

once you've reached that threshold, it will serve to reduce the amount of money being raised. Either one of those is an acceptable result. Either one of those is acceptable. Number one, if they don't give the money and we end up reducing the amount spent on campaigns, the public likes that. They think financing of campaigns is out of control. But number two, if the other result, I think the more likely result occurs, the state at least gets its share of the money. The state gets the tax revenue. It is tax revenue that we may not have to increase income or sales tax or cigarette tax or gasoline tax or all these other things paid by the consumers. We're taxing the politicians instead of the constituents and that I think is a novel approach. Number two, let's be aware of how the act works. The first amount, the amounts that we talked about, and I set forth in my introduction, are exempt amounts. You can raise up to \$50,000 for a legislative campaign and you don't pay tax. The people that want to give you those smaller contributions, those are the people that are going to give to you. They are not going to pay the tax assuming that spending stays within sight. I wholeheartedly agree with Senator Robinson, \$50,000 to mount a legislative campaign ought to be enough. We get to the point where we get past the issues. We get past the substance. We get into the pure fluff or we get into as I saw in a television commercial from the last gubernatorial campaign, we walk in something else. You reach a point where you're not informing the public. What we're hoping we'll accomplish is the money will be a little better used. We'll actually inform the public on the issues. We'll actually go to the public and let them know what is going on and use the money more wisely rather than lavishly because there is no end in sight to it. Finally, touching on what Senator Robinson suggested, I would love to do what Senator Robinson suggested. Let's put that limit on there. Unfortunately, we're constrained by the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Constitution has been interpreted, in the United States Supreme Court case of Buckley v. Valeo, to prohibit us from doing what Senator Robinson suggests. The Supreme Court has said we cannot limit the amount that's being spent on the campaigns. That's why you keep hearing about public financing. The Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution to say you simply cannot limit and they suggested in that case that public financing is the way to go. That's the one that's most acceptable. That's why that keeps popping up and, yet, public financing has been repeatedly set forth that we don't want to spend money on that. We don't want to use the money for that. I suggest to you that maybe