

April 29, 1981

LB 134

wrong, it may be good. In fact, it probably is good to involve as many people as possible in the political process. But I think if I had a thousand man hours of time contributed to my campaign, it ought to show up somewhere in the report as such. I don't think there is anything wrong with it. Surely you shouldn't be ashamed of it. If you can encourage that kind of physical support, it shows that the candidate has broad appeal. I don't think there is anything that can be said against this amendment. I am sure you all will support it, and hope that it will become a part of the law.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Clerk, you have an amendment to the amendment, do you?

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Vard Johnson moves to amend the Schmit amendment. (Read the Vard Johnson amendment as found on page 1634 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Vard Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, this is an earnest amendment. Senator Schmit would require us, if his amendment is adopted, to list the names and addresses and reasonable value of contribution made by volunteers who give us more than four hours of their services during a year's time. Now I know when I ran I had a fairly large number of volunteers to provide help here, help there and right on down the line, and it seems to me that my treasurer would have had a very significant bookkeeping operation, in all honesty, if he or she had to account for the large number of volunteers that I had giving small amounts of time. So by my amendment, very simply I am saying if my volunteer gives more than twenty hours, more than twenty hours of work during a year's time, then and only then must that person's name, address and fair value of the contribution be disclosed. I think that is a more reasonable disclosure requirement because it would tend to sift out the volunteer who gives very small amounts of time from those volunteers who give quite significant amounts of time. As you know right now, we do not have to make disclosures of contributions in excess of...or I'm sorry, below \$100, and again we decided to use a sieve, so to speak, to require only disclosures of what we thought were the larger gifts and not require disclosure by name and address of the smaller gifts. I think the same concept surely ought to apply to a time disclosure requirement, that, in fact, if we are to make disclosures of the times people give,