



## LWVMN CAUCUS RESOLUTIONS – March 1, 2016

Every two years, LWVMN prepares resolutions for our members to take into their precinct caucuses. League holds positions on a variety of issues. Inserting a resolution into the caucus process provides an opportunity for our members to express their voice on issues supported by the League and may influence what is accepted as part of the party platform. In addition, it exposes your neighbors and community to issues that League of Women Voters is following and advocating for legislative changes.

Each party has a form in which a resolution is presented. To date, we have access to the DFL form. Please check with the Republican Party after February 10, 2016.

Caucus Locations: A link will be provided by the Secretary of State's office the week of February 8 for exact locations: [MN 2016 Precinct Caucus Locations](#)

**DFL Resolution Form:** click [here](#). <http://www.dfl.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/09.28.15.ResolutionForm.pdf>

**Republican Resolution Form:** The 2016 resolution form was not online when these documents were prepared. . Check with MN GOP headquarters after February 10, 2016. <http://mngop.com/>

**Caucus information for MN Minor Parties :**  
<http://www.sos.state.mn.us/index.aspx?page=237>

### What is a precinct caucus?

Precinct caucuses are meetings run by Minnesota's [political parties](#). They are the first in a series of meetings where parties endorse candidates and set goals and values (called the party platform).

In 2016, a major part of precinct caucuses will be to vote for the person you want your political party to support for President in the presidential preference ballot.

### Date and locations

Minnesota Republican Party and Minnesota DFL Party

Tuesday, March 1 starting at 7:00 PM.

Find your caucus location online starting the week of February 8.  
<http://mnvotesinfo.sos.state.mn.us/voters/precinct-caucus/>



## **Restore the Right to Vote**

**Whereas**, more than 47,000 Minnesotans are denied the right to vote under Minnesota law due to a past felony conviction<sup>1</sup> and 82% of those individuals are living in the community;

**Whereas**, since 1974, the percentage of voting age Minnesotans disenfranchised as a result of a criminal conviction has increased over 400%;

**Whereas**, as a result of disproportionate conviction rates, disenfranchisement overwhelmingly affects communities of color – African-Americans make up roughly 5% of the Minnesota population and represent over a quarter of the total number of those disenfranchised and American Indians, less than two percent of the population, account for more than 6% of those individuals who are disenfranchised;

**Whereas**, involvement in civic life logically results in stronger ties to the community, and research has shown that persons with past criminal convictions are less likely to be arrested again in states that restore voting rights after release from incarceration;

**Whereas**, a policy that permits all individuals who have served their time in jail or prison to vote reduces confusion among voters and election officials about who can vote, thereby easing election administration and reducing government costs; and

**Whereas** 13 states already disenfranchise only those persons who are currently incarcerated for a felony conviction, not those on probation or parole;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports restoring voting rights to Minnesotans convicted of a felony while they are on probation or parole.

---

<sup>1</sup> A felony is any crime with a sentence of greater than one year.



## **Campaign Finance: Disclosure of Electioneering Communications**

**Whereas**, the United States Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United* opened the door to increased election spending independent of the candidates, resulting in the influx of millions of dollars into Minnesota campaigns;

**Whereas**, under Minnesota law, political action committees and other groups not associated with candidates need to disclose their spending on election advertisements only when certain “magic words” are used, such as “vote for” or “defeat” and need not disclose spending on “electioneering communications” that do not use the magic words;

**Whereas**, the National Institute on Money in State Politics has given Minnesota’s campaign finance laws an “F” because Minnesota does not require disclosure of electioneering communications;

**Whereas**, the federal government and 25 states require disclosure of electioneering communications, and the United States Supreme Court has approved of disclosure as a means of providing transparency for the electorate; and

**Whereas**, disclosure of electioneering communications is in the public interest and gives voters the information they need to cast an informed vote;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports requiring disclosure of spending on electioneering communications.



