

person accidentally shot and subsequently paid a cash settlement by the City of Omaha, all as a result of high speed chases. These are incomplete statistics but are all documented by attached news articles. When a police practice is shown to be exceedingly dangerous to innocent people and the arbitrary judgment of an individual officer does not offer protection to innocent third parties, legislative regulation is a necessity in the interest of the public. Practices, which rather than preserve life and property, jeopardize and destroy both must be restricted. The World Herald, at least once, and the Lincoln Journal have editorially called for regulation. The American Automobile Association and the Cornhusker Motor Club have urged restrictions on such chases which nationally kill 300 to 400 people, the number is up now, and injure 2,500 to 5,000 more annually. A national highway safety bureau report citing the above figures established that over 90% of the chases involve traffic infractions, only 3% to 8% involve stolen vehicles. One of the report's recommendations was to limit the number of chases. After all, how pleased is the owner of a stolen vehicle to receive a pile of twisted metal resulting from a crash in place of his or her auto. Most stolen autos, and note this point, are taken for joyriding, then abandoned. This is according to FBI and other law enforcement figures. LB 65 is reasonable and certainly not anti-police nor pro-violator. It imposes reasonable regulation for the protection of all who may become casualties of high speed chases. Now the basis for this original bill was a recommendation by the International Association of Chiefs of Police and provisions adopted by the Lincoln Police Department. The Indianapolis Police Department, and you have a copy of this letter, the Indianapolis Police Department did not see fit to restrict high speed chases until after the wife of a high ranking police officials, the wife of a high ranking police official became an innocent third party victim of a police chase. Hopefully, such will not have to be the case in Nebraska. Now those who appeared for the bill represented various police and law enforcement agencies. Those who favored the bill, and it is in your bill book but I will read it for the record, this will let you know it is not anti-police, were, I am doing the best that I can, the Nebraska Civil Liberties Union, George Hansen, Chief of Police, Lincoln, and he appeared also representing the City Council of Lincoln, Mark McGuire representing the Police Officers Association of Nebraska, and James Gordan representing the Nebraska Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association. The last three individuals named above appeared chiefly to offer information and to recommend to the committee that the bill was perhaps too detailed and asked to submit amendments. Now the opponent, the only opponent was Mr. Jim Fellows from the Omaha City Attorneys Office and he was not authorized by the City Council to appear against the bill because I called John Miller and Jerry Hasset, who are members of the City Council, so I assume that he appeared as an individual. He stated that he was opposed because he was in the process of working on some regulations himself, but although he had several months to do so, he had no recommendations or proposals in the form of amendments to the committee and it states that Major Whitney of the State Patrol appeared opposing the bill. Major Whitney appeared as a neutral and he wanted that made clear, that he wanted to give information about the bill and point out that there were certain specific