

March 10, 1982

LB 568

we have his amendments adopted and we have a framework within which to operate. Now let me indicate why I think it is important for us to adopt the approach of Senator Haberman's amendments. It seems to me the principal philosophical difference between the Judiciary Committee's proposal and Senator Haberman's and my proposals that we have been making through the weeks is whether or not there should be mandatory weekends in jail, mandatory jail terms for drunk drivers. That really is a principal philosophical question that this Legislature has to answer. Now Senator Haberman and Senator Stoney and me have all come down quite decisively on the side of those people who think that we need to have mandatory sentences for at least second, third and fourth offenders. The Judiciary Committee proposal when you strip away all of the sophistications about it and all the various legal arguments that are being made does not stand for mandatory jail sentences. Experience in California, experience in Maine, experience in other states have shown beyond a reasonable doubt in my mind that mandatory jail sentences save lives. The statistics in states that have had mandatory jail terms show beyond a doubt that mandatory jail sentences save lives. Senator Haberman's proposal represents the concept of mandatory jail sentences and presents a framework for operating within that. Now as I indicated, I know a lot of us have small differences, a lot of us can quarrel over whether some of Senator Haberman's mandatory time is too severe or is not severe enough. We can quarrel over whether we ought to have work permits for first or second offenders. We can quarrel over whether we should permit pre-trial diversion programs for first or second offenders perhaps, perhaps not for third or fourth offenders. However we come down on those smaller issues, the Haberman framework for future debate on this issue in the remaining twenty days in this session is a framework that we should adopt, because I just don't think that the framework put out by the Judiciary Committee which does not at any level provide even for so much as a mandatory weekend in jail, is going to provide the deterrent that we need to send a message to the drunk drivers around this state that if their blood alcohol exceeds .10, they better get somebody to drive them home from that party or from that bar because we are not willing to tolerate the risk that they impose to other drivers in other automobiles around the state. Now, some of you may accuse me of oversimplifying when I frame the issue that way, but I think it is clearly true that Senator Haberman's proposal and Senator Stoney's proposal represent the mandatory jail term philosophy, and the Judiciary Committee's proposal and the DeCamp proposal represent a

8645