## **Early Voting**

**Whereas** the only way a voter may vote early in-person under current law is via an absentee ballot which is not counted immediately;

**Whereas** twenty-one states allow in-person early voting, where any qualified voter can cast a ballot during a designated period prior to Election Day using the same methods and ballots used on Election Day and it is counted immediately;

**Whereas** in-person early voting where ballots are counted immediately is less costly to administer than our present system of in-person absentee ballots;

**Whereas** in-person early voting is a more convenient and easier option for voters than our present system of in-person absentee voting;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports in-person early voting where a voter's ballot is counted immediately during a designated period prior to Election Day using the same methods and ballots used on Election Day.



## **Pre-Registration for High School Students**

**Whereas** our Democracy is stronger when all eligible voters exercise their right to vote;

**Whereas** in 2008, fewer than half of eligible voters between the ages of 18 and 24 registered, a rate 22% lower than in the general population (Project Vote).

**Whereas** currently, 16 year olds can pre-register to vote in Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Rhode Island, and the District of Columbia;

**Whereas** a recent study found that, in states that have implemented pre-registration, youth voter turnout is 13% higher (“Making Young Voters,” American Journal of Political Science);

**Whereas** voter pre-registration is politically unbiased and boosts young voter turnout for all parties and communities;

**Whereas** data shows that citizens who are engaged in the political process when they are young are more likely to vote later in life (“Becoming a Habitual Voter,” American Political Science Review);

**Therefore, be it resolved** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party support pre-registration of high school students ages 16 and 17.



## **MOTOR VOTER LAW**

**Whereas** our present law lets eligible voters register to vote when they apply or renew their driver's licenses only if they "opt-in" by checking a box;

**Whereas** eligible voters who miss the box may end up having to wait in line to register to vote on Election Day;

**Whereas** automatic voter registration will be convenient for eligible voters and help to reduce the number of voters who register on Election Day;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party support changing our present "motor voter" law so eligible voters are automatically registered when they apply for driver's licenses unless they "opt-out".



### **Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Citizens' Board**

**Whereas:** Citizens in a democratic country have a right to view readily, to understand clearly, and to take part easily in governmental decisions; and,

**Whereas:** The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's Citizens' Board was abolished behind closed doors, in the early morning hours of May 25, the last day of the 2015 legislative session; and,

**Whereas:** The Citizens' Board was an excellent example of government of, by and for the people in our state, seen as the last resort for citizens to be heard when they disagreed with actions of the MPCA; and,

**Whereas:** There was no bill, there were no hearings, and no testimony was taken before this open and transparent governmental board was abolished;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ party supports legislation that will restore the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's Citizens' Board to its full capacity and authority.



## **Copper/Nickel Sulfide Mining**

**Whereas:** our clear lakes and rivers, clean air, and healthy forests are emblematic of Minnesota and so much a part of what we as Minnesotans love about our state; and,

**Whereas:** sulfide ore mining results in polluted runoff from mine pits and mine wastes for at least 500 years, if not forever, according to the PolyMet Environmental Impact Statement; and,

**Whereas:** sulfide ore mining has never been done in a water-rich environment without polluting surface and/or groundwater; and,

**Whereas:** sulfide ore mining has created taxpayer liabilities across the country when mining companies go bankrupt, leaving pollution behind; and

**Whereas:** there is no assurance that Minnesota taxpayers will be protected from long term costs of sulfide-ore mining; and,

**Whereas:** sulfide mining carries the same boom/bust problems of current mining, and diversification of the economy of NE Minnesota into other industries will lead to greater stability.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party finds that sulfide ore mining is significantly different from taconite mining, has unacceptable environmental impacts, and should not be allowed in the sulfur-bearing rock from the Voyageurs National Park and Boundary Waters to and beyond Lake Superior and the St. Louis and Mississippi River Watersheds.



### **Agriculture -Local Control**

**Whereas:** In Minnesota, both counties and townships have the authority to do their own land-use planning and zoning; and

**Whereas:** This right is being challenged by large development interests including those seeking permits for large livestock feedlots which can pose a threat to the public health and welfare;

**Therefore:** **Be it resolved** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports maintaining the right of both counties and townships to set stricter standards than those required by the state for land-use and local development, including feedlots, and to enact zoning ordinances to protect the health and well-being of their community.



## **Agriculture and Food - Pollinators**

**Whereas:** Bees and other pollinators are responsible for at least a third of the food we eat; and,

**Whereas:** Bees and other pollinators are in deep trouble –honey bee colonies are collapsing at an unprecedented rate, a problem known as Colony Collapse Disorder; and,

**Whereas:** Pesticides, especially systemic pesticides, are a key contributor to Colony Collapse Disorder, and they are unavoidable for foraging bees; and,

**Whereas:** In fall of 2013, several hives in Minneapolis were killed by a legal pesticide application; and,

**Whereas:** The Cities in Minnesota cannot help protect bees, pets, or kids from pesticides because the State has preempted local laws regulating “any matter relating to the registration, labeling, distribution, sale, handling, use, application, or disposal of pesticides” (Statute 18b.02); and,

**Whereas:** *Systemic* pesticides are not consistent with Integrated Pest Management best practices, and pose particular risks by their chronic exposure to bees and other beneficial insects; and,

**Whereas:** Though the State requires licensed pesticide applicators to inform them of every application, this information is not available to the public,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports addressing the crisis facing pollinators through three statute changes:

- 1) Give municipalities the authority to regulate some aspects of the sale and use of pesticides for non-agricultural purposes, and
- 2) Make the information the State of Minnesota already receives about pesticide applications available to the public, and
- 3) Require all nurseries, garden shops, hardware stores and any business selling plants, to let the public know whether or not the plant has been treated in any way with *systemic* pesticides from the neonicotinoid family.



## **Health Care**

### **Whereas:**

While more Minnesotans are insured under the Affordable Care Act, the ACA has failed to contain large annual premium increases and high deductibles that inherently deny access to health care and are unsustainable;

### **Whereas:**

Over a third of each healthcare dollar is spent on administrative costs, not actual health care;

### **Whereas:**

Medical debt is the leading cause of bankruptcy and a majority of those bankrupted had health insurance when they got sick or injured;

### **Whereas:**

High health insurance premiums have surpassed taxes as the number one business problem, affecting greatly small businesses in our communities that employ half the state's private-sector workforce;

### **Whereas:**

A single-payer system can reduce increasing costs of health care without damaging quality of care;

### **Whereas:**

Starting in 2017 individual states will be able to get a waiver to set up their own approved health care solution, as long as it meets the standards of the Affordable Care Act, allowing states to implement single payer on a state level,

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports an exemption to the ACA for enactment of cost efficient single-payer universal health care in Minnesota that supports basic health and well-being, positively impacting the economic viability of our communities.



## 1. Firearms and Public Safety

**Whereas:** Gun owners and non-gun-owners alike agree that they do not wish to see guns fall into the hands of criminals or other prohibited buyers;

**Whereas:** The Brady Background Law applies only to sales by licensed federal firearms dealers but not to sales by unlicensed individuals;

**Whereas:** Criminals and other dangerous people can easily obtain their guns from unlicensed sellers at gun shows and elsewhere;

**Whereas:** 82% of Minnesotans, including gun owners and non-gun-owners, agree that we need stronger screening for firearms sales;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party supports extending the requirement for background checks before the purchase of firearms to unlicensed sellers at gun shows, internet sales, and sales among unrelated individuals.

## 2. Firearms and Public Safety

**Whereas:** Being on the terror watch list (for which there are objective criteria such as having trained with or given money to a known terror organization and is distinct from the no-fly list) is not among the prohibited purchaser categories that would prevent purchase of firearms or explosives;

**Whereas:** Terror attacks are, increasingly, undertaken by autonomous, radicalized individuals or groups that, because not included in a prohibited purchaser category, have virtually unlimited access to firearms and explosives in this country;

**Whereas:** Minnesota residents outnumber residents of any other state who have gone abroad to fight for terrorist groups."

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ Party of Minnesota calls on its members of Congress to pass legislation preventing those on the terror watch list from purchasing firearms and explosives.



In addition to LWV Minnesota resolutions, Common Cause also has recommended resolutions it hopes to take into precinct caucuses through its allied organizations, of which we are one.

