

answer because I want to get mine out. Then when it says "a distinct color", maybe what they really mean is a different color. There is no definition of this terminology, and if a person placed a stripe around the bus, whether it is a horizontal stripe or vertical up over the bus, that would be a distinct marking but perhaps it wouldn't be a distinct painting. Then when you come to the line above that, "and used for any other purpose than for transportation of school children". This does not say for the purpose of transporting children to school. It modifies the child with the word school meaning that any child of school age, any child who is in school who is being transported. So if a person were not using this for the purpose of transporting children to school, he or she, nevertheless, could be protected by this bill by simply having school children in the bus. You have to relate what you are trying to say here to the destination of the bus and not by describing the nature of the child. With this definition, it is not necessary that it be a bus designed to transport children to school. It merely needs to be a bus with children of school age in it. I don't think that the bill...I don't think the present law is any good, and if you insist on doing something like this, you ought to place the responsibility for enforcement or at least notification of this law on the one in the best position to give it. If these buses, Senator Koch, are going to be sold by school districts, it should be incumbent upon them to notify the purchaser that there is a law requiring that certain modifications be made in that vehicle or else the mere driving of it will place that person in violation of the law subject to a criminal sanction, and if the school people are interested in proper regard for the law, they should be interested also in one of the most important aspects of law enforcement and that is to give the person notice that certain conduct is improper and that engaging in that conduct will subject a person to the imposition of a criminal sanction, and as we all know, when a person is convicted of a crime, that person is now a criminal. So what you can do here is create an entire class of unknowing criminals. This is one of those rare instances where intent is not necessary to constitute the crime. The mere commission of the act with the most innocent of intent, with a total absence of knowledge that you are in violation of the law, can nevertheless cause you to be guilty of a crime if convicted. So I think it is bad law. I think the whole section ought to be repealed, but if you don't want to repeal it, I suggest that you consider seriously the objections that I am raising because they are not intended to be frivolous and I believe that even without being an attorney were I to try to defend a person in court who had been brought to book on the basis