

there should not need to be a reason for excessive reaction. And this is part of the problem. I understand a little bit where Senator Chambers is coming from because he is saying that if there is, let's call it a crisis, for lack of a better term, he wants to be able to resist. The point is with warning, the point is there should not be resistance, it should be better for everyone. Some of the instances he's talking about, at least one, the one where he said they were attacking the boy, I believe that's the one you're talking about, and I haven't seen this, Senator Chambers, but I understand that that was let's call it the second part of the fight. It's after the...and the boy in this case refused to stop attacking the officer, so the dog was brought in. Now that's my understanding of it. It's a little dangerous to use anecdotes in this process, but the point is that a properly handled dog will not get into these situations. And I want to answer the question that he talked about of where a dog can be made unfit for duty, and that's true and that's a part of the reason for the bill. They can be teased, they can have hot coffee thrown on a horse or something like that, any animal, like any of us I would say, can be teased to the point of some reaction, and when that happens it does render that animal unfit, at least temporarily for use in that procedure. And my concern is that properly trained dogs in this situation, someone fights them back, and in a sense that's a form of teasing, they end up probably overreacting. Any of us can be pushed to the point of excess. The point is if a person quits resisting arrest, does as they're ordered to do by a properly uniformed police officer, the problems that Senator Chambers is talking about will not arise, simply stop. If a horse is there in your way you control yourself. If a dog is coming after you, you stop. The point is none of these problems should arise if a person reacts responsibly. The problem we have in many of our, as...of our law contact situations, it seems to me, is there's an overreaction, people refuse to obey a lawful order by a uniformed officer they continue to react, or to fight, or to tease, or to pull hair, or whatever. This simply says that when a dog is doing its properly prescribed duties that it too can be created...treated on a higher plane in terms of the law. And to me that is a logical extension of what we want to do. We want resistance to stop, we want the criminal to be apprehended. And I can't see that that should be a problem in this bill if the proper procedures are followed by the law enforcement officer, then the person that is being apprehended should simply stop the activity, we'll assume it's unlawful activity, and quit. And that's the intention of this.