

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lindsay would move to amend, AM4299. (Lindsay amendment can be found on pages 2149-52 of the Legislative Journal.)

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members, this amendment, AM4299, you should have on your desk. It is LB 529, which with the Campaign Committee Income Tax Act. That was advanced to Select File, it's a Speaker priority later on in the agenda. Obviously we're not going to get to it. It does sort of go hand-in-hand with Senator Baack's bill, but in another manner it's somewhat different, and that is that it's intended, as a revenue bill, it would, if campaign expenditures exceeded those levels, it would result in revenue to the state. A taxing the politicians sort of approach. The bill is...is the same as what we had at Select File when it was advanced with two exceptions, and that is what is now Section 15 allows deductions to take care of concerns that Senators Nelson, Byars, and Wesely had. It allows deductions for those items, and those items are travel that an incumbent incurs as a result of being an incumbent, number two, the seminars, meetings, magazines, books, et cetera that Senator Nelson talked about, and third, Senator Byars raised concerns about legal fees as a result of election contests. And so those three deductions would be allowed. In addition to that, any loan repayment and interest on such loan would also be deducted. And the reason for that, and there was one drafting error, that one part didn't get struck when it was...when it was put back together. And I'll be offering an amendment to the amendment just to clear that up. And that ...the third one is that any loan repayment would also be deducted from the...from the amount of income. The second change is in Section 13. And Senator Byars, I believe, requested and received an Attorney General's Opinion which relied on Buckley v. Valeo. a Supreme Court decision, U.S. Supreme Court decision, regarding campaign limitations. Now Buckley v. Valeo decided that you cannot put limits on spending. It also talked about the area of free speech. The Attorney General's Opinion said because of what was Section 2 of the bill, which has been replaced in this with Section 13, it relied simply on the legislative findings to say that there were problems with the bill. This corrects the problem set forth in that AGO. The...what it sets forth is what the legislative intent is in adopting this portion of the bill, and that is that