TO: The Honorable Senator Nancy B. Sullivan, Senate Chair  
The Honorable Representative Pamela Jabar Trinward, House Chair  
The Joint Standing Committee on Legal and Veterans Affairs

DATE: March 23, 2009

RE: LD 887, “An Act To Amend the Reporting Requirements for Independent Expenditures for Political Campaigns,” Senator Davis, sponsor

Maine Citizens for Clean Elections (MCCE) testifies in opposition to LD 887.

This bill raises exactly the same constitutional red flags that were identified by MCCE and others at the hearing on LD 312. The committee rightly killed that bill with a unanimous “Ought not to pass” vote, and this bill ought to meet a similar fate.

The Maine Clean Election Act contains a matching funds provision that relies on reports of both candidate spending and independent expenditures. These reporting requirements were challenged on constitutional grounds in federal court. While the requirements were upheld, care must be taken to make sure that subsequent changes in the law do not jeopardize its constitutionality. The matching funds system is absolutely key to the successful functioning of the Maine Clean Election Act.

LD 887 raises particular concerns relating to the expedited reporting schedule that is in effect for large expenditures and expenditures made in the last 2 weeks of the campaign. These expenditures must be reported within 24 hours. The purpose of this expedited reporting is to make the matching funds system work well. LD 887 would require additional information that is not directly related to the issuance of matching funds, thus it may raise a constitutional red flag.

In reviewing the accelerated reporting requirement for privately funded candidates, Judge Brock Hornby wrote in his 1999 decision in Daggett v Webster, “The state’s only legitimate interest in requiring the additional reports is to keep track of their funding so that the matching funds system will work. All the Commission needs to know in the additional reports, therefore, are the total contributions and expenditures.” In a related footnote, Hornby states, “If significantly more detail were required in the reports… I would have serious doubts about constitutionality.”

While the rationale for reporting of independent expenditures is somewhat different than for candidate reports, it is not unreasonable to think that a court would apply the same thinking to the 24 hour reports of independent expenditures.
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