

May 15, 1979

LB 158

tactics, but in this late date of the session I do not approve of the tactic. Senator Murphy sat on that Committee, and Senator Murphy had all the opportunity in the world to offer amendments in the Committee in good faith or could have voted no. But Senator Murphy failed to do this. But now after a proper Committee hearing under the direction of Senator George, myself and others I believe for us to send it back to the Committee would show lack of good faith on the part of that Committee and their ability to comprehend the problems of cities. I ask for the rejection of Senator Murphy's proposal.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Murphy, do you wish to close on your motion?

SENATOR MURPHY: Well, once again I would say expediency is no excuse for an error. I fail totally to see why this statute had to be intermingled with urban renewal and why the recommendation in this bill, in fact the mandate is that the drafter shall change the name urban renewal in all instances to conform with redevelopment. Now this is not good legislative procedure. I apologize for not having been at that Committee hearing. I apologize for the difficulty that I had reading and understanding the bill and which I am still having, but I would suggest to you unless you understand this bill a great deal better than I do, that it be sent back to Committee for cleanup work before it becomes a part of the statute. I ask the bill be returned to Committee for further consideration.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is to return the bill to Committee as proposed by Senator Murphy. All those in favor of that motion....Senator Murphy.

SENATOR MURPHY: If I may, Mr. President, and by point of clarification, Senator Koch is correct in saying that I have opposed this bill, but Senator Koch will also remember that when that amendment was drafted I raised the same objection because there was a total lack of definition in the constitutional amendment. I encouraged him to inquire of the Attorney General who concurred that even the constitutional amendment was confusing, but I suggested to him, and I'm sure he will concur, that he bring it back, that we clean up that definition of redevelopment which is what we're presently hung with and that I would support the advance of that constitutional amendment on that basis. I would not have liked the bill,