

and don't allow it to foul up what is otherwise a very good bill. But if you want to debate it now that is fine too. But I hope you will give serious consideration to what has been done and give some thoughtful consideration to undoing it. Let me make one final remark. Sometimes if agencies do a bad job our tendency is to come back and want to undo the statute itself. In this particular case there is absolutely no evidence that the agency has done a bad job. In fact it is my feeling that the Accountability Commission has done an excellent job with regard to all of the statutes, including this one. In the 10-year history of this particular section of the statutes there have been about 35 complaints filed. Of those 35 complaints the commission has only seriously looked into 3 of them, only 3 of them. Of the three of them that they've looked into, two of them have consented to settlement. Basically that is an indication of yes, we did do it, we agree to consent to a settlement. In one instance, in one instance they were proven wrong. But I ask you this, would you do away with your county attorney, with your county attorney's office? Would you fire your county attorney if they were wrong once? Is that a reason for undoing a whole good law? I think not. There may be one or more persons upset by a particular outcome at a particular point in time, but we don't allow people to fire judges just because they don't like the result of cases. That doesn't strike us as justice. So it seems to me equally unreasonable and illogical to suggest that the Accountability Commission shouldn't have any authority over this kind of instance simply because in one case the court said you are wrong, you are wrong. Not only has the court said...did they say that they were wrong in that case, but the Accountability Commission came back and corrected the problem so that the law, in effect, is evolving, the law in effect is evolving in a very progressive kind of way, just as you would expect it to over time. What I mean in this particular instance, for example, is that the question that was in doubt with regard to the burden of proof has been cleared up. There was an argument over whether it was necessary to prove a violation of the statute by a preponderance of the evidence or by clear and convincing evidence. Now we know it has to be clear and convincing evidence. We want to leave the statute in place, it has beneficial effects, it has been administered properly, the law is evolving in a smooth fashion. I would plead with you to reestablish the law and allow it to continue to evolve and have its beneficial effects on the election process.