

phrased in that way, I would not have objected. We do as a courtesy for ourselves to know how many votes are here or not a checking in. It is just a courtesy we do for each other, but it has no specific special rule carrying significance. I felt as if the Chair was interpreting it as if it was the same as a call of the house, which is an act well within our rules, and it would be, I think, a mistake to treat this courtesy with the same matter of right that a call of the house would. In which case, on the other hand, if I thought the rule was a request for the rule to be carried out, I would not have stood on my feet. I felt what was happening was let's have a check in, everybody who was here had checked in, but we were still waiting. That is different. Checking in is a courtesy to people to count votes and that is it. It is not the same thing as a call of the house, and when the Chair begins to treat it as such, that is when I felt the time had run on what the courtesy of checking in is all about.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I hope you will bear with me, but what I am asking for from the Chair, because we are expressing our opinions and they are not binding on the body, is the Chair viewing this request as something that will entitle a member to hold the body up until everybody not excused checked in which would equate it to a call of the house, or just what...that is what I am asking.

SPEAKER BARRETT: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, so then if somebody makes that request, the only way they could insist on every member not excused being here is to ask for a call of the house even though we are on Final Reading, because I think you can ask for a call any time.

SPEAKER BARRETT: That's true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If people are absent and not just showing up.

SPEAKER BARRETT: That is true.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, now I am clear on what you have done. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Anything else? If not, all