

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

January 14, 2004 LB 353

suspension can both be for some temporary period of time to be determined by the judge. Is that right?

SENATOR BAKER: That's my understanding, yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: And that the only reason to use impoundment is because that's what you use elsewhere in the statute, and you're...

SENATOR BAKER: That's correct. That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...trying to be consistent? But what it means is the same as what we understand a suspension to mean?

SENATOR BAKER: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: But somehow the insurance companies are okay with the word "impoundment" but not with the word "suspension"?

SENATOR BAKER: That's apparently correct. And as I said, that simply harmonizes the language in the statutes also, the impoundment rather than suspension. Now, I don't know what that form looks like that a young person would fill out. It's been a long time since I've had that opportunity. But apparently it's something to consider when a person is applying for insurance, whether it's suspension or impounded, though, it still falls back to harmonizing the words in the rest of the statutes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Thank you. I think I understand what's happening, and I hope it works the way as described. I'm not sure that I feel comfortable with Senator Synowiecki's suggestion, simply because, if I'm understanding what he's saying, the judge would be in a position to order no suspension whatsoever, or no revocation, and it seems to me that you're broadening the alternatives of a judge quite a bit. But I would be interested in hearing more about that particular suggestion too. Thank you.

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

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature,