
■

The Cost of Running for the North Carolina Legislature

AN ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE
CAMPAIGN FINANCES DURING THE
1992 ELECTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA

■

BY
KIM KEBSCHULL OTTEN
AND
TOM MATHER



A REPORT BY
THE NORTH CAROLINA CENTER FOR PUBLIC POLICY RESEARCH

SEPTEMBER 1993



North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research

The North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research is an independent, non-profit organization dedicated to the goals of a better informed public and more effective, accountable, and responsive government. The Center identifies public policy issues facing North Carolina and enriches the dialogue among citizens, the media, and policymakers. Based on its research, the Center makes recommendations for improving the way government serves the people of this state. In all its efforts, the Center values reliable and objective research as a basis for analyzing public policy, independence from partisan bias and political ideology, the richness of the state's diverse population, and a belief in the importance of citizen involvement in public life.

The Center was formed in 1977 by a diverse group of private citizens "for the purpose of gathering, analyzing, and disseminating information concerning North Carolina's institutions of government." It is a non-partisan organization guided by a self-elected Board of Directors and has individual and corporate members across the state.

Center projects include the issuance of special reports on major policy questions; the publication of a quarterly magazine called *North Carolina Insight*; joint productions of public affairs television programs with the University of North Carolina Center for Public Television; and the regular participation of members of the staff and the Board in public affairs programs around the state. An attempt is made in the various projects undertaken by the Center to synthesize the thoroughness of scholarly research with the readability of good journalism. Each Center publication represents an effort to amplify conflicting ideas on the subject under study and to reach conclusions based on sound rationalization of these competing ideas.

Published by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research, Inc. (a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation), P.O. Box 430, 5 West Hargett St., Suite 701, Raleigh, N.C. 27602. Telephone (919) 832-2839. Annual membership rates: Individual, \$36; Organizational, \$50; Supporting, \$100; Corporate, \$200; Full-Service, \$250; Supporting Corporate, \$500; Patron, \$1000; Benefactor, \$2000. The Center is supported in part by grants from the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation and the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, as well as by 113 corporate contributors and 750 organizational and individual members across the state.

The Cost of Running for the North Carolina Legislature

AN ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE
CAMPAIGN FINANCES DURING THE
1992 ELECTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA


A Report by Kim Keschull Otten and Tom Mather

© North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research
September 1993

The Cost of Running for the North Carolina Legislature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. The Cost of Running for the North Carolina Legislature	5
II. Summary Tables	
Table 1: Total Raised and Spent by <i>All</i> House and Senate Candidates, 1992 Elections	23
Table 2: <i>Total</i> Raised and Spent by Senate Candidates, 1992 Elections	24
Table 3: <i>Total</i> Raised and Spent by House Candidates, 1992 Elections	25
Table 4: <i>Average</i> Raised and Spent by Senate Candidates, 1992 Elections	26
Table 5: <i>Average</i> Raised and Spent by House Candidates, 1992 Elections	28
III. District-by-District Financing for All State Senate Candidates, 1992 Elections	30
IV. N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections	
Table A-1: Winning Senate Candidates	38
Table A-2: Losing Senate Candidates	40
Table A-3: Winning Senate Incumbents	41
Table A-4: New Senate Members	42
Table A-5: Winning Senate Democrats	43
Table A-6: Winning Senate Republicans	44
Table A-7: Winning Senate Men	45
Table A-8: Winning Senate Women	46
Table A-9: Winning Open Seat Candidates	47
Table A-10: Losing Open Seat Candidates	47
V. District-by-District Financing for All State House Candidates, 1992 Election	48
VI. N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections	
Table B-1: Winning House Candidates	66
Table B-2: Losing House Candidates	69
Table B-3: Winning House Incumbents	71
Table B-4: New House Members	73
Table B-5: Winning House Democrats	75
Table B-6: Winning House Republicans	77
Table B-7: Winning House Men	79
Table B-8: Winning House Women	82
Table B-9: Winning Open Seat Candidates	83
Table B-10: Losing Open Seat Candidates	84



Karen Tam

The Cost of Running for the North Carolina Legislature

AN ANALYSIS OF LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN FINANCES DURING THE 1992 ELECTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA

by Kim Kebschull Otten and Tom Mather

In this study, the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research looks at legislative campaign finances in the 1992 North Carolina elections. The study is a supplement to the ninth edition of Article II, the guide to the legislature that the Center began publishing during the 1977-78 General Assembly. The two publications reveal three major findings: 1) the cost of campaigning is going up; 2) political action committees are becoming an ever-increasing source of campaign contributions; and 3) the demographic makeup of the legislature is continuing to change, with groups such as bankers, blacks, educators, and women growing in numbers.

The price of a seat in the N.C. General Assembly has more than doubled over the past eight years, with political action committees paying a growing share of the tab, the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research has found in a review of legislative campaign finances. Candidates who won seats in the state legislature in the 1992 elections raised \$21,482 on average for their campaigns, up from \$16,941 in 1988 and \$9,075 in 1984, the Center found in its study.¹

Campaign spending and contributions from political action committees have been going up across the country, and the Center's study found that North Carolina is no exception.² In fact, the average amounts spent by House and Senate winners actually exceeded their annual legislative salaries—\$13,026 a year in the 1993-94 session.³ (See

Tables A and B, pp. 8-9.) The Center's study also under-counts the total campaign contributions and spending because it only includes numbers for the 1992 calendar year.

"It's staggering just to see the amounts of money raised and spent by the candidates," says Ran Coble, the Center's executive director. "The total raised by all candidates was about \$4.7 million and the total spent was about \$4.5 million. That's a lot of money."

In comparing its findings with previous studies by *The Charlotte Observer*,⁴ the Center found that the influence of political action committees, or PACs, has increased almost as much as the cost of running legislative campaigns. For instance, the study showed that PAC contributions accounted for nearly half (47 percent) of the money raised by winning candidates in 1992—up from about one-fourth in the 1984 elections. House Speaker Dan Blue (D-Wake) says PACs have become a much more potent force over the past decade. "They've organized," Blue says. "From the early 1980s to the late '80s, they proliferated. Every organization that was anybody started forming PACs."

The study of campaign finances is a supplement to the Center's latest edition of *Article II: A Guide to the 1993-94 N.C. Legislature*. The pocket-sized book is the largest and most com-

Kim Kebschull Otten was the Center's senior policy analyst from May 1989 to May 1993, when she moved to Charleston, South Carolina. Tom Mather is associate editor of North Carolina Insight.

plete guide to the General Assembly. It contains pictures, voting records, committee assignments, effectiveness rankings, and biographical and occupational information on all 170 members of the N.C. House and Senate.

Article II also contains information on trends in the overall make-up of the legislature. The most significant change the guide shows is in legislative turnover, with the 1993 General Assembly having one of the highest proportions of new members in sessions spanning the past two decades. The turnover ratio of 29 percent for the House and the Senate combined is the highest since 1985 (34 percent) and second highest since 1975 (41 percent).

"Turnover was a lot higher because of redistricting, legislators running for higher office, and an unusual number of retirements," says Coble. "That opened up a lot of seats." For example, Reps. Vernon Abernathy, Doris Huffman, Harry Payne, and Dennis Wicker ran for statewide office, while Rep. Johnathan Rhyne and Sens. Ken Royall, Henson Barnes, and William Goldston retired.



Cost of Campaigning Goes Up

The Center's study of campaign financing was based on a review of all contributions and expenditures made between January 1 and December 31, 1992. Although some candidates raise and spend money outside the election year, the Center included only 1992 figures for the sake of consistency.⁵

Legislative candidates in total raised slightly more money, \$4,708,515, than they spent, \$4,544,376. By and large, the amount of money raised and spent by candidates was most highly related to the competitiveness of their races—either in the primaries or in the general election. Candidates who spent a lot of money on their campaigns generally were either newcomers vying for open seats, newcomers challenging incumbents, or incumbents holding off strong challengers. There also were wide differences in the results if one compares winners with losers, incumbents with new members, and Senators with House members. (See Tables A and B, pp. 8–9.) Other significant findings were:

■ **Legislative election winners not only attracted more votes, but dollars.** Winning candidates in both chambers raised a total of \$3,651,944—more than three times the losers' total of \$1,058,303. In the Senate, winners out-raised losers by \$1.1 million, or \$1,552,548 to \$412,185. In the House, winners out-raised losers by \$1.4 million, or \$2,099,396 to \$646,118.

The legislature's leading money-raiser, Sen. George Daniel (D-Caswell), took in \$177,149—eight times more than his general election opponent, Hubert Lowe of Alamance County. In the House, the leading money-raiser, newcomer David Miner (R-Wake), took in \$89,544—nearly three times more than his opponent, incumbent Rep. Larry Jordan (D-Wake). (See Tables C and D, pp. 14–15.)⁶

"THEY'VE ORGANIZED. FROM THE EARLY 1980S TO THE LATE '80S, THEY PROLIFERATED. EVERY ORGANIZATION THAT WAS ANYBODY STARTED FORMING PACS."

—HOUSE SPEAKER DAN BLUE (D-WAKE)



"THE REASON I NEEDED TO RAISE A LOT OF MONEY IS THAT I WAS RUNNING AGAINST AN INCUMBENT—IT'S THAT SIMPLE. I KNEW MY OPPONENT WOULD RECEIVE A LOT OF PAC MONEY—AND HE DID."

—REP. DAVID MINER (R-WAKE)

■ **Election losers didn't just lose votes—they also lost money.** Overall, legislative winners raised \$238,540 more than they spent, while losers spent \$74,401 more than they raised. Senate losers on average spent 8.4 percent more money than they raised, while House losers spent 16.4 percent more than they raised. By contrast, Senate winners spent 12.5 percent less than they raised and House winners nearly broke even—spending a mere 0.4 percent more than they raised.

In the House, Lanier Cansler of Asheville spent \$52,357—nearly 40 percent more than he raised—in losing to Speaker Pro Tem Marie Colton (D-Buncombe). In the Senate, Republican challenger Gerald Hewitt of Forsyth County spent \$21,591—66 percent more than he raised—in losing to Democratic incumbents Ted Kaplan and Marvin Ward for one of the 20th District's two seats.

■ **New members spent much more money than incumbents in winning seats in both chambers.** On average, new members spent \$36,720 for a Senate seat and \$19,895 for a House seat, compared with \$25,236 for Senate incumbents and \$15,043 for House incumbents. Winners of open races, in which no incumbents were running, spent even more money—an average of \$20,858 in the House.

In both chambers, two of the top five money-spenders were newcomers. In the Senate, David Hoyle (D-Gaston) ranked second and Linda Gunter

ranked fourth in amount of money spent by winning candidates. In the House, David Miner and Dewey Hill (D-Columbus) ranked first and second, respectively, in the amount spent by winners. "The reason I needed to raise a lot of money is that I was running against an incumbent—it's that simple," Miner says. "I knew my opponent would receive a lot of PAC money—and he did."

■ **Senate races were nearly twice as expensive as House races.** Candidates spent \$27,992 on average to win a Senate seat, compared to \$16,782 for a House seat. That difference is understandable given that Senate districts generally are larger and more populous than House districts, presumably resulting in higher advertising and travel expenses.⁷

Sen. Daniel, for example, spent \$125,286—\$23,098 more than the biggest-spending House winner, Rep. Miner. In his *losing* quest for the 36th Senate seat, Republican hopeful and former House member Paul "Skip" Stam spent more money than *any* House candidate except Rep. Miner. Stam, a Wake County attorney, spent \$82,567 in losing to Sen. Linda Gunter (D-Wake). He attributes the high spending in that race to keen competition, in both the primary and the general elections. "Each of us had a contested primary," says Stam, who spent more than any other losing legislative candidate and more than all but three winning candi-

—continues on page 10

Table A. Average Costs of Running for the N.C. House, 1992 Elections ¹

1990 figures in (), if available

House Category	Average				
	Amount Raised	Amount From PACs ²	Percentage From PACs	Amount Spent	% Spent of Amount Raised
All Candidates	\$14,441	\$6,057	45.2%	\$14,244	106.4%
Winners	\$17,495 (\$21,433)	\$7,929 (\$8,567)	54.4% (44.9%)	\$16,782 (\$18,971)	100.4% (86.9%)
Losers	\$9,100	\$2,822	29.7%	\$9,777	116.4%
Incumbents	\$16,756 (\$19,858)	\$9,484 (\$9,373)	64.8% (50.8%)	\$15,043 (\$17,280)	93.2% (85.6%)
New Members	\$18,818 (\$27,732)	\$5,144 (\$5,344)	35.9% (21.3%)	\$19,895 (\$25,737)	113.4% (92.2%)
Democrats	\$16,863 (\$21,668)	\$7,896 (\$8,691)	54.9% (44.3%)	\$16,038 (\$19,849)	100.7% (89.2%)
Republicans	\$18,669 (\$20,945)	\$7,989 (\$8,312)	53.5% (46.2%)	\$18,162 (\$17,147)	99.9% (82.3%)
Men	\$17,375 (\$22,629)	\$7,955 (\$9,082)	55.4% (45.3%)	\$16,659 (\$19,816)	103.4% (86.6%)
Women	\$17,975 (\$15,455)	\$7,825 (\$5,996)	50.3% (43.1%)	\$17,274 (\$14,748)	88.7% (88.6%)
All Open Seat Candidates	\$14,630	\$3,807	28.7%	\$15,547	118.0%
Open Seat Winners	\$19,851	\$5,231	35.4%	\$20,858	119.6%
Open Seat Losers	\$6,231	\$1,516	17.9%	\$7,003	115.5%

¹ Based on contributions reported by all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² PACs = Political Action Committees. PAC numbers include contributions from political party PACs.

Table B. Average Costs of Running for the N.C. Senate, 1992 Elections ¹

1990 figures in (), if available

Senate Category	Average				
	Amount Raised	Amount From PACs	Percentage From PACs	Amount Spent	% Spent of Amount Raised
All Candidates	\$22,583	\$9,613	41.0%	\$21,127	96.4%
Winners	\$31,051 (\$31,123)	\$15,190 (\$11,002)	58.1% (44.3%)	\$27,992 (\$28,624)	87.5% (87.8%)
Losers	\$11,140	\$2,077	18.0%	\$11,852	108.4%
Incumbents	\$29,341 (\$27,571)	\$16,557 (\$11,887)	65.7% (50.2%)	\$25,236 (\$25,047)	83.7% (85.3%)
New Members	\$36,467 (\$43,715)	\$10,864 (\$7,862)	33.9% (23.4%)	\$36,720 (\$41,308)	99.3% (96.7%)
Democrats	\$35,039 (\$30,894)	\$16,637 (\$12,025)	54.9% (46.7%)	\$32,360 (\$28,153)	93.9% (87.1%)
Republicans	\$16,913 (\$31,710)	\$10,062 (\$8,370)	69.3% (38.1%)	\$12,506 (\$29,835)	64.5% (87.8%)
Men	\$30,379 (\$30,909)	\$15,161 (\$8,370)	58.9% (38.1%)	\$26,949 (\$29,835)	86.4% (87.8%)
Women	\$35,177 (\$33,046)	\$15,372 (\$11,417)	52.8% (44.4%)	\$34,402 (\$26,596)	94.2% (85.1%)
All Open Seat Candidates	\$27,008	\$7,690	31.4%	\$27,740	101.9%
Open Seat Winners	\$36,467	\$10,864	33.9%	\$36,720	99.3%
Open Seat Losers	\$15,658	\$3,881	28.6%	\$16,964	105.1%

¹ Based on contributions reported by all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² PACs = Political Action Committees. PAC numbers include contributions from political party PACs.

dates. "I don't know what Linda [Gunter] spent, but I spent about \$30,000 through the primary alone."

■ *The amount of money raised by legislative candidates was not consistently related to political affiliation.* In the House, Republican candidates on average out-raised Democrats by more than 10 percent, or \$18,669 to \$16,863. But in the Senate, Democrats out-raised Republicans on average by more than a 2:1 margin—\$35,039 to \$16,913.

In both chambers, however, Democrats dominated the list of top money-raisers. (See Tables C and D, pp. 14–15.) Democrats accounted for seven of the top 10 money-raisers in the House and eight of the top 10 in the Senate—perhaps reflecting more competitive primary elections in their party. For instance, Sen. David Parnell (D-Robeson) says his toughest opponent was another Democrat in the primary election. "My opponent spent a lot of money, so we had to spend a lot of money too," says Parnell, a six-term Senator and former House member. "I've never spent that kind of money [in a campaign] before."

■ *Female candidates were better fundraisers in both chambers, but not by a large margin.* In the House, women raised \$17,975 on average, compared to \$17,375 for male candidates. The difference was even wider in the Senate, with female candidates raising \$35,177 on average, compared to \$30,379 for men.

Among the Senate candidates, three of the top 10 money-raisers were women—Gunter, Leslie Winner (D-Mecklenburg County), and Mary Seymour (D-Guilford). Gunter says she found fund-raising the most difficult aspect of running a

campaign, and was shocked when she found out that she had raised more money than any female legislator and all but a few men. "I couldn't believe it when I added it all up," says Gunter, who raised \$59,758. "I was just floored because nine people gave me \$300 or more. That's wonderful because it shows the wide base of support that I had. With an average contribution of \$35, that's a lot of people." In the House, losing Republican candidate Wilma Sherrill of Buncombe County was the only woman among the top 10 money-raisers.

Campaign Costs Going Up Across The Nation

The rising cost of state legislative campaigns is a nationwide trend, with many states surpassing the increase in North Carolina.⁸ For example, the average amount spent on Senate campaigns in the state of Washington in the 1990 election was \$111,183—more than five times higher than the North Carolina average of \$21,127 in 1992.

Tommy Neal, a campaign reform and elections specialist with the National Conference of State Legislatures, attributes the increases to several factors: inflating campaign expenditures (e.g., mail, advertising, staff salaries); greater professionalism, with more lawmakers claiming 'legis-



"MY OPPONENT SPENT A LOT OF MONEY, SO WE HAD TO SPEND A LOT OF MONEY TOO. I'VE NEVER SPENT THAT KIND OF MONEY [IN A CAMPAIGN] BEFORE."

—SEN. DAVID PARNELL (D-ROBESON)

lators' as their primary occupation; the increased difficulty of unseating incumbents, requiring more spending by challengers; and, greater spending by PACs and other groups in elections preceding or following reapportionments.

"Records are set to be broken," Neal wrote in the May 1992 issue of *State Legislatures*. "And when it comes to breaking campaign spending records for state legislature seats, it happens every two or four years."⁹

Spiraling costs have prompted a number of states to place limits and restrictions on campaign contributions.¹⁰ The Center's 1990 report, *Campaign Disclosure Laws*, listed four major reasons for putting limits on the amount individuals or groups can contribute: to encourage candidates to seek a wide variety of funding sources; to diminish the influence of large contributors or interest groups; to reduce the appearance of a corrupting link between contributions and pending legislation; and to slow the rising costs of campaigns.¹¹

Another critical link in campaign finance reform has been legislation requiring candidates to disclose the sources of their contributions. As the national public interest group Common Cause concluded in a 1993 study: "Disclosure continues to be a basic element of campaign finance reform. Campaign disclosure statutes play a vital role in enabling the public to trace candidate contributions to their sources and revealing the potential influence of large donors."¹²

PACs Increase Contributions to Legislative Campaigns

A key focus of the Center's study of campaign finances was the relative importance of PACs, or Political Action Committees.¹³ PACs are legal devices that allow corporations, labor unions, and other organizations to raise large sums of money and channel it into political campaigns. State law prohibits corporations, unions, and other groups from contributing directly to campaigns.¹⁴ The law also prohibits PACs, like individual citizens, from giving candidates more than \$4,000 per election.¹⁵ But PACs can organize fundraising drives among corporate officers, employees, or interest groups, and then distribute that money to sympathetic candidates.

PAC contributions are important because they tend to favor incumbents, and incumbents tend to win elections. For example, in the 1992 North Carolina elections, all of the 39 Senate incumbents who sought re-election won; in the House, 90



Senate President Pro-Tem Marc Basnight (D-Dare) supports lower limits on individual and PAC contributions to legislative candidates.

percent (78) of the 87 representatives who sought re-election won.¹⁶ A recent study of campaign financing in North Carolina found that the ratio of PAC contributions to incumbents compared to challengers is about 2:1 for Democrats and nearly 8:1 for Republicans.¹⁷ A number of studies have found similar trends in other states and at the national level.¹⁸

"The trend in the past two decades has been one of a steady increase in PAC contributions and a relative decrease in individual contributions for state elections," Keon Chi writes in a recent issue of *State Trends & Forecasts*.¹⁹ "... The rapid growth of PACs may be interpreted as evidence of the weakened roles of political parties in elections."

The Center's latest study showed that incumbent candidates in the North Carolina legislature received twice as much of their funding from PACs as did new members. (See Tables A and B, pp. 8-9.) In comparable studies, *The Charlotte Observer* found that PACs accounted for about 25 percent of the money contributed to state legisla-

“THERE’S A LARGE GROUP OF WOMEN WHO ARE INTERESTED IN PROMOTING LEGISLATION THAT DIRECTLY IMPACTS THEM. THE MARITAL RAPE BILL IS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF THAT.”

—SEN. MARY SEYMOUR (D-GUILFORD)

tive campaigns in 1984 and about 37 percent in 1988.²⁰ The Center’s study found that PAC contributions had increased to 47 percent of the total for winning candidates in the 1992 elections. (The Center included political party PACs in its compilation of PAC contributions, but *The Charlotte Observer* did not. The *Observer* also counted all contributions made during the 1983–84 and 1987–88 campaign seasons, whereas the Center only counted contributions made during the 1992 calendar year.) Other key findings in the Center’s study were:

■ **PACs contributed much more to incumbents than to new members.** In total, PACs contributed \$1,359,452 to incumbents—nearly four times the \$351,539 that they gave to new members. Looked at another way, Senate and House incumbents received nearly two-thirds of their money on average from PACs, compared to about one-third for new members.

In the House, the 10 candidates who received the most PAC contributions were all incumbents. In the Senate, incumbents accounted for eight of the 10 candidates who received the most PAC contributions. (See Tables E and F, p. 16.) For example, Sen. Daniel raised \$59,628 from PACs—more money than any other legislative candidate and 13 times more than his opponent.

Most legislators acknowledge the advantage of incumbency in raising PAC money. Mary Seymour, who raised the second highest amount of PAC contributions in the Senate, attributes much of her success to her long legislative tenure—including three terms in the Senate and four in the House. “A lot of legislators actively solicit PAC contributions; I did not,” says Seymour, while noting that another factor has been her membership on important committees dealing with insurance, utilities, and other business concerns. “I’ve handled a lot of bills that have affected just about every kind of business in North Carolina over the years. I think they’ve found that I’m a reasonable person that they can sit down with and work out reasonable compromises. I don’t feel like I’ve had



any pressure put on me by any of my contributors.”

■ **Election winners attracted much more PAC money than did losers.** For all candidates, PACs accounted for 47 percent of the money raised by winners and 26 percent of the amount raised by losers. In the House, winners on average received 54 percent of their money from PACs, compared to 30 percent for losers. The disparities were even larger in the Senate. Winning senators on average received 58 percent of their funding from PACs, compared to just 18 percent for losers. “Normally, the one who is judged to be the prospective winner attracts PACs more so than a prospective loser,” Sen. Pamell says.

■ **PAC contributions by political affiliation varied from the House to the Senate.** In the House, Democrats and Republicans received approximately the same proportion of their contributions from PACs, slightly more than half, on average. But in the Senate, Republicans depended much more heavily on PAC contributions. Senate Republicans received 69 percent of their funds on average from PACs, compared to about 55 percent for Democrats.

However, virtually all of the legislators who raised the most PAC money were Democrats. (See Tables E and F, p. 16.) In the Senate, the top 10



Sen. Linda Gunter (D-Wake) found fundraising the most difficult aspect of running a campaign, and was shocked to discover that she had raised more money than any female legislator and all but a few men.

raisers of PAC money were all Democrats. In the House, nine of the top-10 raisers of PAC money were Democrats. "That's because the Democrats are the ones in power," says House Speaker Dan Blue (D-Wake). "You would observe the same kind of trend with contributions to Governor Jim Martin in the 1988 election. But that's not unusual. People contribute to people who they think are or will be significantly influential."

■ **Male legislators depended on PAC contributions more than the women in both chambers.** Senate men received about 59 percent of their money on average from PACs, compared to 53 percent for women. In the House, men received about 55 percent of their money from PACs, compared to 50 percent for women. Senators Gunter and Seymour were the only female legislators to make the list of top-10 raisers of PAC money in either chamber. Both Gunter and Seymour note that much of their PAC money came from organizations promoting "women's issues," such as equal rights for women, penalties for marital rape, and freedom of choice in abortion. "There's a large group of women who are interested in promoting legislation that directly impacts them," Seymour says. "The marital rape bill is a good example of that."

PACs Look For 'Known Quantities'

The increasing importance of PAC contributions has caused some critics to question whether the groups play too big a role in the electoral process. Jeff Parsons, chair of the governing board for Common Cause of North Carolina, says that growing PAC contributions have fueled the rise in campaign costs and bolstered incumbents' already formidable advantage in elections. "That really makes it difficult for a challenger to have any kind of a chance," says Parsons, who favors smaller limits on campaign contributions. "There's something to be said for lower [contribution] amounts. If we lowered it down to \$2,000 or \$1,000—both for individuals and for PACs—it would even the playing field."

But representatives of leading Political Action Committees in North Carolina say there's a simple reason for the increase in PAC contributions to legislative campaigns. "There's a lot more PACs now than there used to be—that's the primary reason," says Barbara Clapp, director of the N.C. Realtors PAC, which gave \$51,900 to legislative campaigns in 1992. The Greensboro-based group has been one of largest contributors to legislative campaigns over the past decade, but Clapp says her group hasn't increased its campaign donations. "As far as increasing our individual amounts, we haven't," she says. "We've been pretty consistent—ranging from \$500 to \$1,500 per individual. We're not giving any more per candidate now than we did in 1988."

Ann Hale, executive director of the N.C. Medical Society Political Education and Action Committee, agrees with that assessment. Another factor, she says, is the general apathy toward politics. "If the public, as individuals, would get involved in legislative races, then the PAC contributions would be proportionately less," Hale says. "A lot of people don't even know who their legislators are."

