

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

February 24, 2003 LB 689

a great idea. Because I understand that...by the way, Senator Landis, you're absolutely right. The Revenue Committee amendment ought to be adopted, because you're trying to bring a little order to something that's going to take until 2008 to get it done, but it's being passed off as if it's a fairly slight exercise. I'm sorry, I think we ought not be disingenuous, and we ought to talk about what it is. If we're going to put the value of all property in the state, then I want to do what Senator Connealy is doing. Let's really go for total information. We'll put all the public property on and the valuation of it, all the nonprofit and the valuation of it, and then we'll know all the value of all the properties all the time. And of course, that will help us solve the six hundred and...what is it, \$673 million shortfall, that will come somewhat ahead of 2008. I think this is a lot of effort for nothing. If we...I will support any reasonable tightening of the charitable nonprofit. I know that Senator Jensen was talking about we have too many cars with exempt license plates. Come on, let's do something about it, but let's know what we're doing. Let's exercise the duty and authority of our office, and let's go do it. Let's don't just engage in a theoretical exercise, for whatever apparent purpose we're engaged in it, without knowing why we're doing it, why we're incurring the expense, and why we're going to spend the next five years doing it before it becomes effective. I am in support of the Connealy amendment. I don't know how you'd do that. All I have...I guess we could revive that. But anyway, I'm in support of the Connealy amendment, I'm in support of the committee amendment, and I'm opposed to the bill. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Brashear. Senator Redfield, on committee amendments.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Senator. The reason that we have the figure 2008 in there is because they apply for this exemption once every four years. And so the option was 2004, which is a very short window, or going to 2008, which is the next opportunity to address it. So the committee thought that if we're going to ask for this, let's give them a little time, so that when they have some spare time and down time, they would at least have the opportunity to work on this...and I'm not