

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

January 27, 2004 LB 762

greater than what the law provides anyway. I passed out to you a handout that shows the total spending for legislative races over the years. And you can see that since the Campaign Finance Limitation Act went into effect in 1996, that the spending has been considerably lower, and that if you average out the cycles after 1996, about \$250,000 each cycle less was spent, and that's notwithstanding an increase in inflation, that's notwithstanding the fact that the campaign limitation amount was raised for the legislative races. Many things can go into how much money is spent in campaigns. But I would submit to you that there's a distinct pattern here, and that it suggests very strongly that the campaign finance law has had a lot to do with spending in campaigns. And I want to come back eventually and talk about some individual campaigns, some individual legislative campaigns that I think have a meaningful relationship to the Campaign Finance Act. The limitations...I want to take an aside here and talk about the limitations. The assertion was made that the limitations are not in the appropriate amount. And I will go back eventually and try to take you through the entire act and how it all works. But let me say this to begin with, that when this law was put into effect, the amounts that were inserted in terms of limitations weren't drawn out of the air; they were drawn out of a set of historical records that showed what had been spent on different races consistently over time, up until the time that we put this law into effect. Senator Brashear thinks \$50,000 for the regents race is too low. Maybe it is. I've always stood open to negotiate with Senator Brashear on what is appropriate. I've even offered to put a Consumer Price Indexing into it, so that it always remained the same in terms of resources that could be purchased with the money. None of those things satisfy Senator Brashear. But to give you an example of what I'm talking about, in terms of the way, historically, it was set up, in the regents area, prior to the enactment of the Campaign Finance Reform Act, almost every regents race had been less than the \$50,000 that we set as the limitation. There had only been one that was more, and that was at \$80,000. Compare that to the race for Senator Hawks and Regent O'Brien, who both declined the protection of the Campaign Finance Reform Act, ended up spending \$500,000, \$500,000. Mr. Hawks spent \$400,000, and Regent O'Brien spent \$100,000. The Campaign Finance Act Reform failed? No, it didn't fail.