

aggregates. I would simply...I would simply ask you to reject this amendment. I think it is something that we need to possibly look at down the road again as we move our way into stronger campaign financing laws. I think we are going to see work in this area for a number of years to come, and this is only the first...the first volley, I think, in a war to come in the future on campaign finance limitations because I think you are going to see the public demanding this more and more all along. But I think that in order for us to get on deck and have something in place, I think that we should reject this amendment by Senator Ashford, and then proceed with LB 556 as it is written right now and has been amended by Senator Chambers. With that, I would urge you to reject the amendment. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MOUL: Thank you, Speaker Baack. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Madam President and members. I want to commend Senator Ashford. He has worked long and hard on the campaign finance reform, and I think his sincerity and integrity on this is to be commended. I tend to agree with his philosophy. I have introduced similar types of legislation in the past, and when I introduced those bills, Senator Conway and some other members of the Government Committee used to give me quite a hard time because they felt that the limits I was proposing simply would not work, that other ways would be found around them. And I guess over a period of time in some ways, I have come to the same sort of an agreement. I hate to admit that because I do tend to agree with Senator Ashford. Limits on individual contributions, and like I said, I would rather not have corporate contributions made and all types of other ideas that I have proposed, and Senator Ashford and others have proposed appeal to me, but I guess I am wondering, I still not want to throw it out completely but I would hope, perhaps, one way to approach this would be to have this amendment and concept looked at on Select File with a little more time. My thinking is this that I have seen at the federal level there are certain limitations put on individuals. I think it is \$1,000 per individual, but what happens then is an individual has both, a husband and wife, the two spouses, both give 1,000 each, and that is allowed. So that is 2,000, and then there is other activities that bundle together contributions, and though corporate contributions aren't allowed, corporate executives find ways to get money into different campaigns. And, likewise, at the local level, it seems like whatever restrictions we put