

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

February 22, 2005 LB 570

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...not on the hook for 110,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR LANDIS: ...and that...and this, I think, recites that rule, essentially.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And that's easily understood.

SENATOR LANDIS: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I wanted to get that out of the way. Now, coming back to this blank, the fact that this language is underlined would suggest that it's new language. Is this language simply being transported from someplace else to this location? Or is this new language, the part about the blank being filled in without authorization?

SENATOR LANDIS: I can tell you it is new language. What I can't tell you is, is this an alteration of the existing rule? But, Senator Chambers, I will get an answer for that question for you.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. Then let us discuss it without regard to whether it's already law, because I don't know for sure.

SENATOR LANDIS: Fair enough.

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Now, when a blank is filled in, this receipt is going to go against the issuer. The issuer is going to be held to what was put into that blank. It could have been put in by Captain Kidd or Jack the Ripper. But if I purchase that receipt from you with value...for value, and I don't have notice that Jack the Ripper wrote it in, you're held to what was written into that blank by Jack the Ripper, as I read this language. Is that correct?