

law, they might be considered lobbyists, they might have to file reports. There would be many people, many organizations that I think would violate this law unknowingly, again, nationally based organizations. National Federation of Independent Business Men, for example, I think does a lot of work. National chambers of commerce, national...all sorts of national organizations would be soliciting money in Nebraska and would be using that money to influence Nebraskans on political issues. So I think that this needs a public hearing. It needs some consideration and I think again this amendment to 134 should be rejected. There are some real dangers for variety of political organizations. Political parties as well may suddenly be called upon to register as lobbyists in Nebraska. National congressional committees of each party may be required to register as lobbyists, because all of those organizations are involved in soliciting money in Nebraska and do use that money and I am sure more than a thousand dollars of that money to influence political issues in our state. So with that, I think we should reject this amendment and, Senator Schmit, it may be best to bring in a separate bill that could have a full hearing so we really understand who we are asking to report and what we are asking them to report and not create such a broad situation that people may be violating the law without knowing it.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Labeledz. Senator Dworak.

SENATOR DWORAK: Mr. Speaker and colleagues, without having this amendment in front of us and not having had a lot of time to think about it, I have been listening to the debate and I feel at this point like Senator Fowler that it is premature at this time to put something as far-reaching as this amendment on without further discussion, without even having this amendment in front of us. You know, I am reminded about when I carried the public radio bill, an organization in Norfolk or an individual, and I don't know which, put in a full page ad in the Columbus Telegram and several other papers opposing my position on that particular issue. Now I think they had every right to do that. I really do. And I don't really think that I need to try and stifle their voice in any way even though it was in opposition of the position I held on that particular issue. Certainly I didn't feel very good about it and I would have just as soon not seen it in my paper, but I think they have the right to do that. I think if anything in this country today the problem we have is not too much public involvement, but not enough public involvement. I, personally, would like to see the