

April 7, 1981

LB 478

think that Senator Landis' amendment is good. I would support the bill but I would like to call your attention to the fact that this is adding yet another specific disability to that which would fall under the homestead exemption for the disabled and I think that it ought to be called to your attention at this time because I am intending to introduce perhaps next year a bill which would change entirely the definition. I think it is appropriate to bring that issue up at this time because I think what we are doing is year after year we add yet another exemption for the disabled, this particular one and that particular one, and we should have a more functional definition that indicates, as Senator Landis just did with the financial ability, a little more of an indication of the functional ability of these individuals no matter what specific, particular item may be listed. It seems to me that the better approach is to have a broader disabled definition that takes into account the functional abilities of individuals, rather than having all of these listed separate, particular disabilities listed in which someone may qualify or not but which there is a differing ability that is found within these individuals. So I will support the bill and I think that you ought support the bill as well but I think you also ought to keep in mind that this is yet another in a long list of particular exemptions that I think would be better dealt with with a broader, more comprehensive rewording of the definition of the disabled under the homestead exemption law.

SENATOR CLARK: There is an amendment on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Beutler moves to amend the bill: "To", I assume, "have the provisions of the bill apply to all persons who are totally disabled."

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I spoke before to the second inequity in this bill and that inequity has just now been addressed again by Senator Wesely and that is that we are apparently wanting to apply the exemption to certain types of total disabilities and not to others, and for the life of me, I cannot see it. I hope somebody will stand up and tell me why there is a distinction with regard to those that are disabled in the manners described in the bill and others who are disabled in numerous other ways or with numerous other results. It seems to me that either the exemption should apply to all or it should apply to none and I am bringing up this amendment because we should get our philosophies straight in this Legislature. We are playing it both ways. What do we believe? What is the policy of this state? The amendment does simply this, it replaces the word