

it but then...and must they also both agree that this particular person we're going to deny the registration.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: No. In fact, I think what they are going to do, in fact, I'm positive what they are going to do. They are simply going to send out the message and I think the idea is if people think that it might happen, it may cause some effect. But to my knowledge what they are going to do is simply send the information out, say that it could mean that you would not be able to, but they were simply...they were not at this time going to say, absolutely we would refuse. They would send a possibility that it might, hoping that that would help some of the distress warrants be paid.

SENATOR MORRISSEY: Thank you. I'm in sympathy with their problems of collecting the back taxes. This does bother me, this particular amendment though a little bit on as I mentioned. If I have back taxes that I'm having trouble paying and they want...they decide that I'm a person they should deny my registration and that is my car I drive to work, I'm not going to be able to go earn my wage to help pay those back taxes, so I kind of have a problem with this. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Senator Morrissey. I'll now recognize Senator Beutler followed by Senator Lamb. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I guess my concern this morning is not so much with the substance of this, although I think there is a lot of substance in an amendment like this, a great deal of substance, and to that extent I guess it relates to my question and my objection with regard to process. As you know in the Nebraska Legislature we have a public hearing on everything that we do and I think that that is a tradition and a rule which is a very good one. And I know from experience from time to time later on in the session when something has been forgotten or something that has had a public hearing needs to be acted upon in a particular year, we depart from time to time from some of our rules. But this strikes me this morning as being an early radical departure which does not bode well for our processes and for keeping order in the session. This is an amendment which the senator says openly to us is a bill. It is a bill that has not had a public hearing, it has an opportunity to have a public hearing, it has an opportunity to come up before us. In a sense, it's like