

SENATOR WITEK: This is pretty deep. I'm pretty tired.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, that's all right, I excuse you.

SENATOR WITEK: And I like Landis's bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Say it again.

SENATOR WITEK: I said, and I like Landis's bill.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I don't even know what you said. I'll ask Senator Hall the question, because Senator Hall is (interruption).

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Hall, and I don't mean this facetiously, but I'm...

SENATOR HALL: The answer is no.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right, they don't mean the same thing. And it's clear to all of us and that's why when we're talking about an act that is going to be a crime we require knowledge and intent and it's not unreasonable to require that with reference to any crime, I don't care what it is. But the more reprehensible an act is deemed to be, the more we should require the knowledge and the intent. So if you add these words, "knowing and", it will be no different from what you have agreed to do on other bills that we've had before us this session, and that's what I'm asking that we do. You're giving a lot in the new language in this bill by specifying things that had not been specified in the law before. So I want us to make it as precise as we can in terms of determining that this crime was committed. And because this is, for me, a serious amendment, I'm going to ask for a call of the house, but I will accept the machine vote but I would like a call of the house on this one.

SPEAKER WITHEM: You are requesting a call of the house. The question before the body is, shall the house go under call? All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote nay. Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 13 ayes, 0 nays to go under call.