

and is sitting up here as a priority. LB 1020 attacks the drug problem. It was a bill that I originally introduced as part of an idea to help give law enforcement more tools to take drug and drunk drivers off the road. What I am moving to do is to substitute LB 1020 for 799 and solve several of our problems. And the first one of those problems is when you go up and have an arrest made and an officer will ask you for that, he has to have some probable cause, usually I pick out a senator's name, but this is too serious, so I won't pick out any. Okay, Senator Conway, you volunteered, I'll do you. Senator Conway, this could be close to home. (Laughter.) Senator Conway is driving, and let's say that he's weaving all over the road, the officer stops him. He can't just give him a test, he's got to have some probable cause, he's got to smell alcohol, he might see a fifth of whiskey between the guy's legs in his lap or something. He has the right to ask him for a test to do so. Let's say Senator Conway...I really hate doing that to you, I don't think that is wise. You take the defendant down to the station and you test them, and what happens? They turn out to be .05, they haven't violated the law, got to turn them loose, right? But the officer knows something is wrong, he knows that he's been weaving all over, he's wiped out a couple of signs up on the sidewalk, and he's slurring his speech, he's staggering all over the road, what's his next best guess? Probably some drugs. Maybe he finds a little bit of drugs in the car after they go back and search it or something. Under our implied consent laws you only get one test. What LB 1020 would do and what I'm proposing that we do to try to settle this matter is to put LB 1020 into 799. And it will give an additional test for drugged drivers. The second thing that it does is it goes and wipes out that choice provision of using urine or blood, and just takes that completely out. If you look in your bill books and pull out LB 1020 you'll see where we do that, if I can find it real quick as I'm talking, we do that on page 16 of LB 1020. We wipe out that choice provision. This will solve our problems with the Supreme Court, and will keep our drunk driving laws intact. During the interim, if people want to go and reexamine how we may be able to salvage urine testing for drunk driving, I think that's a wise thing we can do. But, quite frankly, if this Legislature doesn't do anything in the next nine days, you're going to give a license to people to drive while they are intoxicated, choose that urine test, and there is not a thing we can do about it, there is not a thing a prosecutor can do about it, there is not a thing a judge is going to do about it. And our law enforcement are going to...it's a hole, and it isn't a