

February 26, 1979

LB 316

problem and abdicate our responsibility to the courts to finish our job. If we want a general right of privacy law, let's work on Senator Landis' bill, LB 394, which is still in the Judiciary Committee, and with some amendments, perhaps would have a good chance of coming up and perhaps we'd pass this law but let's not throw it into LB 316. It has been said on this floor you can do anything you want as long as you have 25 votes and I guess that is true. However, we are a Unicameral with a small membership and it is flexible, but by the same token, we should be accountable, I think we should carefully guard the amendments we enact, and if we do this, we certainly will get cleaner legislation. I ask you to support my amendment. It will grant privacy to the lady and will not harm the bill. A few days ago several of you were dismayed at some of the amendments thrown in recklessly. There were newspaper articles about it. Senator Landis was concerned. Senator Chambers was concerned and there were two or three others but here we are with a sensitive measure and throwing in a general right of privacy law. Let's think again. Let's have a look. I urge you to support my little amendment to LB 316. In all fairness, Senator DeCamp mentioned it the other day but the true impact was not emphasized at that time. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The discussion is on the Nichol amendment to 316 found in the Journal on page 620. The Chair recognizes first Senator Beutler and then Senator DeCamp. Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I would like to support Senator Nichol's amendment. I believe that the Legislature really does have a public image problem with the public of the State of Nebraska and I believe a part of the reason for that problem is that the Legislature is not perceived to deal directly and forthrightly with all issues. Last year while I was campaigning I heard a number of times about the process of gutting bills. This is not exactly gutting a bill but I think that it is processes like the gutting of bills and like piggybacking unrelated subjects onto bills that is doing us a great deal of damage in the eyes of the public. I think that we are going to have to show the public that we have respect for our own processes and our processes provide for public hearings and for dealing with substantive matters directly and I think that should be done in this case. I think we have to have more respect for our own processes. I think we have to resist backdoor provisions into unrelated subject matter even when we are philosophically inclined to support the provision that is