PA12-117

HB5556

House	7182-7357	176
Senate	4124-4170	47
		223

H – 1144

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
2012

VOL.55
PART 22
7163 - 7513

Emergency Certified House Bill 5556, AN ACT CONCERNING CHANGES TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS AND OTHER ELECTIONS LAWS, LCO 5064.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

House Chair of GA&E, Representative Russ Morin, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good morning.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move passage of the Emergency Certified Bill.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question's on passage of the Emergency Certified Bill.

Will you remark?

REP. MORIN (28th):

Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

The Clerk has an amendment LCO 5275. I would ask that the Clerk please to call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5275, which will be designated House "A."

Representative, hold on for a second.

The Chamber will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Okay. Chamber come back to order.

Representative Morin, as you --

Clerk was going to call LCO 5275.

THE CLERK:

LCO 5275, House "A" offered Representative Morin and Senator Slossberg.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative seeks leave of the chamber to summarize.

Any objection?

Hearing none, Representative Morin, you may precede with summarization.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here before all of you this morning. I'm excited, I'm proud to present this bill,

this amendment. Connecticut has an exceptional reputation for the integrity of how we run and finance our statewide campaigns. In today's debate --

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative, if you could summarize the amendment.

At this point, that'd be good thanks.

REP. MORIN (28th):

I'm getting excited, Mr. Speaker.

Okay. This bill -- this amendment will certainly be making modifications to our state campaign finance laws and various other entities that I will discuss further.

I move adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, move adoption.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative, will your remark further?

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, yes, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Again, it's déjà vu. I feel like Yogi Berra this morning.

I stand before you this morning, as I said. I am very proud to present this bill to you. I've shared

that we have exceptional reputation for the integrity of our elections.

Today you'll hear me use words like transparency and disclosure. There has been an influx of private dollars independently expended with no accountability thrown at races around our country. Really, with the sole intent of affecting our statewide and local campaigns. Some have mentioned that this is strictly a federal matter alluding to the super PACs that we all read about concerning President Obama and Mitt Romney. This isn't the case. All you have to do it ask the people that have run for office in Maine and North Carolina that have seen privately -- seen private anonymous, independent expenditures entering their races, affecting candidates of both parties.

In Connecticut, we run clean, fair elections, and I would subscribe that our citizens, not only support, but demand that. This bill will ensure that our elections will remain in this manner.

A few highlights will include, it will expand the reporting and disclaimer requirements for independent expenditures. It exempts from the definition of independent expenditures of up to $250 in the aggregate made by human beings, individuals, that are

acting alone to benefit a candidate. It defines campaign-related disbursements. It eliminates certain campaign finance reporting requirements that were cumbersome to treasurers. It also, quite nicely, allows military and overseas voters to return their ballots by absentee ballot, by fax, or email.

And I certainly move adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, sir.

Would you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Tony Hwang, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good morning, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you very much.

Through you, to the proponent of the bill. I have some questions for him, please.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

First and foremost, why is this bill an emergency certified bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe we were at the point and time, when we're about to bring it out Saturday where the rules of the House to transmit the bill to the Senate in time would have deemed that it should have been an emergency certified bill, and we just didn't change it since then. As you remember, we didn't take it up on Saturday, and here we are this morning.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you share with me what the rules of the House as it relates to E-CERT. And again, I know this is a time sensitive question, but why the big rush for E-CERT? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang, if you could use your

questioning to talk on the amendment itself, not the process as we are going forward.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Surely, sir.

Let me move on to, through you, Mr. Speaker. I'd love to get what the definition of a business entity is, and if I could through the proponent of the bill, some examples of those organizations. Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A business entity means, whether organized in or out of the state, stock corporations, banks, insurance companies, business associations, trade associations, anything that receives funds for membership dues, and other sources. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. When you say trade organizations, does that include unions, or is that

under a separate category? Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Unions are under the definitions of organization. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could you help in giving me the definition, then, of the organization and its applicability in this law? Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Organization means all labor organizations as defined in the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. Basically, a bargaining representative, organizations for teachers, any local, state, or national organization to which a labor organization pays membership or a per capita fees based upon its affiliation or membership. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Could you elaborate a little bit and explain the definition of "entity"? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin

REP. MORIN (28th):

Sure, one second, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, an entity means whether organized in this or any other state, an organization, corporate and good point, whether for profit or not for profit cooperative association, limited partnership, professional association, limited liability company and any incorporated tax exempt political organization. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It's an interesting question as it related to nonprofits. Have nonprofits been covered under campaign finance law in the past? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure. I know this clarifies that they certainly are covered under this legislation. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, as I asked earlier as it relates to whether they were covered before in the past and why the rationale of including them in the political process? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think they were but again because we're really the just -- of the bill is to look at independent expenditures and ensuring the see who's contributing through these independent expenditures. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And that raises a very good question. The definition of expenditures, what does that cover and could you give me some particular examples that we could use a point of reference in this bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Just give me a second, please.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just looking for that one section.

Give me one second, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

Expenditure, it has many things. The first is any purchase, payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value when made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or election of any person or for the purpose of aiding or promoting the success or defeat of any referendum question. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just a point of question, I was recognizing that there are members in this chamber that have not received the amendments to be able to follow this discussion. Through you, sir.

I don't know how we would proceed.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative, is that a question?

REP. HWANG (134th):

Yes. Should we be waiting for them to receive copies of this amendment? I recognize that in this chamber that most of the members have not received copies of the amendment. Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Hold on, please.

The Chamber will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang, actually, earlier copies were distributed and there should be some available.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Okay. Thank you, sir.

Through you, sir, as a follow up question is -- and I thank the good Chair for his explanation of expenditures.

Can you help me with independent expenditures, and some examples of it? Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. An independent expenditure is an expenditure that's made by an entity, someone that is not in conjunction with the political candidate or committee. I guess simply put it would be an expenditure if it was for particular candidate in a political race that was put forth separate and not paid for by any of the campaign dollars, by a separate entity, for the purpose of the benefit of that said candidate. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Pointing back to a business entity, could you elaborate a little bit in

regards to the exclusion of certain professional services corporations and the rationale behind that. Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess that's under statute under Chapter 594a. They did not include that and they're single, individual, nonstock organizations, which are not engaged in business or profit making activities. And they're as defined in subdivision 7 of this section. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on, as it relates to organizational expenditures on line 192 of this amendment. We are eliminating headquarters from organizational expenditures. Can you give me a little bit more background on why the rationale of caucus headquarters being eliminated and exempt from organizational expenditures, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Sure. This was taken out, basically -- and it was moved to exempt expenses, basically allowing town committees, and such, headquarters -- caucus and town committee headquarters to allow them to put forth their abilities as those groups to provide headquarters and different things for the campaign committees. You know, the use of offices, telephones, computers, and such, to allow those to be really exempt expenses from the campaign. Through you, Mr. Speaker

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, sir.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. When we talk about organizational expenditures -- and I thank the good Chairmen for his explanation -- take me through how their involvement would be, an organization or business entity, in creating contrast pieces of organizational mailings.

What is a contrast piece? And what are limits to it? And what restrictions you may have on it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That would be on line 170.

Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I think in the original discussions in current statute, I believe, you know, under an organizational expenditure, they were not allowed to do a contrast piece. In my opinion and I think as we've discussed, a contrast piece is where you would put a piece of literature, maybe a mailer or something to the sort, out that would allow the ability to use maybe your opponents or the opposites side's stance on specific issue, a particular issue. And what this does is it certainly allows for that to be utilized. The whole idea was originally was not to allow for, you know, negative, real negative pieces, but I think a healthy contrast of a stance of opinions is worthwhile, and that's why it's in there. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Chairman brings up a very good point when we talk about the contrast piece. I think in the past, as he shared, the contrast pieces were exempt. Now, we are moving into a place where organizations and business entities and entities can get involved and, through their organizational expenditures, create contrast pieces. And I think the speaker also said, some negative possibilities of, you know, mailing out pieces.

Can you -- through you, Mr. Speaker, ask the Chair to share with me, what are lines to be drawn between a contrast piece and a potential negative piece? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

And again, I think a contrast piece is how I see it is, is certainly that where the piece of literature would clearly depict the candidate's stance on any particular issue. And a negative piece would be a personal attack on that person for personal reasons or maybe nonfactual. I think it's a great way to go because I think, in Connecticut, we've -- well, no, I think overall, people don't appreciate the negativity

and the false attacks. We should be able to discuss and debate on our merits of our stance on the issues, and I think this clearly dictates that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I greatly respect that premise but in regards of contrast piece, we are, in essence, enabling organizations, business entities, and entities to, in fact, create mailings and mail pieces that in the efforts of contrast go negative. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess, you know, the organizational expenditure is by party committee legislative caucuses, legislative leadership committees. And I think, frankly, I do support -- I do support the whole concept of allowing the contrast piece. It's factual. It's based on your stance on a particular issue. It's not based on personal -- personal innuendos. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I want to share that it is a bit of concern, and I recognize and hope that in future workings of the statute that we properly define and ensure that our mailing efforts on behalf of a candidate through organizations and business entities do not go negative.

Moving onto line 226, can you elaborate a little bit more on what "cover transfer" means as it relates to organizational expenditures, sir? Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A cover transfer is a transfer or payment of funds in an aggregate amount of $1,000 or more in the two years that follow the initial transfer of payment by an entity covered by the disclosure provisions under this chapter to a recipient who uses such funds to make a campaign-related disbursement. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I can ask the chair, can you translate that to a real life scenario for me please, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

So under the definition of an entity, if someone had given in the aggregate, in total of maybe three of four different contributions equaling $1,000 or more in the two years that follow the first time that they may have done that, under the disclosure provisions. So, I guess, if the second time you have given at least $1,000 of more in two years to someone who uses these funds to make a campaign-related disbursement. So I suppose if you gave to an organization that would then make an independent expenditure. So maybe to one of the organizations that typically makes a lot of campaign donations that's where it would to from. Mr. Speaker, through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And also a follow-up on that, line 231, "party building activities." Can you kind of clarify, define that for me, clarify for me and possibly provide some examples.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, under the definitions, a party building activities includes -- it isn't limited to, political meetings conferences, events, conventions, basically, seek use to apply the standard in really in an informal advice and we want to strengthen this. It allows the two-plus PACs the opportunity to conduct these types of activities. I guess, I would say political meetings to discuss the betterment of the party and different events and conferences that may adhere to the same. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Now does that party building is it only limited to political action committees or can business entities, as well as entities, get involved in that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (22nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it's designed apparently to the PACs.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134Th):

Thank you.

Just for clarification. Specific and only to political action committees? Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What are permissible and nonpermissible allocation of funds through those PACs? Are you looking at campaign events or are you looking at fundraising activities?

What are not permissible through party building activities by political action committees in this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to -- if you are asking me what are acceptable uses for party building? I guess I would ask for clarification.

Are you asking, what's applicable for the PAC itself, or for party building activities? I want to make sure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm actually more interested in what is not permissible for the

political action committees under the guise of party building.

Could you give me an example, what would not be permissible? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

I guess under this -- under party building activity, you couldn't make a contribution to some that was participating in the state elections, enforcement directly to their campaign. That's one activity. You know, I know, typically, you did mention what it -- I think at the beginning you did say what is approved or not. I think you can make an independent expenditure, but you can't make a direct contribution to the candidate that's participating. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What I'm hearing right now is the possibility that it is a broad permissibility and what I'm hearing is possibly the only exemption or nonpermissible is to a specific

campaign committee; is that what you understand it to be? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No. I gave -- that's an example. I certainly am not quoting verbatim, because I do not have right off the top of my head every specific item that would be permitted or not permitted. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Sticking along with line 234, we are making an introduction into campaign statutes the term of "social media." Could you define that for me and also include some particulars and examples that we can identify with in everyday life. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Well, social media

means an electronic medium where users may create and view user-generated content, such as uploaded or downloaded videos, still photographs, blogs, videos, podcasts, et cetera. To old guys, like me, it's Facebook. The younger generation people are using different things, Twitter. So through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Now, obviously, the content and flow of information is free in most cases through the Internet and social media. Are there any exemption provisions in that to account for the new brave world of social media? Through you Mr. Speaker

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The way I understand it, you know, it certainly is free. I don't think there is any charge to it. I remember as we -- I think as we discussed to the good ranking member. There would just be the ability if it was specifically for a campaign-related purposes there would have to be

some sort of disclaimer but it is not -- there is no fee for it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker --

Thank you, I'm sorry.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Are there exempt provisions in this statute to protect the interpretation of social media, apart from campaign finance regulations? Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you Mr. Speaker. At this moment, I don't believe so, but I certainly could be wrong and I will find out. Through you Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I can as a reference if I could ask the good Chair to potentially refer to line 377 as it relates to de minimis activity and there is an address of social media, but I would

like to have the Chair read through that and share with me his interpretation and offer does that application provide the exemption on social media? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I'll go through it from the beginning. That didn't sound right but -- subsection 18: "The value associated with de minimis activity on behalf of a party committee, political committee, slate committee, or candidate committee, including for activities, including, but not limited to, the creation of electronic or written communications created on a voluntary basis without compensation, including, but not limited to, the creation and ongoing content development and delivery of social media on the Internet or telephone, including, but not limited to, the sending or receiving of electronic mail or messages.

"The posting or display of candidates name or group of candidate's" -- blah, blah.

So I guess, I guess that says it for you,

Representative. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As a point of clarification, as it relates to the statute, I'm going to use an example of Facebook. Facebook has a private individual account, but they also provide a business account whether it be a politician or a community leader. And Facebook defines it as a separate category.

In regards to campaign advocacy and what it described in the statute. Does the statute recognize the differences between the two and treat them separately, as well? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think I heard the question correctly. You're asking do they -- if both Facebook accounts. Correct? Just the one is your personal and one is deemed whether political or some other form; is that correct? Through you, Mr.

Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As we look through, I don't see that here. It looks to me like it is a de minimis activity. And I don't think there is a separation at this point.

I imagine at some point there may be but I know in the past there have been questions through state elections enforcement on this and it's really been, I think, the discussion during the committee that there really is not any direct -- well, there is not any real difference right now between them. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I would beg to disagree on that. I think the differences are

particular and, through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Chairman's interpretation that the personal account of an individual on a Facebook, even though it may be transmitting of photos and content as it relates to purported campaign work, should be exempt and should reflect that in the statute and the spirit of the law. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

Excuse me -- Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A point well taken, and I will certainly be willing to work with the gentleman from Fairfield to look into that further. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on to line 409, in regards to the change in statutes from advertisement to communications. Could you, through you, Mr. Speaker share a rationale for that change and a definition of "communications"? Through you, Mr.

Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Communication refers to one or more clearly identified candidates, either broadcast by radio, television, satellite communications, Internet, or paid-for telephone communication, or it appears in a newspaper, magazine, billboards, sent by mail. And it's broadcast or appears during the 90-day period preceding the date of a primary or an election.

It really just broadens the communications covered by expenditures, and it clarifies communications relating to legislation that's not covered. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Are there a timeline guideline to it in the context? As I read through the statute that there is a 90-day period preceding the date of a primary or an election. Can you clarify

that that does indeed cover that window and does not expand beyond that?

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, it does state that and the reason it does that because it would, I think, for election purposes, if we went any further than that -- and I think there might have been discussion at some where we a little, there might have been a few more days added but that was not necessarily I think consistent with how we view an election cycle. And this certainly was -- did not want to take away people's ability to talk about or discuss or share with people through these avenues that are described under the definition the ability to discuss pieces and issues with the voters. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on, on section 3 still, and I appreciate the Chair's explanation of

independent expenditures. Could you elaborate a little more on the term "rebuttable presumption" as it relates to these independent expenditures and how they are coordinated in an account as contributions and in a campaign finance law? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The rebuttal, I think I heard he wants the definition of "rebuttal." I couldn't quite hear it. There was some noise around here. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

I'm sorry.

Representative Hwang, could you repeat the question?

REP. HWANG (134th):

Absolutely, sir.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As it relates to section 3, independent expenditures in the rebuttable presumption that these expenditures are coordinating count as contributions. Could you be able to elaborate what the term, "rebuttable presumption" is defining and how does that relate to the contribution

and how they are counted? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I guess the rebuttable presumption is something that you can otherwise. I would ask if there is a specific area the gentleman would like me to look at. I'd be happy to do. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Absolutely, sir.

And I do have one section 3, sub (9) 564, 565. These expenditures made by consultants and creative services.

Are these independent expenditures receivable by candidates and committees that participate under the Citizens' Elections Program in our state? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Starting on 565, I

believe I heard the good man say. No, through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, no, you're saying that participant candidates in our CEP program cannot receive these expenditures. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. You are correct, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Surely. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could you share with this chamber the rationale why these are not allowable to CEP program participants? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Let me check -- just tried to check the area.

Give me one second, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman giving me the time.

I believe they can make the expenditure, but they can't make the expenditure to a candidate that's participating. They can't receive the in-kind contribution. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you. Moving onto subsection 10, the new language takes a look at a one and half year look back for hiring of potential candidate's staff. Can you share with me, why the 18-month turnaround requirement and what application of that is to a staff's role in that campaign? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I guess

this is one where you could say if someone was working for me, personally, and then someone might have wanted to hire that person, you know, to help that person out, you know, even though they were an employee of mine or consultant, and I think it basically just, I think it's, frankly, good to keep the process open and transparent.

