

April 9, 1979

LB 457

Kremer said he doesn't want the bill. The bill has already had a public hearing. Senator Kremer feels, and I don't want to put words in his mouth, but I think his words to me were to the effect that the bill has had a public hearing, that the committee has had a chance to offer legitimate amendments that were arrived at in conjunction with the REAs and this bill was presented on the floor. Now, Senator Goodrich, if you don't like the bill, you can put a kill motion on the bill. You can vote it up or down, but to use this body as a subterfuge for its getting at trying to get back at an individual through this method I think is an unconscionable act. The bill was referred properly by the Executive Committee. These bills were referred to several different committees and I think this bill, since it is a consumer bill, went to the Miscellaneous Subjects Committee because that committee in the past has dealt with consumer oriented issues on a number of levels, not only with utilities, and there is a precedent there where the shut off bill that has been introduced for three years in a row by myself, that bill has always gone to the Miscellaneous Subjects, never to Public Works. We have had other bills on cable TV, the amendment that Senator Fowler had adopted, dealt with the exact same thing, procedures providing public notice to individuals that there is going to be a rate increase, going to let them express their views. I would suggest to the members of this body that if you don't like the bill, and that certainly is your prerogative, then vote the bill down. If you want to put a kill motion on the bill, put a kill motion on the bill but there will be no benefit, it will serve no public interest, by sending the bill back to committee. There is no further study that needs to be done, Senator Kelly, and I think it is kind of interesting and I can certainly sympathize with you, Senator Kelly, about referring bills back to committee after thinking what happened last week when the shoe was on the other foot, but I think in this case in all honesty the issue is a very simple one, either you support the concept of having the public right to know, which this body always in the past has gone on record of doing so. It has done so with public entities. It has done so with cities, with municipalities when discussing legislation. We have done so in this body by saying to the public, yes, you have a right to know and you can attend a public hearing and express your views. We have done so with every other sort of public elected officials. Yet for some reason, yet for some reason, public power seems to be such a sacred cow. Now I don't understand the logic behind that especially when the utilities are not even opposing this bill at this time, but I do think the issue is a simple enough one that we can discuss it on this