

January 10, 1986

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And nobody can prevent that member from having...

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm just trying to show that there are rules in place now which, if a member invokes, some people can see it as being dilatory or harassing in nature or whatever and sometimes asking for a roll call vote time after time can appear that way, nevertheless, one person can ask for it and receive it.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Okay, then I think I do understand your amendment a little better. I was hoping that I was going to become in favor of it because of your patterning it after a call of the house which would require a vote, but what you're suggesting is that one member by themselves, any member could compel the attendance of all members.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Who were absent, right.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: All right, thank you. For...because of that clarification, I would have to be opposed to that. I would not accept this amendment, be in support of the amendment. I can see that while the majority can do some game playings at times, as a matter of fact a majority is what makes law around here. I could see a large potential for game playing, if that's the term you want to use, when any one member could call this house to a halt and can wait for all people to come in for something that is right now in the hands, at least implied in the hands, of the presiding officer. I would oppose the amendment and rather offer the majority idea that I am offering, or short of that, then go back and offer the alternative and codify the fact that the presiding officer would be the person making that determination. If I may have a clarification from the Chair, when the presiding officer makes a ruling such as the compelling of a presence, that is a ruling as I understand it and by ruling such, would the Chair not be also subject to overrule, a challenge?

PRESIDENT: You're asking if the order by the Chair is out to compel all members to come to the Chamber, right?