

learn pretty soon how to play to the crowd, how to play to the press, how to do that which is politically popular. Now those individuals who swim against the tide, for example, may encounter a little additional baggage. I recall when I opposed Amendment 2, the bill which allowed farmland to be valued differently than other types of property, ninety nine point nine nine percent of the farmers I spoke to thought that it meant it had to be valued at less, at less than actual value. One day, in a different kind Legislature, they will learn to their chagrin that all Legislatures may decide to tax farmland at twice its actual value for some meritorious purpose no doubt, but nonetheless it can happen. Notwithstanding that fact, most of my farm constituents, virtually all of my farm newsletters and other kinds of identification thought it was horrible that I would oppose that legislation. I know that the time will come, probably when I'm long gone from this body, when they will learn otherwise, but that will be too late. In the meantime, I do not expect staunch support from those individuals in a campaign for reelection because they think that I did the wrong thing. The same is true in many other aspects. I would wonder, Senator Lindsay, if there ought not to be some kind of an amendment offered to this bill that would say that no candidate could receive more than one negative editorial per campaign, primary and general, and it ought to be limited to four column inches and a very small headline. By the same token, if a candidate gets a positive editorial, should there be a monetary value attached to that? If I get a chance to write a guest editorial in the NACO news magazine, do we put a price on that? I think all of us know there are so many methods whereby you can circumvent the best laid plans of Senator Lindsay that...

PRESIDENT MOUL: One minute.

SENATOR SCHMIT: ..it really doesn't make any difference whether you pass this bill or not. If you do, the campaign contributions for legislators will no doubt stop at 50 grand. I will say also it will not stop the expenditure. There's nothing that's going to stop an individual from sending out 3,000 letters on behalf of a candidate, and who can trace what they cost? Who can identify the amount of money spent for postage or stamps? It's done all the time. It will continue to be done and one scheme after another will be devised. It might, in fact, start a whole new economic development scheme because there will be a lot of innovative individuals who will think of ways to circumvent the bill. I would hope that you would