

Maurstad.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to the Avery amendment. I agree with Senator Wehrbein's thought process where we should set the speed limit and then enforce it. Also the other comments that have been made relative to this basically being a reconsideration vote on the 75-70 issue that would probably be more appropriate on Select File. I have to think, with this type of a penalty scheme, why the State Patrol would ever pull anybody over within this five mile and hour period, but just in case they did, I think we want to think about a potential hidden cost here, and that's the impression that there's no penalty or this wouldn't be a big deal because it would be. Many rating plans for auto insurance deal with the number of moving violations that one has, and there is no distinction on a moving violation, whether it is between 0 and 5 miles an hour, or over 10 miles an hour. So I think that there would be some people that went out and racked up two or three of these fairly innocuous speeding tickets that when their auto insurance came up for renewal would have...would have a rather big shock. So there is some hidden cost involved in this, and would urge the membership to vote against the Avery amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Maurstad. Seeing no further discussion, Senator Avery.

SENATOR AVERY: I would like to pull that amendment.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The amendment is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Senator Avery, you want to pass over as opposed to withdraw, right? Pass over, okay. Senator Chambers, I am back to your amendment, Senator, that you passed over, I think, a time or two. It's found on Journal page 976.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I want to withdraw that one altogether.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: It is withdrawn.

CLERK: The next amendment, Senator Wickersham, AM3638, Senator.