

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HOUSE STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE  
March 2, 1983

CHAIRMAN JOE BRAND called the meeting to order at 8 a.m. in Room 129 of the Capitol, Helena, Montana.

Roll Call was taken and all members were present.

Chairman Brand introduced the new secretary to the committee.

He also mentioned that the committee had been invited to a Department of Agriculture breakfast to be held at 6:45 a.m. on March 8, 1983, and therefore the committee would not meet until 9 a.m. on that day.

The committee members were reminded that the House bill binders that they had requested were ready for them to dispose of at their convenience.

SENATE BILL 286

SENATOR ED SMITH introduced the bill noting this was short bill and it was on the ballot to let the voters of the state decide if they want a five-member appointed commission to continue to reapportion the state or if they want a 12-member legislative committee to do so. He said that he introduced the bill for two reasons. The first reason is because the present system isn't working, and the other reason is because of the suit that Senator Dave Manning has filed against the state. This suit states that it is the legislators' responsibility to reapportion the state of Montana. He briefly went through the bill and covered the highlights of it. It appears that other states are having trouble with their apportionment as well. He stated that reapportionment is not an easy job and that this bill may not be the answer; but if this committee did not think that it was going to work, they should take a hard look at it and not make any quick decisions. It appears that the fifth member needs to be a bipartisan member. He commented on the dissatisfaction in the way that the state was reapportioned last time.

He indicated that the bipartisan member would not eliminate the problem entirely but there were some court cases that arose when the state was reapportioned last time. He felt that these problems will be around for some time anyway. This bill is a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate 20-30.

He then read portions of the bill to the committee and explained the 12-member committee concept. It would be a 12-member legislative committee with six of the members from the western U.S. Congressional District and six members from the eastern U.S. Congressional District. The legislature would make the final decision.

It was explained that this bill would place a referendum on the ballot and let the voters decide whether they should continue under the present system or adopt this new plan for reapportionment.

#### OPPONENTS

ROSE LEAVITT, representing the League of Women Voter's of Montana, spoke in opposition to this bill. She gave a statement that was prepared by one of their league members who is more familiar with the issue. They stand in opposition to Senate Bill 286. They feel that it is obvious that no matter who reapportions the state, there will be problems. But allowing the legislature to apportion itself is particularly unwise because of the inherent self-interest of legislators involved in deciding what area each district should cover. (testimony attached).

NANCY HART, Legislative Coordinator for the Montana Democratic Committee, stated that they were against the bill. They feel that this would cause many problems. Creating a 12-member committee is only going to compound those already existing problems. The people that are going to be serving on that committee are the ones that are directly involved in what those district lines are going to mean. They feel that it takes it out of the realm of study regarding the constitutionality of the mandate, one person, one vote into a more directly partisan effort. The attempt is to make reapportionment a nonpartisan process and if anything, this bill is going to make it a super partisan process because we are going to have republicans and democrats representing legislative districts.

THERE BEING NO ADDITIONAL OPPONENTS TO SENATE BILL 286 SENATOR SMITH CLOSED.

Senator Smith closed by saying, "there is no question that there will be problems and we realize that, but the thing that we have to be very careful about is, if you leave this as it is now, it will be like a pressure cooker and the top will blow off. We have to do something at least about the fifth member that is appointed. It became very apparent this last time; this needs to be corrected. I would hope we would do something this session of the legislature to remedy this. I don't think it should be the Supreme Court that appoints the fifth member. We better start working together and solving our problems together. I did not want this to become a political battle."

#### COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

CHAIRMAN JOE BRAND ask Senator Smith that if they had a vote of 30 in the Senate, would we need a two-thirds vote on this bill. Senator Smith replied that it will go to the floor no matter

what the committee does. "I would like to see the committee look at this bill and see if we couldn't come up with something on it", he said.

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL PISTORIA ask Senator Smith if he was for or against the 12-member committee; it isn't spelled out in the bill. Senator Smith replied that he noticed this and maybe it should be looked into by the Legislative Council.

REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS KOEHNKE ask if the 12-member committee might be a little large. Senator Smith replied that the reason he chose 12 was because many other committees have 12 and then because of the large geographical area of Montana, you could pick someone from the urban area, timber area, western part of the state, etc., so that they might have a little better knowledge of the entire state's needs.

