

SENATOR MATZKE: Well, you're making the argument for the, for both paragraphs being essential because in the first paragraph it refers to that which could endanger...

SENATOR LINDSAY: One minute.

SENATOR MATZKE: ...and the second paragraph, or the second long sentence covers those other acts, so you've got both of them covered with both of them and if your motion were sustained we'd lose half of them.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So you want to cover acts that don't endanger the physical or mental well-being of a person.

SENATOR MATZKE: No, that's inaccurate.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, that's what...I just gave you an example of one that does not endanger the physical or mental well-being and you said you want to keep those in.

SENATOR MATZKE: No, I said I want to keep the language in in the first sentence which covers those acts which endanger the physical or mental health or safety plus the second sentence which covers specific acts which may or may not have actually caused physical harm.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, they don't even have to pose a possibility of causing harm with the language you want left in. How could the forced consumption of any food pose a danger if the food is a crust of bread?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Time. Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Pedersen.

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Mr. President, members of the body, I'd like to ask Senator Matzke a couple of questions.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Senator Matzke, would you respond?

SENATOR MATZKE: Yes, certainly.

SENATOR PEDERSEN: Senator Matzke, you were talking about the young people and this was not something, a bill that, a law that they would harass the young people with. Could you explain a