

parties involved. This amendment, there are really two parts to what is going on here. One is to remove the amendment that was put on the other day with regard to the aggregation of offenses, and I would certainly have no objection to doing that, if that is what is desired. And I think that is what Senator Bernard-Stevens second amendment, which is coming up next, would do, and I don't think anybody would have any objection to that. What is a matter of great import, though, is the other part of the amendment, which would say that a specific type of property, regardless of its value, that a specific type of property, regardless of its value is going to be a certain kind of felony offense. I want to go back and remind you once more how the theft statutes are constructed, and you actually can see how they are constructed if you look at Section 1 of LB 218. And you will see that the theft statutes are structured in accordance with the value of the things stolen, and as the value increases, the penalty increases, and that is the way it should be. It doesn't talk about cattle, or stereo sets, or office equipment, or any particular kind of property. It translates kinds of property into value, and then treats all value, whether it comes from a city area or a rural area or wherever, it treats it in accordance...in the same way. This particular amendment represents a radical and an unfortunate departure from the way our criminal statutes are constructed by saying that cattle, just because they are cattle, regardless of their value, constitutes something special and different and, hence, there should be some higher penalty, some felony penalty applied to cattle, even though the value of the things stolen may only be a couple of hundred dollars, may only be a misdemeanor offense. Now let me remind you that with regard to any item that is \$300 or more, \$300 or more, right now that is a felony, so that if a calf or a cow of some type is stolen and its value is more than \$300, then it is already, it's already the kind of felony offense that Senator Bernard-Stevens is talking about. But as I read this amendment, if I am reading it correctly, regardless of its value, if it is under \$1,000, it is going to be a Class IV felony. Let me ask Senator Bernard-Stevens a question, if I may.

**SPEAKER BAACK:** Senator Bernard-Stevens, would you respond?

**SENATOR BEUTLER:** Senator, if this happens to be some kind of newborn calf, and I don't know what the value of a newborn calf is, but let's say its value is \$75.