

by statute. I just have real problems with this kind of legislation with these kind of statutory restrictions precluding candidates to operate as to their own best judgement. I think that...I very strongly believe in full disclosure and if it is disclosed fully where the public can see where a candidate is receiving funds, the public can make that judgement if that source of funds is an antithesis as to what the public itself believes. So, I think this is another attempt, good intention, Senator Marsh, no question about it, and I think Senator Marsh probably abides by this principle personally, but to mandate it statutorily I think it is ill-advised. You know, it is the same old thing. we attempt to do too many times. We try to over-legislate and over-regulate and we curtail in doing that. We stifle, you know, and I think another thing we have to be very fair about. Contributions may be the only way a certain element can get involved. Another element in our society not able to give contributions might be able to get involved in in kind services. You could have an organization of many, many people, advocates of a particular issue and it is difficult if not impossible for those people to make a lot of political contributions, money. But they can make a lot of in kind contributions such as phone calls, such as door to door solicitation, such as envelope stuffers or that type of effort. We don't do anything to try to curtail that and we shouldn't just another type of organization just as influential, just as important, just as socially desirable in our society may not have those numbers to do that type of thing. So they may have to compensate with a financial contribution. I don't see anything negative about that as long as the public knows it, as long as it is disclosed, as long as people are aware of it and then people can make that judgement. So I think this kind of an amendment inadvertently stacks the deck against a particular group of people and I think that is wrong. I think it should be disclosed. I think it should be open. I think it should be public record but I don't think it should be restricted because we are definitely discriminating against a certain type of campaign contribution and by that I mean broader than financial and in this specific instance it would be financial in favor of another type of campaign contribution that may not be financial. I don't think that is right. I think we are trying to say, hey, some are more equal than others so to speak. We are going to tie your hands just a little bit because that happens to be your wherewithal but somebody else who has a different type of service to offer we are not going to tie your hands. Now that is not fair and that is not right and I think as well intentioned as the Marsh amendment is it still becomes a prerogative