

CLERK: (Read the record vote as found on pages 80 and 81 of the Legislative Journal.) 9 ayes, 28 nays, Mr. President, on adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: The amendment fails. Do you have any other amendment, Mr. President?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vard Johnson would move to amend the bill. (The Johnson amendment appears on page 81 of the Legislative Journal.)

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, you have on your...you are having placed on your desk now the amendment. It is a very simple amendment. During the course of the public hearing on LB 3 before the Judiciary Committee, one of the representatives of the lender community suggested this would be an appropriate way of dealing with Section 14 of the bill. Section 14 of this bill, as you may remember, we struck this morning. All that has occurred here is a provision that in the event that a fair and reasonable bid is not received for the nonhomestead parcel, if that doesn't happen, then the property will simply be subject to another sale, just be sold again. Obviously, it doesn't bring into question what Senator Chambers wanted to do which was the...if a fair and reasonable bid was not received then the property would be appraised and the appraisal bid would be taken. It doesn't do that at all. It just simply says that in the event there is not a fair and reasonable bid for the nonhomestead portion of the property, then under those circumstances the property will be offered again for sale.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator DeCamp, did you wish to speak to this?

SENATOR DECAMP: Yes, Mr. President, after the last hour I have decided maybe I won't miss it quite so much. But, anyway, I have noted over the years in here that if you have an issue that is more complicated than seat belts and maybe less complicated than the entire uniform commercial code, which is about where this one is, then somehow they bog down with a lot of confusion and misunderstandings and things like that and I think that's where this is. Now, I would like to try to synthesize or summarize where I think the situation is on this particular legislation which would then put into perspective why I have suggested simply repealing and going back to the old system, a