

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

March 17, 2003 LB 209

his hat on. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. You've heard the opening on FA1200, offered by Senator Chambers to LB 209. (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion of the Chambers amendment, Senator Bromm.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to oppose this amendment, and let me probably in some respects repeat what Senator Chambers explained. The bill, as it stands, takes away the automatic stay of the revocation of the license. As it stands right now, if your license is taken because you were stopped and there was probable cause to believe that you were operating a motor vehicle, and if there was a test that showed that the alcohol concentration that you had in your blood was greater than that allowed by law, then there is an automatic license revocation. You do have a right to a hearing on that and that...this bill deals with that and that will continue, and then if you do not like the results of that hearing you have a right to an appeal. And the way the law is now, if you enact that appeal you automatically get your license back until the time of the...that the appeal is run, and that is a significant delay. Let me address a couple of things about what Senator Chambers has said. He is a student of the law and he respects the law, and I know that he does, but when he is alluding to due process and the rights of individuals, we need look no further than a very recent case decided by our own Supreme Court in February, which is a case, as a matter of fact, that came out of the county that I live in, but it is Hass v. Neth. And in that case there is a tremendous discussion of the due process considerations in this whole ALR area and the court found that the protections we have in the statute, which we are not changing, that allow the defendant to have a hearing, a prompt hearing, to determine whether there was probable cause to believe that the person was in actual physical control of the vehicle and whether the person was operating or in the physical control of the vehicle while he had an alcohol concentration in violation of the law, that that was a meaningful part of due process. It went on to discuss other due process areas, but the court concluded...Supreme Court concluded as follows, and I think this is significant. We're not talking about...we're