

and I certainly would oppose the Haberman amendment.

PRESIDENT: Chair recognizes Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Well I would rise again to defend the amendment that I put on. I would like to address the two public meeting issue that seems to be Senator Haberman's big one, although he didn't bring in an amendment to say just one public meeting. I think that Senator Simon identified the concepts there and that simply is that you can not introduce a resolution and pass it in the same night at the same meeting. Now most municipalities that I am aware of have a three step process for the passage of ordinance, introduction, public hearing and passage. What the amendment says is that it didn't go that far, it just says that it has to be acted on at two public meetings. Introduction at one public meeting and comment and passage at the second. That does not seem to me to be so burdensome or unreasonable. It would be just like the requirement here that you could not introduce a bill and have a committee hearing and pass it on Final Reading all on one day. We outlaw in our rules certain time periods that things should be acted upon. I do not believe that the cable industry, nor local city councils would object to having a certain distance between introduction and final action. I guess we ought to ask ourselves what are the alternatives to this amendment. What this says is there will be local control, but there must be a public hearing on rate increases. Now some people have indicated that the local subdivisions, the local city councils really don't want to deal with cable TV. But I don't think that they have come to this legislature and have asked for state control. I don't think that they have asked for regulation by the Public Service Commission. I would doubt if the cable TV industry would want any sort of oversight at the state level. I think that cable TV wants to have local franchises but then they don't want to have any local regulation. If the city councils do not want this responsibility, they should ask the state to take it over. They should not have the responsibility and then refuse to assume any sort of duties. The amendment is very simple. It simply says that there must be public hearing on rate increases and notice to customers of those rate increases. Now that simply does not seem to be too much to ask for. I know that a bunch of your local cable TV people have come in and said, oh, we have a fine cozy relationship back home. But I would suggest, based on what Senator Dworak has said and what others have said, that that relationship is not as cozy as they would like us to believe. That there is concern about rates. After I introduced my amendment I got a letter from someone in Omaha who works with the