

lunch or something, or attend, it looks like events within your district, if you read this on page 2, I think Senator Lindsay can clarify, but it looks to me like if you spend anything within the subdivision you reside, which would be your district, or whatever, you can't deduct it, so it goes toward that \$50,000 limit. And, for instance, mailing of a newsletter, if any of you do that, or perhaps I, for instance, buy football tickets and distribute them to charity in my district, all of those things would be deducted from your campaign limits. And I think this is a little too restrictive at this point, for me. I'm concerned about it. I'll listen to Senator Lindsay as he discusses it further. But that would be some of my concerns. It's not exactly a match. The limits are the same, but the time frames are different, and it's a broader time frame that Senator Lindsay has than Senator Baack has, and that is a more restrictive time frame that should concern us, I would think. Thank you.

SENATOR KRISTENSEN: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Lindsay.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Kristensen, members. I have talked with Senator Baack. It is my intent to withdraw the amendment, simply because I don't want to hurt his bill. There have been indications that's going to happen. It does appear later on in the agenda. I've got a little under two hours to get there. But I would like to make a couple of comments beforehand, and that is the objections I've been hearing to this indicate to me that there are some people here that aren't serious about campaign reform. They're telling me they're concerned that during the course of the incumbency we can't send out newsletters, or Christmas cards to constituents, or things like that. What is that but campaigning next time you come around. That's what we're doing. You know we're not serious about cutting down on that vast power that the incumbency has. We're not serious about opening up the process. To that extent I think some of us maybe are being a little hypocritical on it. The four year term of this election period simply would have covered a four year period to prevent stockpiling. What good does it do if you allow an exemption of a million dollars a year in a Governor's race, but you give the incumbent four years to build up a million dollars. That just doesn't make any sense, and that's the reason for it. On the other end, we allow a deduction for reasonable costs of incumbency, not including costs of campaigning, which is exactly what some of those other