

April 29, 1981

LB 134

SENATOR HEFNER: Senator Haberman, I asked for any objections and you did not object.

SENATOR HABERMAN: Well I am objecting now to any more time being given. I am not picking on any individual senator, Mr. Speaker, I am just saying just blanket it.

SENATOR HEFNER: Okay, thank you for your remarks. Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, members of the body, I rise to oppose the DeCamp amendment and I would like to just speak briefly to Senator DeCamp's opening remarks and also to Senator Beutler's remarks which I think both have created a sense, a great historical sense and a sense of this issue. But I really would like to speak to the issue itself and I think that is really where we ought to concentrate our time and energies at this point in time. The question of McCarthyism really is very very abstractly relevant and hardly relevant at all and I think it is a total misinterpretation to try to draw the analogy between "McCarthyism" which was a political philosophy as other philosophies are, socialism, communism, capitalism, et cetera, but in fact, was a philosophy, a philosophy of an individual which did permeate the government at the time but the question and to try to say that the Sunshine Commission or the Political Accountability and Disclosure Commission is an ism is incorrect. It gives a total misrepresentation to the whole function of that commission. It is not a philosophy of government. It is a check. It is an opportunity for the public, this body and the people of this state to feel secure and know that their government is operating as it was intended to operate, know that there are no abuses in the system. I have regretted like others, that we have gotten very personal in our debate on 134. I think that has been a mistake and I think that is something that I wish would have been avoided because there really is an issue here and that is, does this body need to pass LB 134 to further clarify the law? When you look at the issue as the issue alone, take the personalities out of it, take the historical questions out of it, if you will look only at that issue, the answer is, yes, we do need to further clarify the law. There has been no illegalities but the clarification in the law will certainly provide a clear policy statement to candidates for political office, what isn't intended to be used, what funds are to be used for. That is, in fact, our purpose and it is a good purpose. It is a positive purpose. This Legislature must and should respond to those needs. This clarification is necessary. The proposal that Senator DeCamp offers is, in fact, inadequate and it is offered I think because of the old debate that really things can be done better by