

March 17, 1983

LB 155, 542, 542A

having been complied with, the question is, shall the bill pass? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Read the record vote as found on pages 989-990 of the Legislative Journal.) 34 ayes, 12 nays, 1 present and not voting, 2 excused and not voting, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: LB 542 passes. LB 542A.

CLERK: (Read LB 542A on Final Reading.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: All provisions of law relative to procedure having been complied with, the question is, shall the bill pass? All those in favor vote aye, opposed nay. Have you all voted? Record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Read the record vote as found on page 990 of the Legislative Journal.) 33 ayes, 11 nays, 3 present and not voting, 2 present (sic) and not voting, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: LB 542A passes. LB 155E.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on the desk.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Yes.

CLERK: Senator Goll would move to return LB 155 to Select File for a specific amendment and the amendment is found on page 948 of the Journal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Goll.

SENATOR GOLL: Mr. Speaker, I believe we have another amendment that precedes that. Is that right? We do not.

CLERK: Just yours, Senator, is the only one I have.

SENATOR GOLL: Okay. On line...if you will refer to the Final Reading copy of LB 155 and on page 4, line 11, I am proposing to strike the 30 day to 40 day period which a car may be tied up in a dealer's service department for lack of repair. There is a reason for this. We are changing the 30 to 40 days for the loss of use which essentially restores the same time frame as proposed in the original 30 business days. Actually, all I am doing here is defining a length of time for which an explanation appears and, therefore, would require no clarification should a customer and the manufacturer get into a hassle about how long their car has been laid up in a service department. So all I am