

ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 1977
5:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mann
Mr. Sena
Mr. Chaney
Mr. Goodman
Mr. Horn
Mr. Kosinski
Mrs. Wagner

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

GUESTS: Nancy Gomes, Assemblyman
Mike Olsen
William Swackhammer, Secretary of State
David Howard, Secretary of State's Office
Don Klasic, Deputy Attorney General
Pat Murphy, Assemblyman
Darrell Dreyer, Assemblyman
Pat Gothberg, Common Cause

Chairman Mann called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. on February 16, 1977. He stated the purpose of the meeting to be to hear testimony on AB 243 and 259.

AB 243, requires candidate to disclose true legal name when filing for office.

Darrell Dreyer, Assemblyman, as sponsor of the bill spoke in favor of it. He stated that this was a very simple, innocuous type bill whereby a person must use their real name when running for a political office. If they are not using their real name it should be known that they are using an alias.

Mrs. Wagner asked if he felt there was a problem with using other than real name. Mr. Dreyer stated that there was to some degree.

Mr. Horn that this would just require that you disclose what your legal name was on the declaration of candidacy and yet you would be able to designate the name to appear on the ballot. It does not state that these two names must be the same.

Mr. Swackhammer stated that the present time they ask a person running for office how they want their name to appear on the ballot and then they ask them to sign their real name. However, they have no way of checking this in their office.

Mr. Mann stated that he felt that this bill does not accomplish anything more than what is presently being done.

ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES
FEBRUARY 16, 1977

AB 259, increases number of required reports of candidates
campaign expenses.

Assemblyman Wagner, sponsor of the bill, spoke on behalf of the bill. She stated that this bill was identical to one she had introduced in the last session (AB32). It was given a "do pass" by the Elections Committee but did not fare well on the floor and failed. This bill is not designed to harass anybody during the election period. The obvious intent of the bill is inform the voter "more clearly and fully" of a candidates expenditures before he goes to vote. It would be valuable to have this information if a voter was attempting to make some judgement of a candidate before he goes to vote. Mrs. Wagner then referred to a list the states and their filing requirements. This is attached as Exhibit A and herewith made a part of this record.

This type of bill is not that unusual as there are only 6 states that do not require some type of filing before an election. Mrs. Wagner stated that this bill addresses itself only to campaign expenses but she would like to see the Committee add contributions as well.

Mrs. Wagner then explained briefly the time frame that was involved in this bill. She stated that on page 2 lines 20-23, it merely suggests the time period for which campaign periods are determined.

Mr. Goodman inquired whether Mrs. Wagner would feel it would sufficient to leave in (b) (c) and (d) of Section 2 and omit (a). Mrs. Wagner stated that she felt there would be a lot of people who are interested in seeing what people spend in a primary before they vote. She further stated that many races are determined by the primary election.

Mr. Horn inquired what Mrs. Wagner felt AB 259 accomplished. Mrs. Wagner stated that it would make expenditures available to the public. This would be important to those voters who feel the amount a candidate spends is an important consideration.

Mr. Kosinski stated that he agrees that disclosure of expenses is important but that he was concerned about the too heavy of burden of reporting forms. He stated he did not see any other way to achieve the goal except to require reporting prior to elections. He asked if she would have any objections if the recording period immediately after the primary be eliminated. Mrs. Wagner stated that if this would be an significant factor she could live with that.

Mr. Horn stated that he wondered if this would merely make the voter make his judgement based on dollar figure. He further wondered how this bill would help legislate morality. He stated that he felt that the legislature should do everything that they

can to insure credibility and honesty in political candidates but that he was not sure that making these types of reports was the answer.

Mrs. Wagner stated that she felt that amount spent and how was important. She further stated that she personally felt that will to get out and spend time getting the feeling of their constituents is more important in the long run than someone who may have great deal of money who can use the mass media for name identification.

Mr. Horn stated that perhaps what is needed is some further limitations on spending. Mrs. Wagner stated that this has been determined to be unconstitutional.

Mr. Chaney stated that would not carry through in each district as it is more expensive to campaign in some districts than in others. He further questioned the advisability of pointing out the "good guys from the bad guys" by how much they spend.

