

February 13, 1992 LB 111

within that one scheme.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Right.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: And this only applies to the check area?

SENATOR LINDSAY: No, this amendment applies to the bill. There's...I'm...

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay, you're...

SENATOR LINDSAY: ...I haven't been able to get time to sit down.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: I'm sorry. Well, I'll let you go back to work and...and I share Senator Pirsch's nervousness about drafting those things. But we'll probably have to do a review of the criminal code anyway to harmonize all that. Thank you.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Senator Chambers, you are next.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I have a question of Senator Kristensen. Senator Kristensen, with that discussion you had with Senator Lindsay, do you now support the amendment?

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Senator Chambers, you may find this hard to believe. I'm still trying to sort out exactly what it does and whether I can support it. Generally, I guess I...I understand what Senator Lindsay is trying to do and if you're going to aggregate, you've got to do it and you can't play games with the aggregation and make three felonies out of one felony. And that probably would make some sense to me. And so, generally, yes, I'm probably leaning towards the Lindsay amendment unless I think there is somebody that could get away with where there was legitimately three felonies committed and you could only be limited to getting one. And I just don't know if there is enough of those fact patterns to make it worth my time to vote no.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask you another question, Senator Kristensen, mainly because you did serve as a prosecutor. Let's say we have one of these individuals and we won't go into all the details of this...these separate visits to these stores and