I wasn't -- as we discussed this during committee, I think the whole idea was to keep the appearance and not probably the appearance but, definitely, having favors done to help out people who might have worked for any particular candidate by someone that's involved in the campaign. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the answer on that. But the rationale, 18 months, a year and a half. Were there any considerations to a year, to two years? I think in regards to some of the ethics reviews that we had in our committee, there was a two-year cycle turnaround. Through you, Mr. Speaker

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As the discussions went back and forth, I think in our consultations with all of the people that are involved in the committee, the 18-month period was a number, I think, that was responsible and will accomplish the goals. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Moving on to section 11 -- 582, line 582. It is making note to campaign-related vendors. Is that a consultant and would that expenditure be classified under independent expenditure or organizational expenditures? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, it could be some kind of campaign consultant. And it is, as I see it, it's really an entity making an expenditure so I don't see -- no, I think it is definitely just an

expenditure made by a person or entity. Definitely talks about somebody that worked for previously a campaign or candidate through, say, you were utilizing somebody that was doing your campaign literature and then they ultimately went to work for another firm and they had the same information that they'd been with you all along and now they working with somebody making an independent expenditure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, moving onto section 5 and, obviously, we acknowledge the importance of treasurers throughout all of our campaigns and good work. Is this statute's intent to give a greater length of grace period for the input of donations from 14 to 20 days, just a point of clarification. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A very good point and

that was something that was brought forth. It has been brought forth, I guess, for a long time people discussing the hard work that our treasurers and treasurers, in general, do. But this basically just gives them six more day to get -- to get these things deposited, almost an extra week, and I think in a busy time especially, it's very beneficial to our treasurers. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Moving on to section 7, it's a dramatic change from past statutes to raise the individual contributions on an aggregate basis of donations. Could the good Chair elaborate the increases specific for state central committees, town committees, the caucus committees, as well as campaign committees. Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I appreciate that question. These amounts have not been addressed in many, many years. And this is an

individual contributions in one calendar year, and I would be happy to go through them. For a state central committee, it goes from 5 to 10,000 dollars for an individual. For a town committee it goes from 1 to 2,000 dollars. From the caucuses -- let's see, for a legislative caucus committee it goes from 1 to 2,000. Legislative leadership committee goes 750 -- no, it goes 1 to 2,000. For two-plus PACs, it goes from 750 to 1,000.

So I mean the smaller entities are definitely smaller increases to the individual contributions but to state central and, I think, to town committees there was a little more given, and I guess that is based on many years of the numbers staying the same. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. With those increases in allowable contributions, have we raised the aggregate total for an individual to be able to contribute toward campaigns? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Not to the campaign but to these caucus -- or to these committees but not to the campaigns. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could the good Chair share the dollar amount increases allowable under this statute.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think -- I'm not sure if I'm clear. I believe I addressed the town committee, state central, is what an individual can contribute. I don't believe the numbers been changed for what you can donate to candidates. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWAN (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to

rephrase, obviously, clarify a little bit more. Are we increasing the allowable individual aggregate total contribution from the current existing number, I believe of 10,000. Are we increasing it, if not, to 30,000? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm glad you mentioned that because it gave me a chance to look through the section.

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, as I look through it. And I think he's alluding to page 44, lines 1395, where it says, "no individual shall make contributions to such candidates or committee which in the aggregate exceed $30,000 for any single election and primary preliminary to such election." And that's aggregate for individuals that is not for participating candidates, however. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could you share and I know the good Chair had mentioned that these laws have

not been -- these financial numbers have not been updated. But, through you, Mr. Speaker, why such a dramatic increase in those numbers. Through you, sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As I said, the numbers have just -- have been stagnant for many years and there was discussion that this was an appropriate number. And we'll -- certainly, as we go on, I guess I would say if there seems to be a problem or we deem it, I'm sure the GA&E committee will have an opportunity to review this, if there is any problems. I don't sense that, but we would be glad to revisit. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

(Deputy Speaker Altobello in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Welcome, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Which raises the question that I really want to make sure that we

address in this discussion is that fact that -- and I respect that the Chair had said that we haven't made these changes in a while -- but truly to move from a $10,000 individual contribution in one fell swoop to move it to 30,000. You, obviously, look at inflation, cost of living index, et cetera, but that is a dramatic increase, and I would like the Chair to possibly elaborate a little bit more truly the rationale moving from a 10,000 limit to a 30,000. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I guess a lot of the discussion in this bill was in result to outside influences, corporations, as a result of Citizens United. Again, it's a number that we were looking for. It's a number that individuals can contribute and hadn't been addressed in quite a long time. And I think it's allowing an individual to participate, you know, to that level. As I said before, if it seems to be -- if there are some problems, we certainly can revisit that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And it's an excellent segue in our conversation as we look at the statute as it relates to campaign finance. We're moving toward one aspect of this bill that I truly appreciate and support is the increased disclosure requirements for the -- for the intent of transparency.

Moving on to section 9, could the good Chair describe a little bit more in regards to how business entities, organizations, and entities can get involved. And what is the disclosure requirements in regards to their top five donors and we'll rehash that quite a bit. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Good point. Under section 9, which talks about what individuals, and such, can do. Business entities, organizations, associations, committees or a group of two or more who have joined solely to promote the success or defeat of

the referendum question. You know, it's basically what's going to happen is these organizations are going to have to disclose, at least, a list of -- at least, the top five donors whose donors in the aggregate are in top five largest amounts, and they'll have to post it on their website. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If I could ask the Chair to provide some background on this as it relates to the Citizens United decision and its impact on corporations and business entities, and entities to be involved in the political campaign business.

Through you, if I could ask the Chair to summarize the court case and its implications on corporate contributions and why this portion of this statute is so absolutely critical to maintaining clean and fair elections. Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, this is the

whole premise of this bill really is to allow -- to allow for campaigns to be run fairly, cleanly, with transparency. We want to ensure that if people are going to make their independent expenditures and they certainly are allowed to under this legislation. We just want to ensure that when they are making those independent expenditures that the people that are funding these are not silently funding it and least some people will say we didn't go far enough, but some people by asking them to make claim to the top five donors, I think it's really a step in making sure that the people -- the outcomes of elections, it continuously stays to the people and individuals as we have done. And I think we have done a terrific job of over the years. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to rehash back and ask the Chair to clearly define the implications of Citizens United. And what that did in allowing business entities, and entities, and organizations to actively participate in the campaign

finance component.

I think I just need for the body and the Chamber, and for the people to understand that this a reaction to Citizens United to increase, transparency, to ensure that the people that are getting involved in political campaigns are recognized and disclosed their activities.

So I would like to, through you, ask the Chair to elaborate a little bit more about Citizens United and the disclosure implications of this statute, to address that concern. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think you did a terrific job of doing it, Representative Hwang.

The Citizens United did give unions and corporations the ability to give dollars directly, not just through PACs, and I think what we are trying to do is say we want to know where those dollars are coming from, and I think this is a terrific step to get there. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. As we look at these disclosures and, obviously, the intent is good but I hope that we are able to vet out a little bit some of the additional concerns I have in that transparency in hopes of making a good law better.

Can you share with me the implications of these disclosure requirements for entities that may be nonprofits, and are there considerations given in regards to accounting and potential of segregated accounts for those nonprofits because of their unique nature? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think as we talked about segregated accounts, if that, in fact, if entities do want to make these independent expenditures and they don't want to have to disclose to their -- to their governing bodies, if they keep the money in a segregated account strictly for political purposes, then that's one thing. But if they're going to be paying for or contributing in some

form, I believe it's over 4,000. If they do that then they're -- out of their basic account, then they are going to have to disclose and they are going to have to get approval from the governing boards. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the good Chair could explain a little bit, I'm extremely concerned about the burden that is placed on nonprofits in two parts: one, the disclosure of private donors for a nonprofit cause that would be potentially be exposed and the potential chilling effect on those nonprofits; and number two, the burden of creating segregated accounts. And if the good Chair could explain implications and thoughts to both of those issues, it would be greatly appreciated.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Well, through you, Mr. Speaker. And this legislation doesn't take any rights away and, frankly,

if they're going be making independent expenditures, then I think it's a cleaner way for them to get to accomplish that by going into a segregated account. Again, they have -- this is voluntary. They don't have to do this. They don't have to make the donations, but this allows them to continue to do so. They just have to show where their money is coming from. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What considerations would you give and what rationale would you give to be able to support a nonprofit that is a small organization servicing a community, such as Fairfield, and imposing that additional cost burden on them. Are there any exemptions and considerations given to be able to opt out of this system?

I know the good Chair cited voluntary, but if they had many any contributions or any identified support of a candidate, whether intentional or unintentional, this could be an incredible burden on our nonprofits in the community. And I'm extremely concerned as to why we would to include nonprofits as

an entity? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, nobody's -- they're having -- they are still allowed to make the independent expenditure. They just have to disclose whether they're top donors are coming from. I'm not quite sure where the hardship is in that.

It's voluntary, and we are giving them the opportunity to -- they are still able to participate. We just want to see where their donors are coming from. Through you, Mr. Speaker

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Well, we are going to have to agree to disagree on that.

On section 10, again, related to the disclosure components, again, you're looking at requiring a board of governance votes for business entities, and for them to convene and vote on expenditures anything over 4,000.

Obviously, some of the concerns have been raised

is the fact that corporate governance doesn't operate on per item basis and that is not a purview of the corporate board structure.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, could the good Chair elaborate a little bit more on, how he envisions the system to work and how that may be applied in an effective manner. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, if they make an independent -- that's a good point, and I'm glad it was brought up by the Ranking Member.

If they are going to make an independent expenditure, they would have -- of more than 4,000, they're going to have to get board of governance approval and the vote has to be posted on their website.

Again, this whole piece of legislation is geared towards depicting where those independent expenditures are coming from. And if you're going make the independent expenditures in the people that participate, all of us that participate in the campaigns and under the Citizens Election Program,

everyone that donates to our campaign is known to the public. And -- and that's a good thing. And what we're trying to do here is to say if you're going to go out there and make independent expenditures and try to -- to facilitate change in the election process and -- and then we want to see where the money is coming from. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. When you look at expenditures in business, what about a -- a privately held for-profit business -- an example, a real estate company or a -- a private investment company of one or two individuals? Are they covered under this or are they exempted under the business entity that we talked about earlier in -- in section -- section 8, line 59?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe -- and I appreciate that question. I believe it's -- if they have -- if they're a corporation, if they have a board, they're -- they're covered under this. If

they're not, then they would not be. Through you, Mr. Speaker -- or go under a business entity, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And -- and I want to stay on the -- the transparency component but we talked about it and I asked what is a segregated account and what would that be applied from a standpoint of an execution side for nonprofits or for any business? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A segregated account would be an account that was separate of the general expenditure of a -- of any organization, corporation or so that would be used explicitly for campaign purposes, finance, political expenditures. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In reliance to businesses, business entities, there is a clause in section (B) of line 734 in -- in asking of accepting donations from the General Treasury but also as a result of that in excess of anybody over a thousand, you are looking to require those organizations to disclose all of their donors and be able to publish them -- to have to publish them on the internet website; is that true? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Why such an expansive requirement in regards to all the donors if money are drawn from the general treasury instead of the least top five as we looked at it from a segregated account? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, under -- under the guise of the independent expenditures, you -- you can't segregate. How do you know where that money is coming from? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In looking at that same line 746, section (C) -- as I had mentioned earlier our desire to protect and -- and allow these nonprofits -- and I appreciate the Chair's supporting words of saying it's a voluntary program that they're engaged -- I would like to ask the Chair for -- for record to be able to say that section (C) -- does section (C) afford some exemption in coverage for nonprofits to not have to make disclosures if not explicitly the money is being used for a campaign purpose?

And I -- I want to raise that to be sure that we have provided an avenue to protect our nonprofits that if they are not participating in any campaign expenditures, they are to be exempt under this statute, under this language from making disclosures and providing a top five list of their donors.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Very well done, to the Ranking Member. Yes, it allows the exemption for nonprofits if the donations are segregated into an account that is not used for campaign disbursements and such. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Could -- could the good Chair elaborate a little bit more on section 14 of looking at financial statements and the requirements, as such, for not only the treasurers but also for organizations, business entities, entities and organizations? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Give me one second, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I just want to make sure I am able to give the proper response. Yes,

thank you.

Looking for the improvements in section 14, these sections were put in place by request of State Elections Enforcement Commission. By eliminating multiple reports that had to filed within a few days of each other, you know, this legislation under certain committees -- excuse me, I apologize -- that were required to submit filings within close proximity to other filings and sometimes within the same week -- excuse me -- and so they came to us and we -- we realized that this would make it -- some of these filings were just redundant and would have just caused tremendous amount of work for the people that work as treasurers and this was a way to fix that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. On line 1254, section (G) -- I'm reading this language to have considerations to codify that it -- it would allow paying treasurers for their service. If that is indeed the case, through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the good Chair the rationale behind that

and what led to that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I think we all recognize the difficulty of being a -- well, maybe we don't all realize it -- but many of us through discussions in the committee process recognize the work that treasurers put in, the numerous requirements that they face in filing and it gives us an opportunity to -- to give them -- provide them with payment for the great services and that they -- that they provide for us. So I think we did have these discussions in during -- during the committee process, and I fully supported them. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Related to line 1514, beginning in section 23 -- we are making considerations for armed forces members to be able to cast their vote through facsimiles or email. Could you elaborate a more on how that would work? Through

you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I was very much intrigued. I attended a -- a forum that the Secretary of State had -- I'm going to say in February -- at the Central Connecticut State University to discuss the possibility of online voting. There were -- there were people that were there from pro and con. And the Secretary of State from the state of West Virginia discussed how she had implemented a pilot program for military people serving overseas. I don't believe that this necessarily goes to that depth of providing for online voting but what it does do is right now they have the opportunity to get their absentee ballots either mailed to them or -- and so what this will do is -- it will allow the voters overseas to either send the email or fax -- fax it back to the clerk's office. Obviously, they would have to waive any confidentiality due to the effect that somebody would have to physically get that ballot.

But, again, this is something I have to give

credit -- I know Senator Slossberg was very much in support of and we had discussed this and that's why we got to this point. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hwang.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the good Chairman's thoughts and feedback through my line of questioning as it relates to the statute.

I -- I do have to raise a concern that I think to the rationale that was originally offered as to why we're making some increase contribution amounts because it hasn't been done so in a long time. It is a bit of a concern.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the Clerk call LCO 5364 and I would allow leave of the Chambers to be able to summarize. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative.

I think we'd like to deal with House "A" first, however.

REP. HWANG (134th):

I'll just take the money -- okay.

Through you, I'll withdraw that, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

I will reserve the right to speak a second time and thank the Chair for the time to be able to ask the questions.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, sir.

Further on House "A," further on House "A"?

From the 14th District, Representative Aman, you have the floor, sir.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

On this debate there, we're -- we are going to be a bit limited on time. There are a lot of people to speak. So I am just going to talk about a couple of the issues that were brought up so that there is time to do amendments and other things as we move forward on this very important issue.

What I'm concerned about in the debate that I've heard so far and for the good Chairman just so that he knows where I'm going, I'm going to be looking at lines 168 to 173 is where I'm going to be talking

about my questions. And -- and they deal with the idea of what a town committee or another organization can put forward and how it differentiates from straight campaign literature. And the reason I have a problem is that as I remember reading that section and hearing the debate, you're allowed to put in photographs of the candidates, you're going to put in candidates' positions, you could put in a contrast piece with your other candidate, and I'm wondering how that may be differed from a piece of campaign literature or campaign information.

I'm finding a hard time to understand how that could not be classified just as a campaign piece? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think the discussion -- and I was trying to listen closely to the question of Representative Aman. Again, I think we're looking at contrast pieces -- if that's what he was looking at as opposed to a campaign piece. I think certainly it's very -- to me, it's clear the contrast piece is issue driven, yet, it speaks solely to your stance on

a particular issue whereas a campaign piece is innuendo sometimes, oftentimes and an opinion. And I think that's why that -- it is appropriate in that spot.

And if I -- please repeat the rest of the question if I didn't get to it, I'd be happy to do it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. I'm still a little confused because if you put all of those things on it and you don't -- it appears from what I just heard if you put everything on it, except mentioning your opponent, would it be allowed under this provision? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Would you be kind enough -- would the good Representative be kind enough to give me the line he's looking at, and I'll be glad to answer?

REP. AMAN (14th):

Again, I'm looking at --

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. AMAN (14th):

-- the lines 168 to 173 where they're talking about things that a campaign committee can do for a candidate. And -- so that is the area that I'm looking at. It appears he's nodding and he's following. And I'm just trying to figure out and I'm thinking of it for those members of us in the chamber and when we're putting this stuff together so we don't step under -- over the line, where is the line between what they're talking that is allowed here and when it would be classified as a campaign piece? And I'm trying -- I'm having difficulty finding where that line is. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, looking through it leading up until 170 -- line 171, that's all existing law. In line 171, information concerning how each candidate -- such candidate contrasts with such candidate's opponent, and again, I think I -- I,

you know, this is for the purposes of an organizational expenditure and the types of pieces that are -- are utilized during that. It talks about what types of, you know, mail, a display or a mailing. And it -- it's basically an existing statute. It talks about the things that can be on there. And then -- and then I just think the -- the language is strengthened by putting the contrast piece in there. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yes. I think by adding the contrast piece in here it opens it up for -- to go far beyond the original intent of years ago of biography, more of a puff piece on a candidate, and now you're getting into what I consider much more campaign type information.

