

May 8, 1973

I think this bill does precisely that. Instead of exposing anything, I think it covers up. Now every time there's something bad done in government, we pass a bill and we just throw out a sop to the people and say now everything's going to be okay. You got to report it. We passed a reporting bill, we passed an ethics bill. We actually do nothing except make it easier for the crooked guy to operate because the honest fellow is going to try to comply with this silly bill. But who's not going to comply? The guy that's a crook in the first place and he's the one that's going to get elected. While the good man is not. So I'm just as apprehensive as Senator Fellman about all this spending, about it costing a couple hundred thousand dollar to get elected. But certainly this bill is not the answer and I say down the pipe.

PRESIDENT: Senator Schmit and then Senator Chambers.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think we talked about how we want to limit campaign spending. I think that I have a perfect method to limit campaign spending. I think and I'm having an amendment prepared for the bill, Senator Fellman, which will make it a felony for any candidate to know the amount of any contribution given to him by any person and it shall be a felony for the contributor to reveal his name to the candidate. It shall also be the same penalty for the candidate to inquire. So obviously if all contributions are anonymous and no one dares find out about the amount of the contribution, where it came from, who it came from or from what source, there will be no contributions and that will solve the problem of campaign spending and I think that in all seriousness, I think you should take a look at it because as Senator Carpenter has pointed out, you're not going to stop the cash flow but if you put the penalty strict enough, if you make it strict enough we obviously are not going to have the problem because the only purpose for the contribution is for some return. There are very few, as you have said, very few contributions are made out of the goodness of hearts and so, would you object to this kind of amendment? I think it would be a very simple one-section bill and I'll get that amendment drawn and we'll see what happens to it.

PRESIDENT: Well, next to speak is--Senator Chambers, are you passing? Go ahead, sir.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: I'll be very brief, Mr. President. These two bills, 310 and 267 were heard before the Government Committee and there were other sessions and meetings trying to work something out with these two bills in terms of amendments and because it did seem to me and others on the committee that it was a conflict between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, it would be best to allow the Legislature to deal with both bills in the forms in which they were introduced so that the Legislature could see what the best minds in the Democratic Party offered unblemished by the wisdom of lack of wisdom of the committee and the best minds of the Republican Party could offer. Now I wrote a committee statement and I had two reasons for writing it the way I did. First of all, I don't think any body reads, or very few people read, committee statements. Secondly, if people had read the committee statement, they'd be aware of what I'm referring to. Secondly, I did what I did on this particular committee report because there are bills involving the two parties and not the interest of citizens at large and I feel that politicians can take the little thing that I did in writing the committee report. But some of the discussion was about the difficulty of trying to enforce such a bill as this. It's one thing to put into law a policy and a desire and another thing to pass what an effective law is. One who's boundaries can be determined, one which can be enforced by determining when it has been violated and making