

unless the campaign limitation is voluntary, it's a violation of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and so even legislators who are interested in campaign expenditure limitation have a very, very hard time dealing with it as a practical matter and because of the Supreme Court decision. It's just very hard to structure, very hard to structure and anything that is comprehensive that you do structure probably will end up going to court and being tested because there are some structures out there and this is one of them, this is a fairly innovative structure that will have to stand the test with the court. But the public wants us to step forward on this. I have no doubt about that and I hope they understand why it is so difficult to move forward in this area. It seems so easy to them but the court has made it very hard for us. I think it's true, as Senator Chambers has indicated, that the wealthy man and the wealthy classes have the advantages when it comes to campaigns and campaign financing. There is no doubt about that. But I think it's wrong to characterize this bill as exacerbating or making greater that problem. I think on the contrary it makes that problem smaller. It is true that under the bill you have to raise some money yourself, you have to meet a qualifying limitation yourself which in a legislative race would come perhaps to something like \$12,000 under the amendment here in order to qualify for the public funds, but the reason that is done is because you don't want to end up paying public money out to candidates who are not at all serious candidates who are not really making an effort themselves, who have not shown any kind of community support themselves. And so somewhere there, and it's a fair policy argument as to where that line should be drawn, somewhere there there has to be a cutoff line so that the public money is going to serious candidates. But with that bit of philosophy in a short response to Senator Chambers, I think I would finish by indicating to you that I think that this particular scheme has a wonderful possibility to it and that possibility is this, that it may result, if properly structured and fine-tuned and approved by the court, it may result in what is essentially a public financing scheme which never results in any public money being paid. Why? Because why would you break the campaign limitation, why would you go beyond it if you knew any time you did that your opponent was going to get the difference between the campaign limitation and whatever you spent. In other words, it eliminates all incentive not to abide by the campaign limitation and it is the thought, I know, of those who are interested in this bill and the belief that it will not result