PAC representatives, likewise, say there's a simple explanation for why most PAC money goes to incumbents. "An incumbent is a known

Table C. Top Money-Raisers, N.C. House Candidates ¹

Representative ² (Party-County)	Total Money Raised	% PAC Money of Total
1. David Miner (R-Wake)	\$89,544	4%
2. Dan Blue (D-Wake)	\$86,778	61%
3. Lyons Gray (R-Forsyth)	\$54,864	24%
4. Martin Nesbitt (D-Buncombe)	\$49,864	57%
5. Robert Hunter (D-McDowell)	\$48,753	38%
6. James Black (D-Mecklenburg)	\$48,475	26%
7. George Miller (D-Durham)	\$47,179	60%
8. Phil Baddour (D-Wayne)	\$43,384	19%
9. Richard Moore (D-Vance)	\$41,869	29%
10. Wilma Sherrill (R-Buncombe)	\$41,750	4%

¹ Based on contributions reported by all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² Six of the top 10 PAC money-raisers were incumbents. The exceptions were Baddour, Miner, Moore, and Sherrill. Rep. Baddour defeated Republican hopeful Helig Hoffman of Lenoir County. Rep. Miner defeated Democratic incumbent Larry Jordan of Wake County. Rep. Moore defeated Republican hopefuls Louis "Ed" Nicholson of Halifax County and Robert Rector of Franklin County for one of two 22nd District seats. Sherrill lost her bid for one of three seats in the 51st District, all of which were won by incumbents: Nesbitt, Speaker Pro Tem Marie Colton (D-Buncombe), and Narvel J. Crawford (D-Buncombe).

quantity," Hale says. "That doesn't mean that somebody has to agree with you 100 percent of the time, because nobody does. The new folks don't always go to the effort to let the PACs know who they are. It's not that we have a bias against new folks running. But if you've got a friend who's willing to listen, that's kind of a burden for new folks to overcome. We're eager for information

"I don't think PACs, per se, are the problem. PAC money is identifiable and has some limits."

—PAUL PULLEY, CHAIR,
N.C. ACADEMY OF TRIAL LAWYERS PAC

from anybody running for office—because we want to support the best person we can." The Realtors PAC supports newcomers as well as incumbents, but Clapp acknowledges that office-holders often have an edge. "Generally, we go with the incumbent if he's doing a good job and we have an open-door relationship with him," she says.

Despite such trends, PAC representatives see nothing sinister or worrisome in the increasing percentage of campaign contributions coming from their groups. "I don't think PACs, per se, are the problem," says Paul Pulley, a former legislator and lobbyist who chairs the N.C. Academy of Trial Lawyers PAC. "PAC money is identifiable and has some limits. There are things a lot worse than PAC money, in my opinion, such as bundling.

"The increasing cost of campaigning and the increasing importance of funding for campaigns should be a concern for all of us," Pulley says.

Table D. Top Money-Raisers, N.C. Senate Candidates ¹

Senator ² (Party-County)	Total Money Raised	% PAC Money of Total
1. George Daniel (D-Caswell)	\$177,149	34%
2. David Hoyle (D-Gaston)	\$86,083	16%
3. Skip Stam (R-Wake)	\$80,112	18%
4. Robert Pittenger (R-Mecklenburg)	\$80,049	3%
5. Linda Gunter (D-Wake)	\$59,758	38%
6. Leslie Winner (D-Mecklenburg)	\$59,640	18%
7. David Parnell (D-Robeson)	\$52,903	46%
8. J.K. Sherron (D-Wake)	\$47,719	49%
9. Clark Plexico (D-Henderson)	\$46,878	46%
10. Mary Seymour (D-Guilford)	\$42,304	61%

¹ Based on contributions reported by all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² Five of the top 10 money-raisers were incumbents: Daniel, Parnell, Sherron, Plexico, and Seymour. Gunter defeated Stam for an open seat in 36th District. Hoyle won an open seat in 25th District, and Winner captured an open seat in the 40th District. Pittenger lost to incumbent Sen. James Richardson (D-Mecklenburg).

“Recently we had a fairly glaring example reported in the newspapers, where one candidate for lieutenant governor received almost a half-million dollars from four contributors, apparently through contributions that circumvented the law.”²¹

House Speaker Dan Blue shares Pulley’s concern about campaign-finance loopholes, such as bundling—in which corporations and professions can avoid contribution limits and disguise large donations by lumping together large numbers of individual contributions from employees. But he says disclosure requirements and limits on contributions generally prevent PACs from wielding undue influence. Blue also points out some apparent contradictions: PACs with differing goals often contribute money to the same candidates, and individual PACs often contribute to opposing candidates. “They just try to cover the waterfront,” Blue says.

“The primary reasons for limiting campaign contributions are to give challengers a fair, if not equal, chance of competing in elections and, perhaps more importantly, to restore public confidence in government by reducing the influence of money in election campaigns.”

—KEON CHI,
THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS

Table E. Top PAC Recipients, N.C. House Candidates ¹

Representative ² (Party-County)	PAC Money Received	Percent of Total Raised
1. Dan Blue (D-Wake)	\$53,206	61%
2. Martin Nesbitt (D-Buncombe)	\$28,412	57%
3. George Miller (D-Durham)	\$28,258	60%
4. E. David Redwine (D-Brunswick)	\$22,700	65%
5. George Robinson (R-Caldwell)	\$20,000	67%
6. Ronnie Smith (D-Carteret)	\$19,975	68%
7. David Diamont (D-Surry)	\$18,509	70%
8. Narvel J. Crawford (D-Buncombe)	\$18,475	47%
9. Robert C. Hunter (D-McDowell)	\$18,362	38%
10. Larry Jordan ³ (D-Wake)	\$17,359	56%

¹ Based on contributions from Political Action Committees to all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² All of the top 10 PAC recipients were incumbents.

³ Rep. Jordan was defeated in the 1992 election by Republican challenger David Miner of Wake County.

Table F. Top PAC Recipients, N.C. Senate Candidates ¹

Senator ² (Party-County)	PAC Money Received	Percent of Total Raised
1. George Daniel (D-Caswell)	\$59,628	34%
2. Mary Seymour (D-Guilford)	\$25,923	61%
3. David Parnell (D-Robeson)	\$24,150	46%
4. Ralph Hunt (D-Durham)	\$24,084	84%
5. J.K. Sherron (D-Wake)	\$23,354	49%
6. Joe Johnson (D-Wake)	\$23,029	75%
7. Linda Gunter (D-Wake)	\$22,646	38%
8. Marc Basnight (D-Dare)	\$22,641	57%
9. R.C. Soles (D-Columbus)	\$22,350	70%
10. Ollie Harris (D-Cleveland)	\$21,361	85%

¹ Based on contributions from Political Action Committees to all candidates during the 1992 calendar year.

² All of the top 10 PAC recipients were incumbents, except Gunter and Harris. The top Republican recipients of PAC money were: Sen. James Forrester of Gaston County, who received \$18,450 (53%), and Paul "Skip" Stam of Wake County, who received \$14,455 (18%) in his race against Gunter.

House Minority Leader David Balmer (R-Mecklenburg) says the Republican gains in the House are particularly important because Democrats no longer have enough votes to suspend the rules and rush bills through the chamber.



Senate President Pro Tem Marc Basnight (D-Dare), however, favors lower limits on individual and PAC contributions. "Your limits ought to come down—maybe to \$2,000 or somewhere around there," says Basnight, who wants the legislature to create a bipartisan commission to review all of the state's election laws.²² "The laws are just a hodgepodge." A 1990 Center study found that North Carolina was one of 16 states that allowed PAC contributions exceeding \$2,000 per candidate.²³ The study also found that 25 states permit unlimited PAC contributions.

According to The Council of State Governments, a growing number of states have been placing stricter limits on PAC contributions.²⁴ As Chi writes: "The primary reasons for limiting campaign contributions are to give challengers a fair, if not equal, chance of competing in elections and, perhaps more importantly, to restore public confidence in government by reducing the influence of money in election campaigns."²⁵

Some Demographic Trends Hold, Others Reverse

The demographic make-up of the legislature reported by the Center in the 1993-94 edition of *Article II* shows the continuation of a key, long-term trend: the declining numbers of white male Democrats in the legislature.²⁶ (See Table G, p. 18.) Overall, the party affiliation remained unchanged at 117 Democrats (69 percent) and 53 Republicans (31 percent). But that statistic masks changes in both chambers. Democrats gained three seats in the Senate, but lost three in the House. Likewise, Republicans lost three seats in the Senate, but gained three in the House.

Rep. David Balmer (R-Mecklenburg) says the Republican gains in the House are particularly important because Democrats no longer have enough votes to rush bills through the chamber.

"They can't suspend the rules on us, because we've got more than one-third of the House," says Balmer, the House minority leader. "It takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules. Now there's going to be a debate on each bill. There will be no way to race a bill through on us." Balmer also predicts that Republicans will continue to make inroads in future legislative elections. "I think our numbers are going to continue to grow throughout the decade of the '90s, particularly in portions of Eastern North Carolina," he says. "We think Eastern North Carolina will be the last frontier for the Republican Party."

Meanwhile, blacks and women made substantial gains in both the House and the Senate. The total number of African-American legislators increased from 19 in the 1991-92 session to 25 in 1993. Female legislators increased their numbers from 25 to 31. The number of Native Americans remained unchanged at one.²⁷

Other demographic trends, however, appear to have reversed or leveled off. For instance, the total number of retirees dropped from 34 to 32 in

—continued on page 20

Table G. Trends in N.C. Legislative Demographics

Category	Year and Number of Members per Category									
	1975	1977	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1991	1993
Blacks										
Senate	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	4	5	7
House	4	4	3	3	11	13	13	13	14	18
Total number	6	6	4	4	12	16	16	17	19	25
Total percent	4 %	4 %	3 %	3 %	7 %	9 %	9 %	10 %	11 %	15 %
Women										
Senate	2	4	5	3	5	4	4	4	5	7
House	13	19	17	19	19	16	20	21	20	24
Total number	15	23	22	22	24	20	24	25	25	31
Total percent	9 %	14 %	13 %	13 %	14 %	12 %	14 %	15 %	15 %	18 %
Native-Americans										
Senate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
House	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total number	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total percent	1 %	1 %	1 %	1 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	0 %	1 %	1 %
Democrats										
Senate	49	46	45	40	44	38	40	37	36	39
House	111	114	105	96	102	82	84	74	81	78
Total number	160	160	150	136	146	120	124	111	117	117
Total percent	94 %	94 %	88 %	80 %	86 %	71 %	73 %	65 %	69 %	69 %
Republicans										
Senate	1	4	5	10	6	12	10	13	14	11
House	9	6	15	24	18	38	36	46	39	42
Total number	10	10	20	34	24	50	46	59	53	53
Total percent	6 %	6 %	12 %	20 %	14 %	29 %	27 %	35 %	31 %	31 %
Turnover Ratio										
Senate (New Members Elected)										
Number	21	11	7	8	9	18	6	5	8	8
Percent	42 %	22 %	14 %	16 %	18 %	36 %	12 %	10 %	16 %	16 %
House (New Members Elected)										
Number	49	24	30	33	31	39	25	25	21	42
Percent	41 %	20 %	25 %	28 %	26 %	33 %	21 %	21 %	18 %	35 %

(Note: If a Senator or Representative served in the legislature during the immediate past session, he or she is not considered a new member. If a member served in either chamber during sessions prior to the immediate past session, however, he or she is considered a new member.)

**This research was drawn largely from editions of the North Carolina Manual, and does not reflect members who first reached the General Assembly by appointment to legislative vacancies caused by death or resignations.*

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table H. Trends in N.C. Legislators' Occupations

Occupation	Year and Number of Members per Category									
	1975	1977	1979	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1991	1993
Senate										
Banking	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	2
Business and sales	14	18	13	20	19	21	19	15	16	12
Construction and contracting	0	0	2	3	3	2	1	4	3	2
Education	3	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	7
Farming	2	4	3	5	6	6	6	5	6	7
Health care	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3
Homemaker	1	0	2	0	4	2	0	1	0	1
Insurance	5	5	6	7	6	4	4	2	1	2
Law	15	14	13	10	14	17	21	20	17	18
Manufacturing	4	2	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0
Minister	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Real estate	5	5	7	12	8	8	6	6	6	4
Retired	2	0	3	4	6	6	4	6	6	8
House of Representatives										
Banking	3	3	2	3	3	3	0	0	0	4
Business and sales	35	41	37	43	45	45	43	37	33	34
Construction and contracting	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	3	2	2
Education	16	16	10	11	10	15	12	7	15	14
Farming	20	22	22	18	24	16	12	8	11	12
Health care	3	3	6	3	5	4	4	4	7	10
Homemaker	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	2
Insurance	12	11	13	10	6	10	10	8	12	9
Law	36	26	25	26	26	24	23	25	18	21
Legislator	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Manufacturing	1	0	4	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Minister	1	1	0	1	3	7	4	4	2	2
Real estate	9	7	10	15	19	20	15	17	20	17
Retired	5	8	6	15	12	13	17	22	28	24
Self-employed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

(Note: Some legislators list more than one occupation; thus, the total number of occupations may be higher than the actual number of members.)

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

both chambers, stemming a steady increase since the 1970s. (See Table H, p. 19.) Lawyers, by contrast, reversed another long-term trend by *increasing* their total numbers from 35 to 39—although still far less numerous than their peak of 68 in the 1971–72 session.

The data also showed a continuing decline in the numbers of most business professionals, including those in general business, sales, insurance, real estate, and construction and contracting. The total number of legislators in those professions dropped from 93 to 86 since the 1991–92 session. Increasing numbers of legislators were found in the following professions: banking, from one to 6; education, from 19 to 21; health care, from nine to 13; farming, from 17 to 19; and ministry, from two to three.

