

people who have done nothing. And this bill is not in a shape where anything can be done with it, in my opinion. But you can defeat the bracket motion, we can argue and see if something can be done with it. And I'll be here,...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...I won't do like some, say stay here and debate it, and then leave the floor. I'll be here. I'll be carrying the debate. In fact, I have about...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Time, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...seventy-five pages of stuff I'd like to read into the record.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Maurstad. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Madam President, Senator Maurstad would move to amend the Chambers bracket motion by changing the date, Senator, I assume until 3/18/96.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Right.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Maurstad, I rule that motion out of order. It is inappropriate to amend a bracket motion. Senator Lindsay, your light is next.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Madam President and members. I rise in support of the bracket motion simply for the reason that I think when people look at the bill, the bill needs a lot of work. Even if we support the concept, which obviously I don't, even if we support the concept I think the bill simply needs a lot of work. And what Senator Kristensen has said is, I think is correct. Floor amendments, in liability issues, can pose problems. The problems that it can open up can be sometimes make the solution worse than the problem, and that's something I don't think we want to occur in this area. My objections to the bill...so I mean so that it's clear, my objections go to the very heart of the bill which is, is it good public policy to take away any downward pressure on police pursuits? We have police pursuits now, and let's make that clear. Nothing stops a police officer from pursuing when appropriate. How do we know