REPRESENTATIVE CHESTER SOLBERG mentioned to Senator Smith that he thought the ballot portion had been changed a little bit already. Senator Smith stated that this was true but it was just a language clean up.

REPRESENTATIVE JOE HAMMOND inquired what the reason was for changing it from "citizen" to "5-member appointed"? Senator Smith explained that it was because of the partisan issue that had crept into the Commission this time and many people wouldn't know whether this was a 12-member citizen commission or what it was. Several people had made this suggestion prior to drafting the bill.

CHAIRMAN JOE BRAND mentioned that it was disturbing to him that the Senator was going to have somebody appointed to the leadership of the House and Senate and wondered if the minority and majority leaders in both would appoint the commission members. He didn't completely approve of that. He mentioned that maybe the younger legislators should have a crack at the commission seats rather than the ones running the show. Senator Smith answered this by explaining that they would indeed be able to appoint themselves as the bill was presently written.

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER SALES ask what the status of the Manning law suit was at the present time. Senator Smith said, "I talked to him about three or four days ago and as you know the courts are very slow in acting but he is very confident that he is going to win the case. I don't know how the courts will rule."

Representative Sales explained that he was thinking about the timing. This is something that will not reoccur until the next census and maybe we would be better off if we waited until some of these suits have been settled. Then if the courts say that it has to be a legislative body we will be stuck with that.

Senator Smith further explained that if the Manning suit is won, the legislature will be forced to go through and reapportion the state again anyway. The Reapportionment Commission doesn't plan to implement this plan until 1985 when the Senators run for office again. He ask that this committee hold off on a decision for this bill until we know more about the Manning suit.

CHAIRMAN BRAND ask Senator Smith if he thought that the legislature would be in session until the suit was through the courts. Senator Smith responded, "We certainly could be."

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN RYAN informed the committee that he had visited with Senator Manning the day before and he had hopes of getting a decision this month.

CHAIRMAN BRAND ask if the Senator would like to have the committee hold the bill in the committee until the outcome of the suit. Senator Smith replied, "Yes, and after that we could get some people together and if you don't want the legislature to do it, come up with some kind of a plan for at least that fifth member so we don't have the problems that we ended up with this time."

THERE BEING NO FURTHER QUESTIONS ON SENATE BILL 286 CHAIRMAN BRAND CLOSED.

#### SENATE BILL 258

SENATOR BILL THOMAS stated this was just a little housekeeping bill, and he didn't think that there would be much trouble with it. It is just inserting an inflation factor on the recording amounts for campaign contributions. If you refer to the Consumer Price Index, the original act was enacted in 1975, and if you add up the inflation rate from 1975 to 1982, we have an increase of about 182% in the rate of inflation. Supporters of the bill would like to increase the reporting amount from \$25 to \$50. If we raise it to \$50, we will probably wipe out a large portion of those people reporting contributions. When the Campaign Commissioner's office published its report there were a great deal of contributions that were in the \$45-\$50 range. The \$50 amount could be sliced downward somewhat but considering the inflation factor, it should not be decreased much.

#### OPPONENTS

DON JUDGE, Montana AFL-CIO, spoke in opposition to the bill. He stated that this bill would raise the reportable campaign contribution from \$25 to \$50. Although as the sponsor has pointed out, the bill would simplify the reporting requirements, it would also reduce the public's right to know about who is funding state legislative campaigns. It is their belief that this bill would significantly reduce the numbers of contributions recordable. They estimate that as much as fifty percent of the

contributions that presently come under the reporting law would be exempted from the reporting requirements. The public concern for confidence in government has probably never been lower than in the past decade. People are facing hard economic times. (testimony attached).

JON MOTL, Common Cause of Montana, spoke in opposition to this legislation. "When you receive the material I just handed out to you, please review the charts at the bottom of this." (testimony attached).

He explained some of the charts and how they arrived at their figures. This bill does not influence the amount of money you receive. It simply influences what you report and what the public understands you receive from certain types of individuals. That type of reporting is under the general category of disclosures so in that way, it weakens the disclosure laws. It should be noted that in spite of our belief regarding disclosure, we know that like any law, disclosure law can't be overly burdensome on the people that it affects, the candidates or the government.

MARGARET DAVIS, President, League of Women Voters of Montana, spoke in opposition for many reasons previously mentioned. The people are presently comfortable with the reporting requirement. The Commissioner of Campaign Practices has worked over the years to make it easier for candidates to comply with the law. There is really no grounds for raising the reporting limits to \$50 as stated in the present language of this bill. Campaign contributions are made freely knowing that they are available to the public, and this change is not warranted at the present time. "We urge that you give this measure a do not pass recommendation in committee."

