

THE WEALTH PRIMARY

Spending in the 2000
New York State Legislative
Elections



Public Policy and Education Fund of New York
April 2001

We gratefully acknowledge the following foundations for their financial support of the Public Policy and Education Fund's Clean Money, Clean Elections Project:

J. Roderick MacArthur Foundation
The Piper Fund
The Orchard Foundation
Public Campaign

This report was written by Jillian Schneebeck and Richard Kirsch of the Public Policy and Education Fund.

Research for this study was directed by Jillian Schneebeck.

Cover design by E.R. Myrthil.

The Public Policy and Education Fund of New York is the research and education affiliate of Citizen Action of New York. To view this, or any of our previous reports, please visit our website: www.citizenactionny.org. To order copies contact:

PPEF
94 Central Ave.
Albany, NY 12206
518-465-4600
Fax: 518-465-2890
Email: ppef@citizenactionny.org

The Wealth Primary:

Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections

Executive Summary:

The *Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections* reports on spending by all major party candidates for the New York State Legislature in the 2000 elections. The report finds that winners spent more than three times as much as losers and incumbents spent more than three times as much as challengers. In landslide elections, the winner has a landslide spending advantage over the loser – winners spent 25 times more than losers. The majority political party in each house of the legislature has a big spending advantage, with Republicans spending 2.5 times as much as Democrats in the Senate and Democrats spending 2 times as much as Republicans in the Assembly

Spending Figures:

Senate: The 98 major party candidates who ran for the State Senate in 2000 spent over \$21.6 million on their campaigns. The average candidate spent \$220,589.

Assembly: The 259 major party candidates who ran for the State Assembly in 2000 spent \$19.2

million on their campaigns. The average candidate spent \$74,207.

To Win: The average winning Senate candidate spent \$279,148. The average Assembly winner spent \$98,544. However, it takes much more to win in tight races. In races won by 55% or less of the vote, the average Senate winner spent \$1,129,481, while the average Assembly winner spent \$265,322.

The average winner in both houses spent more than 2 times as much as the average loser. Winners in the Senate spent \$12 million more – 3.7 times as much – as losers. Winners in the Assembly spent over \$10.3 million more - 3.3 times as much – as losers.

Incumbents: Incumbents spent 3.7 times more than challengers in the Senate and in the Assembly. In both houses the average incumbent spent more than twice as much as the average challenger.

Major Parties: Candidates of the majority party in each house – Senate Republicans and Assembly Democrats - have a large spending advantage over candidates in the minority party. Republican Senate

candidates spent 2.5 times as much as their Democratic opponents. Democratic Assembly candidates spent 2 times more than their Republican opponent.

No Major Party Contest: In 24 of the 61 races for State Senate there was no major party contest. In 41 of the 150 races for State Assembly there was no major party contest.

Landslide Winners: Candidates who won in a landslide, with more than 65% of the vote, have a huge spending advantage. Landslide winners in both houses spent more than 25 times as much as their opponents. The average landslide winner spent 12 to 15 times as much as their opponent.

Winners with between 56% and 65% of the Vote: The spending advantage among candidates who won with between 56% and 65% of the vote is not as great as in the landslide races. Senate winners spent 65% more than their opponents and Assembly winners spent 53% more than their opponents.

Winners in Close Races (55% or less): In tight elections, the differences in spending by winners and losers in the Senate were great, while spending was close in the Assembly. Winning candidates in close races for the Senate spent 3.8 times as much as losers. But in the Assembly close races were marked by comparable spending with winners spending only 20% more than losers. Party spending was a significant factor in both the

Assembly and the Senate. Parties allocated more than \$2.5 million to candidates for Senate and \$1.6 million to candidates for Assembly.

Spending by Winners and Losers in Open Races: State Senate winners in open races spent much more than losers, 122 times more. State Assembly winners in open races spent 60% more than losers. That is because the Senate races were all in one-party districts, whereas several Assembly races were contested by both major parties.

Big Spenders: Senator Guy Velella spent the most of any candidate in absolute dollars and in cost/vote. Velella spent \$2.0 million, \$51/vote. In the Assembly, Francine Del Monte was the top spender. Del Monte spent \$678,822 or \$27/vote. Two other Senate and two other Assembly candidates spent more than \$20/vote. The average cost for vote for all races was \$4.17 in the Senate and \$3.57 in the Assembly.

Top Races: The top five senate races accounted for 42% of the money spent in the Senate, led by the \$2.5 million spent in the 34th where Republican Senator Guy Velella faced Lorraine Koppell. The top five Assembly races accounted for 21% of the money spent in the Assembly, led by \$1.1 million spent in the 138th Assembly District in Niagara Falls in which incumbent Robert Daly was defeated by Francine DelMonte.

Spending Up In Senate, Not Assembly: Spending in the State

Senate races has rapidly outpaced inflation but not in the Assembly. We have figures on state legislative spending in 1996, the last edition of *The Wealth Primary*. Total spending increased by 72% in the Senate and the amount spent by the average Senate candidate increased by 60%. Inflation from 1996 to 2000 was 10%. However, in the Assembly total spending increased only a little more than inflation, by 16%, and the average Assembly candidate spent only 1% more than the average candidate in 1996, a decrease in real terms.

Party Spending in the Senate Way

Up: The role of party spending in the Senate increased dramatically from 1996 to 2000. Party committees allocated 7 times more money to candidates for State Senate in 2000 than in 1996. Party committees allocated over 1.2 times more money to candidates for State Assembly in 2000 than in 1996. Most of the political party spending was in a handful of tight races.

Recommendations:

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections displays in detail what any observer of U.S. politics in 2001 already knows: money almost always determines the outcome of elections. Candidates for office must either have personal wealth or raise buckets of cash from interests who want government favors. Elected officials and candidates for office spend the majority of their time chasing donors instead of listening to the needs of their constituents. The

need for candidates to compete in the wealth primary has corrupted our electoral system and led to the disillusionment of the American voter.

The Public Policy and Education Fund of New York believes that enacting fundamental changes in the way elections are financed in New York and in our nation will restore faith in our system. ***Clean Money, Clean Elections*** reform offers candidates an alternative to soliciting special interest money or spending personal funds in order to run for office. Under *Clean Money, Clean Elections* reform, candidates who demonstrate that they have strong support in their districts and who agree not to accept private money and limit spending, receive a fixed and equal amount of campaign funding. They are also eligible for additional public funds if they are outspent by their opponents or targeted by independent expenditures.

Clean Money, Clean Elections legislation has been re-introduced in the New York Legislature by Senator David Paterson and Assemblyman Felix Ortiz (S.1638 / A.2630). Sixteen members of the Senate and 34 members of the Assembly have signed on as sponsors. This legislation is also supported by 80 citizen organizations in the state of New York.

More to Come...

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections is the second in a series of

studies that the Public Policy and Education Fund of New York plans to issue on campaign financing in New York. Using the system of electronic reporting of contributions, we will continue to build a database of campaign contributions from interest groups and individuals to New York's elected officials.

The work we do in order to present this information is for the public interest and we encourage members of the public and the media to query us regarding contributions in New York. Please feel free to send questions and requests to followthemoney@citizenactionny.org or call (518) 465-4600 x 107. Please visit our website: www.citizenactionny.org to view this report and our previous reports:

- ***The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections*** (April 2001)
- ***Capital Bargains, Capital Gains: Campaign Contributions to the New York State Legislature from 1999-2000*** (October 2000)
- ***No Bid, No Coincidence: Campaign Contributions and the Awarding of No-Bid Contracts in Nassau County*** (October 2000)

Introduction and Methodology

Introduction:

The term *Wealth Primary* is derived from the racially exclusionary “white primaries” of the post-World War I era in which only those with money or access to money could “vote”. *Wealth Primary* refers to the part of the election process where a small number of groups and individuals who can afford to make large campaign contributions to the candidates of their choice effectively decide who will achieve winning campaigns and who will go on to govern.

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections examines the 2000 elections for State Legislature to illustrate how prevalent the Wealth Primary is in elections for State Senate and State Assembly. In the 2000 elections only one out of 199 incumbents who ran for office were defeated in a general election contest. Three other incumbents were defeated in primaries.

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections reveals that the wealth primary is a major factor in the success of incumbents. The report shows that winning candidates spend much more than losing candidates. Incumbents and

candidates of the majority party have sizeable spending advantages over their opponents.

Methodology:

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections includes data on the 357 major party candidates who received votes in the general election. We report on spending directly by the candidate committees and by political parties on behalf of candidates. The party spending includes the amount of spending by a political party that is reported to be on behalf of a specific candidate. Data was used from the following party committees: The Democratic Assembly Campaign Committee, the Republican Assembly Campaign Committee, the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee, the NYS Senate Republican Campaign Committee, and the NY Republican State Committee – Reporting. Other party committees did not report allocations on behalf of specific candidates. The data in this report is from spending reports filed with the New York State Board of Elections by each candidate and party committee.

Spending by Candidates for Senate and Assembly in 2000

In the Senate:

- 98 candidates spent more than \$15.3 million, 132% more than candidates spent in 1996.
- Political parties allocated more than \$6.2 million to candidates, 7 times more than was allocated in 1996.
- Total spending was \$21.6 million, 72% more than in 1996.
- The average candidate spent \$220,589, over 1.5 times more than the average candidate spent in 1996.

	All Major Party Candidates for State Senate in 2000	All Funded Candidates for State Senate In 1996	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	98	142	
Direct Spending	\$15,391,956	\$11,682,609	132%
Party Spending	\$6,225,724	\$867,816	717%
Total Spending	\$21,617,676	\$12,550,425	172%
Average Total Spending	\$220,589	\$137,917	160%

In the Assembly:

- 259 candidates spent more than \$15.4 million, 115% more than candidates spent in 1996.
- Political parties allocated more than \$3.8 to candidates, 23% more than was allocated in 1996.
- Total spending was more than \$19.2 million, an increase of 116% from 1996.
- The average candidate spent \$74,207, only 1% more than the average candidate spent in 1996.

	All Major Party Candidates for State Assembly in 2000	All Funded Candidates for State Assembly in 1996	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	259	359	
Direct Spending	\$15,496,947	\$13,458,312	115%
Party Spending	\$3,830,863	\$3,114,579	123%
Total Spending	\$19,219,703	\$16,572,841	116%
Average Total Spending	\$74,207	\$73,331	101%

Winners Spend More Than Losers

In the Senate:

- All winners spent almost 4 times as much as all losers.
- The average winner spent more than 2 times as much as the average loser.
- Winners in the 2000 election spent almost 2 times more than winners in 1996; losers spent 51% more in 2000 than in 1996.
- The average winner in 2000 spent almost 2 times more than the average winner in 1996.
- Party spending played a significant role for losers, accounting for 53% of their total spending. Party money accounted for 22% of total spending by winners.
- 24 of the races, 39%, were uncontested.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	61	37		
Direct Spending	\$13,212,778	\$2,179,179	\$11,033,599	606%
Party Spending	\$3,815,252	\$2,410,472	\$1,404,780	158%
Total Spending	\$17,028,026	\$4,589,650	\$12,438,376	371%
Average Total Spending	\$279,148	\$124,045	\$155,103	225%

In the Assembly:

- All winners spent 3 times as much as all losers.
- The average winner spent more than 2 times as much as the average loser.
- Winners in the 2000 election spent 29% more than winners in 1996; losers spent 86% more in 2000 than in 1996.
- The average winner in 2000 spent 28% more than the average winner in 1996.
- Party spending played a significant role for losers, accounting for 38% of their total spending. Party money only accounted for 15% of total spending by winners.
- 41 of the races, 27%, were uncontested.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	150	109		
Direct Spending	\$12,725,641	\$2,771,305	\$9,954,336	459%
Party Spending	\$2,146,323	\$1,684,040	\$462,283	127%
Total Spending	\$14,781,621	\$4,438,082	\$10,343,539	333%
Average Total Spending	\$98,544	\$40,716	\$57,828	242%

Incumbents Spend More Than Challengers

In the Senate:

- All incumbents spent almost 4 times as much as all challengers.
- Incumbents spent 6 times as much as challengers before party spending was included.
- The average incumbent spent 2 times as much as the average challenger.
- Incumbents spent 1.7 times more than in 1996.
- Spending by challengers increased by 57% since 1996.
- Party spending played a significant role for incumbents and challengers, accounting for 23% of incumbent spending and 53% of challenger spending.

	Incumbent spending	Challenger spending	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	58	34		
Direct Spending	\$13,091,502	\$2,178,179	\$10,913,324	601%
Party Spending	\$3,815,252	\$2,410,472	\$1,404,780	158%
Total Spending	\$16,906,750	\$4,588,650	\$12,318,100	368%
Average Total Spending	\$291,496	\$134,960	\$156,536	216%

In the Assembly:

- All incumbents spent over 3.5 times as much as all challengers.
- Incumbents spent almost 5 times as much as challengers before party spending was included.
- The average incumbent spent 2.5 times as much as the average challenger.
- Spending by incumbents increased by 9% since 1996.
- Spending by challengers decreased by 29% since 1996.
- Party spending played a significant role for challengers, accounting for 34% of their total spending, but party spending on behalf of incumbents accounted for only 12% of their total spending.

	Incumbent spending	Challenger spending	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	138	97		
Direct Spending	\$11,236,098	\$2,310,767	\$8,925,331	486%
Party Spending	\$1,464,408	\$1,189,287	\$275,121	123%
Total Spending	\$12,700,507	\$3,482,791	\$9,217,716	365%
Average Total Spending	\$92,033	\$35,905	\$56,128	256%

The Majority Political Party in Each House Spent More Than the Minority Party

In the Senate: (Republican Majority)

- All Republicans spent 2.5 times as much as all Democrats.
- The average Republican spent more than 2 times as much as the average Democrat.
- Republican candidates spent almost 2 times more than was spent by Republican candidates in 1996. Democratic candidates spent over 1.6 times more than was spent by Democrats in 1996.
- Republican candidates received almost 2 times more money from party committees than Democratic candidates.

	Republican	Democrat	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	52	46		
Direct Spending	\$11,555,222	\$3,836,730	\$7,718,492	301%
Party Spending	\$3,927,901	\$2,297,823	\$1,630,078	171%
Total Spending	\$15,483,122	\$6,134,554	\$9,348,568	252%
Average Total Spending	\$297,752	\$133,360	\$164,392	223%

In the Assembly: (Democratic Majority)

- All Democrats spent 2 times more than all Republicans.
- The average Democrat spent almost 2 times more than the average Republican.
- Spending by Democratic candidates in 2000 increased by 22% since 1996. Republican candidates spent over 6% more than was spent by Republicans in 1996.
- Democratic candidates received almost 2 times more money from party committees than Republican candidates.

	Democrat	Republican	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	134	125		
Direct Spending	\$10,529,800	\$4,967,147	\$5,562,653	212%
Party Spending	\$2,462,602	\$1,367,762	\$1,094,840	180%
Total Spending	\$12,884,795	\$6,334,908	\$6,549,887	203%
Average Total Spending	\$96,155	\$50,679	\$45,476	190%

Landslide Winners Spend Much, Much More than Losers

Among candidates who won with more than 65% of the vote.

In the Senate:

- Landslide winners spent almost 26 times as much as losers.
- The average landslide winner spent 12 times as much as the average loser.
- Landslide winners in 2000 spent 31% more than landslide winners spent in 1996.
- 24 of the races, 53%, were uncontested.
- Party spending is very low, accounting for only .05% of total spending by winners and 28% of total spending by losers.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	45	21		
Direct Spending	\$5,698,849	\$166,783	\$5,532,066	3417%
Party Spending	\$277,675	\$65,702	\$211,973	423%
Total Spending	\$5,976,523	\$232,485	\$5,744,038	2571%
Average Party Spending	\$6,171	\$3,129	\$3,042	197%
Average Total Spending	\$132,812	\$11,071	\$121,741	1200%

In the Assembly:

- Landslide winners spent 28 times as much as losers.
- The average landslide winner spent 14 times as much as the average loser.
- Landslide winners in 2000 spent 50% more than landslide winners in spent 1996.
- 56 of the races, 48%, were uncontested.
- Party spending is very low, accounting for only .05% of total spending by winners and 10% of total spending by losers.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	116	60		
Direct Spending	\$8,860,125	\$295,248	\$8,564,877	3001%
Party Spending	\$526,489	\$33,467	\$493,022	1573%
Total Spending	\$9,386,615	\$328,715	\$9,057,900	2856%
Average Party Spending	\$4,539	\$558	\$3,981	813%
Average Total Spending	\$80,919	\$5,478	\$75,441	1477%

Note: See appendix for names of candidates

Winners in Tighter Races Have a Spending Advantage – But Less than in Landslide Races

Among candidates who won with between 56% and 65% of the vote.

In the Senate:

- Winners spent 65% more than losers.
- The average winner spent 65% more than the average loser.
- Direct spending by winners accounted for 58% of spending, while accounting for 40% of spending by losers.
- Party spending was an equalizer for the losers, but winners spent 16% more, which solidified their advantage over the losers.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	10	10		
Direct Spending	\$2,472,000	\$1,034,912	\$1,437,088	239%
Party Spending	\$1,802,615	\$1,559,593	\$243,022	116%
Total Spending	\$4,274,614	\$2,594,505	\$1,680,109	165%
Average Party Spending	\$180,262	\$155,959	\$24,303	116%
Average Total Spending	\$427,461	\$259,451	\$168,010	165%

In the Assembly:

- Winners spent 1.5 times more than losers.
- The average winner spent 53% more than losers.
- Direct spending by winners accounted for 70% of spending, while accounting for 64% of spending by losers.
- Party spending on behalf of winners was 23% more than losers.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	25	25		
Direct Spending	\$2,121,189	\$1,262,977	\$858,212	168%
Party Spending	\$885,923	\$721,427	\$164,496	123%
Total Spending	\$3,007,112	\$1,967,143	\$1,039,969	153%
Average Party Spending	\$35,437	\$28,857	\$6,580	123%
Average Total Spending	\$120,284	\$78,686	\$41,598	153%

Note: See appendix for names of candidates

In Tight Elections, the Differences Between Spending by Winners and Losers in the Senate Were Great, But There Was Little Difference in the Assembly

Among candidates who won with 55% or less of the vote.

