

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 13, 2006 LB 872

SENATOR SCHROCK: Senator Chambers, I would prefer the first choice, where we make an effort to lower emissions, even if it costs us more money. But I would prefer something rational, that would keep our people in business, with the understanding that in the future, you need to be cleaner.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, do you think it's rational to say that we're going to let one polluter take up 80 percent of what is allowed, and another only 20 percent? Shouldn't we do something about actually reducing the amount of pollution...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...by that 80 percent contributor, so that overall, the environment is improved?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Yes, we should, Senator Chambers. And I assume the polluter is going to pay dearly for that trading program, and the person that is emitting clean air is going to receive dearly from the polluter, so there's going to...that's the incentive. So everybody is going to try and get their emissions down.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But Senator Schrock, it will be cheaper for the polluter to buy slack than it would be to install devices or modify the plant to reduce the pollution; isn't that true?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Not necessarily. That's going to get pretty expensive in the future, and with this program, there's going to be incentives for them to reduce emissions. I believe that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: But that's not the case now, because it's cheaper to trade and pay whatever you have to than it is to reduce the pollution; isn't that true?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well, in this case, it might be cheaper to trade than to shut the plant down. But eventually, they're going to...you know, these plants get retrofitted every so often. A lot of time...