

SENATOR BRASHEAR: Truth is the defense in that instance.

SENATOR BROMM: That's right, I understand that. I understand that. But I suspect that in Ohio, in Ohio, there might be some other remedies for people possibly that we don't have here. Is that a fair s*atement?

SENATOR BRASHEAR: That may be. You would be dependent, in Nebraska, in my judgment at this point in time, on common law and case law, and not upon a specifically, you know, statutorily provided cause of action, but I...

SENATOR BROMM: And we all know that's pretty...

SENATOR BRASHEAR: ...but we need to work on that.

SENATOR BROMM: ...that's pretty weak. And I want to...I am going to support your amendment, and I appreciate you getting on it and getting this done. I think it's...at least it maybe saves the right to require organized groups to identify their literature, which is...which is a positive thing. I am going to relate something, which I think there needs to be redress for, and this happened, this actually happened in an election in the recent past. A businessman ran for an office and the night...the night before the election a piece of literature without any identification, whatsoever, was individually mailed to each registered voter that was going to have a chance to vote in this election in an envelope with no...no return address, and, obviously, totally anonymously, and it recited things about the individual, about his business, that were not true, had no basis in fact, and I can tell you that it appeared to change the results of the election, or have a great impact on it. If not that, it probably could have had some impact on his business, and I can assure you that that individual will never run, never, ever run for public office again, and that is just, you know, inexcusable. And...

SPEAKER WITHEM: One minute.

SENATOR BROMM: ...I know that he asked political accountability to help trace the origin of the mailing, and they expressed a willingness to help with whatever information could be gathered. But they won't even be able to do anything about something like that, I don't think, with this Supreme Court ruling, and I think it lacks common sense, once again. It is another ruling that we