

because language by its very nature is never absolutely clear, absolutely precise, absolutely unambiguous. Statutes and rules, despite what courts may say on certain occasions, are almost always subject to different interpretations, depending upon what kind of meanings you want to put upon the language. Let me just give you two examples. Senator Landis makes the comment at the beginning of his remarks saying that a motion to bracket would be appropriate once we start to consider the next motion because, he says, the rules says the bracket motion will not be allowed again at the same stage of the bill. Now, of course, he interprets that stage to mean the particular motion that you are on in the bill. That language could just as easily I think be interpreted to mean the stage of the bill, meaning Select File. That is the stage of the bill we are on, and you only have one motion to bracket on Select File. That is ambiguous language and can be subject to different interpretations. We are on Final Reading Senator Chambers informs me and that is correct, but the point is the same. We are at the stage of the bill, Final Reading, only one motion to bracket. The same thing which Senator Chambers, he cites a rule interpretation which says usually words, if they are included in the text of a sentence, have some kind of meaning, but there are other rules of statutory construction or rule interpretations that say language is often superfluous, that it has no meaning whatsoever, that it is redundant, and courts have interpreted language to not have meaning in certain instances. The basic premise in all of these type of analyses, and all of these statutory interpretation or rule interpretation, when you get to the heart of it, is what was the intent when the rule was enacted or when the statute was enacted. It seems to me the clear intent of Section...of Rule 7, Section 6 was to prevent a succession of bracket motions to delay and stall debate. Otherwise, you would not have had Section 6 at all. You would have not had any limitation whatsoever on motions to bracket. I think the interpretation that Senator Withem, the ruling that Senator Withem advanced, the ruling that we just made to overrule the Chair were correct and appropriate. I would just like to say one thing in closing. I know I have been tempted many times to respond to a lot of the charges and allegations and...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR McFARLAND: ...clear misstatements and misinterpretations that have been made by people who are trying to stall the bill. I have refrained for a couple of reasons.