

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

February 22, 2005 LB 570

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Was that my third time?

SENATOR CUDABACK: That was your third time. Senator Landis, you're...there are no further lights on. You're recognized to either speak or close.

SENATOR LANDIS: This is my closing. Let me give you what the commissioners say this language means, because I think it actually winds up being...puts us all back in the same spot. Referring to this very language, the commissioners say, in their official comments, which would be used by a court in interpreting the language, this would be the tool. Number one, purposes, number one: to make clear what would of course be true without the section, that applicable federal law is paramount. Now, to the extent that the language might be interpretable in some other way, understand that a court, if looking at that language and unable to fashion a clear understanding of it, would go to that comment to guide them into what that section meant. The comment says, to make clear what would of course be true without the section, that applicable federal law is paramount; not modifiable but paramount. Number two: to make clear also that regulatory state statutes, such as those fixing or authorizing a commission to fix rates and prescribe services, are not affected by the article and are controlling on the matters which they cover, unless preempted by federal law. The reference in one of the sections to tariffs and classifications and regulations filed or issued pursuant to regulatory state statutes has been deleted as inappropriate to the modern era of diminished regulation of characters (sic) and warehouses. If a regulatory scheme requires a carrier or warehouse to issue a tariff or classification, that tariff or classification would be given effect via the state regulatory scheme that this article recognizes as controlling. So, if there is a state regulator telling people what they have to do for their titles or for their services or for their tariffs that they're to receive, that's controlling and the code is not meant to supplant that. It's supposed to place legislative authority with the regulation of behaviors in this state paramount to the operation of the code. That's what the comments make sense of. I can understand that as I read it. I think a court would be able to understand that as well. Differences may exist as to