## **Early Childhood Education**

**Whereas**, there is significant research which supports the academic and social value of early childhood education; and

**Whereas**, investments in early learning opportunities have been shown to positively impact regional economics; and

**Whereas**, all children deserve this opportunity to succeed; and

**Whereas**, a child's access to quality early childhood education should not be limited by their family's socioeconomic status or geography; and

**Whereas**, ensuring access to quality early childhood education will help us prepare more students for kindergarten and ultimately for secondary school, higher education and the workplace;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ party supports increasing state funding for early childhood education so low-income and low-middle income families across the state have access to early childhood education.

## **Government - Single Subject Rule**

**Whereas**, Minnesota received a D- grade for openness and transparency in state government from the [Center for Public Integrity](#); and,

**Whereas**, citizens in a democratic country have a right to view readily, to understand clearly, and to take part easily in governmental decisions; and,

**Whereas**, both the House and Senate passed omnibus bills that contain multiple subjects making it difficult for a citizen to understand what provisions are in these bills; and

**Whereas**, the omnibus bills violate the constitutionally required “single-subject rule”;



**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ party supports language on a “single subject rule,” requiring that no bill before either the House or the Senate shall embrace more than one subject (other than major finance bills).

### **Government – Conference Committees**

**Whereas**, Minnesota received a D- grade for openness and transparency in state government from the [Center for Public Integrity](#); and,

**Whereas**, citizens in a democratic country have a right to view readily, to understand clearly, and to take part easily in governmental decisions; and,

**Whereas**, the State Auditor’s office was stripped of its local auditing authority behind closed doors by a few legislators, in the early morning hours of the last day of the regular 2015 legislative session; and,

**Whereas**, this provision was inserted by a Conference Committee into a “must-pass” State Government bill of more than 90 pages; and

**Whereas**, there was no individual bill on the Auditor’s authorities, there were no hearings, and no testimony was taken before these powers were stripped from this constitutional office; and

**Whereas**, this secret procedure was used in exactly this way on several other controversial issues, including the abolition of the MN Environmental Protection Agency’s Citizen’s Board;

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the \_\_\_\_\_ party supports legislation that would require public notification of a Conference Committee adoption vote 12 hours prior to this vote, and require this committee to provide an opportunity for public testimony.

## Citizens United Resolution Fact Sheet

### Summary:

This resolution calls on the [insert party name here] to support the Democracy For All Constitutional Amendment which would overturn the Supreme Court's *Citizens United* decision.

### The Problems:

The 2010 case of *Citizens United v. FEC* removed any limits to campaign spending from sources outside of a candidate's campaign, most notably SuperPACs. This decision has had devastating effects on the ability of regular citizens to have their voice heard.

In the first year after *Citizens United*, outside campaign spending by super-PACs and other sources rocketed from \$8,856,113 in 2009 to \$300,978,067 in 2010 according to analysis by the Center for Responsive Politics. In the 2012 two-year campaign cycle, independent spending took another quantum leap to \$1,038,736,977 – a sum unimaginable in 2008. Many believe this trend will only increase the prevalence of corruption in our political system and drown out the voice of everyday Americans.

From the 2012 election:

- Nearly 60% of Super PAC funding came from just 159 donors contributing at least \$1 million. More than 93% of the money Super PACs raised came in contributions of at least \$10,000—from just 3,318 donors, or the **equivalent of 0.0011% of the U.S. population.**
- The top 32 Super PAC donors, giving an average of \$9.9 million each, matched the \$313.0 million that President Obama and Mitt Romney raised from all of their small donors combined—that's at least 3.7 million people giving less than \$200.
- Super PACs accounted for more than 60% of outside spending reported to the FEC.

Every elected official and every aspiring politician who hopes to hold office must now think about the financial impact of his or her position on virtually every issue. A vote cast in support of a big contributor's position may guarantee the official will have more than enough money to ensure reelection; a "wrong" vote may trigger the financing of a crippling campaign of negative ads.

