

March 16, 1982

LB 854

CLERK: Mr. President, 854 was a bill introduced by Senator Fowler. (Read title.) The bill was read on January 18th of this year. It was referred to the Government Committee for public hearing. The bill was advanced to General File. Mr. President, there are Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee amendments pending.

SENATOR LAMB: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. President, I move the committee amendments and the committee amendments are a little bit hard to explain unless you know what we are talking about in the bill. This bill deals with a special channel for those who have a hearing defect and what the amendment does, instead of providing just one channel which I am sure Senator Fowler will explain how they get that channel, we would have two channels available for use...for special use especially on ETV. I guess it could be done on other channels, too, but we had a hearing on this bill and as explained to us actually what the second channel could be used for and what was alluded to in the hearing was it could be used for agricultural uses. In other words, it is possible at some future date that a special channel could be hooked to AGNET which provides information for agriculture. And there is some argument, and I am sure Senator Fowler is going to talk about this, that now if you want to use AGNET and have a computer system you need a telephone system. And, of course, there was objection from telephone companies for adding this extra channel but it would provide and the idea in the future, it is nothing definite at this time, would be that it could be used for a number of things but one would be for agricultural purposes. So I move for the adoption of the amendment.

SENATOR LAMB? Senator Fowler, on the committee amendment.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, I find myself in somewhat of an awkward situation of indicating that I am going to vote against the committee amendment, not because maybe it isn't a bad concept but at this time there are some in the communications industry, the telephone communications industry that thinks that the language in the committee amendment may be overly broad as far as its grant of authority and they feel that in fact a separate bill should be brought in for use of the second channel. They have no objection to the original bill which would take one of these communication channels off this technology, and I will explain this technology at some point, but they do feel that the second authorization for a second channel at a future date may be a little broad and for that reason I am going to vote against the committee amendment believing that the most important thing right now