

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

February 15, 2000 LB 1018

that the bill is so important that we ought to discuss it step by step, item by item, analyze the actual wording. So the first thing I'm going to do, Mr. President, and I've talked to Senator Bromm about this, is to divide the committee (sic--Bromm) amendment, and we'll come up to the Chair to do it, but I'm going to state it for those who may have an interest and be alerted. The committee (sic--Bromm) amendment in the first part makes it clear or attempts to make it clear that the provisions of this bill are not going to apply to a franchisee or a dealership which exists now. The reason it's necessary to put that language from the committee (sic--Bromm) amendment into the law is because some of the material that is new which is being put in the law that forbids a manufacturer to do certain things would also forbid a franchisee. The language which is being put in the law talks about a representative, an intermediary, a person doing something directly or indirectly, that the policies and management practices cannot be influenced directly or indirectly. Those kind of restrictions would apply to a franchisee. So the first part of the committee (sic--Bromm) amendment can easily be adopted because there does not seem to be a great amount of ambiguity in it, as far as I'm concerned. Once that is adopted, the only thing we will be discussing in the committee (sic--Bromm) amendment is this language about the car which is going to be delivered in Nebraska when the transaction took place outside of Nebraska. Senator Bromm and I have been looking at language in that area already and we're going to discuss those things on the mike to make a record. Because a law such as this may be challenged by a manufacturer; it may be challenged by a dealer. Why would a dealer want to challenge it? We're talking about money and, in some cases, large amounts of money. A dealer could wind up being in cahoots with a manufacturer for the purpose of creating a legal challenge to the bill for certain sugar or juice or vigorish that the manufacturer will give to that dealer. So if we write this bill carefully and select our language and use legal terms, such as "liability" instead of "responsible"...or "responsibility", then we get rid of all of these words whose meanings are unclear, we stick to legally recognized principles, and we can draft as tight a bill as possible, tight in the sense of saying what it is we mean to have achieved. And, Mr. President, it does not take a motion to divide the question because that's just granted routinely, but Senator Bromm and I