

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And the reason I would support such an amendment myself, the main aim that is immediate, in my opinion, is the threat of harm and interfering with the quiet enjoyment of their property.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Chambers. I would pause to recognize guests. We have guests of Senator Chambers in the north balcony. We have 35 fourth graders from King Science Center with their teachers. And from Senator Janssen's district we have his daughter-in-law, Susan Janssen, Alex, Lauren and Elliot. Could all of you please stand and be recognized. Senator Preister, to close on your amendment.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. Before I close, perhaps I could ask the Chair or the Clerk to help me with understanding what I have in this amendment. Since we had adopted Senator Schrock's amendment that changes the "shall" to "may", repeal the language, now this amendment would allow for a second violation. I'm not sure this is...that part of the amendment I have before us is really valid any longer. So if it's not then it might be better that I just withdraw this amendment, and I have another one that, with Senator Chambers' information, may be better submitted. I guess my question is, since we have made an amendment already, is part of this...if part of this is no longer really valid, then perhaps the whole amendment is not really relevant.

SPEAKER WITHEM: In practice, I think, Senator Preister, if your amendment impacts upon the Schrock amendment, the impact of adoption of your amendment would be to...the impact of your amendment would be the dominant statement by the Legislature on that item. I don't know if I understand your question or not. But a previous amendment that is adopted would not render null and void this amendment. This amendment would be the prevailing amendment because it passes at a latter time. I don't know if that's helpful in making a decision or not.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you. Well, I understand the process that this would be the dominant amendment. However, this one doesn't change what he changed, it inserts for a second violation. And therefore they may revoke it for a second violation doesn't seem like it's any longer relevant. With that...let me just ask, according to the schedule, at eleven-fifty we were going to go to Select File reading without amendments attached, is that still the Chair's...the Speaker's