

SENATOR LANDIS: This is part of the contract signed by both parties.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Senator Coordsen, please.

SENATOR COORDSEN: Mr. President, I would like to ask Senator Landis a question if he would.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Would you respond, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: Okay.

SENATOR COORDSEN: All right, here we go. My question is about the same as Senator Pirsch's in that the cost or the fee or the premium or whatever that is charged for the nonfiling insurance is a cost, the committee amendments say that that cost cannot exceed the actual cost of making the legal filings. Now is it possible under the language that we have for a small loan company, since this is what we're talking about, to have an insurance fee, if that is the proper word, of say \$5 for this particular insurance and then charge the borrower up to the \$11 that we have allowed under the terms of the amendment, up to the maximum or up to the recognizable fees that would be?

SENATOR LANDIS: I see your point. Let me see if I got the question right. Let's say it was possible to get filing insurance for six bucks, but the small loan company charges eleven bucks to use this mechanism. Is that permitted by the language? And I would frankly say that in fact that was not contemplated by the committee. The language says you can charge for filing insurance and that fee cannot go greater than the lien. You could arguably say that they are authorized only to charge for filing insurance, but do we have some specific language that says you may only charge the exact premium cost? No, we don't. We said that you may charge for filing insurance. It seems to me, by the way, that there is implicit in there, that idea, but it is not explicit I would agree.

SENATOR COORDSEN: And then the other part of that question is that there is a probability or a possibility for say a large loan because we don't differentiate on the filing fees between the size of the loan, that the insurance may be more than what the company could charge the customer on the legal fees. In that case, they would have the option of only offering the