

officials and public agencies funded by the Legislature may have a part, if not culpable based on intent to do wrong, maybe negligence or carelessness, we cannot ignore this. So, Senator Koch, I am opposed to your kill motion and I hope it will be voted down.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR VARD JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, I rise in opposition of Senator Koch's kill motion. I rise in opposition to his kill motion for a little different reason than I believe has been articulated heretofore and that is this, as Senator Chambers did mention, the public is quite interested in understanding more about the nature of bid rigging, not only in Nebraska but across the nation. In Omaha, at least, the bid rigging story first broke during the exposé of Red Munneily's activities on the OPPD Board and those activities tended to dominate the news and the articles on the bid rigging were relatively modest. In fact it was only when I read the third article on bid rigging that I even realized that Missouri Valley Equipment Company in Grand Island was a subsidiary of Peter Kiewit Corporation. It has struck me that the quality of reporting of bid rigging in this state has not been of the kind that I think the public deserves. We do need to know who is involved, to what extent their involvement has been, and what the true costs are to the Nebraska taxpayers by this type of conduct. One of the values in an investigation of bid rigging in our own state by the Public Works Committee is that their activities should be widely reported and that will assure members of the public that they too are participants in a truth seeking procedure. As you may realize all criminal activities or criminal investigative activities done by county attorneys or done by the State Attorney General or done by the United States Attorney are done in offices or before grand juries and those proceedings are not reported proceedings, and as a result, the public is really shut out from any knowledge as to what is transpiring, learning only in the last analysis if someone has plead guilty or no contest to a charge of antitrust activities or big rigging activities or what have you. I don't think that is an adequate colloquy with the public. I believe that the public needs to be as fully informed as it can be on this subject and I think one of the principal functions of a legislative review and oversight process is to ensure as best we can with the tools that we have that the public be made aware of what has transpired, what has gone or and the kind of things that we, as a public body, can do to repair the losses and to assure that this type of activity will certainly not occur in the future. It is for that reason that I do believe that the