

took a little time and a little paperwork that I didn't think was necessary. So, I say, let's make it automatic, let's put a time limit on there, and I would also suggest that it might should be automatically filed.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Harris, please, then Senator Smith.

SENATOR HARRIS: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to oppose the amendment and this was one of my concerns in the committee, and when we dealt with this bill, I wanted to make sure that this area was dealt with. I believe that the bill as it is presented here adequately deals with this issue. It allows, as opposed to the past, it allows for this to be terminated. It sets up a procedure, it is reasonable. It sets a reasonable number of days as to when this shall be lifted off of the property as far as a lien is concerned and I don't think that the amendment as proposed by Senator Vickers is necessary. I think it is vague to the point of causing problems for the bill, itself. There might be a way to amend it so that it is a little bit less vague and a little bit more specific as to how this shall take place, but as it sets right now, anyone, as in the bill, anyone that wants that lien terminated as to that property, he has the ability to cause it to be terminated with a severe penalty upon the lender if it is not done within a specific period of time. I urge you not to support the amendment. The bill is adequately taking care of this problem, in my opinion. Thank you.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator DeCamp. Did you wish to speak, Senator DeCamp, on the amendment?

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, merely to reiterate again, the problem is legitimate, very legitimate, and the solution in the bill solves problems far better than they are being solved today, and far better than that amendment. Senator Lamb, I am very, very familiar with the situation you described, in other words a lien that hasn't been released, but I can give you better ones. I suspect if you picked any group of 50 farmers, and I am talking about 50 farmers who had borrowed money, and among that 50 if you were checking how many of them had had an experience where a lean wasn't released, I am going to guess that there would be 40, and I am not exaggerating, that have experienced the very problem you have identified, and there is no real solution in the law now, and the bill does a very detailed, complete from A to Z solution to this particular problem. I would urge you not to upset that pretty well drafted and pretty well defined and refined solution for a vague