawyers agreeing on that.

SENATOR BARRETT: Perhaps that is our problem. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: You are welcome. Senator Haberman.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Mr. President, members of the body, may I ask, does not the amendment, by Senator Conway, wipe out...or remove the committee amendment? Would that not take precedent over the committee amendment? There would be no committee amendment then, is that right? Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Yes.

SENATOR HABERMAN: If this body adopts Senator Conway's amendment, would this then not delete the committee amendment which says the interest starts when it hits the trial docket?

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President.