

SENATOR ASHFORD: By statute.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: No.

SENATOR ASHFORD: Okay, thanks.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay.

SENATOR ASHFORD: That's all I...that's a good answer. Sometimes I'm not sure where some of these arguments are coming from. Well, you didn't...if you start out your argument saying that you don't support campaign limits, and I think it's that at least influences, to some degree, how you...one would look at your arguments. I think that any piece of legislation that we pass, obviously, is not perfect, and this isn't perfect. It's come a substantial ways from nothing. Nebraska was one of the...has been and continues to be, until this bill passes, one of the few states in the nation that has no campaign reform legislation whatsoever. And what Senator Baack did, in his initial bill, was to place limitations on campaign spending in the only way that was available to us to do under Buckley v. Valeo. it was the only available method of putting limitations on spending, and that is to include some type of public spending component with it. And that's why the bill is the way it is. And Senator Baack, I'm sure if the Buckley v. Valeo standard was not there, we could have made a more strict and tougher campaign spending law. But the fact that the Constitution, at least as interpreted by this Supreme Court, does not grant us the opportunity to do that, I think we've done as best we can do. And I applaud Senator Baack for doing that. I think it does create a limitation, it does create...having looked at that and having thought about this, I think it does create a limitation that we impose on ourselves. If we go over the \$50,000 limit for campaigns for Legislature, at least the Legislature has recognized that as a limitations, and provides for public expenditures to the opponent, if you go above that amount. I think that's a reasonable, certainly under the laws as it is today, the only reasonable way to react to the problem. The aggregates will make a difference. A \$25,000 aggregate limitation on PAC's, and corporations, and associations lumped into one group will make a difference. It will limit the spending by PAC's, and corporations, and individuals, individual trade associations. It won't wipe it out. It won't put it down to zero, but that is not reasonable either. I think what we