Mrs. Wagner stated that this would be just one feature that voter would consider. She further stated that they would have to compare candidates within the same district rather than compare districts.

Mr. Mann asked Secretary of State Swackhammer to explain what fiscal impact this bill might have on his office. Mr. Swackhammer stated that after the campaign practices bill was passed last session they did not get new employees. They did accomplish what they were suppose to under the act, however they did have a difficult time. They have asked for additional staff but the budget office knocked them out, probably because they understood this was unconstitutional. He further stated that they can handle the ethics, lobbyist registration and the campaign practices without any additional help because peak periods are different. He stated that if they were to get any more tasks he would have to have additional staff.

An example was cited of an candidate who overspent and did not ever file any reports. The point was made that spending money does not necessarily buy elections.

Mr. Kosinski stated that he did not feel the issue here was whether a candidate won or lost but that the issue is to give the voter the maximum information and this bill is trying to do that by providing a reporting period before the different elections.

Assemblyman Gomes then spoke in favor of the bill. She stated that during her campaign she found this to be a very important issue. People were very interested in this. Perhaps it was the aftermath of the milk scandals and slush funds, but people feel this is a step in the right direction. She further stated that she felt it was important to keep the primary disclosure in the bill.

Mrs. Gomes stated that her purpose in testifying was that she does feel that campaign practices are one of the root of what is wrong in government today. She stated that this is especially true on the national level but that perhaps it was a little soon for Nevada.

Mr. Chaney stated that he wondered why the State should get involved in this. Mrs. Gomes stated that it would help the voter determine his vote. Mr. Chaney replied that the candidate should do this by getting out and working.

Assemblyman Murphy stated that he supported this bill. He stated that he felt the public has a right to know about elected officials. He stated that this is not private enterprise as they are running for public positions. It is a privilege to run and serve and there are certain obligations that go along with this. A person loses a little privacy and gets a little more identity and this is all part of a political life. He further stated that he "finds it incredible that this committee has to be convinced that this is an important issue." He added that perhaps if James Ray Houston had been required to file before the election he may not have gotten as many votes as he did.

Mr. Murphy went on to say that this is a basic obligation that the public has a right to know. Government can get involved in anything it wants when it comes to elections. He ended by saying that it is a privilege to run for office and it involves certain obligations.

The next speaker was Pat Gothberg of Common Cause. She spoke in behalf of the bill. A copy of her statement is attached as Exhibit B and herewith made a part of this record. Before she presented her statement. Ms. Gothberg stated that on the whole winners have spend five times as much as the losers in most campaigns. She ended her statement by saying that Common Cause would like to go on record as supporting this bill and campaign reforms in general.

Mr. Kosinski stated that it was interesting to note here that the entire concept of campaign reports are being put to a test. One would begin to wonder whether or not NRS 294A.020 would have been passed at all if it were merely a bill being proposed before this committee at this time. He stated that he had thought that the concept of openness in campaigns was an accepted principal in our State but much of the comments here are not challenging the bill but rather the whole concept of reporting. He ended by saying that he hoped this was not a preview of coming events for this legislature.

Mr. Mann stated that he felt that it was for every member of the body to make that decision for himself.

Mr. Swackhammer stated that he was not speaking for or against the bill but rather to the mechanics of the bill. He stated since passage of the campaign practices two years there has been a Supreme Court decision and two state courts have dealt with this and the problem that is going to have be resolved is whether reportable expenditures are going to be those that a candidate made or those that made with candidate's knowledge and consent.

As far as the mechanics are concerned, Mr. Swackhammer stated in section 2 on page 2, lines 20-23 something needs to be done about the fact the Nevada law is silent of what is the first day a certificate of candidacy can be filed. He added that his office has dealt with this by their authority to promulgate rules and regulations and have set this date as January 1. He added that he felt this should be in the statutes as the general public does not have these rules.

Mr. Swackhammer then went to page 1, line 11 and stated that when this bill was originally passed he was sure that the legislature meant districts to mean county districts not fire districts or soil conservation districts or whatever. Feel there should be some attention to the term district and get it identified to exactly what it should mean.

Mr. Swackhammer stated that certainly agreed with Mrs. Wagner that this information should be made available before the election now after.

