

those are not fair accusations. I don't know if they want to do that but I guess it's just because I'm upset the way the whole process has gone and I'm going to reiterate again if I had it to do over again I can guarantee you I'd never vote...cast a vote for reconsideration and put ourself back in this spot if I'd a known we were going to withdraw this amendment and put us back where we were to start with. And with that, if we can't move any further than this, I think I'll go home. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Vrtiska. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: I yield to Chambers.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Hall. Madam President, members of the Legislature, Senator Bromm, Senator Bromm, do you have a copy of the bill? It would be the committee amendments. It's the one that we were...I meant the E & R amendments because I want to call your attention to a page. If you would turn to page 31.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Section 28, which would be lines 8 through 17, it's creating a new offense it said. It says a person commits the offense of assault on an officer using a motor vehicle if he or she intentionally, knowingly or recklessly causes or attempts to cause bodily injury to a peace officer and so forth. I had mentioned a case earlier and this kid was being chased by the police and a trooper or somebody, some other law enforcement officer, had parked a cruiser to try to cut the kid off. It was winter, apparently, and the kid didn't stop so the officer had to jump out of the street into a snowbank and they charged him with some form of attempted homicide and he was convicted. They did not allow him to post bond so he started serving his nine months in jail. The other day the Appellate Court threw it out saying that an act cannot be both intentional and reckless. A reckless act doesn't require intention, so for you to take the same act and allow it to be both reckless and un...and both intentional and unintentional cannot be done and the court threw it out and it's this exact situation that they have here where they're making the same act intentional and