

# *Use of Campaign Funds: Final Findings by the Special Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services*

Letter from the Chairs	2
Executive Summary	4
Legislative History	4
Findings by Section	5
SECTION 11 (c) (i) - Reviewing Massachusetts' and federal laws	5
SECTION 11 (c) (ii) - Analyzing other states' laws on the matter	6
SECTION 11 (c) (iii) - Examining when these expenditures are considered "personal use"	7
SECTION 11 (c) (iv) - Recommending definition of "child care"	8
SECTION 11 (c) (v) - Determining whether child care expenses existing irrespective of an individual's running for office should be considered an authorized use of campaign funds	10
SECTION 11 (c) (vii) - Determining whether the OCPF has the capacity to scrutinize these expenditures	11
Findings of Fact, Recommendations, and Conclusion	12
Appendix	13
Proposed Bill Text	13
Statutory Charge (H.4223)	
Additional Documents	
Testimony	13
Sources	14



Commonwealth of Massachusetts

The General Court

STATE HOUSE, BOSTON 02133-1053

December 30, 2020

Mr. Michael Hurley, Clerk of the Senate  
State House, Room 335  
Boston MA 02133

Mr. Steve T. James, Clerk of the Senate  
State House, Room 145  
Boston, MA 02133

Dear Clerk Hurley and Clerk James:

Pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 4, Section 2A, the Special Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services (“the Commission”) respectfully submits to the full Massachusetts Legislature the following report: Use of Campaign Funds: Final Findings by the Special Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services.

This report is based on research by the Commission, including a public hearing held by the Joint Committee on Election Laws on May 15, 2019, where the Committee received written testimony from 12 individuals and organizations in support of using campaign funds for child care expenses. The Commission members also met on February 12, 2020 and March 3, 2020 to review and evaluate state and federal laws, regulations, and legal advisories regarding the use of campaign funds to pay for the provision of family and child care services; examine the circumstances in which child care funds constitute a personal use, if at all; discuss whether family care and child care services would exist irrespective of an individual running for office; and discuss capacity availability within the Office of Campaign and Political Finance.

The report presents the Commission’s findings, as well as several recommendations for how the Legislature can effectively implement and amend current legislation to allow Massachusetts candidates to use campaign funds for child care expenses. If the Legislature employs these recommendations, they will make great strides toward a more diverse candidate pool in upcoming elections.

Respectfully filed by the Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services,

Senator Barry Finegold, Co-chair

Representative John Lawn, Co-chair

Senator Cindy Friedman

Senator Ryan Fattman

Representative Liz Malia

Representative Kimberly Ferguson

Representative Hannah Kane

Jill Ashton

Greg Birne

Ruth Bramson

Pam Wilmot

### **Commission Members**

Co-chair Barry Finegold, Senate Chair, Election Laws

Co-chair John Lawn, House Chair, Election Laws

Senator Cindy Friedman, Senate Chair, Women's Caucus

Senator Ryan Fattman, Leader Tarr appointee

Rep. Liz Malia, House Chair, Women's Caucus

Rep. Kimberly Ferguson, Leader Jones appointee

Rep. Hannah Kane, Gov. Baker appointee

Jill Ashton, Executive Director, MCSW

Greg Birne, OCPF designee

Ruth Bramson, MCSW appointee

Pam Wilmot, Executive Director, Common Cause

### **Co-Authors of the Report**

Erika Sweet, Research Director to the Joint Committee on Election Laws

Jacqueline Hubbard, Chief of Staff to Sen. Finegold

Matthew Hartman, Chief of Staff to Sen. Jehlen

Jonathan Hamilton, Legislative Aide to Rep. Meschino

Rep. Joan Meschino

## **Executive Summary**

In November 2019, H.4223, a campaign finance bill, established a commission to study the use of campaign funds to pay for child care. This idea was originally filed as *An Act supporting parents running for public office*, S.408 by Senator Jehlen and H.639 by Representatives Connolly and Meschino. The Special Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services (the Commission), as it became known, convened with a full complement of commissioners in February 2020 to assess and evaluate the logistics of allowing for these types of campaign expenditures. The Commission convened on February 12, 2020 and held one of the three subsequent meetings on March 4, 2020. The ultimate goal was to submit final recommendations to the Legislature by June 1, 2020 but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this deadline was extended until December 31, 2020.

