

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

April 26, 2005 LB 70A

SENATOR CHAMBERS: As far as enforcement is concerned, a person would be better off with no helmet at all than to have a helmet without eye protection. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: That's an editorial comment on your part, and I won't necessarily agree with that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Let me ask it a different way. If a person has no helmet at all, but eye protection, that person cannot be stopped for a primary violation. Isn't that true?

SENATOR SMITH: I'm sorry, Senator. I was...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: That's okay. Members of the Legislature, Senator Smith doesn't know what's in his amendment, and you all don't know what you voted for. If you knew, you would be embarrassed. My questions point out what you have done. And we have educated people, supposedly, who have voted for that amendment. And I'm going to lay it out for you. If a person has no helmet, but eyeglasses on, that person cannot be stopped. And this is supposed to be a safety...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...provision that we're talking about. So no helmet, but eyeglasses, and you cannot be stopped. If you have a helmet, but you forget your eyeglasses, you can be stopped and ticketed for no eyeglasses. So if the safety focus is on the helmet, why should it be a set of circumstances, ever, where if you have a helmet you can be stopped and ticketed with a helmet on but without your sunglasses? So although Senator Smith doesn't want to admit it, it's better for your head to have no helmet than for your helmet to be unaccompanied by eyeglasses. More protection for the helmet than for your head. It's better to have...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time, Senator.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President.