

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

January 23, 2003 LB 70

write a two-party check which then, when endorsed, would relieve them of the liability. Sometimes a lien would be filed soon after the quarterly list was published, maybe two or three weeks after that, but still would need to be taken into consideration that there was a lien filed. If it was after the quarterly list came out, then it's up to the lienholder, it's their responsibility, to provide written notice to the purchaser of these products that there is, indeed, a lien filed against the products. So again, if the list is not...or if the purchaser would not find a lien on the master lien list, and they were not notified in writing, then they understood that they were not liable then to the lien. But the way the bill or the law is written, which was the inconsistency, or the contradictory, subsection (2) says upon endorsement then you waive your right to the lien. Subsection (3) said that the only way that you're not liable is if you subscribe to subsection (2), which would be the endorsement. And it did not mention subsection (1), which says that if you're not on the master lien list, you're not notified, that you are free of the lien. So they were having to go back and do individual searches. And I just have a list here of about 35 cooperative elevators in Nebraska, and the number of checks they would write in a year. The first one on the list, the approximate number of checks that they wrote in 2000, and I know this is a couple of years old, but it probably would still be very up-to-date, is 20,000 checks in a year. And it cost them to do an individual search of \$2.50 per search. So it could potentially cost them \$50,000 to do a search, even though that the lien was not published in the master lien list, or they're not notified, because they could not take the risk. Many times the check is written for \$100,000 or more, if you're paying somebody for their whole crop for the year. And it could be very costly if they did not find out there was a lien there, and that they would have to pay twice for it. The bill simply includes subsection (1) along with subsection (2), and it reads, the part that's changed, "Except as otherwise provided in the provisions of subsections (1) and (2) of this section," it shall not be interpreted that they are relieved of any other liens that might be out there or something. But it includes subsection (1) to be applied as well as subsection (2). With that, I'd like to just ask you to advance this bill. It was voted out of committee unanimously again this year. And if you