In the Senate:

- Winners spent almost 4 times as much as losers.
- The average winner spent close to 4 times as much as losers.
- Winners in 2000 spent almost 4 times as much as winners spent in 1996.
- Party spending in tight races was high, but direct spending by winners was 5 times greater than direct spending by losers.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	6	6		
Direct Spending	\$5,041,925	\$977,484	\$4,064,442	516%
Party Spending	\$1,734,962	\$785,177	\$949,785	221%
Total Spending	\$6,776,889	\$1,762,660	\$5,014,229	384%
Average Party Spending	\$289,160	\$130,863	\$158,297	221%
Average Total Spending	\$1,129,481	\$293,777	\$835,704	384%

In the Assembly:

- Winners spent 120% more than losers.
- The average winner spent 120% more than the average loser.
- Winners in 2000 spent 107% more than winners spent in 1996.
- Party spending was 26% greater for losers than winners.

	Winners	Losers	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	9	9		
Direct Spending	\$1,744,327	\$1,071,085	\$673,242	163%
Party Spending	\$733,911	\$924,897	-\$190,986	79%
Total Spending	\$2,387,894	\$1,995,980	\$391,914	120%
Average Party Spending	\$81,546	\$102,766	-\$21,220	79%
Average Total Spending	\$265,322	\$221,776	\$43,546	120%

Note: See appendix for names of candidates

Spending by Winners and Losers in Open Races

In the Senate:

- Winners in open races spent 122 times more than losers spent.
- Party spending had no role in the Senate because all open races were in Democratic districts – there were no general election contests for these seats.
- The average winner in an open race spent 122 times more than the average loser.

	Winners in open races	Losers in open races	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	3	3		
Direct Spending	\$122,275	\$1,000.00	\$121,275	12228%
Party Spending	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Total Spending	\$122,275	\$1,000.00	\$121,275	12228%
Average Party Spending	\$0	\$0	\$0	0%
Average Total Spending	\$40,758	\$333	\$40,025	12240%

In the Assembly:

- Winners in open races spent 60% more than losers spent.
- Party committees allocated more than \$600,000 to winning candidates and more than \$500,000 to losers.
- The average winning candidate in an open race spent 60% more than the average loser.
- Party spending played a big role in the Assembly. 5 of the 12 districts were not solid, one-party districts, which explains the large amount of party spending. 7 of the 12 districts were solid, one-party districts.

	Winners in open races	Losers in open races	Difference in spending	% Difference in spending
Number of Candidates	12	12		
Direct Spending	\$1,334,429	\$615,653	\$718,776	217%
Party Spending	\$626,239	\$550,428	\$75,811	114%
Total Spending	\$1,870,324	\$1,166,081	\$704,243	160%
Average Party Spending	\$52,187	\$45,869	\$6,318	114%
Average Total Spending	\$155,860	\$97,173	\$58,687	160%

Note: See appendix for names of candidates

The Big 10 of Campaign Spending

In the Senate:

District	Winner	Candidate Spending	Candidate Cost Per Vote	Loser	Opponent Spending	Opponent Cost Per Vote
34	Guy Velella-R	\$1,967,508	\$51.08	Lorraine Koppell-D	\$499,296	\$15.02
26	Roy Goodman-R	\$1,418,396	\$22.26	Liz Krueger-D	\$703,483	\$11.07
35	Nicholas Spano-R	\$1,157,196	\$21.00	Thomas Abinanti-D	\$315,649	\$6.51
44	Hugh Farley-R	\$890,882	\$12.67	Brian Stratton-D	\$963,240	\$18.80
38	Thomas Morahan-R	\$605,301	\$8.48	Ken Zebrowski-D	\$635,953	\$11.35

In the Assembly:

District	Winner	Candidate Spending	Candidate Cost Per Vote	Loser	Opponent Spending	Opponent Cost Per Vote
138	Francine Del Monte-D	\$678,822	\$27.05	Robert Daly-R	\$468,031	\$25.40
120	William Magnarelli-D	\$645,663	\$30.25	Steven DeRegis-R	\$353,428	\$19.55
3	Patricia Eddington-D	\$360,515	\$16.87	Leah Jefferson-R	\$257,979	\$12.44
136	Joe Errigo-R	\$345,384	\$12.31	Christine Saltzberg-D	\$465,212	\$18.30
129	Brian Kolb-R	\$328,570	\$11.42	Samuel Casella-D	\$190,918	\$8.93

Top 5 Spending Races in 2000

In the Senate:

Senate District	Candidates	Total spent in Race	Total Cost Per Vote in Race
34	Velella / Koppell	\$2,466,804	\$34.37
26	Goodman / Krueger	\$2,121,879	\$16.67
44	Farley / Stratton	\$1,854,122	\$15.26
35	Spano / Abinanti	\$1,472,845	\$14.22
38	Morahan / Zebrowski	\$1,241,254	\$9.74

In the Assembly:

Assembly District	Candidates	Total spent in Race	Total Cost Per Vote in Race
138	Daly / Del Monte	\$1,146,853	\$26.32
120	Magnarelli / DeRegis	\$999,091	\$25.35
136	Errigo / Saltzberg	\$810,596	\$15.16
3	Jefferson / Eddington	\$618,494	\$14.69
129	Kolb / Casella	\$519,488	\$10.36

Conclusion and Recommendations

The *Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections* displays in detail what any observer of U.S. politics in 2001 already knows: money almost always determines the outcome of elections. Candidates for office must either have personal wealth or raise buckets of cash from interests who want government favors. Elected officials and candidates for office spend the majority of their time chasing donors instead of listening to the needs of their constituents. The need for candidates to compete in the wealth primary has corrupted our electoral system and led to the disillusionment of the American voter.