He went on to say that their biggest point and the reason they were there was wording on top of page 2, line 1. He stated that reporting on affidavit forms to the Secretary of State is strictly impracticable and unworkable. He enumerated the number of reports he had to handle in the primary election. He stated that they had to make 3 separate reports to 17 District Attorneys and all the supplemental reports. He stated they were able to get it out with a great of effort and dedication on the part of his employees. However, this was

a small state election and he was not sure whether they would be able to handle a large one. He suggested that the candidate would file with the same office he file his declaration of candidacy. This would be more management and practical. This amendment suggestion is shown on Exhibit C and herewith made a part of this record.

Mr. Mann asked if this would have some local financial impact. Mr. Swackhammer stated that the bill as it stands does not but if the committee were to use his suggested amendment it would. Mr. Mann then stated that the District Attorney's office had indicated that they would like to have this control in a local office as it is totally impractical to have this information in Carson City.

Mrs. Wagner stated that she does have a request to make these necessary changes in whereby both contributions and expenses would be reported in this manner.

Mr. Swackhammer then stated that there was one more thing that they would like to see tied down and that was the matter of postmarks. They really need to know if these reports must be physically in Carson City or whether postmarked by the set date is sufficient.

Don Klasic, Deputy Attorney General, stated that for any filing purposes at all, the Legislature had determined that postmark was sufficient with one exception and that is things under the Title 54. Title 54 relates to election matters. This means that reports have to be physically in the hands of the Secretary of State no later than the 15th day and those postmarked on the 14th day and not deliver until after the 15th are technically in violation.

Mr. Howard, Secretary of State's office, stated that he had one comment about the primary and that was that there were offices within Nevada that are determined in the primary if a candidate gets a majority of the votes. That candidate does not therefore have to run in the general. Carson City is an example of this and there may be others.

As there was no further testimony to be heard, Mr. Mann declared the hearing to be ended. The committee then took action on the following bills:

AJR 4 - 58th Session

Mr. Mann stated that he had talked to Mrs. Hayes, sponsor of the bill, and she was having another constitutional amendment prepared that would accomplish what she had wanted. She was aware that Mr. Mann was going to ask for an indefinite postponement for this bill. Mr. Koskinski moved to "indefinitely postpone" and Mr. Goodman seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. 44

AB 243

Mr. Sena moved to "indefinitely postpone" and Mr. Horn seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

AB 259

A brief discussion was held on the bill and Mr. Chaney moved to "indefinitely postpone" and Mr. Sena seconded it. There were three yea votes with Mr. Goodman, Mr. Horn, Mr. Kosinski and Mrs. Wagner voting no. The motion failed. Mr. Mann appointed Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Kosinski and Mr. Horn to work on amendments to the bill which might make it more workable. They will then report back to the committee for further action on the bill.

As there was no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Gagnier

Sandra N. Gagnier
Assembly Attache

Also attached to these minutes are Legislative Action Forms on AB 243 and AB 259 as well as AJR 4.

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE FEB 16, 1977

SUBJECT AJR 4 (of the 58th Session) Proposes to amend Nevada Constitution to clarify requirements for recall of public officers

MOTION: _____

Do Pass ___ Amend ___ Indefinitely Postpone XX Reconsider ___

Moved by Mr. Kosinski Seconded By Mr. Goodman

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
MANN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
SENA	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
CHANEY	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
GOODMAN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
HORN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
KOSINSKI	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
WAGNER	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---

TALLY: 7 0

Original Motion: Passed XX Defeated ___ Withdrawn ___

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Attach to Minutes February 16, 1977
Date

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE February 16, 1977

SUBJECT AB 243, Requires candidate to disclose true legal name
when filing for office

MOTION: _____

Do Pass ___ Amend ___ Indefinitely Postpone XX Reconsider ___

Moved by Mr. Sena Seconded By Mr. Horn

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
MANN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
SENA	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
CHANEY	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
GOODMAN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
HORN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
KOSINSKI	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
WAGNER	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---

TALLY: 7 0

Original Motion: Passed XX Defeated ___ Withdrawn ___

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Attach to Minutes February 16, 1977
Date

59TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE February 16, 1977

SUBJECT AB 259, Increases number of required reports of candidates
campaign expenses

