

direction at any time. Now we have a bill which is everything and nothing. I don't know why there is such an insistence on trying to get through something like this which is a hodgepodge that nobody really can say what the true scope or reach of it would be. I don't think the bill ought to be advanced. I think the bill ought to be left right where it is but if that fails I think the thing ought to be killed. How can anybody say now what this bill means? If you look at Section 2, on page 2, and all of my remarks are directed to the motion to advance because I am opposed to it and my opposition is because we have here a bad bill. In Section 1...this is trash legislation. The amendments are trash too but nevertheless, look at Section 2. This is designed to deal with people who are connected with the media. Now why in the world when you are talking about an exemption will you add these words in lines fifteen through seventeen, "unless he or she is personally disturbing the peace or obstructing the officer?" If this person who is connected with the media would disturb the peace or obstruct the officer that person is merely dispersed. That is all that Section 2 allows and it seems like it is immunizing this person from arrest should that person engage in obstructing the officer or disturbing the peace because this provision deals only with dispersal, not arrest. So what Senator Haberman is saying is if my food friend Frank Parch would read this bill and decide to appear at a disturbance and he doesn't like the people being dispersed maybe he would pick up a stick and go offside an officer's head and an officer would say, you are under arrest, and he would say, well you are operating under 605 where you want to disperse people. All you can do to me since I am at this disturbance and I have identified myself as a member of the media, all you can do is disperse me. Read Section 2. If that news person disturbs the peace personally or obstructs the officer, then that person can be dispersed. Does that make sense to you? Why should we build in an ambiguity? And if you argue, no, that wouldn't mean that. There is another law that would cover that situation. Why are we going to enact laws which create a multiplicity of offensive and litigation possibilities when all of that is unnecessary? I think it is a terrible bill. It is an atrocious bill and whoever drafted these amendments to this bill ought to be ashamed of himself, John Goc.

SPEAKER MARVEL: We are speaking on a motion to advance, readvance the bill. Senator Haberman. The motion is to advance.

SENATOR HABERMAN: I move the question.