

April 13, 1982

LB 568

seven days, or whatever it is, the incentive to use the antibuse program, I believe, will diminish. I think first of all you have to make that individual recognize he has a problem, a problem that can be corrected, a problem that maybe can not be cured but at least can be remedied. I believe the antabuse program is one which can do it. I would hope that we would give it a chance. I know there are persons here who have deep feelings and concerns about it. But, I know it has been my experience and I come from a district where we have a large percentage of people who use alcoholic beverages, but the people who have used antibuse, have gone that program, have not resorted, for the most part, to the abuse of the alcohol again. Very frankly, if they go on the program the way the court directs, they are not going to use alcohol. It just seems to me that it makes a lot of sense. It makes a lot of sense. Do you want to reform the alcoholic and eliminate the problem, or do you want to collect fines, incarcerate individuals, take away their drivers license for a period of time and then turn them loose on the highways again and hope that the program will not be repeated. I believe the ant buse program is by far preferable. I believe that it deserves a try. I believe that it ought to be encouraged, and I believe it will be encouraged with this amendment. I ask the amendment be adopted and the bill be returned. I guess it is the other way around.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Nichol.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I rise to oppose the Schmit amendment. We have run this through twice now and here we are again. We have gone through pretrial diversion twice, this is another version of it. Now if Senator Schmit is really concerned about attempting to rehabilitate the alcoholics, we can do it under this bill, under 568, just the way it is. You can do it on the first offense, you can do it on the second offense, you can do it on the third offense and there is no need to try to soften up now, when we have a type bill, we have a solid bill and to create a big loophole all by itself sitting out here, so people go through again and again and again with what? With no record. Not going to a judge perhaps. The way the bill is, the judge can put them through programs on the first offense. But, if you have this type of pretrial diversion, there is no record kept, it can go on indefinitely through the same court, if you will, having pretrial diversion, no record, second

10779