

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 31, 1999 LB 585

the keys away, putting them in storage until the per...whoever's car it is has either paid his fine or...or whatever, and then it's either given back to them for the cost of the storage or sold at action. With that, thank you, Madam Chairman.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Janssen. Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Madam Chair. As we're studying this section and trying to figure out ways to make it better, we're working on something that I think might...I doubt that it would bring Senator Chambers on as a cosponsor of the bill, but I'm concerned about his health and he's not one who can sit down and have a glass of wine to settle down or unwind, obviously, and so I don't want it on my hands if I get him overexcited. So we're working on an amendment which I think, in seriousness, would possibly be more palatable, I would guess, to the majority of the body and, as we're working on it, I will give you a big of a heads up here, but in order for this amendment to work Senator Chambers wanted me to not be so agreeable, I'm now going to oppose his amendment, as he would prefer. Because, if we put his amendment on, it will foul up the language that we need to replace. So I'm going to ask that his amendment not be adopted and I'm going to ask Senator Chambers to support the defeat of his amendment or to eventually withdraw it. What we're doing is, in examining the words and what will work here and still allow us to access, even with increased penalties, access the federal monies that I think are important for a highway system, we're looking at restricting the immobilization to the revocation or suspension of the motor vehicle's registration and license plates, again, at the discretion of the court, for repeat DWI offender. Will...our intent will be to take away all of the problems and complications and costs, quite frankly, of the immobilization impoundment provisions, and that...and that...I will feel fairly good about that, because one of the things I do have reservations about in all of these cases are the costs and who's going to pay the costs and what kind of...is that going to solve a problem? In some cases, I'd rather see the \$100 or the \$200 go into a treatment program or help to try to correct the problem in the long run. But at the same time we do have to have a significant, noticeable inconvenience, at least, for the repeat offender and we are just talking about repeat offenders here, not...not someone who makes a mistake for