

other than bonds and we also reinstated a stricken provision regarding the type of notice which must precede a public sale. The housing authorities wanted to do away with this public notice. We said the public notice had value. We kept it. We also struck provisions on how to handle claims by tenants who have property that have been perhaps taken or at least allegedly taken by a housing authority and they wanted to take away some of the existing claims procedures and use a different procedure. We struck that provision leaving them with the same claims rights that they have now. Those are the kinds of things that the committee amendments do. Essentially they cut back on the list of gimmes that the housing authorities came to us with when we were looking at LB 435. It tries to pare down to, number one, the idea of joint housing authority mergers in rural areas outside of Douglas County. It continues the concept of the bill to update state language so it is consistent with federal law changes of the last ten years and it makes some slight increase in duties for housing authorities for as far as public information about their tasks and the availability of that. We had testimony in the committee that information about bond issues, information about property that was being purchased was not commonly available and we made it clearer that that information had to be public record and open to public inspection prepared for a report for the city councils and given to those city councils and then open to the public. So that is what is left in 435 if you vote for the adoption of the committee amendments. I move for their adoption at this time.

PRESIDENT: The Chair recognizes Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I do have a few questions of Senator Landis if he would give me a little bit of his time. Senator Landis, can you explain what the reasons are for not permitting a joint housing authority in Douglas County?

SENATOR LANDIS: Yes.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: ....great controversy on the committee.

SENATOR LANDIS: Well it was not on the committee. The controversy was in the hearing room and we had a lot of testimony about the prospect of merger there forced on one or other of the bodies by an outraged citizenry, by intimidation, by political machinations at election time and the like. The introducers of the bill, the housing authorities, who came to us with this idea said, "We brought this to you essentially because we want to merge rural districts. We