The Public Policy and Education Fund of New York believes that enacting fundamental changes in the way elections are financed in New York and in our nation will restore faith in our system. ***Clean Money, Clean Elections*** reform offers candidates an alternative to soliciting special interest money or spending personal funds in order to run for office. Under *Clean Money, Clean Elections* reform, candidates who demonstrate that they have strong support in their districts and who agree not to accept private money and limit spending, receive a fixed and equal amount of campaign funding. They are also eligible for additional public funds if they are outspent by their opponents or targeted by independent expenditures.

CMCE will accomplish the following goals:

- **Reduce and limit campaign spending.** CMCE sets strict spending limits, and prevents the outrageously high amounts spent on recent campaigns for Governor and some legislative races.
- **Stop the flow of special interest money.** CMCE limits campaign contributions to participating candidates to no more than \$100 and to other candidates to \$1000. Now individuals can donate tens of thousands of dollars to a candidate for office in New York.
- **Give regular people a fair shot at winning office.** CMCE candidates, who collect a set number of \$5 contributions from voters in their districts, receive a fixed and equal amount of public funds, enough to run a competitive campaign. Under CMCE, you don't need to be rich or raise money from well-funded special interests, to run for office.
- **Stop the endless money chase.** Under CMCE, candidates qualify for office and can then spend their time raising issues, instead of raising money.
- **Restore the principle of "one person, one vote."** Under the current system, the candidates

who raises the most money is considered the front runner. With CMCE, candidates receive a fixed and equal amount of funding, so they can concentrate on campaigning for votes, not dollars.

Clean Money, Clean Elections

legislation has been re-introduced in the New York Legislature by Senator David Paterson and Assemblyman Felix Ortiz (S.1638 / A.2630).

Sixteen members of the Senate and 34 members of the Assembly have signed on as sponsors. This legislation is also supported by 80 citizen organizations in the state of New York.

More to Come...

The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections is the second in a series of studies that the Public Policy and Education Fund of New York plans to issue on campaign financing in New York. Using the system of electronic reporting of contributions, we will continue to build a database of campaign contributions from interest groups and individuals to New York's elected officials.

The work we do in order to present this information is for the public interest and we encourage members of the public and the media to query us regarding contributions in New York. Please feel free to send questions and requests to followthemoney@citizenactionny.org or call (518) 465-4600 x 107. Please visit our website:

www.citizenactionny.org to view this report and our previous reports:

- ***The Wealth Primary: Spending in the 2000 New York State Legislative Elections*** (March 2001)
- ***Capital Bargains, Capital Gains: Campaign Contributions to the New York State Legislature from 1999-2000*** (October 2000)
- ***No Bid, No Coincidence: Campaign Contributions and the Awarding of No-Bid Contracts in Nassau County*** (October 2000)

Appendix

Races Where There was No Major Party Contest:

Senate Districts:

4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 28, 36, 37, 39, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 61

Assembly Districts:

11, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 41, 46, 48, 53, 58, 62, 64, 70, 84, 85, 87, 91, 92, 93, 102, 108, 109, 112, 113, 115, 116, 118, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 130, 137, 141

Landslide Winners Spend Much, Much More Than Losers

Senate winners with more than 65% of the vote:

Kenneth La Valle (1), Owen Johnson (4), Malcolm Smith (10), Ada Smith (12), Daniel Hevesi (13), George Onorato (14), Serphin Maltese (15), Toby Stavisky (16), Nellie Santiago (17), Velmanette Montgomery (18), John Sampson (19), Marty Markowitz (20), Carl Kruger (21), Seymore Lachman (22), John Marchi (24), Martin Connor (25), Thomas Duane (27), Olga Mendez (28), David Paterson (29), Eric Schneiderman (30), Efraine Gonzalez (31), Pedro Espada (32), Ruth Thompson (33), Suzi Oppenheimer (36), Vincent Leibell (37), William Larkin (39), John Bonacic (40), Stephen Saland (41), Neil Breslin (42), Joseph Bruno (43), Ronald Stafford (45), James Wright (46), Raymond Meier (47), John DeFrancisco (49), John Seward (50), Thomas Libous (51), John Randy Kuhl (52), Michael Nozzolio (53), Richard Dollinger (54), James Alesi (55), Patricia McGee (56), William Stachowski (58), Dale Volker (59), Mary Lou Rath (60), George Maziarz (61)

