

makes, I'm not talking about the decisions from the Chair, but that the body tends to make decisions based on what is favorable to deciding a particular question as opposed to what the rules should be and we don't pay attention to precedent and the precedent that has been established. I do recall earlier in the session, and it's coming back to me and I was hoping I could even refer you to the page where the body...the ruling was exactly opposite of this one previous in the session and that ruling was allowed to stand. The facts, as I recall them, I had a motion early in the session to suspend the rules to allow a bill to be, in essence, referred directly to the floor of the Legislature, a bill dealing with property tax relief. To do that, a number of rules, I think probably nine different rules had to be suspended to allow that to happen. I filed a motion to suspend all nine rules. Customarily what we do is we debate those, or we vote on that motion as a whole. Senator Chambers, being in one of his more pleasant moods that morning I think, asked that that question be divided. Now I don't know if that was the right decision to make to allow that to be divided, but we allowed it to be divided and we didn't challenge that. We then had a series of nine separate motions. The first one was voted on and was voted down. In essence of saving time for the body, I said, well, then I would like to withdraw the remaining, the remainder of that motion. I was not allowed to do that. The body did not allow me to do that. They said each motion has to be divided on separately because the motion had been substantively changed by the defeat of one portion. The remainder of it was different. It was no longer mine to withdraw, it was the body's. That was the precedent that is established and I'm going to be looking through my agenda so I can refer you to the particular page within the Journal where you can refer to that. The precedent has been established that once part of a divided question has been established, according to Senator Moore it is page 393 of something or other, I assume this word is Journal here, I can't read his writing very well, page 393 of the Journal where that precedent was established and I think if our rules are going to mean anything, we need to, once these sort of rulings are made, we need to continue to live with them so I think the Chair is not in order in this particular case by making this ruling.

PRESIDENT: Senator Labedz, do you wish to speak on it?

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I oppose the challenge of the Chair, naturally. I've been here 13 years and