STATE OF MINNESOTA OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR ST. PAUL 55155

March 10, 1980

The Honorable Edward J. Gearty President of the Senate

Dear Sir:

I am vetoing Senate File 550. This act, if allowed to become law, would have permitted candidates campaigning for a legislative or constitutional office to spend an increased amount of money on their elections.

The focus of public policy should turn from the cost of a campaign to the sources of the money for a campaign.

I have long been an advocate of reduced contribution limits. It is illogical to assume that candidates are tainted by the amount they spend on their campaigns. Rather, the potential for creating undue influence is derived from the amount any one individual or group can contribute to a candidate.

Merely increasing spending limits is not the solution to ensure that elections will be fair and free from abuse. It's my belief that S. F. No. 550 has the potential of repressing rather than improving our political process.

Campaign financing is an important facet of Minnesota's Ethics in Government Act. It is an area of law which should be addressed in toto rather than piecemeal. By simply raising expenditure limits the Legislature has failed to consider other changes which have been recently suggested by the Ethical Practices Board. This Board is given the statutory authority to indicate apparent abuses and offer legislative recommendations regarding this Act.

For seven months the Board undertook an extensive analysis of public financing of election campaigns. Their study focused on how well Minnesota's program has met the goals of the public financing system which was adopted in 1974.

Their report, transmitted to the Legislature in January, recommended the *elimination* of expenditure limits. The bipartisan Board concluded:

a. Spending limits do not hold down the costs of campaigns;

85th Day

b. Sp name rec has alres

c. Cu Rather, paign mo

I find contrary to even (

It is q politicall without not bene

I am adopted Board, I tions wh

a. In (joint);

b. El

c. Su system o

d. El

e. Re

For the that the S. F. No you unsign

Osthor repassed suant to of Minne

Kempt

b. Spending limits inhibit a challenger's ability to obtain name recognition and identity which any incumbent inherently has already acquired;

c. Current emphasis on spending limits is misdirected. Rather, public policy should be to control the impact of campaign money by a reduction in contribution limits.

I find it regrettable that the Legislature not only acted contrary to the Board's conclusions, but more disturbing, failed to even consider them before enacting this bill.

It is quite apparent that the provision of S. F. No. 550 are politically motivated. This act has been placed on my desk without careful study or legislative deliberation. This law would not benefit the people of this State.

I am encouraged that the Senate Elections Committee has adopted several of the recommendations of the Ethical Practices Board. I urge that they all be adopted. The Board's recommendations which received unanimous approval included:

- a. Increase the political checkoff to \$2.00 (single) and \$4.00 (joint);
 - b. Eliminate the party designated checkoff;
- c. Substitute a matching fund system for the current grant system of public financing;
 - d. Eliminate campaign expenditure limits;
 - e. Reduce contribution limits.

ij

is

્ત !ic

; 811;

For the reasons set forth in this message, and with the hope that the Board's recommendations be adopted, I cannot allow S. F. No. 550 to become law. I am, therefore, returning it to you unsigned.

Sincerely,

ALBERT H. QUIE Governor

Osthoff moved that S. F. No. 550 be now reconsidered and repassed, the objections of the Governor notwithstanding, pursuant to Article IV, Section 23, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota.

Kempe was excused from 4:45 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.

The question was taken on the motion of Osthoff to reconsider and repass S. F. No. 550, the objections of the Governor not-withstanding, pursuant to Article IV, Section 23, of the Constitution of the State of Minnesota and the roll was called viva voce. There were 68 yeas and 65 nays as follows:

Those who voted in the affirmative were:

Adams	Corbid	Kalis	Nelsen, M.	Sieben, M.
Anderson, B.	Eken	Kelly	Nelson	Simoneau
Anderson, G.	Elioff	Kostohryz	Novak	Stoa
Anderson, I.	Ellingson	Kroening	Osthoff	Swanson
Battaglia	Faricy	Lehto	Otis	Tomlinson
Begich	Fritz	Long	Patton	Vanasek
Berglin	Fudro	Mann	\mathbf{Pehler}	Voss
Berkelman	Greenfield	McCarron	Peterson, D.	Waldorf
Brinkman	Hokanson	McEachern	Prahl	Welch
Byrne	Jacobs	Metzen	Reding	Wenzel
Carlson, L.	Jaros	Minne	Rice	Wynia
Casserly	Johnson, C.	Moe	Rodriguez	Spkr. Norton
Clark	Jude	Munger	Sarna	-
Clawson	Kahn	Murphy	Sieben, H.	

Those who voted in the negative were:

Aasness	Erickson	Johnson, D.	Nysether	Searles
Ainley	Esau	Kaley	Olsen	Sherwood
Albrecht	Evans	Knickerbocker		Stadum
Anderson, D.	Ewald	Kvam	Peterson, B.	Stowell
Anderson, R.	Fjoslien	Laidig	Piepho	Sviggum
Biersdorf	Forsythe	Levi	Pleasant	Thiede
Blatz	Friedrich	Ludeman	Redalen	Valan
Carlson, D.	Halberg	Luknic	Rees	Valento
Crandall	Haukoos	McDonald	Reif	Weaver
Dean	Heap	Mehrkens	Rose	Welker
Dempsey	Heinitz	Nelsen, B.	Rothenberg	$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{ieser}}$
Den Ouden	Hoberg	Niehaus	Schreiber	Wigley
Drew	Jennings	Norman	Searle	Zubay

Not having received the required two-thirds vote the bill was not repassed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

Anderson, R., was excused from 5:10 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

H. F. No. 378 was reported to the House.

Otis moved to amend H. F. No. 378, as follows:

Amend the title as follows:

Page 1, line 5, delete "legislative approval;"

The motion prevailed and the amendment was adopted.

85th D

Fors; The mo

Otis 1

Page

Page

Page

Page

Page

"(1) cessor, l and terr proposed

(2) ible meacuracy."

The m

Waldo

Zubay

Page 1

In the

Line 9 the"

Line 1

Line 1 a means

The mo

On the call of the to their r