

guilty, then a second date is set at which time you will be tried. If you decide on the first appearance to plead then you can plead guilty and take care of it then if you want to. If you plead not guilty, a second date is set so that's what happens if you do it way that the system is set up and wants you to do it. What Senator Johnson and the people who put this bill together want to do is say that if you don't show up for this procedure, then you lose your right to drive your vehicle and I don't think the two are related at all. If I shoot somebody I don't automatically lose the right...let's say that the gun is registered, if you're in Omaha or Lincoln. If you're outside Omaha and Lincoln, a hand gun doesn't have to be registered or you shoot somebody with a shotgun. You don't automatically lose it because that incident occurred. Now, the place where the analogy breaks down is that if they feel a crime was involved, then they will seize the weapon for the purpose of its being used as evidence, but you're not denied ownership of it or anything like that. The point I'm trying to get to is this. When a law imposes a punishment there should be a relationship between the punishment and the offense being punished. That's the only purpose that punishment should serve. If you use it for some other reason, then it is not punishment. In my mind it is a perversion of the system. If law enforcement does not have adequate means to enforce the law the way it is written, change the law or put more people to work, but don't change the function of punishment. So I hope that this bill will be killed, but in addition to what I said about punishment, it is another hidden charge placed on the public, one that they have no notice of and no warning about. And as you all know, ignorance of the law is no excuse for anyone other than a lawyer. A lawyer can commit an act of malpractice and if a court finds that that particular area of the law is not within his realm of expertise, they call it a mistake in judgment and he or she cannot be held accountable for a mistake in judgment even if the client is severely damaged by it. But what the court does do is presume that the ordinary citizen, even if he or she is totally illiterate, knows everything about the law and all the statutes, all the court decisions and understands them and holds you accountable for everything in those laws even if you never knew they existed. Because of that presumption there ought to be some consideration given before we enact laws like this that are told to us by certain bureaucrats that they're very convenient and make their work a lot easier for them.