

on, you may close. No closing. The question is the adoption of the Chambers amendment. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Members, we need some attention to your attendance in the Chamber and your attention to the voting board. Can't tell people how to vote and people, obviously, ought to vote their conscience, but would appreciate your paying attention to the business inside the Chamber. Record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: The Chambers amendment is adopted. Other items, Mr. Clerk?

CLERK: Senator Chambers would move to amend, Mr. President. (FA548 appears on page 1874 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, none of these amendments that I'm offering is something that catches the introducers of the bill by surprise. I just haven't had a chance to get them over to Senator Bohlke because we're moving rapidly now, but I...I hit two out of three. If you wanted to move over here to the culture corner, then we could include you. But this...this is a simple amendment and it goes to something that was discussed this morning. On page 5, line 26, and again on page 6, line 5, I would strike the word "values." Senator Rasmussen has pointed out that those who were trying to advocate or be advocates for recipients wanted this word included. After hearing what people gave as a reason, I'm not going to condemn or criticize anybody for offering it. My only purpose is to remove it because I think it's one of those terms that offers the chance for more mischief while not really doing anything that's of value. Since the portion of statute that is being dealt with lists...I know I'm being redundant in addition to being repetitive, the portion of statute that we'll be dealing with lists out some specific items that are going to be talked about and there is a greater degree of objectivity in that listing. But as soon as values is inserted, it...it raises too many questions and too many concerns, in my mind. So this amendment is dealing with that part of the bill that would require an assessment instrument. That instrument would not assess anybody's values. All this amendment does is strike the word "values" from two portions of the bill where I located it. I hope you will support it and if you have any questions, I will answer them.