The new *Article II* also contains the Center's legislative effectiveness rankings—the most publicized feature of the guide. The Center compiles the rankings from surveys conducted at the end of each long legislative session, held in odd-numbered years. Surveys are sent to legislators, registered lobbyists, and capital news correspondents—asking respondents to rate the effectiveness of individual legislators. The Center then compiles the rankings and publishes the scores. *The rankings contained in the latest edition of Article II were originally released in April 1992.* Rankings for members of the 1993–94 General Assembly will be released in the spring of 1994. Other information included in the guide are the new House and Senate district maps (after redistricting) and complete committee listings. □ □

* * *

Article II and The Cost of Running for the N.C. Legislature can be ordered by calling (919) 832-2839 or writing to the N.C. Center at P.O. Box 430, Raleigh, N.C. 27602. *Article II* costs \$22.70, and the campaign finance publication costs \$9.48. Or, the two reports can be purchased as a set for \$26, a savings of \$6.18. All prices include sales tax, postage, and handling.

Editor's Note: The preceding article originally was published in the August 1993 edition of North Carolina Insight, the journal of the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research. However, the tables and charts following this article are published here for the first time.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Figures from the 1984 and 1988 elections were taken from articles published in *The Charlotte Observer*. See the series on legislative campaign finances by Ken Eudy, et al., June 16–20, 1985, pp. 1–8 in special reprint; and Jim Morrill, et al., April 9, 1989, pp. 1A, 8–10A.

² For a detailed look at nationwide trends in campaign finance, see Keon S. Chi, "State Campaign Finance Reform: Options for the Future," *State Trends & Forecasts*, The Council of State Governments, Vol. 2, Issue 1 (April 1993), pp. 1–35.

³ According to the Legislative Services Office, a legislator's total compensation includes: \$13,026 per year in base salary; \$522 per month in expenses; \$92 per day for a subsistence allowance, seven days a week during sessions; \$1,500 per two-year term for postage and telephone expenses; and 25 cents per mile for one round-trip a week between Raleigh and their homes.

⁴ See Ken Eudy, "PAC Contributions Win Attention From Candidates," *The Charlotte Observer*, special reprint from articles published June 16–20, 1985, p. 1. The *Charlotte Observer* study did not include political party PAC contributions, which the Center included in its study.

⁵ According to the state Board of Elections, candidates in the 1992 campaign were required to file reports on their contributions on April 27 (10 days before the first primary election) and October 26 (10 days before the general election). Primary losers also had to file reports 10 days after the primary election or runoff, if required. Candidates who had not closed out their campaigns at year end were required to file annual reports by Jan. 29, 1993.

⁶ Rep. Miner says that he raised an additional \$22,000 in 1991, increasing his contributions for the entire campaign to more than \$110,000.

⁷ According to the 1990 Census, the average Senate district has 132,572 people—more than twice as many as the average House district, which has 55,239 people.

⁸ For more on the national perspective of rising campaign costs, see Tommy Neal, "The Sky-High Cost of Campaigns," *State Legislatures*, May 1992, pp. 16–22.

⁹ *Ibid.* p.16.

¹⁰ See Chi, pp. 2–22. Also see Kim Kebschull, et al., *Campaign Disclosure Laws: An Analysis of Campaign Finance Disclosure in North Carolina and a Comparison of 50 State Campaign Reporting Laws*, N.C. Center for Public Policy Research, March 1990, pp. 14–19. The report was summarized by Kebschull in "Campaign Reporting Laws: The Inadequacies of Disclosure," *North Carolina Insight*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (June 1990), pp. 34–46.

¹¹ Kebschull, p. 55.

¹² See Julie Marsh, *Campaign Finance Reform in the States*, Common Cause, Washington, D.C., January 1993, p. 20. For more on campaign financing reform, see Ann McColl and Lori Ann Harris, *Public Financing of State Political Campaigns: How Well Does It Work?* N.C. Center for Public Policy Research, November 1990.

¹³ The Center counted as PAC contributions all donations by political committees registered with the Campaign Reporting Office. This includes political party organizations, both local and state. Party donations are usually small, however.

¹⁴ N.C.G.S. 163-278.19.

¹⁵ N.C.G.S. 163-278-13. The \$4,000 limit applies separately to each election—primary, runoff (if necessary), and general election.

¹⁶ Incumbent Representatives who lost in the 1992 elections included: Howard Chapin (D-Beaufort), Gerald Anderson (D-Craven), Bruce Ethridge (D-Carteret), Joe Hege (R-Davidson), Wayne Kahl (D-Iredell), William Withrow (D-

Rutherford), Marty Kimsey (R-Macon), Larry Jordan (D-Wake), and Edward McGee (D-Nash).

¹⁷ See Joel Thompson, William Cassie, and Malcolm Jewell, "A Sacred Cow or Just a Lot of Bull?: The Impact of Money in State Legislative Campaigns," paper presented at the 1991 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.

¹⁸ *Ibid.* Also see Chi, p. 8.

¹⁹ See Chi, pp. 6-7.

²⁰ See Ken Eudy, "PAC Contributions Win Attention From Candidates," *The Charlotte Observer*, reprinted from June 16-20, 1985, p. 1; and Jim Morrill, "Lobbyists Escalate 'Arms Race,'" *The Charlotte Observer*, April 9, 1989, p. 1.

²¹ See Sarah Avery, "Donations to Hardison called illegal," *The News & Observer*, Raleigh, N.C., May 8, 1993, p. 1A. *The News & Observer* reported that a State Bureau of Investigation probe had found that former state Sen. Harold Hardison (D-Lenoir) had improperly collected \$465,000 from four businessmen during his unsuccessful campaign for lieutenant governor in 1988. The men accused of making the contributions were: Wendell Murphy, a major pork farmer and former state senator;

Robert Hill, a nursing home operator; Marvin Johnson, president of a turkey processing company; and William C. Shackelford, now in federal prison on fraud and conspiracy charges stemming from the misuse of \$34 million in funds from Interstate Insurance Co.

²² As quoted by *The News & Observer* of Raleigh, "Basnight seeks new election laws," May 20, 1993, p. 3A.

²³ See Kebschull, pp. 63-69.

²⁴ See Chi, p. 6.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ For more on trends in legislative demographics, see Jack Betts, "In the Legislature, White Male Democrats Become a Minority," *North Carolina Insight*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (June 1991), pp. 65-71. Also, see Paul T. O'Connor, "Legislative Demographics: Where Have All the Lawyers Gone?," *North Carolina Insight*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (September 1986), pp. 44-47; and "The General Assembly of the 21st Century," *North Carolina Insight*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (September 1992), pp. 58-68.

²⁷ Rep. Adolph Dial (D-Robeson) was the only Native American in the 1991-92 session, while Rep. Ronnie Sutton (D-Robeson) was the sole Native American in the 1993 session.

How can you tell who's who in the legislature?

By reading the 1993-94 edition of . . .

ARTICLE II

A Guide to the N.C. Legislature

Complete with past legislative effectiveness rankings compiled by the N.C. Center for Public Policy Research. Also, information on each legislator's occupation, education, committee assignments, and voting record, as well as trend data since 1975. A bargain at \$22.70—and that includes tax, postage, and handling. Or, order it as a set with the Center's newest research report, *The Cost of Running for the N.C. Legislature*, for \$26 (a savings of \$6.18).

So give us a call at (919) 832-2839, and order a copy of our who's who—Article II

SECTION II. SUMMARY TABLES

Table 1: Total Raised and Spent by All House and Senate Candidates, 1992 Elections

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total Raised</u>	<u>Total From PACs</u>	<u>Total % From PACs</u>	<u>Total Spent</u>
All Candidates	\$4,708,515	\$1,987,232	42.2%	\$4,544,376
Winning Candidates	\$3,651,944	\$1,710,991	46.9%	\$3,413,404
Losing Candidates	\$1,058,303	\$277,166	26.2%	\$1,137,258
Winning Incumbents	\$2,405,165	\$1,359,452	56.5%	\$2,117,304
New Members	\$1,246,779	\$351,539	28.2%	\$1,296,100
Winning Democrats	\$2,681,823	\$1,264,759	47.2%	\$2,513,011
Winning Republicans	\$970,121	\$446,232	46.0%	\$900,393
Winning Men	\$2,974,295	\$1,415,594	47.6%	\$2,758,008
Winning Women	\$677,649	\$295,397	43.6%	\$655,396
All Open Seat Candidates	\$1,471,997	\$397,589	27.0%	\$1,543,075
Winning Open Seat Candidates	\$1,172,113	\$323,916	27.6%	\$1,212,369
Losing Open Seat Candidates	\$299,884	\$73,673	24.6%	\$330,706

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

**Table 2: Total Raised and Spent by Senate Candidates,
1992 Elections**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total Raised</u>	<u>Total From PACs</u>	<u>Total % From PACs</u>	<u>Total Spent</u>
All Senate Candidates	\$1,964,733	\$836,359	42.6%	\$1,838,110
Winning Senate Candidates	\$1,552,548	\$759,523	48.9%	\$1,399,602
Losing Senate Candidates	\$412,185	\$76,836	18.6%	\$438,508
Senate Incumbents	\$1,114,940	\$629,155	56.4%	\$958,966
New Senate Members	\$437,608	\$130,368	29.8%	\$440,636
Winning Senate Democrats	\$1,366,510	\$648,836	47.5%	\$1,262,031
Winning Senate Republicans	\$186,038	\$110,687	59.5%	\$137,571
Winning Senate Men	\$1,306,307	\$651,916	49.9%	\$1,158,790
Winning Senate Women	\$246,241	\$107,607	43.7%	\$240,812
All Senate Open Seat Candidates	\$594,185	\$169,181	28.5%	\$610,271
Winning Open Seat Candidates	\$437,608	\$130,368	29.8%	\$440,636
Losing Open Seat Candidates	\$156,577	\$38,813	24.8%	\$169,635

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

**Table 3: Total Raised and Spent by House Candidates,
1992 Elections**

<u>Category</u>	<u>Total Raised</u>	<u>Total From PACs</u>	<u>Total % From PACs</u>	<u>Total Spent</u>
All House Candidates	\$2,743,782	\$1,150,873	41.9%	\$2,706,266
Winning House Candidates	\$2,099,396	\$951,468	45.3%	\$2,013,802
Losing House Candidates	\$646,118	\$200,330	31.0%	\$698,750
House Incumbents	\$1,290,225	\$730,297	56.6%	\$1,158,338
New House Members	\$809,171	\$221,171	27.3%	\$855,464
Winning House Democrats	\$1,315,313	\$615,923	46.8%	\$1,250,980
Winning House Republicans	\$784,083	\$335,545	42.8%	\$762,822
Winning House Men	\$1,667,988	\$763,678	45.8%	\$1,599,218
Winning House Women	\$431,408	\$187,790	43.5%	\$414,584
All House Open Seat Candidates	\$877,812	\$228,408	26.0%	\$932,804
Winning Open Seat Candidates	\$734,505	\$193,548	26.4%	\$771,733
Losing Open Seat Candidates	\$143,307	\$34,860	24.3%	\$161,071

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

**Table 4: Average Raised and Spent by Senate Candidates,
1992 Elections**

[1990 figures in (), where available]

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>Average % From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>Average % Spent of Amount Raised</u>
All Senate Candidates	\$22,583	\$9,613	41.0%	\$21,127	96.4%
Winning Senate Candidates	\$31,051 (\$31,123)	\$15,190 (\$11,002)	58.1% (44.3%)	\$27,992 (\$28,624)	87.5% (87.8%)
Losing Senate Candidates	\$11,140	\$2,077	18.0%	\$11,852	108.4%
Senate Incumbents	\$29,341 (\$27,571)	\$16,557 (\$11,887)	65.7% (50.2%)	\$25,236 (\$25,047)	83.7% (85.3%)
New Senate Members	\$36,467 (\$43,715)	\$10,864 (\$7,862)	33.9% (23.4%)	\$36,720 (\$41,308)	99.3% (96.7%)
Winning Senate Democrats	\$35,039 (\$30,894)	\$16,637 (\$12,025)	54.9% (46.7%)	\$32,360 (\$28,153)	93.9% (87.1%)
Winning Senate Republicans	\$16,913 (\$31,710)	\$10,062 (\$8,370)	69.3% (38.1%)	\$12,506 (\$29,835)	64.5% (87.8%)
Winning Senate Men	\$30,379 (\$30,909)	\$15,161 (\$8,370)	58.9% (38.1%)	\$26,949 (\$29,835)	86.4% (87.8%)
Winning Senate Women	\$35,177 (\$33,046)	\$15,372 (\$11,417)	52.8% (44.4%)	\$34,402 (\$26,596)	94.2% (85.1%)

continued

Table 4, continued

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>Average % From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>Average % Spent of Amount Raised</u>
All Senate Open Seat Candidates	\$27,008	\$7,690	31.4%	\$27,740	101.9%
Winning Open Seat Candidates	\$36,467	\$10,864	33.9%	\$36,720	99.3%
Losing Open Seat Candidates	\$15,658	\$3,881	28.6%	\$16,964	105.1%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

**Table 5: Average Raised and Spent by House Candidates,
1992 Elections**

[1990 figures in (), where available]

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>Average % From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>Average % Spent of Amount Raised</u>
All House Candidates	\$14,441	\$6,057	45.2%	\$14,244	106.4%
Winning House Candidates	\$17,495 (\$21,433)	\$7,929 (\$6,567)	54.4% (44.9%)	\$16,782 (\$18,971)	100.4% (86.9%)
Losing House Candidates	\$9,100	\$2,822	29.7%	\$9,842	116.8%
House Incumbents	\$16,756 (\$19,858)	\$9,484 (\$9,373)	64.8% (50.8%)	\$15,043 (\$17,280)	93.2% (85.6%)
New House Members	\$18,818 (\$27,732)	\$5,144 (\$5,344)	35.9% (21.3%)	\$19,895 (\$25,737)	113.4% (92.2%)
Winning House Democrats	\$16,863 (\$21,668)	\$7,896 (\$8,691)	54.9% (44.3%)	\$16,038 (\$19,849)	100.7% (89.2%)
Winning House Republicans	\$18,669 (\$20,945)	\$7,989 (\$8,312)	53.5% (46.2%)	\$18,162 (\$17,147)	99.9% (82.3%)
Winning House Men	\$17,375 (\$22,629)	\$7,955 (\$9,082)	55.4% (45.3%)	\$16,659 (\$19,816)	103.4% (86.6%)
Winning House Women	\$17,975 (\$15,455)	\$7,825 (\$5,996)	50.3% (43.1%)	\$17,274 (\$14,748)	88.7% (88.6%)

continued

Table 5, continued

<u>Category</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>Average % From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>Average % Spent of Amount Raised</u>
All House Open Seat Candidates	\$14,630	\$3,807	28.7%	\$15,547	118.0%
Winning Open Seat Candidates	\$19,851	\$5,231	35.4%	\$20,858	119.6%
Losing Open Seat Candidates	\$6,231	\$1,516	17.9%	\$7,003	115.5%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

SECTION III

State Senate Candidates, 1992 General Election

Notes: Figures given include all money raised and spent by candidates competing in the general election during the 1992 calendar year.