MOTION: _____

Do Pass ___ Amend ___ Indefinitely Postpone XX Reconsider ___

Moved by Mr. Chaney Seconded By Mr. Sena

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

AMENDMENT _____

Moved By _____ Seconded By _____

VOTE:	MOTION		AMEND		AMEND	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
MANN	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
SENA	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
CHANEY	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---	---
GOODMAN	---	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---
HORN	---	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---
KOSINSKI	---	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---
WAGNER	---	<u>X</u>	---	---	---	---

TALLY: 3 4

Original Motion: Passed ___ Defeated XX Withdrawn ___

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Amended & Passed _____ Amended & Defeated _____

Attach to Minutes February 16, 1977
Date

ALABAMA

Threshold: Include names of contributors of more than \$10 and the amount given by each, gifts and loans too.

Filing: Finance Reports due within 30 days after election.

* ALASKA

Threshold: Over \$100 - name, address, occupation and employer of contributor. Date and amount of contribution.

Filing: 30 days before election
1 week before
10 days after

* ARIZONA

Threshold: Over \$25 - Itemized account

Filing: General election - Not more than 15 nor less than 10 days before election.

* ARKANSAS

Threshold: Over \$250 - itemized list of contributors.

Filing: Not less than 25 days before each election.
Not less than 7 days.
Final report no later than 30 days after
Supplemental Report if received after.

* CALIFORNIA

Threshold: Broken down to under and over \$50. Over \$50: Itemized, name occupation, employer or name of business.

Filing: Due not later than 40 and 12 days before an election and 65 days after.

* COLORADO

Threshold: \$100 in-kind contributions) name, address,
\$ 25 contributions) and date

Filing: 11 days before and 30 days after each election.

* CONNECTICUT

Threshold: Name and address of each contributor and amount.
Those under \$15 may be grouped together.

Filing: Second Tuesday of January, April, July, September.
30th and 7th day before election.
45 days following an election.

* DELAWARE

Threshold: Over \$100 - name and address, date and amount

Filing: 20 days before election
By December 31 of year following.
By December 31 after election.

* DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Threshold: \$50 or more - name, address, amount
Filing: During election year March 10, June 10, August 10,
October 10, December 10.
15 days before election.
5 days before election.

* FLORIDA

Threshold: Any contribution must be itemized.
Filing: 40th day before election.
45 days after election.

* GEORGIA

Threshold: \$101 or more - list name, etc.
Filing: 45 and 15 days before - 10 after primary
15 days before general
After - December 31 of election year.

* HAWAII

Threshold: More than \$100.
Filing: 10th day before each election.
20th day after.

* IDAHO

Threshold: Listing of contributors giving over \$50.
Filing: 40-30 days before.
14-7 days before
Cumulative report 30 days after.

* ILLINOIS

Threshold: More than \$150.
Filing: No later than 15th day before.
No later than 90th day after.

INDIANA

Threshold: Amount of each contribution and name.
Filing: 45 days after each election.

* IOWA

Different limit for different offices.
Filing: January 20, May 20, July 20, October 20.

* KANSAS

Threshold: Over \$100 - Name, amounts, date
Filing: 7th day before primary.
10th day after primary.
7th day before general.
December 3 of every year.

* KENTUCKY

Threshold: More than \$100 - amount, date, name, address,
occupation.
Filing: From campaign treasurers:
32nd day before election
12th day before
30 days after

* LOUISIANA

Threshold: Statewide \$100)
District \$500) Name, address and amount
Other \$250)
In-kind contribution, too.
Filing: 10th day prior
30 days after

* MAINE

Threshold: Name and address of each donor of \$50 or more.
Filing: 7th day before (completed on 11th)
45 days after election.

* MARYLAND

Threshold: Not specified.
Filing: 7th day before
30th day after

* MASSACHUSETTS

Threshold: \$15 or more - names and addresses
Filing: State Senate and House
8th day before
January 10th - following year

MICHIGAN

Threshold: Name and address of all contributors.
Over \$200 - include occupation and place of
business.
Filing: 10th day before
20th day after

* MINNESOTA

Threshold: Over \$50 - legislative candidates and \$100 for
statewide - Name, address, employer, and occupation.
Filing: 8 days before
No later than 10 days after.

