

in this Legislature is in the tradition of the great American movie. It always has a happy ending for the majority, one way or another, for the majority it is a happy ending. So at least we can have some consolation in that, but I think that yesterday was an unfortunate interlude in the discussion of a public policy on this bill. It obviously got into personalities and I think it does us no further good to continue that sort of debate and it certainly does not do the development of public policy any good or the people of the state any good. And so I hope today that we can return to a stable and rational discussion of the pros and cons of the different ideas that were floating around in this general area and specifically, the ideas that are in LB 134. And I would like to say that for my part and I think for most everybody involved in the bill, that the bill really doesn't have to do with the impugning of anyone's character, of any one individual's character, nor the character of politicians in general. All of the bills that we have before this Legislature, regardless of the subject, derive from a fact situation. If you don't like the law that governs the University of Nebraska it probably has to do with the fact that you have viewed a fact situation here or there and you believe that there could be a better public policy in that area and you come into the Legislature and you propose a bill. That is the natural course of things in the Legislature. That is the way we identify problems and solve problems and that is exactly what is happening here. It is no different than anything else. If we were not following that process then Senator Clark would be asking his question, "If it is not broken, why fix it?" You have to perceive that something should be different before you proceed to change it. Rather than being the impugning of character of any one individual or of politicians generally, I suggest to you that the bill is for the protection of politicians more than for the protection of the public. It is attempting to better define some vagaries in the law. Again, I wouldn't try to persuade you that it settles all the situations. Obviously it does not, although with an amendment that Senator Lowell Johnson is proposing when we get to it and I hope we do get to it, five or six of the most important situations that have concerned people and that I have heard on floor debate are addressed and are specifically identified as situations for which it is okay to spend campaign monies. But the point I am trying to make is that by drawing a line in the sand and saying this is personal expense and this is campaign expense, we help the politician. Then he is able to do things with a clear conscience knowing that it is all right that it be done and not having to worry about either legal action or worse than, moral approbation which is undeserved and I think if there is anything that we should learn from the example of last year, it is that a person, a politician,