And I'll use as an example, last night we discussed the budget at length. Since I can contrast my -- with my opponent, could someone run under this section a statement of comparing and contrasting and saying: Representative So-and-So gave $15 million to the casinos in the budget. I would have used that money for the homeless shelter down the street.

Would that have been a legitimate thing for, under this provision, to put into that document? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose if it's a contrasting piece to your stance on issues. It can be an organizational expenditure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Yeah. And so that's the point that I'm making. I'm having a hard time seeing how an organizational piece and a campaign piece is different.

Going on to roughly line 231, party building activities. This, again, like the similar thing, I think is so wide open that anybody doing this sort of activity is pretty much free to go anywhere they want. They can give out unlimited amount of material, which I translate to campaign literature, bumper stickers, et cetera, as long as they are helping to build the party -- for party building activity. They are

allowed to, obviously, have speeches and things. And I know a lot of my party building activities that are legitimate. The roasting of your opponents and the roasting of candidates and sarcasm runs rampant. It's one the more fun things of a party building activity.

But now we're not only sanctioning it and saying that it exists. We're allowing the money through campaign finance to go to pay for those type of activities. And I am very concerned that that party building activities, they way it is written, is just subject to unbelievable amount of gray area abuse, potential abuse, that can be done.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have problems with many sections of this bill, but I wanted to just bring up those two and have -- give them a chance for other people to talk on it.

I thank the proponent for bringing it forward.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Aman.

From the 125th, Representative Hetherington, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you to the proponent. As I look at this

amendment it appears that all of the provisions which deal with raising the amount or reducing the amount, for that matter, changing the amount of grant sums from the Citizens Election Program, those appear to be gone from the amendment; is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you.

I would like to focus, just for a moment, on one of the same provisions that the previous speaker mentioned. That's in lines 172, and so forth, involving the contrasting positions. And I would emphasize that this would appear to allow a statement that was not only affirmative -- positive from the standpoint of one candidate but pejorative for another. That is to say our positions contrast. I want to save the environment while my opponent wants to trash the environment, dump toxic waste into our

rivers and lakes and, generally, make a mess of our environment.

Now that -- those would be contrasting positions, wouldn't they? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I think that under this -- this is under the organizational expenditures by a party committee, office committee or leadership committee for the benefit of a candidate or candidate committee. So that's how that would go. And again, the contrast piece is, I think, a factual piece -- a piece that would state that if you were using that same train of thought that my opponent cut -- or this person -- Candidate A cut $140 million to an environmental issue that's important to this district in the vote shown here, and the Candidate B that's being supported fought for that funding based on their vote. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

I see.

And Through you, Mr. Speaker. How is the content to be challenged if a piece went out that made pejorative references to one candidate and flattering comments about the other candidate all in terms of portraying positions. How would that be challenged? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Based on the same ways that you would deal with any type of potential or -- campaign violation with a complaint to the State Elections Enforcement Commission. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

And presumably they would be prepared to handle these on an expedited basis so as not to -- not to interfere with the campaign. Correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that they would react on it as quickly as they could --

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Okay.

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- with available staffing. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

I'm -- by the way, through you, Mr. Speaker, would we -- do we anticipate that there will be regulations issued that might go further in defining these various categories of acceptable or unacceptable pronouncements? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that there will be opinions offered by the regulating agencies and --

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Yeah.

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- and when once if this becomes law, they will

be providing interpretations for all the statutes to the --

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Yeah.

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- treasurers and all the pertinent people that are involved in campaigns. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. In lines 48 through 58, there refers to organization -- the definition of organization and it refers to state, local and national organizations and in the case of an organization that has a parent national body, as well as local chapters or locals, is each -- is the local and national considered separately, each one a separate organization to the -- to the point, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the point that a transfer of funds from the local to the national or from the national to the local would also be considered a -- a covered transfer for these purposes? Through you, Mr.

Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's quite a good question. I don't believe that that's the bill's intent.

Frankly, these types -- I think these transfers are automatic monthly, you know, pass-throughs of small individual payments that aren't designed for any particular expenditure. So these transfers would not be reportable. The entity that ultimately makes the expenditure would, of course, have to report it and report that the source of funds is -- is the periodic dues payments of its members or the members of its affiliated local.

And, you know, I guess, a brief piece of information, you know, especially in the -- in the unions, the organizations locally, typically monies that are expended for political purposes are not dues related. They're typically separate donations that the individual member has to -- has to agree to make that donation towards political purposes.

And I would say for most dues paying people,

especially, at least in state service, they're donation -- even their dues over the course of the year probably don't equal more than, you know, probably a thousand dollars at the most. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

So if the national organization makes an expenditure in a particular state for political purposes and the national organization's war chest, political war chest, is funded by the dues or the contributions of local members to their local chapter or local that would be a covered transfer for reporting purposes; would it not? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I -- I'm not sure. And I guess, I would go -- I guess, if a national organization was making an expenditure, I think they would have to just disclose it, the locals that are providing dollars to them. Whether, you

know, the different locals or the different organizations whatever those dues or funds are transferred over the course of the year. I'm not so sure it would get back to the individual dues paying member. But it -- is I believe I heard the gentleman state if it was a national making an expenditure and they were looking for something for disclosure, they would have to -- they would be able to say the locals that provided them funds through the course of the year. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you, thank you. I think this is a -- and I appreciate the Representative's efforts to respond to that. I think this is a knotty question and I -- I think it really has substance because -- and I'm not just thinking about labor unions. I'm thinking about nonprofit organizations operating on a national basis that -- that recruit funds, solicit funds through their local members.

But let me -- let me pass on from that.

Going to lines 419 and after that, expenditures -- the definition of expenditure, and an excluded

expenditure is a communication -- expenditure for communications made for the purpose of influencing any state or local government or administrative action.

So that would mean that an entity can promote the success or defeat of any public policy even though it may be closely identified with a candidate. I'm sure we're familiar with, you know, as campaigns shape their strategy, they inevitably target issues and seek to portray the opponent as the villain of those issues. And if this is the case and if I -- unless I'm reading this incorrectly -- it is not an expenditure to carry on in a communication about -- as long as you can -- as long as can identify it with a particular issue as closely identified as that may be with a particular candidate. And I -- I think that the -- I don't expect a yes or no on that but if the proponent -- if the proponent would agree that that is certainly an issue with respect to this definition. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to come up with the appropriate answer for my friend,

Representative Hetherington.

I -- I guess I can't disagree with the Representative on his summation of that. Again, it's -- this is clarifying communications relating to legislation that's not covered.

And it's broadening the communications covered by these expenditures. So -- I mean, I think it's -- the whole crux of this subsection 2 is -- is basically stating what communications can be utilized and what -- what can be or what can't be included. So --

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

I see.

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Okay. I thank the proponent for attempting to deal with that, and I -- but I think it's troubling. Once you make an exception for speaking out on matters of public policy, that is, government, legislative or administrative action and you can sufficiently identify a candidate with one side or the other, that's gets very, very dangerously close to actually a political communication.

I'm going to move along quickly because I know

others wish to speak, but I do want to go just briefly visit the subject of the disclosure that's required for donors under Independent Expenditures. You know, it's a -- it's a early tradition in this country that many things were -- were published anonymously. Some of our founding leaders would sign, you know, publico or other anonymous names, false names, pseudonyms to the pieces they put in the paper. And I'm not so sure that -- that what we have -- that we have such an unquestioned affinity to the idea of prohibiting anonymous political statements.

You know, a few years ago there was a -- there was a president who it was reported kept an enemies list. And if you spoke out against the administration, you went on that enemies list.

And I'm not convinced -- I'm not convinced that privacy of expression and the anonymity of expression is wholly inconsistent with the idea of personal liberty. And in an effort to reveal donors because they support the publication of a particular point of view, I think it's worth, at least, asking ourselves whether or not that is really so much at the core of our liberty, or whether or not we -- we do value the ability to support quietly an unpopular cause.

By the way, final question to you, Mr. -- through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent. What -- what is the value, in your judgment, of disclosing the identify of all donors? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. -- through you, Mr. Speaker. The value of all donors under -- under the independent expenditures? Would you please clarify that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Hetherington.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Well, I was asking, through you, Mr. Speaker, what's the value of identifying the donors? I know we -- we assume that sunshine is the best disinfectant and I -- I accept that by and large. That's right. We want to have everything else in the open.

But there is a counterargument and we should recognize that and that is that there is some value in privacy and the ability to express an unpopular opinion without being subject to fear of repercussions, so I just raise that for consideration.

I withdraw the question because it's a

philosophical point, and I -- I'm not going to seek a response on that. But I do think it's worth a consideration, particularly, when we get into the nonprofit groups, groups, good government groups. Do we really want to insist? Is the value of disclosure sufficient to outweigh the value of privacy in expression in a free society?

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Hetherington.

Further on House "A"?

Representative Alberts from the 50th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may, several questions to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

You surely may.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you.

Earlier this week we had the opportunity, the proponent and I, to look at some of the language in a previous version of this amendment, and I want to direct the proponent's attention to page 14 of the

amendment that in section 3, the section -- or the paragraph that begins with line 409.

And one of my concerns was that many of the communications that we use in our campaigns, we call them door cards, buck slips, handouts were not referenced in this section. And I just want to make sure that the term "communication" that's identified here, in line 409, either includes those forms of communication, political communication, or another paragraph may address that. So through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent, where would I find reference to those handouts?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- through you, Mr. Speaker, and again, under the definition of expenditure, I think anything of value would -- would cover that. I did appreciate the Representative bringing that to my attention because I'm not sure just by looking at that -- those lines that that would be made clear. But I -- I was assured speaking with LCOs that under the -- anything of value would cover that because it was a very good question. Through

you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate that clarification.

Looking a little further in section 5 on page 20, on line 602. We're making a change in terms of the timelines that a campaign treasurer will have to make a deposit. We're going from 14 days to not later than 20 days. And from my perspective this is not a tightening up of restrictions, it's a loosening of restrictions. And I'm just trying to get a sense of what the reason or rationale for that change may have been? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think the rationale was just to allow the treasurers to -- to deal with a very cumbersome matter. Oftentimes when you're getting in all these things and you -- some treasurers utilize an online form and it requires a lot of input. And I think this just gives them a little more time to

get the work done. I'm not sure I agree that it's, you know, lessening oversight or restrictions but well noted. I appreciate the comment. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And looking a little further in section 8, on page 23, the top of the page. There has been some changes that are -- that are being considered in terms of the deadlines for filing the report. We're looking to go from 48 hours to 24 hours when particular payments are made in the campaign. And then, when -- as the campaign gets closer to the date of a primary or an election, we're looking to go from 24 hours to 12 hours. And I -- I guess I'm concerned about that 12-hour time frame. How is that information to be transmitted to the State Elections Enforcement Commission? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I understand that this should be done -- can be done

electronically. And again, it's -- this is the -- we keep going back and with -- I apologize if I seem redundant -- but we want people to know where the money is coming from that's trying to alter our campaigns. And the people that are making -- again, this is for people making independent expenditures or expenditures that they're going, you know, they'll have to do this. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm actually an avid supporter of that. I think that we should make sure that information is publicized. I guess, I'm not sure about how this actually translates if an independent expenditure, say, is made on a Saturday and this information is transmitted within these new guidelines, if the amendment is adopted, what does -- what do we expect State Elections Enforcement Commission to do with this information on a weekend? Are they staffed on the weekend to deal with this? What do they -- how do they -- do they log this information? Is there some type of response they have? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I'm sure it will be put out on their website, and it will be dealt with as soon as they get it, and they're available to take of it. It's a requirement to report and State Elections will address it as soon as they possibly can.

But again, I -- I get what you're saying, but I think a lot the -- lot of the times and I'll use if you were going to book a radio or, you know, a television slot, I think those expenditures typically are booked far in advance and -- or pretty far in advance, and I think that's -- that's what the goal of this was is to get those -- those time frames put forth as soon as -- as soon as those dollars are expended. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm still -- I appreciate the response. I guess I'm still concerned on what the expectation is of the

State Elections Enforcement Commission. I mean, we're not giving them any accountability or responsibility here except to -- except to accept the information. So that -- that has me -- that has me concerned. And perhaps as the proponent has mentioned, there will be a detailed plan that will be developed.

Looking further into section 9, on page 25. There are a lot of references here. It appears that we are trying to properly characterize the phrasing for different campaign language. And for example, on line 768, there's the insertion of the word "disclaimer"; 789, as a disclaimer; 805, as a disclaimer. And I -- just an observation I think that this word is a poorly chosen word.

My understanding of disclaiming is when we deny the claim of something. I think what we really are doing here in this language is making at attribution. So an attribution would be "I did it, I made this payment." So for wordsmithing, I think, this section fails us. So not to be a humbug but that's my observation that we could do some improvement there.

On page 28, line 870, makes reference of including on a billboard -- and we're now requiring that certain language is going to on that billboard.

I don't see reference to any type of font size or any type of mandate in terms of how that's to appear. Did I miss that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no. You did not miss that. It's not specified.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I hope in the future that when we go back -- and I'm sure perhaps a year from now we'll be looking at making some adjustments that we tackle that.

And then my last observation is -- makes -- is in reference to section 15, on page 40, of the amendment. Lines 1254 to 1259 contemplate, perhaps, a final expenditure of a treasurer on a qualified candidate committee.

And I just want to make sure I understand this. As I read this the treasurer of the committee exclusive of any previous agreement that's been made in terms of doing work on behalf of a committee and

any payments that have been accepted and agreed upon between the campaign committee and the treasurer can receive an extra $1,000 -- or up to $1,000 so the treasurer is paying the treasurer $1,000; is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Right now that is existing law, but I -- I see, typically -- semantically, the good gentleman is correct, but that part of the law has been existing. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Alberts.

REP. ALBERTS (50th):

Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess, yes, part of the law is there but what we're adding here is "exclusive any payments that have been rendered pursuant to a written service agreement," so we're creating an opportunity for some additional funding.

I do appreciate the proponent's answers to the questions. I will listen to the testimony further.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Alberts.

From the 135th District, rising from his seat, Representative Shaban, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may, a few questions to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

You may. Please proceed, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to start with line 746 -- the entire section -- in section 6 there -- I think, as well as part of section 8. In truth, I'll try not to rehash old ground. I actually promise that. Starting with section (C), line 746, it speaks if a donor restricts his or her donation to a not for profit. It's basically saying don't use my money for campaign-related items or political items. That basically gets that donor out from under the otherwise -- the requirement of them being identified; is that a proper reading? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Only if the money is segregated into a different account, not used to make campaign-related disbursements. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yep, that's right. I see that on 747.

But if a similar donor or similar person who might otherwise qualify as a donor under the bill donates to an entity that's not a not-for-profit that carve-out doesn't apply. Correct? I mean it just -- it has to be a not-for-profit. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker., As I believe I heard through this particular section, it's clearly for not-for-profits. Again, I think in other areas of the bill, it does talk about if -- if donations and

expenditures are coming from segregated accounts, these matters don't have to be put forth.

But under this, if we're looking at Subsection (C), I believe the Representative is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So in the same section, section 6 (A) which starts at line 723 and moves on basically delineating the disclosure requirement. You know, you're disclosing your donors. First -- and I know this definition is in here, but I just want make sure for legislative history, you know, that we're really solid in what the definition of a donor is, i.e., if I run a law firm -- which I do -- but if I have, you know, a government relations practice and you have a client. And the client says -- I mean I want to make sure a client who wants their attorney or their representative or anybody working for them to advocate a certain position that this thing can't be construed to come back and require that advocate to disclose the identity of their client.

So through you, are clients of law firms and -- and lobbying firms and whatnot -- not lobbying firms -- but of law firms, would they be protected or required to be disclosed under -- under this bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. Concerning political campaign activities? I -- I think that's what I'm hearing? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

That's correct. A client comes to me and says John, I want you to go push for, you know -- I don't know, you know, Sunday sales. Obviously, not here because I'm -- I'm elected but in another state but whatever.

A client comes says, Attorney, I want you to go push for a certain activity. And gives a fairly large fee to do so. Is that -- I just want to make sure -- that client is not also characterized as a donor under this law? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A couple things: if they're lobbying, there's no disclosure; if we're making an independent expenditure for a campaign, it's if you've donated in the aggregate over $1,000 -- Through you -- and you have to disclose that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you.

Well, if -- if that same client said, John -- and assume I'm a trustee for a family office or something like that -- and the same client says I want you to route $5,000 to a particular cause or a particular campaign.

Who gets disclosed? Is it me, as trustee, or the underlying client? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe,

as the scenario is being portrayed -- and I hope I'm correct -- it seems if you're lobbying, that's already covered. If you're lobbying, you know, you have to have those disclosures.

But if you're going in a political -- if you're making an independent expenditure for a particular political reason, whether it's particular against a candidate or a slate, then the independent expenditure that we're alluding to in this section it comes into play.

But as far as lobbying, that's a different -- that's a different subject. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate that. Yeah, my question may have been imprecise so I apologize.

Stepping away from the lobbying part because I understand that has a whole separate genre of rules.

Just contributions, if I'm a trustee for a family office, the, you know, the Smith family trust. And the Smith family says, John, as trustee, I want you to donate $10,000 to somebody's campaign.