Bolded names signal incumbents; underlined names signal winners.

PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

<u>District</u>	<u>Democratic Candidate</u>	<u>Republican Candidate</u>
1st	<p><u>Marc Basnight</u> Raised: \$39,530 From PACs: \$22,641 % From PACs: 57.3% Spent: \$18,206 % Spent: 46.1%</p>	
2nd	<p><u>Frank W. Ballance, Jr.</u> Raised: \$17,255 From PACs: \$16,350 % From PACs: 94.8% Spent: \$14,940 % Spent: 86.6%</p>	<p>Raymond Killeen Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>
3rd	<p><u>Beverly M. Perdue</u> Raised: \$21,410 From PACs: \$14,900 % From PACs: 69.6% Spent: \$20,065 % Spent: 93.7%</p>	<p>Donald L. Phillips Raised: \$6,962 From PACs: \$1,365 * % From PACs: 19.6% Spent: \$8,012 % Spent: 115.1%</p>
4th	<p>William G. Smith Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>	<p><u>John Codington</u> Raised: \$36,587 From PACs: \$8,980 % From PACs: 24.5% Spent: \$26,497 % Spent: 72.4%</p>
5th	<p><u>Charles W. Albertson</u> Raised: \$38,835 From PACs: \$13,145 % From PACs: 33.8% Spent: \$37,390 % Spent: 96.3%</p>	<p>Corbett L. Quinn Raised: \$35,975 From PACs: \$4,575 % From PACs: 12.7% Spent: \$41,090 % Spent: 114.2%</p>

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

6th

Robert L. Martin

Raised: \$22,135
From PACs: \$17,205
% From PACs: 77.7%
Spent: \$21,376
% Spent: 96.6%

7th

Luther Henry Jordan, Jr.

Raised: \$24,382
From PACs: \$11,934
% From PACs: 48.9%
Spent: \$38,420
% Spent: 157.6%

8th

John H. Kerr, III

Raised: \$16,320
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$16,310
% Spent: 99.9%

Walter S. Hatch

Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

9th

Edward N. Warren

Raised: \$30,275
From PACs: \$14,025
% From PACs: 46.3%
Spent: \$14,633
% Spent: 48.3%

Edwin R. Griffith

Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

10th

Roy A. Cooper, III

Raised: \$38,247
From PACs: \$20,010
% From PACs: 52.3%
Spent: \$45,721
% Spent: 119.5%

William W. Lewis

Raised: \$19,845
From PACs: \$7,912
% From PACs: 39.9%
Spent: \$19,905
% Spent: 100.3%

11th

James D. Speed

Raised: \$25,025
From PACs: \$19,425
% From PACs: 77.6%
Spent: \$37,467
% Spent: 149.7%

Bill Sharpe

Raised: \$14,046
From PACs: \$888
% From PACs: 6.3%
Spent: \$14,151
% Spent: 100.7%

12th (2 seats)

Fred Folger, Jr.
Raised: \$13,513
From PACs: \$9,288
% From PACs: 68.7%
Spent: \$7,940
% Spent: 58.8%

Jack M. Bailey
Raised: \$2,195
From PACs: \$2,035 *
% From PACs: 92.7%
Spent: \$2,307
% Spent: 105.1%

A.P. Sands, III
Raised: \$25,558
From PACs: \$17,550
% From PACs: 68.7%
Spent: \$20,727
% Spent: 81.1%

Larry A. Wilson
Raised: \$8,729
From PACs: \$4,175
% From PACs: 47.8%
Spent: \$8,260
% Spent: 94.6%

13th (2 seats)

Wilbur P. (Wib) Gulley
Raised: \$37,884
From PACs: \$6,423
% From PACs: 17.0%
Spent: \$32,855
% Spent: 86.7%

Melodie A. Parrish
Raised: \$785
From PACs: \$375 *
% From PACs: 47.8%
Spent: \$761
% Spent: 96.9%

Ralph A. Hunt
Raised: \$28,797
From PACs: \$24,084
% From PACs: 83.6%
Spent: \$22,645
% Spent: 78.6%

Victoria Peterson
Raised: \$12,805
From PACs: \$1,833 *
% From PACs: 14.3%
Spent: \$11,624
% Spent: 90.8%

14th (2 seats)

Joseph E. Johnson
Raised: \$30,882
From PACs: \$23,029
% From PACs: 74.6%
Spent: \$37,246
% Spent: \$120.6%

Joe Overby
Raised: \$1,087
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$1,087
% Spent: 100.0%

J.K. Sherron, Jr.
Raised: \$47,719
From PACs: \$23,354
% From PACs: 48.9%
Spent: \$37,995
% Spent: 79.6%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

15th	<u>Elaine F. Marshall</u> Raised: \$31,915 From PACs: \$10,116 % From PACs: 31.7% Spent: \$42,891 % Spent: 134.4%	Linwood H. Parker Raised: \$15,500 From PACs: \$4,900 % From PACs: 31.6% Spent: \$21,772 % Spent: 140.5%
16th (2 seats)	<u>Howard N. Lee</u> Raised: \$19,015 From PACs: \$13,375 % From PACs: 70.3% Spent: \$15,713 % Spent: 82.6%	Charles A.S. Phillips Raised: \$8,010 From PACs: \$125 * % From PACs: 1.6% Spent: \$10,154 % Spent: 126.8%
	<u>Russell G. Walker</u> Raised: \$14,905 From PACs: \$11,605 % From PACs: 77.9% Spent: \$10,571 % Spent: 70.9%	
17th (2 seats)	<u>J. Richard Conder</u> Raised: \$35,104 From PACs: \$16,414 % From PACs: 46.8% Spent: \$29,602 % Spent: 84.3%	William P. Davis Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%
	<u>Aaron W. Plyler</u> Raised: \$37,137 From PACs: \$19,291 % From PACs: 51.9% Spent: \$27,649 % Spent: 74.5%	Edward Price Raised: \$1,050 From PACs: \$525 * % From PACs: 50.0% Spent: \$2,432 % Spent: 231.6%
18th	<u>R.C. Soles, Jr.</u> Raised: \$31,865 From PACs: \$22,350 % From PACs: 70.1% Spent: \$63,329 % Spent: 198.7%	Jim Whitworth Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%
19th	George Whitman Raised: \$272 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$272 % Spent: 100.0%	<u>Robert G. Shaw</u> Raised: \$15,671 From PACs: \$13,000 % From PACs: 83.0% Spent: \$9,697 % Spent: 61.9%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

20th (2 seats)

Ted Kaplan

Raised: \$30,112
From PACs: \$16,800
% From PACs: 55.8%
Spent: \$28,484
% Spent: 94.6%

Ann Esch

Raised: \$2,060
From PACs: \$675 *
% From PACs: 32.8%
Spent: \$2,060
% Spent: 100.0%

Marvin M. Ward

Raised: \$19,532
From PACs: \$12,438
% From PACs: 63.7%
Spent: \$18,315
% Spent: 93.8%

Gerald N. Hewitt

Raised: \$12,955
From PACs: \$1,375
% From PACs: 10.6%
Spent: \$21,591
% Spent: 166.7%

21st

George B. Daniel

Raised: \$177,149
From PACs: \$59,628
% From PACs: 63.7%
Spent: \$125,286
% Spent: 70.7%

Hubert G. Lowe

Raised: \$22,179
From PACs: \$4,525 *
% From PACs: 20.4%
Spent: \$21,837
% Spent: 98.5%

22nd

Jean K. Ramsey

Raised: \$5,253
From PACs: \$1,700
% From PACs: 32.4%
Spent: \$5,253
% Spent: 100.0%

Fletcher L. Hartsell, Jr.

Raised: \$19,680
From PACs: \$9,750
% From PACs: 49.5%
Spent: \$16,518
% Spent: 83.9%

23rd

Paul S. Smith

Raised: \$12,545
From PACs: \$10,900
% From PACs: 86.9%
Spent: \$6,676
% Spent: 53.2%

24th

Lura S. Tally

Raised: \$19,214
From PACs: \$13,350
% From PACs: 69.5%
Spent: \$20,005
% Spent: 104.1%

Bert Esworthy

Raised: \$11,557
From PACs: \$525 *
% From PACs: 4.5%
Spent: \$9,924
% Spent: 85.9%

25th

David Hoyle

Raised: \$86,083
From PACs: \$13,700
% From PACs: 15.9%
Spent: \$91,505
% Spent: 106.3%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

26th	Jerry W. Willard	<u>Austin M. Allran</u>
	Raised: \$14,438	Raised: \$17,670
	From PACs: \$3,500	From PACs: \$10,450
	% From PACs: 24.2%	% From PACs: 59.1%
	Spent: \$14,538	Spent: \$17,851
% Spent: 100.7%	% Spent: 101.0%	

27th (2 seats)	Ted A. Poovey	<u>Donald R. Kincaid</u>
	Raised: \$125	Raised: \$13,100
	From PACs: \$0	From PACs: \$11,950
	% From PACs: 0.0%	% From PACs: 91.2%
	Spent: \$125	Spent: \$7,398
% Spent: 100.0%	% Spent: 56.5%	

	<u>Daniel R. Simpson</u>
	Raised: \$13,077
	From PACs: \$8,200
	% From PACs: 62.7%
	Spent: \$9,080
	% Spent: 69.4%

28th (2 seats)	<u>Herbert Lee Hyde</u>
	Raised: \$14,075
	From PACs: \$13,150
	% From PACs: 93.4%
	Spent: \$8,129
% Spent: 57.8%	

	<u>Dennis J. Winner</u>
	Raised: \$12,737
	From PACs: \$10,562
	% From PACs: 82.9%
	Spent: \$12,658
	% Spent: 99.4%

29th	<u>Clark Plexico</u>	Charles M. Lusk
	Raised: \$46,878	Raised: \$5,522
	From PACs: \$21,350	From PACs: \$700 *
	% From PACs: 45.5%	% From PACs: 12.7%
	Spent: \$40,541	Spent: \$5,522
% Spent: 86.5%	% Spent: 100.0%	

30th	<u>David R. Parnell</u>	George Thompson
	Raised: \$52,903	Raised: \$125
	From PACs: \$24,150	From PACs: \$0
	% From PACs: 45.6%	% From PACs: 0.0%
	Spent: \$58,406	Spent: \$125
% Spent: 110.4%	% Spent: 100.0%	

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

31st	<u>William N. Martin</u> Raised: \$9,177 From PACs: \$5,950 % From PACs: 64.8% Spent: \$8,134 % Spent: 88.6%	R. Odell Payne Raised: \$1,987 From PACs: \$125 * % From PACs: 6.3% Spent: \$2,655 % Spent: 133.6%
32nd	<u>Mary P. Seymour</u> Raised: \$42,304 From PACs: \$25,923 % From PACs: 61.3% Spent: \$34,798 % Spent: 82.3%	Judith P. Mendenhall Raised: \$16,547 From PACs: \$2,775 % From PACs: 16.8% Spent: \$16,892 % Spent: 102.1%
33rd	<u>James F. Richardson</u> Raised: \$39,212 From PACs: \$16,827 % From PACs: 42.9% Spent: \$21,175 % Spent: 54.0%	Robert Pittenger Raised: \$80,049 From PACs: \$2,075 % From PACs: 2.6% Spent: \$82,124 % Spent: 102.6%
34th	<u>T.L. (Fountain) Odom</u> Raised: \$37,337 From PACs: \$11,712 % From PACs: 31.4% Spent: \$33,976 % Spent: 91.0%	Linda McCall Raised: \$8,485 From PACs: \$3,225 % From PACs: 38.0% Spent: \$8,740 % Spent: 103.0%
35th		<u>Jerry Blackmon</u> Raised: \$4,450 From PACs: \$4,050 % From PACs: 91.0% Spent: \$837 % Spent: 18.8%
36th	<u>Linda Gunter</u> Raised: \$59,758 From PACs: \$22,646 % From PACs: 37.9% Spent: \$61,954 % Spent: 103.7%	Paul (Skip) Stam Raised: \$80,112 From PACs: \$14,455 % From PACs: 18.0% Spent: \$82,567 % Spent: 103.1%
37th	<u>J. Ollie Harris</u> Raised: \$25,048 From PACs: \$21,361 % From PACs: 85.3% Spent: \$22,468 % Spent: 89.7%	Dennis Davis Raised: \$3,062 From PACs: \$570 * % From PACs: 18.6% Spent: \$2,920 % Spent: 95.4%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

