

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 11, 2002 LB 707

the contention that the limits we have are based upon a realistic analysis of what has occurred or what needs to occur in order to reach particular constituencies. I would suggest to you that if these limits are not acceptable, I certainly think increasing limits is one of my objections. We've got a bill that was passed in 1992. We didn't have any money in the fund. Nobody did anything until the fund aggregates \$300,000, but nobody keeps the thing up to date. It's like the more we can dampen down, the tougher we can make it, the purer will be our process. It's simply not true, and we all know it's not true. It's not aiding the process; it's not energizing or invigorating the process. People aren't being drawn to the process. We haven't...I...I don't know of people who have said, oh, I have no money, and I can't raise any money. Of course, we...we have people who will say they don't have any money and can't raise any money and don't need any money. But to say you...I have no money, I can't raise any money, but I want to serve and the CFLA has made it possible, that's not real. And I'm sorry that Senator Bromm, but he acknowledged that there may have been some facts he didn't have, and I would like to respectfully suggest there were, was not taken with the approach in the Ferlic race. And I will tell you, it's my experience in being associated with that race, and then when I saw what the Accountability and Disclosure Commission did not do in the face of an absolute admitted violation that strengthened my resolve to handle this bill this session this way. In the Ferlic race, you're asking somebody, who I happen to believe had credentials, the voters must have agreed because they switched from being 2 to 1 against to 60 percent in favor, you're asking somebody to run against an entrenched, long-time public officeholder, long-time Regent among 200,000 people, one-eighth of the state, and you're saying to them that if you don't agree to do it for \$50,000...now we in the Legislature, we get \$73,000, and we only talk to, what, 34,000 constituents? You have 200,000 constituents you have to reach. We get \$73,000, but because we've got a poorly crafted kind of botched-up law that we don't update and we can't afford you have to abide by the limit we stuck in, in 1992, for \$50,000. And if you can't take that incumbent out with your message at \$50,000...

SENATOR DIERKS: One minute.