

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 29, 1999 LB 550

SENATOR VRTISKA: And following up on what Senator Brashear has been talking about, if, in fact, the banker said you're out of credit, we can't lend you any more, the fertilizer, chemical, whoever the company is, has a right to know that. They know that his credit is extended. I mean extended...overextended his credit, so then it becomes his obligation to make up his mind does he want to, in fact, step in and take the chance that he is going to get his money back or does he go to the len...to the institution, to the farmer and say, you know, you're out of credit, you got all your marbles in one basket. Why don't you go back to the bank and see if you can't work out an arrangement? I guess this is the part that I'm trying to figure out, why do we have to bring a second party in and take the risk if, in fact, it's available, as I understand it and correct me if I'm wrong, but it's available for that instit.. for that...for that company to know whether he, in fact, has got good credit or not, or whether he is already overextended. Is that correct? Or am I...am I following the wrong trail here?

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Coordsen might not think that you were spot on. I happen to think you're spot on and let me give you some response. It grows out of Senator Brashear's question. Being a second or third or fourth filer will not make you number one unless the first filer screwed up in some way. And by demanding that you keep the rules as technical as possible, I guess you run the chance of the first filer screwing up, but I don't think that's what the whole purpose of this filing system is about. What rights a second, third and fourth filer, an agricultural inputs producer might do in a situation you described will remain unchanged under existing law or the new Article 9. They will take their rights subordinate to the first in time filer, which in your hypothetical is the bank. That's not going to change one way or the other. What will be preserved by the Coordsen amendment, however, is a sort of a little technicality, which if the bank screws up, the second, third and fourth can jump in and say, okay, now we're...now we're ahead of them, and that's just not the point of the Article 9. It's not the point. The point is to tell the world of these relationships, not to create a bunch of technical rules that can be tripped over and trap, in this case, a lender, although it could be a borrower or a lender, depending on how we construct the scenario.