

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

April 5, 2006

LB 925

really is a privilege, in that if you receive a sentence of probation, one of the privileges you get to continue with is to engage your employment. And that my concern of the bill...or, of the amendment, was that it doesn't explicitly indicate that the offender themselves are responsible for payment for this machinery, and...

SENATOR BOURNE: Right, but it doesn't specifically do it the other way, either. Right now...well, let me ask you this. When a probationer is allowed a conditional permit or driver's license, conditioned upon the ignition interlock device, does the probationer pay for that, or does the state?

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: The probationer.

SENATOR BOURNE: Okay. So what this would do is, would allow...the problem with the ignition interlock device--that's under federal law, if they want the license back, the federal law says they have to have that--my understanding is, in some instances, that is defeatable, whereas the continuous alcohol monitoring device is not. And so the rule and reg would be promulgated in the same manner as the ignition interlock device. It's silent as to the cost, meaning, the rules could be promulgated either way, but I would assume it would be the way that the ignition interlock device rules are promulgated today.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: You know, I...just for a sense of uniformity, I think it would be important that somehow we in...because my disagreement with Senator Pedersen, quite frankly, is, this is not a criteria to get probation. You don't have to have this machinery...

SENATOR BOURNE: That's correct.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: ...to get probation. It's not a criteria.

SENATOR BOURNE: That's right.

SENATOR SYNOWIECKI: So an individual can get probation, and if they can't afford this machinery...I guess you can stretch the logic and indicate and say that the court won't place an