

by the way, I am in favor of the aggregation concept but the body can work it as the bill moves through the system rather than as an amendment on Final Reading. And, number two, after striking the Wickersham amendment, which takes the aggregation out of the bill, then it will be...the second part of the amendment would simply say the following, that on the Class IV felonies, there would be the following addition, "or the thing involved is cattle and the value is not over one thousand dollars". That would then solve the problem that Senator Pirsch saw which eliminated Class III. That would still be there if it was over \$1,000. If it is under \$1,000 in the cattle industry, that would be a Class IV felony. I understand very well that if I am a county prosecutor and I don't want to make it a felony, I could change it to attempted theft. I understand that. Those are discussions and details that need to be worked with each individual county attorney, and I can't be responsible for that. So in conclusion, the amendment that I am asking the body to return this bill for will strike the Wickersham amendment, and make under \$1,000 in cattle a Class IV felony. If we do not adopt this amendment, then what will be left is aggregation and some other details on branding, and there would be only a Class IV felony at this particular point for all cattle, for all cattle theft. If this amendment does not go, just so the body knows my thinking, I want to be as straightforward as possible today, if this amendment is not agreed to, then the amendment that I have filed which was temporarily skipped, I will go back to, when it comes up in its due course, would simply be to delete all areas of the theft and the Wickersham amendment, all of Section 1, leave us with the Branding Commission things that need to be done, and leave the bill clean and let it move on its way. With that, that is what I would like the body to do. If there is anyone that has questions on it, I would be certainly more than delighted to respond to them. It is a small thing. It has implications, I understand, but it is something that the cattle industry needs, something they feel they need, and something I put before the body to see if the Legislature concurs. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Discussion on the motion to return, Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, and members of the Legislature, this is going to get us back into the discussion we had a few days ago, and we resolved the issue. However, it was not resolved in a way apparently that was satisfactory to all the