

PRESIDENT MOUL: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...maybe overreaching in that sense and that is why I raise that question.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Landis. Senator Chambers, followed by Senator Will. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Madam President and members of the Legislature, I am opposed to this bill as I was in committee. I was not there when they voted it out of committee, but had I been there my vote would have been a nay. This is one of those bills which I think is overkill. It's a political statement rather than a legitimate law enforcement regulatory type act to handle conduct which a society should want to restrict. If you look at page 4, and since we have an Executive Board meeting in a minute or two, I'm not going to be able to offer my amendments but I want to put them on alert, by them I meant the people who support this bill, because on Select I'm going to offer it and maybe some others. But on page 4, lines 20 through 25 you find these words, failure to obey more than one such order and each such incidence of restriction or obstruction shall each and individually constitute separate violations, regardless of the fact that multiple violations are alleged as a result of one uninterrupted undertaking by the party or parties accused. That means if one of these game wardens of whoever is going to do the enforcing says, stop, and you don't, he or she says, stop. However many times they utter that word it becomes a separate violation. There was a U.S. Supreme Court decision that was talking about cruel and unusual punishments. It said the law, the Legislature has the authority to make the drinking of one drop of liquor a crime, but if by taking one glass of liquor, dividing it into the number of drops that it would take to make up that amount of alcohol, by so doing create an indeterminate sentence for the drinking of one glass of alcohol would be cruel and unusual punishment. I believe a provision like this is just as ridiculous, it's just as much of an overkill and when these kind of groups bring this kind of legislation, they don't understand the law. We as legislators have an obligation to stop this kind of thing from being placed in the statute books. There is no other law, regardless of how serious the offense which makes a repetition of an order by an officer a separate, individual offense prosecutable as such, and if there is a conviction, a consecutive sentence attached to each one of those