

.January 8, 1996

Chambers is trying to present it. I think that it still gives us the opportunity to bring it as a package, but it also gives the opportunity to separate it and I think that's the way it should be. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Dierks. Senator Will.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you, Madam President, members of the body. Senator Chambers is correct in that the driving force behind this proposed rules change is a clarification of the situation and I would reiterate that the...that the, quote, change that has been proposed would simply put into the rules specifically what the precedent currently is as far as the last ruling from the Chair that we had regarding the divisibility of a veto override on a...of a line-item appropriations. I guess I would emphasize to you that, again, Senator Chambers is also correct in that if there...if divisibility is not allowed certainly the amendatory process would be in order and would be allowed in any combination of the...taking out any combination of the proposed veto overrides in a given package. I guess what I would emphasize to you is let's do one or the other. If you want the question to be divisible, adopt Senator Chambers' amendment and then pass that rules change. If you agree with the status quo, with the ruling from the Chair that we are currently operating under, and that is that a motion under this section is not divisible, then vote down the...Senator Chambers' amendment and adopt the rules clarification as proposed by the Rules Committee. I would urge the body simply to do one or the other. Let's...if you like divisibility, adopt the Chambers amendment. If you don't, reject it and adopt the clarification proposed by the Rules Committee. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Will. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, because I don't know how this vote will come out, I still want to make as clear in the record as I can what is likely to occur. In the first example I gave, my motion would be to amend the proposed veto override package which I'm saying, for ease of discussion, would have ten parts. Divide, take out the first part and leave the other nine. So that is the amendment. We discuss that for awhile. Before we vote on it, I then move to amend that amendment so that we take out, instead of the first one, we take out the first two. We discuss that