

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office

March 1, 2000

LB 1285

collecting evidence, hearing evidence and making rulings, and that's part of their docket day in and day out. That is not necessarily true of the Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. They don't act as evidentiary ones. In a lot of the cases that we have up there, remember they asked for stipulated facts. They will take the case if they have stipulated facts. It's because they don't act like a trial court. They don't act like a jury. They review the records, they examine the facts and the law to see if the facts fit the law and if the policy is to be one, and that's what I think people are going to struggle with here today. It's not whether Senator Bromm has got the right idea or not. I think the idea is there and universally probably agreed upon.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: The issue is, how you do it?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Kristensen. Further debate, Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, one thing I want to keep before us while we discuss all aspects of this bill, there is a question that might help bring the whole thing into focus, at least from where I'm looking. Whose interests are to be protected and safeguarded through the activities of the PSC? The ultimate interest that is to be served is the interest of the public. These companies have decided to offer services for sale to the public, but the PSC has a primary duty and responsibility to the public, not to these companies. Now when a violation or some activity is taking place which the PSC, in discharging its duty to the public, feels is inappropriate and will enter an order, I think at that point the story that Senator Landis presented to us would come in and have some play. Are you going to allow a misbehaving company to continue with this activity causing, presumably, ongoing damage to the public interest while this wrongdoer benefits from delay and not initiating immediate action to have the issue, that is the bone of contention, resolved? First, there should be concern about the interest of the public. Secondly, there should be every incentive that's possible built into the law to have these companies resolve or