

then we will have said, no, no, no, we want the policy, and then I, personally, would turn around and say if we are going to have the policy, then you'd better have something like 548 but let's don't sing the same song year after year after year, we say we like campaign finance reform, if we can just find the right mechanism. I don't think there is one out there that the body is going to like. So that's why the amendment is there. Thank you.

SENATOR LINDSAY: Thank you, Senator Bernard-Stevens. Senator Hall.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Mr. President, members. I rise in opposition to Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment. The proposal is, I guess, an honest one on its face but at the same time it probably does more damage than it does good, but he does bring a bit of, I guess, truth or consequences, if you will, to the proceedings. Because what he is saying is if it is not going to be 548, which I happen to oppose, because I think it creates a whole new system that is more paper work than it will be revenue. I think it penalizes a few people who happen to participate in representative government through their contributions to fund all of the public contribution or a great portion of the public contribution to campaigns, and I don't see it as the right way to do it. Now Senator Bernard-Stevens says, okay, everybody is saying that we like the public financing but we don't like whatever form or fashion Senator Beutler chooses to raise those monies. I've got an amendment drafted that will have a General Fund appropriation. If we are going to have public financing, all of the public should participate in the process, not a select few who happen to give through their contributions. Now there will be those who don't like that. They won't like the General Fund appropriation over and above what has already been earmarked. They are going to look for some other vehicle or means by which to fund this, and I guess I understand that then you're at, you're at a stalemate, and maybe then at that point in time, you say, okay, Senator Bernard-Stevens, you're right. Let's repeal the public funding aspect of it. If it's tried on this bill a couple of different times to refocus where the money comes from, and it is unsuccessful, at that point in time then I will be supportive of a similar amendment to this, but not now. I don't think that the opposition to 548, as it is written, means necessarily that you have to do away with the underlying legislation passed a few years ago that allows for the public finance. This, basically,