

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

January 30, 2003 LB 295

function of that acreage site wouldn't be for agricultural purposes, it would be for something else, just living in the country. But if it's sold as a part of the agricultural scheme and that function of that would be for farming, it can't be compared, or comparable, to something that isn't used for agricultural purposes. Would you concur with that, Senator Baker?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Would you yield, Senator Baker?

SENATOR BAKER: Yes, I would. I concur, and I agree with you 100 percent. The key word in there is "functional." If it's part of a functioning farm, an operating farm, that clarifies it. If it's an acreage, it's an acreage; it's not part of a farm. That's...

SENATOR JANSSEN: All right. Thank you, Senator Baker, and...

SENATOR BAKER: ..."function" is a very key word.

SENATOR JANSSEN: I agree with you there, too. And thank you, Senator Cudaback.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Janssen. For discussion of AM0104 to LB 295, further discussion, Senator Beutler, followed by Senator Jones.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Baker, just a couple of questions, if I might. I'm a little disoriented now about what's happening. With your amendment, the definition of farm home site goes back into the statutes, and the definition of farm site goes back into the statutes. In fact, everything in the entire bill that was...that changed the law is stricken. Right?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Is that a question, Senator Beutler?

SENATOR BAKER: That's correct.

SENATOR BEUTLER: All right. So that the only change that's made all together, ignoring the first change, which seems to be clarification, is that one sentence at the beginning of