

page...and on page...there is...there is the definition of the...of the election period, and I think that's on page 3. And it says that the calendar year is the period for the election cycle.

SENATOR BROMM: Thank you. Yeah, I saw the...I saw what the...the election period meant the calendar year. But I didn't know that that was the same as the reporting period. And that's what, you know, what was confusing me somewhat. I also...I guess I would point out that as the law is right now, if you receive \$110 in the primary, that person's name goes on your report. Now, under...under this...under this change you could receive \$110 in the primary, you could receive \$135 in the general, that would be \$245, and their name would not...would not appear. So it isn't, in my judgment, a change from \$200 to 250, if you look at it in that fashion. It is, you know, under that scenario, it is a change from 100 to 250, because they...they could give us \$100 in the primary, and \$145 in the general, and their name would never appear. So I guess that's...that's my point, and not...I wasn't inferring that anyone was trying to pull anything. It's just when you stop and think about it, that's the effect of the change, and I know \$100 has been in there a long time, but I don't see anything wrong with that, and I don't see anything wrong with reporting everything over \$100 myself, that's just my feeling. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bromm. Senator Bernard-Stevens, your light is next.

SENATOR BERNARD-STEVENS: Just briefly, I rise to oppose the amendment. I guess the rationale that I have to oppose is based upon a couple...a comment that Senator Bromm made in his opening on his amendment and a response that Senator Baack made when he discussed his opposition to the amendment. Senator Bromm referred to the...the idea that if...originally that we were at \$100, and we wanted to raise it to 250, therefore we'd have a lot of people who would be able to give and would not be reported. Senator Baack responded, no, that is not the case because we're at a cumulative process, it is a change in the process, and it really isn't that much different. If we're not careful there's going to be a perception here that once again the Legislature is trying to hide things again. There's contributors, contributions going to be made that don't have to be reported. And I'd like to base at least the opposition I