

questions to this kind of a resolution, and this is not a simple resolution, is what does it cost the federal government in terms of lost revenues. Now I would ask Senator Wesely if he could answer that in some way. Maybe he knows just what the impact of this whole thing is and maybe he doesn't because you know there is a simplistic way of looking at this to jump up and say, yes, we think this is a great program and it is a great program. As long as everybody else in the country has got it, we should have it and we should use it. But now Congress is moving instead to try to limit the program, to try to save those revenues and to try to provide this assistance in a more targeted and direct way. Senator Wesely, do you know what the revenue loss to the federal government is?

SENATOR WESELY: I don't have that figure.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, I am wondering, we have had a rule that talks about whether or not resolutions like this should go to committee and I think that I would like to discuss this with the Clerk and with Senator Wesely and ask Senator Wesely if he would feel more assured and feel more comfortable as I would if this went to committee, if we had the answers to the questions of what the lost revenues were, if we had the question to what other facets of housing we may be talking about. I think we really need to understand this issue before we say on this floor, yes, we are for this or, yes, we are for that. I think this is a much more significant and meaningful resolution than one that should be just dealt with in a few minutes of floor discussion, floor debate, at this time. Senator Wesely, would you mind if I made a motion to refer this to the Executive Board to be sent to committee?

SENATOR WESELY: Well, quite frankly, although the resolution I do believe is important, the recommendation is not a specific one. If you read the final clause, it says that the 97th Congress be urged to take prompt action in amending the Mortgage Subsidy Bond Act of 1980 to remove unnecessary and unwarranted restrictions. Although I interpret that one way, perhaps that could be interpreted other ways and I think that it is a general enough resolution that it talks about a general concept, a fundamental principle of do you believe we should have a continuing Mortgage Finance Fund in Nebraska or not and I think it is not specific enough that we really need to take the time in committee to look at it. If I had a specific recommendation about specifically this change or that change, I would agree but it is a general concept, a general principle in an effort to try and find out the sense of the Legislature and whether or not they want to