

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

March 27, 2003      LB 208

it. We need to increase the consensus of judges to use that authority to provide treatment when an assessment indicates that is needed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BROMM: Thank you, Senator Kruse. Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I've been occupied with other bills, so I haven't had the time to spend on this one that I wish I had. But the relatively short period of time I've had has brought to my attention a number of flaws that I see in the bill. We could debate from now till the cows come home on all of those. Senator Kruse and I, however, have had some discussions. And there are two items he's going to strike from the bill which we have agreed on. And I told him that I intend to discuss some aspects of this bill while we're on General File, and if the body chooses to advance this bill. Now, I cannot vote for it. I will talk to Senator Kruse between now and Select File, and we'll see which things we can reach an agreement on. And if we cannot reach agreement, I will make my wager fight on Select File. Ordinarily I don't do that. But Senator Kruse has been very accommodating in the time that we've had to discuss this bill. So I want to show him some good faith on my part. I do not like the kinds of bills that increase punishments for the mere sake of increasing them. That's what I see a lot of in this bill. To simply punish somebody more harshly is not going to alter that person's conduct. If a person has a sickness, which we've been told alcoholism is, punishing, punishing, punishing is not going to do the trick. I do understand that there must be punishment when a person violates the law, especially if the violation actually harms another person or is dangerous and could harm somebody. So I am not an apologist for drunk drivers. But again, I don't want a bill that is manifesting what seems to me the anger that society feels against a particular classification of people. So after Senator Kruse offers an amendment, I'm going to hope that I can stick by my agreement, which I can, and that's that I will not offer any amendments on General File. Because if we can work our way to some accords rather than piecemealing amendments, we will be able to combine whatever we agree on, if we can agree on anything, into one amendment, then take individual sections or segments of the bill from that point