

March 6, 1973

(Start Belt #11)

and some of the rest of them, and they didn't seem to care whether it was on the agenda or not, but the thing was official I guess, is a violation of law in my book, the way I read the law that I introduced a year ago, so I don't, since they really don't care, I wonder what all the smoke is and fire about going further on this. We're not utilizing and neither is the press utilizing what we now have, effectively. I've always been for opening up open meetings, letting the press in closed meetings, but there is a limit to how far I feel we should go. You know you have a lot of different type people in these United States, and if you open some of these closed meetings to them, well you may not even survive the meeting. I mean it seriously, so I think it is about time to call this whole thing a, stop it. The bill wasn't too bad in it's original form, but not it is awful.

SPEAKER: The Chair next recognizes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, and members of the legislature, I can see that this bill is going to have a tortured and agonized existence as it moves from general file across the board to final reading and final passage, and signing by the Governor, but I feel that this body is made up of strong honorable men who are able to withstand the criticism and the opposition and the pressures which are going to be brought to them by special groups who want what they do with reference to the public's business to be conducted in secret and in private. Senator Carpenter pointed out some of the most significant parts of a discussion are the decisions, the developmental discussion that leads to a decision. We need to know what position various public officials are taking on important issues. I think this bill ought to be passed and as for terms let Senator Proud inject it into the discussion like extremist coming to meetings, extremist that's a term by the way which can be used like a hat, you can put it on any head that comes close enough to attach it to, so to a conservative somebody who is not conservative is an extremist, to somebody like me who is not a conservative, Senator Proud is an extremist, but I don't hold grudges either, I think that Senator Proud is acting out of a clean conscience when he votes, when he asked to have this bill killed, but for the rest of the legislature, with nothing to hide, I don't see how they could quite vote to indefinitely postpone this bill, and I think that Senator Proud knows that I'm just engaging in a little fun here this morning, but to be completely serious now, the tone of the discussion seems to me this morning, to indicate that most of the people sitting on public bodies are very shifty runners, that they are not about to conduct public business in public even though there is a law which says that they should. So what I think Senator Proud and others who use terms like conservative and radical should understand is that the term conservative applies in the classical sense to the individual who upholds the law. So when you find an individual who finds a method of skirting the law, because of what he considers to be conservative tendencies he is really being radical in his actions in reference to that particular law. I don't think anybody has the right to say that any part of the public can not attend a meeting, you can set certain rules of decorum and conduct which if they are violated by anybody during the conduct of the meeting, can be ejected or expelled. I think that this bill ought not be indefinitely postponed, all it's doing really is declaring the public policy of the state of Nebraska. The penalty if you can call it that merely is that any formal action or official action taken, in a way that does not comply with this law is void, it would mean that they would have to turn around and come clean and do it properly. This is all Senator Proud that the law does, it is not going to put anybody in jail for violating it, it's not going to make them lose their position, it simply says