



"Kathy Gillich-Adams"
<kgillich-adams11@law.du.edu
u>

11/12/2008 11:41 AM

To <millionairerepeal@fec.gov>

cc "Kathy Gillich-Adams" <kgillich-adams11@law.du.edu>

bcc

Subject Comment on Proposed Rulemaking for Millionaire's
Amendment Repeal

To: Mr. Robert M. Knop
Assistant General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
millionairerepeal@fec.gov

From: Kathleen Gillich-Adams
3021 Waterstone Court
Fort Collins, CO 80525
(H) 970-226-4342
kgillich-adams11@law.du.edu;

Date: November 10, 2008

Subject: Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 203, Page 62224, Notice 2008

-

11

Millionaire's Amendment Repeal

I am opposed to changing the 2002 "Millionaire's Amendment."

Even

though I clearly understand why the Federal Election Commission is revising or deleting parts of this amendment, I am opposed to the changes and disagree with the Supreme Court decision. The June 2008 decision by the Supreme Court declared the entire section 319 relating to house elections, a violation of First Amendment free speech rights. In the past, without the Millionaire's Amendment to level the financial playing field, Americans saw the wealthy purchase their political office by dipping into their own deep pockets and outspending their opponents. According to figures from the Center for Responsive Politics, at least nineteen House candidates and nine Senate candidates have spent \$350,000 or more of their own money on their campaigns during this election cycle. In the 2006 elections, the number was 52 candidates.

With the proposed changes to the Millionaire's Amendment, the rich can spend as much of their own money as they deem necessary to purchase a political office - creating a strong political advantage for the wealthy. Political offices are now for sale to the highest bidder.

These changes may lead the Supreme Court to strike down more central rules, such as limits on campaign spending by corporations and unions. The new campaign rules can be expected to revive the practice of airing ads during a campaign by unions, corporations and special interest groups that purport to be about a specific issue, but are in fact intended to sway voters for or away from a particular candidate. This is not the direction in which we want campaign reform to go.

Sincerely,
Kathleen D. Gillich-Adams
Juris Doctor Candidate - 2L Evening Student
University of Denver Sturm College of Law



winmail.dat