NANCY HART, Montana Democratic Party, spoke in opposition to this bill. She said that it is interesting that the inflation factor was a consideration. We have not noticed the contributions going up because of the inflation. If anything we have noticed that they are going down because of the poor economy. "The last time that I checked on the average contribution, it was less than \$25." Even under the old rules over half of the contributions wouldn't have to be reported. If you want to eliminate the problems with reporting you could do away with the law entirely. "I know that this isn't an exciting thing to handle (committee contribution reports), but it is one of the most important things that we do for the party. We should keep this at \$25, and I ask that you oppose this bill."

THERE BEING NO FURTHER OPPONENTS TO SENATE BILL 258 SENATOR THOMAS CLOSED.

Senator Thomas made a closing statement indicating that maybe \$50 is a little high and it could be adjusted downward somewhat. It is very difficult to get campaign money, and it will be harder and harder as the economic conditions seem to deteriorate. We are simply asking for an inflation factor.

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

REPRESENTATIVE PAUL PISTORIA ask Senator Thomas if they had any opposition in the Senate to this bill. Senator Thomas replied that they did, but it has passed with a two-thirds vote. He then explained about the amendments that the Senate put on the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE BRENT BLISS ask Don Judge about his presentation concerning different interest groups giving to different candidates even though they were all from the same occupational field. Don Judge explained that they were just trying to show the committee that even under the current law, for instance, there could be 23 persons from the same field of work who contribute to the same candidate. Those contributions had to be at least \$25 to have been reported. These 23 people represented an interest group that have an interest in electing an individual to come to the legislature. These people that contribute singly as the example shows, could have more of an impact than a political action committee (PAC) because a PAC is limited to \$300.

Representative Bliss replied, "So the public finds out, so what?" Don Judge stated that they felt it was the public's right to know. Knowing who is interested in the legislature and a particular legislator when he gets elected is the public's right.

REPRESENTATIVE BILL HAND ask Jon Motl if he really believed that people go down to the court house and study these listings, etc. Jon Motl replied that he did think that they did. In fact, he has done so himself.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN PHILLIPS wanted more clarification on the study conducted by Don Judge. Don Judge explained that these people might have made contributions of more than \$25 to other people in other races, but what they are trying to point out is, a tremendous amount of money can go into a race from a select interest group. It doesn't matter what interest group that is. It tells you that your opponent is getting a great deal of money from certain interest groups, and it can be an issue in your campaign against this person, as it would be for your opponent, if he found out that type of information about you.

CHAIRMAN BRAND asked, "Senator Thomas, what kind of increments of money do people contribute to campaigns on an average? Do they giver \$25, \$30 or \$35? What is the average they are giving?" Senator Thomas replied that it is hard to say. It depends on

who has the money.

Chairman Brand ask if a survey had been conducted on this issue. Senator Thomas replied that he did not know but Don Judge responded to the question saying that their information indicated that about 50% of the reportable contributions would be wiped out if the reporting amount was raised to \$50.

Chairman Brand ask why \$25 was originally put in the bill. Senator Thomas said he was not sure how the \$25 was established. He ask Don Judge if he knew. Don Judge stated that he felt the intent was to make it less burdensome.

Chairman Brand inquired about the percentage of contributions made which would fall under the \$25 figure since the law was first enacted. Senator Thomas replied that he did not know if that information was available or if any research had been conducted on it.

Chairman Brand ask Senator Thomas if it bothered him that 50% of the contributions would not be included in the reporting process under this new bill. Senator Thomas replied, "Yes, it does bother me and I have stated repeatedly that I don't think that we should wipe that many out of the report. There are other areas that we need to clean up though. It is being abused now."

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER SALES mentioned that he had never been involved with anyone that was bothered about his contribution being public knowledge except union members. They seem quite concerned about this. Sometimes each spouse will give a \$20 check and then neither one has to be reported. Senator Thomas stated that he did not think that it was the public in general that was against this bill. It was more likely the candidates.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER QUESTIONS ON SENATE BILL 258 CHAIRMAN BRAND CLOSED THE HEARING ON THIS BILL.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chairman Brand stated that the committee would wait on Senate Bill 258 until there was a full committee to take action.

