

custom or a spec home. What if it starts out as a custom and turns into a spec home? Or more likely, what if it starts as a spec house, is sold and turns into a custom situation? These are questions that are not answered in the bill. And while we are on the subject changing from one to the other, what about transition sections in this bill? What happens to those poor contractors who have done work before January 1, 1982 and have a right to file a lien? Along comes January 1, 1982 and what must the contractor do to protect himself? Must the contractor file a notice of commencement? May the contractor give a notice of lien liability? Who knows. There are no provisions in the bill for transition. Three, this just concludes the first two paragraphs. What do the next five paragraphs say? They explain the maze that a contractor must go through to make certain that he has a lien even though limited in amount. And if you can read this and understand it even in this simplified version, then I congratulate you. I cannot accomplish that feat. It is for this reason, members of the Legislature, that I request that you vote to bracket LB 512.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, obviously this is equivalent to a kill motion on the bill, and I don't know quite how to address it except to suggest to you that I think that the most accurate way to characterize it is as last minute blitz scare tactics. Let me tell you the quality of information you are getting here, just to give you an idea of what they are trying to do to you. This letter from Tegtmeier, for example, says in Sections 10 and 16 that we are reducing the lien period from 90 days to 120 days. Well, he either can't read or he didn't have the latest version of the bill, because it is still 120 days which is what it always was. It is just patent misinformation. With regard to Section 19, it is two years just as it has always been, not one year as claimed in the letter. That is patent misinformation. These letters I only have received this morning so I haven't had a chance to review them in detail. The Millard Lumber letter, looking at that on the face, the homeowner is not required to file notice of termination. That is patently untrue to protect his rights. There is other misinformation in here, and some of the other information I don't even know if it is true or not because I don't understand what they are talking about. But I suggest to you that the lawyers that they are paying their big hourly fees to probably should be spending a