Based on its findings and conclusions, the Commission recommends that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts allow campaign fund expenditures for childcare needs. First, campaigns at the federal level and in at least 13 other states are already allowed to use campaign funds to pay for childcare needs. There is an abundance of precedence demonstrating that this can be done ethically and effectively. In addition, these cases help show that using campaign funds for childcare can be easily integrated into the current best practices for determining proper spending. Namely, campaign funds can be used for childcare expenditures only when the childcare would not be necessary but for a candidate's campaign activities. Otherwise, the use of funds for these purposes would be considered personal use – the distinction made for all cases.

While the Office of Campaign and Public Finance (OCPF) has previously stated that candidates in Massachusetts cannot use campaign funds for child care needs, even when those needs arise because of a candidate's campaign activities, the OCPF representative to the Commission stated that the OCPF has the capacity to scrutinize the use of campaign funds for child care, to ensure the expenditure is appropriate for reimbursement, and does not constitute a "personal use" in that instance, as defined by Section 6 of Chapter 55 of the General Laws. Furthermore, the OCPF regularly gives advisory opinions to candidates on all manner of campaign expenditures for which candidates may or may not use campaign funds. In short, it would be reasonable for Massachusetts candidates to use campaign funds for child care needs when those needs are the direct result of the candidate's campaign activities, as is the case with other expenses arising directly from their campaign activities that OCPF already scrutinizes and permits.

## **Legislative History**

The issue of allowing campaign funds for child care first arose in the 190th Session as H.2898 and S.386, *An Act supporting working parents who choose to run for public office*. This bill was filed when Lee Erica Palmer, a Somerville resident who was running for school

committee, made a request over the phone to the Office of Campaign and Political Finance to use campaign funds for child care and was denied. Candidate Palmer went to Representative Connolly and Senator Jehlen. The former then engaged Representative Meschino. These three legislators refiled the bill in the 191st Session as H.639 and S.408, *An Act supporting parents running for public office*, and earned the endorsement of 11 House and 12 Senator co-sponsors. In May of 2019, 12 individuals and organizations submitted testimony in support of these bills. Both bills are pending currently in the Joint Committee on Election Laws.

Concurrently in the 191st Session, H.4223, *An Act relative to campaign finance*, which included a section to create a commission to study the issue of using campaign funds for child care, was passed. This special commission was titled the Special Commission on Family Care and Child Care Services. While the Commission met before the brunt of the COVID-19 pandemic, beginning on February 12, 2020, their work was suspended once commissioners transitioned to work remotely. The original reporting deadline of June 1, 2020 was extended to December 31, 2020.

## **Findings by Section**

### SECTION 11 (c) (i) - Reviewing Massachusetts' and federal laws

#### *Federal*

On the federal level, provisions have already been made for candidates to use campaign funds for child care. Federal law allows for the use of campaign funds for “expenditures in connection with the campaign for Federal office of the candidate or individual” so long as the expenditure is not used “to fulfill any commitment, obligation, or expense of a person that would exist irrespective of the candidate's election campaign.”<sup>i</sup>

In 2018, the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) advised that Ms. Liuba Grechen Shirley, a candidate for the 2nd Congressional District of New York, would be permitted to use campaign funds to pay for child care expenditures during campaign obligations, because the child care expense was “incurred as a direct result of campaign activity”, and therefore would not be necessary “irrespective of” her obligations as a candidate.<sup>ii</sup>

During one meeting of the commission on March 4, 2020, members participated in a conference call with a representative from the FEC. In that discussion, examples of different care needs were presented and discussed. The representative from the FEC stated that the federal “irrespective test” provides for a relatively simple process of determining the legality of a campaign fund expenditure, as the candidate must show that for each claimed expense there is a direct relationship to the campaign as a cause for that expense.<sup>iii</sup> Child care services were roundly allowable so long as the expenses were directly a result of campaign activity and would not otherwise exist.

## *Massachusetts*

Meanwhile, in Massachusetts, there are no laws or regulations specifically regarding the use of campaign funds for child care at the present. However, the OCPF is known to have advised over the phone that candidates are not permitted to use campaign funds for child care because it is a “personal use.”<sup>iv</sup> Aside from these phone call advisories, the regulations for the use of campaign funds for child care remain undefined. As such, the general campaign finance laws are helpful.

