

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 15, 2004 LB 560

than abandoned, but, still, within a limited number of days, 14 days, that boat could be sold, as I read it. I could be wrong. Let me give you another analogy or a situation. Say Senator Chambers' father goes out of town for a couple weeks. Senator Chambers, being the irresponsible individual that he is, he borrows his father's boat, unbeknownst to Dad. The boat has a flat tire. It's by the side of the road. They take the boat. The father is out of town. I mean, quite literally, this boat could be sold in two weeks of no...not due to any of the negligence or anything of the boat owner, as I read it. Now, again, I need to study it a little bit further, but it just seems to me to be a very accelerated way to sell off a piece of property that belongs to an individual that, for one reason or another, did not claim it. What...for...I don't know how many of you have ever had a car impounded. If you have, you probably won't admit it. But say you didn't pay your tickets; they take your car. They tow your car away and...this has never happened to me, by the way, Senator Redfield...but, as I understand it, they charge you a hundred and some dollars for the tow, and then a certain amount per day to store that boat in the yard. What if you don't have the \$300 or \$400 to get your \$10,000 boat out of hock or out of the motor pool or salvage pool, whatever it's called? They could still sell it, the boat, as I read this. So again, I had said to Senator Baker that I think there's some problems with the bill. He is committed to working on those, but I do think that there's a lot of unanswered questions here. To me, when the state takes someone's property and sells it, that is the most awesome power, the most significant power that the state can exercise. When somebody has a piece of property that is theirs, the state should only be able to take that as an absolute last resort, and I don't see that narrow construction, that narrow proper drafting in this particular bill. So I see some real problems with this. I don't know what the mood of the body is. Do you want to move this over for a...and I think it's more than a little rewrite. I think it's a significant rewrite. I do think the ability for somebody, for the state, to take an individual's property in a very short period of time is significant. I wanted to also point out one other thing, and this also is in the green copy of the bill, Section 17, which, as I read it, is still included in the green copy. It talks about proceeds of the sale or from the sale of the abandoned