

March 6, 1973

that any action taken under circumstances that do not conform to this law will be void and they will have to turn around and do it properly, therefore I don't see the bill as being a danger or threat to anybody, and we must remember at all times, that public bodies are to serve the public. The public has the right to know what public officials are doing, even if law suits are to be considered, if there is a cost involved, the public ultimately may have to bear it, so the public should know what it's servants are doing, therefore, I'm against Senator Proud's motion to indefinitely postpone the bill.

SPEAKER: The Chair next recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, members of the legislature, this is a bill I'm highly concerned with and since I've heard Senator Syas talk during the last three years about being the pioneer of the open meeting law, I would like to discuss the actual origins and history of this law, and how it came to be where it is today, back in 1967, I believe the legislature had a program with the University of Nebraska Law School, and that program involved various students at the law school working or assigned to particular Senators here. I think it is a program that we should have now, but anyway, this program had these students work with specific Senators on specific legislation. One of those students was myself back then, and I was assigned to work with a guy named Senator Eugene Mahoney. At that time Senator Eugene Mahoney had an open meeting law, which he was attempting to get through the legislature and he needed research done on it. I and a number of other students over there worked on it and we went to the committee hearing and at the committee hearing it was determined after enough testimony that there was strong support for the bill, but there was violent opposition also. Senator Carpenter, who was the Chairman of that committee took three or four of the major parties involved in it, took them out in the hall and said look, the only way you are going to get an open meeting law is to put in there an executive session provision so that they can go into executive session at any time. We pointed out to Senator Carpenter then that 37 states at least back in 1967 had already adopted an open meeting laws and the majority of those didn't have to have the executive session provision. He said that's fine, but in Nebraska in 1967 if you want to get a bill through you're going to have to put that in. That compromise was made, the executive session was put in and the hope was that ultimately the bill would reach it's pure form, which would allow the public and the press to be at any public meeting. Now the objections are raised here as they were back then as they were in other states, that golly this open meeting stuff was going to prevent anybody from going out to coffee, it's going to prevent a couple of members from getting together and discussing business, it's going to do all these terrible things, and going to actually retard public information. It hasn't done that yet in Nebraska, thus far at least, and I have no reason to believe it will. If anybody will read the bill very carefully, they'll see it does not prevent this in any way, that is deals specifically with public meetings as advertised by law, and all this would do, would make the actions at that public meeting, more available to the public, and so the objection about being afraid to go to coffee, or being afraid to discuss something in private with another person falls completely flat. The bill as it is now, or as it is proposed, is essentially the same as most other states have and has worked out very well in those states. I see no reason why Nebraska people, citizens should receive less information about what happens by their Government officials than the people of other states, and so I would urge you to adopt the bill.

SPEAKER: We have one more, we have one more person waiting to be heard on this particular motion to indefinitely postpone, but before we do that the Chair wants to break into the debate here, and I apologize in a way for doing this, but we do have