

precedent set the other day, and that precedent was I suppose predictable had we sat down and thought about it beforehand, if we took a cross-section of us and said, what will happen if, and there was an amendment that had 19 divisions, we would say that would frustrate the body. There would be some kind of response to that, probably there would be an attempt to divide the issue, and that if the Chair allowed it, the body would be sufficiently frustrated to overrule that, and that's what's happened. The Chair is, I think, on the other hand honoring the most recent attempt of the application of precedent but ignoring the long history of our precedent. And I understand that the Chair is, I assume, trying to be sensitive to the present state of affairs on the floor with respect to this issue. But Senator Chambers gives us an opportunity to return to the rules that we all normally have followed in this body, and that is that a division of the question does lie with the introducer, if in fact there are sensible divisions in the question. Now, we got off onto a wrong foot because the body clearly felt that the first time this was brought the number of divisions was unfair, unclear and unreasonable, and it acted to defend its own interests. The Chair, on the other hand, is giving too much credence to a recent precedent which grows out of the frustration of the moment without adequately recognizing a longstanding tradition of many years. And, in fact, if you take a look at it, the division of the question is not unreasonable in this circumstance. Now the foot of the Legislature was on the neck of what it believed to be an unreasonable circumstance the other day, and its will was done. It seems to me it's time to take the foot off the neck now, that you have a sensible division before you, and allow our longstanding precedent to take its toll in this case and to be followed. To do that we must let the Chair know that we are prepared to go back to a previous longstanding tradition, and unfortunately we have to use the device of overruling the Chair, but remember that the much longer tradition lies in those forces asking the Chair to permit the division of the question than the temporary aberration of yesterday and its frustrations, forcing a new and potentially nefarious reading of the rule that does not permit an introducer to request divisions of the question. I would urge the body to overrule the Chair.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Crosby.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I'd like to say, because I know there are people who watch the Legislature every