

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, you are not a...

SENATOR DECAMP: I don't know. I think you would buy it, I think you would buy it free and clear, but I don't know. I suppose it would fall under the receiving stolen goods...I'll find out for you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'm asking...right. Here is why I'm wondering, I don't believe that a thief can give good title. But under this bill if a thief is also a liar he can perfect title by being two times a bad fellow. I think it is something that ought to be considered. I had it brought to my attention how animals are rustled in this state. And I didn't even realize as much of it was going on as is. So the way the bill is drafted I can see why the buyers would want it because they might be able to make a good deal in purchasing an item. They don't want to have to look behind the signature which, under the bill, they don't have to. So that is why the buyers don't object. They can get a good deal. Those who will be selling this stuff certainly are not going to object either because if there are other lienholders, or any impediment to their disposing of this and getting some cash, and a bill makes it possible to erase all that, and they get the cash, I can see why they want it. I can see why everybody wants this bill. But because everybody wants it does not necessarily mean it is good public policy. So some of these issues need to be clarified. The question I am asking is this, oh, Senator DeCamp, you have the answer now?

SENATOR DECAMP: It would not change existing law. You would have to give up the grain, but that is existing law.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: All right, so that we have it clear, if the buyer purchases stolen goods he does not get title, and the true owner still can claim.

SENATOR DECAMP: Yes, any more than you would now, Ernie.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. But I want to make sure what this law does.

SENATOR DECAMP: It is not intended to change that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Would you object to something