

February 16, 1984

LB 675

other is currently wrestling with the idea of continuing headquarters in our state. These letters explain, much more eloquently than I, the need for LB 675. I've also distributed a copy of the Revenue Committee statement on this bill because prior to the public hearing it was suggested that I verify the fact that the new language in 675 would not impair any current local use of this section by any city. So I asked the League of Nebraska Municipalities to examine the bill and, if that was an issue, to attend the hearing in opposition, but they are not listed on your statement. In another separate handout is a copy of an article that appeared for some unknown reason yesterday in only the metropolitan edition of the Omaha World Herald. As I read it, it says that Omaha probably will not implement those two ordinances, with a big if. I'll leave it up to you to finish that sentence. But very frankly I am more concerned about what the article doesn't say. It doesn't say that such ordinances won't surface next year in Omaha, or Scottsbluff, or Grand Island, or Norfolk. But LB 675 does. This bill should be considered by the body at large. I urge the adoption of the motion. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I have to rise in admiration to Senator Fenger in the defense and promotion of his bill. I am fully aware that he has many constituents in his district that live there and work in Omaha. I am quite sure that the pressures have been extremely great on him to do something. For that, Senator Fenger, we do take our hats off to you. I rise to oppose the motion on behalf of the committee action. I do this with the explanation that generally the committee felt, inasmuch as Omaha was governed by a home rule charter, that legislation in the area that this involves was somewhat of an infringement upon that charter, and that we should perhaps keep our hands off and not deal with it. I think that you will also notice, from the committee statement, the vote of the committee, that there were six for the indefinite postponement, there was one abstention, and one