

SENATOR CHAMBERS: This is not one of the things that we were allowed to exempt, so why are you going to get your back up and exempt a federal employee when you won't do anything for the citizens of the state? I'm asking that you bring this bill back and if we're going to buckle up we should all buckle up together, those at the state level, those at the federal level. We're talking about federalism now, not heavy-handed dictatorship by the federal government. If you agree that this amendment that I am offering is valid based on the rationale, you'll bring the bill back. If, on the other hand, you think that the federal government, which is pushing this bill, should allow its employees on those rural roads to be exempted from the bill, you won't bring it back. That's what the issue is. Either it is one of safety or it's not. Maybe what you are saying is that these letter carriers are not exposed to dangers on rural roads so if that is the case and the road is the nature of what we're dealing with in making our determination, why don't we then expand the definition to say that anybody driving on a road, driven by a rural mail carrier shall not be required to wear a safety belt? I hope you will bring the bill back.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, these amendments are opportunities to discuss the bill and so I'm going to discuss the bill in the guise of the amendment as well. I haven't spoken on the bill before. I've been voting against the bill and I want to speak just a little bit about my rationale. Although I'm not supporting this series of amendments because I think that they are simply reflections of what the bill is meant to do and the various logics that are competing in the proponents and opponents, I do want to address the underlying issue of the seat belts. Let me pose to this body a question I posed to a class of students that I teach on the History of Democracy. I asked them, why do you follow the law? And we had little group discussions as to why they did and their answers, surprisingly or perhaps not surprisingly, reflected the two schools of thought that philosophers give us. One of them is by Thomas Hobbs who says that it is fear of punishment and the power of the sovereign that coerces citizens to obey the law. The other school of philosophy is that of Thomas Aquinas who says that law is a product of