Representative Hammond stated he thought the committee needed some additional information on the bill.

Chairman Brand ask the committee if they wanted to have Lois Menzies get some more information on the bill. Senator Thomas had mentioned that he would like to see the bill amended down.

Representative Pistoria said that he would like to see the amount be more than \$25 rather than more than \$50.

Chairman Brand ask Lois Menzies to look into this bill and find out as much as she could regarding the impact the increase might have and the percentage of contributions that would not be included with this new bill.

SENATE BILL 286

Chairman Brand reminded the committee that Senator Smith had ask that this bill be held in committee until more information could be obtained on the Dave Manning law suit. He asked if this was the committee's wishes as well. This was agreeable with the committee.

SENATE BILL 285

Chairman Brand ask Ron Sundsted, Chief of the State Employee Benefit Bureau, to talk to the committee regarding some questions that had arose on this bill.

Rod Sundsted explained that he administers the state group insurance plan. He mentioned that they already include all of the provisions in this bill in the state insurance plan. But he further explained there are some costs involved in doing this. Maybe local governments would experience the same things that the state has. As it is right now, retirees and their spouses represent about six and one-half percent of the total group and about eight or nine percent of the premiums in the state plan. For each dollar the state takes in from our retirees and their dependents, the state pays out in claims and administrative fees about \$1.55. In other words, the state loses on our retiree plan about \$450,000 a year. For the employees, on each dollar that the state takes in, they pay out 92 cents and they use that other 8 cents to subsidize the retirees' and their dependents' costs. He explained that this bill does not effect state employees; it covers school districts, local governments, employers and all other groups.

Chairman Brand asked if there is a slight cost factor involved in operating this plan. Rod Sundsted replied, "Yes, there is a cost factor, but we are looking at ways to mitigate that. We have only allowed retirees to be in this program since 1979, and we think that it is a good plan."

Chairman Brand asked, "When you first implemented this in 1979, what cost effect did you have?" Rod Sundsted explained that this changes every year. It would be difficult to break out the cost exactly based on the impact of this bill, but it would probably be less than ten percent of the total amount.

Representative Sales mentioned that the title refers to public employees, but the bill doesn't mention it.



Representative McBride stated that she thought that it was confusing because it is not mentioned in the body of the bill.

REPRESENTATIVE WALTER SALES MOVED to reconsider the action taken by the committee the previous day and this was seconded by Representative Chester Solberg.

Representative Sales explained that he felt that this is opening it up to cities, school districts, counties, etc., and obviously this option is available to them now through their contract negotiations. However, if we pass this bill we will be saying that they have to make this available to these people. They will not have the choice that they have as it stands now. He felt that this should be left up to them to decide.

Representative Driscoll referred to the bill and the 31 days, explaining that they can't wait until they get sick before they can take out this insurance. He stated that this would just make it fair. Why should a person have to die before he is eligible for insurance? He didn't feel that this would be causing anyone any great cost.

Representative McCormick stated that he had to speak against Representative Sales motion.

The question being called, BE NOT CONCURRED IN as MOVED by Representative Sales failed.

Senate Bill 285 was reported out of committee AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN.

#### SENATE BILL 230

Chairman Brand ask Lois Menzies to read to the committee what she had prepared on amendments to this bill.

Lois Menzies explained the proposed amendment to committee. The first and third amendments would eliminate the right for the registered voter to challenge the verification of a signature on a petition. These amendments were made at the suggestion of Bill Romine. He thought that was an oversight on the Senate's part. The second amendment on that page is grammatical. Amendments 4, 5 and 6 address Representative Sales' concern about combining the two sentences that appear in subsection (4) of section 2.

Representative Bill Hand MOVED to accept the amendments as read and this was seconded by Representative Francis Koehnke.

Representative Jerry Driscoll ask Lois Menzies if amendment 2 required each signature to be verified.

Lois Menzies replied, "Yes, but if you are more comfortable with, "he is an elector" we could go that way."

Chairman Brand replied that he would prefer that language. He ask Representative Hand if he would accept the change in the language for his motion. Representative Hand replied that he would.

The question being called, the motion carried unanimously to accept the amendments.


REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS KOEHNKE MOVED this bill AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN and it was seconded by Representative Bill Hand.

The question being called, the motion carried unanimously.

MOTION for Adjournment was made by Representative Mueller and seconded by Representative Hand.

