

William L. Jenkins
63 Ridge Road
Chaplin, CT 06235
860-455-9337

OPPOSE Section 10 of HB 5528 which changes 9-608(e)(1)(G) as follows:

"G) The [campaign] treasurer of a qualified candidate committee may, following an election or unsuccessful primary, make payment to a [campaign] treasurer or campaign staff for services rendered to the candidate committee, provided such payment does not exceed one thousand dollars per individual; and"

You've got to be kidding me..... It was bad enough that State Representative Mary Mushinky's bill that was shot down by this committee last year with the "let's give the treasurer a bonus of up to \$1,000.00 AFTER the election if we have money left over with no previous contract in place" secretly wound up in an e-cert "budget implementer" bill where legislators were given less than an hour to read this 350 page document (HB 6651 in 2011).

The proper thing to do with surplus campaign funds is to return them to the Citizens' Election Fund, not just give out free money to campaign workers and friends of the candidate or treasurer.

This proposed language will allow any taxpayer funded campaign to give up to \$1,000.00 to an UNLIMITED NUMBER of "individuals" if there is money left over after an election or primary. This sure looks a whole lot like "post-election bonuses" which are strictly prohibited under RCSA 9-706-2(b)(11). I'm fairly certain you can see the potential abuse here but allow me to lay out what may seem like an unlikely scenario but something that could indeed happen if this part of the bill becomes law:

Let's get a candidate to pretend he's running for State Rep. in a seat where we have absolutely no chance of winning, we'll raise the \$5,000.00 from 150 contributors (which is fairly easy), get the public "grant" (which is really taxpayer money), not spend one dime campaigning, give out thousand dollar checks to as many of our friends as we can after we get trounced on Election Day and thanks to HB 5528, IT'S ALL PERFECTLY LEGAL! Not only that, we can refund the initial \$5,000.00 to the original contributors and claim they are permissible expenditures as allowed by 9-607(g)(2)(L), (T), (Y) or (Z)!

If a treasurer were to work this scam to its fullest potential, he or she could wind up handing out tens of thousands of PUBLIC dollars to themselves and their friends because as you know, there is no limit on how many candidate committees one can be a treasurer for. As of today, I'm a treasurer for a State Senate candidate and a State Rep. candidate and will probably be the treasurer for another State Senate candidate and two more State Rep. candidates this year.

In all seriousness, please take this potentially dangerous and expensive language out of this bill and I am urging you to go one step further and take out the Mary Mushinsky language allowing post-election bonus payments to treasurers which became law with the passage of HB 6651 last year (Subsection G of 9-608(e)(1)). It will save the Citizens' Election Program from being robbed by campaigns and restore the integrity of the program which was reduced by allowing the Mushinsky language to become law last year. In these trying economic times, in my opinion it's best for Legislators to look for opportunities to reduce spending and eliminate opportunities for fraud and "gaming" the system. Removing all of Subsection G from 9-608(e)(1) will do just that.