

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

March 30, 2004      LB 1047

resubmit an amendment, however Senator Beutler prefers. But I do think that in light of the agreement that was made in committee, it would be best if we included the three-year look-back. And, Mr. President, if Senator Beutler would like to respond again.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator...

SENATOR REDFIELD: Senator Beutler,...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...Senator Redfield, let me...I'm not sure if I understood what you're saying. Are you saying that we put a \$50,000 cap on, and that cap applies as well to the look-back situation? Is that what you're saying?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Well, I believe that the concern is that we have still a look-back on that provision. And so while it's only \$10,000 now that's exempt, with no look-back, that would be in an increase of \$40,000 without; that currently we don't have a look-back because it's only a \$10,000 exemption. But if we go to \$50,000, there's concern that I'm hearing from members of the body that in fact we include a look-back. So I'm asking for your will on how you would like to proceed, whether you would like to ignore that, or whether you would like to reinsert that three-year look-back language.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, let me...I'm not following fast enough, and I'm sorry. But let me ask you this. The cap is \$50,000. If you put the look-back back in, are you saying that over and above \$50,000, if it's more than three years ago, would be exempt? Or are you saying the three-year period applies, and beyond that only \$50,000 is exempt?

SENATOR REDFIELD: I believe the concern is having the look-back for the three years for the increase there up to \$50,000;...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR REDFIELD: ...that the lid would still be there, but the