

members of the body, I rise to support the motion to overrule the Chair and I do so for a couple of practical reasons and one just philosophically. I believe that the issues can be and should be able to be divided because we're not changing the essence of what is before us in regards to the veto. I do want to try to set the stage, if I can, of what we're actually doing here and Senator Chambers can correct me if I'm...if I'm saying...if I'm presuming something that may not be presumable or making, Senator Chambers, an elicit presupposition. So you be sure and correct me if I do that. What I think Senator Chambers is trying to do is make a...get the ruling now because he's trying to set the stage for LB 392. When we have a series of potential motions, the Appropriations Committee may come up, which is why he was asking Senator Maurstad earlier, may come up with a motion to override all or only maybe...maybe only half, and those that would be in, or maybe only two. Would those be divisible or would we have to take those all or nothing? And I think what Senator Chambers is saying is we, in the body, may all have differences of what we might want to be overthrown...overridden or not, so let's go ahead and make the case now on the rules. In talking with Senator Wehrbein, he would not be opposed to pulling the motion of the Appropriations Committee and Senator Maurstad puts the motion that he already has upward, therefore, the...for the Beatrice veto, and Senator Owen Elmer is already working on a motion that would do the 25,000 for Curtis and do two separate motions. But Senator Chambers has his motion to override the Chair so we can't do that because that would be the second motion at one time and you can only have one motion at a time. Senator Chambers wants the position of the Legis...of the ruling decided upon whether we can divide the question or not. Since...I know it's a complicated argument, but since if the rule...if the motion to override the Chair was not here, Senator Wehrbein would not have any difficulty in withdrawing it so that we had two separate amendments, that would be the same as dividing the question, in essence, but we have this motion, so I would urge the body to overrule the Chair so we actually would be able to do and set the precedent of separately looking at the issues not only tonight but, more importantly, on LB 392, because, quite honestly, what would happen if we go the other route and don't override the Chair, we're going to end up doing the same thing anyway, I suspect, by offering then the separate amendments on...on the motion...on LB 392. So, in order to save time and end up doing what we're going to probably end up doing anyway, we should overrule the Chair. It's not any inferences toward