

April 25, 1979

LB 495

and then they discuss it twice, don't they? In Omaha?

SENATOR NEWELL: On the city? Yes.

SENATOR SIMON: Okay, that is what I thought. They read it once and then they discuss it twice. I don't know how they do it out in Imperial, but in Omaha at least they do hold three, three public meetings Senator Haberman. Not two but three. I would suggest that that argument really doesn't hold much water. If you felt that strongly about the public meeting and felt that it was too excessive, certainly you could offer an amendment to have one public hearing. I would suggest that that is not the real reason. Have you got a better reason than that one or is that your biggy?

SENATOR HABERMAN: How much time do I have on this next one?

SENATOR SIMON: I'll give you another 30 seconds. I'm looking for a legitimate reason and I haven't heard one yet, from you or anyone else in the cable industry. I thought that maybe you could provide the body with, you know, some legitimate reason.

SENATOR HABERMAN: All right, I'll give you another reason. Senator Newell stated some things that I don't think are quite correct.

SENATOR SIMON: I don't care about Senator Newell, I want to know why you want the amendment?

SENATOR HABERMAN: Because the cable TV industry asked me to propose the amendment, and I'm not ashamed to do that.

SENATOR SIMON: Thank you Senator Haberman. Now we are getting down to the real issue. Nobody even knows why they want the amendment. The cable industry TV doesn't know why they want it. Senator Haberman, who I have given two chances to defend his position, doesn't know why he wants it except that the cable TV wants it. Now that is a noble reason, but I certainly can't support that. I would suggest that there is no thought process going on behind this amendment excluding Senator Haberman who has been gracious enough to offer it. There is no legitimate reason presented before us. It seems a very clear case of over reaction on the part of the cable TV industry. I would suggest that it would seem to me that this body should take a position that we would certainly look at intelligent amendments, well thought out amendments that need to be presented to this body, but in this case there has been proven no justification, no reason whatsoever