Section 6 of Chapter 55 of the General Laws states that “Any other political committee duly organized on behalf of a candidate may receive, pay and expend money or other things of value for the enhancement of the political future of the candidate or the principle for which the committee was organized.”<sup>v</sup> Furthermore, section 6 of Chapter 55 states that “A political committee organized or operating on behalf of a candidate...may receive, pay and expend money or other things of value for reasonable and necessary expenses directly related to the campaign of the candidate but shall not make any expenditure that is primarily for the candidate's or any other person's personal use.”<sup>vi</sup> Any such expense “shall not be primarily for the candidate's or any other person's personal use.”<sup>vii</sup>

During meetings of this commission, OCPF representatives confirmed that this is the current policy. It was also discussed that the OCPF followed a policy of considering the provision of child care services as a “personal use” because the Legislature had not provided sufficient definition of personal use as it related to child care services.<sup>viii</sup>

## SECTION 11 (c) (ii) - Analyzing other states’ laws on the matter

Many states permit the use of campaign funds for child care services, generally only when the child care is necessary because of the candidate’s campaign obligations. These states include Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Utah, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. Particularly relevant is California, which passed a statute in 2019 stating that “Campaign funds may be used to pay or reimburse a candidate for reasonable and necessary child care expenses for a dependent child resulting directly from the candidate engaging in campaign activities”.<sup>ix</sup> Similarly, Colorado permits that “a candidate committee established in the name of a candidate may expend contributions received and accepted by the committee during any particular election cycle to reimburse the candidate for reasonable and necessary expenses for the care of children or other dependents the candidate incurs directly in connection with the candidate's campaign activities during the election cycle”.<sup>x</sup> In 2019, The Maryland Board of Elections decided that “child care expenses would have to have an electoral purpose in order for them to be permissible. For example, a candidate hires a babysitter to care for the candidate’s children while the candidate attends a fundraiser event. This expenditure would not have occurred but for the candidacy...”.<sup>xi</sup> In Minnesota, the “costs of child care for the candidate's children when campaigning” are considered to be “permitted

expenditures when made for political purposes”.<sup>xii</sup> Analyzing these examples reveals that when child care is necessary for the campaign activities of a candidate, the candidate is permitted to use campaign funds to pay for child care expenses.

The commission examined at least a dozen other states’ statutes and agency decisions that analyzed child care as a campaign expense. States overwhelmingly chose to implement a basic test that determined whether the expense was directly related to the campaign and would not exist but for the ongoing existence of the campaign. Subsequent to the first two meetings of the commission, the state of New Jersey passed a statute that allowed for the usage of campaign funds for child care, signed in October 2020. These materials are included in Appendix C in depth.

### SECTION 11 (c) (iii) - Examining when these expenditures are considered “personal use”

Section 6 of Chapter 55 of the General Laws states that candidates “for the office of governor, lieutenant governor, attorney general, state secretary, treasurer and receiver general or state auditor” may use campaign funds for “reasonable and necessary expenses directly related to the campaign of the candidate”.<sup>xiii</sup> However, candidates are “not to make any expenditure that is primarily for the candidate’s or any other person’s personal use”.<sup>xiv</sup> Under Section 6 of Chapter 55, “personal use” of campaign funds is not considered to include “expenses relating to the provision of constituent or legislative services or to the opening or maintaining of a legislative district office”.<sup>xv</sup> It stands to reason then that when child care services are necessary because of a candidate’s campaign activities, the necessary care is “directly related to the campaign of the candidate” as well as an expense relevant to “the opening or maintaining of a legislative district office”, as specified in Section 6 of Chapter 55, and should therefore not be considered “personal use” of campaign funds.<sup>xvi</sup>

