

of any other way to tell you that. I want to avoid that abuse. I don't have a problem with the penalties being the same. I think the committee, and I'll take offense that the committee wasn't wise, quite frankly I think they exercised awfully good judgment, and there are parts I wish they'd keep their good judgment when they voted on some of these amendments. But that didn't happen. But the issue here is that the committee brought you a bill that has got as many amendments to raise the speed as it does to lower it. The committee brought a broad-based bill that had a balance of increase in the speeds, and with that comes the responsibility that we don't want people traveling 80 miles an hour, as a rule, on the interstate, and we for sure don't want people traveling at 90, and if they do they're going to face the penalty and punishment for that. And I guess right now what I'd like to do, and I don't know if there's an amendment to your amendment coming or not, Senator Chambers, and whether you and Senator Maurstad had some discussions or not, but I'd like to at least except out the villages and cities, and that makes some good sense. Could I ask Senator...Madam President, could I ask Senator Chambers a question, please?

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Senator Chambers, you've listened to my short dissertation on the variation. I think that's, under anybody's terms, that's an acceptable classification for cities and villages not to accept it.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Because the other part could be that if we do have higher penalties, regardless of where they're at, but if you're going 40 miles an hour in a 20-mile an hour zone and facing a \$200 fine, practically that isn't as good a policy. That's dangerous.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Okay.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I agree with what you have said and the rationale you gave for it, and however you would craft an