

May 18, 1981

LB 543

sense and I think that we ought to adopt it and I am willing to go with it because it is a more reasonable one than the Goodrich amendment. I think that it is clear though the message that we are carrying over there is, target the money for low and moderate income, keep up your withholding program to target the money to the lower income individuals, give them a first shot at it and do the different things that you are talking about in putting up slightly higher rates for the higher income and a lower rate for the lower income, and do some of the things that we are interested in doing in helping the lower income individuals benefit from this fund. So I think that this is a good compromise. I think our message is loud and clear, and I think the Fund is listening and they will respond. So I support the Newell amendment.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I oppose the Newell amendment for two reasons, and specifically, number one, as Senator Goodrich pointed out, we have only eight days left. At this time to attempt to drag a bill back and make an amendment on it which may or may not be a serious amendment, I think is not good judgment. Number two, and I am not saying this is Senator Newell's reason but I can tell you very frankly that if you want to be lobbied up one side and down the other for the next three or four days, move the bill back and you are going to see some very intensive lobbying, and that may be what you want. If you like it that way, fine. Number three, the intent of the Legislature has been pretty well established. The court has outlined that it should be for low income persons. Senator DeCamp has pointed out, you can't sell a bunch of risky high risk loans along to investors unless you put some of the better loans in there at the same time. I suggest perhaps that maybe the members of the Fund are going to have to have the flexibility that we have provided in the first place. To come along now and to place in the statute a limitation of \$26,000 in itself is meaningless. It means absolutely nothing because it's only \$2000 below what the board has set as their upper level, and that is a point at which very few loans will be made in any case. I believe it has been expressed many times on this floor and I don't think the Fund is going to survive unless they help the low income persons. But you have got to be able to sell the package or you won't help anyone, and if you want to package up a bunch of really high risk loans and think