

motion. So what that tells me is that, in a sense, the committee loses control of the bill until the motion is heard, and the proponent or the person that tries to take the bill from committee takes a real chance by doing that, because if the motion fails, the bill is indefinitely postponed. So if we have a rule that says that there is a risk that the bill is going to be indefinitely postponed if the motion fails, and we also have the rule that the motion must be held...must be heard within five days, so we want prompt action by this body, and that's consistent with the bill being in a state of suspense until that motion is decided. So if the bill is in a state of suspense, and if the motion is successful, the bill comes out to the floor, and if it fails it's IPP, then we have a rule, it seems to me, that is consistent with the fact that the committee does lose control of the bill until that motion is disposed of. And once the motion is disposed of, then one of two things happens, either the bill is IPP, and it would have to be revived by the committee, or the bill is out on the floor. Now I think the rule could be clearer when you mesh...when you try to mesh the 30 votes and the motion that's required under indefinitely postponed bills with the motion for a bill just being held. I suppose that could be clearer, and perhaps that's in order to do that on another day. But we're talking about two entirely different motions here, one where the bill is being held, or another where the bill has been IPP by the committee. And so I think if we follow the rules as they are written, I have to conclude that that bill is in a state of suspense until this motion is disposed of and if...if Senator Stuhr is unsuccessful, the bill is IPP, and if she's successful, the bill is on the floor. So that, for what that's worth, I believe that most of this argument is about how we think the rules should be, and the proponents that feel the rules should give the committee the authority to continue to act have a good point. But as I tried to reconcile subsection (c) of 19...

**SPEAKER WITHEM:** One minute.

**SENATOR BROMM:** ...with what's going on here, I have to conclude, if we follow the rules as they're written, I think we have to follow the Stuhr motion to its conclusion, and then...and that would be 25 votes under the rule. And if she is unsuccessful it's IPP. Now, I don't...I've not heard anybody else reconcile subsection (c) with what we're doing here, so that's why I bring that up, and perhaps someone else has a