Who gets disclosed, if anyone? Is it me as trustee? Is it the Smith family trust, or is it the members of the Smith family who directed me to do so? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The donor to the trust is the one that would be identified. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So if the trust is a longstanding family trust -- and we have hundreds of these in our State and, obviously, thousands throughout the country -- the money has been in there for generations in some instances.

I just want the legislative history to be clear about, you know, what a donor is and what a donor isn't. So -- and I appreciate it. It's sort of a nuanced question and if we're not sure, we can figure this out after the fact. I -- I appreciate that as

well.

But if the family trust which has had -- had been in existence for generations -- who would be a donor to that family trust under that scenario? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess if they're making those political contributions, they'd have to register as a political committee, and then, again, it's the top donors over $1,000.

If you've donated over $1,000 towards an independent expenditure, then you're going to have to be registered. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I think -- let me move on. I'm not sure -- I think we're a question and answer kind of missing -- closely -- but missing in the night. But it's a nuanced question, and I appreciate the back and forth.

Still in section 6 (A), starting on line 723, and

some of this was mentioned before. I mean, you know, if there is -- if you're a donor that is otherwise required to be disclosed under this section but you, as a donor, say don't disclose my name because you fear economic or social retribution and you say as much to the entity that's donating the money. Does that entity still -- can that entity protect your interests in avoiding economic or social retribution, or is that entity required to make disclosure under this bill? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If they don't want their name to be seen, they have to give less than $1,000. They're not required to disclose under a $1,000 donation. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- otherwise they do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you. So -- so as a condition of entry to participating in the political process at over $1,000, you're saying that losing their anonymity is a condition of entry. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, if -- if it's out of -- if it's out of a segregated account, that's one thing. If it's an account that all kinds of different expenditures are utilized, then they're going to be -- the top five will be disclosed. But if they want to remain anonymous and they're making independent expenditures, then they -- they have to give less than $1,000.

The bottom line is this is the whole idea where we are at this point what's brought us to this is we want to know the people that are trying to frame elections and have effect on them and by disclosing large donors we'll be able to do that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Through you. And -- and yeah, I appreciate the gentleman's response because I think that really kind of teases out the issue here that if you want -- if you want to participate in the electoral process or the political process at an amount greater than the arbitrary figure, the figure of $1,000, that under this bill, as a condition of entry to do so, you can no longer remain anonymous, which is an issue -- which is something that we need to be concerned about which, frankly, has been discussed in court decisions for many, many years, and I flag it.

Same question with respect to just basic privacy. Forget about ostracism or economic retaliation. If I -- if I as a donor of $1,001 just want to be private. I don't want people to know what I'm doing. It's none of their business.

Under this bill, as a condition of entry of me giving that $1,001, as a condition of entry, my name and my privacy have to be disclosed? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If -- based on the statute as written, yes, you have to -- if you're

going to be involved in political activities and you're going to donate $1,000 or more for independent expenditures, you'll be disclosed. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

And Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, that -- that's an issue because as we've heard a little bit before and you'll undoubtedly hear again putting conditions of entry on people's involvement in political activities, whether it's speech, whether it's donations, whether it's giving money to promote speech implicates certain civil rights. It implicates certain rights under our First Amendment federally and our Bill of Rights under the State.

So I think we're going to hear more about this issue as this bill, assuming this bill passes, because putting conditions of entry on anybody's political speech is, to put it at a minimum, an issue constitutionally.

But I appreciate the gentleman's questions, and I thank you for the debate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative.

From the 149th, Representative Floren, you have the floor, madam.

REP. FLOREN (149th):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you.

As you know -- many of my colleagues will know anyway -- I have spent -- it's been my honor to serve on the Government Administrations and Elections Committee for my entire legislative life, which has been the past 12 years. I guess that makes me a goo-goo -- that's what they call a good government type. I've been through it all: contracting reform, ethics reform, voting technology reform and campaign finance reform.

Although I have never ever supported the concept of taxpayer funding of campaigns, since 2005, it has been the law of this State. We enacted the Citizens Election Program legislation for very clear and very laudable reasons: to eliminate corruption, to increase access and ability to become a candidate for public office and, generally, to level the playing field.

In large measure this program has been very, very successful, and it has been embraced by many members of this chamber. However, I do think that the grants and the organizational expenditures go way too far.

It's one thing to level a playing field. It's quite another thing to buy the entire field and then build a gigantic stadium on it.

The campaign donation thresholds are extravagant and outrageous especially in this economy. Tax revenues are needed to maintain the safety net for our most vulnerable citizens: the elderly, the indigent and the ill and to pay for public education. We should not be condoning and encouraging the pouring out of money on banners, beanies, bumper stickers and badges. That's just bologna.

So my opposition to taxpayer funding remains. However, I honestly and sincerely value the work of the GAE Committee and its sincerity in trying to improve this program. And I totally embrace the stringent disclosure aspects of this legislation. I will be voting yes.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, madam.

From the 16th District, Representative Schofield, you have the floor, madam.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the comments of the prior speaker. I, too, find that the disclosure requirements are an appropriate response to the -- the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United.

I do have a couple of questions that I think can be resolved for -- through statements of legislative intent that will just make me one tad little bit more comfortable.

So through you, Mr. Speaker, in section 10, I just want to be clear it's my understanding that Connecticut does not have any jurisdiction over other states, other municipalities, other nations, and so when we're talking about requiring disclosure and statements about any campaign-related disbursements, we're really only talking about campaign-related disbursements for state of Connecticut candidates; is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. That's absolutely correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, I do -- I do support the general idea of this section. I have a small concern, and I guess we'll see how it plays out over time that there may be some businesses that are multistate or multinational businesses that may have a branch here that they may end of deciding to go away because of the implications to them, but I think I'll learn to live with that.

I also have some questions on section 3 that have to do with communications, and again, I think, if you can just help me with legislative intent that would be terrific. There is a section here where we've bracketed out the public access channels. Historically, they were not considered communication and in looking at the OLR summary it says the bill expands the definition to include broadcasts by public access channels.

I know many of us here in the chambers have public access TV shows on a regular basis, including

in the 90 days prior to a campaign. My public access TV station prohibits us in the month before from being on, except specifically for campaign purposes, and they give all candidates equal access and equal time. We don't pay for it, but that's -- that's their particular rule.

I just want to make sure that we're not placing a burden on public access channels who typically are run by volunteers or a very skeleton staff. So that it's -- it's clear that we're not saying that they have to report this as an expenditure if we have any kind of regular show during that 90-day period prior to the election day. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I fully concur with your thoughts. I don't -- I don't think that it becomes an issue. I, also, do shows year round, and I -- what I would commit to you, it was taken out based on many discussions. If there does seem to be any issue that arise, I'd be happy -- I'm sure the whole committee would be happy to try to look and addressing it see if we can, if necessary, make any adjustments.

I don't believe it will, but if necessary, I'd be happy to entertain that. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you.

So let me just clarify, through you, Mr. Speaker. Is it -- is my understanding correct that for purposes of legislative intent if you have a public access TV show that you're not paying for that that would not be considered an expense. That's a reportable expense? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you.

Thank you for rephrasing that, Representative Schofield. You're correct. That's how I believe the intent is to be.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you. And one more question even though I'm not running again so it really doesn't affect me I

just want this to be clear. By coincidence, I'm having a big event in my district in a couple of weeks and am lucky enough to have a commercial TV station invite me to participate on a TV show to promote that event. It is a commercial station. I'm not paying to be on it. Would they be expected to file any sort of statement because that -- if I were running -- might fall in the 90-day period? Would I be expected or would they be expected to report that as an expense just because I happen to be on television or, you know, for that matter, could be in a magazine about something that isn't really campaign related, per se, but I could be the candidate? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think -- I think you're correct if it's prior to the 90 days, and it's for a specific -- we all get involved in specific organizations, specific things that we try to do help out in our community. And I suppose if it was a show or taping where they were talking directly about your candidacy, that's one thing. Talking about your fight

for a cause is totally different so it would not fall under these -- these regulations. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And so, again, just to clear for legislative intent, even if it is within the 90 days, but it's not something that I've paid for and it's not about the campaign or my candidacy, per se, but I happen to be a candidate who happens to be on television, is that something that the television station would have to report as -- as a related -- or as an expense? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think -- I think based on what I've been hearing and trying to read through, I guess, if it's within the 90 days, it would be considered. So I believe that's the intent so, again, I think it's something that we're going to have to look at again if it does create a problem. Through

you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that you will be able to fix that and clarify that in a future technical corrections bill.

In the meanwhile I'll support this but I think that's a concern because lots of people, perhaps, could even have a job. For example, there might be someone who, in the future, is a representative and also happens to work in the television or newspaper area and, you know, for them to be banned from their job for three months would be a bit of a problem. So I think we just need to clarify that area a little bit.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Schofield.

Continuing along the back row, lofty perch that it is.

From the 57th District, Representative Davis, you have the floor.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And through you to the kind gentleman from Wethersfield a few questions?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to draw the Chairman's attention to line 500 of the amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering if he could provide some clarification or, perhaps, a definition of what the general or particular understanding of a candidate as far as an independent expenditure may go. His general or particular understanding of what -- his or her general or particular understanding of what could be done by this outside organization as an independent expenditure? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. In this section, we are discussing independent expenditures, and in this particular section, we are talking about coordination.

This is existing law and so I -- it's nothing that we overtly discussed. It does discuss, you know, the candidate committees and, you know, like I said it's not anything that we really actively pursued because it was existing law. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I ask that question because in some of the new language we are expanding the ability for these independent expenditures to be made by organizations outside of the candidate committee, and I ask that because if you are part of a town committee or part of a state party or part of a national party, wouldn't it be a general or particular understanding that those specific organizations would be making independent expenditures on your behalf? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. I was -- there was something going on around me -- but I think

I would ask that you rephrase that so that I can give you the proper answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's -- it's kind of very -- it literally is general because it says a general or particular understanding. And my concern is that if you're a member of a party, if you're a member of an organization and -- would it not be inherent that as a general or particular understanding that that organization would make an independent expenditure on your behalf if you both share the same goals and aspirations for your position in whatever ballot or election? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I appreciate the gentleman restating that.

I think it would try -- I don't -- I think the answer is no, but I think we're talking about maybe a town committee that's making an independent

expenditure to a nonparticipating candidate. I think that's probably where we're at. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, even if you were a nonparticipating, wouldn't it be a general or particular understanding that that organization would be making that expenditure on your behalf and, thus, it's rather ambiguous to try to prohibit that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't necessarily think so but, you know, I guess, we all -- the Representative certainly can interpret the wording. I don't necessarily see it that way but -- through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And another situation that could perhaps come up is through the social media that was touched upon a little bit earlier from the Representative from Fairfield in that a general or particular understanding of what's going on through much of social media you can retweet something from someone, you can tag somebody in a photo or in a tweet or a post on Facebook. Through you, Mr. Speaker, would this constitute general or particular understanding of that particular expenditure being made? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would state that that's probably a de minimis item. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And by making these de minimis activities, do they have put a disclosure statement on that activity?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, not -- not for that de minimis activity. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And what was mentioned earlier, by the Representative from Fairfield, a situation where you have your own personal account and you have a -- a political account, as well, as far as disclosures on if you were -- had your political account and, for instance, on Facebook you are prohibited from being able to put certain information on certain pages, yet disclosure statements require or at least the interpretation from the SEEC requires that a disclosure be put on every page of that activity. You can't do that through Facebook.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if there's any clear indication of where those disclosure statements have to be whether through your own

personal account or through an independent organization's account. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- and again, they all seem to come in together, but I believe we changed that law to include that last year to include all of what's being alluded to as de minimis. Again, because it's very difficult to -- to put a price on what your Facebook account is, and such. I think that's the appropriate answer. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So just to be clear there is no need for disclosure statements on these de minimis activities? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. --

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative -- Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- jumping the gun.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You're correct, Representative. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just to go back real quickly about what the Representative from Fairfield said, so if you were to post something on your personal account rather than something on your political account, what -- how would that difference be determined by the campaign finance rules that are in this bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

I'm not sure that they are addressed in here, but I think ultimately it's -- it's something that -- it is a de minimis matter. It doesn't really follow into anything. I suppose if somebody made a complaint and State Elections Enforcement deemed that you were violating something, I'd imagine they would bring it to your attention. I can't envision that this would

be much of an issue because we've used the word a few times. It is a de minimis activity.

So -- but again, people file complaints all the time on all sorts of different issues during the campaign and the State Elections Enforcement Commission, oftentimes, will just issue a ruling and make people aware what's going on. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the kind gentleman for his comments. We just want to make sure that use of social media is only growing, especially for political uses and for campaign uses, so I just wanted to make sure that that is clearly defined and so that the SEEC knows our intent in these bills is not to include those kinds of situations and definitions within this amendment and eventually the bill.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Davis.

Continuing along the back row. We seem to be on a roll here. From the valley -- 105th, Representative Greene, you have the floor.

REP. GREENE (105th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate for a couple of hours now, I think. And actually most of my questions -- I had quite a bit to start off with but most of them have been answered already.

I do have, however, a rather nuanced question just for clarification purposes, if I could. Through you to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. GREENE (105th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, lines 409 to 425 deal with the definitions of expenditure. We've already covered a number of different pieces of this, but I was looking through and for some reason it stuck out in my mind the definition of a magazine which, you know, a weekly, monthly periodical, whatever you want to call it, a regular occurring piece. And the first thing that popped into my mind was newsletters.

And I understand that throughout the bill there are a number of requirements for disclosure purposes in excess of $1,000. So I would like to be clear on this. If, for example, my local Lions Club has a weekly newsletter and they include a legislative profile that talks about the actions of what I've done up here and they in the aggregate over the course of the year, of an election year, mention my name in excess of 30 -- or $1,000 not $30,000. Would they be required to disclose their donors under this bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's a very good question. I suppose if they, in fact, mentioned the good Representative, specifically, for a legislative work, it would certainly count, be covered by this. But I'm not quite sure what the value of that would be, as far as how it appear to the -- I think it's -- we'll go back quickly. Yes, it's no different than if it was in a newspaper or magazine or anything else under this description, and it is -- it is current law but he makes a good point. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Greene.

REP. GREENE (105th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate that clarification. Mr. Speaker, I see this issue as being somewhat problematic. That little nuance just kind of added to it. But I believe Representative Shaban in his comments earlier kind of touched upon the bigger concern that I have and that was placing conditions on an individual's ability to exercise participation in the electoral process through contributions be they financial, voluntary, whatever you want to call it. I really believe that that's a problem.

I don't think that we should be meddling with that, in my opinion. I understand the need for clean elections, and I understand the purpose of this bill which is very well intended. And I understand there's been a lot of work done on this, and I commend that work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and if I could, I would ask that when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is whether or not to have a roll call on House "A."

Would those in favor of a roll call on House "A" please indicate by saying aye?

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The 20 percent threshold has been met. When the vote is taken, it shall be taken by roll.

Thank you, Representative Greene.

From the 113th District, Representative Perillo, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate it.

If I may, a few questions through you to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much. I'd like to touch on some of the requirements in terms of disclosure as they pertain to individuals, you know, the top five individual donors.

As I read this, specifically, in lines 820 to 840, it seems as though in a written message of some sort there would be a requirement that the top five donors of whomever is paying for the advertisement would have to have their names published in that advertisement along with the address of the organization as I see it; is -- is that correct? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the gentleman's answer and that is what I thought.

But as we move on, specifically, in lines 931 to 968 and then 969 to 994, we talk about two other kinds of communication: that first being radio communication, the second being telephone communication whether recorded or otherwise. As I read that the requirement to list the top five donors

is still in the language for those types of communication, again, radio and telephone. Am I reading this correctly? Is that correct? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman is reading that correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate, again, the gentleman's answer.

I guess I'm concerned about the practicality of having to list the top five donors, as well as the organization's Internet website address. It makes perfect sense in a written document. I mean it's not that difficult to do logistically. But when you get into radio ads which are typically about one minute and then when you get into telephone calls which you might want to try to keep to 30 seconds, I could imagine that might be logistically difficult.

You know, I just, you know, sort of timed it

quickly to list five names as well as an Internet address and it takes 17.4 seconds as I did it. 17.4 seconds out of a one-minute radio ad is a long time. 17.4 seconds out of a 30-second telephone call or telephone recording is more than half the call. It would seem to me that that's a significant challenge if you're trying to communicate a message either through radio or via a telephone call to have to list those top five donors.

I'm just wondering, you know, not having had the benefit of the public hearings whether there was any concern about the burden that may cause in those situations where one is trying to communicate a message verbally whether it be through radio or through telephone. Could the gentleman just address that please. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't -- I don't recall specifically hearing anything to that manner.

And again, while I -- I appreciate the manner that the Representative is bringing this to us. It kind of goes back to where we are that we want to

ensure that people that are making independent expenditures are -- are -- the largest donors are, in fact, being disclosed. And again, you know, as we go forward, if, hopefully, this legislation becomes law, it will give us an opportunity. I'm sure there will be issues that will be brought forth and we would be willing to revisit. But again, this is based on independent expenditures only and -- and we want to see who is making them. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, I thank the gentleman for his answer to the question.

