

in this bill, we struck all of Section 1 from the green copy and the only thing that Section 1 was to allow, the only thing that Section 1 did was to allow the Department of Roads to determine whether when there is a dispute and the award is paid into court, whether or not the condemnee must accept that award right then. The way the law is now, the condemnee must agree by way of stipulation with the condemnor to take the award right at that point rather than let it stay in court, collect interest and receive it at the end of the litigation. It was felt by the committee that the law should remain as it is now and not allow the Department of Roads unilaterally to determine how this particular award money is to be dealt with. So another provision is the striking of Section 1. If anybody has enough interest to want further discussion of it, I will give it. Otherwise, I will move adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

PRESIDENT: Is there further discussion on the committee amendment as amended? If not, all those in favor of adoption of the committee amendment vote aye, opposed vote nay. The Clerk will record the vote.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the committee amendments.

PRESIDENT: The committee amendment is adopted. Senator Chambers, do you want to move the bill? Excuse me. Senator Warner. Senator Warner, the amendments have been adopted on LB 36. I guess we have your pending motion to move the bill.

SENATOR WARNER: Yes. Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I think that the bill...or no, the bill is the committee amendment now. And again, as has been indicated by Senator Chambers, it is to ensure that those funds are not just lying there idle but are invested and interest being accrued which eventually is either to the benefit of the condemnor which could be the state, could be other entities as well, or to the condemnee should the award be greater at the end of the transaction. At least it would provide the funds in part. So I would move the bill be advanced.

PRESIDENT: The motion is to advance LB 36. Is there discussion? If not, all those in favor of advancement vote