

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

April 9, 2003

LB 303

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. On with discussion of the Brashear amendment to the Transportation Committee amendment. Senator Bourne, followed by Senators Johnson, Smith, Stuthman, Bromm...Brown rather, Beutler, and Thompson. Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Members, I have an enormous amount of respect for Senator Brashear. Everywhere I go I say, Senator Brashear has ideas and that's what I really like about Senator Brashear, and usually those ideas are very good; this one is not. (Laugh) I'm afraid I don't support the slippery slope argument generally. I think it's kind of a bogus argument usually, but in this situation I'm really struggling. And, like Senator Chambers said, if this is for illustrative purposes only, that's great, but what this says is that if a person doesn't wear a helmet they will not be, to the extent possible, eligible for any benefit provided by this state relative to healthcare, healthcare, rehabilitation, long-term care, or any other service necessary to patch somebody up from an injury sustained. And, again, I believe that if this goes on and if this is serious and this is adopted and is made law, well, then where does it stop? What about women that don't take care of themselves during pregnancy? That would be a far greater cost to society than any helmet injuries. What if they don't do something as simple as prenatal vitamins and the state incurs a huge cost because of that? Should we add those people in there? Senator Landis mentioned smokers. I like Big Macs (laugh) and I'm going to pay for that one day I suppose, so should I, because I have an affinity for Big Macs, not be eligible perhaps for some state benefit? People who drink? Senator Aguilar says yes. What about people who speed, and then they speed with a seat belt or without? I mean, where does this stop? Then take it a little further. What happens if we don't agree with a person's particular religious beliefs? Should we exclude them from any benefit from the state? Or what happens if we don't agree with their lifestyle? Let's exclude them as well. I just...I see this as harmful. I'm certain that Senator Brashear is doing this as a demonstration rather than a real amendment to this bill. If Senator Brashear would like some of my time, I'd be happy to yield it to him.