This resolution addresses a nonpartisan issue. The power of big money undermines the ability of all candidates and elected officials to act on their conscience, to worry much less about fund raising, and to put in more of their time doing the people's work.

**Resolution Supporting Constitutional Amendment to Overturn *Citizens United***

**WHEREAS:** Wealthy special interest groups are drowning out the voices of everyday Americans in the political process. The Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. FEC* declared that the First Amendment prohibited the government from limiting independent political spending allowing special interest groups (corporations, labor unions, etc.) to spend unlimited amounts of money in political elections; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** That [Political Party Name] supports legislation, such as the Democracy for All bill, which would overturn the Supreme Court's ruling in *Citizens United* through constitutional amendment.

## Equal Voting Access Resolution Fact Sheet

### Summary:

This resolution calls on the [insert party name here] to promote equal access to the political process by encouraging Congress to restore the Voting Rights Act and to compel candidates of the party to do the same.

### The Problem:

The VRA was designed to protect the voting rights of racial and language minorities. Specifically, the act prohibited voting practices and procedures that discriminated against minority voters.<sup>1</sup> The act requires something called preclearance, which applies to certain areas of the country with histories of using discriminatory voting policies and procedures.<sup>2</sup> Preclearance requires certain areas of the country to prove to the federal government that their proposed voting law changes will not be discriminatory before they take effect.<sup>3</sup> Section 4 of the act sets forth the criteria that determine which areas of the country are subject to preclearance.<sup>4</sup>

In *Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder*, the Supreme Court held Section 4 of the VRA unconstitutional.<sup>5</sup> The Court reasoned that the criteria in Section 4 were out of date and did not reflect “current conditions.”<sup>6</sup> By finding Section 4 unconstitutional, preclearance areas can no longer be designated. This means preclearance itself as a safeguard against discriminatory voting practices, can no longer be enforced.<sup>7</sup> As a result, areas of the country that have histories of passing discriminatory voting laws “can now implement discriminatory voting changes without the federal government providing oversight...”<sup>8</sup>

Some examples of how preclearance has protected the right to vote:

- Since January 1, 2012, Section 5 has blocked discriminatory voting changes in Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas and required South Carolina to adjust its voter ID law to make it substantially more flexible.<sup>9</sup>
- Since 1982, the Department of Justice has rejected more than 1,000 discriminatory changes from being implemented, including more than 30 since 2006.<sup>10</sup>
- Between 1982 and 2006, 656 voting changes were withdrawn and 198 were superseded by altered submissions after DOJ requested more information.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *History of the VRA*, THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, <http://www.civilrights.org/voting-rights/vra/history.html> (last visited October 9, 2015).

<sup>2</sup> *See id.*

<sup>3</sup> *See id.*

<sup>4</sup> *See generally, Voting Rights Act*, THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, <http://www.civilrights.org/voting-rights/vra/> (last visited October 9, 2015).

<sup>5</sup> *See id.*

<sup>6</sup> *See generally*, Ryan J. Reilly, Mike Sacks, and Sabrina Siddiqui, *Voting Rights Act Section 4 Struck Down by Supreme Court*, HUFFINGTONPOST.COM, June 25, 2013, [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/25/voting-rights-act-supreme-court\\_n\\_3429810.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/25/voting-rights-act-supreme-court_n_3429810.html) (citing *Shelby County, Alabama v. Holder*, 570 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2013)).

<sup>7</sup> *See id.*

<sup>8</sup> THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE EDUCATION FUND, PROTECT THE VRA BACKGROUNDER: THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AND *SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER* 1 (2013).

