

March 18, 1981

LB 446

mayors and city officers is four years. There has been some ambiguity in this area. We struck the new language in Section 30 as to what constitutes electioneering. Finally we reinstated the original language in Section 23 on allowing the public to issue editorials with the Secretary of State's publication of constitutional amendments in the newspaper. We added language that the Secretary of State would issue a disclaimer in the paper that the editorial was not the opinion of the state. Now this is kind of interesting. I am sure you have all seen the ads in the papers that tell you about an amendment, a constitutional amendment that is going to be on the ballot and many times there is sort of an editorial below that telling what it is about from some particular viewpoint, not necessarily that of the state or of any...has anything to do with the Secretary of State's office. These people or organizations who put this information in there do pay for it but what the Secretary of State wants to do is if this is done, an explanation of the amendment is added that it would state who is responsible for it rather than making it look as though the Secretary of State had put it in there himself. I think this is reasonable. There are some additional amendments but I think we should adopt the committee amendments first.

SENATOR CLARK PRESIDING

SENATOR CLARK: Is there any discussion on the committee amendments? If not, all those in favor of adopting the committee amendments vote aye...Senator Vickers.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, I wonder if Senator Kahle would respond to a question please. Senator Kahle, in Section 23 where you are reinstating the stricken language, if I understood your explanation, that on a constitutional amendment when the detailed explanation of the amendment from the editorial point of view, either pro or con, is printed in a paper following the amendment that this is put in by some organization perhaps and by leaving the stricken language in here you would allow that to continue to happen. Is that correct?

SENATOR KAHLE: It could continue to happen but it would have to state who it was put in by and I think we decided that it had to be separated by a line or some other denotion in the paper that it was added to rather than part of.

SENATOR VICKERS: Well if that is the case I guess I am a little curious as to why we just didn't go in and strike the language. If we struck the language in Section 23, then if an organization did want to, in fact, have an editorial on one side or other of the issue, then it probably