

through referendum of both measures.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Horgan.

SENATOR HORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members. This is exactly the debate that I knew we would get into. This is a very confusing issue and I think the debate that's gone on on the floor demonstrates that. We've heard that it repeals, if there is a repealer, if there is a referendum of the bill, we've heard, well, it will only repeal those parts in the amendment and that the helmet law would remain in place that was enacted in 1988. We've heard, no, the other side, if a referendum is held, the entire helmet law would be repealed. It's confusing. It's hard to...it's hard to sort it all out. It's hard to figure it out. LB 958 is a controversial bill. It deals with safety belts, safety restraints in automobiles on our streets and roads. Dealing with the chin straps of helmets on motorcyclists is confusing to this entire issue and we, as a body, don't understand it. I don't know how we could expect the public to understand it and I think you would motivate people, certain groups of people, to go out and be energized in opposition to 958, not because they're necessarily against seat belts but because they're against helmets and Senator Moore I think is, you know, is telling us, is being truthful with us when he says he would encourage people not to do that, but that's exactly what would happen because some people would believe that they could, by referendum, eliminate the helmet law by 958 with this amendment on there. Other people would be telling them, no, you're only going to eliminate the strap provisions that were taken care of and the other penalties that are in the amendment. We need to deal with the essence and the importance and the primary purpose of the bill, which is the safety belts in automobiles and I, again, would encourage the body to reject Senator Moore's amendment. Thank you.

SENATOR WARNER: Senator Lynch.

SENATOR LYNCH: Scotty, I hate to accuse you of this, but you're playing games and I'm telling you why. You know exactly what you're doing. You're a smart young fella, and when you put in the statutes Section 39-6,211, replace it with what your amendment is, you know when that section's repealed it will completely emasculate the motorcycle helmet law because you will strike the language that has to do with having people having to wear helmets. The issue has very little to do with what kind of