Bill as Introduced

SB 30-FN – AS INTRODUCED

2003 SESSION

03-0502
03/09

SENATE BILL ***SB 30-FN***

AN ACT relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.

SPONSORS: Sen. D'Allesandro, Dist 20

COMMITTEE: Judiciary

ANALYSIS

This bill makes any person who publishes a statement about a candidate knowing the statement to be false guilty of a class A misdemeanor.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

SB 30-FN – AS INTRODUCED

03-0502
03/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 New Section; Illegal Influence; Publication of False Statement. Amend RSA 666 by inserting after section 7 the following new section:

666:7-a Publication of False Statement. Any person who publishes a statement about a candidate knowing the statement to be false shall be guilty of a class A misdemeanor.

2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

LBAO
03-0502
1/9/03

SB 30-FN - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Judicial Branch, Judicial Council, Association of Counties, and Department of Justice state this bill may increase state and county expenditures by an indeterminable amount in FY 2004 and each year thereafter. There will be no fiscal impact on state, county, and local revenue or local expenditures.

METHODOLOGY:

The Judicial Branch states this bill makes publishing a statement about a candidate, knowing the statement to be false, a class A misdemeanor. Each prosecution has the potential to be expensive for the judicial branch since a class A misdemeanor can involve a bench trial in the District Court, a de novo jury trial in the Superior Court, as well as an appeal to the Supreme Court. The fiscal impact of this bill depends on how many prosecutions are brought which cannot be determined at this time.

The Judicial Council assumes that any cases arising from the enactment of this law for which the Indigent Defense Fund may be liable, will in the first instance, be handled by the public defender or contract attorneys who accept these cases on a fixed fee basis of $250 for each misdemeanor charge. If an assigned counsel attorney must be used, the hourly rate of $60, with a fee cap of $1,000 for misdemeanor cases will apply. If a motion to exceed the fee cap is approved and/or "services other than counsel" are approved, these will also be chargeable to the Indigent Defense Fund. The Council is unable to predict the number of cases that may result from the passage of this legislation, therefore, they are unable to estimate the dollar amount of the anticipated costs of such representation.

The Association of Counties states the fiscal impact of this bill depends on the number of individuals who are sentenced to a county house of corrections as a result of this bill. The Association has estimated the average annual cost to incarcerate an individual in a county house of corrections to be $21,634.

The Department of Justice states this bill will involve the agency in additional litigation. Costs would include the production of documents, research, travel, overtime for support staff, and additional caseloads for attorneys. Exclusive of staff time, the cost of litigation averages $2,388 for civil cases and $1,351 for criminal cases. In addition, any increase in the number of complaints to the agency will increase both workload and the priority in which they are handled.

The Department of State states this bill will have no fiscal impact on their Department.

Committee Minutes

Judiciary Committee

Hearing Report

To: Members of the Senate

From: Susan Duncan
Senior Legislative Aide

Re: **SB 30** – *AN ACT relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.*

Hearing date: January 21, 2003

Members present: Senators Peterson, Foster, Clegg, Roberge and Sapareto

Members absent: None

Sponsor(s): Senator D'Allesandro

What the bill does: This bill makes any person who publishes a statement about a candidate knowing the statement to be false guilty of a class A misdemeanor.

Who supports the bill: Senator D'Allesandro

Who opposes the bill: No one spoke in opposition

Summary of testimony received:

- This legislation was filed because of the tenor that has been evident in recent political campaigns: people are "getting away" with saying anything. If this isn't addressed, it will just become more of a problem.
- It is an unacceptable situation when another candidate or group can put out abusive lies about the opposition. People should be held accountable for their actions in a campaign, just as candidates are held accountable when elected.
- Conviction of a class A misdemeanor would involve time sentenced to jail.
- In responding to the question relative to the attached fiscal note, Senator D'Allesandro noted that if justice is to be served, then it should be served – with or without a cost.

- Senator Sapareto asked if the bill should be amended to have a requirement to correct the false statement. If that is not done, then incarceration.
- Senator Sapareto suggested amending the bill with the following language:

  "Any person who publishes a statement about a candidate knowing the statement to be false and found guilty of such offense shall, within 10 days, immediately issue a public apology and clear correction in the same scope and text of the false statement. Should such person fail to take this action, he or she would be guilty of a class A misdemeanor."
- Senator D'Allesandro noted that all a person has to run on is their reputation and that it's tragic when one event can destroy it.
- Senator Clegg asked regarding the word "published" and how that would affect telemarketing-type calls and the newer technology of automated messages. Senator Foster noted that "published" covers either spoken or written communications.
- Senator Foster asked why go the route of making it a crime when one can sue the person who makes the false statement. Senator D'Allesandro responded that because the situation has gotten out of control and society is growing to accept this situation. He said it's up to the Senate to take a stand.
- Senator Foster asked if there could be a potential problem by the county attorney's office choosing not to prosecute. Senator D'Allesandro said that he hoped this wouldn't happen. He reminded the committee that the degree of difficulty in proving that a statement is false and that they knew it in advance of publishing it is still very high. In his opinion, the public's opinion of those in the elected arena is at an absolute low and that something needs to be done to clean up the process so that good people will continue to put themselves forward as candidates.

Funding: See attached fiscal note.

Future action: The committee took the bill under advisement.

sfd
[file: SB 30-FN report]
Date: January 22, 2003

Date: January 21, 2003
Time: 11:15 a.m.
Room: State House, Room 105-A

The Senate Committee on Judiciary held a hearing on the following:

SB 30-FN relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates

Members of Committee present: Senator Peterson
Senator Foster
Senator Clegg
Senator Roberge
Senator Sapareto

The Chair, Senator Peterson, opened the hearing on SB 30 by calling on Senator D'Allesandro, the prime sponsor, to provide testimony.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. For the record, I'm Senator Lou D'Allesandro representing District 20, Manchester Wards 3, 4, 10 and 11 and the Town of Goffstown.

The bill you have before you is SB 20 (sic). It is relative to the dissemination of false statements about candidates. I have been in the political arena for over thirty years as a candidate and as a supporter of candidates. I don't think I have ever seen an election like the last one that we went through. I think it is important that elections be conducted on a fair and certainly legitimate basis. By that I mean both parties have ample opportunities to look at the records of candidates and to produce those records in the method that they think is most advantageous. What I have a quarrel with is the false statements that are being issued about candidates. I could reference my own election, but I think that that would be an individual situation and I want to talk in a much broader context.

It seems to me that, because of the exposure of a candidate, people are at this point in time saying anything about a candidate, anything at all. And, under the guise of the fact that it is a legitimate situation, are getting away with it. I don't think that's appropriate. We who risk our reputations by running for public office, and I mean that, we do because we put ourselves out before the

public, the public scrutinizes us and, as a result of that, we open ourselves up. There is no question about that. I think that is a legitimate situation. Each one of us, when we decide to seek public office, understands this. But, when people put out abusive lies, I think that that's an unacceptable situation and I don't think that's part of the democratic process and I don't think that's part of the political process. People should be held accountable when they do this. They should be held accountable for their actions as we are held accountable for our actions. We are held accountable by the electorate; we are certainly held accountable by our colleagues. Everybody should be held accountable. The one aspect of this that I think is frightening is that, if this goes without someone addressing it, it will continue to escalate and it will become even more of a problem than it is right now.

I want people to look at this carefully. I want people induced into the process. I want more people to run for public office. I think it's very important that we encourage people to become involved in the process. When people fear the process because of what can happen to them personally, I think it's a real detriment to the process and, if we don't do something, that detriment will take precedence and we will have fewer and fewer people involved in the process.

I feel very strongly about this. I think it is a very legitimate situation. I think it's something that both Republicans and Democrats can be supportive of because, in essence, it protects the process. All of us are in a position where this could happen to any person seeking public office.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you. I have very strong feelings about this and might I add by saying, I have been involved in this process when it was a gentlemanly process, it really was, when our Legislature was a gentlemanly process. People never went to the well and criticized one another. That's something that has happened and I think it is as a result of things like this. We are a deliberative body. We have the largest House in the United States. It just seems to me that the character of that House really should be an elevated situation where honor, decency and respect for one another should be paramount. I have noticed the deterioration in that in the time that I have been in public office and I think it is as a result of what's happening on the street where anybody says anything about anybody and they should be held accountable for that.

Again, I thank you very, very much. I will try to answer any questions that you might have.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you, Senator. I need to testify at another hearing and I am going to ask Senator Foster if he would take

over this hearing. If I may, I would like to just ask two questions before I leave. The first is that the bill sets the penalty as a Class A misdemeanor which, my understanding, means in many instances jail time. Is that your understanding as well?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Yes.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Secondly, the worst abuses that I experienced in my own election and that I saw occurring around the state parenthetically as I had a spare moment to look were perhaps attributable in some cases, not to individuals, but to broad statements made by political parties. Exactly who would go to jail?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Well, I think it would be the person whose name is affixed to the statement. I think I take exception to what you're saying. I was involved in many campaigns where individuals, not parties, were the perpetrators. To the best of my knowledge, as this situation has exacerbated, it's individuals who are now doing this. As I say, I have been involved in elections for a long period of time and I realize that the parties do take an active role in these under the soft money committees and so forth and so on have taken an active role.

We have to do something to mitigate the negativity. I think we have to do that on a national scale. I don't know that we can accomplish this here in the New Hampshire Senate, but we can set a tone. I think that the individual aspect, because of the items that are available to individuals now in terms of their ability to access the media caused this problem and, as I say, intensify this problem. That's how I see it and certainly your point is well taken. The parties have been involved and we should be toning that down.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you, Senator. I apologize for having to leave the discussion and will return as soon as I can.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator Roberge?

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Maybe not necessarily a personal example, but can you give us an example?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Sure. For example, and I will use my own case. I sponsored a piece of legislation along with Senator Ned Gordon, along with Larry Emerton from the House, along with Joe Morgan. A piece of legislation that was requested by a state agency. This piece of legislation was to address a certain situation that developed in Manchester. That legislation was distorted, lies were perpetrated about that piece of legislation, literature

was sent out about that piece of legislation, and that inconsistency has gone on ad infinitem. Now that's one example.

Now the thing that was in place that brought relevance to that was the fact that, in the Senate, we do verbatim hearings and you can go to the transcript of those hearings and find out exactly what that legislation was all about. Important situation when you are talking about the truthfulness of a particular item. I think I testified before Judiciary on a number of occasions about people who were coming to me looking for testimony because of the fact that untruths were being told and the only way to address those was by looking at the testimony given on those pieces of legislation when they were before the Senate. That's been the situation that has been ongoing since I have been in the Senate. That is a personal example that I give you that I believe is relevant.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Have you read the fiscal note on this?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I went through it today.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Would I gather from reading the fiscal note that the justices really do not like your legislation?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Well.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: There is a pretty high ticket on it.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I think that if justice is to be served, then justice is to be served. Whether the justices concur with that, in my estimation, is irrelevant. I am here to legislate. I'm not here to react to the fact that someone else doesn't like what I'm doing. If I perceive that I am doing the right thing, I'm going to do the right thing. Now, everyone who is convicted of a crime there is a penalty and that penalty involves a cost. We have two thousand people in the New Hampshire State Prison. I'm sure that a lot of people don't like the fact that we have two thousand people in the State Prison; there are a lot of people that love the fact that we have two thousand people in the State Prison. So, you get a situation where you are going to hear from both situations. It seems to me, if we had cleaner elections, decent elections where people who ran for public office ran on their record, their record was clear, and that all of these innuendoes and persecutions that are developed against candidates could be somehow mitigated, we would have gone a long way toward achieving something that's beneficial for everybody.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator Sapareto?

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: Thank you Mr. Chairman. It would seem to me that when something like this... I think there are a couple of problems. One is, what if you have a mailing that goes out and the top of the mailing says, "Candidate so and so is a baby killer" for example. Now, that is a statement that is made on the piece of literature that is sent out. You can't attach that to the campaign, perhaps the individual. I would think the damage that is done there is during elections and swaying voters. The way I suggest is that the equivalent, say you have just done a mailing of ten thousand pieces that are going out with the cost of eight grand. The penalty for such thing would be a requirement by the court of the candidate or campaign, or whoever issued it equivalent to correct that if ordered by the court. Now there would be no fiscal note. If they failed to do so, then maybe a penalty. But it seems that the damage that is done is done to one's reputation and depending on how it is done and how it impacts the election. It seems to me that the same equivalent public saving going out would do better to correct defamation of character than incarceration that the public may not be aware of.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Well, that may be. I don't quarrel with your logic. But you talk about the damage to one's reputation. One's reputation is all one has in this life and one spends your life building your reputation, building a reputation on things you have done in the public interest if you are a public servant. I think that the tragedy is that one event misleading untrue can destroy a person's reputation. I believe the people are willing to do that today, more than willing to do that today, and they do it over and over again. We have such a high threshold as public servants. Your legal counsel will tell you that. They can almost do anything to a public official, an elected public official, and get away with it and there's too much of that. I think the time has come when we, as public officials, ought to say wait a minute, enough is enough. If we want to encourage people to run for elected public office, elective office of any kind, we ought to say to them, "listen, you don't face innuendo, lie and character assassination as a basis, as the starting point for your public life". I think people are too willing to do this today.

