

very next day and give notice of another rate increase?

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: No.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Thank you. Now, I ask you that, we have been tussling, wrestling and agonizing over Initiative 300, the proponents have said, we just got it in the Constitution and now you want to run us through the wringer again, can you imagine the reaction of the public if the Public Service Commission says, no, the rate increase is not justified and according to the amendment given by the good Senator Johnson you must refund the overcharges as of March 25, 1986, and the company says, all right, we will do it, and on March 26, 1986 they file another notice of a rate increase and the process is repeated. Even with Senator Smith's amendment, I think by the time you went back to the constituency, I hope you are listening, ladies and gentlemen, by the time you went back to the constituency and said, we must now come back again and again and again and ask you to sign this petition protesting the rate increase, and so my 81-year-old mother and whom Vard knows and some other people are going to be getting on their high horse and starting to circulate the petitions again, and so we go through the process, and then it is denied and the overcharge is returned, and then the next day again, Senator Johnson, Senator DeCamp, the company can do the same thing again. Now, there ought to be some element of fairness, some degree of equity. I think we all recognize that the resources of the Public Service Commission, the resources of the companies, are not balanced. I would suggest, I would suggest, and there has been some concern and some justifiable concern because of delays on the action, on the part of action of the Public Service Commission, but if we were to spend a small fraction of the money that will come out of the pockets of the ratepayers to allow the Public Service Commission to add some staff and function as we know they can, it would be a far less costly adventure than to allow this process which would be actually the most embarrassing thing, I think, we could do. So while the amendment again, the amendment again makes sense, it does not go far enough, it does not do that which needs to be done to make the bill a workable piece of legislation. I ask you to vote against the amendment, because if you do not do so, you are going to be lulled into complacency and eventually you are going to be in the same position and I have told this story at least twice a year since I have been here, the same position my old friend,