

not, again, if we do not feel comfortable implementing the entire...the entire law, with respect to all the elections, then I suggest that we consider enacting it at least for those elections that are...that are \$50,000 and less. And I would...I propose this amendment as much to get the feel of the body for that. And I've got the discussion from General File. And I don't think...there were a lot of things going on. I don't think we adequately debated this issue on General File, and that's one of the reasons for the amendment. And I...I'm not out to cause us fiscal problems here. But I do think it's worthy of more discussion than we've given it, and that's the purpose of proposing this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Bromm. That's the opening on the amendment. Senators...Senator Pirsch is next, followed by Senators Baack, Schimek, Moore, Witek, Ashford and Abboud. Senator Pirsch.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Thank you, Mr...Senator Hall. I...Senator Bromm, I was with you on the first two amendments and...because from the...from the appearance it sounded like this was making this legislation better. It's not because of the budgetwise that I oppose this. But I'd like to go over some of the procedure that this bill has been through. And I'm afraid here I have to part company with you, Senator Bromm. This bill was introduced in the Government, Military and Veterans Affairs Committee, and actually had no hearing on the content of the new language in this bill. Senator Baack introduced it and asked that it be delayed. That is all that was discussed. And when the committee took it up, that is all we discussed. We did not look at the words, we did not look at the proposals. We did not look at the new language. We simply gutted the new language and amended it with a delaying date, as Senator Baack had requested. Much to my surprise, on General File then, the committee amendments were urged to be rejected by our chairman, and Senator Baack reintroduced the new language, but still keeping on the delaying date. Now, I argued at that time, why do we want to go to the expense of adding the new language if, indeed, we were not going to consider this, or we were going to consider this bill over the interim, in an interim study and really spend some time and look at the proposals, not only the original one, which people had found flaws in, but also the new language which we had not even considered. Actually, what we're doing is writing this bill on the floor, and I don't know if anyone is even conscious, except of course Senator Baack, on what was