

bringing them in front of the body at the same time?

PRESIDENT: The question is hypothetical, you said "if." I'll address that when it is brought up.

SENATOR PAPPAS: Okay, thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, then as I understand the latest theory is you simply put some amendment that says something in the budget bill and then say well now that relates to something bill that was outside the call, now that brings it all inside the call. As I say, I think you are making a mockery of your constitutional principles. By that standard I could have put some amendment...or intent language in the budget bill that says and the budget and the Legislature is anticipating revenues from other sources in the future, including lotteries, blah, blah, blah. Then you'd make all the lotteries and everything else inside the call. I think the Attorney General erred in the first instance when he tied...try to tie hands, and now to try to untie them in the theory that Senator Landis has, which is you put "intent language" in another bill, and then make completely unrelated bills off somewhere else within the call. I think at some point you've got to look in the mirror and say what are you doing to your Constitution and what are you doing to your original principles you came in here under. You can't have it both ways. You can't have a wide open session or an extremely limited session and then try to legitimize things that were outside the call through devious means. That is what we've been playing the last two days. I think when the Governor and the Attorney General got together and decided they were going to cut everybody out of here from doing any business, and then try to bring in their own limited business under devious means, I think you've gone too far. Senator Landis says the proper time to object is when the play is finished. Senator Landis, I know you've been to law school, and I know you know that if you don't object at the right time you lose your rights to object, you waive your rights by not objecting. I'm objecting at this time. I think it is just completely improper because you can just put any amendment on something and then say something else is related under this theory.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis.