

State Patrols and State Police as they are called in some jurisdictions have said they simply cannot enforce a 55 mile an hour limit and because they cannot, they automatically build in a certain rate of speed over the limit that they allow the person driving. So what I am saying is that since people have settled in at a certain relative speed on the interstate in total disregard of what the sign says the limit is, LB 143 with the 65 mile per hour limit will cover the speed that most people are driving right now. Then, I don't believe it would be possible to strictly enforce even a 65 mile per hour limit but the problem of enforcement is reduced because the number of people exceeding the speed limit will be reduced a pace also. I think Senator Beutler's amendment ought to be defeated and in order that it is clear what his amendment does, it would take away the ten mile per hour grace amount that exists currently and leaves the speed limit at 55. If you defeat his amendment there will be a 65 mile per hour speed limit on the interstate plus the stricter fine that is found on every other highway and I think I should tell this to some of you so that after we defeat this amendment, I have an amendment on the desk also because the way the bill is drafted it places a 65 mile per hour limit on any freeway. Although we have discussed this bill in terms of interstate, although the committee report puts in parenthesis, interstate, the bill itself does not specifically refer to the national system of defense highways and interstate. So the amendment that I have up there will incorporate into the body of the bill, the language "interstate or national defense system, national system of defense highways" so that it is clear. The bill deals only with the interstate and raises that limit from 55 to 65 only on the interstate. So I am asking that you defeat Senator Beutler's motion which would reduce the limit from 65 to 55. Then adopt the amendment that I am offering to ensure that the 65 will be only on the interstate with the exception of the area of Omaha as has already been adopted by prior amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Stoney.

SENATOR STONEY: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I rise in support of Senator Beutler's amendment and I think if we look at this rationally, what he is suggesting and recommending should be interesting for a number of people for a number of reasons. I think we have some economic and monetary considerations here. Senator Koch addressed that earlier when he talked about the property damage that is caused with higher speed rates. Additionally the probable loss of \$70,000,000 in federal highway funds for maintenance and road construction and if we have to rely more heavily on the gasoline tax that we