

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

February 1, 2006 LB 876

way the current law reads, an objection to the conversion within 15 days after a certain publication occurs. The word "objection" in the current statute is just sitting there unmodified. The new language offered by LB 876 would put the two words "a substantive" before "objection." There is no definition of "substantive," and that word has a different meaning to different people. I doubt that if we gave everybody on the floor a slip of paper on which he or she would write a brief definition of the word "substantive," there may be some general agreement, but there would also be differences found. Because we're dealing with a technical area of the law and we're talking about a hearing, whether or not there will be one, when a conversion is proposed, I think the insertion of an undefined, subjective term, which can have different meanings to different people, can lead to a type of controversy and even litigation, which currently is not the case. Because this is--and I told Senator Mines this--it's, for a person such as myself, an esoteric area of the law, I could read in the newspaper or wherever a notice of a conversion is to be printed and I would not make an objection. I wouldn't even know what basis would allow for an objection. So my belief, from having read this bill, grasped as much of it as I could in the short time I've spent on it, is that an objection is not going to be raised other than by somebody connected with the industry. And these people are a little more reluctant than are legislators to look foolish, so I doubt if a person connected with this industry, or even a part of it, would come forth to the director and say, I object to this conversion and I think there should be a hearing;...

PRESIDENT SHEEHY: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...and the director would say, on what basis do you object; and the person would say, well, this morning when I had my breakfast, my bacon wasn't crisp, my toast was soggy, my coffee was lukewarm, so I object. Now, legislators would do that, but I don't think the people who are dealing with the industry that this bill addresses would do that. I believe, and I could be mistaken, and I stand to be corrected, that we don't need to modify the word "objection." But if I have it told to me that frivolous, unjustified objections have been made and the