

a succession of motions, one to tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m., another one to tomorrow morning at 8:05 a.m., another one to tomorrow morning at 8:10 a.m., and an indefinite number of motions like that. I would argue that the intent of this clause is to prevent that type of delaying action, to give a member an opportunity to offer a motion to postpone to a time certain, but once that has been offered and been decided either through voting it up, voting it down, or by the member withdrawing it, that ought to be the one shot that they get at it. Anything else allows a member to either offer a succession of postponing to time certain motions, one right after the other, or to offer the motion, have it debated, withdraw it, immediately offer it again, have it debated again, withdraw it, immediately offer it again, so I would argue and ask the Speaker to rule on whether or not the Chambers motion is, in fact, out of order because it violates Rule 7, Section 6. I would like to make it clear that I tend to I think try to raise points of order, not so much on how they affect the given matter under discussion, but what the potential is. And I think a ruling that would allow members to either offer and withdraw or to offer a series of motions to different times certain would defeat the purposes of the rules, and really allows any single member to control the body at any time that member may choose by continuing to offer a series of motions along this line. So for that purpose, I would ask for a ruling of the Chair as to whether this motion is in order.

**SPEAKER BARRETT:** Thank you, Senator Withem. You make a good point. Senator Chambers, do you have any comment while I am studying the question?

**SENATOR CHAMBERS:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the words of the rule are crystal-clear. There has been no decision on that motion. We have a rule which indicates that the only time a member can withdraw a motion is if there has been no decision on it, no amendment, or final action by the Legislature. That is the only condition under which a member can withdraw a motion. So we actually have two rules at play here. If there had been a decision on that first motion to bracket, I could not have withdrawn it. It is clear that there was no decision by the Legislature and I understand what is being done here because it enables the rules to be suspended by a vote of 25 or whatever it takes to overrule the Chair. But the fact is that there was no decision made on my motion to bracket. Therefore, I could withdraw it, and as a matter of fact, I did that. I think the language of the rule is so clear that to continue to talk is to