

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

May 19, 1999

LB 105

this housing authority, I think we need...we need to keep this, if we want the housing authority to function properly, we need figures like this, so I simply oppose Senator Jensen's amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Hartnett. Senator Jensen, on the Jensen amendment to LB 105.

SENATOR JENSEN: You know, I...thank you, Mr. President, members of the body. I think we need to think a little bit about where we are here. Somebody mentioned that I built some homes. I did build about 150 homes. I never have built a Section 8 home. I have never built a home that required government subsidy or I've never been part of that, however, I represented an association that did work very hard for public housing and for those issues to build houses for those of low income. But, first of all, you set up a housing authority who can get money at a below market rate to build units and go against the private enterprise system with those low-interest dollars, below market interest dollars, and then build homes that are not for the low income. Now that...that just seems to fly in the face of what we have. You know, it's not that these people cannot get financing. We have NIFA financing. We have other means of financing for individuals who do have means, and here we are allowing them to go into units, to allow a nonprofit organization to...or profit organization or a partnership thereof to build units for those who can afford to buy units in the marketplace, and that I just think is wrong. Now I can go along with a certain percentage, but when we take 60 percent of those housing units are going to be for people who have a hundred percent, I just think that's out of line. And so I would like to reverse that and have 40 percent of those individuals be above that hundred percent or above line, and have 60 percent of those be low income. I think that's the purpose of public housing and when we go venturing out into other areas I think you're really hitting the private sector in the face. You are allowing a disadvantage. You're not on the same playing field. So I would certainly urge the body to change that one word from "sixty" to "forty" and to not have public entities enter into the private market, a market that has provided housing for this country for many, many years, and with units still available in the public housing sector for those of low income. So, once more, I would just urge the body