

offices are purchased, there is very little given to the merits of a subject and very little consideration is given to the qualifications running for office. It is who has the most money and who can run the slick campaign and who can run the public relation type job that has to convert a scoundral into a savior of the people and when you look at Watergate and who sits in the White House now, you see that this job was done very effectively and all the bills that we are talking about now comes back to the horse that has escaped from the barn and he can not be captured. I think that the public morales have been corrupted and a good start toward undoing the public damage was done by public officials and it is for a public body like this to have this amendment which has not been a...not Senator Fellman, but the one that is going to impose the \$1,000 limit. I'm not sympathetic towards the problems of churches, they are untaxed in the first place. They can have untold millions of dollars in holdings and not give a nickle in tax. If they can figure out a way of not paying taxes, then certainly they can find a way to donate more than a thousand dollars to a cause of their choice and by saying this I am implying that they too are made up of people who are unethical who are not going to abide by the law. This is a fact of life and unethical conduct is not done away with by abolishing it by a statute that makes it acceptable. I'm opposed to Senator Fellman's amendment. Senator Fellman, everything that I am saying is devoted to the issue and not to you. It just happens that you are the defender of unpopular causes and I think that causes are...a...a...causes that are somewhat tainted because they are related to the political parties, and if I have my way, I'm going to do all that I can to weaken the party structure by that I don't mean do away with the two parties, I mean to weaken the influence that they have in determining the outcome of elections and determining what laws are on the books. I'm going to say this again for emphasis there have been too many successful ones today in taking their practices, the practices of their parties and have them become the law of this state. I am opposed to what Senator Fellman is trying to do.

PRESIDENT: Next to speak is Senator Kelly, then Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR KELLY: Mr. President, members of the body, I can see no parallel between a limit on the amount of money that a candidate can spend and the amount of money that a private citizen can invest in elections. When you limit the candidate you may be limiting his ability to perform. When you limit what an individual can give to the election process you are limiting his ability to influence politics and probably this is good. We have spend several minutes now, explaining how all of these can be gotten around. However, LB677 is nothing but a reporting procedure and restricts all spending for political activities out of one checking account. It makes all contributions be identified and go into that checking account. This were in place, we would not need limits. As long as it is not in place, I will have to support the limitations.

PRESIDENT: Senator Cavanaugh.

SENATOR CAVANAUGH: Will Senator Fellman yield to some questions?

SENATOR FELLMAN: Yes.