

don't think that you can read it that it says that there includes the absolute enforcement of it. That wasn't our intent. Our intent was to highlight that speed limits should be a primary key for enforcement and the reason is this. It is difficult to quantify why people have accidents. It is easy to quantify that as speeds go up more accidents and injuries occur. That is important. That's the reason the phraseology is in there. I would urge you to defeat the Chambers amendment. If the amendment's adopted, the world doesn't stop and go away, but I do think it's a good emphasis. I think it complements the package and I'm going to vote against the amendment and I would hope that you'd do the same. Thank you Mr. Clerk. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, did he file a substitute amendment? Okay, there are two spots in the bill that have this language, they're roughly the same thing and when you're voting on that realize that that's the amendment and not just subsection (4). Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Okay, we need procedurally to get to a clarification of what we have up here. Senator Chambers' current amendment indicates we need to strike Section 4. You have filed an amendment that says strike Section 4 and 9. You could either ask for a substitute or you could withdraw that amendment and then this amendment would be before us. Procedurally, it makes no difference how we get there, but we need to get there.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I've withdrawn it and offer that one.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Okay, the current Chambers amendment is withdrawn. The next amendment, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend by striking all of Sections 4 and 9 of the original committee amendments. (FA492 is found on page 1071 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Chambers, you're recognized to open on your new amendment.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and, Senator Kristensen, thank you for calling that to my attention. Let me ask you a question, and I do this in all seriousness. You're just doing it for emphasis. Do you agree that it carries no legal impact in terms of changing the legal duty of these