

regard for the speed of such vehicles and the traffic upon it and the condition of the roadway, period. Now it seems to me that that says what Senator Withem is trying to do. But Senator Withem says no, the patrol tells them that they cannot get enforcement, they can't enforce that particular rule or that particular law. So this amendment that I offer to you would change the reasonable and prudent language and would simply say that the driver of a motor vehicle shall not follow another vehicle more closely than 300 feet, period. Now if the patrol thinks they can judge distance out on the highway, better than they can what is reasonable and prudent, and get a conviction under it, then perhaps 300 feet is a good idea. I have no problem with that. It would strike the rest of the new language. We wouldn't have any of the language about a specific law for a specific kind of vehicle in regards to the maintenance vehicles of the Department of Roads. It would say 300 feet to everybody, period. I guess what I am trying to say is if we really want to get those over the road truckers then let's get the rest of us as well, then let's get the rest of us as well. There are those people who are afraid of a semi following another semi close enough that he can read the license plate with his bifocals, and I know that. But I'll tell you, if you spend any time out there on the road at all you see a lot of vehicles following the semi, that aren't another semi, close enough to read their license plate with their bifocals, cars, motorcycles, whether they have helmets on or not. If I'm going to be driving that semi that is in front, I don't know whether any of you have ever done that or not, but a few of us have, if somebody is going to be right on my tail I'd rather it would be at least another semi, I can see him, I know he's back there. But if you are going to let a little car get right behind you, or somebody on a motorcycle, you can't even see them. You don't know they are back there. But this Legislature is saying that is okay? That is what you are saying. Read the bill. It says that is okay. But it is not okay to have another semi back there, the argument being, I guess, that with a little car you can stop in time, you don't have as much weight. Well if that truck in front of you hits his air brakes, that little car is not even going to have time to get his foot on the brakes, I don't care what kind of brakes he's got on it. So it seems to me that if you want to change the rules of the road, saying that we ought to have something that the patrol can enforce, and they can't enforce the reasonable and prudent language, then take the language out and put in