#### *“But for” and “Irrespective of” test*

The “but for”/ “irrespective of” test, as used in (i), is codified at the federal level by the FEC as part of the definition of “personal use” as it applies to funds used in a campaign account.<sup>xvii</sup> The test considers whether an expense would exist “but for” campaign activities to determine whether it should be considered a campaign expense. The OCPF has referred to the FEC’s “irrespective of” test when issuing advisory opinions in response to inquiries from candidates regarding the use of personal funds for certain expenses. In 2013, the OCPF advised gubernatorial candidate Dr. Berwick that his travel expenditures made primarily for non-political purposes would not be subjected to Massachusetts finance laws, because they would exist “irrespective of” his campaign for governor.<sup>xviii</sup> However, when travel plans were made for the purpose of his political goals, the expenditure would be subject to Massachusetts finance laws, because they would not exist “irrespective of” his campaign.<sup>xix</sup> Furthermore, in the case of

District Attorney Blodgett in 2011, the OCPF advised that campaign funds could be used to pay for increased security in his home.<sup>xx</sup> Because the extra security was only necessary due to a threat posed to Blodgett because of his position as a public official, and would therefore not exist “but for” his position, the OCPF advised that the security would be considered a campaign expenditure.<sup>xxi</sup>

Child care needs can reasonably arise from the candidate’s campaign obligations in the same manner as the travel and security expenses in the examples described above, in that the expenses are necessary only because of the candidate’s campaign activities. Logically, the use of campaign funds for child care expenses arising out of a candidate’s campaign obligation passes the “but for” and “irrespective of” tests.<sup>xxii</sup>

#### *In-kind donation discussion*

During meetings, some commission members raised the issue of informal donations of child care services as potentially implicating the “in-kind” donation rules and limitations.<sup>xxiii</sup> Donations of supplies or services are currently treated and reported in the same manner as a cash donation to the campaign based upon the value of the supply or service.

Massachusetts General Law defines what is considered a “contribution” to a campaign, as well as what is not a contribution and would thus be exempt from reporting. A “contribution” “shall not include the rendering of services by speakers, editors, writers, poll watchers, poll checkers or others, nor the payment by those rendering such services of such personal expenses as may be incidental thereto.”<sup>xxiv</sup> Additionally, the “exercise of ordinary hospitality” is also not considered a “contribution” to a campaign.<sup>xxv</sup> Furthermore, some services that are offered to candidates are currently exempted from reporting as “personal services” under OCPF guidance.<sup>xxvi</sup> Services referenced in OCPF guidance include those of a campaign volunteer who offers her own time to create a campaign website, and the services of someone who offers food for a campaign event in their home.

OCPF representatives to the commission did not draw conclusions on how informal caregiving arrangements would be treated during discussions. It is the recommendation of the commission that OCPF include in their regulations of caregiving expenses clear guidelines for the types of caregiving services that would not be considered exempt “personal services” and would need to be reported as in-kind donations. In addition, as discussed below, many caregiving services offered by family members would be exempt from reporting because they would not be compensable services under the draft legislation.

### SECTION 11 (c) (iv) - Recommending definition of “child care”

#### *Massachusetts and other states’ laws’ definitions of “child care”*

Under Massachusetts regulations, child care centers are defined as “Any facility operated on a regular basis whether known as a day nursery, nursery school, kindergarten, child play

school, progressive school, child development center, day care center, pre-school, or known under any other name which receives children, not of common parentage, younger than seven years old, or younger than 16 years old if such children have special needs, for non-residential custody and care during part or all of the day separate from their parent(s).”<sup>xxvii</sup> This definition excludes “any part of a public school system; any part of a private organized educational system, unless the services of such a system are primarily limited to kindergarten, nursery or related pre-school services; a Sunday school conducted by a religious institution; a facility operated by a religious organization where children are cared for during short periods of time while persons responsible for such children are attending religious services; a family child care home; an informal cooperative arrangement among neighbors or relatives; or the occasional care of children with or without compensation therefore.”<sup>xxviii</sup> Notably, these definitions exist under the context of the regulation of child care services by the Department of Early Education and Care, an agency tasked with the responsibility to create healthy, safe, and age appropriate caregiving and learning settings for young children and are specifically intended to apply regulation to only certain settings.

