

out. I hate to have people get up here and say they passed out, then I'm always breathless waiting to find out more about it. But they distri...he distributed it, on the floor yesterday, and it was a very thoughtful article by David Broeder (phonetic). And asked us, essentially, to say to ourselves, does it accomplish what we want it to accomplish? Does it help the process? And I'm not sure we're at the point where we need to be at with this bill. I'd like at least the summer to look it over, and I would just ask the body to consider it carefully. Thank you.

SENATOR HALL: Thank you, Senator Schimek. Senator Moore, on the Bromm amendment.

SENATOR MOORE: Mr. President and members, first off, I rise to oppose Senator Bromm's amendment on the basic concern about the, what has always been the concern, is how much a bill like this costs. And, as we said before, had this law been in effect in 1990, it would have cost the state about a half million dollars, well, \$462,000, a little something short than that. So that's one thing you have to understand. There is the...there is a cost issue there. You may want to talk about the entire cost of it before you talk about implementing the bill. Secondly, Senator Bromm, would you yield to a question?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Bromm, would you respond, please.

SENATOR BROMM: Yes, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE: Senator Bromm, are you aware of any other state, and I don't know, but are you aware of any other state that has election campaign limits, like contained in 587 that would be in effect in '94?

SENATOR BROMM: No, I'm not, Senator Moore. I...I...I'm certainly not.

SENATOR MOORE: Well, it's my understanding, and I...maybe...maybe I'll ask that of Senator Schimek or Senator Baack, if they're...are they aware of any state that has a contribution limit, anything similar, compared to 587, involved in the '94 election? Senator Baack, are you (inaudible)?

SENATOR HALL: Senator Baack.