

is running, have you seen...

SENATOR BEUTLER: Strong in what sense, financially strong?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Well, that has appeal and might be a strong challenge to the incumbent. Have you seen instances where those who do give money, like political action committees and even some individuals, businesses, unions and corporations will give money to both candidates, I guess that's called hedging your bet.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Yes, I've seen that.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. So, if there are two such contributors who would give the same amount to the incumbent and the nonincumbent, if the race were to be cut off at that point, then you'd say they're in a dead heat, as far as what has been raised by way of contribution. But there might be many, many additional contributors who are not going to give the nonincumbent the money, so I still see this as a bill, and any bill that's passed which would favor the incumbent, unless, as Senator Baack and I were discussing, we were to change the definition of the term incumbent to mean the person who is challenging for an office and not currently occupying it. But with reference to the way this bill is drafted, let me ask you a question because I know you support it. Does this bill by its terms limit any candidate in the amount of money that can be spent during an election?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Not without such a choice being made by the candidate.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: So, by its terms the bill does not limit anything. Is that correct?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Under the...that's correct, Senator Chambers, within the...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay, now...

SENATOR BEUTLER: ...yeah, within the...as you framed the question that's right.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Okay. And I'm not going to stop there. Did you give it as your impression, and if I misheard you then you