

February 9, 1981

LB 143

CLERK: 16 ayes, 21 nays on adoption of the amendment to the amendment, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Okay, we are now on the Maresh amendment.

SENATOR MARESH: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the amendment. If that amendment did not carry to the amendment I don't think the amendment will carry so I don't think we need to spend any more time on this.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Is there any objection? Okay, the amendment is withdrawn.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator DeCamp moves to indefinitely postpone LB 143.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, I shall not take but about two minutes. When you put the Omaha amendment on I began to lose faith in the bill because you created a completely different system there. I wonder how many more different systems. As I understand it now, with the bill, we have got the following system. Outstate we have got a set of laws on speed limits, Omaha we have got another set of laws on speed limits on the interstate, the interstate itself outside of Omaha we have got another set of speed limits and we have completely changed the system that everybody is accustomed to on the ten mile matter. Now they can say that that is right or wrong, good or bad, or whatever, everybody knows what the rules are and everybody knows how it works. This completely eliminates that. I had originally supported the concept of going to 65 miles an hour on the interstate, a relatively simple concept. It has become pretty complicated now. I want to alert you to one thing and I could care less how you vote on this but I thought I ought to raise a question so nobody says I tricked them. This morning I had a meeting with Paul Douglas. He asked me whether the portion I had put on the bill, remember, that is in there that is part of the committee amendments, having to do with the Governor having the authority to lower it back down after a public hearing if he determines that is a risk to the funds. He said, do you feel that is Constitutional? I said, I don't know. I realize it might have some problems. I haven't asked for an opinion. I don't know whether anybody else has but in case it is I am alerting you now so nobody says I tricked them. I don't know. At the time I proposed the idea I felt that you could draft such a thing so that you would eliminate the federal funds question but I am not going to kid you. I don't know whether it can be or can't be. It is on the bill