

February 13, 1992 LB 111

certainly would agree with if you would like to have proof that it be one scheme, if that's what's necessary.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Well, you know, I really think though that what you're talking about in aggregation is that you need to prove one scheme to at least intellectually or legally prove aggregation. And that one scheme may not be as defined as you normally would think but it's the pickpocket that goes through the airport and picks ten pockets, you can sort of say that's one scheme that occurred in that one day and did that. If you're talking about writing a check in...one check in July, one check in August, one in September, one in October and one in November, that's a lot harder scheme to prove but in aggregation your understanding of the way the bill is right now if that occurred at any time within that period of time, that you can aggregate that.

SENATOR LINDSAY: I don't believe that the Dierks amendment required a scheme.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Now the bill does.

SENATOR LINDSAY: The Dierks amendment simply requires that they be written within a certain period of time.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: But it does...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Right. So what the purpose of your amendment to do would be saying...and I guess when I talked about the 1,000 what I really meant 300 when I used my three series of \$100 checked, you're saying you're going to have to put all the...if you're going to aggregate, you've got to use those all together in one aggregation, could you still then get ten misdemeanors from that?

SENATOR LINDSAY: Yes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: So you would have the option of going after the traditional ten misdemeanors or one aggregation...

SPEAKER BAACK: One minute.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: ...first, you couldn't do three felonies