

CLERK: Senator, I now have AM2672. Any revocation of license for a third or subsequent time, for a period greater than two years may be reduced upon application of the court, if the court finds that such applicant has been treated successfully for alcohol or drug disorder.

SENATOR HALL: Mr. President, members...Mr. Speaker, I would...or Mr. Clerk, I'd like to pass over that amendment.

CLERK: Senator, the next amendment I have then is AM2673. An order of probation...still found on page 616.

SENATOR HALL: Yes, correct. This is AM23...2673?

CLERK: Yes, sir.

SENATOR HALL: Listed as number six on that page?

CLERK: If you say so, I don't have the page in front of me.

SENATOR HALL: Yes, it is.

CLERK: Okay.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you very much. Again, I apologize to the body for the confusion. The amendment here, and I'll read it for the body because it's about seven lines is all. It says, an order of probation, pursuant to Section 39-669.07, may not include a provision requiring abstention from use of alcohol, unless professional evaluation is submitted to the court that problems with abuse of alcohol exist, period. Such order may include requirements that such person attend meetings for therapeutic purposes, but shall not include meetings of political, quasi political, or advocacy groups. This is an important amendment, ladies and gentlemen. And it goes to the whole issue, I believe, what's behind LB 291. LB 291, to date it has now been shown that there is a problem with our current driving while under the influence laws, that they are not harsh enough. As has been pointed out by some of the proponents of the proposal, it is an issue that we have a conviction rate, at least in the county that I'm most familiar with, Douglas, 97 percent. Those individuals who are going to court are pleading guilty, conviction is taking place. I guess the argument for the bill would be that we want to make sure that 3 percent don't get off. There is nothing in the bill, nothing