SB 1154 and SB 1155 Schwartz (Wallace)

DIGEST: These bills address the problems between the City of Houston and the residents of Clear Lake City. SB 1154 gives the Clear Lake City Water Authority powers to provide a number of services, subject to a contract between the authority and the City of Houston. SB 1155 allows the authority and the City of Houston to enter into such a contract and provides for a reapportionment of property taxes paid by Clear Lake City residents to Houston.

REASONS FOR VETO: The majority of people in Clear Lake City are opposed to the bills. Those affected don't want them. Therefore, they should be vetoed. These residents wish to disannex from Houston, and feel that these bills would weaken their efforts. The conference committee never met to work out the differences in the House and Senate versions, but a report was signed nonetheless.

REACTION: Representative Caraway, who represents Clear Lake City, said that the Governor had vetoed this legislation without consulting either him or any of the local elected officials of Clear Lake City. The bills were strictly permissive and could have taken effect only after they were approved by the people. The veto takes away the voters' option to decide for themselves at the polls.

Representative Caraway feels that lobbyists from the City of Houston and other special interests influenced the veto. He said that he is urging the Governor to include disannexation legislation in a call for any special session.

SB 1256 Grant Jones

DIGEST: This bill provides that the state would be liable for damages for a social psychotherapist under contract to the state who is found guilty of negligence or deprivation of a person's constitutional rights.

REASONS FOR VETO: This bill would open the door for the state to be liable for damages incurred by other groups in the future. Social psychotherapists do not need this special treatment.

REACTIONS: Social psychotherapists would be more likely to contract with the state if the state were liable for damages. The state should be responsible for the actions of persons whose services it engages.