Now, we've got lawyers here who know much more than I what's going on in this context. I think it is very important that we say something about this because people's lives can be ruined. People's lives can be ruined. People have families, most people in public life. A woman runs for public office, she's got her children and husband. A man runs, he has children and his wife. Well, I think your family is severely damaged by some of this stuff. Again, use myself as an example. I have been in this business a long time. I have seen my family feel terrible. I have seen my wife feel threatened by this and

I think that is unconscionable. Why does that have to be part of the political process? Why? Why do we accept that? I can't understand that. I keep going in the process and I have kept going in the process.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator Clegg?

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Senator D'Allesandro, I certainly understand what you have gone through. I also know that, having watched Senator Francoeur's campaigns, I watched a group put out something that said that he was a pro abortionist and it was so outrageous it almost made you laugh, but it wasn't really funny. I guess my question to you is, and I have a series but I will be quick. The first is, what do you consider to be published? Only something that's actually on a piece of paper and handed out or would you consider a telemarketing call to be a published report?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I think there is kind of a fine line, but this piece of legislation says a published statement, a published statement. I don't know if, in the broad context, you could consider one of those phone calls a public statement. I'm not a lawyer. The phone calls have become part of the game now. We all know that when we started in this... When I first ran for public office, there was no such thing as an auto call. Who ever heard of an auto call? And those auto calls can be pretty vicious. So, the term public statement I think that has to be qualified. I assume it is a written document. But, is an auto call a public statement? I don't know.

Attorney Lehman: I think publication is communication.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: And some of those calls can be pretty vicious.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: And, my other question was, I understand, the way I read the bill, you're only looking for this to take effect during the election process and not afterwards?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: My intent is to make elections better. So, the answer to your question is yes.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: 'Cause I could kind of use it now because my daughter is a teacher and she had to go to a union meeting where they said all these nasty things about Senator Clegg and she stood up and said, "My dad never sponsored that bill and it's not one of his bills now". As you say, we are subject to just about anything.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Right. You know, Senator Clegg, having been a public official, my kids are involved in the process and your kids are involved in the process. We take a lot and there is a lot that we have tolerated. What I am saying is that escalation has been so dramatic over the past few years that the things that we used to accept have gone far beyond what I would say is acceptable.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: I agree with you.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: The press has something to do with this as well.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Sure.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Very frequently they are able to keep an issue going when it's time has gone past. What would you do about that?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Senator Roberge I have had battles with the press, particularly the statewide media over the last thirty years. The only thing I can do is outlive them. That's the only thing I can do at the present time. I can't... The press has an opportunity to do what it has to do. Hopefully, it does research on its material that is required.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: And, if they don't?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Well, we suffer.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: I know.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: And...

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: I think in many cases the press is just as guilty as probably your opponent.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I'm not specifically talking about my opponent. I am talking about any opponent.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Any opponent.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Any opponent.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: The press can be an opponent.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I understand that. I have been the victim of front-page editorials. You can have a lot of opponents, but by the same token, false statements are false statements and they have to be dealt with. We can't allow people to make false statements. That is not appropriate.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Further question. If you had a publication that was doing it in your district, how would you deal with that? Would you take the editor to task or would you take...? How would you do that?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Who is making the false statement? Again, an editorial, the press is one situation, this is an individual situation. If the press makes a false statement, you can always sue. Your chances of winning, I don't know what they are, but people have won. Richard Jay Lehman says he is not going to take the case, but I can think of a couple of instances where people have won. Litigation is a tough situation. If you get yourself involved with litigation, it is extremely problematic.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator Sapareto?

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In that context, in the case of an editorial, it seems to me a subsequent editorial with a correction on it would do more to help the character without going after the person without his knowledge. I would suggest if found guilty the analysis of the bill, "statement about a candidate knowing the statement to be false and found guilty of such offense shall, within ten days, issue a public apology and correction in the same scope and context as the false statement. Should such person fail to take this action, he shall be guilty of a class A misdemeanor." Whereas now what you've got is that you have placed the financial burden back on the entity that did the offense to make that correction. If they fail to do so within the allotted time, then maybe a misdemeanor would apply. But, in this case, it would also solve the correction of the scope of the slander. Then you have, for example, a statement if I just pass a piece of paper out to ten people that says something that is false, of course, I would have to make the correction with the same people who got the false statement. It would seem to me the correction of one's character should be of utmost importance here. The publication of that correction, the apology would certainly not cause a fiscal note.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: The correction or rebuttal are always important, but those are always put on page three in the bottom corner in one and a half type.

