

good job. I think I could raise maybe 30, 40 thousand dollars, and then he looks or she looks at the incumbent and sees an incumbent and sees...looks at the figures on incumbency and sees that 90 percent or 95 percent of the time the incumbents win, that when they need...whatever amount of money they need, they seem to be able to raise, that there are often discrepancies...

SENATOR LINDSAY: Time. Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Bernard-Stevens.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the Legislature, I will speak one time on the amendment. I spoke yesterday and, obviously, I have a closing that I can use so I won't take any of my time and let the body debate the issue. I put the issue before the body for, again, a feeling of frustration I have had over the years, and if those of you who were not here when we enacted it, I was one of the few senators that voted against it. And the reason I voted against it is because there was no funding for it at that point. And my point was that what we are putting on the public is a hoax, that we believe in campaign reform and we are going to do something, look what we've done, but we've never funded it. Senator Beutler came to this body the last two-year session that we had and fought a very good fight on many, many areas trying to find different funds, different fees, different service charges, anything he could think of, to try to get funding to this proposal. All were defeated. All were defeated. Now we have another attempt, and when we got to the discussion yesterday, it was at least clear to me that the body was not going to be favorable on 548 because of different reasons, and everyone always has a different reason. One group will say, well, I like 548, but another very small group says, no, I don't, we won't go anywhere. Another group says, well, I like the fact that we are going to have a pop tax or a fertilizer tax or whatever the tax may be, but other groups will say, no, I don't, and we never got it. The point I am trying to make is if we are not going to fund it, then let's be honest and say let's don't do the law. Because if we are not going to fund it now, when we get to budget crunch time later one, not only this session but certainly down the line, this would be the first one to go if there is not any real support for it. So this amendment was put forward to the body so that we can just come clean to the issue and say, look, if we are not going to fund it, let's get rid of the policy. Let's don't continue the charade, and that is why the amendment is here. Certainly if the amendment is defeated,