

long time. They have worked with county attorneys. They have had some success and not success. Some county attorneys prosecute, some do not. Some plea bargain down. That is simply the county attorney's decision, and that is something if they don't obviously like what the county attorney does, they need to either get a new county attorney or work more with the county attorneys they have. But over the years, they have come up with the idea, one that they would like for their industry, one of the largest industries in the state. Nationally, it is a \$15 billion industry as far as farm income. They would like to have something simple from the Legislature, and that is that we simply say that anything under \$1,000 would be a Class IV felony. Anything above a thousand to two thousand is a Class III and so on, as the statutes would have. That is what the intent of the bill was, and then there are some branding things that needed to be in there at the end of the bill on the Brand Commission, and those things are necessary as well. As the bill went through the process, there is a drafting error that simply eliminated a Class III and that was not the intent. And there was also an amendment put on by Senator Wickersham, all in good faith, on a day I will admit that I was not real sharp on my feet, on aggregation. Aggregation would be where you are going to be able to add up the values of those things that were stolen in order to be able to reach a felony issue or not. That, members of the body, was the language of the aggregation which Wickersham's amendment was LB 101. It passed committee, is on General File now. I spoke with Senator Pirsch and she is in agreement, at least understands, I should say, understands what I am trying to do. Senator Wickersham added LB 101, which is Senator Pirsch's bill as an amendment, and the body approved the amendment on Final Reading. Now, members of the body, aggregation has been something that has been fought over for about 10 years or longer and, personally, I think that if we are going to do something on aggregation, it shouldn't be as an amendment on Final Reading, because if we continue with the aggregation amendment, I know there will be amendments by Senator Kristensen and others, Senator Chambers has an interest in aggregation, that would try to clarify that, and this is not an aggregation bill. So what this amendment that I am asking you to return it for will do, I am asking the body to return it to Select File for a specific amendment. The amendment will do the following: It will, number one, strike the aggregation section, the Wickersham amendment. It will strike that, and the body then, when LB 101 comes up for discussion in its due time, the body then can work its will on that particular concept. And