Senator Frank V. Sapareto, D. 19: However, this is a requirement of placing it in the exact same context. If I take out a half page ad that calls

someone, I make a false statement, then I am required to pick up the same scope and text to correct that and make a clear statement otherwise. That seems to me to be the best correction of it.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator Clegg?

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Thank you. I guess I am going to make a speech, too. All of that sounds really good, but if I am running against Lou D'Allesandro and he spends $8,000 to do something and I can put one statement that is going to cost me eight grand, but I am going to get his seat probably pretty cheap. $8,000 to ruin your reputation and then apologize for it later, but I win. I think that's what you were trying to say and I would never do that. I don't agree. I think what you're trying to say is that's what is happening. People are taking the shot knowing they are wrong because the only outcome, the only thing they have to pay for afterwards is an apology.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: If indeed they do that.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: If indeed they do that. But an apology really doesn't have any affect on whether they will do it the next time.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: That's correct.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Senator D'Allesandro, if I may. While I am sympathetic to the issue that we are trying to resolve here, I just wanted to ask a couple of questions.

Under the current laws certainly you could sue whoever makes a false statement, lie or slander. Could you tell us why you think you want to raise it to the level of a criminal penalty beyond that?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Sure. Because I think, Senator, what's happened is this situation has become, has gotten out of control. People are very reticent to take action against someone who has slandered them. They're very leery of that and find that to be a costly situation and so forth. I think that society has now, particularly as it relates to politics, has accepted this. I don't think that's right. And, as I said, I can only equate it to the demeanor that we have in our elected bodies today. When I came to the House of Representatives in 1972 there was mutual respect by both parties for one another, mutual respect by the individuals for one another. I have seen that deterioration and as a result of that, I find that very disconcerting. That's why I proposed the legislation.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: One follow up question if I may. This presumably would be prosecuted by the county attorneys' offices who themselves are politically elected. Do you see any concerns about selective prosecutions or that sort of thing under the circumstances?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Well, there are problems with everything in this life. So, one has to say that hopefully that wouldn't happen. I can only relate to our county, Hillsborough County, where we have an awful situation that exists right now. How do you deal with that? I don't see where selective prosecution would be a problem. I really don't. This is a very difficult situation to begin with, even with the enacting of this piece of legislation if indeed it passes, that the degree of difficulty is still high. I equate this to a high dive off of the board. Degree of difficulty ten.

This is a very difficult situation, yet we have got to do something because the public's opinion of us as political figures is at an absolutely ebb. You can't go any lower. Why do they have such disdain for us? I am talking about us in a very global sense. Because they say they are lying all the time. Well, who feeds that? That's fed by a public that believes. Why do they believe it? Because they hear it over and over and over again. When is the last time, when is the first time you have heard somebody defending a Senator or a Representative based on their character, their integrity and them being straightforward and telling the truth?

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: That wasn't a relative.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: That wasn't a relative, a close relative at that. It's awful.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Thank you. Any further questions?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I appreciate the opportunity to be before you. Thank you very much.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Anybody else who is here to testify on SB 30? I will close the hearing.

Hearing concluded at 11:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Gail Brown
Senate Secretary
1/27/2003

Speakers

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Date 1/21/03 Time 10:45 a.m. Public Hearing on **SB 30**

Relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates

Please check box(es) that apply.

SPEAKING	FAVOR	OPPOSED	NAME (Please print)	REPRESENTING
☒	☐	☐	SEN. D'ALESSANDRO	Dist. # 20
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date:

THE COMMITTEE ON Judiciary

to which was referred Senate Bill SB 30

AN ACT relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.

VOTE: 4-0

Having considered the same, report the same with the following resolution:
Resolved, that it is: **INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE.**

Senator Joseph A. Foster
For the Committee

SB30 Docket

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Bill Title: relative to dissemination of false statements about candidates.

Date	Body	Description
1/9/2003	S	Introduced and Ref. to Judiciary; SJ 2, Pg.24
1/14/2003	S	Hearing; January 21, 2003, Room 105-A, SH, 11:15 a.m.; SC3
1/31/2003	S	Committee Report; Inexpedient to Legislate [02/06/03]; SC7, Pg.2
2/6/2003	S	Inexpedient to Legislate, MA, VV === KILLED ===; SJ 4, Pg.44

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Docket Abbreviations