

our friend who raised the money of course, picked up his cup of coffee and chortled all the way to the bank and the rest of us who simply do not engage in those kinds of fund-raising tactics were left holding the bag. Now, don't lose sight of the fact, ladies and gentlemen, that this is a very simple bill designed to correct that practice. It simply says that money raised for campaigns can be used only for campaigning and for nothing else. Don't let yourselves be manipulated into opposing this very simple bill. Don't let yourselves be manipulated into amending this very simple bill to gut the Sunshine Act or to do a whole variety of other things which I would imagine are contained in the six amendments that are currently on the desk. Now let me just talk for a moment about the implications of the failure to pass LB 134. This is a bill the people of the State of Nebraska want desperately to be passed. Now how do I know? I know because of my long-standing interest in this area and because this is my priority bill. I have talked about this bill at townhall meetings in my district extensively. In the straw votes I have taken among my constituents on two occasions have indicated unanimous support for this bill as written. Now consider the implications if we don't pass this bill or if we use it as a vehicle to gut the entire Sunshine Act as Senator DeCamp's amendments would do. We will be sending a message right back to the people of the State of Nebraska that we think it is all right to have \$30,000 a year legislators, financed 60% with special interest money raised from our friends in the lobby from people who do business before the Legislature on a daily basis. Now, I don't think that is right. I think that most of us don't think that is right and if that is the way this Legislature is going to operate, I don't want to be a part of it. Now during the debates last Friday there was some talk about the meaning of the word "bribery" involving Senator Chambers and Senator Wesely and Senator Newell and others. Now let me attempt to put the word bribery into perspective. Senator Russell Long the former chairman of the Senator Finance Committee stated a few years ago, "There is a hair line's difference between a campaign contribution and a bribe." Now I ask you what happens to that hair line's difference when campaign contributions can be converted directly into personal use without paying taxes on it for matters like mortgage payments and medical bills? Now if our colleague who engaged in those practices was genuinely interested in closing a loophole in the Sunshine Act, why is he opposing a bill that is designed to do just that? Why, instead, is he coming in with his annual amendment which he has offered since 1977 or 1978 like clockwork on a regular basis