The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
REPRESENTATIVE JOE BRAND,  
CHAIRMAN

Cleo P. Anderson, Secretary

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

1 of 2

March 2 19 83

MR. **SPEAKER**

We, your committee on **STATE ADMINISTRATION**

having had under consideration **SENATE** Bill No. **285**

**blue**

**third** reading copy ( )  
color

"AN ACT ALLOWING THE SPOUSE OF A RETIRED PUBLIC EMPLOYEE TO  
REMAIN A MEMBER OF A GROUP INSURANCE PLAN OR TO CONVERT A GROUP  
INSURANCE POLICY; AMENDING SECTION 2-18-704, MCA."

Respectfully report as follows: That **SENATE** Bill No. **285**

1. Title, line 9.

Following: "MCA"

Insert: "; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE"

2. Page 2, line 17.

Following: "(1)"

Insert: "for remaining a member of the group"

3. Page 2, line 21.

Strike: "and"

4. Page 2, line 23.

Following: "33-22-508"

Insert: "; and (c) continued membership in the group by anyone  
eligible under the provisions of the section notwithstanding the  
person's eligibility for medicare under the federal Health Insurance  
XOCXAS for the Aged Act"

continued

CONTINUED

STATE PUB. CO.  
Helena, Mont.

Rep. Joe Brand,

Chairman.

COMMITTEE SECRETARY

March 2, 1983

3. Page 3.

Following: line 2

Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 2. Effective date. This act is effective June 30, 1983."

AND AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

1 of 2

March 2 19 83

MR. **SPEAKER**

We, your committee on **STATE ADMINISTRATION**

having had under consideration **SENATE** Bill No. **230**

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

**"AN ACT TO REVISE THE LAWS RELATING TO RECALL PETITIONS; AMENDING  
SECTIONS 2-16-613, 2-16-620, AND 2-16-621, MCA."**

Respectfully report as follows: That **SENATE** Bill No. **230**

1. Page 1, line 23 and 24.

Strike: **"=="** on line 23 through **"challenge"** on line 24

2. Page 2, line 2.

Strike: **"THEY"** through **"electors"**

Insert: **"he is an elector"**

3. Page 2, line 23 through line 10 of page 3.

Strike: Subsection (2) in its entirety

Renumber: Subsequent subsections

4. Page 3, line 23.

Following: **"any"**

Insert: **"portion of a"**

5. Page 3, line 25 through line 2 on page 4.

Strike: **"the"** on line 25 through **"of"** on page 4, line 2

**REPAIRS**

**CONTINUED**

**CONTINUED**

STATE PUB. CO.  
Helena, Mont.

**REP. JOE BRAND,**

Chairman.

**COMMITTEE SECRETARY**

March 2,

33

..... 19.....

6. Page 4, line 4.

Following: line 3

Strike: "on the petition or"Following: "or on"Strike: "any"Insert: "that"AND AS AMENDED BE CONCURRED IN

REP. JOE BRAND,

Chairman.

## VISITORS' REGISTER

HOUSE Administration COMMITTEE

BILL SB286

Date 3-2-83

SPONSOR        Smith, et al

[illegible]

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

The League of Women Voters of Montana opposes SB 286. It is obvious to us that no matter who reapportions the Legislature, there will be problems and unhappiness with the plan, but allowing the Legislature to apportion itself is particularly unwise because of the inherent self-interest of legislators involved in deciding what area each district should cover. The Legislature can appoint a less "partisan" committee than they believe the present committee to be....that could not be done if the Legislature is directly involved...party affiliation could really get in the way.

Along that same line, another problem we can see with the bill is having an even-numbered committee consisting of six members from each party....this could create a stalemate that could go on indefinitely with no satisfactory plan being devised.

Being a Constitutional Amendment, this bill will have to be sent to the floor, but we hope with the disapproval of the committee.

Joy Bruck

League of Women Voters of Montana



# VISITOR'S REGISTER

HOUSE Administration COMMITTEE

BILL SB258

DATE 3-2-83

SPONSOR Thomas, et al

[illegible]

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.



JAMES W. MURRY  
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Box 1176, Helena, Montana

ZIP CODE 59624  
406/442-1708

TESTIMONY OF DON JUDGE, MONTANA STATE AFL-CIO  
HOUSE STATE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

SB258  
March 2, 1983

I am Don Judge, representing the Montana State AFL-CIO. We oppose SB258, which would raise the reportable campaign contribution limits for an individual from \$25.00 to \$50.00.

