

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

May 16, 2003

LB 208, 775

Senator Foley's amendment, that is not even uppermost in my mind. That just happens to be the thing in front of us. But if it's added to the bill, then...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...it gives me another thing to attack. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Visitors introduced.) Senator Baker on the Foley amendment to the Kruse amendment. Senator Baker.

SENATOR BAKER: Thank you, Senator Cudaback and members. I guess as committee chairman I need to explain a bit how we got into this position. We had two bills, LB 208, which was the recodification, which was a massive rewrite, as Senator Kruse has said, and then Senator Kruse came to us and said, if we can tie these together, let's do it. And it would appear that we have too much material here, and a lot of changes in one package. The other bill was LB 775. I think I understand what we're doing from a layman's point of view. The technical part of it, I'm not a lawyer. And I can understand Senator Bourne's, Senator Chambers' concerns. Maybe we should have left them two separate packages. And it can be worked out yet, but I'm willing to listen. What we had is a recodification of drunk driving laws. And when Senator Bourne brought up the issue of various references back and forth, that's the transition period. We have the new statutes as referring back to the old ones for prior convictions. I...from a layman's standpoint, I don't...you know, in a very generalities...a general way, I can understand what we're doing. Perhaps the technical part of it, from a lawyer's standpoint, does pose some problems. But that's a bit of the history of the bill. We've spent a lot of time on it. It's been very, very time consuming, very complicated. But that's how we got to where we are. Now then, if Senator Bourne and Senator Chambers are willing to work on it, that's going to be up to them and Senator Kruse, as far as I'm concerned. But that's a bit of how we got where we are. Perhaps, looking back, we should have had, as I said, left it as two different packages. There's some question whether it should have been