

would be increased for all of the roads because the speed limits have increased for all of them. I genuinely believe that all the work we have done so far on LB 901 will have been in vain if we allow a skewed system of fines as would be the case without my amendment. Without this amendment, you would have this system, one to five over the interstate would be \$25, but only 10 on the state roads where you've also increased the limit. Six to ten over would be \$50 on the interstate, 15 on other roads. Eleven to fifteen miles over the limit would be \$100 on the interstate, but only \$30 on state roads. Sixteen to twenty miles over the limit would be \$200 on the interstate, but only \$50 on state roads. Twenty-one miles and over would be \$250 on the interstate but \$100 on state roads. So let's say you really are in a big hurry and you are willing to run a risk, so you are going to calculate and see what would be the least expensive thing for you to do. You have a Jaguar that will go 250 miles an hour, I don't know whether it will or not. The only thing I know about a Jaguar is the creature with four legs that they shouldn't be killing because they are probably on the endangered list now. But, anyway, you have this vehicle with that name on it and it'll go 200 miles an hour. Why stay on the interstate and drive 200 miles an hour and pay \$250, when you can get on a state road and drive 200 miles an hour and pay \$100. You can go just as fast on the state road but for \$150 less. Does it make sense when with all the discussion we've had about the difference in safety between the interstate and the state roads to say that you will be punished more harshly on the less safe road than on the one which is more safe. It makes no sense, and when the committee was considering it, as I evaluate what I've heard, sense and logic were not the things considered but rather trying to give the message that they would like to see the public made aware of the fact that when the sign says 75 miles an hour, that's what is meant. But they didn't have that same concern on the state road when the limit was raised. The penalty there was not changed. So what I am doing is scrapping LB 901's attempt to create a double system of fines, which not only, in my opinion, creates an unfairness, but an actual constitutional infirmity in the bill. I can't think of anything else to tell you, so that's what I'm offering. If you have any questions, I will answer them.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Avery.  
Senator Avery.