

June 1, 1995

LB 344, 391, 563, 563A, 860, 860A  
LR 3

an amendment. Division does nothing. It would be like you have two rooms that interconnect and you have a door. All I'm saying, by dividing the question, is shut the door. You don't change the rooms, you don't change what is in the rooms, you just have two separate compartments now. That's all that I am saying is involved in my request to divide the question. If you vote to uphold the Chair, then any packaging that comes out here has to be all or nothing, all or nothing. And I don't think that is a wise way for us to deal with overriding items in the budget. If the Governor can veto an item at the time, why are we required to accept what the Appropriations Committee says without dividing it? We should be able to select the items that we want. And if the rules are thrown out, Senator Maurstad, I hate to tell you, I hope you have 31 votes because you'll lose mine. I think the rules are more important than any one of these items. And all those people to whom I said I would vote to override with the university items, I will not because we're not dealing with the same thing anymore. So, depending on the Chair's ruling, I have now made it clear exactly what I intend to do, and I'm stating it on the record, I will back away from my promise to override on Beatrice, and I will back away from my promise to override for the university if we cannot divide these questions.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Mr. Clerk, items for the record.

CLERK: Madam President, just very quickly I want to report that LB 860 and LB 860A have been correctly enrolled.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: While the Legislature is in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do hereby sign LB 344, LB 563, LB 563A, LR 3CA, LB 860 and LB 860A. Senator Schrock, you have your light on, do you wish to speak to the motion to overrule the Chair? Senator Wehrbein, do you wish to speak to the motion to overrule the Chair?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Yes, Madam Speaker, members. I can't disagree a lot with what Senator Chambers said in terms of I really had felt the question was divisible in terms of the programs. I felt that was...now I understand the interpretation of the rule is on a different part of the rule and I really am not prepared to speak to that. I do think the items themselves would have been divisible under normal...under...on a straightforward circumstance, but, because this is peculiar to a