

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

February 17, 2005 LB 242

wondering on that...or if it were an educating ad, if that would have any play in that. I apologize for the long question.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: Senator Smith, could you more concisely state that, please? (Laugh) I'm sorry.

SENATOR SMITH: That's a fair request. When you're replacing "campaigning" with "supporting or opposing," I can see that wording not accomplishing its objective because someone may be holding themselves out to educate the public on a voting record, and that's not necessarily supporting or opposing. How should we use "support or oppose" in an attempt to be more clear?

SENATOR SCHIMEK: If somebody is going to point out somebody's voting record, you don't think that would be in opposition to that candidate?

SENATOR SMITH: Not necessarily. Wouldn't have to be. I can see pointing out a voting record that would be in support of. I mean, it would come down to the tone of the ad, probably, but what I'm getting at is the fact that the more we try to regulate, the more problems we're going to have.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: I think the language is okay, Senator Smith, but I'm willing to listen to what...

SENATOR SMITH: Okay.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: ...you have to say.

SENATOR SMITH: Well, and thank you, Senator Schimek. There's been this movement across America in an attempt to remove money from campaigns and rich people from being so involved in campaigns that (laugh) we brought more rich people to the table in this last federal election than ever before. And they specifically dodged McCain-Feingold and actually made McCain-Feingold look like a joke to the American people who typically supported it through surveys, and we're doing, I think, the same thing at the state level in trying to eliminate dollars. We set limits. We have these triggers for campaign...public financing of campaigns. We have a lot of