

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

May 26, 2005

LB 645

but yet if you go to Section 4 there is specific authorization to use Internet or telecommunication services, any form, for its own uses. So my question is, if it's not an expansion, then...well, is it expansion or is it expansion? Are they already authorized in statute to do this sort of thing for own use? And if so, why do you need this section? But I'm not particularly bothered with it, except to point it out, and to me it means that it's sort of maybe a double statement but clearly the Section 5 language on restrict or expand should not mean that companies or public power suppliers, if they're not presently authorized to do this sort of thing for their own use, would not, therefore, in the future be restricted from their own use. Okay. So tortured, I understand. The second thing I think Senator Chambers pointed out about the idea here is that if you talk about putting a ban on services that are currently legal or currently, yeah, currently legal, is there anything in the set? If you restrict public power suppliers, for example, from providing retail services, is there any way that they can legally do that now anyway, so what's the need for the ban? I guess I'm told in that connection that home rule charter cities or entities, for this...for those types of entities, this is in fact a legitimate ban because currently, with the resolution by a city council, without this Section 5, they would be allowed to provide telecom services. A final thing refers to the subsection (2) and there it says that a public power supplier shall not provide on any basis broadband services. I guess I'd just like to make it clear for someone who might like to comment, power suppliers, for example, have poles and so a telecom provider may contract with a power company to hang wires on the poles. So I'm assuming that that language would not mean that a public power company could not agree to provide poles, if you will, for a private company, or in fact I don't know how far you might go with that,...

SENATOR CUDABACK: One minute.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...but I am assuming all of that would be within bounds in terms of what this section would say. So I point those out for purposes of discussion. I don't see a problem with it, but I think maybe it's worth pointing out that there is in fact some legitimacy to the ban with home rule