

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on the desk. Senator Remmers would move to return the bill for the purpose of striking the enacting clause.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Remmers.

SENATOR REMMERS: Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislature, I know that or I thought perhaps that Senator Haberman worked pretty hard this morning and talked to a lot of you people and you listened to him which is certainly his right but I did not contact you but I hope you would pay a little bit attention now. I think there are some things about this bill that are a little bit disappointing. Seems to me it's almost a conspiracy against the small elevators coming from three directions. I think there's three groups probably that are here with soiled hands. First part of it I want to address is the letters from the Public Service Commission. I guess maybe to begin with I should say that it's a little, I think a little bit inappropriate for Public Service members to lobby in this manner for a bill that increases, enlarges their empire, gives them more power, more employees for their department. Along with that, I think that some of it wasn't altogether honest. Have a letter here signed by Harold Simpson and Eric Rasmussen that says the Nebraska Public Service Commission wishes to express their unanimous support for LB 73 as it is presently drafted. Now that may be, is original state, I don't know whether it's the present form or the original form. I don't believe that that can be verified. I don't think there ever was unanimous consent even for the original bill. And to publish a letter of this type when there's nothing in their records, I understand, to indicate that they had this kind of a vote, I think it's very inappropriate. Another comment from the Public Service Commission that I'd like to comment on, we have been in consultation with individuals from the bonding industry and they have categorically stated the cost of the bond will not be increased because of this provision. Do they mean to tell us that you can increase your insurance coverage at no extra cost? I've never seen this happen and I can't see that it happened in this case. So if they're talking about no increase in cost, then certainly they must be talking about less coverage in some other areas. And I think if you look carefully at this bill, you will see that it would be less coverage in other areas. I think the original purpose of this bill or the original thrust on this bill was to, to protect farmers from the sort of a situation that Wayne Cryts found himself in in Missouri. And that is the bonding to cover the grain in storage. Now you're expanding this to increase the bonding for, also for bad checks. Now if the Public Service Commission says that it's not going to cost, increase