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* citing Pérez, Myrna and Agraharkar, Vishal. “If Section 5 Falls: New Voting Implications.” Brennan Center for Justice. June 12, 2013. Can be found here: <http://www.brennancenter.org/publication/if-section-5-falls-new-voting-implications#scribd>.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* citing Fraga, Luis Ricardo and Ocampo, Maria Lizet. “More Information Requests and the Deterrent Effect of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.” *Voting Rights Act Reauthorization of 2006: Perspectives on Democracy, Participation and Power*. Pgs 47-82. Berkeley Public Policy Press, University of California, Berkeley. 2007. Can be found here: [http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/ch\\_3\\_fraga\\_ocampo\\_3-9-07.pdf](http://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/ch_3_fraga_ocampo_3-9-07.pdf)

*For questions or comments about this document, please contact:  
Jeremy Schroeder at (952) 923-6691 or [jschroeder@commoncause.org](mailto:jschroeder@commoncause.org).*

Common Cause Minnesota  
550 Rice St.  
St. Paul, MN 55103  
(o) (612) 605-7978  
[www.commoncause.org/mn](http://www.commoncause.org/mn)

**Resolution Supporting Equal Access to Voting**

**WHEREAS:** Our democracy is undermined when elected officials only hear policy preferences of a few privileged groups at the expense of racial minorities and the poor; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** that (political party) supports measures such as: early voting, automatic registration of voters, and restoration of the Voting Rights Act of 1964; and opposes requirements that prevent equal access to voting for any part of the voting population.

## Resolution Opposing Big Money in Politics Fact Sheet

### Summary:

This resolution calls on the [insert party name here] to support public campaign finance reform solutions such as matching funds, tax credits, or small-dollar vouchers.

### The Problems:

**Wealthy Elite Drowning out the Voices of Everyday Americans** – Current campaign finance laws allow unlimited and undisclosed donations. Political contributions, which totaled \$7.1 billion in the 2012 election cycle, were joined by Super PACs and other third party entities. The law currently allows unlimited, undisclosed donations from any source. This is particularly troubling because the top 1% of donors accounted for 67% of the donations (Center for Responsive Politics). Moreover, the average net worth for a member of Congress in 2011 was \$7.9 million (as per Open Secrets). This is proof that the ultra-wealthy have much more power in our political system than the average American citizen. This opens the door for corruption. Public campaign financing will help to close that door and return American democracy to the American people.

**Special Interest Domination of Politics** – All candidates are spending an increasing amount of their time fundraising at the expense of the job they were elected to do. As a result of the Supreme Court's decision on *Citizens United vs. FEC*, members of Congress are more beholden to the special interests that disproportionately fund their campaigns. Public campaign financing will help elected officials be more responsive to the majority of the people and less to the wealthy and special interest groups.

### The Solutions:

- **Give Average Americans a Voice**
  - Public campaign finance initiatives like vouchers and matching fund systems will help give average Americans a chance to compete against the ultra-wealthy. These reforms allow Americans, regardless of economic background, to compete alongside each other on equal footing, seeking to help lead the nation we all belong to.
- **Take Back Control from Special Interests:**
  - The Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United* to allow unlimited political spending by corporations and unions has resulted in an unprecedented amount of money being injected into our political process. Public campaign finance can force candidates to agree to restrictions on contributions and expenditures in order to receive public campaign finance vouchers or matching funds.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Matching funds systems force candidates to agree to expenditure limits and enhanced disclosure requirements in return for having their small donations matched based on a certain ratio. For example, this system has been used successfully in New York City where candidates receive matching funds in amounts "up to \$175 of each contribution at a six-to-one ratio." See generally, ANGELA MIGALLY AND SUSAN LISS, THE BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE, SMALL DONOR MATCHING FUNDS: THE NYC ELECTION EXPERIENCE <http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/Small%20Donor%20Matching%20Funds-The%20NYC%20Election%20Experience.pdf> (2010).

*For questions or comments about this document, please contact:  
Jeremy Schroeder at (952) 923-6691 or [jschroeder@commoncause.org](mailto:jschroeder@commoncause.org).*

**Resolution Opposing Big Money in Politics**

**WHEREAS:** Wealthy special interest groups are drowning out the voices of everyday Americans in the political process and voters have a right to know who is trying to influence their views and elected representatives; therefore be it

**RESOLVED:** That the [Party Name Here] supports:

1. Public financing for all political candidates for public office as well as small donor campaign contributions in the form of matching funds, tax credits, and small-dollar vouchers for all elections
2. Transparency of political campaign contributions through executive orders, agency rulemaking, or legislation that implements effective disclosure requirements