house could be given because I objected to it and I think...and I don't know what Senator Landis is going to say, I see his light is on, but I recall he and I having several discussions on we, as individuals, using our time to serve our constituents, as we saw fit, objecting to being called back to the floor to hear debate. And a rule change was brought to the floor saying you can't do that, you can't bring people to the floor simply to hear debate, that that is not a fair use of the power of the body over a member's time, and we rejected that change. The body went on record at that time saying, yes, it is fair to place the house under call, and if people object to placing the house under call at a given time, there is a simple way of dealing with that and voting no. Why Senator Korshoj does an excellent job each time the motion has been made of pushing his red button. It is not that big a deal, Frank. I am not giving you that much of a compliment. You don't have to necessarily pay that much attention but he does vote no on calls of the house, and we can do that. If we think it is unfair, that Senator McFarland is asking for an unfair advantage at this moment by bringing the body back in to hear his motion, we can vote no on it, and I think that is what the Legislature said at that time. I would like to see us restrict this call of the house to only coming in to vote on measures. I think it would be a fair rule change, but I don't think our rules provide for that and I don't know that there is a basis in the rules for this particular ruling. So I am reluctantly going to vote in favor of the override.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Moore, please.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. Speaker and members, like Senator Withem, I, too, somewhat reluctantly rise to urge you to overrule the Chair. I also agree with Senator Warner's frustration in the timing of this call of the house but the fact of the matter is I don't know how you can read the rules and think that Senator McFarland's motion is out of order. I think the proper thing to do, probably, is to overrule the Chair, and if you really don't want to have a call of the house, then vote against Mac's motion. But I don't think...my reading of the rules, I don't simply understand how this motion could be out of order. Once again, as we always do when we deal with rules like this, we are setting a precedent, and if you would side with the Chair on this matter, the only time in the future, theoretically, you could have a call of the house is for the actual vote, and that sure has not been the precedent this body has operated under the