

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

February 25, 1999 LB 356

is not valid in relationship to the lives that this bill would...this bill will save. There's all the opportunity in the world to harass anyone that any law enforcement official wants to use at this point. I urge you not to bracket.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator. The Chair recognizes Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. President, colleagues. You know I think...I think there's a way to make some headway on this, and there have been several suggestions I know, and Senator Byars said early on that he was going to go to the mat on it, and Senator Chambers has consistently said that he would go to the mat, which basically means 24 hours, if necessary, and I understand that. But...and I also appreciate Senator Tyson's remarks about accepting responsibility. I agree with that 100 percent, but the fact of the matter is that the record in other states, the record in other states where this has been implemented suggests that it works to save lives, and that's...that's really the bottom line. The record indicates that it saves lives. And I missed a very part of...the early part of the debate this morning, but I have yet to hear any other suggestions that will have the impact on saving lives that this measure would have. I also heard Senator Beutler's suggestion that perhaps some time be spent to try to see if we could work something out on this matter, and I think that was a good suggestion. In the meantime, I've become aware of an amendment that hasn't been filed, that's been drafted, I think, by Senator Wehrbein, which takes away the ability of the officer to stop someone for the seat belt problem and use that as grounds to proceed with other matters, such as search and seizure of other articles in the vehicle. Basically, the amendment provides that the failure of a driver to wear the seat belt doesn't constitute reasonable suspicion for the peace officer to proceed with other matters concerning the vehicle. I think there...the important part of this is that I think there is a common ground here. What I hear Senator Chambers saying is that he objects to the increased probability of harassment, and I...if we can take away that increased probability of harassment, then my question is, is there enough support on this floor to adopt the measure? And if there is, then I think we've got something here that we could work with. If Senator