

March 27, 1980

LB 986

determine the constitutionality of a bill that according to the constitutional amendment that authorized it and the legislation that was enacted provides an incremental tax refund on one page of the bill, a three quarter mill tax on the next page of the bill; that provides for acquisition and preparation of land to be leased or sold in one page of the bill and the proposition to acquire, lease, reconstruct, build and pay back to the developer the funds to do it with; the proposition that this agreement within this statute shall continue for a period of fifteen years on one page and on the next page shall continue or not to exceed ninety-nine years. I think maybe there is just one or two little things that somebody should look at and I would like the Attorney General to express whether or not you can have a law that goes in two completely diverse directions.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Senator Murphy. I guess I would just like to express a concern I have had on this bill that I think that we have delayed and we have delayed. The bill was introduced and heard. It has been debated time and again on the floor and Senator Murphy himself has talked to me several times about one of the problems of the Legislature, why we aren't getting things done, why we aren't solving problems and taking care of some of the needs and issues which face this state, and that is that we repeatedly attack bills that we disagree with and not allow ourselves to be satisfied with the fact that the majority of the members of this Legislature as representatives of the people of this state support this legislation or legislation which we do not agree with and, once again, we are seeing this sort of tactic where we have heard the bill, we have discussed the bill. It has been a part of our law now for a year with LB 158 being passed last year. This is an amendment to LB 158. It is not the fundamental statutes which authorized and created the incremental...tax increment financing legislation which this bill again just amends and so the questions that Senator Murphy has raised do not really particularly deal with this bill but, in fact, deal with the bill which we passed last year. This is a tightening of the language. It is not a fundamental change in that legislation. It is an attempt to clarify that legislation so that a particular project in Lincoln can be constructed and so that other such projects that may be considered in other parts of the state can be constructed and it seems to me that we have had a full and open hearing on this matter and there is not a need to delay further its enactment. I think the majority of the members of this Legislature