

the Judiciary Committee. But over hundreds of years, we have defined particular categories violations of the law, and we have done that for so long that they are pretty solid. And we know if you destroy somebody else's property, that is vandalism. And we know if you take their property, that's stealing. And we know if you assault somebody or if you hit somebody, that's assault, or if you threaten to hit somebody. All of these things are covered and most of these things that are in this bill are covered under one of those other categories. And, probably, if a prosecutor was asked to prosecute this kind of activity, he would go back to one of those traditional categories, if he possibly could, because those are familiar; they are defined in case law; he has a better chance of operating under those provisions. But what happens in the political world? In the political world, one particular interest group or one particular societal problem is elevated at a particular point in time, for a variety of different reasons, and so right now there is this tension between animal rights people and hunters. And so the hunters, not understanding how the law works, or understanding it but wanting additional emphasis put on their particular problem, they come in with these national laws like this, which are really highly duplicative of the existing law, and the political forces are so strong that we do this, even though it doesn't add a whole lot, maybe nothing at all in some cases, to our law. And then we will do this five or six or seven times over a period of time, and then comes a year like 1977. That was the year that Roland Luedtke and the Judiciary Committee took all of the criminal laws, knocked out all of the crap that was put into them over the last 25 years, and, basically, reverted back to those categories of criminal offenses that you and I have long known are the real offenses. We've got most of them covered. It's a rare thing for somebody to discover a new crime, you know, and we are really big on crime these days, but there aren't any new crimes out there. Criminals have been real innovative but they haven't discovered any new crimes. And, so, as Senator Chambers knows, years ago I used to fight these things tooth and nail, as he is still doing, and maybe that is what should be done, but I've kind of acceded to the process that maybe there is some value to passing a bill like this for the purpose of emphasizing to society that there are laws that apply, and this is how, in our modern language, this is how we state those laws. It is not the best language, but it is almost an educational function. If there is an importance to this bill, it is its educational function; it's not what it adds to the legal authority in the