

February 25, 1986 LB 494

back in that when the city council has not acted on a rate increase, when the gas company has to go to court to get the rate increase put into effect, that it will be that rate increase, the one that was originally filed for and not some aberration of that increase. This is important language. It needs to be clarified. I would urge your adoption.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Abboud, please.

SENATOR ABOUD: Mr. President, would Senator Withem yield to a question.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Withem.

SENATOR WITHEM: Yes.

SENATOR ABOUD: Senator Withem, if this amendment is attached, will you make any other attempts to attach any other amendments to LB 494?

SENATOR WITHEM: Senator Abboud, my comments, if I can repeat my comments I just made in my closing, I will, if there are agreements that are reached between the parties who are involved with this, there is a good opportunity I will be back. I think my remarks spoke for themselves. On the other hand, I am pledging to you that if 1003 continues to be an issue which folks are fighting over and doing battle over, I will not scuttle your bill by attempting to impose greater time for consideration. If it is not agreed to, then 1003 is going to take its turn in the progression. If it is agreed to, then I would assume that the folks who are...the four names up there that are sponsors of this bill also ought to have a hand in saying whether it is an agreed to or not agreed to amendment. If it is agreed to, yeah, I am going to try to amend it. If it is not agreed to and if it is going to scuttle 494 and 1003 remains a battleground, let's keep 1003 back on General File and let the fight be fought there.

SENATOR ABOUD: So what you are saying, you mean agreement among the four principal sponsors, is that what you are saying?

SENATOR WITHEM: Basically I am talking about is the affected individuals, those that are now charged with the responsibility of regulating gas rate increases and those