

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

April 26, 2005 LB 70A

be stopped without a second...without a different violation, because the failure to have eye protection is a primary violation. Correct?

SENATOR SMITH: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So a person with a helmet can be stopped without eye protection; but a person with eye protection and without a helmet cannot be stopped. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: That's conceivable, yes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So what we have here is that it's better for your head to have no helmet than for your helmet to have no eye protection. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: I can't say that, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, if you have no helmet on your head, you can't be stopped. But if you have no eye protection, you can. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: I...you can paint that however you would like. I mean, I...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No, I don't want to paint it how I like. I want to paint it according to your amendment. You ought to know what's in your amendment.

SENATOR SMITH: Right. I said that...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Do you know what's in your amendment?

SENATOR SMITH: I said that it's conceivable that something like that could happen.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Now, it would be better to have no helmet at all than to have a helmet without eye protection. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: I won't go that far, Senator Chambers.