

closing. The question is, shall the Chambers amendment be adopted? All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Have the senators all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on the adoption of Senator Chambers' amendment.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: The amendment is adopted. Senator Chambers, on the third amendment. You are recognized to open. (See FA327 on page 2617 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President and members of the Legislature and, Senator Wehrbein, I feel so conspicuous doing this because I really think what I'm offering improves the bill, and I don't like the bill but I'm starting to...my dislike for it is starting to diminish, but as we go along, I think it is going to get a bit more difficult, but maybe not necessarily so. On page 3 of the E & R amendment, which constitutes the bill, and that would be on the flip side of your Enrollment and Review amendment if you are following along, page 3, line 7, it would be the line 7 near the top of the page. I am going to read the existing language, then tell you, then insert the language I want to add. A person commits harassment of a police animal if he or she knowingly and intentionally teases or harasses a police animal in order to distract, agitate, or harm the police animal, period. Before getting into the penalty section, I want to tell you what I'd like to do. At the end of that sentence, I would add this language, "for the purpose of preventing such animal from performing its legitimate official duties". Then here is how the sentence would read: A person commits harassment of a police animal if he or she knowingly and intentionally teases or harasses a police animal in order to distract, agitate, or harm the police animal for the purpose of preventing such animal from performing its legitimate official duties. I will tell you why I am offering this language. We use a number of words, each of which is very vague. We don't define distract. We don't define harassment. So in order to have a person convicted of a crime, which is what harassment would be, you should have to show that this is done for the purpose of preventing the animal from doing what it is supposed to do. Under the language that's in the bill now, if one of these canine trucks was going down the street and somebody whistled at the dog, that could distract the dog, and yet the dog is not engaged in the performance of any duty. The dog is just riding along. That would be distracting the dog and that