

SENATOR BAACK: That's correct. Yes, it says that, and my amendment changes that from 10 percent of the spending limitation to 25 percent of the spending limitation.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, would it be possible to just state what has to be done to qualify for the public funds? Is it a situation where one person is not going to agree to stay within the limit and goes over?

SENATOR BAACK: Right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Then the only way you can qualify is to have raised a certain amount of money.

SENATOR BAACK: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So then if it's a situation where a poor person such as myself, for example, would be running against a well heeled individual who has much support from all over the state and I can't raise the amount of money necessary to reach the threshold, I get no public funds, do I?

SENATOR BAACK: That is correct.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that other person exceeds the limit and whatever the purpose of the bill is is defeated. Isn't that true?

SENATOR BAACK: In that particular case, Senator Chambers, you would be correct, yes, because you do have to raise a certain amount of money.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. Members of the Legislature, this bill is a rich candidate's bill. I'm not saying that was the intent of those who drafted it, but if a disparity exists between one candidate and another, whether the poor one is the one in office or trying to get in office, this bill exaggerates that disparity. It gives the appearance, by looking at what the bill overall is designed to do of limiting campaign expenditures, but it really doesn't limit anything. All it says is that if you are poor, you shall remain poor still because you cannot get the public funds unless you've raised a much higher amount than maybe you'd ever be able to raise under any circumstances. So a bill that is designed to work a reform