

override the \$900,000 veto but rather putting back in language that was inadvertently taken out in the process of vetoes. So I suppose by now I have gotten everyone totally confused on this. Just vote green and you are going to be right. It is a good...very seldom can you get into an appropriations override that doesn't cost any money. So if there are questions, I would try to answer them.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Questions or discussion, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would like to add my confusion to an explanation in my normal fashion. Senator Coordsen used the term "intent language" which I have inadvertently used as well, which is not accurate for either of us to use, Senator Coordsen. In almost all capital construction measures, there is a maximum cost for a structure, and in this case, the language that was stricken was the million, nine, as the maximum cost for the construction. However, that was not in an appropriation. I repeat, that was not an appropriation. It is more accurate to describe it as a condition of the appropriation, that is the dollar actually appropriated was to go for a structure that would not exceed in a cost of a million, nine. But because it was not an appropriation, then you could very properly argue that it was not a valid veto as well, since it was not an appropriation; a condition of appropriations but not an appropriation. And it would be very seldom that I can think of that it would be feasible to offer the kind of motion that Senator Coordsen is offering. I would argue that it is not necessary to override that language, but if you do, why I suppose at least it is an expression of reaffirmation, so to speak, of the Legislature that the condition of the appropriation for 1 million was for a structure that would not cost more than a million, nine, although I think that is true in either event, whether it is overridden or not, but this should not be considered something of a precedent that can be used frequently because it is questionable, in my mind, if you can override a veto that is, in effect, not a valid veto to start with. I will leave it at that. I think personally whether it is or is not overridden as the motion was offered will not alter the ability for other funds to be used for the completion of the project.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. There are no other lights on. Senator Coordsen, a closing statement?