Senate Losers:

Linda Minardi (1), Cynthia Jenkins (10), Katina Kiourkenidis (14), David Brown (18), Dennis Healy (20), James Sutliff (22), Karol Murov (27), Alphonzo Mosley (29), Roger Madon (30), Dorothy Dunn (31), Sarah Newmark (32), Martha Tuberman (33), Gene Flagello (41), Joseph Sullivan (42), Steven Porter (51), Kirk Morris (54), James Markovics (55), Frank Pagano (56), Daniel Krawczyk (58), Thomas Casey (59), Mark Doane (60)

Assembly winners with more than 65% of the vote:

Patricia Acampora (1), Steven Englebright (4), Steve Levy (5), Robert Wertz (6), John Flanagan (9), Robert Sweeney (11), Steven Labriola (12), Thomas DiNapoli (16), Earlene Hill Hooper (18), Harvey Weisenberg (20), Audrey Pheffer (23), Mark Weprin (24), Brian McLaughlin (25), Ann Margaret Carro (26), Nettie Mayerson (27), Michael Cohen (28), William Scarborough (29), Margaret Markey (30), Pauline Rhodd-Cummings (31), Vivian E. Cook (32), Barbara Clark (33), Ivan LaFayette (34), Jeffrion Aubry (35), Michael Gianaris (36), Catherine Nolan (37), Anthony Seminerio (38), Frank Seddio (39), Diane Gordon (40), Helene Weinstein (41), Rhoda Jacobs (42), Clarence Norman (43), James Brennan (44), Steven Cymbrowitz (45), Adele Cohen (46), William Colton (47), Dov Hikind (48), Peter Abbate (49), Joseph Lentol (50), Felix Ortiz (51), Joan Millman (52), Vito Lopez (53), Darryl Towns (54), William Boyland (55), Albert Vann (56), Roger Green (57), N. Nick Perry (58), Eric Vitaliano (60), Robert Straniere (61), Sheldon Silver (62), Steven Sanders (63), Richard Gottfried (64), Alexander Pete Grannis (65), Deborah Glick (66), Scott Stringer (67), Adam Clayton Powell (68), Edward Sullivan (69), Keith Wright (70), Herman Farrell (71), Adriano Espaillat (72), Carmen Arroyo (74), Ruben Diaz (75),

Peter Rivera (76), Aurelia Greene (77), Jose Rivera (78), Gloria Davis (79), Jeffrey Klein (80), Jeffrey Dinowitz (81), Steven Kaufman (82), Carl Heastie (83), J. Gary Pretlow (84), Ronald Tocci (85), Richard Brodsky (86), Michael Spano (87), Willis Stephens Jr. (91), Alexander Gromack (92), Samuel Colman (93), Jacob Gunther (98), Patrick Manning (99), Robert D'Andrea (100), Kevin Cahill (101), John Faso (102), James Tedisco (103), John McEneny (104), Paul Tonko (105), Ronald Canestrari (106), Pat Casale (108), Elizabeth Little (109), George Ortloff (110), Bill Magee (111), Dierdre Scozzafava (112), Marc Butler (113), David Townsend (115), RoAnn Destito (116), Michael Bragman (118), Joan Christiansen (119), Clifford Crouch (122), Jay Dinga (123), Robert Warner (124), Martin Luster (125), Gary Finch (126), George Winner (127), Robert Oaks (128), James Bacalles (130), Joseph Morelle (132), David Gantt (133), Joseph Robach (134), Charles Nesbitt (137), David Seaman (139), Robin Schimminger (140), Arthur Eve (141), Paul Tokasz (143), Sam Hoyt (144), Brian Higgins (145), Richard Smith (146), Daniel Burling (147), Catherine Young (149)

Assembly losers:

Joseph Turdick (1), Philip Moncayo (4), Thomas Sarsfield (5), W. Jonathan Hark (6), Hubert Johnson (9), John Tartaglia (12), Jerome Galluscio (16), Raymond Rhoden (18), Peter McDonald (20), Anthony Stasi (23), Philip Sica (24), Michael Roemmelt (28), Robert Hutchison (33), Rafael Merino (34), Vincent Tabone (36), Alice Lemos (37), William Johnert (38), Lori Sue Maslow (39), Amelia Smith-Parker (40), Bernard Sampson (42), Austin Hurd (43), Michael Sanchez (44), Fred Fields (45), Nora DeAngelo (47), Josephine Frediani (49), Stella Harmatiuk (50), Hilario LaBoy (51), Veronica Pawson (52), John Venturina (54), Edwin Anderson (55), Aaron Bramwell (56), Arthur Goodridge (57), Frank Peters (60), George Hartigan (61), Frank Scala (63), Peter McCoy (65), Joseph Mauriello (66), David Herz (67), Rose Pascale (68), Mary Louise King (69), Charlette Jordon (71), Nilda Luz Rexach (72), Emmanuel Wansi (74), William Newmark (75), Charles Serrano (76), Eloise Henderson (77), Paul Dzung-Do (78), Lorraine Franklin (80), Martin Richman (81), Sarah Tuttle (82), Tina Taylor (83), Carol Reynolds (86), William Brenner (98), Maurice Salem (99), Dennis Gravelle (100), Fawn Tantillo (101), Bruce Trachtenberg (103), Thomas Hoey (104), James Bruner (105)

