

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

January 28, 2000 LB 175

everybody is making, farmers, for example, are not rolling in dough. I still hear members on this floor, I read articles quoting members of Congress at the national level, I read articles from those who are dealing in agriculture all the time pointing out that, as far as they're concerned, agriculture that is, all of this talk of a robust economy is of no consequence because it is not having a solid impact or any significant impact on their economic situation. So what I'm requesting that those people in agriculture do is consider that there are people even worse off than they are and those people are embraced in the existing language of the law--the blind or partially blind person, the hearing-impaired person, the physically disabled person. So when you don't have a lot of money, what seems to be a small amount to somebody else is very prohibitive to you. So if I am impoverished and I'm scarcely able to pay the cost of a loaf of bread right now and they're going to raise the cost of a loaf of bread a mere 25 cents, to those who have plenty 25 cents is a mere increase, even though they might say it's too high a percentage increase and argue it in an abstract way. But in terms of being taken out of the situation where they can afford to purchase a loaf of bread, it doesn't have that impact. When people who are affected by this section of the law that I am trying to amend are trying to get anything that costs money, they have to count pennies and sometimes they don't have extra pennies to count. So even though the existing law says that when a person in these categories goes to rent an apartment, one-fourth of the monthly rent total has to be put down as a deposit because they have one of these dogs. The law says, even if you adopt my amendment, that such owner would be liable for any damage done by one of these animals to the premises. So if they put up the 25 percent down payment, and let's presume or assume that some damage is done by the animal and it's an amount...an amount greater than that 25 percent, the landlord is going to have to go to Small Claims Court or do something to try to recoup that money. So I am suggesting that if damage occurs let it all be handled in that manner because that's going to be available even if the one-fourth amount is put down. I have been contacted by people not on this aspect of the bill, but just the deposit anyway. That deposit manages to always be gobbled up because the landlord finds something wrong here and there and lets the person know how difficult and expensive it will be to try to get back that deposit, so most people just let