

March 26, 1985

LB 38, 313, 313A, 324, 326, 350, 391  
391A

PRESIDENT: While the Legislature in session and capable of transacting business, I propose to sign and do sign LB 313, 313A, LB 324, 326, 350 and LB 391 and 391A. We will now move into General File for discussion of LB 38 and it is one hour limitation which will be timed and individual member's times will be timed separately, time beginning from the recognition of the first speaker. Read what we have on the record, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: Mr. President, right before that, if I might, I have an Attorney General's Opinion addressed to Senator Vard Johnson. (See page 1191 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, LB 38, of course, has been discussed by the Legislature on a couple of occasions, the latest was yesterday very briefly. It is the bill that was introduced by Senator Lamb and Senator DeCamp. (Read title.) The committee amendments, of course, were defeated, Mr. President. There was a motion made yesterday to indefinitely postpone the bill offered by Senator Wesely. That is now before the Legislature.

PRESIDENT: Motion of Senator Wesely is now before the membership and the Chair recognizes Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you. Mr. President and members, and especially Senator Lamb, I haven't said anything about LB 38. I have kept quiet as we have gone through sixteen different amendments that have been proposed and we have gone forward, backward, forward, backward, forward, backward and are now on the original bill as introduced and we are about to start another forward, backward, forward, backward auction with some amendments being offered following this kill motion. I think clearly there is not a majority sentiment in terms of what direction to take with the legislation, but even if we had reached that majority position in terms of what level of a rebate we should propose, I feel this bill is fatally flawed. I put the kill motion on this bill as soon as it was advanced from the committee. I felt the bill wasn't worthy of advancement and isn't worthy of passage by this Legislature because the concept approaches the question of property tax relief completely wrong. Property tax relief ought to be at least in part targeted to those people in greatest need. I don't think you want to just throw money at the problem of high