

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

January 27, 2004 LB 762

thing to do. I'm one of the friends who opposes Senator Brashear's bill. My greatest concern about it is free speech. Free speech is not free; it is available only to those who have money. I have run two campaigns. Both of them have been on my own funds. In the first campaign, I was outspent three to one, and guess what, my free speech didn't count. In the second campaign, my opponent was up against a limit, which is really helpful, because here I am. Free speech is available only to those with money. And we all know it. I don't have to speak more to that. Senator Brashear asked if there's a single positive difference that we can cite from this law. Well, I would hope that I'm a positive difference, and I would point to many others on the floor who are here because the incumbent could not raise more money. He speaks of giving the incumbent an advantage. I fail to see that. It's the incumbent that could raise \$100,000 or \$200,000 and swamp any person coming in. Believe me, as a challenger, I found out that the incumbent has a lot of advantage, including fund-raising. There's also a suggestion in this debate--which, again, I welcome, I think it's time for us to talk about it--that money is evil. I don't consider money evil, especially since it buys me free speech. It does good things for us. In its excess it is...can be evil. The love of money is certainly evil. But the...with the caps in there, I don't consider the use of that money evil. If a tree falls in the forest with no one to hear, does it make a sound? If I make a speech on a street corner with no one to hear, do I have free speech? I don't think so. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Kruse. Senator Schrock, followed by Senator Connealy and others.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I have no argument with the stated purpose of the Campaign Finance Limitation Act. In general, it's a good idea, preventing the buying of elections to big money interests. My problem with the Campaign Finance Act is I don't believe it works. It hasn't worked, and it won't work. It has the effect of contributing state money, which is tax dollars, to a candidate only twice in the past ten years it's been law, and then only because an opponent messed up and didn't amend a spending budget declaration. It's a complex formula, so complex it seems it can