I guess I gained some sort of solace in knowing that all organizations, you know, for independent expenditures across all, you know, the entire political spectrum would have to participate and abide by this five top donor requirement in terms of disclosure; is that correct? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That -- that's how I

see it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I -- but to that point I'm a little bit concerned though as there may be some sort of difference between certain types of organizations. I refer to lines 1020 to 1023, which states that this top five requirement -- top five donor requirement, is only triggered if those top five donors have given over $1,000 towards this cause, towards this independent expenditure. Am I reading lines 1020 and -- to 1023 correctly? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe you are correct, and I think that was the intent all along. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm trying, you know -- okay. So at first, perhaps, I thought that this would be total parity across the board. Now I'm told that there is not total parity. You know, I can certainly understand there are organizations with donors over $1,000 that would have to trigger this top five donor disclosure requirement, but then I think about organizations that perhaps may not have top five donors over $1,000. In fact, they may not have any donors over $1,000. And I'm wondering if the gentleman, you know, could indicate what types of organizations might, you know, expend independent expenditure on behalf of a campaign that wouldn't have donors with over $1,000 but then perhaps they would have a broad base of donors but not over $1,000. Are there any types of organizations that would come to mind for the gentleman? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. And I want to get back -- I'll answer that. I imagine I suppose small -- small groups. I don't have any off the top of my head. But this -- this particular, on lines

1020 to 1023 -- and I don't think I stated that previously -- this is for donors, you know, part of a disclaimer on an Internet website so that only applies to donors whose donations in the aggregate. So I don't know if I was clear on that previously. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I'm having a little bit difficulty hearing the gentleman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin, do you care to restate your --

REP. MORIN (28th):

Sure I do.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

-- answer?

REP. MORIN (28th):

Sure I do, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make sure. I wasn't -- I don't know that I was clear on the previous question that the Representative asked. This particular lines really are for people -- apply to donors whose donations are greater than $1,000 as

part of a disclaimer on an Internet website. So I don't think I was clear on that previously, and I wanted to make sure I did. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Just to clarify, I don't know that the gentleman is correct and maybe I'm misreading, but as I read line 1020 it says any requirement to list donors as part of a disclaimer or on an Internet website pursuant to the provisions of the section shall only apply to donors whose donations in the aggregate are in an amount of $1,000 or greater.

So we're stating the requirement to list donors as part this disclaimer or on an amendment not on an Internet website, not on the Internet website. Is my understanding correct? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, the Representative is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much. I appreciate that and I appreciate the gentleman's answer.

But -- but back to my question previously. I'm trying to understand what types of organizations there might be where there weren't any donors over $1,000 but where there were significant dollars contributed to independent expenditures. You know, the gentleman indicated, perhaps, that might be small organizations. I would have to imagine there might be some large organizations, perhaps, organizations that have some sort of subscription program or membership or dues of some sort. Could the gentleman answer what types of organizations that might be that would not have to abide by this disclosure requirement? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose -- I don't know any corporations that don't have donors that give over $1,000. I -- I can't surmise or guess who they might be. It could be a large corporation; it could be a small corporation. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And just a follow-up, the gentleman is talking about corporations. To clarify I believe the scope of this bill and this amendment before us goes beyond corporations; is that correct? I believe it would encompass any sort of organization that would give -- it would provide independent expenditures to a campaign. The gentleman referred to corporations. I'm wondering if there are any other types of organizations. I just want to make sure that we're talking about the same thing. Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. Anyone that makes those independent expenditures could be whether it's a not-for-profit as was discussed earlier, so the Representative is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

And again, the gentleman said that, perhaps, there may not be corporations that are in a situation where there are no donors -- there are no donors over $1,000. But again, I have to think about organizations, as I said, have some sort of subscription program, some sort of membership, some sort of dues that go toward the organization. And these types of organizations, perhaps, may not have the disclaimer requirement that is required of organizations that have donors with over $1,000. And again, I was not privy to the drafting of this amendment, and I certainly, you know, as not being a member of the committee, was not involved in the public hearing process. But I wondering if there was any discussion about what organizations, perhaps, don't have donors of over $1,000, but they would have significant amounts of money to contribute towards independent expenditures. Could the gentleman speak to that? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the

organizations -- and I think we discussed it earlier -- on the local level. Organizations receive dues and they are -- they vary in what they entail and how much they are -- excuse me -- so that -- they could be anywhere from 500 to -- I don't even know how much they are in the year. That being said, you know, typically, for political for independent expenditures -- and I can speak to what happens in Connecticut -- is those folks that make political donations through their organizations, it's not through their dues so if there is political independent expenditures, I'll say by -- for clarity for the people in the chamber and at home -- if a labor union were to make that type of expenditure for one of us, the monies don't necessarily come from the labor unions' dues. They come from independent donations from the members that have to say -- state that those dollars are to be strictly for political purposes and those numbers could -- could rank anywhere. Typically in the state of working people, they're not that high. But the monies don't come from dues. They come from specific donations that people are willing to make for political purposes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

So just to clarify what the gentleman said, in a labor union, dues cannot be utilized for the purpose of independent expenditures only contributions can be utilized for the purpose of independent expenditures. Is that what I heard the gentleman say just now? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that based on Citizens United, dues can be used. But again, the individual donors are typically are not what you would consider high -- the dues paying members are not overall looking at large amounts of money. I suppose if it did come over -- I'm not sure if it came over $1,000 in the -- I guess if it does come over $1,000 in the aggregate, they would have to list that. Through you, Mr. Speaker. But that -- I don't think that's common, but it probably would apply.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And I would agree with the gentleman that, perhaps, the dues contributed by a member of a union would not necessarily exceed $1,000 and, perhaps, none of the members' dues within that union would exceed $1,000. So the solace I gained before by understanding that, perhaps, all organizations across the board would have this requirement to take up 17.4 seconds of their radio ad or 17.4 seconds of their telephone call because their donors are over $1,000, to take up that time with their five top donors wouldn't necessarily apply to everyone. It would seem that organizations, perhaps corporations, that have donors of over $1,000, would get tied up in that.

But as the gentleman just said, and if could please clarify for me, in the case of the labor union where dues are not over $1,000, that same message about a candidate from that labor union would not have to include that 17.4 seconds of disclaimer in a radio ad or in a telephone call. So if the gentleman could please just clarify if my understanding of that is correct and whether or not, in the case of union where

dues do not exceed $1,000, they would not have to, you know, issue the disclaimer; is that correct? Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe you still have to do the disclaimer, but I don't think you would have to do the individual donors. Through you, Mr. Speaker. I was listening through the clamor, but I think I heard it enough and that's how I understand it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

I'm having the same problem the gentleman is. Could he just repeat his last statement? I -- I couldn't hear it either.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

One moment please. Would the Chamber come to order? The speakers are having a difficult time hearing each other and they're only 20 feet away. Take your conversations out of the chamber please.

Good afternoon, Selim. How are you?

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, they'd have to -- they'd have to do the disclaimer but -- the printed disclaimer but not the individual donors. That's how I understand it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

And Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

So I thank the gentleman for his answer. So we're in a situation where unions would not have to list their donors, would not have to take up that 17.4 seconds on a phone call or on a radio ad; is that correct? Would the gentleman please clarify?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If none of them are greater than $1,000.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the gentleman for his answers to my questions.

So again, just to revisit, my hope that this would apply -- that this 17.4 second disclaimer would apply to all organizations that are involved in independent expenditures, but it would seem, from this discussion, that that would not be the case that organizations with dues with memberships, with subscriptions of under $1,000, even if it were collected from 2 or 3,000 people and perhaps that organization that is spending more on the independent expenditures than another organization that has donors of over $1,000 would be exempt from that time requirement.

So indeed we're not treating organizations the same way. We're treating organizations, like unions, differently than we're treating organizations that have contributions of over $1,000 from individuals.

I think that's a concern because if the goal here is fairness, if the goal here is parity, if the goal here is to treat all organizations similarly or in the same way to give everyone the same advantages and disadvantages, then we're clearly not doing that here. And that is something we should be concerned about and that's something, I think, needs to be aired, and I wanted to ensure that that was in folks minds as they

were considering this amendment and eventually their vote on the bill.

I appreciate the Chamber's time, and I certainly appreciate the gentleman's answers. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Perillo.

Off to the 8th District, Representative Ackert, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And a couple of questions through you to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you.

In lines 30 -- 394 to 398, that's a new section that was added that allows for a RTC or DTC to have offices and can be used for the candidates in support of candidates. Is there any dollar cap or any reporting that needs to be done for that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. These -- these are now just listed as, you know, expenditures, contributions that could be made and are approved. I mean it used to be that it was, you know, you went through a minutiae to determine the cost of a room, of a telephone, and I think this -- this is just so -- I don't think there is any specific dollars listed, though. I guess to answer to your question, no. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you. That's what I was wondering if it -- just a yes or no. Thank you for that to the good gentleman.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, on sections 437, 447 -- I hope I'm not repeating this question -- but it looks to be that you could pay volunteers or supporters, you know, some volunteers travel expenses. Does that -- is that true and, if so, do they need to be reported?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. On reimburse, yes, they do have be disclosed. But again, if they're not an expenditure of the committee, if they're truly a volunteer, you know, going out and doing issues for you, they're not a campaign staff person. They have to be a volunteer. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

So they don't -- so if they are truly a volunteer, and I understand that they do not need to report that and -- in any way.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I want to state, first, that that was the first time that this question was asked so I'm glad to hear that and, no, they don't have to report it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you. And then just preceding section down -- 452 to and continuing on in that one section. What this does is it expands who can host a volunteer or a -- a meet and greet. You can now -- a candidate could actually now do one in their own home residence; is that true? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. I believe that's true.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

And it seems like the cap is $400 in that election season. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is that true?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

-- Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

That is correct or if it's hosted by two or more individuals it can go to $800. Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's at a single event. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Single event -- but the cap it's a -- through you, Mr. Speaker, it's a single event and the cap is 400 for the election season, though. So it's 400 in a calendar year from -- if I'm not mistaken. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's -- that's correct. I think it is -- I thought it was 800 per calendar year or a single election. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you. And then back to one that has been asked because I do have concerns after a couple, on

lines 409 through 412. I actually host -- unless I'm here late at nights -- every Wednesday night a TV show, and I see concerns with being able to do that TV show on Wednesday nights through what I read in line 411 being eliminated.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If -- if it's a news show, I don't think there's any issue. I'm taking you're doing it on cable access?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. MORIN (28th):

-- is that fair? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

-- Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Yes. It is a issues -- issue show so with call-in voters so any question can be asked through the call into the -- some controversial, some exciting -- so it could be open to anything if somebody were to call and ask the question, you know, Representative, are you running for reelection and what do you stand

on? I'd say, well, I have to be silent to that because I'm on a TV show and I can't answer those questions. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. ACKERT (8th):

That's the concern.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

-- Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. And -- and I certainly am sensitive to the, you know, the conflict that the Representative is alluding to. I think it's -- it's -- look at line 448 to 451, and I think it's a news story, commentary or editorial of any broadcasting station. You know, I think, again, I -- you're not -- it's not controlled by a political party, the committee or a candidate. It's a not-for-profit. It's a show done on cable access. I think many of us do so I don't think that there's a problem there, but if one was to arise, I'm sure it's something we would have to deal with. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

And -- and thank you to the good gentleman.

And then final -- just close on that -- on that one subject that I do have concerns, and I think it's up to interpretation, and I think it would go through the audit department and they would have some work to do on that.

So final question and I could not find it in here but it does not look, through you, Mr. Speaker, that there is any additional groups that can support the -- a candidate's, you know, election. In other words, your local committees, town committees can support you to a certain amount and leadership groups can support you to a certain amount. This does not expand that it any way. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's correct. The -- the -- no increases to those contributions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

And thank you and thank you to the good gentleman from Wethersfield.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, sir.

Further on House "A"? Further on House "A"?

If not, staff and guests please retire to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the chamber. The House of Representatives is voting House Amendment Schedule "A" by roll call. Members to the chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Please check the board to make sure vote is properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked.

Representative O'Neill, for what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

If I might be recorded in the negative, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

You may be recorded in the negative.

Representative O'Neill in negative.

From the Insurance City, Representative Deputy Speaker Kirkley-Bey, you have the floor, madam.

For what purpose do you rise?

REP. KIRKLEY-BEY (5th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to have my vote cast in the negative please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Kirkley-Bey in the negative.

Further? Further? Before I have the Clerk announce the tally -- Ollie Ollie in free -- would the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5556, House Amendment "A."

Total number voting	148
Necessary for adoption	75
Those voting Yea	101
Those voting Nay	47
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

House "A" is adopted.

Further on the bill as amended? Further on the bill as amended?

Representative Chapin of the 67th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, section 15 deals with what candidate committees can do with surplus money at the end of a campaign. And right now they're restricted to certain avenues, one of them being that they can contribute it to nonprofit 501 (c) (3)s.

I have an amendment that would expand that. I would ask that the Clerk call LCO 5389, and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Would the Clerk please call LCO -- one moment please -- the Clerk might have LCO 5389 but the Speaker does not.

Yes, Representative Willis, you are too late to vote on House "A."

Well, let's forge ahead anyway.

Would the Clerk please call LCO 5389 which shall be designated House Amendment Schedule "B"?

THE CLERK:

LCO 5389, House "B" offered by Representative Chapin.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Very simply, Mr. Speaker, as I said, one of the things that a person can do with their surplus campaign funds is give those funds to 501 (c) (3)s. I found it a little disconcerting that something like a local Legion Hall or VFW could not be recipients because they're classified as 501 (c) (19)s. Very simply this amendment would allow -- would add 501 (c) (19) -- 501 (c) (19)s to that list of things you could do with surplus funds.

And I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House "B". Adoption of House "B".

Representative Morin of the 28th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

And he may have stated it and I may not have heard. This is for a candidate that is other than a participating candidate in their campaign Citizens' Election Program? Is that fair to say, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, yes, in line 12 of the amendment, it does specifically say other than a participating candidate. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I consider this a friendly amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support it as well. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

A popular statement, evidently, Representative.

Further on House "B"? Further on House "B"?

If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor

signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Opposed.

The ayes have it.

Further on the bill as amended by House "A" and "B"?

Representative Perillo of the 113th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

We do a lot in this bill now it is as amended. We do some things that I don't think the people of Connecticut want. I refer, specifically, to lines 153 through 173, where we outline new expenditures that can be considered organizational expenditures.

Currently, in statute, without what's in here, without what's in this bill, organizational expenditures include a number of things. However, there is one thing they don't include. They don't include negativity about a candidate's opponent. They don't include that. Why?

Well, one reason why is because here in the State of Connecticut and throughout the country, people have stated time and time again that they're tired of negative campaigning. They're tired of smear campaigns. They want to hear about what a candidate believes, what the candidate's philosophy is. They don't want to hear negativity.

But this amendment, this bill does something different. This bill, in lines 171 to 172, adds a new expenditure that can be made in terms of organizational expenditures. It adds information concerning how each such candidate contrasts with such candidate's opponent.

Now, one person's contrast piece is another person's negative piece. We all know it, we've all seen it. I don't think that's what the residents of Connecticut want. And I think we have an opportunity here to change that. I think we have an opportunity to change this bill in order to ensure that campaigns stay positive, organizational expenditures stay positive.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 5375. I ask that he please call that amendment and that I be given leave

of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Would the Clerk please call LCO 5375, which shall be designated House Amendment Schedule "C"?

THE CLERK:

LCO 5375, House "C" offered by Representative Hwang.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The good Representative begs leave of the Chamber to summarize.

Is there objection to summarization?

Seeing none, please proceed, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

As I said before, this amendment is very, very simple and it is meant to ensure that the will of Connecticut's residents is followed in terms of negative campaigning. What it simply does is eliminate the language in the amendment from lines 171 to 172, specifically, it eliminates the language information concerning how each such candidate contrasts with such candidate's opponent. It eliminates the ability of organizational expenditures

to include negative campaigning and smear campaigns about one's opponent.

And I would urge adoption and I would ask, though, that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is twofold: one is adoption of House "C"; the other is whether or not when this vote is taken, it shall be taken by roll. And I'll try your minds on this latter issue.

All those in favor of having a roll call on House "C," please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The 20 percent threshold has been met handily. When the vote is taken, it shall be taken by roll and machine tallied.

Further on House "C"?

Representative Morin of the 28th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

And I appreciate the intent of the good

Representative's amendment. I would ask that my colleagues do not support it. I think, you know, the language discussed a contrast piece. And again, I think it's absolutely correct for there to be a determination and a distinction between a candidate's positions on issues.

I -- I fully agree with the good Representative that nobody wants attack pieces, smear pieces, falsely stated innuendos about each other. It's discouraging and disgusting to me that this type of behavior comes into play.

But I will say this, I think it's very important, and I personally -- I'll stand personally and say I've never had an issue with any opponent coming up discussing their take on my stance on an issue. That's what we're here for to take positions, to stand and take a -- to take a position, and I certainly will continue to support that, and I'll support whoever opponent's rights are to -- to bring that to the voters.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I urge rejection.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Morin.

Further on House "C"? Further on House "C"?

From the 125th District, Representative Hetherington, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HETHERINGTON (125th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in strong support of this amendment. It would be -- it's extremely difficult, even for a skilled editor with no sentiment in the race, extremely difficult, to do a neutral statement of contrasting positions.

Certainly, there's no reason that the candidate for whom the organization expense is being expended -- there's no reason for that candidate not to state his or her position but the challenge here is to characterize in a neutral way the position of the opposing candidate. It -- it is an invitation to -- to pejorative statements concerning a candidate's position. There is no effective way to police this in any timely way.

