

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

February 1, 2000 LB 175

raise that amount to \$1,000; it would quadruple the amount. If we were talking about anything else, if you said you were going to raise something by 400 percent, everybody would be up in arms. The committee amendment would cut the \$1,000 in half, but it would double the amount that the landlords currently can run away with, like the dish ran away with the spoon. My amendment would leave this part of the law just as it is. It would say that the \$250 is what the landlord would have as a ceiling, to say that he or she wants to keep the property, sell it or destroy it, without any additional notice to the tenant. I think that this amendment that I'm offering is not unreasonable. I think the current law creating this situation is unreasonable because it does not give a full picture. The tenant can be deprived of property that has resale value. Resale value is presumed in this language, regardless of what the total amount turns out to be. That property is not taken to satisfy unpaid rent, that's not what it's taken for. It's taken so that the landlord can keep it, sell it or destroy it, that's what it's for. There need be no accounting and there is no set-off of that amount against what the landlord has claimed that the tenant owes. So my amendment would do nothing other than say, leave this portion of the law where it is, let the landlords seek to gouge someplace else. But when it comes to this aspect it seems to me that even if the person whose property is at stake is a tenant, if there is no respect or consideration given to the tenant, show some respect for that concept of private property. Much is said when they talk about lowering property taxes, so I guess holding property and wanting to say that it's yours is an important notion in this society, but, if you're a tenant, it suddenly means nothing. How is a landlord going to be harmed if this amount remains at \$250? I believe this is one of those throw-away provisions they put in the bill anyway, so that when it went they could give the impression they gave something up. But if by some miracle it slipped by the Legislature and they got this increase, then that's just a bonus, something that they just threw out there as a wish, but not expecting such wish to be granted. So I hope you will adopt this amendment. It will leave the law exactly where it is when it comes to this property of the tenant. And on this one, Mr. President, I will ask for a call of the house.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. The question