

would find completely and totally impossible to enforce because, as I said earlier, if there is anybody else in the vehicle, then it is going to be accessible to the driver if there is anybody else in there. I don't care if it is clear in the back seat, in the window back of the back seat, if it is clear back in the trunk...or in the back end of a station wagon or a van. If there is anybody else in the vehicle, they can go get it and make it accessible to the driver and I would suggest to you that it would happen. So if we are going to be honest about it, if we are going to...if we really, truly mean to say we don't want any beverages, any alcoholic beverages unless they are sealed in their unopened containers, then that is what we had ought to say. So by striking Section (B) we remove that part of it, we don't get into a discussion or a situation where the law enforcement officials are going to have to measure the driver's arms to see how long they are. I suspect that if I am the driver, I could probably...it would be accessible to me in a lot of places that it wouldn't be accessible to some folks that didn't have to buy 35 inch sleeve lengths on their shirts. I just think that that particular section is going to really make this bill unenforceable so I would move to strike Section (B) from the committee amendments.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Chambers, please.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I would like to ask Senator Sieck a question. Senator Sieck, would you be opposed...

SENATOR SIECK: Yes, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...would you be opposed to this amendment?

SENATOR SIECK: Yes, I would be.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Would you tell me why?

SENATOR SIECK: The bill doesn't do much good after you take that out.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is it your...

SENATOR SIECK: Because the containers are there and they are within reach and if they are there, well, then...and