

SENATOR HOAGLAND: What is the issue on that one, Senator Schmit?

SENATOR SCHMIT: LB 376 was the issue. The bankers who placed the ad are in opposition to it. They called attention to my support of the bill and asked my constituents to contact me. Would you consider that a political ad?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Sure, I think that is a political ad, yes.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Now if I were to take an ad, suppose some people were to raise some money to buy an ad to refute this, would that be considered a political expenditure?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: To buy an ad to do what, Senator Schmit?

SENATOR SCHMIT: To answer this kind of an ad. To answer the objections that are voiced at 376.

SENATOR HOAGLAND: It would not be a political expenditure under the current law because it is not made to influence a candidates selection or a ballot question.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Do you think, Senator Hoagland, really in your . . . deep in your own heart that this isn't designed to influence the next race in which I am a candidate?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Well only indirectly. I think the principle purpose of that is to bring about the defeat of 376, Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Well for less than a dollar they could have all four written me a letter. They didn't really want to do that you see. They wanted to intimidate me, I believe, by using this ad. So if I respond with a written letter to them and it goes into the waste basket, where I'm sure it would be headed, then what happens, you know. Suppose I change my vote on LB 376, in response to this ad. Surely then the ad would have had political connotations, right?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Oh it is clearly political. I won't argue with that.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Then how is an individual who is elected to office supposed to counteract this activity?

SENATOR HOAGLAND: Well I'm not sure that there is anything wrong with that kind of activity, Senator Schmit.