

wording out of statute, "Any person owning a motor vehicle licensed in this state shall be guilty of a Class II misdemeanor", then it goes on to say, "if they are operating it". And his contention was that it was not unlawful, it's just the ownership of a vehicle was not...well, just by ownership of a vehicle you were guilty of a Class II misdemeanor, and further it only references the registration sections of statute. So we worked on this. We went down many alleys and this is either the third or fourth version of the bill and it's been relatively static since then. What the proposed bill includes is fundamentally two sections. One is on page 21 of the bill which provides, at the time of registration, by paying the fees, the owner certifies that insurance will be maintained and proof will be provided on demand. And that carries with it a separate penalty of a Class IV misdemeanor if you falsely certify at that time, you tell them...you pay the money to register your vehicle, you don't have insurance, you're guilty of a separate penalty. On page 22 is where we get at the somewhat of the meat of the matter. It provides that when operated on the roads of Nebraska, it shall be unlawful to operate a vehicle without minimum financial responsibility. Provides for a Class II misdemeanor upon conviction. Upon conviction, there is license registration...license, driver's license, registration and license plates are suspended by the court and you can't get them reinstated until you secure insurance and provide what's called an SR22 filing, that is you have to provide to the Department of Motor Vehicles proof that you have continually maintained the minimum financial liability as required by law. If you happen not to have insurance, proof of insurance in your...or proof of financial responsibility in your vehicle at the time we're asking, then you...but you are, in fact, covered on that...at that instance, you may, within ten days, prove that to a law enforcement officer. It's like a Mr. Fix-it ticket, and there would be no further penalties at that time. In the context of this then, it's my contention that, given that the current requirement for providing proof of insurance at time of registration is, in fact, double kill, it...it applies certainly to the 95 percent or so people that do, in the ordinary course of operating a motor vehicle, carry the minimum financial responsibility coverage on their vehicle. It's my position that we really don't need to double hit on that if we have changed the registration statutes in such a way that the mere act of registering, the owner of the vehicle certifies that they are aware of and will comply with the laws. I look at the attendance this morning and I would tell you that I am going to