

April 5, 1979

LB 418

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Walter George, please.

SENATOR GEORGE: Thank you, Mr. President. I have to support Senator Koch and others who want to send this bill back for study or to committee. I will give you one very specific example. On page 3 of LB 418 on line 6, the definition of what is a mobile home has been completely rewritten and you will find on line 15 where it says a mobile home shall mean a structure and so on with or without a permanent foundation. That, of course, means that any mobile home, doublewide for instance, is pulled into a town, is put on a permanent foundation and then will be taxed as a mobile home. Now that is a total impossibility. I have a lot of towns in my district that have allowed these doublewide trailers to come in. They can be put on a permanent foundation and they are taxed as a home. Now Senator Kelly's bill would completely change that and within the tax structure, specifically school, that is impossible and I would most certainly have to oppose this bill if this definition stays in. I do prefer, as long as you talk about something mobile, I do definitely prefer the old definition as is stricken there from line 6 to 13. A mobile home on a permanent foundation is not a mobile home, and if these would be taxed as mobile homes, I can certainly imagine that all the towns that I know of would not let one of them anymore into town. Therefore, I do support another study on this bill or at least an amendment on the definition. Thank you.

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Cullan.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, as Chairman of the Public Health and Welfare Committee, I rise in opposition to sending this bill back to a committee. I think the issue here is really the red tagging of these units and the fact that the manufacturer would have to pay for the parts and labor or have to repurchase his product and I think that that is good. Now out of state manufacturers have complained that they have not had the opportunity to participate in the discussion on LB 418 and we did have a public hearing. They did not show up. I don't think it is our responsibility to continue to hold public hearings on bills because some parties choose not to or do not hear of a public hearing. If we do that, we can continually get in the practice of sending bills that have some controversy back to the hearing process all the time and so I see no need to send this bill back for a hearing, and secondly, I would point out that some out of state manufacturers contacted me before the bill was advanced from committee and asked me