

February 11, 1991 LB 21, 68

SPEAKER BAACK: The house is under call. All members please report to the Chamber, be seated and record your presence, please. The house is under call. The house is under call. All senators please report to the Chamber. Senator Landis, please record your presence. Senator Cudaback, please record your presence, would you please. Thank you. Looking for Senator Lamb. Looking for Senator Elmer, Senator Lamb, Senator Schrock, and Senator Schmit. Senators Lamb and Schmit, please come to the Chamber, we are under call. Senator Chambers, we can go ahead and proceed? Board...just a machine vote, right? We will now proceed to vote on the advancement of LB 68. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? We have a request for a roll call vote. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: (Roll call vote taken. See page 616 of the Legislative Journal.) 19 ayes, 16 nays, Mr. President, on the advancement of the bill.

SPEAKER BAACK: LB 68 fails to advance. We will now proceed to the next bill, Mr. Clerk. The call is raised.

CLERK: Mr. President, the next bill is LB 21. (Read title.) The bill was introduced on January 10, referred to Natural Resources. The bill was referred to General File with committee amendments attached. Those amendments were offered on February 8, Mr. President. At that time there was an amendment to the committee amendments that was offered.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Rod Johnson, I think we should have a...would you do a quick kind of summary of the committee amendments first, and then we will proceed to Senator Beutler's amendment to the committee amendments.

SENATOR R. JOHNSON: As originally drafted, LB 21, which is sponsored by Senator Coordsen, would eliminate the 2 cents of valuation on \$100 of valuation, or 2-cent tax that would be applied to \$100 of valuation in a special protection area. That tax only applies to those property owners living within the special protection area. Senator Coordsen argued, before the Natural Resources Committee, that, one, the tax does not generate that much money to basically assist the natural resource district to address the ground water contamination problem that might exist in that area. And, number two, it's unfair to ask only the property owners in that special protection area to carry the burden of this tax since, in his