February 3, 1989 LB 195

time, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Senator Conway, are you going to handle this? Okay.

SENATOR CONWAY: Mr. President and members, LB 195. as we discussed yesterday, is dealing with the boating while intoxicated. We had at least began some relatively thorough discussion yesterday associated with this legislation. Basically, what it is dealing with is to provide the standards by which we can provide enforcement for anyone who is deemed to be under the influence of alcohol while operating a motorboat. I think at this point, since we went through it yesterday, I am not going to spend a great deal of time on the opening and to make myself available for any questions or interact with any of the discussion that comes about. So I would offer LB 195 for your consideration and ask for you to advance it to Select File.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Hannibal, please.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Thank you, Mr. President and members. Since we started yesterday talking about LB 195, I have had a chance to discuss with Senator Conway the goal and the purposes of the bill, and I am somewhat satisfied that the goal and the purposes of the bill are quite laudable. I am still fairly resitant, however, about the bill because it does open up an area of potential harshness in some people's eyes and may be putting that harshness in the hands of people that aren't typically used to dealing with those situations. So if I may, I would like to ask Senator Conway a few questions, if he would respond.

PRESIDENT: Senator Conway, please.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Senator Conway, I think as we talked yesterday that the goal, of course, of this bill is to have in law more clearly some things that are already in law, that is, that it was already against the law for a person to operate a motorized water vessel, a motorboat, if you will, under power and it is prohibited for them to be doing that while under the influence of alcohol, is that correct?

SENATOR CONWAY: That is correct.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: And one of the problems in the past has been that while it is against the law currently, there hasn't been a major mechanism to determine, in fact, whether they were under