

that the principle comes into play and the government's hand is staid. And the government is told, this far you can approach and no further. But this Legislature does have contempt towards rules. And it's because of a particular issue, which in some cases will attempt to foist a religious point of view on everybody in the state, and they feel they have the right to do that. So they've got to understand that people who disagree are going to fight, tooth and nail, against that being done. And I think it is juvenile and silly to say that a senator, because of some pretended notion of courtesy, has to sit back and not do everything to defeat...

PRESIDENT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...legislation that he or she sees as being pernicious. What do you mean courtesy, if the ones who offer it were being courteous, they'd withdraw it. But those are arguments that move one way. We are dealing now, Mr. Chairman, with the integrity of the legislative process itself because the Chair has chosen to disregard the clearly written rule. And the Chair was very derelict in its duty, and that should call for some kind of censure by this body, but the body lacks the belly to do what it should. The Chair should have properly ruled, based on the rule, and then let somebody move to overrule the Chair. But for the Chair to say the Legislature has shown itself to be a disregard of the rules, therefore, I'm timid and I want to get along with them, so I'm going to rule again, when the question of division arises, that the question cannot be divided. Weakness, moral incapability to stand in the face of opposition is moral cowardice and when it occurs it has to be called what it is.

PRESIDENT: Time. Senator Labeledz, please, followed by Senator McFarland.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Mr. President, I'm speaking now to Senator Bernard-Stevens and Senator Chambers. The Chair did have the belly or the courage to rule the first amendment, I believe, that Senator Bernard-Stevens had and said that he was able to divide the question. He ruled with Senator Bernard-Stevens. I overruled the Chair, and I believe there was 33 votes that voted to overrule the Chair. On the second motion to divide that into less than the 18 amendments, the Chair ruled, because of the 33 votes that were obtained on the prior motion. So he did have the courage, Senator Chambers, to do that on the first vote.