

May 1, 1979

LB 158

SENATOR MURPHY: Senator Haberman, I don't know what we have got here. Constitutionally, we said that the purpose of this constitutional amendment was to permit the redevelopment of blighted areas and we repeatedly said "blighted areas" on this floor during the discussion of that amendment. Now, however, instead of enacting a clean separate and distinct law to implement that constitutional amendment, we have married it to urban renewal and community development. So we now have a cat, a dog and a rabbit in the same sack and the overlapping implications are that now under this act we can use eminent domain which was never discussed in the constitutional proposition. We can also proceed to use general obligation bonds which I would refer you to section 17 for those who would question the fact that the city can, in fact, be obligated because they make specific reference to general obligation. These are the things we said we would not do.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Thank you, Senator Murphy. I made three or four talks during the campaign and I explained to the folks that the amendment was to allow for shopping centers and commercial industry to come into these blighted areas because that is the way the constitutional amendment was interpreted to me. Now according to this amendment, we are going to use it for parks and playgrounds, and parking and this wasn't the intent, this isn't what the people voted on. So I would like to ask your support to defeat the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: We are going to have to limit ourselves or we simply are not going to get through with this bill. Senator Beutler, do you wish to close on your amendment?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, I don't regard this as having anything to do with rural or urban. The definition that I would have in there that would be in there if you adopted this amendment would be equally applicable to rural and urban. It is a predominance of a buildings rule and I assume that that is controlled somewhat by what you define in the first place as the area that you are considering, and that is flexible and that would be as flexible on the small town as it would be flexible in a large city. Secondly, I would like to make a comment generally with regard to the fact that these bonds are not a general obligation of the cities, that is, it is true that the city, if one of these projects goes blotto, is not going to be obligated to pick up the principal and interest on the bonds but I think there are a couple of things that you should consider before you allow private developers to use the credit of the city, and they are doing