

this is an issue that unless we deal with all contractors in a uniform manner, the potential is there for the laundry list to grow. We take out lottery operators at this point, at some point down the line it could be another vendor who has a state contract that some feel have...where there may be a perception of mistrust, for some reason or another an interest that is incurred on someone's part because of the award of the contract, I don't know what. But rather than have to worry about that if we feel that there's a problem in this area then really what we ought to do is just limit anyone who has a contract over \$100,000, that figure was pulled out of thin air, so when that question gets asked that's where it came from. Many con...there are very few contracts that are under that, and those individuals, I would guess, would be less likely to make contributions to candidates for purposes of statewide or legislative offices. The \$100,000 figure is a minimal amount in terms of a state contract. The \$1,000 threshold is one that I think is not, in terms of the cost of elections today, one that is going to influence too many races. And I would argue that there are few, if any, races that are influenced by campaign contributions, period, in the State of Nebraska. With that, I offer the amendment to LB 28 to incorporate anyone who has a contract with the state of over \$100,000 and limit the campaign contributions not to exceed \$1,000. Thank you, Mr. President.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Thank you, Senator Hall. For discussion on the Hall amendment, Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I'd rise to oppose the amendment by Senator Hall for a number of reasons. One of which, as I indicated on General File, cited the court cases where this limited prohibition was, at least in a case in New Jersey, approved by their Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court did not accept the case when it was appealed there. So that has been, at least in that limited area, sustained. When you read those court cases they inevitably talk about a compelling state interest had to be shown. Most of what I have seen or read will direct that to more restrictive qualifications for contributions. Where gambling is concerned the court seems to hold that inherently the opportunity for some inappropriate action is more likely there. I don't know if that's necessarily true, but nevertheless that's what you find in the court decisions. But I would hope the body would reject the amendment. If someone wants to make a broader one, obviously they could introduce a bill to do that some time. But