

very, very supportive of particularly subsection (4) of this language. It is language that parallels existing policies in other states, Colorado being one of them, where you terminate a chase when you know the identity of the person you are chasing because you can run them down later but... Okay, I guess this is the problem that I have. Let me explain one qualm I have about the bill. If we read these cumulatively and a chase is to be broken off under any of those four situations, I think it can be very difficult to interpret. Number one says, "The original violation was a traffic offense", possibly this example. There is a taillight, the policeman sees the taillight. He initiates the normal procedure pulling over for a defect ticket. At that moment the person jumps, increases speed tremendously, and a felony is committed, a felony act is committed at that moment by a homicide or a manslaughter action. There could be no pursuit under Section 19 since the original violation was a traffic offense, and if that cannot be read cumulatively with other sections of the bill, the policeman who observes that felony is by this law not allowed to give pursuit because the original infraction was a traffic infraction. If these are read cumulatively, however, if the original thing is a traffic violation, plus the fact that there has been no felony committed during the pursuit, plus the fact that we are not talking about a known felon, if we add those factors up, then it becomes far more reasonable. I do want to add one piece of information to this body as we talk about high-speed chases. There are 250,000 of them a year according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. 8,000 of those end in crashes. 400 people a year are killed in them and 5,000 people a year are injured in high speed chases. They are serious and they are relatively common. It just seems to me that if we read Section 19, however, as only four separate acts each of which then presupposes a high-speed chase, I guess that is too restrictive, and if they are to be read cumulatively I certainly can support Section 19, but as I understand Senator Chambers, that is not to be so.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Howard Peterson.

SENATOR HOWARD PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I call the question.

PRESIDENT: Okay, we are ready for a closing anyway. Senator Chambers, would you close on your motion?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I misunderstood the thrust of Senator Landis' question and while he was asking it I was working on another amendment up at the desk and he is absolutely right in the way the