

April 3, 1979

LB 143

other individuals from the utility industry and see if perhaps we can work out some agreements but at this time I don't think that we are prepared to do so and I would strongly urge the rejection of the Johnson amendments.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Dworak, do you wish to speak to the Johnson amendment.

SENATOR DWORAK: My short friend back here has been utilizing the microphone, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I reject Senator Johnson's amendment also and I think he gives us a real strong argument to reject the bill. You know it was told to us this bill is the old foot in the door type approach and on down the road we are going to have all these kind of build ons onto this bill and the ink is hardly dry on the bill and we are starting already. Three pages of amendments on the bill and we have been...Senator Simon has assured us that he has got the bill in the shape he wants it and that there would be no further attempts to broaden this particular concept and now here on Select File, not next year, not two years down the road, not five years down the road, but on Select File, the second stage of debate, here comes broad, massive, liberalizations of this type of bill. Now I have got real problems with this bill philosophically. I think it is one of those hidden inflationary costs. I think inflation is the greatest problem facing the United States today and the federal government can't even get its hands...can't even get its hands on it because we have built so many indirect hidden pressures and the list is so long. It is like the catalytic converter on the automobile. It is like the seat belts on the automobile. It is like environmental concerns. It is like chemical restrictions for agriculture, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. These things are all nonproductive and they are all adding cost to the consumer in this country and we can't even tell you how much it cost. There is no accountability for it and that is essentially what this bill is doing. It is adding cost indirectly to ratepayers. If you want legitimate social legislation, then for heaven's sake get a bill devised to do it, assess the cost and stand behind it. But to try to bury these costs, try to put them on the ratepayer indirectly like we are doing with this bill is absolutely wrong. It is a great idea but then to say that a man, a landlord, doesn't pay his bill and we preclude the utility company from shutting him off and force that utility company into expensive litigation, that tab has got to be paid by somebody and the person that is going to pay that tab is going to be the ratepayer and the real cost of that is another handful of