

the human being closer and closer together. In the instance you gave that would be interference with the officer. It would not be harassing the animal but it would be interfering with the officer. There are some activities which the dog would not be actively engaged in, even if with the handler. Let's say that the dog is in the truck and the handler, if that what you called this person, is handcuffing an individual and the person resists and maybe the dog grows agitated in the truck and begins to bark because it thinks its handler is being attacked, that would not constitute harassment of the animal because none of the persons' actions are aimed or geared toward the animal. It would be resisting arrest, and if you were trying to stop the officer from arresting somebody else it would be interfering with an officer. So I believe that what you mention would be covered under the statutes relating to the duties of the officer himself or herself.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay, thank you.

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

SENATOR SCHMITT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Really, I just wanted to see if this mike would work after what Senator Maurstad said here and I and...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Obviously, a senator...

SENATOR SCHMITT: ...and Senator Brashear was wondering.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: ...a senator with more experience as yourself knows how to use the mike back there.

SENATOR SCHMITT: Oh, okay, thank you. No, I had one question for Senator Chambers, and I'm not really disagreeing with his amendment but I guess I just wanted this clarified.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR SCHMITT: If the officer had the dog in his vehicle, which they do a lot of times, and got the window rolled down partially and maybe went into eat and something like this, somebody comes by and is pestering the dog, would they be covered under this other statute or...