

people that are trying to circumvent the laws of the State of Nebraska. So with that explanation, Mr. President, I just urge the body's adoption of LB 32 or vote for LB 32 to move it over to Select File.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Beutler, do you have an amendment to LB 32?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler would move to amend the bill by striking Section 5.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, if you would take a look at Section 5, the one and only thing that it does is to confiscate the property that is the subject of a violation and I want to strike that so the property is not confiscated. I think that establishing precedence with regard to the confiscation of property is a very dangerous matter. We could start confiscating firearms if you fired one in the wrong place on one occasion. We can start confiscating cars for different kinds of violations. We could start confiscating all different kinds of property of the individuals of this state for the violation. The proper object of the law ought not to be to confiscate property but to properly punish and if necessary fine on a uniform scale within a uniform system. When you confiscate property you don't treat people equally. In the case of CBs, the example is not so clear but even there with radar transmission equipment somebody may own a \$3,000 set or somebody a \$300 set. I don't know how much they cost but the point is that there can be a substantial price differential and you are punishing people unequally when you just make an across-the-board rule that you confiscate the property. Secondly, I think you should make a distinction between property that is used improperly on one occasion and property that is illegal and contraband at all times. If you are talking about drugs, if you are talking about cocaine or marijuana, that generally speaking is illegal to possess at all times and you might even want to treat that differently although I think some questions come up there, but where you are talking about property that an individual may normally own, a firearm, a car, an electronic equipment, and where the violation of the law is one particular use of that property, I think it is highly improper and a dangerous precedent to start making laws that we are going to confiscate this object or that object upon a violation of the law, and for that reason I would ask you to strike Section 5. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The Chair recognizes Senator Cullan. Do