

anything more to it, Madam President, unless there's anything...any other questions that anyone might have.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Withem, anything further?

SPEAKER WITHEM: I don't believe there's much further. I'm just wondering, and I know this mirrors the other language. It's one of those things where I think I know what it means, and I think you know what it means. I just wondered maybe if there was a better way of stating it so that sometime, 10, 20 years from now in some small community somebody pulls out the statute book and says, look, I had four votes, or you indicated a six-member council, I had three and there are three against it, so the statute here says that it passes. I don't think that's what it means. You said that's not what it means. I'm just wondering if maybe the language couldn't clarify that a little bit. But those are my concerns and I think Senator Bromm has responded adequately to those.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Withem. The Chair recognizes Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Senator Bromm, again, if you'd yield to a question.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Certainly.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: And again, if you would just take some of my time and go through the process. Let's assume that we have a city council out there, county board out there, or in this case a city council. You have a majority of a quorum to start the meeting, at some point the quorum is not there anymore, they may...I assume what this is saying is, you know, some members may be able to leave to go get the other people to bring them back. And let's assume for a minute that the quorum never gets reestablished, okay. Would a council be able to vote under those circumstances the way the bill is written?

SENATOR BROMM: I think not.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay, and the key question I have is, you think not, but my concern is, again on lines 8 through 10, unless a greater vote is required by law, and maybe that's where