

I can't honestly say that the makeup of the Public Works Committee provides an adequate safeguard or assurance that all those interests throughout the state would be properly and vigorously represented during the process of this investigation. I, for one, am interested in being on that committee and not being a person who just come and sits and listens to other people talk but have the opportunity to ask questions, to review data, to request information because I have been given some information to date that I haven't heard discussed by any of the investigators, and by that I mean the county attorney, the Attorney General, the U. S. Attorney, whoever else may be involved and I don't know that any county attorneys are involved in the investigation as of this date. But to restrict such a wide-ranging issue, broad-reaching issue to one committee I think would not be appropriate. If you have an extraordinary set of circumstances, then there is a justification for an extraordinary measure. Now it is not really extraordinary to establish a committee to undertake a specific investigation of a specific issue. That has been done with reference to the State Patrol enforcement of drug laws, and as a result of the activities of that committee, there have been many worthwhile changes in various aspects of the criminal law. So I have to oppose Senator Lamb's amendment. I don't think that it is given to squelch an investigation or to keep certain people off but by virtue of its structure that will be the result and I am not in favor of that. I would hate to feel that an investigation that involves such high-powered individuals as the Peter Kiewit Company could reach into this Legislature and create an appearance in the minds of the public that certain people are not to be involved in this investigation because they dig too deep, they persevere, they ask difficult questions, they will not be bought off or frightened off. Now the Public Works Committee has had difficulty dealing with the issue of water so I can't say that the public which is not privy to everything that happens in this Legislature, which does not understand why a committee may deadlock on an issue, I cannot say with their lack of privity that they would accept the idea that the Public Works Committee which cannot deal effectively with the water issue can deal effectively with a large scale bid-rigging problem. So, Senator Lamb, my opposition to your amendment is not that I see anything sinister in it at all, and I can appreciate your attempt to keep everything flowing through the existing structure, and as head of the Executive Board that may be your responsibility as you see it, but as a member of the Legislature, I am not bound by the constraints that are on Senator Lamb. I do want to be a part of that committee and maybe I should not have stated that because by making that clear it may cause other people to vote in such a way as to ensure that