

March 11, 1974

can be when the state gets playing around with drivers licenses. Now, the State of Nebraska has not exercised a lot of the areas that other states have in the area of drivers licenses. In other words, we've been extremely lenient. One of the clear cut areas a lot of states have exercised in control and regulation of drivers licenses involves financial responsibility. The state, if it determines for one reason or another, that this person is financially irresponsible, can pull away that person's right to operate a motor vehicle on the roads. This particularly has come up in the area of insurance claims, for example, Mr. Jones is barreling down the road. He has an accident. It's clear cut liability on his part. He doesn't have any money to pay for the damages. He doesn't have any insurance. So the state can exercise police power under the United States federal constitution and say well look, until you get these things paid, we're going to not allow you to drive on our roads. We're going to pull your drivers license. Okay, you can argue, will this directly relate to driving? Well, does it? What it really gets down to is his financial stability, his financial status. Okay, we regulate it in a lot of other words. We set that 16-years of age is when you can get a license in Nebraska but we allow under certain conditions people to drive at a younger age. Other states refuse to allow them to drive until they're much older. So the point I'm making that in the area of drivers licenses, the state does have tremendous latitude and flexibility. Now, if there's any area that indicates financial responsibility or irresponsibility or dereliction of responsibility, it would have to be the most sensitive area of all which is child support. If a person isn't competent or responsible enough to keep up this court ordered payment, is he responsible enough to be out on the roads driving? So there is a relationship and I say that if the statute as drafted now doesn't directly relate or isn't clear enough or doesn't provide enough safeguards, I think it's quite possible to re-draft it or amend it to that point. One point that was brought up that was brought up both today and the other time, in this bill there's no provision for a person to offer arguments. To show, for example, that the money he's been paying hasn't been used in the right way, has'nt been used for child support, that the gal he's been paying it too has been using it on her boy friend instead of the kids. Well, now we have that problem clearly solved in LB1015 and LB1015, we have provisions that any time the person who's paying the child support can demand a complete accounting and the court will get it. So that problem is taken care of. If there are other minor technical problems in the bill, they can be corrected by amendment. But let's get down to the overall point. The main thrust of the bill is to throw the burden on the guy who hasn't been paying or the gal who hasn't been paying child support instead of having the burden always on the person who isn't getting it....child support, that is. Now, the person who hasn't been getting their child support under the present system has to go find a lawyer usually, go into court, go through the hearings like it's been points out and then pay a good chunk of the child support that they might recover, if they recover any, to the lawyer or whoever. Under this system, this most valuable of all things, your drivers license and it is valuable, people will pay lawyers thousands and thousands of dollars just to save drivers license and I know that, I can testify to that. Anyway, this most valuable thing they have, they have to get out and save once the complaint and a hearing has been had to show they haven't been paying child support. So I think the bill will accomplish a tremendous amount and the argument of unconstitutionality is