

familiar with, and maybe not as deeply as you ought to be, that affects each and every one of us and those exceptions, unfortunately, sometimes become the rule. And in the history of this body we have, from time to time, besides my own election contest, had other election contests that, however they weren't identical in nature, were similar. The 30th District legislative race from the time that Senator Pat Morehead ran her first race against Bud Pence some reason became, maybe because of our relationship to Lincoln, but became a very expensive legislative race. This continued into her contest with...when she was challenged by now Mayor Dave Maurstad, and carried into my race when I was challenged by Attorney Paul Korslund. That race being very expensive, there were a good number of dollars spent on both of our parts through the election itself. Then, when we came to the matter of the contest of election, we run into the unique circumstances that I think we need to address in this type of legislation. I'm not opposed to campaign spending limits. I hear what Senator Robinson is saying. But, gentlemen, if I would...if this statute would have been in effect at the time that I determined to defend the contest of election, and probably would have made some of you happy and some of you sad, I would not be here today for this reason. The attorney fees that I incurred in that contest of election to defend a principle that I felt was absolute, the voters in my district, cost me in attorneys' fees \$42,000, \$42,000. Because of the cost of the election itself, basically, this legislation would have required me, in order to defend my seat, defend the voters of my district, to raise approximately \$80,000 to pay those attorneys' fees in order to pay this tax. The other participant in the contest of election, who is an attorney, was able, because of the nature of his profession, to give himself legal advice and to get in-kind legal advice which, in effect, would be half as expensive as mine. And even though there are provisions within the bill that you do have to pay the tax on in-kind, in effect, cash that would have to be raised would be the equivalent of half of that amount and that would be strictly to raise the tax. Aren't we, in effect, doing just the opposite here as far as being prejudicial as what we're trying to do by establishing the bill in the first place? Now, as I said, I understand this is the exception, but we have to take exceptions into account and I'm not sure that this is the adequate remedy for this particular situation. Anybody, logically, if I would have known...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.