

there is an issue of germaneness. What it does is to offer some minimal regulations of the use of radar, and perhaps rather than using the term "regulation", it should have to do with direction. I gave you a handout which contains some material lifted from an article about a judge in North Platte. He tells about his requirements where a radar citation would be involved in his court. He wants to know that the officers are trained in the use of the radar, where it was pointed at the time the reading was taken and things of that nature, but even more important than that was the copy of an article that came from a magazine called Crossroads. It is put out by a large magazine, Montgomery Wards, and it points up the types of errors that occur in the use of radar. With proper training some of these errors can be detected by a competent operator. The bill that I would seek to amend would be such a vehicle for offering that type of guidance. Already the State Patrol is incorporating the types of items that my amendment would contain into their training. One of the considerations that was not emphasized in the past when radar requirements were discussed is the need to give direction to local police agencies and sheriffs departments. Even if the State Patrol had all of the training that was necessary, had the best type of radar equipment which in fact they don't have, but assume they had all of those things, you have hundreds of local police officers, hundreds of sheriffs' deputies out there not knowing the proper way to operate radar. The requirements that would be contained in the amendment that you will find that I am offering would give guidance and direction. It would tell them the types of things that a judge is going to look for when one of these citations is presented. I have been asked by some people whether or not these types of requirements will only teach an unscrupulous officer what things to say in court to buttress an invalid ticket. The experience has been in states where they do have training, where courts have imposed requirements such as these is not what was suggested, namely, that officers who were unscrupulous would be better able to defend bad tickets in court. They found out that with knowledge of the radar device, how to properly operate it came a certain type of professional pride. There were fewer bad tickets written and those that were written could result in more convictions because the officer knew what he was doing, he knew the conditions under which he had operated the device, and all of his procedures withstood judicial scrutiny. What I would like to do this afternoon is have this amendment adopted, but before that would occur, any questions you ask me I am prepared to answer them. In the past there had been some concern expressed over two provisions by Colonel Kohmetscher. One dealt with the specific requirement that there be visual observation prior to the taking of a clocking for the purpose of writing a ticket. Despite his opposition to that proposal, he subsequently wrote a letter, a copy of which I have given you in