The Commission, similarly to other states’ regulations, does not only address child care centers; babysitters are also considered legitimate child care providers by many other states. To account for babysitters, the definition provided by California state law is useful.<sup>xxix</sup> In a California statute passed in 2019, “child care expenses” are defined as “the reasonable costs of professional daycare services, babysitting, nanny services, food and beverages, transportation to and from the location of a child care services provider, before and after school programs, summer day camps, and preschool. Additional qualifying expenses include costs related to a nurse, home care provider, or other care provider for a disabled dependent child.”<sup>xxx</sup> This law does not include “private school tuition, medical expenses, tutoring services, or payments to a relative, within the third degree of consanguinity, of a child, unless the relative owns or operates a professional daycare or babysitting service and the cost of the service is no greater than the relative would otherwise charge.”<sup>xxxi</sup>

The commission discussed many aspects of these definitions in other states and the federal usage of the expense. The OCPF representative raised the idea that any additional allowance for child care should be restricted to certain periods of time. Many members of the commission questioned how this limitation could be determined because no other allowable campaign expense is regulated in this manner. There was also discussion of the use of the federal tax definition of “dependent” as a possible source of how to structure a campaign finance allowance for a variety of care needs. Ultimately, the federal definition raised too many questions about being tied to a changing federal term and whether using a tax definition unduly complicates a campaign finance need. Members preferred that a specifically crafted definition for care needs be applied in Massachusetts.

### *Recommended definitions*

Given these helpful definitions, a definition specifically for the Commission can be recommended:

“Child care,” care provided to a candidate’s child, including but not limited to, professional or casual baby-sitting services, non-profit or for profit organizations that provide such services, and any other costs directly related to such services that occur as a result of campaign activities. Expenses may not include payments to a relative of a child, unless the relative owns or operates a professional daycare or babysitting service and the cost of the service is no greater than the relative would otherwise charge.”

The Commission discussed the inclusion of a specific definition for “family care” and ultimately decided to focus on child care at this time for the purposes of promulgating legislation and regulations. Commission members agreed to address the inclusion of family care at a later date, as the types of care that may fall under such definition needed further examination.

### SECTION 11 (c) (v) - Determining whether child care expenses existing irrespective of an individual’s running for office should be considered an authorized use of campaign funds

Massachusetts General Laws state that “a political committee organized or operating on behalf of a candidate...may receive, pay and expend money or other things of value for reasonable and necessary expenses directly related to the campaign of the candidate but shall not make any expenditure that is primarily for the candidate's or any other person's personal use.”<sup>xxxii</sup> It follows that if child care needs would exist irrespective of a candidate’s campaign activities, meaning that the child care needs do not arise specifically from the candidate’s campaign obligations, to use campaign funds for said family care or child care would constitute a “personal use”.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

The commission discussed at length the potential benefits and pitfalls of allowing for the use of campaign funds for this new purpose. Two main themes arose from those discussions among most members; that the allowance could dramatically impact some candidates’ ability to run for public office, and that clear regulation on the matter was in the best public interest.

The Commission heard testimony from proponents that the goal is a more diverse legislative body, which means that we have to take intentional steps to support a more diverse candidate pool, and reimbursing a candidate’s child care expenses is one way to do this. One member described the use of campaign funds for child care expenses as likely “small but meaningful dollars” for a candidate with these needs.

Most members agreed that there would at least be some increase in the ability of previously financially restricted candidates’ ability to run for office as a result of allowing for the

expense. Indeed, testimony offered by candidates and former candidates at the Joint Committee on Election Laws hearing in May 2019 clearly described the positive impact it would have had on those candidates' ability to campaign successfully. [See Appendix D for testimony.]

In addition, commission members also expressed concerns that this expense could be a potential regulator pitfall if it was too complex to navigate and use. Members agreed that the best regulation of this expense would be one that was treated similarly to other expenses and had only limited differences that were clearly spelled out. Those limitations are included in the draft legislation.

Ultimately, the commission felt that the choice on whether this was a beneficial policy should be left to the Legislature and the Governor through the legislative process.

