

this, but there does need to be one point of clarification about you might see an additional videotape in light of newly discovered evidence. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: The puppeteer is pulling my string and took my lines even. In the event, Senator Hall, of newly discovered evidence, a subsequent videotaping may occur to quote Senator Scofield as closely as I can, but that also was a part of the understanding of the bill and we want that into the record.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you very much, Senator Chambers and Senator Scofield. With that, Mr. President, I would withdraw the motion.

PRESIDENT: Very well, the motion is withdrawn.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Hoagland would move to return the bill. (Senator Hoagland's amendment appears on page 2376 of the Legislative Journal.)

PRESIDENT: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Let me just make a few comments, Mr. President and colleagues, in light of the fact that it sounds like we are like some people that may not have participated in the drafting of the bill are attempting to make some legislative history that may or may not clearly reflect what the Judiciary Committee had in mind when these amendments were drafted and redrafted. By and large, I have no quarrel with the representations made by Senator Hall and certainly Senator Chambers and Senator Scofield have accurately stated their results and their meaning. Let me state, however, that the general purpose of the bill is to give the courts additional flexibility in determining how to take testimony from children as witnesses or as victims in criminal cases, in felony cases. It's intended to give the court considerable more flexibility than it currently has both in the taking and the preservation and the use at trial. And I think it is particularly important to emphasize that the bill...the language of the act speaks for itself and necessarily prevails as against comments made on the floor as to what that is intended to mean, the clear meaning of the act prevails, with the understanding the general purpose is to give the courts the flexibility they need to obtain trustworthy and credible evidence in regard to criminal acts and the court, I think, in future interpretations of the act should not allow floor remarks to cause the court to interpret the