

February 3, 1981

LR 12

money for all Nebraskans and stimulate the economy. In my mind this is very important, and unless we get these changes in the federal law, we will not see the energy funding availability that we need and which was authorized by LB 954 passed last year. Again I support the resolution and encourage you to oppose the Newell motion to refer it to committee.

PRESIDENT: Any further discussion on the Newell motion?
Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like for my fellow legislators to look at page 388 of the Legislative Journal to see precisely what is at issue here. When Congress amended the law in 1980 it did not repeal the Mortgage Subsidy Bond Act. It did not repeal the program. It tightened up the program. That is all it did. It just said simply if these bonds, in effect, are to be tax exempt bonds, then the program that these bonds are funding has got to be a bit tighter. We don't like cavalier expenditure of money even in the name of housing for low and moderate income people. It has got to be a more tightly run program. We are not eliminating the program. That is what Congress said and that is what this act is all about. Now the Nebraska Mortgage Finance Fund wants to relitigate the issue. It says, "Holy Smokes! We don't like some of these restrictions. We think it is going to be too tight. So we want to loosen it up again so we can have more free and easy spending." But you know something, fellow legislators, you and I don't even know what the restrictions were or exactly what the loosening is going to be. We don't know and yet we are being called on to vote for this resolution so that Mr. Rasmussen can take it back to Washington, D.C. tomorrow to argue a case that you and I don't even know. I genuinely do not know precisely what it is he wants to have lessened or eliminated. I think that this resolution should be referred to committee so that at least we will know what it is we are voting on. Secondly, do you have any idea as to how much money this program effectively costs in lost tax revenues? This program costs more to the United States Government in lost tax revenues than the entire general fund budget of the State of Nebraska. I keep in my desk a document which is published annually by the United States Treasurer entitled The Tax Expenditure Budget of the United States and the tax expenditure budget represents those deviations from a nominative tax model that show in effect the price that you and I pay through the loopholes, the shelters, the dodges and the gimmicks, how much the ordinary taxpayers and the U. S. Government in effect lose because we have set up special loopholes,