

March 21, 1979

LB 273

They chose one of two ways to go. They chose to say, well if you are going to have a tax exemption based on the nature of disability then it should be extended to those people who are disabled. Another alternative is to cut it back to veterans who were injured and whose disability is traceable to conduct in the service of the country. It is also one that I would certainly consider but at the present time I think the existing language is not defensible as a matter of public policy. The committee chose one way. I do not say it is the only way but it is certainly more defensible than the existing law and for that reason, since Senator Murphy is objecting to this amendment, leaves us with original language which I think has very little purpose, I will vote against the Murphy amendment in this case. I will vote for the committee amendment and I will keep open options that we may have to make a more sensible law in this area but I think the only really unsupportable language that has been talked about today happens to be the language that is already in the statute books and that should be changed.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Hoagland.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I have a question for Senator Keyes, Mr. Speaker. Senator Keyes, will you yield to a question?

SENATOR KEYES: I will try.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Senator, I wonder if your committee staff has given any figures as to how many people are currently covered or how many people are currently qualified for exemptions under the law and how many additional people will qualify if this amendment is passed?

SENATOR KEYES: I was looking for the fiscal count and it isn't here but it should be here. I think it should if they know and I don't know whether they know or not.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: I have a fiscal note here that indicates that the agency hasn't had sufficient time yet to respond to the amendment. I guess I would at this time suggest that we support Senator Murphy's amendment because I think we just don't really have sufficient information as to what the fiscal impact is going to be and we are clearly stretching this current law well beyond its original intent which, as Senator Landis indicated, is to give benefits to persons who became paraplegics by virtue of serving their country and I think until we more fully understand the consequences of opening this thing up, we should oppose it.