

Members of the Legislature, Senator Johnson did give us the National Automobile Dealers Association letter and you are not getting information firsthand from my friend, Lizzie, you are getting what the National Automobile Dealers Association tell you that she said. We don't know whether she said this or not, and from my dealings with her, Senator Johnson, I am not sure that this is what she said. For example, if she was concerned about a person not being injured in an auto accident while the car is in motion, why would she say they must have the belt on when the car is in forward motion? That would mean that if a person is driving backward, there is no concern about the person's safety. People often back out of their driveway, they back out of parking spaces. Some will even back halfway down a block to get into a place where they can turn in and then come out and go forward. So they back out of commitments, Senator Beutler says, and they don't have to wear seat belts, and, Senator Vickers, I am still interested in them putting some safety devices on toothpicks. But at any rate, if you are not driving your car forward, you don't have to have a seat belt. They ought to say whenever the car is being operated on a public thoroughfare if they are really interested in safety. I have another thing, in the bill as it stands now, they say, you have to use only the belts that the manufacturer decides to put into the car. The Legislature is not adopting a policy with reference to safety. The Legislature is underlining and accepting anything the manufacturers decide to do. I wonder if Senator Vard Johnson agrees that that is what we were elected to do in this Legislature. If five people can fit in the front seat of a vehicle and the manufacturer puts one safety belt, then with all this yapping and yammering about safety, we are not concerned about the other four who don't have belts. The manufacturer determines how much safety will be there. If it becomes nonfeasible to put any seat belts in the car, he doesn't have to do it and the Legislature says, fine, and yet we pretend we are going through all this deliberative process, we have thought about safety, we are interested in the welfare of the public, and what is the conclusion that we very solemnly announce, that if the manufacturer puts a seat belt in the car, then you have to wear it. That is preposterous. The motion that was just adopted and made a part of the bill, to my understanding, such as it is, did not necessarily deal with the person who is not wearing a seat belt because of a physician's excuse. So if the person has a physician's excuse and can't wear a seat belt and gets