

to...or a motion to bracket to a time certain to be considered once and only once at a stage of debate. That is the obvious intent. In response to Senator Wesely's comment about that would allow someone else who didn't want to bracket to make a motion, then withdraw it, and, thereby, preclude anyone else from making a motion to bracket, I don't think that is the correct interpretation at all. As I read the rule about withdrawing, it says, once...on page 53, it says once motions are stated they may be withdrawn by the mover before a decision. I would think that in the event that someone wanted to withdraw a motion and was playing that kind of game that the Speaker could say that I am not going to allow you to withdraw that motion. It doesn't say the motion shall be withdrawn at the mover's request. It seems to me the Speaker or the Chair has and could have, in fact, when Senator Chambers made his original motion, could have, in effect, said I will not allow you to withdraw it and we will take it to a vote. And for that reason, I think Senator Withem is obviously correct in the spirit and the intent of Rule 7, Section 6 that the decision was made. Senator Chambers made the decision to withdraw the motion. He should not be allowed to again reintroduce another motion to bracket to a time certain or else, in effect, you achieve a result that this rule was obviously intended to prevent, and that result would be a series of successive motions to bracket that would never end, yet the obvious intent of Rule 7, Section 6, was to limit it to one-time consideration only. I think it has been considered. When he decided to withdraw it, that was his decision and the Chair should be overruled. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, never have I heard such an attempt by people who should know better to distort and deliberately misread clear language to accomplish a specific purpose. I think it is obvious that the Chair is correct, and to instruct Senator McFarland on the construction of language, at the top of page 73, we read what he was talking about which I referred to earlier, "Once motions are stated, they may be withdrawn or modified by the mover before a decision, amendment, or ordering of a vote has been made." The reason the word is "may" because if you said "shall", then it would mean that before anything was done, the mover would have to withdraw the motion. Saying "may" leaves it to the discretion of the mover. It wouldn't make sense to read it in this fashion, once motions