* MISSISSIPPI

Threshold: List of contributors of \$500 or more for state
and district candidates.
County - \$100 or more
Filing: 5th day of each month of campaign
Saturday before each election

* MISSOURI

Threshold: More than \$25.
Filing: 40 days before
7 days before
30 days after

MONTANA

Threshold: \$25 or more - name, address, occupation
Filing: March 10 and September 10 of each election year
15th and 50th day before each election
20 days after election

NEBRASKA

Threshold: Over \$100
Filing: 15 days before
5 days before
20 days after

NEVADA

Threshold: Over \$500.
Filing: 30 days after general
15 after primary

* NEW HAMPSHIRE

Threshold: Name, address, amount of each contributor.
Filing: Wednesday before primary and general
2nd Friday after primary and general

* NEW JERSEY

Threshold: Over \$100
Filing: 25 days before election
7 days before
15 days after

NEW MEXICO

Threshold: List of contributions and names
Filing: 10 days after primary and general

NEW YORK

Threshold: Name and amount of those who contributed
Filing: 25th and 10th day before
20th day after

* NORTH CAROLINA

Threshold: Over \$50
Filing: 10 days before primary - 10 days after
10 days before general - 10 days after

NORTH DAKOTA

No campaign finance reports

* OHIO

Threshold: List all contributors, amounts, date
Filing: 12 days before
45 days after

* OKLAHOMA

Threshold: Over \$200
Filing: 10 days before primary and general
40 days after general

* OREGON

Threshold: Statewide \$100, other \$50
Filing: Between 30 and 21 days before
12 - 7 days
30 days after

PENNSYLVANIA

Threshold: Over \$150
Filing: 30 days after

PUERTO RICO

Threshold: All contributions
Filing: 30 days after (Contributions over a specified amount - \$500 - received a short period before election must be reported 48 hours after receipt.)

* RHODE ISLAND

Threshold: Over \$200 - name and address
Over \$25 - just list contributions
Filing: 30 days before and 30 days after

* SOUTH CAROLINA

Just expenditures before and after election.

* SOUTH DAKOTA

Threshold: \$100 or more - name, address, occupation
Filing: 7 days before
Within 30 days of the close of calendar year.

* TENNESSEE

Threshold: More than \$100.
Filing: 8 days before
30 days after

* TEXAS

Threshold: Over \$50 - list name, address, amount, etc.
Filing: 30 days before
7 days before
30 days after

* UTAH

Threshold: Itemize all contributions and those who gave
Filing: 5 days before
December of election year.

* VERMONT

Threshold: \$25 or more - list everything
Filing: 40 days and 10 days before
10 days after

* VIRGINIA

Threshold: Over \$100 - name and address
Over \$500 - occupation and business
Filing: 5 days before
30 days after

* WASHINGTON

Threshold: Over \$10 - list name, address, date and amount
Filing: 5th and 19th day prior to an election
10 days after primary
20 days after general

WEST VIRGINIA

Threshold: More than \$250
Filing: 5 and 10 days before
30 days after

* WISCONSIN

Threshold: Over \$20 - name and address
Over \$100 - occupation and place of business
Filing: Between 8 and 14 days before
Between 21 and 30 days after

WYOMING

Threshold: All contributions and name of contributors
Filing: 10 days after each election.

* UNITED STATES

Threshold: Over \$100 - name, address, occupation, place of
business.
Filing: Not later than 10 days before
Not later than 30 days after



NEVADA

February 16, 1977

Testimony before the Assembly Elections Committee

by: Pat Gothberg, CC / Nevada

Re: AB 259

Why do citizens ask for this type of campaign reform law? What are the objectives behind requiring candidates expenses be reported prior to election day? I'd like to quote from some of our Nevada newspapers in an effort to answer these questions.

An editorial in the L.V. Sun, on Sunday, Nov. 7, 1976, said, "Under the present law, expenditures are reported 15 days after the primary and 30 days after the general election, which means the voters become aware too late that a candidate has incurred some heavy obligations to moneyed interests while traipsing down the campaign trail.

"The laws must be revised to provide that preliminary reports be filed prior to the balloting."

