

procedures in Section 20 of the bill, but yet I guess they are going to arbitrate an oral agreement that they have. I think if the body is determined to say that this should be something that they should have the ability to have a different set of rules by which to handle their contracts, that's fine, but in no way should that be, I think, something just for protection of both sides involved, the manufacturer and the wholesaler, that an oral agreement is one that should be in statute. It just...it does not make sense to me and I don't have a clue as to why the provision is in LB 371. With that, all the amendment does is strike the reference to an oral agreement and...between the wholesaler and the supplier. With that, Mr. President, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Ashford, please.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Very briefly, Mr. President, it's important that we not adopt this amendment. We're not putting oral agreements into the statute. We're not giving them the force and effect of law per se. What we're doing is, and granted, most of these agreements are written and not oral, but you don't want a situation to arise where a franchisor and a franchisee enter into an oral agreement and not, without terms and conditions set out that could in some way abrogate this statute, that it could some way get around the statute. So it's even more important when you have an oral agreement that the terms and conditions of the public policy contained in LB 371 be in force and effect. Otherwise you could get around or abrogate the intent of the whole law by simply entering into an oral agreement. So that's the...you don't want to take oral agreement out. You want to leave that in so that you can't...a franchisor cannot get around what we are intending to do in LB 371. I think it's that simple.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. Senator Wesely, please.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President, members, Senator Hall, I appreciate what you're doing. I've had to do this on occasion myself in trying to rise and raise some questions, and, frankly, most of us, as you can guess, have felt that the bill was probably in shape to advance today and are kind of caught by surprise and are fairly neutral on what is being discussed here. I'd like to make a suggestion in good faith. I think bringing these amendments has served a purpose. I know several of us have talked about the fact that we're looking at the bill and we