

time. Mr. President, I'm becoming somewhat unsure of how many times I've spoken on a given amendment. Is this my second time that I'm on now?

SPEAKER WITHEM: This is your second time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And it's my amendment. Do I have another opportunity to speak or can I only close?

SPEAKER WITHEM: You would have another opportunity to speak and then you would have an opportunity to close. Hold on just a second, let me consult with my scorekeepers here. I'm sorry, a breakdown in communications up here. You have spoken three times. You've opened and then you've been recognized to speak twice. You would be recognized to close as there are no other lights on at this point.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That was almost like an invitation. But since nobody accepted it, I will now enter my close...my closing. What this amendment does, on page 1, in line 17, is to insert the words "knowing and" in front of the word "intentional", and the intentional refers to the touching of the victim's, and it mentions various parts, or the intentional touching of the victim's clothing covering those parts. And what I would do and should have done but didn't was put knowing in front of that word intentional, which we find on line 19 also. But I cannot do anything other than press forward with what I have, then try to correct that. But the reason I want to put those words there is I feel any time we're talking about a crime and you read statutes that are talking about crimes, we require knowingly and intentionally doing the act. Knowledge and intent are not the same thing. Senator Witek, because I think you're alert enough to grasp this,...

SENATOR WITEK: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...if I know,...

SENATOR WITEK: You handing me the baton?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, no, I don't want to point because Senator Fisher was made nervous by that. I could know that a car is going to run into a child. Does that mean that because I know that, I intend it?