

have additional information. We have knowledge of the price, quality, all these things. We know that this came from the man himself, Senator Chambers, because we have that photographic evidence. I'm not wanting to make a joke about this because it is serious. It is proof I think quite simply that photographic evidence at a time and at a place can serve a particular function and so let me quickly address the other issues Senator Chambers raised and raised by my good friends in the press over there. Why spend time, first of all, specifically defining shoplifting rather than just working on theft laws? Well just one quick example, you've got a lot of problems of proof because you have different types of activity go on in shoplifting than maybe just stealing something. For example, Johnny goes in, which he'd never do, and he goes to the counter where they have the \$14.95 pants and right next to it is the counter with the \$4.95 pants and he takes and he switches tags, \$4.95 over to the \$14.95 and vice versa. Therefore, when he goes to the counter he has paid something of value and you get into all kind of problems in the court on proof. Did he steal or didn't he? Well certainly he did. We all know he did but from a legal due process standpoint, he went through the process, his crime was in shifting so we have to define and set out elements like that. So there is a fundamental reason for getting exactly what constitutes shoplifting identified, separating it out as a crime, so on and so forth. Now as to the photographic evidence, Senator Chambers suggested that somehow we're just going to take a picture and wander into the courtroom and say, well, here is a picture of my forty-seven diamond rings worth \$208,000 that were stolen. Well it doesn't work quite that way. You've got to have satisfactory proof by backup witnesses of the value, of all these things, however, since Senator Chambers has raised the question, and as I say, he is valuable here, very valuable because he does raise questions, but since he has raised the questions as to the standards for the photographic evidence, I would be willing and am willing on Select File to put any reasonable standards that he thinks needs to be specifically written into the law on what evidentiary material is necessary for the photographic evidence. Additionally if you will read the bill, it doesn't say "must" use photographic evidence. That is merely a "may", an option. Now obviously any twit with even a half an ounce of brains isn't going to risk the entire case particularly on something pretty valuable by having just a incompetent photographic evidence without backup witnesses as to value and everything. So, Senator Chambers as I say, raises some good questions but I think there are adequate answers and nobody is going to vote for this bill because any Pied Piper or anybody else led them down any trail. I think the members of this Legislature recognize shoplifting as a serious problem. I think we know that we need to do something,