

March 19, 1982

LB 870

Stoney amend the present bill any way he wishes, and if his amendments pass, fine. But let's deal with one bill because we do not have time to deal with two and both of them will go down the tube and you know what that is going to look like and we do need a change in our DWI bill. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Kremer. We will come back to Senator Kremer. We will go to Senator Apking.

SENATOR APKING: Mr. President and colleagues, yesterday I had my office talk to Sheriff Byron Buzak from Crete. As probably all of you know, Saline County has had a great deal of tragedy with drunk drivers in the past couple of years and Sheriff Buzak is the law enforcement officer of the area. He certainly is no stranger to dealing with drunk driving problems and so forth. He compared the two bills and he said that the committee bill even though it has some good points to it really leaves too much up to the judges, and that seems to be the heart of the problem that the judges are suspending sentences, plea bargaining and so on and so forth. He felt that the Stoney bill while it does have some parts that need amending, it would be the much easier bill for our law enforcement officers to try to get these drunk drivers off the road. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Sieck.

SENATOR SIECK: Mr. President and members of the body, I have had kind of a rough morning here. I have lost a cow out there because of the mud and power, and another one is down so that is what I have been doing, I have been on the phone quite a bit. But on this particular bill, I just cannot support something here that will not work. It just will not work, and I can't understand why we want to do something. We have to get something here that will work and the committee bill is the one that will work. And as Senator Haberman said, we made some compromises even though I don't agree with some of the compromises, we do have to get something, and we have to have something that will work and get the job done, and I feel it will get the job done. But I do have a question of Senator Nichol.

PRESIDENT: Senator Nichol, would you respond?

SENATOR NICHOL: Yes, sir.

SENATOR SIECK: You mentioned here earlier in your statement ex post facto, and I tell you I am lost, I don't know what that means. Could you explain that to me?