

March 12, 1974

so the committee decided to go ahead and put both bills on the floor and let the Legislature deal with them. I was opposed to both of them, I'm glad to see that the Legislature is acting in a wise fashion this afternoon, and Senator Syas, with whom I often agree, but with whom I often disagree, sounded like a very elequent spokesman for the reich today wouldn't you say, SEnator Barnett, you articulated the best opinions of the government committee. And I think that this bill should be killed. It is unworkable. It won't accomplish what is desired. And I'm going to say now, what I said this morning. Before you can have clean political campaigns, you have to have clean people running. If something is not done about a person's ethics, ab out the ethics of politics, these kind of bills are like tossing a pebble into the Pacific ocean and hoping to alter them by the movement of the tides, it cannot be done. This bill will not accomplish anything worthwhile and I think it should be killed.

PRESIDENT: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President and members of the Legislature. I think this Legislature would come to regret killing this bill, and this Legislature should regret killing the amendments of Senator Kelly proposed. His amendments would have made the bill much more workable. Senator Syas objected to a Section. Section 8. Senator Kelly and his amendments had that changed. He developed the amendments to try and make the plan more workable based upon objections raised in the committee. But publically every politican claims they have nothing to hid as far as campaign spending and campaign contributions. This bill would prove that fact. It is not a difficult process, and a smart campaign would be keeping these sorts of political records anyway. The public is demanding a cleaning up and openness of political campaigns. Senator Syas says that we need a good disclosure bill. I can't think of any better disclosure bill than to take the candidates own account and make that available to public inspection. Some people seem to feel that these sorts of laws have no value. That if a person is going to commit a crime, indeed they will do so whether or not we try and find through these sorts of disclosure methods. I'd say that in the case of Watergate, which is course is one of the reasons that there is so much interest in campaign disclosure and tightening of laws with regards to campaign contributions. There is a Federal Disclosure Law that lead to much of the information that lead to the discovery of many of the incidents. Without this of reporting and requiring of reporting those who are unethical would not be able to be drawn out during the course of the campaign. So I think that SENator Kelly's bill is a very simple bill. It gets the information that we need. I think it would have value in separating ethical from unethical politicians. So I would oppose the motion to kill it.

PRESIDENT: WE are still debating the motion to indefinitely postpone Senator Nore next to speak.

SENATOR NORE: Mr. President and members I would oppose the indefinite postponement of this desclosure of this bill. I think it can be worked over so that to the satisfaction of everyone. There is only one area that I am wondering about. What kind of an impact would this have on the Secretary of State's Office, if everyone in the State of Nebraska..how many thousands of people. How many thousands of pieces of mail would they be getting weekly. And how many PTE's or equivalents, or full time