

process, but the Attorney General said, no. He said this and this and this and this are without the call and the theory that Senator Nichol, by his own statements relied on, is that the amendment of the Appropriations Committee created the magic that brought it within the call. Not that it was originally within the call, not that it was part of the necessary process, but that the amendment put on by the Appropriations Committee created this mystical bringing within the call, and it is this point I am trying to make to you. That you cannot have any lines defined for any special session if you're going to rely on this theory in the future, and that the Attorney General, if this is the basis for our doing things, has destroyed the integrity of any predictable special session. What about then changing the Cash Funds in the appropriations...or I mean the budget bill, the appropriations bill on something to do with the lottery or some other similar thing? Does that make lotteries then within the call? I am saying simply, the Governor defines the limits. We have the authority to act within those and this process of in and out, contracting and expanding on almost a totally capricious basis, based upon what one member or another puts into an amendment on whatever bill is no reliable or responsible method of defining the limits of the session. I contend LB 29 would have been within the call by our natural legislative rights, not by virtue of a chromosome theory of Senator Chambers, not by virtue of the amendment. It was there inherently all the time or it's not there now. Now, as I say, I happen to believe it was there originally. We had the right to deal with it as a part of the process, but that's not the basis this Legislature has operated on. You operated on the basis that it was outside the call and that it magically got inside strictly as a result of the Appropriations Committee amendment. That's the basis for the ruling here. That's the basis for the Attorney General's Opinion and that is apparently the basis upon which you're taking it up now. And so that's my basis for objecting to the Chair. He may be right that it is within the call, but the foundation upon which he bases his reasoning and upon which the Attorney General bases it is faulty, and for that reason the Chair should be overruled and the thing should be left outside the call.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted that wish to? Record, Mr. Clerk, please.