

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Three hundred, 300 would be closer.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Let's say it is a couple hundred, couple hundred dollars. Whatever its value is, regardless, maybe it is crippled, maybe it is not even worth that much, but whatever its value is, it is going to be a Class IV felony if you steal it under this provision, is that correct?

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: That is correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Well, I think therein and that simple answer tells you why that is not right. It is not right to value a type of property simply because it is one type of property as more than another type of property. Is my office equipment, is that worth less than a cow or a calf? You know, there is...I have heard this argument that somehow cattle is more important because you are putting energy or you are putting material into it, but that is true of an awfully lot of things, in items that go into a manufacturing process in the cities, for example, lumber in the lumberyard.

SPEAKER BAACK: Time.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Those are all things that will be worth more someday as you put more time and work into it, and as it grows in value, but that is not justification for treating it differently. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BAACK: The next speaker is Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. I rise in opposition to AM1029, and my basis for opposing it is somewhat along the same lines as Senator Beutler. First of all, Senator Bernard-Stevens is half right, and the first part of his amendment is good. I think he is right when he says that aggregation of offenses, whether you disagree or agree with that, that is a major change in the criminal law, and it ought to be treated by itself, rather than being added onto a bill dealing with cattle and brands. It is just simply not the type of change in our criminal code that we ought to be making with a Select File amendment. There is a bill in the Judiciary Committee, and that is where the amendment came from. There has been a bill in Judiciary Committee, I believe, each of the last