

here's what I, and it is hard for us sometimes to give examples 'cause...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: I understand.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...they don't exactly fit but let's say that a horse is on this parade route, and the horse is standing there because the officer is with the horse doing whatever he or she does, if in that situation, even though the horse is not moving, if somebody interfered with or bothered that horse in that setting, to me that would constitute the harassment.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Okay. That, I agree, the example I used probably would be that. I think this amendment is okay with me. I think we might be getting...I'm not into the criminal law area. Senator Chambers may well be right,...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: One minute.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...we ought to focus a little more. And so I'll accept his amendment as expanding on the clarity of this particular amendment or statute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you, Senator Wehrbein. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Chambers, one question if I may.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: I'm wondering if possibly the amendment is a little too narrow in the sense that one could have a purpose in addition to preventing the animal itself from performing its duties, but one could have the purpose of preventing the handler of the animal from performing his or her duties as, for example, thinking more of a horse than a dog, spooking a horse or otherwise preventing the proper management of the horse so that the rider is unable to perform his or her legitimate duties. It would seem to me that the way it's drafted here that possibility, that motivation would not subject you to harassment of the animal. And I just would ask you to expound on that a little bit.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Beutler, the difficulty we have here is that as I stated there's an attempt to bring the animal and