

January 24, 1995 LB 153, 167, 202

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Thank you, Senator Pirsch. Any further discussion on LB 167? Seeing none, Senator Jones, do you wish to close? Closing is waived. The question before the body is the advancement of LB 167. All those in favor vote aye, all those opposed vote nay. Have you all voted? Please record.

CLERK: 28 ayes, 0 nays, Madam President, on the advancement of 167.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: LB 167 advances. LB 202.

CLERK: LB 202 was a bill originally introduced by Senator Cudaback and Vrtiska. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 9, referred to the Revenue Committee, advanced to General File. There are committee amendments pending by the Revenue Committee, Madam President.

PRESIDENT ROBAK: The Chair recognizes Senator Warner on the committee amendments.

SENATOR WARNER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, the committee amendment in effect places into LB 202 some of the provisions of LB 153 which was introduced by Senator Schimek because in part they dealt with the same section or the same fee change, but what would not be in the bill and what would be added to by the committee amendment, first, in both bills was an increase in the tax deed from \$2 to \$10 and the tax deed is when some taxes are delinquent and not paid and they go for tax sale and someone buys that tax...buys that property at a tax sale to hold it, essentially to hold it for investment obviously and the filing of that tax deed cannot be done for that \$2 fee. In some instances there has been a substantial number of those. And that was the main item in 202. In 153, which was Senator Schimek's bill, she also had an increase in the issuing of a marriage license from \$10 to \$15 and that was included as a committee amendment. Her bill in addition also increased the filing fee for a redemption of a tax deed sale where the individual who had, in fact, originally owned the property was able to retire that debt of taxes and then get a clear title, it was an increase in the filing fee for that. The feeling of the committee was that we should not make that additional cost. I think the comments that were made was along the line that the individual who is facing a tax deed sale on their property already are paying a substantial 14 percent interest. They've