

March 11, 1982

LB 547

SENATOR WESELY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, Senator Schmit talked about the fact that Senator Fowler and Senator Chambers and Senator Hoagland are now asking questions about this bill on Final Reading. Well, I raised questions on the bill back on General File about some other provisions and I was concerned about these as well, and I guess that it is clear that we need some legislation passed in this area having worked with Senator Schmit last year in passing LB 487 that cleaned up the lodging legislation that we were talking about and did a number of things that were beneficial to the lodging industry, but as he said, we did eliminate statutes that are now present in LB 547 and we need to reimpose some sort of limitations. I think that is probably reasonable that we should do that. Nevertheless, I think Senator Fowler is correct in pointing out the fact that perhaps we are being too restrictive on what liability we ask of lodging establishments. I was talking to some individuals who just recently traveled to Atlanta, and they were telling me that in the hotel down there, I don't know which one it was, they told me that they had their cleaning people come through their rooms and just basically wiped out anything that wasn't nailed down of all the guests that were there, and when they'd come back to their rooms, they'd find nothing that they had before, and they claim absolute no liability whatsoever for the fact that their employees ripped off and stole from their guests, and evidently the law down in Atlanta and in Georgia does not protect those individuals. Now that is not the case here in Nebraska but, nevertheless, we have to be aware of the fact that perhaps there will be instances where theft and loss of property may take place. We have to have reasonable limitations so that people are not in a situation such as I just described that this individual found himself in in Atlanta with no recourse. So I think when we talk about limitations, they have to be reasonable. Now I am not sure exactly what would be the case in this instance to be reasonable and I am not sure that we want to totally wipe out the legislation that we have before us but I do think it would be nice if some of those individuals pushing this bill would be willing to sit down with some of us who are concerned about some of those provisions and talk about where that line ought to be drawn between the liability that we are talking about here and I still think Senator Chambers' amendment was a wise amendment and had merit. Yet that was rejected. And I still think some of the other provisions of this bill dealing with some exemptions that had been agreed to previously ought to be looked at as well but those in support evidently want to push it right through and see this legislation pass without too much discussion, without too much question, but I think there ought to be question about some of the provisions in this bill. Now as it stands

8687