

self-regulation of expenditures might be put in place by candidates. That is to be achieved in the following manner: at the time that you file, and they have various time frames for various things, but I am making it as simple as I can, if you indicate that you are not going to abide by the spending limit, which for the Legislature is \$50,000, and you, in fact, raise and spend more than \$50,000, the way the amendment reads now, the amendment which is to become the bill reads now, is that the other party would have to raise 25 percent of that amount in increments of \$200 or less. After having raised 25 percent of that \$50,000 in increments of \$200 or less, eligibility for funds of a public nature is established, but no public funds will actually be available based on the way the amendment reads now until that other person reaches the \$50,000 mark. I had argued the other day that many people indicate this type of reform, as it is called, is necessary because incumbency gives an advantage. The more likely scenario would be that the incumbent would have a surplus amount of money than that the challenger would have. So if the challenger has a problem raising money, he or she would never raise \$50,000 to be entitled to the public funds. So if the bill were put into law as it exists now, there would be an appearance that public funds are available and some type of restriction on spending has, in fact, been put in place, but the truth of the matter is that that would not be so. What my amendment says is that if Candidate A expresses an intent to exceed the 50,000 dollar voluntary spending limit, Candidate B would have to raise the 25 percent in increments of \$200 or less, but having raised that amount of money, he or she would then be entitled to receive public funds. The amount of the public funds received would be the difference between the 50,000 dollar limit and what Candidate A spends over \$50,000. My amendment would not say that the candidate who is entitled to the public funds would receive the difference between 25 percent of \$50,000 and what Candidate B spends, but, rather, the difference between \$50,000 and what Candidate B spends. I am offering this amendment to somewhat mitigate the injustice that I see existing in the bill the way it is written. I think this is a very reasonable amendment. I had talked to Senator Baack. I don't think he opposes it, and if and when it is adopted, and I have an expectation that it will be adopted, I will point out what I still see as a deficiency in the bill. But rather than just make a shotgun blast at various aspects of the bill, I am trying to do what initially I said I would not try to do, and that is to bring about some degree of equity. Frankly, even with the