### SECTION 11 (c) (vii) - Determining whether the OCPF has the capacity to scrutinize these expenditures

The Office of Campaign and Political Finance scrutinizes the uses of campaign funds for various expenditures on numerous occasions. For example:

- In 1992, the OCPF gave an advisory opinion on the use of campaign funds for cleaning services and the renting of clothes for campaign activities to Representative Menard.<sup>xxxiv</sup>
- In 2011, the OCPF gave an advisory opinion on the use of campaign funds for the expense of added security to District Attorney Blodgett's home. This advisory opinion was described in.<sup>xxxv</sup>
- In 2006, the OCPF gave an advisory opinion on the use of campaign funds for Ms. Cronin to join the University of Massachusetts Club.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

Additionally, the OCPF's representative to the Commission stated that the OCPF has the ability and the capacity to scrutinize child and family care expenditures. Moreover, the OCPF website lists 7,466 registered, active filers on their website and has given over 670 advisory opinions since 1982, both of which suggest that the OCPF has this capacity.<sup>xxxvii</sup>

To understand the impact this commission would have on Massachusetts, usage information from other states and the federal level is useful. For example:

- In 2019, \$1,013.52 of campaign funds were spent on child care in Colorado on the state level.
- In 2019, \$3,240.00 of campaign funds were spent on child care in Utah on the state level.
- In 2018, \$1,047.50 of campaign funds were spent on child care in Arkansas.
- From 2017 to 2019, \$80,030.00 of campaign funds were spent on child care on the federal level.[See Appendix C for full data].

Given that child care expenses can reasonably become necessary due to a candidate's campaign obligations, in the same way as other expenditures which the OCPF scrutinizes regularly, as well as the statement of the OCPF's representative to this commission, it stands to reason that the OCPF is equipped to scrutinize these types of expenditures as well.

## **Findings of Fact, Recommendations, and Conclusion**

### *Findings of fact:*

1. Federal law allows a candidate to use campaign funds for child care expenses.
2. Twelve states in the United States allow a candidate to use campaign funds for child care expenses.
3. Massachusetts law does not expressly prohibit the use of campaign funds for child care expenses.
4. Use of the "but for" and "irrespective of" tests can be used to determine whether a child care expense is a campaign expense or for personal use.
5. Different Massachusetts state laws provide an effective and appropriate definition for "child care."
6. The OCPF has the capacity to scrutinize a candidate's child care campaign expenditures.
7. This legislation will not significantly increase total expenditures.

### *Recommendations:*

1. The Joint Committee on Election Laws should amend current legislation in committee as described below (see appendix A for bill text) to allow the OCPF to regulate campaign funds for child care expenses.
2. The Joint Committee on Election Laws should amend current legislation in committee as described below (see appendix A for bill text) to include a limitation on allowable child care services to those services that would not exist but for the existence of the campaign.
3. The Joint Committee on Election Laws should amend current legislation in committee as described below (see appendix A for bill text) to require that implementation of regulations at OCPF occur not later than July 1, 2021.

### *Conclusion*

Massachusetts candidates should be permitted to use campaign funds for child care expenses that would not exist but for the candidate's campaign obligations, as they are permitted to do with other expenditures that would not exist but for the candidate's campaign obligations. As with other expenditures, this would mean that candidates cannot use campaign funds for child care expenditures that exist irrespective of their campaign activities, as this would constitute "personal use".<sup>xxxviii</sup>

## **Appendix A**

### Proposed Bill Text

An Act supporting parents running for public office.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:*

SECTION 1. Section 1 of Chapter 55 of the General Laws, as appearing in the 2016 Official Edition, is hereby amended by inserting

“Child care,” care provided to a candidate’s child, including but not limited to, professional or casual baby-sitting services, non-profit or for profit organizations that provide such services, and any other costs directly related to such services that occur as a result of campaign activities. Expenses may not include payments to a relative of a child, unless the relative owns or operates a professional daycare or babysitting service and the cost of the service is no greater than the relative would otherwise charge.

SECTION 2. Section 6 of Chapter 55 of the General Laws, as appearing in the 2016 Official Edition, is hereby amended by inserting, after the word “office”, in line 66 the following: -

or expenses relating to the provision of child care services that would not otherwise exist but for the existence of the campaign.

SECTION 3. The director of the office of campaign and political finance shall promulgate rules and regulations to implement this act no later than July 1, 2021.

## **Appendix B**

### Statutory Charge (H.4223)

SECTION 11. (a) There shall be a special legislative commission pursuant to section 2A of chapter 4 of the General Laws to examine the feasibility of authorizing the use of campaign funds to pay for the provision of family care and child care services by candidates for state, county or municipal elected office.

