

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

March 13, 2002 LB 1073

health purposes and highway trust funds for highway purposes. But times are a little different than a few months ago than when I wrote this bill with these folks, and so I'm going to...the technical amendment that follows will include that information. Let me tell you about two other parts of this bill. A second, and smaller section, deals with seat belt and occupant safety restraints being used by passengers of provisional drivers. And I'll be passing around, shortly, information on 16-year-old drivers and the number of crashes and the number of fatalities that result to themselves and their passengers. And this is an area that we can make a difference by helping educate the public that all children, or adults, who are riding with a 16-year-old provisional driver, or as our provisional driver's law reads, most of them are 16-year-olds; and so this would require that all their passengers use an appropriate restraint. And that also contains...contained in the next amendment is language that was also suggested to us by the Department of Motor Vehicles, that if we include this, we should also include drivers with school permits. The third section of the bill deals with eliminating the first offense waiver. There were problems several years ago with the way our...our bill...our law was written, and Senator Baker worked on this particular aspect a couple years ago. And we used to automatically waive the ticket for a person who might have been picked up for not having an appropriate...appropriately restrained child, or not having a...a child seat for the children. I think, Senator Baker, that was at under 4, still, at that time the...where they could bring in a receipt showing they'd purchased a...a safety seat. What law enforcement told us at that time was, people brought in the receipt, returned the child safety seat, there were lots of abuses going on. And so a new method was tried for the last couple of years, and that was an automatic waiver for a first offense. And what I heard and what the people developing this bill said was, this was not working for the local county attorneys, because there was no way to know whether or not a person had a waiver. And also because from county to county you wouldn't know if someone had gotten a waiver in another county. There wasn't a way to keep these records. And both local law enforcement and the county attorneys felt it would be better to...to just eliminate this, make it an infraction. What law enforcement people tell me is they usually issue a warning