Winners in Tighter Races Have a Spending Advantage – But Less than in Landslide Races

Senate winners with between 56% and 65% of the vote:

Byron Brown (57), Hugh Farley (44), Dean Skelos (9), Caesar Trunzo (3), Charles Fuschillo (8), Frank Padavan (11), James Lack (2), Nancy Lorraine Hoff (48), Thomas Morahan (38), Vincent Gentile (23)

Senate losers:

Bob Woolworth (57), Brian Stratton (44), Edward Oppenheimer (9), James Heath (3), Jeannette Santos (8), Rory Lancman (11), Thomas Cleere (2), Philip LaTessa (48), Ken Zebrowski (38), Robert DiCarlo (23)

Assembly winners with between 56% and 65% of the vote:

Fred Thiele (2), Thomas Barraga (7), Philip Boyle (8), John Conte (10), David Sidikman (13), Marc Herbst (14), Donna Ferrara (15), Maureen O'Connell (17), Robert Barra (21), Thomas Alfano (22), Amy Paulin (88), Naomi Matusow (89), Sandra Galef (90), Nancy Calhoun (94), Howard Mills (95), Thomas Kirwan (96), Joel Miller (97), Frances Sullivan (117), Harold Brown (121), Brian Kolb (129), Susan John (131), David Koon (135), Francine Del Monte (138), Sandra Lee Wirth (148), William Parment (150)

Assembly losers:

Kevin Mitchell (2), Thomas Hroncich (7), Willard Christy (8), Raymond Sansiviero (10), Neil Bergin (13), Gary Burke (14), Darlene Sigalow (15), Emil Samuels (17), Alan Bergstein (21), Vincent Raimo (22), Max DiFabio (88), Francis Corcoran (89), John Sarcone (90), James Sollami (94), Noel Spencer (95), Lee Kyriacou (96), Joseph Ruggiero (97), Terrence Hammill (117), Daniel O'Hara (121), Samuel Casella (129), Beverly Griebel (131), Sean Hanna (135), Robert Daly (138), Richard Fontana (148), Randy Elf (150)

In Tight Elections, the Differences Between Spending by Winners and Losers in the Senate Were Great, But There Was Little Difference in the Assembly

Senate winners with 55% or less of the vote:

Carl Marcellino (5), Kemp Hannon (6), Michael Balboni (7), Roy Goodman (26), Guy Velella (34), Nicholas Spano (35)

Senate losers:

Lawrence Silverman (5), Mark Keefe (6), Jon Brooks (7), Liz Krueger (26), Lorraine Koppell (34), Thomas Abinanti (35)

Assembly winners with 55% or less of the vote:

Patricia Eddington (3), Kathleen Murray (19), John LaVelle (59), John Ravitz (73), Robert Prentiss (107), H. Robert Nortz (114), William Magnarelli (120), Joe Errigo (136), James Hayes (142)

Assembly losers:

Leah Jefferson (3), Steven November (19), Robert Helbock (59), Jerome Polansky (73), Daniel Lynch (107), Darrel Aubertine (114), Steven DeRegis (120), Christine Saltzberg (136), Daniel Ward (142)

Spending by Winners and Losers in Open Races

Senate winners in open races:

Pedro Espada (32), Ruth Thompson (33), Byron Brown (57)

Senate losers:

Sarah Newmark (32), Martha Tuberman (33), Bob Woolworth (57)

Assembly Winners in open races:

Patricia Eddington (3), Steve Levy (5), Robert Barra (21), Michael Gianaris (36), Diane Gordon (40), Steven Cymbrowitz (45), John LaVelle (59), Adam Clayton Powell (68), Jose Rivera (78), Carl Heastie (83), Amy Paulin (88), Joe Errigo (136)

Assembly losers:

Leah Jefferson (3), Thomas Sarsfield (5), Alan Bergstein (21), Vincent Tabone (36), Amelia Smith-Parker (40), Fred Fields (45), Robert Helbock (59), Rose Pascale (68), Paul Dzung-Do (78), Tina Taylor (83), Max DiFabio (88), Christine Saltzberg (136)