

suggest you do what Senator DeCamp says and kill the A bill. Now, he may have sort of a premonition of what is going to happen to LB 835. I hope he will listen to this. If the bill is going to die, he doesn't need the A bill. That might not be all bad either. There are provisions whereby we have a slight chance to redeem LB 835 yet with some improving amendments. I have suggested those twice in the past and I have enough confidence in this body to believe that they will still become law. But I want to point out that what Senator DeCamp has talked about is not factual. There is no way this bill, in the present form, if it should become law, and may God forbid that, that it can be enacted without an A bill. It must have an A bill or else you are going to be back here next year with a deficit appropriation because there is no way, there is no way 835 can be implemented in its present form without substantial cost. Now, you can argue about the extent. The extent of the costs are going to be dependent upon how much time and money and effort will need to be held to hold those hearings. They have 136 exchanges at LT&T, or 37, you have a whole bunch under Bell, you have a multitude in the smaller companies. If you have rate notices filed, rate increase notices filed, there is a procedure for those to be appealed. If that happens, the PSC has got to do some work. Now, if you think that they've got enough in their budget right now to carry on those hearings without that money in the A bill then you disagree with the fiscal office, and you disagree with the PSC. I think I'll lay my money on the fiscal office and the PSC rather than on my good friend, Senator DeCamp, who is trying desperately to salvage something from the ashes of an Attorney General's opinion which we know, notwithstanding some other rhetoric, which we know is factual. Now you can talk all you want to about drawing an opinion to suit the cause. I want to point out again that this Legislature, and I'm not an attorney, I'm not handicapped by that kind of education, but this particular opinion says, very bluntly, the Legislature does have the right, under certain parameters, to tell the PSC what they can do insofar as regulatory measures are concerned. But it does not have the right to take away, to annihilate that responsibility. From a constitutionally originated body it is time to stop the facade, it is time to blow away the rhetoric, it is time to be factual. We can mislead the public if we want to. We might even go a little farther than that, but we should not try to mislead each other, we get into difficulty that way. It is time to lay it on the line and tell it like it is. You've got a bill here which will cost money. It's going to cost a substantial amount of money. The killing of the A bill is not...