

proportionately. We need to send home the message that driving under the influence is not acceptable, and if it takes a habitual criminal approach to this, then so be it; that we don't have, I am going to be careless with words here perhaps, but the luxury of allowing a certain amount that society, in my lifetime, has tended to allow. I can remember back in my college days when I knew of this behavior. It was kind of a joke. Got home, stayed out late and made it home. With half or a third or a fourth or ten percent of the cars that are on the road today, perhaps, I never considered acceptable behavior then, but perhaps it was more accepted by society. We are in a different world today. Traffic is enormous and I think the message has to be getting across that driving under the influence of alcohol is not acceptable today with the risks that we are presenting to society. And if this is what it takes to do something about this very serious thing, then I think it's time to make some changes, and to recognize whether it is intent or not, when one gets in a car under the influence of alcohol, the odds are much higher for an accident, and are much higher for killing someone. And that we've reached a point in society and we are heading into an even more crowded society, if you will, even in Lincoln, Nebraska, or even the State of Nebraska, that there is not that much room for tolerance, and that it cannot be acceptable in society to allow this kind of behavior to continue, and so I support the amendment.

SENATOR WILL: Thank you. The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Members of the Legislature, again I wanted to ask Senator Lindsay some questions, if I may, just to be sure that I understand the consequences of my vote.

SENATOR WILL: Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, let me make a couple of statements first and if you would verify that whether they are correct or not correct, and then I'd like to get an affirmation from you that the consequences are doing one thing or another on this amendment do follow as I describe them. But as I understand the way this habitual criminal statute is structured, we have essentially divided it into two parts, one part now deals with violent crimes, and the other part deals with felonies, but felonies that are not violent, generally speaking. Is that correct to begin with?