

April 8, 1975

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I yield.

SENATOR KEYES: Senator Cavanaugh due to the fact that I have raised a lot of children, and we have had suspended drivers licenses, we have had high risk insurance. Now is the high risk insurance \$200, 300, 400, 500 a year is that going to be in effect for the year, or will that be in effect for just six months with our drivers license that I hope that we can give these young folks back. When they go from 18 to 19, they suddenly and their record of driving. So is this going to be for six months or will it be for a year?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Your insurance rating?

SENATOR KEYES: Yes.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: I don't know how they do...well if you have a suspended license for a year, I would assume that you wouldn't buy any insurance for that year.

SENATOR KEYES: Oh no, but when you come back you have got that high risk insurance, and are we going to be six months closer to getting out of that thing?

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: No, I think that your rating is completely separate from any penalty that is imposed upon you.

SENATOR KEYES: Anytime that anyone on the floor of this Legislature can bring up some bill that will get these high risk insurance off, I'm for it.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Well...

PRESIDENT: Senator Luedtke.

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President, members of the Legislature I would just like to add to what Senator Cavanaugh said earlier and I would oppose the indefinitely postponing this bill because you must consider the fact of exposure of people that live in urban areas, where there are 25 MPH speed limits and without accusing the police department of setting up Radar Traps, I can say nevertheless that those radars are there and it is extremely difficult sometimes to avoid rolling down a hill at 30 MPH and you get points taken off. Now that is quite different than rolling down a hill in open country in the western part of the state of Nebraska so the masses of people that live in urban areas are continually exposed to this kind of a thing. I'm not suggesting that it is wrong to crack down on speeders, but the point of it is, that it was earlier suggested that we have to be somewhat compassionate in our outlook as to what is the proper punishment to fit the crime, and 12 months is simply too long, and economically it just absolutely destroys people. Six months is even a very long time, and I can tell you some people who have visited me professionally about this who have come into problems because of the 55 MPH speed limit and we have not seen to take care of this situation as some states have by cutting back the number of points between 55 and 75 on the interstate except for the 10 miles over on the speed limit and I think that actually this is a good bill and we ought to pass it and I would oppose killing it at this time.