

realize you have just heard the primary argument for anarchy? If you don't want to make laws in the state, if you don't want to make public policy decisions about what is right and what is wrong, we can go that way. We can have total anarchy. That is what you have and it is not Chris Beutler or Peter Hoagland that is going to make the distinctions between personal use and campaign expenditures, it is the Political Accountability Commission. It is everybody on this floor who we have solicited to give their ideas. It is going to be the Legislature next year and the year after that and the people of this state responding to what is happening in the state. This is not our personal thing. This argument reminds me a little bit about the argument on LB 252, the transversion diversion bill. On the one hand you have Senator Chambers and Senator Higgins who are coming from different directions, Senator Higgins saying it doesn't go far enough. Why doesn't it do this, why doesn't it do that? Then on the other side you have those who say it does too much which suggests to me that perhaps the bill does, in fact, have the balance that we hoped it would have. It doesn't solve all the problems but it is a step in the right direction. The bill does not prohibit expenses related to candidacy. There will be an amendment up shortly which was acceptable to all of the introducers and which included a number of items that people felt strongly about that they wanted to find in the bill and we have included them and they include such things as meals, lodging and travel by an officeholder related to his or her candidacy. I don't think that the members of this Legislature and officeholders generally should have an overwhelming fear that all of a sudden the funds are going to be cut off for a number of the uses that they are presently using them for. There are a number of legitimate uses, a number of other items on here which are perfectly acceptable to us, newsletters and other communications of information, a number of types of things. I don't think there is any point in my going through them one by one but I just wanted to...I guess I have a fear that in some people's minds this proposition appears to be radical. This is not radical at all. This is making just the first distinction. It is just saying, "Let's start to try to define what the difference is between a personal use and a campaign use." And I think common sense tells us all that there is a difference and I think common sense tells us that is not the purpose of those funds to spend them for personal uses and we have argued before and I made the point before that disclosure is not enough. Disclosure is not enough in my mind because the widespread use of these funds for uses that are perceived by the public to be personal will result in a reluctance on the part of the public to contribute to all people running for office to the detriment of us all and I