

the requirement of my fellow colleagues on the committee that they would not move the bill unless it was amended that way.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Did they give an indication that they would refuse to amend it that way because of what they heard these cab company owners say?

SENATOR HORGAN: No, I think, I believe the discussion among the committee members was that the bill, in 1985, was front seat passenger only, and I believe you participated in the debate of that for a long time on the floor and there was no desire to revisit that issue, and so they wanted to move the bill out of committee only with front seat passengers being required to wear safety belts.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then considerations of safety are not the main ingredients in this bill?

SENATOR HORGAN: No, that's not true, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, do you feel that restraints of this kind for passengers in the backseat provide safety?

SENATOR HORGAN: Yes, absolutely.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And why don't you want to require them if your aim is safety? And I'm not talking about the other committee members now.

SENATOR HORGAN: Well, Senator, the reason LB 958 was drafted the way it was which required all occupants to wear safety belts was because I believe all occupants in a motor vehicle ought to wear safety belts. But we do have a child restraint law. Children, small children, which only and illogically, in my mind, deals only with five-year-olds and younger, but those children are usually, not always, but usually are in the rear seat of an automobile and, therefore, they would be belted, due to our child restraint law, and having front seat passenger restraints, those are the people most likely to go through the windshield so we do provide protection there. If I had my way, everybody would be required to wear safety belts but that's not going to...that's not politically possible.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then political considerations rather than safety are the primary determinant of the form that you have