We would be challenged to define what a particular candidate's position might be. Is it what that candidate has said? Is it on the basis of votes that have been taken? It is -- it is a candidate's position as characterized by one party in a

competitive election situation. It is an invitation, an open invitation to campaigns of vilification, mischaracterization. Even done in good faith, it would be a challenge to describe or to set a standard for accuracy. It's unenforceable, it's unworkable, and it defeats the purposes of our interests in having clean, fair elections.

And I strongly support the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Hetherington.

Representative Noujaim, from the Brass City, you have the floor, sir.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good afternoon, sir. How are you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

I'm terrific. How are you, sir?

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank God. Good to see you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Wonderful.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief and I will not be redundant repeating what some of my colleagues have

already said. I did vote in support of Senate Amendment "A," which passed a few minutes ago, knowing very well that this amendment that will be brought by Representative Perillo was going to follow.

I am a person who does not believe in negative campaigning, never done it before, never subscribed to it. And I think this amendment that is being presented now would make this bill a better bill. If this amendment is not adopted, then I will be voting no on the entire bill as amended.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Noujaim.

Once again to the back row. From the 2nd District, Representative Carter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Just a few comments on the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you.

You know, as I looked over this amendment, I know

none of us here like the fact of having negative campaigning. And what's interesting about this is my colleagues have mentioned this really opens the door to a lot of negative campaigning. And what's worse is we're basically saying it's okay for somebody else to negative campaign in our name. I mean, in fact, if we vote on this that's kind of what we're doing, we're allowing it to happen.

And, you know, we might think for a minute we could control what other people are going to say, but at the end of the day, it's going to reflect on us, and it's going to reflect on this process. So I really -- I really don't understand why we would allow an -- excuse me -- an organizational expenditure that would allow somebody to go out, in our name, contrast what an opponent would be like. And I guess I shouldn't say in our name. They're -- they're doing in their name for us. But it's clearly an opportunity for people to take advantage of candidates.

Now, I personally believe we're better than this. You know, each one of us as we run campaigns we can decide what we want to do, but I think it's really -- it's really kind of low rent if we turn around and we say, oh, it's all right if somebody else does it. And

that's -- that's what we're doing if we allow this to happen. We're allowing people to take advantage of our law to go out and say whatever they want about the two opposing candidates, and we're opening ourselves for trouble.

Ladies and gentlemen, I really think we're better than this. I hope we can support this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Carter.

Further?

Representative Betts, of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much and good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Just one quick question, if I may, through you, to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

You may proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much.

My question is does this amendment prohibit contrast between candidates if you remove this language? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative --

REP. BETTS (78th):

-- Perillo.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

-- Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And in answer to the gentleman's question, there actually is no prohibition inherent in this amendment on contrast pieces on negative campaigning. A candidate and a candidate's campaign committee can still make that choice to involve themselves in contrast pieces, negative campaigning, about their opponent.

What this amendment does, though, is prohibit nebulous, you know, campaign organizations, nebulous political organizations from launching those two kinds of attacks. So that ability for the public to gain access to that information from a candidate, him or herself, still remains. But if you're going to do that, you ought to be able to attach your name to it as a candidate.

And you shouldn't necessarily funnel it through a loosely affiliated organization. That's the intent of

this amendment. Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

On House "C" -- back to the back row again.

Representative Davis, of the 57th you have the floor.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to stand briefly in strong support. There's really no reason why we should be increasing independent expenditures and organizational expenditures to do negative campaigning here in the State of Connecticut. As we hear time and time again from our constituents that is not what they want to hear. They want to hear about a positive message for the State of Connecticut.

So today I stand in support of this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you, Representative Carter.

Representative Rowe of the 123rd, you have the

floor, sir.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you. Good afternoon there, Mr. Speaker.

Briefly if I could frame a question to the proponent if he could finish his -- we good?

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

You may proceed, sir.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It was a little bit of a follow-up question than that which was posed by Representative Betts but -- and I think I know the answer, but I want a clarification. Does the gentleman think that his amendment would have any -- any chilling effect on -- on free speech or the First Amendment rights?

And I think he answered the question a bit indirectly with Representative Betts but maybe if it could be asked directly, I'd appreciate his thoughts on that. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the gentleman for his question.

I'll address that in two different ways. First of which we are still allowing organizational expenditures in a positive way to speak positively about a candidate, and we are still allowing contrast pieces in negative campaigning. What this amendment simply states, though, if you're going to do that and you're going to engage in that type of negative campaigning, as a candidate, put your name on it. Own up to it and don't funnel it through some other independent organization.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Rowe.

REP. ROWE (123rd):

Thank you. That's responsive and I appreciate the answer.

And I will be in support of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Further on House "C"? Further on House "C"? Further on House "C"?

If not, staff and guests please retire to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll

call. Members to the chamber. The House is taking a roll call vote on House Amendment "C." Members to the chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Please make sure your vote is properly cast.

If all members have voted, the machine -- have all members voted?

Please check the board to make sure vote is properly cast.

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked.

Will the Clerk please take a tally. And would the Clerk please announce the tally?

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5556, House Amendment "C"

Total number voting	148
Necessary for passage	75
Those voting Yea	54
Those voting Nay	94
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

House "C" is defeated.

Further on the bill as amended by House "A" and "B"? Further on the bill as amended by House "A" and House "B"??

Representative Hwang of the 134th, you have the floor.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in urging my colleagues to support this amended bill for the simple reason is this, our elections is sacrosanct in our state. And the idea that our Citizens' Elections Program and the premise of being able to keep money out of the political process is a daunting task.

In light of the Citizens United program -- election decision we felt there was a concern in regards to money coming into this -- into our state's campaign. We have made a diligent and a successful effort to raise the disclosure requirement in this bill. On the merits of that alone, it allows us to be able to recognize that if money is coming into the state, in light of the Citizens United, that we have a disclosure path to recognize that these organizations, PACs, corporations or wealthy individuals would have to be recognized in that contribution. So I would

urge the Chamber's support in that regard.

The second thing I would also say is this, it is a testimonial to good, collaborative team committee work. I recognize that in the beginning of this bill we had issues in relates to trigger provisions that would escalate the money that would come into campaign fights. And I have to recognized good work of our committee Chair and all of our committee members in GAE to recognize that we were able to make the proper revisions and create a bill that reflects a clean election can be done without an influx of money; that we can practice good political business in our state without having to resort that because everybody else is doing it that we have to escalate the financial wars.

So for that, I urge this Chamber's very strong support of this.

Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you for your support.

Representative Morin of the 28th.

REP. MORIN (28th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And as I close and wrap up, I, too, also, first

of all, would like to thank the members of the GA&E Committee, especially my ranking member in Senator Slossberg and every other member that participated in this discussion to get us to where we were. I truly thank and appreciate the debates and comments that came to me from my colleagues -- mostly from to my right -- but I valued the questions and appreciated them bringing them to light.

And when I opened, I talked about transparency, disclosure. We got to this point because we worked with people that we recognized were going to come into our state and change the landscape of how campaigns are run and change the way voices are heard. And we didn't want to stand for it and we were able to come to a point through the hard work of the committee, and I was remiss by not thanking and recognizing all the hard work that people, staff and the advocates put forth to get us to this point. I certainly don't ever want to forget them.

I really appreciate the fact that we're going to let the people of Connecticut have their voices heard. And we're not telling the people that make these donations, the independent expenditures, that their voice can't heard -- be heard but we want to know

exactly who your voice is and who you are.

And this bill does that and I urge adoption.

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Thank you.

Further on this bill as amended? Further on this bill as amended? Further on this bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please retire to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the chamber. The House is taking a roll call vote. Members to the chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast.

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked.

Would the Clerk please take a tally. And would the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Emergency Certified House Bill 5556 as amended by

House "A" and B"

Total number voting	148
Necessary for passage	75
Those voting Yea	94
Those voting Nay	54
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The bill as amended passes.

Are there any announcements or points of personal privilege? Any announcement or points of personal privilege?

Representative O'Brien of the 61st District from the Barndoor Hills, you have the floor, madam.

REP. O'BRIEN (61st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of guests here today I'd like to introduce.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Please proceed, madam.

REP. O'BRIEN (61st):

I have two people from my home town, Dave and Ann Patagonus, who are up here witnessing democracy in action. And both of them are actually pretty involved in my home town. Dave has served on both the board of

S - 648

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2012

VOL. 55
PART 13
3941 – 4222

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would ask the Clerk to call from Senate agenda number two, emergency certified House Bill 5556 as amended by House A and B.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

House Bill number 5556, AN ACT CONCERNING CHANGES TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS AND OTHER ELECTION LAWS. LCO Number 5064 introduced by Representative Donovan and Senator Williams.

THE CHAIR: .

Good evening, Senator Slossberg. I hope it's still evening. It is.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Good evening, Madam President. I move the joint committee's favorable -- I move the emergency certified bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR: .

On concurrence and adoption will you remark?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. The bill before us provides additional disclosure requirements for entities that engage in independent expenditures. The purpose is to ensure that voters are fully informed about the person or the group who is speaking about the candidates or the issues in an election.

It also expands the ability of our military persons serving overseas to submit their ballots and it provides for other minor changes to our elections law. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark? I guess Senator McLachlan did hear you. Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for the purpose of questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Slossberg, could you give us a little more clarification, perhaps a summary of the changes proposed in this bill as they seem fairly dramatic. If you could possibly begin if we look at the -- let me get to it here -- one moment. If we look at the changes that are proposed in this bill related to contribution limits to various political organizations, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Through you, Madam President. Okay. The bill increases the limits on contributions from individuals to certain packs and party committees. It -- the current law is 5,000 dollars to State (inaudible), the bill is 10,000. Current law is 1,000 dollars for individuals to contribute at town committee, legislative leadership committees, legislative caucus committees. The bill is 2,000 dollars. It increases the contribution limit from 750 to 1,000 dollars for most other PACs.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. And why are you doubling these contribution limits? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Madam President, the first two are doubled the last one is a 250 dollar increase. But het reason these are being doubled is that these limits have not been raised my understanding is for approximately 20 years.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. And as it relates to changes that are being proposed in allowable expenditures specifically expenditures known as organization expenditures are there any changes in this bill under current -- in comparison to current law? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSERG:

Through you, Madam President. I think the question is are there any changes in this bill with regard to org expenditures? And would that be correct, Madam President, if I may through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan, would you repeat your -- your question please?

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. And through you are there any changes in the current law for organization expenditures? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, yes, there are changes to the org expenditure law. Currently the change in the law right now will allow for an organizational expenditure to be a mailing or other distribution with information concerning how each such candidate contrasts with the candidate's opponent if any so it allows for a contrast piece. It also eliminates the org expenditure definition.
It's no longer an org expenditure. The use of offices, telephones, computers and similar equipment that does not result in additional cost to the party committee, legislative caucus committee or legislative leadership.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

(Senator Duff in the Chair.)

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, as it relates to organization expenditures that are allowable has there been an expansion of specific allowable types of expenditures? Through you, Madam -- Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. I'm thinking that you're referring, Senator McLachlan, I may be wrong but to the bill that we heard in committee originally that increased the organization expenditure limit. That is

not in this bill and we are not -- that does not change in this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you, Senator Slossberg, it's my understanding that there has been a change in the allowable type of expenditure in the way that it's counted between town committees and candidate committees. Could you clarify that please? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. I'm -- regretfully I'm not clear on what you're referencing, sir.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I believe current law if I'm not mistaken required an organization expenditure to include rent for headquarters, use of equipment -- office equipment and telephones. Has there been a change in that current law? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Through you, Mr. President. That's exactly what I was talking about when I said that's no longer an organizational expenditure.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. The sound system in this building when you and I communicate is difficult so forgive me if I misunderstood you. Through you, Mr. President, Senator Slossberg, can you tell me what's the impact of the brackets beginning on line 192 and ending on line 195? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. That means that's not -- no longer considered an organizational expenditure.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And Senator Slossberg, through you, through you, Mr. President. Senator Slossberg, has this been inserted elsewhere in campaign finance law? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. Yes, it is. It also makes it clear later in the bill that it is not a contribution.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, to Senator Slossberg, on line 234 there is a description of social media. Could you share with us for clarification why we have that description and what is the impact of changes related to social media in this bill before us?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. This was actually a definition that was later -- that was in a paragraph later in our campaign laws. We thought it made more sense for it to go in the definition section.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, Senator Slossberg are there changes in the way campaign finance law treats social media under this proposed bill? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. No I don't believe so. It's not considered a contribution or -- or an org expenditure.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Slossberg -- McLachlan.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

A little ping pong. Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President. And for clarification social media is things like YouTube, Facebook, twitter, some of those more common things that we're all relatively familiar with now? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Through you, Mr. President. That is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, to Senator Slossberg, in section two of the bill specifically around lines 243 could you clarify the words anything of value and what that means differently than we have under current law. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President, that is current law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

And this doesn't change current law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

I'm sorry. Through you, Mr. President. I didn't hear you, Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Oh, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you, the words anything of value in lines 243 are -- is current law and it is not changed by anything in this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, Mr. President. Is there in this description anything of value does that mean a contribution such as someone creating email on behalf of the candidate or putting gas in their car to help them run errands for the campaign or buying coffee for volunteers? Is that anything of value? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. I -- the language that's in here which is current law describes in general what a contribution means which includes any gifts, subscription, loan, advanced payment, or deposit of money or anything of value made for purpose -- made for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or any personal purpose for the promote of the success or defeat of the candidate.

I don't -- you know, I'm paraphrasing but the idea here is that this is the general category of what a contribution means which includes anything of value and as I'm sure Senator McLachlan you're aware when we get to sub B it exempts -- there are the exemptions to what that doesn't mean.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator. Going down to sub B, contribution does not mean, could you clarify if there's been any changes proposed in this bill in comparison to current law? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. On lines 288 and 294 there are clarifying language changes. They don't -- we don't believe that that actually changes the way the law operates but we had been advised by elections enforcement that this language was not clear to them. And so that's clarifying language. It doesn't really change anything operative.

The next change in -- in this is line 394, subsection 19 which is the same language we talked about before when -- the use of offices, et cetera where you -- we spoke earlier about whether this was an org expenditure. This is the language that I referenced earlier where this is

not a contribution.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. On line 291 it says residential premises and I recall discussions in committee about what is the impact of a condominium resident and is their condominium community clubhouse considered their residential premises for the purpose of hosting parties, et cetera? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. Earlier in that same language it does discuss a community room in the individual's residence facility but again all of this language is current law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg in section -- subsection 18, lines 372 are there any changes to the description of diminimus activity as it relates to political campaigns? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you to Senator McLachlan I -- I think you said line 272. Mr. President, could I just ask for that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, to Senator Slossberg, I meant to say line 372.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG: .

Okay.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Sorry, Mr. President. Hold on. Okay. Through you, Mr. President, I believe the question is are there any changes to the diminimus language. This is -- we move the definition of diminimus -- excuse me, move the definition of social media. This is the definition that was moved to the beginning of the -- beginning of the legislation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. On line 394 subsection 19 I see familiar language but what is the impact of that being placed in this location of the bill? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. Senator McLachlan, this is -- this is the same paragraph that we keep referencing

with regard to this is not a contribution.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Section three is clarification of the term expenditure. Could you summarize for us changes in this proposed bill in comparison to current law of the terminology expenditure in a political campaign. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan -- Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Madam -- I mean Mr. President. In the first paragraph -- the first paragraph is actually the change is not it's actually clarifying language. It's -- LCO prefers that it be written the success or defeat of any political party as opposed to on behalf. So that first paragraph's about expressed advocacy and that does not change the operative language. Section two refers to issue ads or issue communications and the general vernacular.

And it is a little broader than the language that previously existed. And it also provides an exemption for issue advocacy earlier than the 90 day period where current -- 90 days before an election. So there's an express exemption for advocacy that could be considered petitioning your government as opposed to election activity.

THE CHAIR: Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Mr. President. Through you to Senator Slossberg, the -- just for clarification would that be the -- for instance an incumbent State Senator who has mailing to communicate with their constituents. Is that what we're talking

about? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you to Senator McLachlan, no, that's not what we're referring to. This -- this section is intended to refer to -- you know, to cross reference with the definitions of independent expenditure and so this is the operative language that relate to that activity.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. Can you give me a specific example or two of what you mean by this language in lines 419 to 425?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. Sure. Section two is about, you know, issue communications or issue ads so if it is during session and a group wants to advocate on a particular issue in relation to a specific matter that is -- that is pending before the legislature, under those circumstances -- so for example if somebody's lobbying and they want to send out a mailer that basically says please tell Senator McLachlan to vote no on amendment 4726.

If that's during the -- as long as that's during the legislative session and you know they're petitioning the government than this is an exception to that. Our current law says that at 90 days before an election when generally we are not in session current law says that that is an issue.

