

January 8, 1996

of permanent rules. Senator Will.

CLERK: Madam President, excuse me, Senator. I'm sorry.

SENATOR WILL: Go ahead.

CLERK: Madam President, the Rules Committee has a series of rule...proposed rules changes. You'll find them printed in your Legislative Journal. (See pages 264-68.) Senator, the first proposal I have in front of you involves an amendment to the...regarding the division of a question with respect to a Governor's line-item veto, override motion.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: And this would be on page 264 of the Journal, Mr. Clerk? Is that correct?

CLERK: I believe that's right, Senator.

SENATOR WILL: Okay. Thank you. You should have received in your offices on Friday a packet of six proposed rules changes that the Rules Committee has recommended to the body. Currently, I'm having passed, that same packet passed out on the floor so you'll have that in front of you. In addition, they are, the rules changes are printed in the Journal beginning on page 264. As the procedure's been in the past, I would suspect that I will introduce each change. If there is a specific introducer, I will then defer to them and then we'll proceed to a discussion and an adoption of each individual rules change on its own. So, with that, as I said, there are six. The proposed rules change number one in your packet, it was a recommendation of the Rules Committee and it would amend the rule dealing with overrides of Governor's line-item vetoes when it comes to appropriations bills. There has been in the past some discussion and ambiguity with respect to whether a veto override motion of a line-item veto is divisible or not. I think, I believe the Chair most recently in the past has ruled that such rules changes are not divisible. The rule is silent on that and what this proposed rules change would do is simply specify that any motion of a package of line-item vetoes to be overridden would not be divisible. This would not prevent any individual senators from coming up with their own packages. It's just any one package would not be divisible. That's the proposed rules