

April 7, 1981

LB 478

SENATOR BEUTLER: I am sorry, Senator Fitzgerald, but I don't know where you are. Page 2 of what?

SENATOR FITZGERALD: Page 2, line 3.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Whose amendments are these?

SENATOR FITZGERALD: Sir. Oh, these are Landis', pardon me. Dave, would you explain that to me? My understanding, a veteran is a veteran is when in military service, he has drawn disability. All right, this is a nonmilitary accident so you have got veteran up there. It should just be a private citizen if he is going to draw disability for this here.

SENATOR LANDIS: I am sorry. Could you give me the question again. Tom, I am sorry, I didn't catch it.

SENATOR FITZGERALD: Line 3, "Veterans who are totally disabled by nonmilitary accident or illness", why do you have a "veteran" there? If it is a nonmilitary accident, he is not a veteran because a veteran, his injuries are caused in service.

SENATOR LANDIS: When Senator Fitzgerald points to line 3 of the Peterson-Landis amendments which were adopted, he is pointing to existing language which already allows for veterans who are totally disabled by nonmilitary accident or illness and that is just simply the status kind of homestead exemption I was talking about. If you fit into the category of being a veteran, who also happens to be disabled because of a nonmilitary accident, you get this kind of a homestead exemption. That choice was made a number of years ago by the Legislature. I am not sure I understand it and could justify it but it is one of the statuses that in the past has received a homestead exemption, and that is existing language in the law for at least ten years, I believe, Senator Fitzgerald.

SENATOR CLARK: Does that answer your question, Senator Fitzgerald?

SENATOR FITZGERALD: Thank you. Yes.

SENATOR CLARK: We are not on that amendment, incidentally. We are on the Beutler amendment. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the body, I guess I uncovered a can of worms that keep squirming out everytime this bill comes up. I am not adverse to