

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

June 1, 2005

LB 70

exactly the same way as Senator Jensen and Senator Beutler does. Senator Smith, you owe Senator Jensen an apology. You were totally and completely out of line. Senator Jensen, nobody cares about people in this body more than Senator Jensen does. Nobody has been a stronger advocate for people who need an advocate than Senator Jensen does. The language you have in the bill is wrong, Senator Smith, and you need to admit it. You can put a five-year-old, a four-year-old, a three-year-old, a ten-year-old on the back of that motorcycle, and no law enforcement officer can stop it, unless the driver does something in violation of the law. Now, I've tried to keep my peace on this. I've tried to talk to you on this. You know how adamantly I'm opposed to doing anything to deflate the helmet laws as they are. But you have gotten personal, you have gotten out of control, and you owe Senator Jensen an apology. I yield my time back to the Chair.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Byars. Senator Smith, your light is on next.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President. I apologize that I got a little out of hand, Senator Byars. I want the facts to be what they are. We have secondary enforcement of a vehicle operator's license. Vehicle, all cars. You must be pulled over for something else before we even know for sure you have a driver's license, Senator Byars. And what I have a problem with is when Senator Jensen says that all five-year-olds can go on a motorcycle without a helmet under LB 70. That is not true. We have an 80 percent compliance rate with seat belts with the secondary enforcement; 80 percent. That's very relevant. What I didn't want to see happen, without some of this language, was that there was the random pulling over of someone, just because. I have a problem with that. I think there are law enforcement resources better spent otherwise, in other directions. And that's why I get a little fired up when I hear mischaracterizations of the bill. We all have a bias here. I fully understand that. I have a bias that leans toward less restriction, and there are other biases in this body that lean another direction. And that's fine. That's good for public debate. But if we're only going to stand in the way so that we can control, control, control, I don't think that's what this