

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

February 18, 2003 LR 18

Legislature. I am going to support the committee amendment, because I agree with Senator Landis that I think it more nearly directs the intent that Senator Redfield had in mind. I am, however, going to oppose the advancement of the resolution. And I wanted to really talk mostly about that. I obviously am conflicted here. Senator Schimek was kind enough to point out to me that I had signed onto the bill, even though I am now opposing it. I explained to her that I knew early on that it was a bad idea, but I was afraid everybody wouldn't understand it was a bad idea, so I needed to have the opportunity...well, so much for that. At any rate, it is an interesting issue, and I think one that you can move back and forth on. I'm not going to move again, though. I'm against it now, and let me explain to you why. Again, the mechanism of the homestead exemption is that you are...with that program, the property taxes, in effect, are collected, but rather than from those individuals, they're collected from the state. So Senator Redfield is exactly right. It is a state funded program. It is aimed, of course, at a certain group of taxpayers, low-income and low-house value. So there are sliding scales on both. If you get below a certain income level, you are completely exempt, or you become a full beneficiary of the homestead exemption program, up to a house value of a certain amount. So, for example, if you have a house value, depending a little bit on where you're located, of, say, under \$40,000, and you have an income of under \$15,000, say, you would not pay property taxes; the state would pick that up for you. Currently, the way it is, that would be your total property tax obligation, whether it's on a voter-approved bond issue or one that is improved...approved indirectly by voters by electing either local board members or state representatives or all the other officials they elect. Now, there is a sliding scale, so to speak. As your income moves up from the qualifying level, \$20,000...and I think Senator Redfield mentioned it is indexed...then you begin to pay a percentage of that property tax obligation. And of course, any house value you have above a certain level is not exempt. So you have to pay property taxes on that. My concern is this. Suppose you have a person who is destitute in terms of both house and income, very low income, very low house value, really have no money to pay any property tax, don't even have enough money, maybe, to buy food. Suppose there is a local bond issue that is passed, and suppose this