

duty properly. What this bill is doing is requiring mandatory arrests which is a departure from the law. You know what the last amendment was that you added to this bill because it was discussed and I'm not going to go into that again. And now we are saying that officers who do things pursuant to this bill are not liable criminally or civilly. I don't think that ought to be in this bill. I don't think that ought to appear anywhere in the law. Instead of us lowering the level of our legislation to meet the mentality of certain ignoramuses who call themselves law enforcement officers, we should require them to meet the levels of the law as the law is written. We should not say that because an officer may not understand what the word assault means and he doesn't know to go look it up in the statute, if he commits an assault pursuant to this bill if he thinks he's right, then he should not be liable civilly or criminally because how can a cop be expected to know what the law says, which, by the way, every other citizen is presumed to know. If this language is not designed to lower the standard of law enforcement, it has no place in the law. If its purpose is to lower the standard, then it certainly has no place in the law. So what my amendment would do is, on page 9, in the two places the language appears would strike that language and I will read it again. No peace officer or law enforcement agency shall be held criminally or civilly liable for his or her actions pursuant to this section taken in good faith. I can commit an assault in good faith but I'm still held liable. And police officers who are given discretionary power to take human life, to deprive people of their freedom, to make warrantless intrusions into people's homes, to mandatorily arrest people who violate one of these orders, this bill is going a long way toward undermining or weakening rights that Americans, to use that term loosely, have come to believe traditionally are theirs. That is simply because a person represents law enforcement, he or she does not have a right to do any and everything he or she has the power to do, and by power I mean the gun, the badge, the club, the mace and the handcuffs. So this is the worst type of language that could be in a bill such as this and I'm asking that it be stricken.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Bernard-Stevens, discussion on the Chambers amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: It will just take a brief moment, Mr. President. I concur with Senator Chambers. I think it's a good amendment and I hope it is adopted. Thank you.