

February 13, 1992 LB 111

now we have enough for a felony, we can do it for a one-time felony charge and that's it, or if they choose not to do a felony, they can go misdemeanor and a series of misdemeanors if they want to, but they can't...they can't mix the two, it's one or the other. Is that...would that be a fair understanding?

SENATOR LINDSAY: That is...that is accurate.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: With that understanding, I totally am in support of the amendment by Senator Lindsay.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you. Senator Lindsay, are these the same as the...as the check valuations then?

SENATOR LINDSAY: We...the check...I got up to stand a little late to amend that to...I'll have the same thing applied to checks. I'm in the process of drafting an amendment that would allow the same type of thing.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Is it less for checks (interruption)?

SENATOR LINDSAY: We're not on values here. Is that what your question is dealing with?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yeah.

SENATOR LINDSAY: No, we...

SENATOR PIRSCH: You were on values in aggregation of theft here?

SENATOR LINDSAY: No. No, this amendment...I think you're looking at the amendment that came around.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Oh.

SENATOR LINDSAY: We're back on the one that was printed in the Journal that would simply say, except that amounts may not be aggregated into more than one offense. That's the only...it was on page 635 of the Journal.

SENATOR PIRSCH: The agg...that they may be not aggregated for