

May 21, 1979

LR 30

minutes of my closing.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, how much time remains to Senator Newell?

SPEAKER MARVEL: I would say two and a half minutes Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. I'm sorry I wasn't here when the debate started but I had an appointment with the Governor that was set up earlier in the day and I didn't want to miss that. I think that in the same way, members of the Legislature, that Senator Fowler and I on LR 43 which dealt with Nebraska investments and companies that deal with South Africa was submitted and subjected to a public hearing, resolutions that relate to constitutional amendments certainly ought to have that same public scrutiny. I believe that at the time that resolution by Senator Fowler and I was introduced, I could have stood on this floor and embarrassed and humiliated the legislature to such an extent that if you were inclined not to support withdrawing support from South Africa to save face you would have voted for the resolution. But, we were not trying to hasten something through the body to say that we have a resolution that passed the legislature. We wanted the public to be educated as to the seriousness of the issue, why such a resolution is in point and why the state ought to act in a certain way. When agreements have been made that a resolution like LR 30 would be subjected to a public hearing and some of us notified people that when the hearing occurred we would tell them and then have it come out in this fashion it is somewhat of the sleight of hand game. Now the day that the Executive Board voted this out I happened to have been out of the state but I was not playing or vacationing, I was dealing with the United States Army and their mistreatment of a National Guardsman from this state. Consequently I was not able to argue with the Executive Board on this particular move that they were going to make. I think that the resolution ought to be referred to a committee and I think that there should be a public hearing. Just one other point. I don't know whether they stated on the floor in my absence that this would give too much representation to a certain interest. But the US Constitution gives one state at least three votes in the Senate right now. Every state has two senators. The Vice President is the President of the Senate and the US Constitution gives to the Vice President a vote in all cases where the members are evenly divided. Yet nobody says, amend the Constitution to take that third vote away from whichever state sends the Vice President. So, I have to tell you the way I view this, the way I view this it is a move to deny