38th

Betsy L. Cochran

Raised: \$12,000
From PACs: \$9,747
% From PACs: 81.2%
Spent: \$5,798
% Spent: 48.3%

39th

Jeffrey Dean Thomas

Raised: \$1,020
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$1,090
% Spent: 106.9%

James S. Forrester

Raised: \$34,738
From PACs: \$18,450
% From PACs: 53.1%
Spent: \$34,233
% Spent: 98.5%

40th

Leslie Winner

Raised: \$59,640
From PACs: \$10,925
% From PACs: 18.3%
Spent: \$55,301
% Spent: 92.7%

Ray Warren

Raised: \$18,573
From PACs: \$11,903
% From PACs: 64.1%
Spent: \$17,843
% Spent: 96.1%

41st

C.R. Edwards

Raised: \$7,643
From PACs: \$1,850
% From PACs: 24.2%
Spent: \$7,105
% Spent: 93.0%

Thomas V. Monsour

Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

42nd

Robert C. Carpenter

Raised: \$6,520
From PACs: \$5,210
% From PACs: 79.9%
Spent: \$2,986
% Spent: 45.8%

SECTION IV

Table A-1
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Candidates

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Albertson	\$38,835	\$13,145	33.8%	\$37,390	96.3%
Allran	17,670	10,450	59.1	17,851	101.0
Ballance	17,255	16,350	94.8	14,940	86.6
Basnight	39,530	22,641	57.3	18,306	46.1
Blackmon	4,450	4,050	91.0	837	18.8
Carpenter	6,520	5,210	79.9	2,986	45.8
Cochrane	12,000	9,747	81.2	5,798	48.3
Codington	36,587	8,980	24.5	26,497	72.4
Conder	35,104	16,414	46.8	29,602	84.3
Cooper	38,247	20,010	52.3	45,721	119.5
Daniel	177,149	59,628	33.7	125,286	70.7
Edwards, C.	7,643	1,850	24.2	7,105	93.0
Folger	13,513	9,288	68.7	7,940	58.8
Forrester	34,738	18,450	53.1	34,233	98.5
Gulley	37,884	6,423	17.0	32,855	86.7
Gunter	59,758	22,646	37.9	61,954	103.7
Harris, J.O.	25,048	21,361	85.3	22,468	89.7
Hartsell	19,680	9,750	49.5	16,518	83.9
Hoyle, D.	86,083	13,700	15.9	91,505	106.3
Hunt, Ralph	28,797	24,084	83.6	22,645	78.6
Hyde	14,075	13,150	93.4	8,129	57.8
Johnson	30,882	23,029	74.6	37,246	120.6
Jordan, Luther	24,382	11,934	48.9	38,420	157.6
Kaplan	30,112	16,800	55.8	28,484	94.6
Kerr	16,320	0	0.0	16,310	99.9
Kincaid	13,100	11,950	91.2	7,398	56.5
Lee, Howard	19,015	13,375	70.3	15,713	82.6
Marshall	31,915	10,116	31.7	42,891	134.4
Martin, R.	22,135	17,205	77.7	21,376	96.6
Martin, W.	9,177	5,950	64.8	8,134	88.6
Odom	37,337	11,712	31.4	33,976	91.0
Parnell	52,903	24,150	45.6	58,406	110.4
Perdue	21,410	14,900	69.6	20,065	93.7
Plexico	46,878	21,350	45.5	40,541	86.5
Plyler	37,137	19,291	51.9	27,649	74.5
Richardson, James	39,212	16,827	42.9	21,175	54.0
Sands	25,558	17,550	68.7	20,727	81.1
Seymour	42,304	25,923	61.3	34,798	82.3

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Shaw	15,671	13,000	83.0	9,697	61.9
Sherron	47,719	23,354	48.9	37,995	79.6
Simpson	13,077	8,200	62.7	9,080	69.4
Smith, Paul	12,545	10,900	86.9	6,676	53.2
Soles	31,865	22,350	70.1	63,329	198.7
Speed	25,025	19,425	77.6	37,467	149.7
Tally	19,214	13,350	69.5	20,005	104.1
Walker	14,905	11,605	77.9	10,571	70.9
Ward	19,532	12,438	63.7	18,315	93.8
Warren, E.	30,275	14,025	46.3	14,633	48.3
Winner, D.	12,737	10,562	82.9	12,658	99.4
Winner, L.	59,640	10,925	18.3	55,301	92.7
Total:	\$1,552,548	\$759,523		\$1,399,602	
Average:	\$31,051	\$15,190	58.1%	\$27,992	87.5%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table A-2
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Losing Senate Candidates

<u>Name of Candidate</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Bailey	\$2,195	\$2,035 *	92.7%	\$2,307	105.1%
Davis, Dennis	3,062	570 *	18.6	2,920	95.4
Davis, W.	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Esch	2,060	675 *	32.8	2,060	100.0
Esworthy	11,557	525 *	4.5	9,924	85.9
Griffith	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Hatch	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Hewitt	12,955	1,375	10.6	21,591	166.7
Killeen	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Lewis	19,845	7,912	39.9	19,905	100.3
Lowe	22,179	4,525 *	20.4	21,837	98.5
Lusk	5,522	700 *	12.7	5,522	100.0
McCall	8,485	3,225	38.0	8,740	103.0
Mendenhall	16,547	2,775	16.8	16,892	102.1
Monsour	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Overby	1,087	0	0.0	1,087	100.0
Parker	15,500	4,900	31.6	21,772	140.5
Parrish	785	375 *	47.8	761	96.9
Payne	1,987	125 *	6.3	2,655	133.6
Peterson	12,805	1,833 *	14.3	11,624	90.8
Phillips, C.	8,010	125 *	1.6	10,154	126.8
Phillips, D.	6,962	1,365 *	19.6	8,012	115.1
Pittenger	80,049	2,075	2.6	82,124	102.6
Poovey	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Price	1,050	525 *	50.0	2,432	231.6
Quinn	35,975	4,575	12.7	41,090	114.2
Ramsey, J.	5,253	1,700	32.4	5,253	100.0
Sharpe	14,046	888	6.3	14,151	100.7
Smith, W.	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Stam	80,112	14,455	18.0	82,567	103.1
Thomas	1,020	0	0.0	1,090	106.9
Thompson, George	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Warren, R.	18,573	11,903	64.1	17,843	96.1
Whitman	272	0	0.0	272	100.0
Whitworth	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Willard	14,438	3,500	24.2	14,538	100.7
Wilson, L.	8,729	4,175	47.8	8,260	94.6
Total:	\$412,185	\$76,836		\$438,508	
Average:	\$11,140	\$2,077	18.0%	\$11,852	108.4%

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table A-3
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Incumbents

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Allran	\$17,670	\$10,450	59.1%	\$17,851	101.0%
Ballance	17,255	16,350	94.8	14,940	86.6
Basnight	39,530	22,641	57.3	18,306	46.1
Blackmon	4,450	4,050	91.0	837	18.8
Carpenter	6,520	5,210	79.9	2,986	45.8
Cochrane	12,000	9,747	81.2	5,798	48.3
Conder	35,104	16,414	46.8	29,602	84.3
Cooper	38,247	20,010	52.3	45,721	119.5
Daniel	177,149	59,628	33.7	125,286	70.7
Forrester	34,738	18,450	53.1	34,233	98.5
Hartsell	19,680	9,750	49.5	16,518	83.9
Hunt, Ralph	28,797	24,084	83.6	22,645	78.6
Hyde	14,075	13,150	93.4	8,129	57.8
Johnson	30,882	23,029	74.6	37,246	120.6
Kaplan	30,112	16,800	55.8	28,484	94.6
Kincaid	13,100	11,950	91.2	7,398	56.5
Lee, Howard	19,015	13,375	70.3	15,713	82.6
Martin, R.	22,135	17,205	77.7	21,376	96.6
Martin, W.	9,177	5,950	64.8	8,134	88.6
Odom	37,337	11,712	31.4	33,976	91.0
Parnell	52,903	24,150	45.6	58,406	110.4
Perdue	21,410	14,900	69.6	20,065	93.7
Plexico	46,878	21,350	45.5	40,541	86.5
Plyler	37,137	19,291	51.9	27,649	74.5
Richardson, James	39,212	16,827	42.9	21,175	54.0
Sands	25,558	17,550	68.7	20,727	81.1
Seymour	42,304	25,923	61.3	34,798	82.3
Shaw	15,671	13,000	83.0	9,697	61.9
Sherron	47,719	23,354	48.9	37,995	79.6
Simpson	13,077	8,200	62.7	9,080	69.4
Smith, Paul	12,545	10,900	86.9	6,676	53.2
Soles	31,865	22,350	70.1	63,329	198.7
Speed	25,025	19,425	77.6	37,467	149.7
Tally	19,214	13,350	69.5	20,005	104.1
Walker	14,905	11,605	77.9	10,571	70.9
Ward	19,532	12,438	63.7	18,315	93.8
Warren, E.	30,275	14,025	46.3	14,633	48.3
Winner, D.	12,737	10,562	82.9	12,658	99.4
Total:	\$1,114,940	\$629,155		\$958,966	
Average:	\$29,341	\$16,557	65.7%	\$25,236	83.7%

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table A-4
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
New Senate Members

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Albertson	\$38,835	\$13,145	33.8%	\$37,390	96.3%
Codington	36,587	8,980	24.5	26,497	72.4
Edwards, C.	7,643	1,850	24.2	7,105	93.0
Folger	13,513	9,288	68.7	7,940	58.8
Gulley	37,884	6,423	17.0	32,855	86.7
Gunter	59,758	22,646	37.9	61,954	103.7
Harris, J.O.	25,048	21,361	85.3	22,468	89.7
Hoyle, D.	86,083	13,700	15.9	91,505	106.3
Jordan, Luther	24,382	11,934	48.9	38,420	157.6
Kerr	16,320	0	0.0	16,310	99.9
Marshall	31,915	10,116	31.7	42,891	134.4
Winner, L.	59,640	10,925	18.3	55,301	92.7
Total:	\$437,608	\$130,368		\$440,636	
Average:	\$36,467	\$10,864	33.9%	\$36,720	99.3%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Table A-5
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Democrats

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Albertson	\$38,835	\$13,145	33.8%	\$37,390	96.3%
Ballance	17,255	16,350	94.8	14,940	86.6
Basnight	39,530	22,641	57.3	18,306	46.1
Conder	35,104	16,414	46.8	29,602	84.3
Cooper	38,247	20,010	52.3	45,721	119.5
Daniel	177,149	59,628	33.7	125,286	70.7
Edwards, C.	7,643	1,850	24.2	7,105	93.0
Folger	13,513	9,288	68.7	7,940	58.8
Gulley	37,884	6,423	17.0	32,855	86.7
Gunter	59,758	22,646	37.9	61,954	103.7
Harris, J.O.	25,048	21,361	85.3	22,468	89.7
Hoyle, D.	86,083	13,700	15.9	91,505	106.3
Hunt, Ralph	28,797	24,084	83.6	22,645	78.6
Hyde	14,075	13,150	93.4	8,129	57.8
Johnson	30,882	23,029	74.6	37,246	120.6
Jordan, Luther	24,382	11,934	48.9	38,420	157.6
Kaplan	30,112	16,800	55.8	28,484	94.6
Kerr	16,320	0	0.0	16,310	99.9
Lee, Howard	19,015	13,375	70.3	15,713	82.6
Marshall	31,915	10,116	31.7	42,891	134.4
Martin, R.	22,135	17,205	77.7	21,376	96.6
Martin, W.	9,177	5,950	64.8	8,134	88.6
Odom	37,337	11,712	31.4	33,976	91.0
Parnell	52,903	24,150	45.6	58,406	110.4
Perdue	21,410	14,900	69.6	20,065	93.7
Plexico	46,878	21,350	45.5	40,541	86.5
Plyler	37,137	19,291	51.9	27,649	74.5
Richardson, James	39,212	16,827	42.9	21,175	54.0
Sands	25,558	17,550	68.7	20,727	81.1
Seymour	42,304	25,923	61.3	34,798	82.3
Sherron	47,719	23,354	48.9	37,995	79.6
Soles	31,865	22,350	70.1	63,329	198.7
Speed	25,025	19,425	77.6	37,467	149.7
Tally	19,214	13,350	69.5	20,005	104.1
Walker	14,905	11,605	77.9	10,571	70.9
Ward	19,532	12,438	63.7	18,315	93.8
Warren, E.	30,275	14,025	46.3	14,633	48.3
Winner, D.	12,737	10,562	82.9	12,658	99.4
Winner, L.	59,640	10,925	18.3	55,301	92.7
Total:	\$1,366,510	\$648,836		\$1,262,031	
Average:	\$35,039	\$16,637	54.9%	\$32,360	93.9%

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table A-6
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Republicans

