

PRESIDENT: All right. So now you want to start with page 1, lines 1 through 7.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: That is correct.

PRESIDENT: All right.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Labeledz, for what purpose?

SENATOR LABEDZ: I would like a ruling from the Chair whether this amendment can be divided as he has just stated. It is ridiculous and I would like a ruling from the Chair.

PRESIDENT: All right. Thank you, Senator Labeledz, and what we are looking at is Rule 7 on page 54 of the Rules. It says any member may call for a division of the question, and so forth, and you may look at that if you like. Now it is my understanding that we have never had a challenge on the Chair saying that an amendment was divisible. So what we will do here, I will rule that it is divisible and you may challenge the ruling of the Chair. However, I wish to remind you and anyone else in the room that we are setting precedent here by saying that the Chair can be challenged on allowing an amendment or a bill to be divisible. Okay. I will rule, then, that the motion by Senator Stevens is divisible.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President, and I will make a motion to overrule the Chair.

PRESIDENT: All right.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Is that debatable?

PRESIDENT: Yes, ma'am. Every member may speak one time on this type of an issue.

SENATOR LABEDZ: It is unfortunate that I did not object to the substituting the amendment. I did not think that Senator Bernard-Stevens would take an amendment and divide it line by...first section by section, and then line by line. It is uncalled for. It is unfair, and it is very seldom that I make a motion to overrule the Chair but, in this case, it has to be done, and, hopefully, there will be 25 votes, at least in this