

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

April 25, 2005 LB 70A

would be sufficient, correct?

SENATOR SMITH: If I understood you correct, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Does that make a mockery of this whole thing?

SENATOR SMITH: No.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'd like to ask Senator Stuhr a question.
Senator Stuhr,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Stuhr.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...did you hear the exchange between Senator
Smith and myself?

SENATOR STUHR: No, I did not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, I'm going to tell you what we talked
about. If a person has no eye protection, that is a primary
violation and a person can be stopped for that alone. For
simply not wearing a helmet, the only reason a person can be
stopped for that and punished is if there's a violation apart
from not wearing the helmet. To get around not wearing eye
protection, a person can wear sunglasses. Is that what you had
in mind for the eye protection a person would have to wear on a
motorcycle?

SENATOR STUHR: No, I would be thinking of something a little
bit more secure than sunglasses.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Actually, you don't need to wear sunglasses.
You could be a person who needs regular glasses and you could
just be wearing your eyeglasses and that would be sufficient.
Had you thought of that when you voted for what you just voted
for? How do you think the public...that's all I will ask you,
thank you. I wonder how these people think the public is going
to react to what they voted for when they find out that if a
person is wearing eyeglasses that prevents failure to wear eye
protection from being a violation. In other words, a person
cannot, in effect, be stopped for not wearing a helmet; and