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Allran	\$17,670	\$10,450	59.1%	\$17,851	101.0%
Blackmon	4,450	4,050	91.0	837	18.8
Carpenter	6,520	5,210	79.9	2,986	45.8
Cochrane	12,000	9,747	81.2	5,798	48.3
Codington	36,587	8,980	24.5	26,497	72.4
Forrester	34,738	18,450	53.1	34,233	98.5
Hartsell	19,680	9,750	49.5	16,518	83.9
Kincaid	13,100	11,950	91.2	7,398	56.
Shaw	15,671	13,000	83.0	9,697	61.9
Simpson	13,077	8,200	62.7	9,080	69.4
Smith, Paul	12,545	10,900	86.9	6,676	53.2
Total:	\$186,038	\$110,687		\$137,571	
Average:	\$16,913	\$10,062	69.3%	\$12,506	64.5%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Table A-7
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Men

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Albertson	\$38,835	\$13,145	33.8%	\$37,390	96.3%
Allran	17,670	10,450	59.1	17,851	101.0
Ballance	17,255	16,350	94.8	14,940	86.6
Basnight	39,530	22,641	57.3	18,306	46.1
Blackmon	4,450	4,050	91.0	837	18.8
Carpenter	6,520	5,210	79.9	2,986	45.8
Codington	36,587	8,980	24.5	26,497	72.4
Conder	35,104	16,414	46.8	29,602	84.3
Cooper	38,247	20,010	52.3	45,721	119.5
Daniel	177,149	59,628	33.7	125,286	70.7
Edwards, C.	7,643	1,850	24.2	7,105	93.0
Folger	13,513	9,288	68.7	7,940	58.8
Forrester	34,738	18,450	53.1	34,233	98.5
Gulley	37,884	6,423	17.0	32,855	86.7
Harris, J.O.	25,048	21,361	85.3	22,468	89.7
Hartsell	19,680	9,750	49.5	16,518	83.9
Hoyle, D.	86,083	13,700	15.9	91,505	106.3
Hunt, Ralph	28,797	24,084	83.6	22,645	78.6
Hyde	14,075	13,150	93.4	8,129	57.8
Johnson	30,882	23,029	74.6	37,246	120.6
Jordan, Luther	24,382	11,934	48.9	38,420	157.6
Kaplan	30,112	16,800	55.8	28,484	94.6
Kerr	16,320	0	0.0	16,310	99.9
Kincaid	13,100	11,950	91.2	7,398	56.5
Lee, Howard	19,015	13,375	70.3	15,713	82.6
Martin, R.	22,135	17,205	77.7	21,376	96.6
Martin, W.	9,177	5,950	64.8	8,134	88.6
Odom	37,337	11,712	31.4	33,976	91.0
Parnell	52,903	24,150	45.6	58,406	110.4
Plexico	46,878	21,350	45.5	40,541	86.5
Plyler	37,137	19,291	51.9	27,649	74.5
Richardson, James	39,212	16,827	42.9	21,175	54.0
Sands	25,558	17,550	68.7	20,727	81.1
Shaw	15,671	13,000	83.0	9,697	61.9

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Sherron	47,719	23,354	48.9	37,995	79.6
Simpson	13,077	8,200	62.7	9,080	69.4
Smith, Paul	12,545	10,900	86.9	6,676	53.2
Soles	31,865	22,350	70.1	63,329	198.7
Speed	25,025	19,425	77.6	37,467	149.7
Walker	14,905	11,605	77.9	10,571	70.9
Ward	19,532	12,438	63.7	18,315	93.8
Warren, E.	30,275	14,025	46.3	14,633	48.3
Winner, D.	12,737	10,562	82.9	12,658	99.4
Total:	\$1,306,307	\$651,916		\$1,158,790	
Average:	\$30,379	\$15,161	58.9%	\$26,949	86.4%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table A-8
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Senate Women

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Cochrane	\$12,000	\$9,747	81.2%	\$5,798	48.3%
Gunter	59,758	22,646	37.9	61,954	103.7
Marshall	31,915	10,116	31.7	42,891	134.4
Perdue	21,410	14,900	69.6	20,065	93.7
Seymour	42,304	25,923	61.3	34,798	82.3
Tally	19,214	10,925	18.3	20,005	104.1
Winner, L.	59,640	10,925	18.3	55,301	92.7
Total:	\$246,241	\$107,607		\$240,812	
Average:	\$35,177	\$15,372	52.8%	\$34,402	94.2%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Table A-9
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Open Seat Candidates

<u>Name of Senator</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Albertson	\$38,835	\$13,145	33.8%	\$37,390	96.3%
Codington	36,587	8,980	24.5	26,497	72.4
Edwards, C.	7,643	1,850	24.2	7,105	93.0
Folger	13,513	9,288	68.7	7,940	58.8
Gulley	37,884	6,423	17.0	32,855	86.7
Gunter	59,758	22,646	37.9	61,954	103.7
Harris, J.O.	25,048	21,361	85.3	22,468	89.7
Hoyle, D.	86,083	13,700	15.9	91,505	106.3
Jordan, Luther	24,382	11,934	48.9	38,420	157.6
Kerr	16,320	0	0.0	16,310	99.9
Marshall	31,915	10,116	31.7	42,891	134.4
Winner, L.	59,640	10,925	18.3	55,301	92.7
Total:	\$437,608	\$130,368		\$440,636	
Average:	\$36,467	\$10,864	33.9%	\$36,720	99.3%

Table A-10
N.C. Senate Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Losing Open Seat Candidates

<u>Name of Candidate</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Bailey	\$2,195	\$2,035 *	92.7%	\$2,307	105.1%
Davis, Dennis	3,062	570 *	18.6	2,920	95.4
Hatch	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Monsour	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Parker	15,500	4,900	31.6	21,772	140.5
Parrish	785	375 *	47.8	761	96.9
Quinn	35,975	4,575	12.7	41,090	114.2
Smith, W.	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Stam	80,112	14,455	18.0	82,567	103.1
Warren, R.	18,573	11,903	64.1	17,843	96.1
Total:	\$156,577	\$38,813		\$169,635	
Average:	\$15,658	\$3,881	28.6%	\$16,964	105.1%

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

SECTION V

State House Candidates, 1992 General Election

Notes: Figures given include all money raised and spent by candidates competing in the general election during the 1992 calendar year.

Bolded names signal incumbents; underlined names signal winners.

PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

<u>District</u>	<u>Democratic Candidate</u>	<u>Republican Candidate</u>
1st	<p><u>Vernon G. James</u> Raised: \$7,750 From PACs: \$7,350 % From PACs: 94.8% Spent: \$5,483 % Spent: 70.7%</p>	
2nd	<p>Howard B. Chapin Raised: \$13,075 From PACs: \$10,825 % From PACs: 82.8% Spent: \$11,409 % Spent: 87.3%</p>	<p><u>Zeno Edwards</u> Raised: \$9,476 From PACs: \$1,725 % From PACs: 18.2% Spent: \$11,521 % Spent: 122.0%</p>
3rd	<p>Gerald L. Anderson Raised: \$26,554 From PACs: \$16,450 % From PACs: 61.9% Spent: \$34,918 % Spent: 131.5%</p>	<p><u>John M. Nichols</u> Raised: \$19,613 From PACs: \$6,675 % From PACs: 34.0% Spent: \$18,846 % Spent: 96.1%</p>
4th (2 seats)	<p>W. Bruce Ethridge Raised: \$16,606 From PACs: \$10,851 % From PACs: 65.3% Spent: \$18,544 % Spent: 111.7%</p>	<p><u>Jean R. Preston</u> Raised: \$30,379 From PACs: \$13,188 % From PACs: 43.4% Spent: \$36,254 % Spent: 119.3%</p>
	<p><u>Ronnie L. Smith</u> Raised: \$29,345 From PACs: \$19,975 % From PACs: 68.1% Spent: \$25,981 % Spent: 88.5%</p>	<p>Clifford R. Tilghman Raised: \$3,487 From PACs: \$1,625 % From PACs: 46.6% Spent: \$3,487 % Spent: 100.0%</p>
5th	<p><u>Howard J. Hunter, Jr.</u> Raised: \$3,275 From PACs: \$3,150 % From PACs: 96.2% Spent: \$3,259 % Spent: 99.5%</p>	

6th	<u>Richard Eugene (Gene) Rogers</u> Raised: \$2,975 From PACs: \$2,800 % From PACs: 94.1% Spent: \$3,562 % Spent: 119.7%	
7th	<u>Dock M. Brown</u> Raised: \$9,633 From PACs: \$6,525 % From PACs: 67.7% Spent: \$6,969 % Spent: 72.3%	Jesse E. Shearin, Jr. Raised: \$13,092 From PACs: \$125 % From PACs: 1.0% Spent: \$13,092 % Spent: 100.0%
8th	<u>Linwood E. Mercer</u> Raised: \$9,840 From PACs: \$3,000 % From PACs: 30.5% Spent: \$9,713 % Spent: 98.7%	
9th	<u>Charles L. McLawhorn</u> Raised: \$8,055 From PACs: \$6,550 % From PACs: 81.3% Spent: \$7,459 % Spent: 92.6%	
10th	<u>Vance Alphin</u> Raised: \$7,950 From PACs: \$3,750 % From PACs: 47.2% Spent: \$15,941 % Spent: 200.5%	Cynthia B. Watson Raised: \$9,142 From PACs: \$4,925 % From PACs: 53.9% Spent: \$9,314 % Spent: 101.9%
11th	<u>Phil Baddour, Jr.</u> Raised: \$43,384 From PACs: \$8,200 % From PACs: 18.9% Spent: \$41,048 % Spent: 94.6%	Helig W. Hoffman Raised: \$2,460 From PACs: \$525 * % From PACs: 21.3% Spent: \$2,460 % Spent: 100.0%
12th	<u>Edward C. Bowen</u> Raised: \$7,325 From PACs: \$4,650 % From PACs: 63.5% Spent: \$6,510 % Spent: 88.9%	

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

13th	<p><u>Karen E. Gottovi</u> Raised: \$31,274 From PACs: \$5,401 % From PACs: 17.3% Spent: \$36,013 % Spent: 115.2%</p>	<p>William T. Steuer Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>
14th (2 seats)	<p><u>Dewey Hill</u> Raised: \$7,300 From PACs: \$5,600 % From PACs: 76.7% Spent: \$64,240 % Spent: 880.0%</p>	<p>Kelly Holden Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>
	<p><u>E. David Redwine</u> Raised: \$35,149 From PACs: \$22,700 % From PACs: 64.6% Spent: \$33,518 % Spent: 95.4%</p>	
15th	<p>Alex Lee Raised: \$11,084 From PACs: \$3,450 % From PACs: 31.1% Spent: \$19,410 % Spent: 175.1%</p>	<p><u>J. Sam Ellis</u> Raised: \$8,597 From PACs: \$6,075 % From PACs: 70.7% Spent: \$7,204 % Spent: 83.8%</p>
16th	<p><u>Daniel H. DeVane</u> Raised: \$4,020 From PACs: \$2,850 % From PACs: 70.9% Spent: \$2,022 % Spent: 50.3%</p>	
17th (2 seats)	<p><u>Theodore J. Kinney</u> (replaced Luther R. "Nick" Jeralds) Raised: \$0 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$0 % Spent: 0.0%</p>	<p>Jim Walen Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>
	<p><u>Mary E. McAllister</u> Raised: \$4,205 From PACs: \$350 % From PACs: 8.3% Spent: \$2,887 % Spent: 68.7%</p>	

18th (2 seats)

Billy Richardson
Raised: \$30,563
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$30,775
% Spent: 100.7%

Catherine A. Cheney
Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

K. Owen Spears, Jr.
Raised: \$15,775
From PACs: \$3,650
% From PACs: 23.1%
Spent: \$32,843
% Spent: 208.2%

Richard M. Miller
Raised: \$4,515
From PACs: \$725
% From PACs: 16.1%
Spent: \$4,525
% Spent: 100.2%

19th (2 seats)

Bobby Ray Hall
Raised: \$19,570
From PACs: \$3,950
% From PACs: 20.2%
Spent: \$10,136
% Spent: 51.8%

William P. Elmore
Raised: \$21,807
From PACs: \$3,375
% From PACs: 15.5%
Spent: \$21,807
% Spent: 100.0%

Clarence (C.P.) Stewart
Raised: \$18,937
From PACs: \$8,650
% From PACs: 45.7%
Spent: \$19,874
% Spent: 104.9%

20th

Larry E. Tetterton
Raised: \$16,528
From PACs: \$4,470
% From PACs: 27.0%
Spent: \$18,246
% Spent: 110.4%

Billy J. Creech
Raised: \$23,826
From PACs: \$13,000
% From PACs: 54.6%
Spent: \$21,206
% Spent: 89.0%

21st

Daniel T. Blue, Jr.
Raised: \$86,778
From PACs: \$53,206
% From PACs: 61.3%
Spent: \$60,186
% Spent: 69.4%

22nd (2 seats)

Richard H. Moore
Raised: \$41,869
From PACs: \$12,025
% From PACs: 28.7%
Spent: \$37,501
% Spent: 89.6%

Louis E. (Ed) Nicholson
Raised: \$2,562
From PACs: \$350 *
% From PACs: 13.7%
Spent: \$2,562
% Spent: 100.0%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

22nd (continued)

Michael S. Wilkins
Raised: \$36,496
From PACs: \$8,550
% From PACs: 23.4%
Spent: \$16,794
% Spent: 46.0%

Robert E. Rector
Raised: \$3,055
From PACs: \$375 *
% From PACs: 12.3%
Spent: \$4,939
% Spent: 161.7%

23rd (3 seats)

H.M. (Mickey) Michaux
Raised: \$6,750
From PACs: \$6,600
% From PACs: 97.8%
Spent: \$6,077
% Spent: 90.0%

