

February 23, 1995 LB 828

SENATOR BRASHEAR: At first blush, Senator Chambers, I've not had the opportunity to hear the entire debate, but at first blush, yes, I may be able to.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And really there is no hook in this. There is nothing hidden. If they are provided these services at less than the cost of providing the service, wouldn't that be a subsidy to these companies in addition to everything else they're getting and that could impinge on the other ratepayers who have to make up for it? In other words, if these companies are not even paying their way, then somebody else has to make it up. So all this amendment does or attempts to do is to prevent that from happening. I don't like LB 828 and what it's doing for other reasons. If we could give consideration to some of the groups that I'm concerned about, then it wouldn't be too difficult for me to go along with 828 because I don't feel as strongly about or against it as I do some of the provisions of 830. But I definitely think it would be wrong if we passed legislation without making it clear that these companies cannot be given these services for less than what it costs to provide them. When we raised the cost of marriage licenses and we say that we want people to get married, people talked about increased costs of administering some of these programs so they raised the cost of something that we desire the public at large to make use of. So we should say at the same time that we're going to make these companies at least pay the amount for what they receive that it costs to provide it to them. If you have any questions I will answer them.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Those wishing to speak to the Chambers amendment, Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I rise in support of the Chambers amendment. It may not be properly drafted, but it was what I discussed earlier with Senator Beutler about the fact that he was saying the IRS rules required be at cost, and the board of directors, it's their intent that it be at cost, but it doesn't say anything in statute that it has to be at cost and one way or the other it would be nice to be able to have that bottom line. And how you determine cost is not easy so this is...I did not offer something because technically I'm not sure quite how you get it done, but the intent of what Senator Chambers is trying to do is something that would ease some of the concerns that I have. I also want to note I passed around for you a 1988 editorial