

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

January 14, 2004 LB 353

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...and the reason that an impoundment wouldn't appear is because it takes a revocation, under the language of the bill now, in order for the information to go over to the Department of Motor Vehicles.

SENATOR VRTISKA: That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Is that accurate?

SENATOR VRTISKA: That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay.

SENATOR VRTISKA: Impoundment doesn't do that.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. So let me go from there. For myself, there does not appear to be an insurance problem, and maybe that will change depending on what further information we get before Select File. So there is no reason to put "may" in there for insurance reasons. There is still the legitimate argument of putting "may" in there to give the judges greater flexibility. But we might note the history of this whole piece and I think that history is that at one time everything was so slack that we decided in here that we needed to jolt these teenagers a little bit and do something a little more serious to get their attention. If you do not adopt the Synowiecki amendment and you leave it the way it is, "shall" will be there, but it will be shall impound or revoke. So you could impound for one day or for two days or for some very...or for two hours. You could do it for a very short period of time, but you would continue to require that this teenager receive the knowledge and that the word spread that you, in fact, are probably going to lose your license for some period of time if you disregard these provisions at that period of time when you're supposedly learning how to drive this car. So I don't think...I think the range is still pretty broad and you'll have to decide whether you want to make it even broader and allow a judge to say no suspension or no impoundment of the license whatsoever, or whatsoever may be...