(b) The special legislative commission shall consist of: the house and senate chairs of the joint committee on election laws, who shall serve as co-chairs; the house and senate chairs of the caucus of women legislators; 1 member of the house who shall be appointed by the minority

leader; 1 member of the senate who shall be appointed by the minority leader; the director of campaign and political finance; the executive director of the commission on the status of women established under section 66 of chapter 3 of the General Laws; the executive director of Common Cause Massachusetts; 1 person appointed by the governor who shall have experience or expertise related to reducing gender, racial and economic disparities in civic engagement; and 1 person to be appointed by the commission on the status of women.

(c) The special legislative commission shall: (i) review and evaluate state and federal laws, regulations and legal advisories regarding the use of campaign funds to pay for the provision of family and child care services, by candidates for state, county or municipal elected office; (ii) analyze campaign finance laws in other states regarding the use of campaign funds for family care and child care services; (iii) examine the circumstances under which the expenditure of campaign funds for family care and child care services constitute a personal use of such funds under section 6 of chapter 55 of the General Laws; (iv) recommend definitions for the term “family care” and “child care”, including, but not limited to, allowed and disallowed expenditures for family care and child care services; (v) determine whether family care and child care services expenses, occurring in the normal course of a candidate or elected official’s duties would exist irrespective of an individual running for elected office should be considered an authorized use of campaign funds under section 6 of chapter 55 of the General Laws; and (vii) determine whether the office of campaign and political finance has the capacity to scrutinize expenditures of campaign funds for family care and child care services, to prevent unauthorized or impermissible uses of such funds.

(d) The commission shall submit its report together with recommendations for legislation, if any, to the clerks of the house of representatives and the senate not later than ~~June 1~~ December 31, 2020.

## Appendix C

Documents supplied to commission members at the meetings.



Child Care State  
Statutes.xlsx



CFC Expenditure  
Data.xlsx



FEC Definitions and  
Determinations.docx

## Appendix D

Testimony provided on H639/S408



<sup>i</sup>52 U.S.C. 30114 (a)-(c).

<sup>ii</sup>*Id.*

<sup>iii</sup>11 C.F.R.113.1(g)(ii).

<sup>iv</sup>Mass. Gen. Lawsch.55.

<sup>v</sup>Mass. Gen.Lawsch.55, §6.

<sup>vi</sup>*Id.*

<sup>vii</sup>*Id.*

<sup>viii</sup>*Id.*

<sup>ix</sup>Cal.Gov't. Code §89513.

<sup>x</sup>C.R.S. §1-45-103.7.

<sup>xi</sup>Kinnally, Kevin. "State Issues New Guidance on Campaign Contributions, Allowable Expenditures." *Conduit Street*, 28 May 2019, [conduitstreet.mdcounties.org/2019/05/28/state-issues-new-guidance-on-campaign-contributions-allowable-expenditures/](https://conduitstreet.mdcounties.org/2019/05/28/state-issues-new-guidance-on-campaign-contributions-allowable-expenditures/).

<sup>xii</sup>Minn. Stat. §211B.12.

<sup>xiii</sup>Mass. Gen. Lawsch. 55, §6.

<sup>xiv</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xv</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xvi</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xvii</sup>11 CFR § 113.1(g)(ii).

<sup>xviii</sup>AO-13-02 OCPF.

<sup>xix</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xx</sup>AO-11-04 OCPF.

<sup>xxi</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxii</sup>11 CFR §113.1 (g)(ii).

<sup>xxiii</sup>970 C.M.R. 1.03.

<sup>xxiv</sup>Mass Gen. Lawsch. 55.

<sup>xxv</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxvi</sup>GL-18-02, GL-05-10 OCPF.

<sup>xxvii</sup>606 C.M.R. 7.02.

<sup>xxviii</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxix</sup>Cal. Gov't. Code §89513.

<sup>xxx</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxxi</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxxii</sup>Mass.Gen,Lawsch. 55,§6.

<sup>xxxiii</sup>*Id.*

<sup>xxxiv</sup>AO-92-05 OCPF.

<sup>xxxv</sup>AO-11-04 OCPF.

<sup>xxxvi</sup>AO-06-03 OCPF.

<sup>xxxvii</sup>"Data Downloads." *OCPF*, <https://www.ocpf.us/Data>.

<sup>xxxviii</sup>Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 55 §6.