

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

March 27, 2003      LB 208

title may be transferred to another family member so that the family does not lose their vehicle. And there's provision, of course, if it's a rented or leased car, that they get it back immediately. And that's put upon the police department to expedite that. The...this particular provision I would expect to be used very seldom. It is far more psychological. And on two points. First, it is psychological that the defense attorney can use this with a client that keeps coming back. The defense attorney can say, if you keep this up, you're going to lose your car. The threat of it is far more important than the actual doing of it. And the second psychological piece of it, which is far more important to me, is that family and friends of repeat offenders are not to loan their car or they may lose their car. Our son was paralyzed for life by a nice new sports car which was loaned to him, an 18-year-old, when he was twice the legal limit and was barely able to walk. I would hope that this provision would cause that car owner to think twice. The car owner, of course, has to know that the person is too impaired to drive, or that they have prior convictions. In this case, the owner knew both, because she told me that. We ought not to loan a car to a person in this condition. It puts all of us at risk. And number nine, notice of prior convictions. This is to deal more clearly with plea bargains. We cannot, in our branch of the government, prohibit plea bargains, even though some of us have ground our teeth and wish we could once in a while. Rather, this says that a prosecuting attorney who chooses to ignore previous convictions...and on this poster boy of mine, he's got a seventh third offense in his record. They are required to put in writing and make public all of the previous convictions of...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR KRUSE: ...this offender, and then to indicate why those convictions are not being followed. Then finally, the only objection that we have received in the hearing and that the committee has received to this bill is from defense attorneys who wish that more treatment would be ordered by judges. I agree. I strongly agree. It is already there. It's lost in the present statutes, but I think it's clarified. It's on the bottom of page 58 of the amendment, out there where all can see