

to be an individual senator making that decision, somebody who doesn't want to bracket could offer the motion to bracket and then withdraw it just to preempt somebody else, under this rule, from having a chance to offer the bracket motion. You don't want to get into a situation, I think, where that could happen either, where you could preemptively block bracket motions by simply introducing it, getting up, and then withdrawing it. So you have a two-sided, two-edged sword here, Senator Withem. I see what you are saying, and in this particular case with Senator Chambers, but I think there is another side to it and abuse could occur another way as well. And so I think the way it has always been interpreted, that I know of, in the past is that a vote would have to be taken, that a bracket motion decision had been made, and then you wouldn't be able to reoffer or make another motion on bracketing. And that is the way most of us have interpreted this now through the years, so I think to overrule the Chair is to overrule precedent, and I don't think we want to do that. Now there is frustrations, there is perhaps hard feelings, and maybe we are crowding our thinking on this a little bit, but just as Senator Withem worries about the rules and their effect on the body, I think I, and others, do as well, and so it is a worthwhile thing to consider not just in this particular case, with this particular issue, but other issues and other cases that would follow and what could result. And I am simply stating that there could be a problem when you allow an individual senator that much ability to offer a motion, then withdraw it, and thus tying up the body from again offering a similar motion. I don't think you want to be able to do that.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator McFarland, followed by Senators Chambers and Schimek.

SENATOR MCFARLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I would like to compliment you on your objectivity and your willingness to try to be totally fair with everybody because I think there would be a tendency, if I were Speaker and in your chair, to rule that this motion was inappropriate from the start, but I think you have tried to interpret the rule correctly, although I think you are incorrect in your interpretation. I would emphasize Senator Withem's point. It said no motion to postpone to a time certain being decided. It doesn't say being voted upon. It doesn't say being rejected or being upheld or anything like that. It says being decided and I think taking into context the obvious intent of this particular Section 6, Rule 7, 6, the obvious intent is to allow a motion to postpone