

being perceived that he had a conflict, but other people who have a direct interest in the industry that is affected by this bill and are pushing it, and that industry is lobbying in Nebraska and other states, and spending a lot of money, but the same issues don't arise. What I am going to try to do perhaps is see if Senator Schmit will cut me in on a business that he has got and I will support bills that benefit that industry and why should I not. We have to bring this issue into sharp focus and strip away all of the pretense. This is an auto industry bill and not related to safety. That is not the driving force behind it and everybody on this floor knows it. I don't believe there is a person on this floor who will stand up here and say that this bill would have been here had there not been pending a regulation requiring state of the art safety equipment in cars. So this bill is designed to prevent state of the art safety equipment from being used. It is designed to prevent that. So how can a bill which is designed to prevent state of the art safety equipment be argued as a safety bill? That does not compute. But we are not interested in safety in this Legislature, we are interested in the auto industry. It is their bill. Now people like to give examples of what happens if somebody is wearing a safety belt or not wearing a safety belt. I read the newspapers, the World Herald, the Lincoln Star, the Lincoln Journal, other newspapers that are not quite so significant like the New York Times, the Washington Post, Wall Street Journal and Christian Science Monitor, but we have to get the fringe areas, too, so that is why I read those other papers, but in the World Herald Sunday, there was a picture of an accident that occurred on an overpass heading into Omaha. A van had struck a guardrail, tipped to its side, and slid over a hundred feet on its side, and the driver got out, and by the way, he was intoxicated, too. He violated two of the principles of safety. Staggered out of his van. They said, "How do you feel?" He said, "I feel fine." They said, "Your van tipped over going at a high rate of speed and slid across the highway. Obviously, you were wearing a safety belt." "Never wore a safety belt in my life and I ain't going to start today because I am not hurt." And that is the fact of the case, the individual was not wearing a safety belt, the individual was driving while intoxicated, and did not get hurt. Now other people can show examples where people were wearing safety belts and the safety belt prevented them from exiting a vehicle and they burned to death or suffocated. So the arguments can go either way. But safety, again, is