

SENATOR AVERY: In your interpretation, would you believe then that human beings would be covered in other parts of law as we have it today in terms of protection?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, yeah, for an example, if you're hunting one of these mammals you couldn't do that to a human being because of the stalking laws. If you're using one of these animals in a dog trial, whether you can take it or not, you could not set a dog upon a human being. If you're after these mammals for the purpose of enclosing them in a zoo or some other set of circumstances you could not do that to a human being because it would be false imprisonment, illegal imprisonment and such things as that so the requirement that no human being can be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, we don't have to say that this language relating to animals has to except human beings. They would automatically be excepted from it. And I think it demeans the concept of what a human being is and it blurs exactly what this definition is supposed to be about, in my opinion. If you're going to keep it here then I think in any other area of the statute that talks about a mammal you're going to have to say except human beings, and I don't think that would be necessary and I certainly don't think it would be appropriate.

SENATOR AVERY: Thank you..I...for that explanation. I don't see anything wrong with that and for terminology in terms of this bill, this section of statute and the definition here, that I will support Senator Chambers' amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Avery. Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Honorable President, friends all. As I understand the amendment that Senator Chambers has proposed, and maybe since Senator Chambers is busy I could ask Senator Avery, I believe that this is on the committee amendment on page 6...

SENATOR AVERY: Right.

SENATOR PREISTER: ..line 13.

SENATOR AVERY: Right.

SENATOR PREISTER: Okay. Thank you, Senator Avery. As I look