

SENATOR HALL: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Let me say to begin with, and not trying to evade your question in any way, because of the...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: It's nebulous, I understand.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...different choices that could have been made in past elections, you never know what would have happened entirely. But the last set of legislative elections involved probably as many contested, highly contested races as any, certainly more than '92 and '90 and probably as many as there have been in history. And looking at that it looks to me like that maybe the worst case scenario, if everything, all the choices went the wrong way might be about \$130,000 if all the choices went the wrong way. And based on '92 figures, '92 races, having races like '90...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: So that would, if I read this...

SENATOR BEUTLER: I'm sorry, '94 races.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Right, and so if I read this correct and I may not be, that the dollars that would have been collected by the passage of this bill would have been somewhere, if it had been in the past we could have built it up somewhere around 53,000?

SENATOR BEUTLER: If you have the estimated 31,000 that would be raised by this bill, this tax, and available for the next election, that would add 31,000 to the 115,000 that's otherwise estimated to be available at that point in time and that's based on the assumption that I described to you earlier that adding the 115 to the 31, there would be just short of \$150,000 available...

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Okay, all right.

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...for the '96 races which, as measured against the worst case scenario, should be enough if you have the campaign tax.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: And I asked Senator Warner if the committee amendments had changed this and he indicated it had