

January 2, 1974

SENATOR RICHENDIFER: Yes.

SENATOR NORE: Is this taking away any of the income from our local newspapers?

SENATOR RICHENDIFER: How much?

SENATOR NORE: Is it taking new...is it taking away income from the papers?

SENATOR RICHENDIFER: Oh yes, definitely.

SENATOR NORE: Then I am opposed to it

(end belt # 15)

(start belt #16)

for the reasons, without a doubt you were distracted there, and I won't repeat it.

SENATOR RICHENDIFER: Well I think that you probably misunderstood this Senator Nore. The original bill eliminates any publication of salaries except an aggregate amount. Mine makes it mandatory once a year. So actually what the bill is taking away I am giving them back once a year, in my amendment. Now as far as the bill is concerned, the whole bill, the purpose of the bill was to eliminate the publication of the salaries once a month. The total list. But my amendments make it mandatory once a year, this is what you might call a compromise.

PRESIDENT: We are still discussing the Richendifer amendment to LB377. Chair recognizes Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DE CAMP: Mr. President, members of the legislature just some background on this particular bill. It was put out here by the committee I think with the understanding that Senator Simpson would have a particular amendment which would only deal with Lancaster County and which most of us would be inclined to support. One of the things brought up in the committee as I recall was exactly what Senator Nore pointed out that a lot of the small town newspapers and whether you like to admit it or not they are very important to our rural areas. It may be the only source of news of the small towns that we have. A bill like this and a lot of others would throw a real monkey wrench into their operation. You can call it subsidizing them or you can call it whatever you want but they are important enough that we have to do what is necessary to keep them alive. So it would cut a tremendous amount of money that these small town newspapers are now receiving. But it is not just a one way street. There are a lot of benefits that we in the country are receiving from the publication of this information. Maybe it isn't so much the practice in the city but I would guess that up in my area of the country probably 5 or 7 out of every 10 people read very thoroughly that budget as it comes out in the paper. They know how much the engineer, the surveyor, and how much everybody is getting and it gives us a very effective control over what is happening in our local government. So if Senator Richendifer wishes to withdraw his amendment and if we can go with the original Simpson amendment then I would be inclined to support the bill as it was understood in committee that it would be done. But with the Richendifer amendment you would effectively wipe out about 11/12ths of the information that is now being published and thereby a great amount of the income.