

came to vote to reconsider I voted with him. What he reminded me of during his presentation was the argument that caused me to go along with it in the first place. The limit would be set, but it could be lowered on those stretches of roads where it was found that it ought not be 65. We have that situation presented to us only we're looking at its mirror image or taking it from the opposite direction. You start by posting the limit, based on the law, at 60. If a compelling or maybe just persuasive argument is presented to justify raising it to 65, that can be done. Let me ask Senator Elmer a question.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Elmer.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Senator Elmer, it is discretionary as to whether this increase will occur. There is nothing in your amendment, or is there, that says it shall be raised to 65 miles an hour?

SENATOR ELMER: Senator Chambers, in context. The amendment is, of course, on page 997 and what it would say in context is that 55...

PRESIDENT ROBAK: One minute.

SENATOR ELMER: ..it would say that, except that beginning after September 1, 1996, such maximum speed limits shall be 60 miles per hour, and the amendment adds, "Except that the Department of Roads may, where..."

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR ELMER: ..design and traffic conditions allow..."

SENATOR CHAMBERS: You answered it. "May" is the word. We're running out of time. It doesn't mandate that that increase occur. The discretion is left there, after the study and evaluation that Senator Elmer's amendment calls for. I will support him.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator. Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Madam President, I will try to be brief. Again, the chair of the Transportation Committee I think makes arguments that are perfectly astonishing in the context of