

issue, another day. You lose credibility in this body. It is not the proper way to do business. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. I have several lights on. I don't know if you wish to speak about this issue or not. Senator Landis, did you? No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: (Mike not on. Inaudible.)

SENATOR LAMB: (Mike off) because just playing into your hands, Ernie, and so we will just go on from there.

PRESIDENT: Senator Landis, did you wish to speak? Your light is on. All right. Senator Ashford, did you wish to speak about this? Senator Labeledz, did you wish to speak on the motion before us? Bernard-Stevens challenged the Chair on ruling that it takes 25 votes to cease debate, that is what we are talking about. Okay. Senator Schmit, did you wish to speak about...okay. Senator Chambers, did you wish to speak on this?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, and Mr. Chairman, I just learned something about honor. Senator Bernard-Stevens told Senator Lamb to relinquish the rest of that time to me, and Senator Lamb refused saying he didn't want to play into my hands, so I just want that as a matter of record, and I think it is something that should be there in view of his comments about learning this and learning that. There are a lot of lessons being taught by the way various members are doing. Now you all can criticize my tactics any way and any time that you please, but I have never done something of that kind, and I don't need to do things of that kind to make my point. But what Senator Bernard-Stevens has done is, as he stated, following along behind what the procedure has developed, but if I were the Chair, which I am not, and it might lead to a challenge but it would be a challenge on the right issue, I would rule that having articulated what the rules state, that ruling is not subject to be overruled. A motion to overrule that ruling is out of order and I would not entertain the motion. Now if that ruling were to be challenged, fine, but if I were the Chair, I would not entertain a motion to overrule a declaration from the Chair which is in accord with the specific statement and requirement of the rule. But, see, if I were in the Chair, we wouldn't be where we are now because I would have complied with the rule that says a question can be divided. The quagmire or the cesspool, I think it is, that Senator Barrett described the