

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

March 27, 2003      LB 208

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Kruse just told me that driving without a license is three months and up to \$500 fine. So it's not the six months. I'm taking Senator Kruse's word, as he's taking the word of whoever told him. But I thought it was six months. So maybe that has been changed. And I think, personally, that three months is too long a time. But that's not what the issue is here. After...the explanation that I gave Senator Jensen sees more clearly what this amendment deals with. This amendment does not deal with DUI. This amendment does not deal with that. And if it did, Senator Kruse would not be proposing this amendment. There are other parts of the bill, as I've stated, that I have a problem with, because I see inconsistencies. And the next time I'm recognized, I'm going to point out some of those inconsistencies. But if anybody wants to ask me questions in the meantime about what we're considering now, I will answer those questions. But if I'm not asked any, then the next time I speak I want to show some inconsistencies. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Bromm.

SPEAKER BROMM: Well, thank you very much, Mr. President. And Senator Kruse, I may have some questions and concerns that I would not have if I had an opportunity to study the bill in greater detail. But I'm kind of learning here as we go. And we moved along and got to this bill fairly quickly here today. I do...as I read your summary, I guess, I do have some concerns. As you know, at many times in the past I have sponsored bills that increased the penalties, or proposed to increase penalties, for various degrees of DUI and related offenses. And I, in theory, have supported, certainly, getting the drunk driver off the road. And I do support that. I have a judge in my district that handles...that presides over a lot of these kinds of cases. And he has told me numerous times that he needs...that he feels that oftentimes the first offender...first offense, unless an evaluation, an alcohol evaluation reflects that they have an alcohol problem that needs addressing, that many times a first offender is embarrassed, made a mistake, isn't going to happen again. And that's fine. He said, now, when the second offense