

was accused but the merchant has already been given that item and has sold it?

SPEAKER MARVEL: Your time is up. Senator Cope.

SENATOR COPE: Mr. President, members, as a retailer most of my life I think I understand the situation reasonably well. I oppose the amendment. I really don't see that the retailer, it should cost the retailer money for something that he has nothing to do with. In other words, he didn't ask anybody to shoplift in his store and it does cost him money if the merchandise that has been stolen is off the rack or off the shelf or out of stock for any length of time, particularly as Senator Nichol stated, in perishable merchandise such as clothing. Senator DeCamp mentioned the expensive items, the interest on the money, that he probably borrows to run his business. So due to that reason, I'm not going to reiterate all the others, I will oppose this amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Pirsch. The question has been called for. Do I see five hands? Okay, the motion before the House is, shall debate cease. All those in favor of that motion vote aye, opposed vote no. Okay, record.

CLERK: 25 ayes, 0 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Debate has ceased. Senator Chambers, you are recognized to close on your motion.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I read that the way of the transgressor is hard. That doesn't seem to be the case. This is a proposition which I think you've closed, some of you, your minds to because you are looking at shoplifting and not what I am talking about. I'm accepting the definition of shoplifting. Suppose these people that Senator DeCamp is talking about produce a photograph and they say this ring is worth \$50,000 and suppose there had been some embezzling within the company or within the store itself? Do you know that there are imitations of jewelry? Does that bother you at all? Does it bother you that there are what they call inside jobs and people on the inside will substitute items and they are not found out until an inventory is taken. Then they see the thing that is on the shelf does not have the value it is supposed to have. So the easiest thing in the world is to just produce a photograph whether it is for advertising purposes or whatever and say, this is what somebody stole. That becomes prima facie evidence. It takes the place of the item that is supposed to be stolen. There is no opportunity to inspect it, to make certain that this is the item that was stolen or anything