

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

March 22, 2000 LB 171

agree with that. Senator Kristensen said he didn't like the amendment. I agree with him on that. He said he did like the bill. I disagree with him on that. I think it's a bad bill. Senator Chambers pointed out that this tax breaks has nothing to do with need or, as far as I'm concerned, any other valid basis. I agree with him on that. He did say, however, that he was going to support the amendment. I disagree with him. This is, as far as I'm concerned, an amendment that should be defeated and a bill that should be defeated. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Raikes. On the Raikes...excuse me, on the Wickersham amendment, Senator Wickersham.

SENATOR WICKERSHAM: Mr. President, members of the body, I feel chastened, not chaste, chastened that Senator Kristensen would represent to you that there is no intellectual basis for the amendment that I'm bringing to you. (Laughter) I don't know whether he's indicating that I have lost my wits or I never had any to start with. But I think there is, as I've indicated, an intellectual basis for the amendment and that was the basis drawn by Senator Kristensen himself. Now you can argue about whether it's a county of 100,000 that indicates that there's an adequate base for a broadcaster to sell advertising and to recover part of the cost, although I doubt that they recover most of this cost through local advertising. I think they receive significant revenues from the national broadcasting systems. But, at any rate, 100,000 population seemed to me as good an indicator as any of what kind of a market area might be able to sustain the kind of costs that are going to be involved in the conversion to digital. The other perfectly rational basis for bringing this amendment is simply to cut its...to cut the cost of the bill and, if you've...if you've noticed, there is now a revised fiscal note for this bill and, if you look at your sheet, you'll see that the cost is extended a bit in the...on the sheet. The sheet is indicating that over three years this bill would cost us \$1.8 million. Now, you don't see that cost up there in the appropriations section, this hasn't got an A bill attached to it, but the sheet shows that this bill, in its present form, costs us \$1.8 million and, in fact, I think it will cost us more than \$1.8 million because if you remember on General File Senator Kristensen had submitted