

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

April 10, 2000 LB 179, 301, 1279

referred to. I...personally, I felt that this was the intent of the Legislature, to expand the homestead exemption program last year, and that's why I voted for the bill. Let me give you a little history, as I see it. Back in 1998, Senator Peterson introduced...Senator Chris Peterson introduced a bill, LB 1025. And the original bill did not have the "or" language in there, but the committee amendment, AM3232, did add the "or" language to the disability, and said...so it says...the committee amendment (inaudible) says, has a permanent disability, use of a mechanical aid or a prosthesis, et cetera, just like it is today. Last year, Senator Peterson reintroduced LB 301. Let me clarify just a bit. LB 1025 was referred out of the Revenue Committee and, by a committee amendment, did have the "or" language within it. In 1999, Senator Chris Peterson introduced LB 301. That bill was referred...or, excuse me, it was referred to the Revenue Committee. It had the language that says, have a permanent disability or who have lost all mobility. The "or" language is in LB 301. LB 301 and several other bills, I believe, of Senator Preister's, Senator Bohlke's...there were a couple of bills that were all merged together that ended up to be Senator Preister's LB 179, which, of course, he prioritized and we advanced. These bills were put together under a committee amendment that included the "or" language. So basically, what we had in 1998, we had a bill referred out of the Revenue Committee that had the "or" language; in 1999, we had several bills that were put together by the Revenue Committee that held the "or" language; and now we read in the paper where it was somehow advanced as a mistake. And I don't believe that it was. And let me tell you why it's significant. What this will do is, people that have, oh, say, a heart attack, or things of this, that are disabled such that they don't necessarily need mobility devices but are disabled to the extent that they can't work, this would kick those people off of the homestead exemption program, so that they'd, of course...you know, those people who are disabled and can't work would be the very people that are kicked off of this program. So my amendment, again, reinstates the "or" language so that the bill would read as it was, or does, when we passed it last year that individuals who have a permanent physical disability or who have lost all mobility such as to preclude locomotion without the regular use of a mechanical aid or prosthesis would qualify, subject to the income levels that are found later on in the