

the Chair but for our...us to make a proper...be able to proceed in this in a proper manner, I think the Chair needs to be overruled, we set the precedent, then we move on.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Robinson, to speak to the motion to overrule the Chair. Is there any further discussion of the motion to overrule the Chair? Senator Chambers, any closing comments?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, for those who may find this the first time they're going through this, understand that we have a lobby out there and special interest groups. They try to bludgeon the Legislature in having to do or not do something by this packaging that they try to achieve. I'm not being accusatory toward the Appropriations Committee or anybody for trying to get their issue taken care of in the way they want. That's what politics is about, and those of us who disagree with that system have to speak because that also is what the political process is about. What they tend to do is take things that they know might not have all the support it would need to garner the override votes, so they will hook it up with something that they think the senators will feel they more or less have to override or that is more likely to be overridden, then the bad is taken with the good. You should think of that movie...Senator Hall, if you would...if you would help me with the theme song, The Good, the Bad and the Ugly, that's what the packaging is, and they want us to be required to do such a thing as that. Now if the constitution, and I will say it again, allows the Governor to go through these appropriations bills and line-item out an entire amount or reduce it, why are we, as a Legislature, going to say that we are not able, under our rules, to take an item at the time? There are some big issues that will be subject to attempts at override. Some of my colleagues have already mentioned that they favor one of the items but not the other one. So if I favor one and let's say Senator Lindsay is against another, we cancel each other out, because his no vote is not a yes vote, obviously, on mine. Because his is there, let's say that I would change my mind and instead of voting yes I now vote no because I don't like his, well, his no vote, say, would be against the university and now my no vote counts against the developmentally disabled because although I favor the university, I don't favor this other one so I vote no. And the university draws a no vote which was there anyway but the developmentally disabled draws a no vote now because I'm not