If a mailer went out and said, you know tell Senator McLachlan to vote no on an amendment and then had something that said we -- we support people who support the blue sky and it was, you know, about an issue and there was a clear reference to you and you were a candidate then that would come under regulation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, President. I think tomorrow is a blue sky day, Senator, that everyone's probably looking forward to. The next question I have relates to the term expenditure does not my -- does not mean in lines 437 to 447. Could you just clarify for us please what this new language does and how it impacts current law. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Okay. Sure. Thank you, Mr. President, through you. This section just tries to clarify that volunteers are volunteers and they are -- this is clarifying language so that that is not -- the time, the services they provide as volunteers are not an expenditure.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. In lines 491 -- through you, Mr. President to Senator Slossberg, in lines 490 to 493 it talks about human beings. And I just -- I see a lot of references to -- to that terminology. If you could just give us a general clarification of what this language is attempting to accomplish in the underlying bill. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

I'm sorry. Mr. President, through you, I didn't -- I couldn't hear the whole question. I only heard a little bit of it. Could you please repeat it or what lines you're on?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Referencing lines 490 to 493, if you -- this language that references a human being, if -- is present in several places in this bill. If you could just give us a general summary of what that language attempts to do. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. Okay. Human being in line 491 is just that a human being and the idea is that this creates a diminimus exception to expenditures under the independent and expenditure law and basically what we're trying to make sure is that we don't capture the -- you know, the person who is working on a campaign and wants to send out 100 letters to their friends and says, you know, please vote for -- vote for my friend who's candidate to try to make sure that we don't -- we don't capture that grassroots advocacy that is in fact diminimus.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. Without referencing exact lines I wonder if we could now turn to the general discussion about changes to disclosure requirements for nonhuman beings, organizational -- or not organizational expenditures but expenditures by an organization.

Namely some of the somewhat controversial parts of this bill relate to the disclosure requirements for businesses and political action committees. If you could give us a more detailed summary of those changes being proposed. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. Well Senator McLachlan, the purpose here generally is that what we're trying to do is ensure that the electric -- the electorate has information about the sources of election related and spending and we know that the expectation is now in the wake of the Citizens United decision corporations can spend money in unlimited amounts from their corporate treasury to -- you know, to make independent expenditures and so they can make ads and communications and really participate in the political process.

And we just want to make sure that there is adequate disclosure so that the citizens of our State know who is spending money in significant sums to -- to be able to speak to us about the candidates who are running. You know, I believe that disclosure helps our citizens make informed choices in the political marketplace and so that's -- that's generally what -- what we're trying to do with this language to really make sure that we capture who is speaking.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. There is a OLR summary which is oftentimes I'm very grateful for the work that they do because sometimes they take the -- the legalese of the bill language and put it into somewhat easier to read, easier to understand information.

And when you look at the summary it talks about requirements for instance in television advertising for an organization making an expenditure that requires some very detailed disclosures and I wonder could you clarify for us what are those changes that are being proposed in this bill? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Okay. Generally or I can, you know, if you like we can go through the bill. But generally when an -- when an entity which is broadly defined is going to make an independent expenditure which is, you know, they're taking on an expense to either create a television or a, you know, a written communication whether it's in a billboard or a mailer or something like that, their requirement is then to make sure there is an attribution on that so that they have to show their top -- at least their top five contributors or we call them donors.

So that has to -- that language has to be on there so that people know who is actually making that speech just like we do in our campaigns. You know we write paid for by on everything. It is the same thing with television ads. There is the disclaimer requirement as well. You know those are some of the very big things that are required and it expands on the current law that we have.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN: .

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator. So for further clarification if it's a candidate committee doing

a television advertisement, not that we do television advertising but we're use to seeing an awful lot of it on the federal campaigns. The disclosure in a television advertisement generally is at the end, paid for by John Smith for Congress and a personal communication from the candidate. And I guess what I'm trying to understand is what's the difference between a candidate's advertising disclosure and what this bill is requesting or requiring for an entity disclosure requirement through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. Well as you know as a candidate we are required to place paid for by and it's our candidate committee and then also you know we are required to make, you know, substantial filing requirements with elections enforcement and to disclose all sources of financial support. And so all of our contributors need to be disclosed if we're participating candidates or if we're not participating candidates we also have extensive disclosure requirements.

So people really know who is speaking when -- when we put out an ad as a candidate. The -- an entity making an independent expenditure needs to do a little bit more to be able to make it clear who is actually speaking. So they need to -- the communication has to bear on its face at least five of the donors to the entity who's -- who's basically it's your top five largest donors have to be covered and disclaimed on the face of the communication.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, Mr. President to Senator Slossberg, isn't the proposed changes here for entity disclosure far more challenging, far more inclusive, a much higher bar if you will than it is for a candidate committee? When both the candidate committee

and the entity have reporting requirements to the State Elections Enforcements Commission.

So for clarification there is a different bar for a candidate committee versus an entity and I wondered if you could talk about that and why the -- you're proposing such a higher bar in this proposed bill. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG: .

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. I'm not sure that I would call it a higher bar. I'd just call it a different disclosure requirement trying to get at the same thing to make sure that citizens know who's actually speaking. So, you know, if there's a particular issue in the bill that you consider to be a higher bar I would be more than happy to discuss that with you.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg, the higher bar that I refer to is that we seem to treat ABC manufacturing, perhaps a local business different in the way that there disclosure requirement is for a television advertisement if they choose to do that than the disclosure requirement for John Smith for Congress. And my question to you is why is there that different disclosure when we know who ABC manufacturing is? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG: .

Through you, Mr. President. I think the difference is that if it's ABC manufacturing and they are a corporate

entity taking -- you know using money out of their corporate treasury it's not really clear, you know, who is behind that ad if we really don't know where that moneys coming from unless they disclose because ABC corporation doesn't necessarily -- doesn't file a disclosure requirement -- disclosure report the same way we do.

If we put out a television ad and it says paid for by John Smith candidate we know that you can go to the website at the -- at the State elections and you can find out exactly who is paying for that and then also it's a candidate so you know who's speaking about the candidate because it's the candidate and they're speaking themselves.

The challenge is when you have entities where it's not clear who's speaking. And it's not clear where the -- what the source, the funding source is of that speech because we all know that we make discussions as to someone's credibility based on knowing, you know, who they are.

And when mass media is out there whether it's television ads or billboards or communications it might say ABC company but we don't necessarily really know who that is and the citizens don't know who that is and we think it's important for them to know that to be able to make an informed choice in the political marketplace.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg. So you're -- my point is that you're really treating ABC manufacturing very differently than you're treating others and I'm wondering why -- what's the mystery about ABC manufacturing? They're in the Yellow Pages. They're probably a member of our local chamber of commerce. They employ our constituents. They're on Main Street, USA.

What's -- why are you asking their chief elected official to put his picture on an ad that's for someone else as part of their free speech opportunity in the country and why are you asking their internal ownership to disclose their names and addresses and so forth. It is a corporate entity

that's making this pitch if you will like General Electric or any other corporate entity.

I'm just trying to understand more clearly why you're holding them to a much different requirement than a political action committee, a candidate committee, a legislative pack here at the State Capital. Just if you could further clarify why they're being held to a different standard. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. I wouldn't say that they're being held actually to a different standard at all. The operation is different because you're delaying with different entities.
When you have a candidate or any of these political packs or anything like that they disclose everyone who gives to them. You know exactly where that money is coming from. You know exactly who's funding it. You know exactly who's speaking and you can decide and the people can decide gee, I like what they're saying or I don't like what they're saying but I also know, you know what their interest is in this.

When you have another entity engaging in that -- in that speech, and you know they just put down their attribution on the bottom without any more information, without any disclosure, we have no idea who's there. It may say ABC manufacturing and they may be on Main Street but you don't know if some other large -- maybe some -- some, you know, wealthy person has decided to, you know, put ten million dollars into their corporate treasury so that they can -- they can put out these ads.

And you don't know if that same person is spreading money all over the community to put out certain ads to try to, you know, sway the electorate to go in a particular decision one way or the other. And that's fine. That's great. They can do that. But we think it's really important for the citizens to know who's speaking.

When I hear an ad on the radio for something or against

something I want to know who's telling me that. Is it, you know, are they telling me that because it's in their interest that I should believe them? Are they going to make money from that? I want to know who's speaking and then I can make a decision about whether I should believe them or whether I agree with them or whether I want more information.

And we've seen on the federal level in particular and also in a number of other states where this has been a significant issue where groups have come in and either, you know, given money to, you know whether it's a business or a corporation or an entity or where businesses have given money to an individual in order to make that sort of political speech and also to make sure that people didn't know who was actually putting that out.

We're saying that's fine. Speak. Speak lots. That's great but you know, own your speech. Tell us who you are.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg. I don't disagree with your concept own your speech. I don't have a problem with that at all. I think the disagreement that you and I seem to have is that ABC manufacturing is the donor and the advertiser.

In the case of a political action committee candidate committee, there is candidate committee checkbook who is funded by multiple donors but in this case the donor is the advertiser. It's the same. So my point again is why are we holding them at a different standard than we are a more complicated arrangement in the case of a political action committee or a legislative caucus committee here at the State Capital. ABC manufacturing is a corporation. It's an entity.

And so they don't have donors, they have owners. And the owners are whoever they are they're identifying themselves as ABC manufacturing doing business in our community. Now, you know I can't speak for a situation where it's somebody in Oshkosh, Wisconsin that has nothing to do with

Hartford, Connecticut.

I'm talking about our local people and that's sort of where I'm trying to get down to earth with you on why are we demonizing our local businesses and saying that there's some mystery. They're not a mystery. They're right in front of us. And -- and they are being held -- in this bill they're being held at a far different bar requirement of disclosure than anyone else is. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'm not really sure there was a question there, Senator McLachlan, in that discussion. I will try to respond to what I think is the point that you're referencing and that is, you know, if ABC corporation is going to be, you know, putting out billboards or something and participate in, you know, political speech and they want to do that, they can do that. They are -- if they don't have any donors then there's really nothing for them to disclose other than the attribution which is what, you know, you and I are talking about.

So, you know, their disclosure requirement is the attribution, the disclaimer but just like if it was an individual the only person that would write down would be the individual unless they had received money, you know, from another entity in order to pay for that independent expenditure which is not what you're talking about.

As I understand what you're talking about is our regular neighborhood company that has by the way never had the ability to make independent expenditures until the Citizens United case and now they're going to be participating. If they are not getting any donations or contributions then they have the regular, you know it's the same attribution requirement that we do.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. Let me move then because we can't seem to find agreement on the attribution part and why there's a different level of requirement. Let me move then to the reporting requirement.

The reporting requirement we all are very familiar with of candidate committees and individuals, legislative political actions committees. What is the difference between the reporting requirement of those organizations versus ABC manufacturing? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. The -- you know, any of these entities that they do not have to make any -- there's no reporting requirement unless they engage in independent expenditures. Once they engage in independent expenditure they have the requirement to report, you know, the same way that we do as candidates.

In addition they also have to -- they have a choice they can submit if they to a regular report to their shareholders, their members or the donors they have to report their independent expenditures or if they don't have any sort of a report or thing like that if they'd like to they can just provide on their website a link to their, you know, disclosure reports that are filed similar to what we do.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg, so there's my point again. The disclosure -- the reporting requirements are very different as well because you're talking about now

bringing in another party, the board of directors and the amounts of the relationship there is part of that reporting requirement.

Let me say organizations that participate in the political process currently how about a union? A union has disclosure requirements what are they in comparison to what is being proposed in this independent expenditure? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. If a union engages in independent expenditure they have the same reporting requirements as any other entity. All entities are held to the same standard.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Through you to Senator Slossberg, so does that require unions or members so I guess their stockholders so they have to have their membership disclosure similar to ABC manufacturing? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President, all entities have the same disclosure requirement so if, you know, if they are required under the provisions of this bill because they've made an independent expenditure to report that to their shareholders or their members then that is what they'd have to do.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you to Senator Slossberg, the -- this -- the proposed scheme of attribution and reporting that's being proposed in this bill you mentioned seeks to address the Citizen United Supreme Court case which allowed business entities to participate in the political process in a way that they were not allowed in the past.

Could you share with us please, are there any other states who have addressed this issue the way that's being proposed in this bill? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. There are many other states who have enacted disclosure laws after the ruling in Citizens United. I don't -- I could possibly list them all and they're all -- they vary. Our bill was developed as a result of the laws that we have in our State which are different then other states. So I -- all I can tell you is that many, many other states if not all have some disclosure requirements.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And so for further clarification granted there are other states that have new disclosure -- disclosure requirements as a result of the Citizen United decision. Are other states seeking to be as what I would describe as burdensome, you would not describe as burdensome in the requirements, the bar so to speak. Are other states -- have they raised the bar as high as is being proposed in this bill before us? Through

you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Through you, Mr. President. You're right, I would not describe any of this as burdensome at all in any way, shape or form. Certainly, they, you know, they need to disclose it's really not such a great burden and certainly the Supreme Court has found very clearly that disclosure is not burdensome and in fact it is a -- you know, it is a balancing out of allowing corporate entities to engage in political speech.
So in the first instance I wouldn't agree that it's burdensome but in the second question is there are other states that do have similar provisions to the Ones being proposed here.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you to Senator Slossberg, I think that I wouldn't call them burdensome if they were more similar in disclosure requirements to what we currently do. And what I mean by that is if the attribution requirements were more similar to what is currently required I believe that that would meet the spirit of the Citizen United decision which you say the Supreme Court has suggested and indirectly that disclosure should happen.

I don't disagree with that at all. I think disclosure should happen. The point that I keep circling back around to is there's no comparison in the disclosure requirements before us for business then what currently exists for other entities in the State of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. President, could you speak to the concern of many that we've all heard that the proposal before us probably can be challenged in some way under constitutional matters? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President, and although I am an attorney I am loathe to give a legal opinion. So please do not take my, you know, my words as definitive. All I can do is share with you what is my opinion and what I know from, you know, from the research that I've done and the work the other lawyers who have reviewed -- reviewed this.

You mentioned Citizens United saying something about indirectly allowing disclosure and I'd just like to just share, you know Citizens United most people focus on the part that allowed corporate -- you know, corporations to be able to participate in political speech that they have first amendment rights. The other part of Citizens United people don't talk about but that part is really what gives rise to the legislation in front of us because very clearly the court stated that -- that providing the electorate with information about the sources of election related spending is a justified governmental interest.

They -- they reaffirmed decisions that had happened previously where they said that you know quote that the, you know the court upheld BCRA which was the federal law that has the same, you know similar provisions here on the ground that they would help citizens quote make informed choices in the political marketplace. Some of the corporate language that I think that you know you've raised -- that you've alluded to in terms of people being worried that this is too much.

If I may just share with you from Citizens United it very clearly states that you know -- and I'm just going to quote from there if I may, with the advent of the internet prompt disclosure of expenditures can provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters. Shareholders can determine whether their corporations political speech advances the corporation's interest in making profits.

The first amendment protects political speech and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages. So very clearly Citizens United you know, expected that we would be talking about making sure that members and shareholders, you know, knew what a corporation was doing, that our citizens would know what -- who was making the ads and paying for it.

And many lower court cases after Citizens United have also talked about some of the things that we specifically have in here and found that they are also appropriate and constitutional and that -- that they would be upheld. You know and there is a whole host of them.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and thank you, Senator. I've read the Citizen United decision and I appreciate you reminding me a couple of the points there. But that second part of Citizen United that I was referring to a is fairly general suggestion about disclosure of political activity.

And I don't believe anywhere in the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States that they tell the Legislature of Connecticut that we have to demand a business to go to their board of directors to get permission to make a expenditure and then furthermore disclose who their five top stock holders or donors are.

I don't think any of that is in Citizen United. And that's the point I'm trying to make is that I think this bill before us is going far beyond what our Supreme Court of the United States sought to accomplish in the Citizen United decision.

Now let me back up a minute. We can agree to disagree on Citizen United. That's a whole different argument and you and I have actually had that conversation that there's an awful lot of people who are a lot smarter than I about

law -- I'm not a lawyer, who think that that may not have been a good decision. But it is the decision. And -- and so the point is that if we have the Supreme Court of the United States affirming the first amendment rights of entities, namely businesses to have their free speech rights, I'm not seeing anywhere in the Citizen United decision telling any legislature to do what's being proposed in this bill to this degree.

And that's my point. I started here and I'm going back to it and I'm going to keep going back to it. The point being that it is not a -- an acceptable, comparable level of disclosure that we are holding them accountable to that everybody else has to do that's been in the business of political campaigning and political advertising for many, many years.

So the point is that this bill before us seems to really change the dynamic of the disclosure and the -- the process of political advertising. So if we look at radio advertising for just a moment and radio advertising in today's marketplace is often a 30 second advertisement. It used to be 60 seconds but now I guess it's a 30 second advertisement.

And the disclosure requirement here requires pretty extensive words that have to be said in a relatively short period of time comply with -- with the disclosure. When you -- when you map that out there is no logical reason for someone to purchase a 30 second advertisement if they have to spend 50 percent of the time they've purchased to do the disclosure that you're asking them to do when the disclosure under current law of other political organizations only takes five seconds or less. So that's sort of distills my point.

My point is that we have this one disclosure requirement paid for by McLachlan 2012, John Smith, treasurer, approved -- this is Mike McLachlan and I approve this message. The point is that that disclosure roughly what's required under current law for a political ad from a candidate campaign takes five or six seconds but it's a different requirement now that's triple that for a business. And that's my point.

Citizen United didn't say that we had to hold them to a different bar and that's exactly what's going on here. So

having said that that they're being held to a different bar than everyone else in the world of political advertising. Through you, Mr. President to Senator Slossberg, could you comment on that though as it relates to the constitutionality of this requirement that's being proposed in this bill. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG: .

