

Chair was correct and that is that there was not a member of the body that was not clear, was not clear in their mind what they were voting on and we're not a court of law. We are a deliberative body and the body made a decision when they voted on my original motion that it was time to move forward, that we would allow debate and we would allow discussion on the motion to advance and that that was what was voted on. The fact that this particular motion to bracket was not included, I mean, I can understand. If people want to vote in a legalistic, clearly legalistic literal sense of the rules, then they will vote with Senator Chambers to overrule the Chair, keeping in mind it's not for Lieutenant Governor Robak that we're overriding at this point. It would be Senator Hall. She just happens to be sitting there at the moment. On the other hand if you want to remain consistent with what you voted on, what was in your mind when the motion was put forward, then you'll vote to sustain the Chair and my vote will be among those voting to sustain the Chair. Senator Abboud, I don't know if that's helpful to you. If you have more, I'd yield the rest of the time back to you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam Chair, actually Senator Withem laid out exactly what I thought, that I think Senator Chambers is right technically and that there was a...the motion didn't include everything it should so I think on that ground he's absolutely right. I will plan to vote to overrule the Chair but Senator Withem is also right in the sense that we knew what we were trying to vote for when we voted for the motion, so it does come down to whether or not you want to be technically correct or in terms of the thrust of what we're trying to do be correct.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Madam President, I wish we'd had the same latitude on amendments. I know we have a lot of times amendments that we conceptually talk about what we'd like to do and find out that it was written incorrectly and it would be too bad if we just can on Final Reading say say well, we know this is what it says, but this is what we meant to do and not have to bring things back to be amended. It would be really simple to do that if we could just pass concepts and it would be no problem. Technically Senator Chambers is correct and I think that's how you have to vote and one of the things I