

like, well it is \$32 per ton for the license and about the maximum that a vehicle normally could be licensed for is around 80,000 pounds. Now you can have, like I have indicated, a large transformer where the load could be in the vicinity of 200,000 pounds. These are occasional loads, very infrequent loads. Only one other state in the Union requires the full cost. What the bill does then is states that we will continue what has been the practice, that the tractor has to be licensed for the maximum it can normally carry, and other than the fee charged, that is for the special permit, that would be the extent of it. Obviously, many of those loads, and you should also understand that once you get a tonnage license that is for a full twelve month period, even though the use of that may be for only a very short period of time and conceivably maybe only once during the course of a year. It seems unreasonable that you would charge that full tonnage when it could not be used except for a very limited purpose and for a very limited time and very possibly only once during the course of a year. So the introduction of the bill was to clarify that the Legislature could clarify that we would continue the same practice that we have had, and in effect, reverse the opinion that the Attorney General has come down with. They have purposely not implemented the change, even though the letter was written last summer, in order to provide the Legislature the opportunity to review whether or not as a matter of policy we wished to continue past practices. It seems to me it is reasonable, what has occurred, the way it has operated in the past has been satisfactory. There was no objection expressed from the Department of Roads or from anyone else to continuing that practice as is proposed by the bill after the committee amendments. It seems to me it is a reasonable thing. Obviously, the special loads have to have some means of being moved. Obviously, I suppose you could put a higher cost on it which only would be reflected in the cost for the movement but I don't think that this is a reasonable base to expect a license for a full twelve month period to be paid for a movement that in some cases could be down to a few hundred yards or less of actual travel on a public road. With that explanation, Mr. President, I move that the bill be advanced.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is to advance LB 287 as amended to E & R for review. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. We are voting on the advancement of LB 287 to E & R for review. The Clerk will record the vote.

ASSISTANT CLERK: 26 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to advance, Mr. President.