On January 9, 1977, the Political Front column in the Nevada State Journal dealt in part with amounts spent in Nevada Senate and Assembly races in 1976 as reported by Secretary of State Swackhamer. After giving the average amounts spent by both winners and losers, the article goes on to say "The figures show that money counts "In all, Swackhamer's report is an invaluable reference, particularly for those persons who are still not convinced campaign reporting laws are needed. One may not enjoy seeing the role the money plays in an election but it's better to be exposed than hidden."

In the Review Journal, October 30, 1976, an article entitled "Campaign Spending Reform Urged", dealt with the subject of prosecution of violators of the law. Assemblyman Demers, the then chairman of the Elections Committee in the Assembly said, "When the people are seeking the public trust, the voters should know if they have violated the law before the election."

In 1974, Alaska passed a law to require pre and post-election reports.

In 1974, Arizona passed a law requiring pre-election campaign reports.

In 1975, Arkansas passed a law requiring reports of expenditures.

In 1974, California voters approved Prop. 9 which, among other things, requires full disclosure of campaign expenditures.

In 1974, Colo. passed a law requiring pre-election reports.

In 1975, Conn. law was amended to require new and more frequent reporting - pre as well as post election.

In 1974, Delaware enacted its first campaign financing law - pre-election filing is part of that law.

In 1974, the District of Columbia enacted a Campaign Finance Reform and Conflict of Interest Act - campaign expenditures must be disclosed.



common
cause

NEVADA

In 1974, Georgia passed a law requiring pre and post-election expenditure reports.

In 1974, Idaho voters approved an initiative to require pre and post-campaign disclosure.

In 1974, Illinois passed its first campaign financing law - pre filing was included.

In 1976, Indiana enacted a campaign financing law that includes pre-election disclosure.

In 1974, the Kansas legislature revised the state's campaign financing law to provide for pre-election reporting.

In 1975, Louisiana passed a law to require pre and post election reports.

In 1974, Maine decided to start requiring pre-election reports.

Current Massachusetts law requires pre-election expenditure reports.

In 1976, Michigan passed a law which includes pre-election reporting.

In 1975, Montana enacted a comprehensive campaign financing package, including pre and post-election disclosure.

In 1974, No. Carolina's General Assembly enacted a law requiring pre-election reporting.

In 1974, Ohio started requiring pre-election reports.

In 1974, Oklahoma enacted a law requiring pre-election reports.

In 1974, Rhode Island's first campaign financing law required pre and post-election reports.

In 1975, So. Dakota required pre and post-election disclosure.

In 1975, Tennessee passed a law -pre-election filing was required.

In 1976, Vermont's new law required 2 pre-election reports.

In Virginia, last year, additional legislation required one more pre-election report.

It is time for Nevada to join this trend.

Common Cause urges your positive vote on AB 259.

B-259

— 2 —

1 report his campaign expenses to the ~~secretary of state~~ on affidavit forms
2 to be designed and provided by the secretary of state.

3 2. Any candidate who willfully violates any of the provisions of this
4 section is guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

5 SEC. 3. NRS 294A.030 is hereby amended to read as follows:

6 294A.030 1. In any primary or general election, the campaign
7 expenses of a candidate for any of the following offices shall not exceed
8 the greater of the amounts indicated for that office:

9 (a) Governor: \$150,000 or 80 cents for each registered voter.

10 (b) Lieutenant governor, secretary of state, state treasurer, state con-
11 troller, attorney general and justice of the supreme court: \$75,000 or 40
12 cents for each registered voter.

13 (c) District judge: \$10,000 or 80 cents for each registered voter.

14 (d) Justice of the peace and every elective city, county and township
15 officer: \$3,500 or 80 cents for each registered voter.

16 2. For the purposes of subsection 1: ["registered"]

17 (a) "Registered voter" is limited to those registered voters who are
18 eligible to vote for candidates for the office specified, as of the close of
19 registration for that election.

20 (b) Campaign expenses are determined for the periods:

21 (1) Between the first day on which a certificate of candidacy may
22 be filed and the primary election; and

23 (2) Between the primary election and the general election.

24 3. Any candidate who willfully exceeds the limitations upon cam-
25 paign expenses prescribed in this section is guilty of a gross misde-
26 meanor.

50

same office he filed his declaration
of candidacy per NRS 293.135