

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

January 16, 2004 LB 279

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...that in the broader scheme of things some money is going to be lost. That has been the historical trend whenever the length of time for which a license plate would be issued was extended. And if they try to come back here while I'm in the Legislature, I will fight against any effort by any county or county officials or any other officials to recoup the money that they know right now they are likely to lose, and none of them can say they didn't know it because I'm sure that if they looked at it, in the same way Senator Wehrbein did and others on the floor have done, they know it. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. (Doctor of the day introduced.) On with discussion of the Baker amendment, Senator Preister.

SENATOR PREISTER: Thank you, Mr. President. If I could, I would like to ask Senator Baker a question or two, please.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Baker, would you respond?

SENATOR BAKER: Yes. Certainly.

SENATOR PREISTER: Senator Baker, let's say that someone doesn't register their vehicle for one year. We heard Senator Wehrbein talk about the numbers going down in the years when plates weren't...new plates weren't actually issued. Say someone didn't renew their license that following year and then a new plate came out and they, at least according to those numbers that Senator Wehrbein suggested, decided then they would go in and they would renew. They hadn't been caught in the intervening time. They drove or didn't drive their vehicle. I don't know. What would happen? Would the county treasurer, who they would go in to buy the plates from, pull up on their screen and automatically see that they hadn't renewed and charge them that fee? Would nothing happen? Would they just issue them new plates? What would take place in that case? Could you tell me?