1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB190)

Received: 03/14/2000					Received By: kuesejt Identical to LRB: By/Representing: Maureen McNally			
Wanted: Today								
For: Mary Panzer (608) 266-7513								
This file may be shown to any legislator: NO				Drafter: kuesejt				
May Contact:					Alt. Drafters:			
Subject: Elections - campaign finance					Extra Copies:			
Pre Top	pic:			***************************************				
No spec	ific pre topic gi	ven						
Topic:		The second secon						
SA to S	B-190							
Instruc	tions:							
Per attac	ched, #8.							
 Draftin	g History:				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Vers.	<u>Drafted</u>	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required	
/ ?	kuesejt 03/14/2000	jgeller 03/14/2000				·		
/1			jfrantze 03/14/200	00	lrb_docadmin 03/14/2000	1rb_docadmin 03/14/2000		
FE Sent	For:			∠END>				

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB190)

Received: 03/14/2000	Received By: kuesejt Identical to LRB: By/Representing: Maureen McNally Drafter: kuesejt Alt. Drafters:			
Wanted: Today				
For: Mary Panzer (608) 266-7513				
This file may be shown to any legislator: NO				
May Contact:				
Subject: Elections - campaign finance	Extra Copies:			
Pre Topic:				
No specific pre topic given				
Topic:	·			
SA to SB-190				
Instructions:				
Per attached, #8.				
Drafting History:	di Billindina.			
Vers. Drafted Reviewed Typed Proofed. Vers. Drafted Reviewed Typed Proofed Cop Co	Submitted Jacketed Required			

FE Sent For:

<END>

Kuesel, Jeffery

From: Sent: McNally, Maureen

Tuesday, March 14, 2000 8:33 AM

To:

Kuesel, Jeffery

1. SB113 The Ellis Plan-as a substitute amendment to the bill

And the following simple amendments

- 2. An amendment requiring candidate to receive a set amount in donations of less than \$100 from within their district in order to qualify for the state grant (amounts as enumerated in the Ellis plan SB 113)
- 3. An amendment that includes the penalties contained within the Ellis plan (nullifying the election, special election called, etc.) if the rules of the grant are violated.
- 4. An amendment to make funding of the plan sum sufficient.
- 5. An amendment to prohibit sitting legislators from soliciting a specific monetary campaign contribution *for any candidate* in exchange for specific legislative action. (See attached information)
- 6. An amendment requiring that candidates receive no more than \$1,000 on any given day from a state other than Wisconsin.
- 7. An amendment that imposes a \$100 fine per offense for not listing, within campaign finance reports, the occupation of contributors who give more than \$100 per cycle. With the fine going to the Common School Fund.
- 8. An amendment to ban PAC to PAC transfers; conduit to conduit transfers; and conduit to PAC transfers.

Thank you!

Maureen McNally

Chief of Staff
Senate Republican Leader Mary Panzer
202 South, State Capitol
608/266-7513
maureen.mcnally@legis.state.wi.us



1

State of Misconsin 1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

A 1789/, LRBa1571/1 TTK)cmh;hmh

WANTED TODAY 3/14 9:45Am

SENATE AMENDMENT,

TO 1999 SENATE BILL 190

D-note

2	1. Page 24, line 8: after that line insert:					
3	"Section 37m." 11.25 (2) (ap) of the statutes is created to read:					
5	11.25 (2) (ap) No committee identified under s. 11.05 (3) (c) as a special interest over and in committee that receives a contribution made or transferred to the committee in					
6	violation of this chapter may make a disbursement from the property or funds that					
7	constitute that contribution.".					
8	2. Page 26, line 18: after that line insert:					
9	"Section 46m. 11.26 (8m) of the statutes is created to read:					
10	11.26 (8m) (a) No committee identified under s. 11.05 (3) (c) as a special interest					
11	committee may make any contribution or contributions for an amount or value					
12	exceeding \$100 cumulatively within a salendar year to any other committee					
13	identified under s. 11.05 (3) (c) as a special interest committee.					

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

1 (c) (b) No conduit may transfer any contribution or contributions in an amount or
2 value exceeding \$100 cumulatively within a calendar year to any committee
3 identified under s. 11.05 (3) (c) as a special interest committee.".
4 (END)

text: treat (b) No conduit may transfer any contribution or contributions to any other conduit.

JTK:jl<u>g&kmg:if</u>

Proposed ss. 11.24 (1t) and 11.25 (4) probabit the former personal campaign committee of a candidate which becomes an independent committee from making contributions or disbursements to advocate the election or defeat of a candidate from money or property acquired by the committee prior to its change in status. The U.S. supreme court has held that limits may not be imposed on the spending of committees that wish to express their views independently of candidates. See Buckley v. Valeo, et al., 96 S. Ct. 612, 644–650 (1976) and F.E.C. v. N.C.P.A.C., 105 S.Ct. 1459, 1465–1471 (1985). However, the court has also held, in Buckley, that reasonable contribution limitations may be imposed upon committees. If one views this proposal simply as an attempt to restrict independent spending, it would likely not meet the court's current standard for passing constitutional muster. If one views this proposal as only a limited restriction designed to protect contributors by ensuring that their contributions are not used for purposes they did not intend, the proposal may be viewed more favorably, and could be sustained.

(a) Talso want to note briefly that a few of the provisions of this draft are innovative, and we do not yet have, to my knowledge, specific guidance from the federal courts concerning the enforceability of provisions of these types / It is well possible that a court may find a rational basis for these provisions that would permit them to be upheld. However because of the concerns expressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in Buckley v. Valeo, et al., 96 S. Ct. 612 (1976), and certain other cases that attempts to regulate campaign financing activities may, in some instances, impermissibly intrude upon freedom of speech or association, or equal protection guarantees, it is possible that enforceability problems with these previsions may occur. In particular, those provisions concerning which we do not have specific guidance at this time are.

(a) Proposed s. 11.26 (7) and (8e), which prohibits certain contributions to be made by candidates to other candidates or political parties. and conduits

ttees from bits conduits from is an innovale provided in the conduits from the condu (b) Proposed s. 11.26 (8m), which prohibits political action committees from making certain contributions to other political action committees, and prohibits conduits from transferring certain contributions to political action committees

(c) Proposed s. 11.31 (2e), which imposes upon all candidates a limitation upon disbursements using moneys derived from sources other than individuals

Jeffery T. Kuesel Assistant Chief Counsel 266-6778

conduits

DRAFTER'S NOTE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBa1789/1dn JTK:jlg:jf

March 14, 2000

Proposed s. 11.26 (8m), which prohibits political action committees and conduits from making certain contributions to other political action committees and conduits, and prohibits conduits from transferring certain contributions to political action committees is an innovate provision, and we do not yet have, to my knowledge, specific guidance from the federal courts concerning the enforceability of a provision of this type. Because of the concerns expressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Buckley v. Valeo*, et al., 96 S. Ct. 612 (1976), and certain other cases that attempts to regulate campaign financing activities may, in some instances, impermissibly intrude upon freedom of speech or association, or equal protection guarantees, it is possible that enforceability problems with this provision may occur.

Jeffery T. Kuesel Managing Attorney Phone: (608) 266–6778