SENATOR HANNIBAL: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, do you also say that if we take the definition of that term that the courts have given and put it in the statute, that definition will lead to future judicial confusion?

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The court then will be confused by what it has already ruled.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: In some cases, yes, or it could be, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Members of the Legislature, do you see how far afield Senator Hannibal is? I'm embarrassed for him. This discussion now has no conclusion that is logical other than to say that Senator Hannibal has made a mistake in taking the position he has. Based on this discussion, I hope that you will...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...look at the amendment that I offered, and Senator Hannibal has never denied that the words of my amendment are what the court says, based on his interpretation. And my words say that no cause of action accrues or no claim accrues until the person knows or should know that the claim exists and you put the "should know" to make sure that the person is taking cognizance of all information that would inform a prudent or a rational person that is something is wrong here and the person who has the claim could not deny direct knowledge.

SENATOR MARSH: Thank you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You're welcome.

SENATOR MARSH: Senator Chambers and members of the Legislature, and, Senator Hannibal...

SPEAKER BARRETT: Ten seconds.

SENATOR MARSH: ...it seems to me that the ten seconds left should be said, I'll help take off this amendment if it can be shown to me in the meantime before Select File...