Through you, Mr. President. Again I don't know that I'd you know -- as far as I can see and as far as the cases that I've read in the other states that have similar disclosure and also our federal law under BCRA also requires a significant amount of disclosure.

You know it's -- the goal here is to ensure that the citizens know who is making that speech, who is speaking. And so if the concern is that it takes up too much time on a radio ad because you've got all of these various corporate entities who have given to each other and the money's been shuffled around all over the place and that's going to take so much time because they actually have to disclose all those things then, you know, then if they equation is they don't want to do that then they certainly are able to do a, you know -- they are able under those circumstances to you know use the corporate treasury but, you know, so that's it's not a shell for all of these other -- all of these other donations.

So that if it really is one person making an ad and they want to make that -- make that ad that's simple. If it's corporation that is just making that ad then that's simple. If it's, you know -- if it's the situations though where the intent is to prevent the public from actually know who's making the speech then that's going to be a little bit harder for them but certainly doable.

And you know easy in terms of, you know, their top five donors and then you direct them to a website. I think there was certainly plenty of ads out there for pharmaceuticals where they're required to list out all of the things that will happen to you if you take their drugs, you know, including some really horrible things. That

goes on quite a while.

So you know, I wouldn't consider this to be burdensome when in fact when we're talking about, you know, speech to try to influence the outcome of an election.

(President in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Senator Slossberg. Senator, we -- we agree and I think I stated some time ago that we agree disclosure is appropriate. There's no need to think for a moment that anyone in this esteemed body of the Connecticut State Senate doesn't think it's appropriate that political advertising should be owned by someone.

Certainly this State Senator firmly believes that there shouldn't be mystery speakers in a political campaign.

That's not what I'm talking about. What I'm clearly talking about is different rules for different people. And that's not Citizen United. And that's probably the point that I think people who were claiming that this may not be constitutional is that it's not a fair treatment. It's not an equal treatment.

And I don't think that anyone who would object objects to saying I'm saying this. What they're objecting to is the burden placed upon them that is far different than what has been the norm in political advertising for generations. And so I think that apparently we have to agree to disagree. But I was hopeful that you would share with me why it's not -- why it is constitutional but there -- I can't seem to engage you in that discussion.

That would be helpful because I'm having a lot of people tell me that it's not constitutional and I would love to hear you as the proponent tell me why it is constitutional to hold certain people to a different standard than those that have done this for many years. So if you'd care to comment on that, Senator Slossberg, I'd certainly

appreciate it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Madam President, perhaps I can help you -- help Senator McLachlan. I think that part of the equation here is the question that you're asking in terms of constitutionality. There's nothing that says that, you know -- there's nothing in Citizens United that says everything has to be exactly the same.
In fact it is just the opposite because as we discussed in Citizens United they challenge the BCRA disclaimer and disclosure provisions that apply to the commercial entity. And in response to that the Supreme Court very clearly said that, you know, disclaimer and disclosure requirements could -- might burden the ability to speak but they impose no ceilings on -- ceiling in campaign related activities and it is an appropriate governmental interest to be insuring that our electorate ahs the accurate information as to who is speaking.

That's what makes this constitutional. Citizens United very simply said you can require disclosure and you can require disclosure to make sure people know who is speaking and who is spending money on elections and that is clearly what we are doing.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. Okay. So we agree on disclosure. No question about that. Why is it -- does it not just said paid for by ABC manufacturing, John Smith, president just like everybody else has to disclose? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG: .

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. If ABC corporation has no donors and all they do is they have their corporate treasury then that is what it would say. The issue is when other people are contributing to that corporate treasury in order to allow them -- you know, to be making those -- to be making those expenditures that then the disclaimer which is what we're talking about -- then the disclaimer requires more so that we know who's actually speaking.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. So back to other organizations that have participated in the political process for years, we certainly have campaigns so we know when money comes in that's disclosed from contributors. We have here at the State Capital political action committees and by State law when there is a campaign -- contributors they're disclosed.

But we have in the State of Connecticut and across the country other political organizations, let me say unions for instance. Now unions have different levels of political activity. I believe they have political action committees and then they have general treasury disbursements for political activities. So in the case of a union does that require the union to disclose all of their membership? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Well again that depends also on where they are making the expenditure from. If they're making the expenditure from

their corporate treasury then they need to disclose all their donors but I would clarify that, you know, to the extent that unions transfer dollars between their affiliates, you know in their internal transfers, that is not covered by that disclosure.

Just you know that that is -- that is not the intent because if the union is disclosing, you know, who's paid their dues and who's made contributions then that would be -- that would be captured. If they have a segregated account and this what we're talking about right now applies to any business, any entity not just, you know, a labor organization.

If there is a segregated account for political activity then they only have to disclose the donors in that segregated account. They don't have to disclose everybody, only the people who have given to that account. And in the case of not for profits if the -- if someone wants to give money to a charity, a not for profit and they say they don't want their money used for political activity and the not for profit says all right we'll keep that segregated and they segregate that -- that from their -- either from their general treasury or they don't have a separate -- or they wouldn't be able to have a separate political activity but as long as that is segregated then that does not have to be disclosed either.

THE CHAIR: .

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN: .

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg. That doesn't sound like a similar disclosure requirement of the entities that we've been talking about previously. I think I'm going to set that aside for now because we're -- we seem to be not coming to any agreement that there's even a difference there when there clearly is a very dramatic difference.

When people who are not involved in this process on a regular basis look at the requirements they say well that's odd. Sometimes maybe we're looking too closely at it. You know us here in the political process look at it differently than people on the street. I will tell you

that the people on the street are saying this is really sort of bizarre.

They're being told by the Supreme Court of the United States of America that they can now participate in a different way in the political process and the State Legislature here in Hartford is throwing all these very unusual rules that have never existed before for anyone else who's participated in a political process before including unions and political action committees and for that matter individuals, so I think we're -- we're going to have to agree to disagree that there are people outside of this building, and a few that have been wandering around this building the last couple of days, but mostly outside of this building who say that this bill is misdirected, misguided, in that it doesn't make common sense and it doesn't make constitutional sense.

So I guess we'll have to wait and see if this Legislature decides to move forward with it. I'm assuming the votes exist in this body. I don't know if the Governor is going to pass this or not. I don't know if he's going to sign this bill or not.

There was a media report today that his chief legal counsel suggested that there were constitutional issues in this bill. So it's even someone as close to the political process in Hartford, Connecticut, as the Governor of the State of Connecticut, chief legal counsel, a former member of this body -- I believe that's who it was -- who's suggesting that there are challenges with this bill, which is what I've been trying to smoke out in this discussion. And we really haven't gotten anywhere on that discussion.

It sounds to me like if the bill goes forward, it probably very quickly will be another court case to try to determine it. And I'm -- I'm always suspect about legislation coming before this Legislature that almost instantly is contested. That -- that almost instantly is -- actually, during crafting it, during public hearing, and during consideration, and during debate, is called into question as being logical, level-headed, and, in this case, is it constitutional. So that -- that clearly is a problem.

Ironically, that's where the problems are in this bill, in that topic. There's some other things here that I -- I'm okay with. You know, you're fine-tuning language

in the -- in the campaign finance law that makes perfect sense. And you're giving opportunities to the military to expand opportunities to vote when they're overseas.

Through you, Madam President, to Senator Slossberg, could we just clarify what changes are being proposed to benefit our -- our military members in this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you. Through you, miss -- Madam -- Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Don't worry. At this hour, it's fine.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Through you, to Senator McLachlan.

This bill simply allows our military personnel to return their ballots by either e-mail or fax, something which is available in at least 19 other states.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Slossberg.

Any way that we can find a way to allow our military members to vote and have their vote count makes perfect sense. There's nothing more frustrating when I hear stories about active members of the military who went through the traditional absentee ballot process only to find out that there was no way, with the window of opportunity provided through the traditional mail channel, there was no way that their vote was going to get back in time for election day.

So if -- if there are ways that we can allow those special

people in our country to count their vote, because they're the people -- the very people who defend our right to have a vote, they, especially -- their vote should be preserved. And so I'm supportive of that.

Madam President, there are other concerns that I have with this bill. Namely, I'm concerned that we are dramatically increasing contribution limits to political action committees. And -- and I'm not sure that that -- that is the direction that this Legislature seems to be headed for a number of years now claiming to -- to have clean elections.

If it's a question of clean elections, why would the contribution limits double by the stroke of one pen? Why would we be talking about such a dramatic change in the -- in the campaign finance process with -- with that one very dramatic change?

And the reason why there's a -- it flies in the face of what this Legislature has celebrated for so many years -- I came to the -- to the Legislature in 2009 when campaign finance reform had already passed. The -- the Citizen Election Program had just completed its first campaign cycle. And as I walked in the door, as the ranking member of the Government Administration and Elections Committee, it was a nonstop -- nonstop -- a victory lap on how successful the clean election campaign is in Connecticut. And frankly, that's a whole nother discussion. But some of these proposals don't make sense to me.

Now, I'm glad to see that some other changes that were in a previous alliteration of this bill have been removed, namely, a very dramatic increase in citizen election program grants to -- to statewide offices, and it was a very dramatic increase at that. I'm also glad that there was, in a previous version of this bill, very dramatic increases in the organizational or independent expenditures that -- that are part of the, sort of, our loopholes in the campaign -- clean campaign election law. So I'm happy about that. That those changes have been made.

But I would ask, based upon these concerns, that this body reject the bill before us.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Roraback.

SENATOR RORABACK:

Thank you, Madam President.

And I appreciate the high-minded aspirations of this bill. And high-minded aspirations are something that this body should always fix its attention on.

But before we plow new ground, Madam President, in looking where high-minded aspirations might lead us, I would respectfully suggest that this -- this body take a long hard look at where we've come from and to focus our attention on the shortcomings of the system we have now. I'd like to -- Clerk, to please an amendment, which is LCO Number 5170. And if the Clerk could please call the amendment, and if I might be permitted to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, could you please call LCO 5170.

THE CLERK:

LCO 5170, Senate Amendment Schedule "A", offered by Senator Roraback.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Roraback.

SENATOR RORABACK:

Thank you, Madam President.

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is adoption. Will you remark, sir.

SENATOR RORABACK:

And I will note for the record, Madam President, 24 hours to go.

THE CHAIR:

On this bill?

SENATOR RORABACK:

No, no.

THE CHAIR:

Oh, thank you.

SENATOR RORABACK:

If you'd like but --

THE CHAIR:

No, thank you, sir.

SENATOR RORABACK:

Thank you, Madam President.

Connecticut was in the forefront in adopting a system of publically financing campaigns. Madam President, in what seems like eons ago, I think it was 2005 or 2004 when I was privileged to serve in the roll that Senator McLachlan now serves in as the ranking Senate Republican on the Government Administration and Elections Committee, and when we were educating ourselves about the plusses and minuses of public financing, the -- oh, boy -- it's -- it's named after a Supreme Court justice -- there's a -- there's an institute in New York that brought us experts from around the country.

And they brought in a senator from Arizona named Spitzer. He was Eliott Spitzer's cousin. I think his name was Marc Spitzer and he was a Republican state senator in Arizona. And he was coming to, kind of, comfort Republicans that

adopting a system of public financing could be the right thing to do.

And what he told us was the beauty of public financing was that it took the ability of incumbents to leverage their relationships with lobbyists out of the picture. And the reason the challengers had such a hard time breaking into a body such as this was that incumbents had the benefit of trading on their relationships with lobbyists.

So when we adopted our system of public financing, we created a set of rules consistent with the Arizona model that said if you chose to participate in the public financing system, you would not avail yourself of your connections with lobbyists in order to underwrite your campaign. And those were the rules under which we lived, I think, for the first two cycles of public financing.

Then something changed, Madam President. And what changed wasn't clear to me. But in the where's-the-outrage department, when this body revisited public financing in order to comply with some court decisions, we changed the rules of the program to allow for lobbyist contributions to count against what we needed to raise in order to unlock the public treasury.

So, Madam President, in my view, instead of going from a system which was supposed to be the best of all worlds, we went to a system which was the worst of all worlds. Allowing lobbyists to turn the key for all of us to tap into the public treasury -- and the state senators, I think that these are still the rules -- you can get 85,000 in taxpayer money. This is how you do it.

You get a 150 lobbyists -- and tonight it wouldn't be hard, Madam President. There are 150 lobbyists within 100 feet of this room. You get 150 lobbyists to give you $100 each. And you raise the $15,000 that you need to qualify for public financing. And then you go back home to your district and you get 300 of your constituents to give you $5 each.

If you can do that, and there's not a single state senator in this circle who couldn't do that without breaking into a sweat, you make yourself eligible for $85,000 from the citizens of the State of Connecticut. And if you should be so hapless as to be a challenger in the world, you don't

have that opportunity because there's no lobbyist in their right mind who's going to be writing a check to a challenger and fear igniting the wrath of incumbent who has the odds-on favorite of winning their seat.

So, Madam President, what this amendment does is restore integrity to the Citizens Election Program. It -- it made me want to scream. And it still makes me want to scream when my friends from the Connecticut League of Women Voters and Common Cause, they were here night and day -- and God bless them -- advocating for us to pass this bill. They were hanging out in the balcony. They were calling us, e-mailing us, sending us letters, this is the right thing to do. And then we perverted the system. And they've been conspicuous by their absence and their silence.

Madam President, they have abided a system which was supposed to invite people to participate in clean elections, and they've abided changes to that system which have upended the very foundations upon which the program was constructed.

And so I hope their watching. Because every time I go and meet with the League of Women Voters or -- or Common Cause, I ask them, when they want something done, they know, Madam President, they know how to get their message out.

And I hope that tonight, in offering this amendment, I will encourage every senator to search their soul about whether we want to have a system with integrity, a system that -- no one has to participate in public financing. It's optional. And if you don't participate in public financing, you can raise money from lobbyists. That the -- lobbyists have a first amendment right to contribute, and you have a first amendment right to accept their contributions.

But if you're going to participate in public financing, you shouldn't be able to have your cake and eat it too, to go back to your constituents and say, look, I'm a clean election candidate, wink, wink. But, by the way, the vast majority of the money that I raised to become eligible for my 85,000 public dollars came from lobbyists.

Let's do the math. If I get 150 lobbyists to give me $100 each, that's $15,000. If I get 300 of my constituents to give me $5 each, that's $1500, and that qualifies me. So,

I think, that $16,500 -- I think that means that 90 percent of the money that I get which enables me to participate in public financing is lobbyist money. And then I go and proclaim to the world, look at me, look at me, I'm a clean elections candidate.

Madam President, I think we'd be sending a much -- forget about the underlying bill. The underlying bill is plowing new ground. And, quite frankly, if Senator Slossberg will get on her feet and tell me that she agrees that this amendment is consistent with a -- the high-minded aspirations of the underlying bill, that would go a long way towards convincing me to support the underlying bill.

But if she doesn't believe that this amendment is friendly or that it doesn't make our system a better system, that's going to cool my enthusiasm considerably, Madam President, for the underlying bill. So, I guess, I would ask that when the vote is taken on this amendment that it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

The amendment will -- there will be a roll call vote.

Would you remark, Senator Slossberg?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Yes. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

You are on your feet.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, Madam President.

And I do rise reluctantly in opposition to this amendment. I think that we've got some concerns. I've got some concerns with regard to -- as Senator Roraback remembers, I'm sure, that we originally did have a lobbyist ban. And while I recognize -- that was then struck down by the second circuit. And while I recognize we're talking about qualifying contributions, I'm not clear that that would -- that would not run afoul of that.

So, as we stand here this evening, I will speaking in opposition to the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark?

Senator Roraback.

SENATOR RORABACK:

Thank you, Madam President.

For the second time, I just want to answer Senator Slossberg's punitive concern that this would somehow run afoul of any kind of constitutional law.

Madam President, our public financing system is a voluntary system. No one needs to participate. There's no compulsion for anyone to participate. We are free to set the rules of that system as we see fit. And the underlying reason for the -- for the system is to try to restore the public's integrity that there isn't undue influence on the part of lobbyists or special interests.

Madam President, there was an aggressive, an ambitious constitutional challenge to this bill. The provision of the bill banning lobbyists from making participating contributions was not challenged and was not found unconstitutional. To make that argument is, I think, to provide an insufficient basis upon which to reject this amendment, so I do urge adoption.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Mr. Clerk, will call a roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted?

If all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call a tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A"

Total Number of Voting 34
Necessary for Adoption 18
Those Voting Yea 15
Those Voting Nay 19
Those Absent and Not Voting 2

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, staff -- I'm sorry -- Mr. Clerk, will you please call roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

I feel like I back in the --

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

If all members have voted, if all members have voted, the machine will be closed. The Clerk will call a tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5556,

Total Number Voting 35
Necessary for Passage 18
Those Voting Yea 20
Those Voting Nay 15
Those Absent and Not Voting 1

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank -- Madam President, if we might stand at ease for a moment. We are preparing for a consent calendar to present.

THE CHAIR:

We will definitely stand at ease for that, sir.

Senators, at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate is coming back to order. And we're going to call on our wonderful majority leader, Senator Looney.

Senator Looney. Oops. We've got you now, senator.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I'm very pleased to announce that we do have a consent calendar. I wanted -- it's a great tribute to a collegiality and bipartisan cooperation this evening, Madam President. And I will begin to list the items on the consent calendar and then call for a vote on that