

Senator Dierks is right, we've been having some trouble trying to remember way back last spring as far as what the reasons were. On this particular section the reasons for deleting Section 8 were that what we are doing, and we've got to make that clear, what we are doing is making someone responsible for somebody else's criminal activity. We're not talking about a civil fine here or civil liability. We're talking about potential criminal sanctions to be imposed on somebody because someone else happens to commit a crime. We are...certainly we're talking about a parent-child relationship, but nonetheless we are talking about if a child...and we don't have to look at a four, five, six, seven-year-old, let's look at the persons who are still minors. Let's look at an 18-year-old who goes out with some high school friends, and goes out and cruelly mistreats an animal. It's the 18-year-old who should be responsible for that crime, not the parents of that 18-year-old. We can't just look at this in terms of a small child who a parent really may have the control over. We're seeking here to impose criminal liability upon someone for the acts of another person who has all the capability of determining what is right and what is wrong. I think the reason for striking in committee was just for that reason. Let's make the person who commits the act criminally liable. We have in most cases, if we're talking about some of those older kids, some of the older teenagers, we've got the juvenile court system that can be used to handle those matters. I don't think we want to overstep that and start dragging parents, who may or may not have any control over the child, drag them into the criminal system and impose criminal sanctions. I would urge the rejection of the Dierks amendment to the committee amendments.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Dierks.

SENATOR DIERKS: Well, it just appears to me that someone has to have control of these minors. And as long as we designate minors in law, they still are under the jurisdiction of their parents, and this legislation would simply strengthen that jurisdiction and allow for the nonanimal neglect. We're not...I'm not concerned as much about cruelty here as I am about their inability to feed the animals and keep water from them. I think that we're more concerned about neglect in this particular instance than we are about cruelty. But I still think that there has to be some responsibility for all these animals. If they happen to fall in that category, that they belong to a minor, which we all know is described by law, then that