

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

March 27, 2003      LB 208

elude the peace officer, it could mean the officer is on foot. So if the officer is walking up to your car and you drive off, that's a separate offense from attempting to elude pursuit by a peace officer. Or is it? Who knows? We can all have our opinion, but a criminal law cannot have questions such as that. If you mean by elude a peace officer, you should say a peace officer who is on foot to make it clear what you're talking about. And if you mean pursuit by a peace officer, you should make it clear that that officer is in a vehicle or a bicycle or on a horse, or just what do you mean?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers and Senator Hartnett. Senator Synowiecki.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Senator Kruse, if I could engage you. Is he on the floor?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Kruse, are you available?

SENATOR KRUSE: Yes.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: I've been kind of in and out and haven't been able to listen to the entirety of the debate. Could you just, very briefly, expand on the intent in raising the maximum sentence on that second offense conviction? What is the intent behind that?

SENATOR KRUSE: The intent there is to make it flow, be more consistent with comparable offenses.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: Do you have any statistics or anything? I guess, Senator Kruse, the question would be, currently, is the court implementing the current maximum sentence with any degree of consistency or frequency? Because the reason why I asked, in my experience, very seldom for a true second offense did anyone get the maximum 90 days jail. So I'm wondering on the logic behind raising that then to six months if the 90 days was very,