

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

March 27, 2003 LB 46, 208, 209

onward. I will show you one idea in the bill which cannot possibly stand constitutional scrutiny. And Senator Kruse I believe agrees with this. But I'm not going to offer an amendment right now, because I see too many little things that might have big implications, and I don't want to spend time on this bill taking it piece by piece. If Senator Kruse had not been willing to discuss it, because he was so wrapped up in it that he felt each word, each clause, each phrase, each section has to be kept intact,...

SPEAKER BROMM: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...then what I would have done is attempted to strike each section, so that we would discuss it that way. I'm explaining on the record why I'm taking the approach I am. So it might let others know that I'm not unreasonable. But others must be reasonable with me. Since I only have a minute left this time, I'm not going to launch into a discussion of any of these points that I find a problem with. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SENATOR RAIKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature. Senator Kruse, if I could ask you a couple of questions, please? What I'd like you to do is to place this kind of in a broader perspective for me, if you would. I'm thinking particularly of LB 46 and LB 209, both of which are in the process now. LB 209, I've struggled to understand that one a little bit, but that's the one that has to do with administrative law revocation, I think. This...what you're talking about would have nothing to do with the administrative law revocation, but would deal instead strictly with the criminal side or the criminal prosecution associated with a drunk driving arrest. Is that correct?

SPEAKER BROMM: Senator Kruse?

SENATOR KRUSE: Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR RAIKES: Okay. To what extent does the