

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

March 17, 2003      LB 209

has filed an amendment that I will support. We'll discuss that when we get to it. But it's critical that people understand, and most of us have...were now in the body when the ALR bill was passed in 1992. It became law in 1993, January 1. Need to do some background educating here to my...and not only for my own good but for the body. But the ALR process is becoming...it's being used more and more each year. And we had an interim study. It was LR 353. It was conducted on October 24 of 2002. For those of you not on the Transportation and Telecommunications Committee, anyone who wants to see this, we have copies of it. It's an extensive study. This particular issue we're talking about now with the Chambers amendment was a critical part of the discussion, and that, of course, was the judicial bypass. I think Senator Bromm has offered a logical solution to the problem here. The stay now can only be granted if you meet these four qualifications and, as Senator Chambers pointed out, I guess it was Friday we were on the bill, all these had to be met. It wasn't or one of them. There are four of them. They had to all be met. So I'm in support of Senator Bromm's amendment, which we'll discuss in a bit, but certainly have to oppose Senator Chambers' just because it goes against what came out of the study and all the testimony we had in that particular study back in October. This was a critical part of it. People are able to file an appeal to district court while their license was revoked through the ALR procedure, get an appeal filed and automatically have that suspension lifted, and the process would allow a lot of people to drive while this...obviously, those people could drive while their appeal was being heard, and quite often the 90-day suspensio. under the ALR provisions would run out before the appeal was ever finally determined. So it's important that we maintain language similar to what's in the bill through Senator Bromm's amendment, rather than just strike the...or reinstate the language as it existed in the law now. So I certainly am willing to listen to Senator Chambers. Maybe he can convince a few people of some points there, but we can't simply just put the old language back in. It goes against what...all the testimony we had in the hearing and so on. And I will continue to oppose the Chambers amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Baker. Senator Bromm, on