

February 4, 1980

LB 696

SENATOR NICHOL: No, no other amendments. I wanted to make a statement toward the bill itself.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, one thing I would like to call to your attention prior to the advancement of this bill is that the original fiscal note on the bill was in error in that it stated a new category of fleeing to avoid arrest has been created by this bill. This is not the case. Right now there are two statutes on the books regarding fleeing to avoid arrest. One contains a misdemeanor section. The other contains both a misdemeanor and a felony section. It is necessary to merge the statutes to prevent procedural conflict. Once again I would state that the original provisions of this bill did not create any new offenses, merely merging two already existing statutes. Mr. Chairman, I move for the advancement of LB 696 to E & R Initial.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Wesely, did you want to be heard on this bill?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes, Mr. President, members of the Legislature, a few questions of Senator Nichol, and I apologize, I didn't have a chance to hear all of your introductory comments but I guess I am a bit concerned about exactly why the changes you are proposing are coming up at this time. 696 means it was introduced this session, just recently, and you have totally rewritten the bill and come in with something completely different than it sounds like the original bill was introduced to do and is there a reason for this complete change?

SENATOR NICHOL: Are you talking to the amendments, Senator Wesely?

SENATOR WESELY: Yes.

SENATOR NICHOL: Each year we have several things, as I explained in talking about the amendments, that come in that we don't feel we should introduce a bill for each minor thing and we call it a catchall bill and we have included those three items that I spoke of in the amendment and that is why it was attached to this bill. It is a good thing to question it because these three things that we have talked about are not that substantive, we didn't think.