

So I am not perturbed that we have Senator Hoagland's bill in here. I am in favor of Senator Haberman's amendment and Senator Chambers' amendment and I support it because I think it will make a better deal, a better bill, not so offensive, and I do not think we ought to have elements in this bill that make it advantageous for those who are 100 percent at fault to be usurping honest money from those who are innocent and have had nothing to do with the bill...had nothing to do with the facts of the accident. So I do support the Haberman amendment.

SENATOR LABEDZ: We have gone through several of the names for the Hoagland-Chambers amendment. We still have two lights on. Senator Hoagland, do you wish to speak on the Haberman amendment? And then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Let me, in order to add a little bit more mud to the debate here, ladies and gentlemen, let me just say one simple thing, that is that Speaker Nichol and Senator Chambers are trying to do exactly what Senator Beutler, Johnson, and I are trying to do. We are all trying to do exactly the same thing which is to preserve the status quo and not have a seat belt be used against you. We are just doing it in slightly different ways. Our way of doing it would make the seat belt law in compliance with federal standards. Senator Haberman and Senator Chambers' and Senator Nichol's way of doing it would take it out of compliance. Now Senator Morehead and Senator Goll and I and others have had conversations about this and we have until 1989 to put the bill into compliance so we will have future sessions to deal with it. So I think the sensible thing for us to do is to compromise, to accept the Haberman amendment. And with that, Mr. Speaker, let me yield the rest of my time to Senator Morehead so she can give you, as the primary sponsor, she can give you her views on what we should do at this point.

SPEAKER NICHOL PRESIDING

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Morehead.

SENATOR MOREHEAD: Mr. President, this is a little bit of a surprise to me. I guess that everybody does not want to unduly harm a plaintiff in a case where there was noncompliance with a safety belt. Now being a nonattorney, I am sure I will get all the attorneys screaming at me here