be taking place in the next few minutes will not necessarily be on 769, nor to my knowledge will it be on the topic of abortion at all. I think the discussion that should take place in the next couple of minutes is the question of how difficult it is to maintain democratic principles. Yesterday what we had is a rule within the body, found in the Rule Book of the Unicameral, which allows for a senator to divide a question, whether on a bill or on amendment, in whichever way the senator deems necessary. There is no other section in there that whether or not the other bodies concur with what the senator wishes to do. There is a part of the rule that says the Chair can rule that it is not easily divisible, or it is not divisible in the way the senator wishes. And then if it simply cannot be divided, then the question would not be whether or not the senator could divide the question, but simply the question would be the way that it was going to be divided was not proper because it was not divisible in those...in that manner. of the body, what we had yesterday was a motion by myself, or actually not a motion. I asked the Chair to divide an amendment that I had into some say 18, some say 19, some say 20, but quite few sections. The Chair, and I hope the Chair is listening again to remind himself also of yesterday, the Chair ruled correctly that it was divisible. Senator Labedz, and I think this is the important point, did not ask the body, did not the Chair, are you sure it's divisible in that manner; are you sure that it can be divided in the places that Senator Bernard-Stevens wishes to have it divided? That is not what she asked the Chair. She simply asked the Chair to rule and the body to then vote on whether or not I am going to be allowed to divide my amendment. That's what the vote was. That's why you had people, like Senator Moore and others, who are very much in favor of 769 jumping to my defense at some point saying, wait a minute, wait a minute here, we are stepping on parliamentary and democratic principles here, we better take a minute and think about what precedent we're setting. The Legislature voted, if I recall, 24 to 14 not to allow a senator to divide the question, even though it was divisible. I then suggested to Senator Labedz during that debate that I would be willing to withdraw that motion and divide it into seven parts instead of the 18. Senator Labedz then refused, at that point, to withdraw her request to override the Chair, in essence saying I don't care if you have 20, 7, 3 or 2 divisions, I, Senator Labedz, do not want this senator to be able to divide the question because of So Senator Labedz then asked when I did ask the Chair to divide my amendment into seven sections, Senator Labedz then