Although this bill would simplify the reporting requirements for candidates, it would reduce the public's right to know about who is funding state legislative campaigns.

It is our belief that this bill will significantly reduce the numbers of contributors reportable. We estimate that possibly as much as 50% of the contributors who presently come under the reporting law would be exempted from reporting requirements.

The public's concern for confidence in government has probably never been lower than in the past decade. People are facing hard economic times, with little government relief in store. Watergate eroded public confidence in elected officials probably as much as any single event in this last decade, and, as a result, campaign reform became the trend.

Here in Montana, campaign reform followed the national move, and reporting of campaign contributions to a non-partisan independent campaign commissioner became law. That law, we believe, has done much to reestablish public confidence in elected officials. However, much more has yet to be done.

The legislature is considering many measures to strengthen our campaign reporting and financing laws. The bills include a limiting of total PAC contributions a candidate can receive, establishing a limit at which an individual can contribute to any single PAC, and providing voluntary campaign spending limitations for elections. We think that these ideas have merit. However, SB258 would be a step backward in campaign reform.

In addition to weakening the public's right to know about who is financing elections in Montana, this bill would make it more difficult to track reporting of expenditures and receipts of PAC contributions;

allow individuals of certain occupational or interest groups to contribute large amounts of money to several campaigns without public knowledge; and would, in doing so, erode an already weak public confidence in our elections process.

We encourage you to leave the reportable contributions limits where they are at present, and to consider campaign reform, not campaign deform. Please vote no on SB258.

TESTIMONY SUBMITTED IN OPPOSITION TO S.B. 258  
BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STATE ADMINISTRATION  
Representative Joe Brand, Chairman  
March 2, 1983

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Jonathan Motl and I am the lobbyist for Common Cause Montana. I speak on behalf of Common Cause Montana in opposition to the passage of S.B. 258. Common Cause is a citizen group funded and run by its members. It has 750 members in Montana and 250,000 members nationally.

Common Cause is opposed to passage of S.B. 258 because it believes that the changes proposed by the bill would lessen the openness of Montana's political process. S.B. 258 would lessen the openness of the political process by changing the minimum reportable amount of individual campaign contributions from \$25 per campaign to \$50.01 per campaign. The following chart indicates the effect this change would have had on contribution disclosures in Legislative races had it been in effect for 1982 campaigns. The chart was prepared by using the "Summary of Contributions and Expenditures" Book prepared by the Montana Commissioner of Political Practices. Common Cause prepared the chart by starting with the Senate race listed on page 72 of the Book and examining each race listed every 30 pages thereafter.

Page # of Cont. & Expenditure Book	Legislative District #	Total # of Reported Contributions		# of Reported Cont. - \$50 or less		% of Cont. Eliminated By S.B. 258	
		R	D	R	D	R	D
71-72	Senate 4	53	9	28	3	53	33
101-102	Senate 31	58	38	37	29	64	76
131-132	House 5	18	5	6	5	33	100
161-162	House 22	10	31	10	20	100	65
191-192	House 39	36	14	28	3	78	21
221-222	House 60	30	13	13	9	43	69
251-252	House 75	28	51	10	32	36	68
281-282	House 96	12	10	3	6	25	60

As the above graph indicates, S.B. 258 would have a substantial effect on the disclosure laws relating to campaign contributions. In most campaigns, over half of the individually reported contributions would disappear with that money being reported under a lump sum listing of "campaign contributions of \$50 or less." This change would affect many Montanans and in particular reporters, citizen groups, and opponents of candidates, all of whom regularly inspect a candidate's campaign financing reports to determine what individuals and special interests are supporting that candidate. In a democracy that type of access to information is important as it insures that possible abuses of influence by individuals or special interests can be spotted and debated thereby allowing the democracy to reform and adjust to correct those abuses.

It should be noted that, despite our belief in the merits of disclosure laws, Common Cause understands that these laws must not be overly burdensome on government or on candidates. Thus, if S.B. 258 was solely a matter of limiting a large number of required reports of contributions, Common Cause would support it. However, as the above chart indicates, this is not the case in Montana. Generally, a legislative candidate receives 10 to 50 individual contributions with about 50% of those being \$50 or less. Common Cause does not see the reporting of that number of contributions as being overly burdensome.