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

May 31, 2005 LB 645

amendment to the committee amendment, please?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Just very briefly, Mr. President, this is one of those issues that has been discussed through some of my amendments, and this one simply says "Strike section 5." But so that the body or at least that portion who might be interested will be aware of what this is, it relates to a prohibition against certain public entities getting involved in the kind of telecommunications activity that the bill relates to. This is an amendment that I'm very serious about, and I think, Mr. President, that explains what the amendment is. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. You've heard descriptions of what is contained in the amendments, and the bill, and the committee amendment. (Visitors introduced.) On with discussion of LB 645. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator Cudaback, members of the Legislature. I'm sure a portion of what Senator Brashear would like to do here should be done, but the broadness of this bill is just mind-boggling. And I want to get into some of the areas here and inquire with Senator Brashear again, for some additional information. Brashear...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Brashear, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Yes, Mr. President, I will yield.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator, I was not aware of and have now become aware of the sections of statute, part of which you are repealing, and it's called County Telephone Systems. And it provides for a mechanism by which a county can have an election, and a county can levy a tax, and basically a county can have its own telephone system. And this set of statutes apparently has been used for a large number of years, in terms of being a form of leverage, or at least a backup kind of set of provisions that could be used, if a county ever thought its service was so bad that they wanted to have a public telephone system. Sounds odd to us now. This set of statutes, to my knowledge, has never been used. If this kind of public prerogative can be in statute