

debate the bill.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Let me make one introduction and then we will proceed. Underneath the North balcony, Wendel Hefner, who is Senator Hefner's brother, from Sioux City, Iowa is present. Will you raise your hand so we can say "Good Morning" to you? There you are.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I want to make it very clear what I perceive to be in the particular bill and why I am voting against it and I think it is important we understand what is in the bill because I think it is precisely the opposite of what most people think and what the World Herald poll polled. Number one, the bill appears to increase the speed limit to sixty miles per hour. It is my argument and I think those that have driven the interstate, those that are familiar with the system, Senator Chambers included, would have to say that in fact it is a lowering of the speed limit by five miles per hour rather than an increasing of the speed limit by five miles per hour. Why do I say this? Because when you adopted Senator Beutler's amendment, you eliminated the provision that now exists between fifty-five and sixty-five miles per hour to receive what I choose personally to call a \$10 energy fine without points, without court costs, without anything else. You put the entire system of points, court costs and everything else into the law and at sixty-one miles an hour you would get the court costs, you would get the points, and so on. The net effect is a lowering of the speed limit for all practical purposes by five miles per hour. That may be good. That may be what you want, but at least know that is what you are doing because the poll in the World Herald and the poll that the people are thinking is that you are giving them another five miles per hour on the interstate. Now what is the benefit that you are getting in return for doing this? The benefit is that you are risking your federal funds when you think you are increasing when you are actually decreasing. So who are you helping? Which group are you accommodating? Is it the people that want to go faster? No, once they discover what you have really done they are going to say, "Hey! You hurt us. You didn't do what we thought." Are you accommodating the law, the sacredness of the laws, and sanctity of enforcement? No, because you are defying the feds and risking losing your funds. Who are you accommodating? I submit in this form the bill is a total disaster. If you want to go to sixty-five, fine, and you want to have some system so that we can get it back to fifty-five if we really do lose funds, I could go along with that. But that is obviously not going to. It hasn't flown so far. So I submit