

May 1, 1979

LB 158

operate a museum, if you will, and use the property tax base of this state to fund it. Now if that is part of urban blighted renewal, I have become quite narrow in my thinking. But once again I say, we are creating a law to implement a constitutional amendment and I would suggest to you that there is a strong possibility that provisions such as this are flatly unconstitutional. Never was that brought up in discussion on the floor, never was it brought up at any time until now. We are going to take up one building buildings, we are going to operate museums, we are going to expend money for purposes other than what it is being levied for. I ask that this amendment in fairness to our constituents whom we told we were creating a redevelopment act not find that suddenly they are being taxed to operate a museum somewhere for somebody. I ask the adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Is there any other discussion? Senator Koch, do you wish to....

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise to oppose. If you read that section that Senator Murphy is alluding to it says that you can restore those properties that have architectural historic value. I submit to you that that is not unreasonable. Many times we attach our future to certain things in the past that we look at as landmarks that are significant historically. In fact, this Legislature is on record, there is statute about landmarks and the values thereof, and you know as well as I do, that for something to be treated as a landmark in historical and architectural value, there is a process through which you go for that purpose. So I submit this is not unreasonable. It is tying the past to the future and shows that this community, whoever it might be, respects those who preceded them in their efforts that might have been monumental achievements in terms of architecture and historic values. I submit that this is a good part of the bill and that we should defeat Senator Murphy's amendment.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Keyes, your light is on. Do you wish to respond to...as soon as the discussion, as soon as this motion is taken care of we will have to go to the next bill, so go ahead, Senator Keyes.

SENATOR KEYES: I am a little amazed at what I have heard now because the house that is on my farm has part of the old courthouse that was moved from Springfield to Richfield and then it wound up on my farm as part of my house. Now would I be able to restore that to its original consent