

discussed, whether at the federal level or the state level, with reference to politicians, the public is suspicious and wary, feeling that the Legislature, whether it is federal or state, will only do something in order to hold off or blunt public criticism of the activities of people in office. The Legislature, based on that premise, should not put in place any program which is not able to deliver what is promised. The only way what Senator Beutler is talking about can deliver is to have a substantial amount of money available. With all of the descriptions, however glowing, of the great things that can be done by this reform or whatever it is going to be called, if the public analyzes it and sees that it takes money and the Legislature did not provide enough money to achieve the stated result, it will be clear that another sham has been worked. There is no practical way to put a substantial amount of money in this fund. There is nothing in the law to prevent a first come, first served race for the money, and there is nothing to prevent one candidate from exhausting the entire fund. If such a thing happened, and one candidate were to exhaust the entire fund, where is the impact in terms of restricting the amounts spent by those in all of the other political contests? There are too many ifs connected with this plan. There is no practical way of funding it that anybody has come up with. If this would be adopted as the policy of the state, General Fund appropriations should be the means by which funding would result. Naturally, I would oppose that because I oppose the idea. But to speak on why I will vote for Senator...it's Senator Bernard-Stevens' amendment, but it is Senator Witek's motion to reconsider. Again, I think the discussion should be in terms of whether or not the legislation on which all of our discussion is based should continue on the books. If Senator Beutler would choose to withdraw his bill, that means we will not further discuss the issue this session, which would be fine with me. The shell would remain on the books, and it is a part of a shell game, in my opinion, because the money will never be there to fund it, but no great amount of mischief will result. I am going to support Senator Witek's motion, and I hope there are enough votes for us to do that.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Senator Bromm.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, fellow senators. I rise to oppose the motion and the Bernard-Stevens amendment, and it might seem to some that perhaps a conservative, such as myself, has taken a turn here that is unexplainable, and I'm getting the