

April 6, 1982

LB 868

stand behind that and I believe this body will do the same also. Thank you, colleagues.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Labeledz.

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I beg to differ with Senator Koch. I think the people that have been lobbying in the rotunda are excellent. They have done a great job. Otherwise we wouldn't have agreed to the compromise. They have been there faithfully every day. I want to reiterate some of the things but I don't want to repeat what Senator Landis and Senator Wiitala said, but mainly this is permissive authority and I have every faith, as Senator Wiitala said, in the committee that it will be a fair hearing. And those people that have been out in the rotunda and did such an excellent job will be there and they will set up some guidelines or whatever is needed to make sure that they get a fair shake on what is going to happen. I am a member of an SID and I think that if we can come to some agreement, some of those people out in the rotunda may be better off than they are now because rather than get a few homes or many of the homes in an SID district, they may get it all. I'm not saying the ones that haul for us are very bad but there are more than one that come through the SID as is happening now. I've been contacted by three SIDs that they do want this bill but it was very difficult for me to agree to the compromise which I did. At first the date was April 1st. Then we went to June 1st and now we're at May 1st and we've all agreed and I urge the passage of this amendment so that we once and for all can get LB 868 settled and there will be a public hearing on the interim study and any views that they have will be brought forward and I'm sure that Senator Landis has always been fair and he will be fair at the hearing. Thank you.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Fenger.

SENATOR FENGER: Mr. President, I only want to correct what could perhaps be considered an understatement. The truth of the matter is LB 939 was introduced by Senator Labeledz. If you will turn to the green sheet on it you will find the committee statement. You will find that on the 17th day of February that bill had a public hearing. In addition to the introducer there were three proponents, not one opponent to the bill at the public hearing. Now in view of the priority structure the limited number of priority bills, the committee voted and I am reading from the statement, "to indefinitely postpone the bill because those provisions will be incorporated in the committee amendments in the other bill." It has been suggested that this is sneaking up on these people, they had no previous knowledge of it, and I only wanted to correct that statement because there was a public hearing held on this issue and there were no opponents to LB 939 at the public hearing at the time. Thank you.

10349