

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

January 27, 2005 LB 118

record what it is that we're doing. Thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. You've heard the opening on AM0136. Open for discussion on that amendment. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, for continuity purposes, I'd yield my time to Senator Chambers, so he can finish the explanation of the amendment.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, you have almost five minutes. We'll give you five minutes.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Beutler. And I will not take all of your time. I want to read what the bill will say if you adopt this amendment. "If a supplier has contractual authority to approve or deny a request for a sale or transfer of a dealership or an equity ownership interest in a dealership, the supplier shall neither unreasonably deny nor unreasonably withhold its response to such a request. The dealer's request"...and then you can read the rest of it, what that request must include. But it eliminates the language about the 60 days and so forth. With that having been said--and I think you can follow what the amendment does now--I return Senator Beutler's remaining time. And I appreciate the fact that he gave it to me.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature, I think that the amendment certainly improves on the situation with regard to two or three potential problems with the bill. One that we haven't talked about--and perhaps the lawyers have addressed it, but with the amendment, it would certainly be addressed--and that is the question of whether a current contract can be modified by a subsequently passed law, without an impairment of contract. That may depend, I think, on exactly how a particular contract is worded. And it may depend on other circumstances. But that is certainly one question that most people would raise in a situation like this. That situation, I think, would be corrected by Senator Chambers' amendment. And