

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

April 9, 2003 LB 303

am doing a wrong thing here can understand why I'm going to oppose this legislation. If nothing else, if it saves one person in my district it's well worth it. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Janssen. Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Chambers.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Smith, if I could just ask you a quick question, it would help me understand whether I thought anything more needed to be done on Select File, but I'm on this eye protection provision and on both 16 and 17, with respect to both of your exemption clauses, it says that in order to get the exemption you have to be equipped with eye protection. And the words I am interested in are "equipped with eye protection." And I think I know why those words were chosen, because you define eye protection as meaning glasses or a protective face shield attached to a protective helmet, or a windshield of a certain height, on the top of page 17.

SENATOR SMITH: Yes.

SENATOR BEUTLER: But...so you have to say "equipped with" to a certain extent because the motorcycle itself can have a shield on it and be equipped with, right?

SENATOR SMITH: Right.

SENATOR BEUTLER: But under this language, is it intended and do you require...or elsewhere in the bill do you actually require that the person be using the eye protection when they are operating the motorcycle without a helmet? In other words, if, for example, your choice of eye protection is a protective face shield attached to a protective helmet, do you have to be operating with that in place? You can't have it flipped up and back? Or if your choice are goggles or eyeglasses, do you have to have those on, as opposed to having them in your pocket, being equipped with them but not using them at the time? I want to be sure that this means you've got to be using whatever your choice of eye protection is at the moment that you're operating the motorcycle without a helmet.