

November 11, 1982

LB 1

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: I call the question.

SENATOR LAMB: The question has been called for. Do we have five seconds? I see five seconds. Those in support of ceasing debated vote aye, those opposed no. Have you all voted? Record, please.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 7 nays to cease debate, Mr. President.

SENATOR LAMB: Debate has ceased. Senator Cullan, you may close.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I guess I am a little disappointed with the implication made by some and the direct comments made by others that this was an attempt to in any way diminish at all the openness of the Nebraska Legislature. Some talked about returning to smoke filled rooms, something like that. I don't think Maurice Kremer who has been an institution in this Legislature for years would advocate that and he signed the amendment. I don't think Bob Clark or Larry Stoney or Carol Pirsch or Cal Carsten or Merle VonMinden or Rex Haberman or Bill Nichol or Howard Peterson or Elroy Hefner or Lowell Johnson or Dick Peterson or George Fenger or Harry Chronister or Sharon Apking or Emil Beyer or Don Wagner or Wiley Remmers or Harold Sieck or Walt Duda believe that we should have a less open Legislature. I think they believe this is a change that would be better for this institution. I think they believe it is a change which is necessary and appropriate at this particular time before we start the legislative session. We will maintain an open Legislature whether we have Educational Television service or not, and I have not criticized the content of the Educational Television programs that have been offered in the last several years. I simply make the point that in the process of deciding what you condense into a half hour there are decisions made as to what is important and what is not important and that is inevitable. Those decisions affect what the public is shown and to the limited extent that this program is watched, those decisions affect public opinion, and I as a matter of philosophy do not believe that public funds ought to be involved in that particular purpose. Secondly, I have never attempted to nor will I ever attempt to in any way, shape or form regulate what the media, public or private, in the State of Nebraska shows, but I do not believe it is necessary for us to fund continual gavel to gavel coverage of the Nebraska Legislature. If private industry wants to fund continual gavel to gavel coverage of the Legislature, the commercial networks want to do that, that is up to them, but I believe it is not necessary from the public pocketbook. I do think there are some things that we can do with \$73,000 that are of more importance to the State of Nebraska than Educational Television coverage. I think some of this money could be used for the Supreme Court to lessen the impact on the judiciary that we have made in the current budget proposals, and I also think perhaps some of it could be used for mental retardation programs. So we have a philosophical choice before us. I would urge you personally to adopt this amendment and I appreciate the support of all the 21 individuals who

00064