

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

May 24, 2005

LB 40

big problem with that, and I think you should, too. Let's make this fair. Let's make it competitive, get out on the street and put something together that we can help the working poor get a leg up by giving them a house. But not by making sure three different areas of this state have a rock-solid opportunity to walk away with the money, regardless of what kind of competitive process they have inside their own community. I believe in being fair, not to just three communities. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Flood. Further discussion on the Redfield amendment? Senator Smith, followed by Senator Landis and others.

SENATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. President and members. I feel like saying ditto and sitting down. But those who know me know I can't quite do that. Would Senator Redfield yield to a question?

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Redfield, would you yield?

SENATOR REDFIELD: Yes, I would.

SENATOR SMITH: Senator Redfield, I'm looking at this amendment and I see the term "entitlement area." Is that a phrase unique to this certain policy?

SENATOR REDFIELD: We were using...going back to the definition that currently exists under federal law. And this is how they define the Community Development Block Grant.

SENATOR SMITH: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen, I share Senator Flood's sentiments on this. I think that allowing...effectively allowing Lincoln, Omaha, and Bellevue an extra year to come up with ideas, when everyone else is competing on a competitive basis, the most level playing field, I think, possible, and yet the three larger communities...largest communities in the state have an extra year. They have funds protected, because if they don't use them within the year, then they revert back to everyone else, but they have that year built in there. And that does concern me. I've said it before, and I guess I need to say it again, that