Paul Luebke
Raised: \$19,070
From PACs: \$4,690
% From PACs: 24.6%
Spent: \$19,878
% Spent: 104.2%

George W. Miller, Jr.
Raised: \$47,179
From PACs: \$28,258
% From PACs: 59.9%
Spent: \$48,158
% Spent: 102.1%

24th (2 seats)

Anne C. Barnes
Raised: \$8,517
From PACs: \$3,550
% From PACs: 41.7%
Spent: \$3,468
% Spent: 40.7%

Barbara C. McCoy
Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

Joe Hackney
Raised: \$9,530
From PACs: \$5,633
% From PACs: 59.1%
Spent: \$5,371
% Spent: 56.4%

25th (3 seats)

J. Fred Bowman
Raised: \$15,336
From PACs: \$6,300
% From PACs: 41.1%
Spent: \$15,163
% Spent: 98.9%

Ken Miller
Raised: \$3,945
From PACs: \$1,775 *
% From PACs: 45.0%
Spent: \$4,765
% Spent: 120.8%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

25th (continued)

E. Nelson Cole

Raised: \$16,573
From PACs: \$7,850
% From PACs: 47.4%
Spent: \$15,622
% Spent: 94.3%

James D. Williams

Raised: \$2,226
From PACs: \$625 *
% From PACs: 28.1%
Spent: \$2,227
% Spent: 100.1%

Bertha M. (B) Holt

Raised: \$10,153
From PACs: \$7,025
% From PACs: 69.2%
Spent: \$7,311
% Spent: 72.0%

26th

Herman C. Gist

Raised: \$6,810
From PACs: \$5,400
% From PACs: 79.3%
Spent: \$6,930
% Spent: 101.8%

27th

Steve Wood

Raised: \$9,990
From PACs: \$8,750
% From PACs: 87.6%
Spent: \$10,980
% Spent: 109.9%

28th

Will Burton

Raised: \$3,483
From PACs: \$1,650
% From PACs: 47.4%
Spent: \$2,863
% Spent: 82.2%

29th

Bruce Byrd

Raised: \$1,335
From PACs: \$150 *
% From PACs: 11.2%
Spent: \$1,335
% Spent: 100.0%

Joanne W. Bowie

Raised: \$21,465
From PACs: \$2,900
% From PACs: 13.5%
Spent: \$13,230
% Spent: 61.6%

30th

John A. Scotton

Raised: \$3,110
From PACs: \$910 *
% From PACs: 29.3%
Spent: \$3,126
% Spent: 100.5%

Arlie F. Culp

Raised: \$7,500
From PACs: \$6,575
% From PACs: 87.7%
Spent: \$5,789
% Spent: 77.2%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

31st	Walker L. Oldham Raised: \$11,509 From PACs: \$2,400 % From PACs: 20.9% Spent: \$11,509 % Spent: 100.0%	<u>Richard Morgan</u> Raised: \$39,647 From PACs: \$17,216 % From PACs: 43.4% Spent: \$43,340 % Spent: 109.3%
32nd	<u>Hugh A. Lee</u> Raised: \$1,450 From PACs: \$1,250 % From PACs: 86.2% Spent: \$1,464 % Spent: 101.0%	
33rd	<u>Foyle Hightower, Jr.</u> Raised: \$5,250 From PACs: \$3,350 % From PACs: 63.8% Spent: \$10,265 % Spent: 195.5%	
34th	<u>Bobby Griffin</u> Raised: \$6,380 From PACs: \$2,215 % From PACs: 34.7% Spent: \$5,346 % Spent: 83.8%	Fern H. Shubert Raised: \$4,788 From PACs: \$1,125 % From PACs: 23.5% Spent: \$4,493 % Spent: 93.8%
35th	Herman F. Beaver Raised: \$7,065 From PACs: \$1,500 % From PACs: 21.2% Spent: \$7,251 % Spent: 102.6%	<u>Charlotte A. Gardner</u> Raised: \$17,705 From PACs: \$11,925 % From PACs: 67.4% Spent: \$18,263 % Spent: 103.2%
36th	<u>James B. Black</u> Raised: \$48,475 From PACs: \$12,600 % From PACs: 26.0% Spent: \$33,804 % Spent: 69.7%	Cheryl Jones Raised: \$2,122 From PACs: \$1,025 * % From PACs: 48.3% Spent: \$2,774 % Spent: 130.7%
37th	<u>Paul J. McCrary</u> Raised: \$20,216 From PACs: \$3,980 % From PACs: 19.7% Spent: \$13,598 % Spent: 67.3%	<u>Joe H. Hege, Jr.</u> Raised: \$15,635 From PACs: \$12,830 % From PACs: 82.1% Spent: \$15,083 % Spent: 96.5%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

38th	Terry J. Oliver		Harold J. Brubaker	
	Raised:	\$780	Raised:	\$12,800
	From PACs:	\$163	From PACsL:	\$12,300
	% From PACs:	20.9%	% From PACs:	96.1%
	Spent:	\$780	Spent:	\$12,200
	% Spent:	100.0%	% Spent:	95.3%
39th	Keith Y. Sharpe		Lyons Gray	
	Raised:	\$1,685	Raised:	\$54,864
	From PACs:	\$350	From PACs:	\$13,200
	% From PACs:	20.8%	% From PACs:	24.1%
	Spent:	\$1,693	Spent:	\$26,017
	% Spent:	100.5%	% Spent:	47.4%
40th (3 seats)	David H. Diamont		Marshall Hall	
	Raised:	\$26,284	Raised:	\$1,770
	From PACs:	\$18,509	From PACs:	\$1,675 *
	% From PACs:	70.4%	% From PACs:	94.6%
	Spent:	\$17,729	Spent:	\$1,737
	% Spent:	67.5%	% Spent:	98.1%
	Judy F. Hunt		William S. Hiatt	
	Raised:	\$14,898	Raised:	\$9,599
	From PACs:	\$12,958	From PACs:	\$5,525
	% From PACs:	87.0%	% From PACs:	57.6%
	Spent:	\$12,627	Spent:	\$9,599
	% Spent:	84.8%	% Spent:	100.0%
	Wade F. Wilmoth		Gene Wilson	
	Raised:	\$18,148	Raised:	\$3,625
	From PACs:	\$11,708	From PACs:	\$3,225
	% From PACs:	64.5%	% From PACs:	89.0%
	Spent:	\$21,268	Spent:	\$4,684
	% Spent:	117.2%	% Spent:	129.2%
41st (2 seats)	Faye L. Cox		John W. Brown	
	Raised:	\$8,775	Raised:	\$9,650
	From PACs:	\$4,950	From PACs:	\$8,250
	% From PACs:	56.4%	% From PACs:	85.5%
	Spent:	\$8,767	Spent:	\$9,052
	% Spent:	99.9%	% Spent:	93.8%
	Fred M. Hincer		George M. Holmes	
	Raised:	\$125	Raised:	\$13,625
	From PACs:	\$0	From PACs:	\$13,000
	% From PACs:	0.0%	% From PACs:	95.4%
	Spent:	\$125	Spent:	\$8,685
	% Spent:	100.0%	% Spent:	63.7%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

42nd	J. Wayne Kahl Raised: \$6,420 From PACs: \$5,350 % From PACs: 83.3% Spent: \$5,862 % Spent: 91.3%	<u>Frank Mitchell</u> Raised: \$7,585 From PACs: \$4,675 % From PACs: 61.6% Spent: \$6,748 % Spent: 89.0%
43rd		C. Robert Brawley Raised: \$16,625 From PACs: \$11,400 % From PACs: 68.6% Spent: \$16,917 % Spent: 101.8%
44th	<u>John R. Gamble, Jr.</u> Raised: \$10,190 From PACs: \$7,850 % From PACs: 77.0% Spent: \$12,762 % Spent: 125.2%	John C. Hodge, Sr. Raised: \$4,985 From PACs: \$625 % From PACs: 12.5% Spent: \$4,619 % Spent: 92.7%
45th (2 seats)	J. Ed Robinette Raised: \$13,225 From PACs: \$1,300 % From PACs: 9.8% Spent: \$13,208 % Spent: 99.9%	<u>Cherie Killian Berry</u> Raised: \$10,191 From PACs: \$3,975 % From PACs: 39.0% Spent: \$10,078 % Spent: 98.9%
	Ray Hoyle Raised: \$1,635 From PACs: \$150 * % From PACs: 9.2% Spent: \$4,828 % Spent: 295.3%	<u>Charles R. Preston</u> Raised: \$17,138 From PACs: \$5,125 % From PACs: 29.9% Spent: \$17,108 % Spent: 99.8%
46th (2 seats)		David T. Flaherty, Jr. Raised: \$15,021 From PACs: \$10,336 % From PACs: 68.8% Spent: \$16,998 % Spent: 113.2%
		<u>Gregg Thompson</u> Raised: \$13,346 From PACs: \$2,200 % From PACs: 16.5% Spent: \$13,381 % Spent: 100.3%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs

47th

Walter Church, Sr.
(replaced Ray Fletcher)
Raised: \$200
From PACs: \$200
% From PACs: 100.0%
Spent: \$0
% Spent: 0.0%

48th (3 seats)

John J. (Jack) Hunt
Raised: \$7,710
From PACs: \$6,825
% From PACs: 88.5%
Spent: \$9,129
% Spent: 118.4%

Dean Allen
Raised: \$2,647
From PACs: \$525 *
% From PACs: 19.8%
Spent: \$3,588
% Spent: 135.5%

Edith L. Lutz
Raised: \$3,919
From PACs: \$3,200
% From PACs: 81.7%
Spent: \$3,919
% Spent: 100.0%

John Weatherly
Raised: \$14,998
From PACs: \$5,835
% From PACs: 38.9%
Spent: \$17,110
% Spent: 114.1%

William H. Withrow
Raised: \$6,265
From PACs: \$2,050
% From PACs: 32.7%
Spent: \$6,193
% Spent: 98.9%

49th

Robert C. Hunter
Raised: \$48,753
From PACs: \$18,362
% From PACs: 37.7%
Spent: \$55,180
% Spent: 113.2%

Jerry Lee Hunter
Raised: \$15,464
From PACs: \$4,525 *
% From PACs: 29.3%
Spent: \$15,464
% Spent: 100.0%

50th

Larry T. Justus
Raised: \$11,461
From PACs: \$3,500
% From PACs: 30.5%
Spent: \$8,011
% Spent: 69.9%

51st (3 seats)

Marie W. Colton
Raised: \$30,536
From PACs: \$12,500
% From PACs: 40.9%
Spent: \$29,778
% Spent: 97.5%

Lanier M. Cansler
Raised: \$37,706
From PACs: \$4,725
% From PACs: 12.5%
Spent: \$52,357
% Spent: 138.9%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

51st (continued)

Narvel J. (Jim) Crawford

Raised: \$39,304
From PACs: \$18,475
% From PACs: 47.0%
Spent: \$25,367
% Spent: 64.5%

Larry T. Linney

Raised: \$2,050
From PACs: \$1,550
% From PACs: 75.6%
Spent: \$2,214
% Spent: 108.0%

Martin L. Nesbitt

Raised: \$49,864
From PACs: \$28,412
% From PACs: 57.0%
Spent: \$43,066
% Spent: 86.4%

Wilma M. Sherrill

Raised: \$41,750
From PACs: \$1,825
% From PACs: 4.4%
Spent: \$40,824
% Spent: 97.8%

52nd (2 seats)

Charles M. Beall

Raised: \$3,438
From PACs: \$2,800
% From PACs: 81.4%
Spent: \$2,194
% Spent: 63.8%

Liston B. Ramsey

Raised: \$12,203
From PACs: \$7,650
% From PACs: 62.7%
Spent: \$14,063
% Spent: 115.2%

53rd

Thomas K. Jenkins

Raised: \$24,253
From PACs: \$9,110
% From PACs: 37.6%
Spent: \$23,751
% Spent: 97.9%

Marty E. Kimsey

Raised: \$27,593
From PACs: \$11,787
% From PACs: 42.7%
Spent: \$25,509
% Spent: 92.4%

54th

John B. McLaughlin

Raised: \$10,675
From PACs: \$7,500
% From PACs: 70.3%
Spent: \$8,706
% Spent: 81.6%

John E. Sturgis

Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

55th

David G. Balmer

Raised: \$21,670
From PACs: \$10,125
% From PACs: 46.7%
Spent: \$4,350
% Spent: 20.1%

56th	<u>Martha Alexander</u> Raised: \$22,855 From PACs: \$5,400 % From PACs: 23.6% Spent: \$18,877 % Spent: 82.6%	
57th	Dottie Coplon Raised: \$14,821 From PACs: \$2,200 % From PACs: 14.8% Spent: \$19,757 % Spent: 133.3%	<u>Connie Wilson</u> Raised: \$32,380 From PACs: \$9,575 % From PACs: 29.6% Spent: \$31,336 % Spent: 96.8%
58th	<u>Ruth M. Easterling</u> Raised: \$3,575 From PACs: \$1,800 % From PACs: 50.3% Spent: \$2,535 % Spent: 70.9%	
59th	<u>W. Pete Cunningham</u> Raised: \$4,904 From PACs: \$2,500 % From PACs: 51.0% Spent: \$2,734 % Spent: 55.8%	
60th	<u>Howard C. Barnhill</u> Raised: \$6,025 From PACs: \$2,900 % From PACs: 48.1% Spent: \$10,261 % Spent: 170.3%	Joel Blackwell Raised: \$2,350 From PACs: \$825 % From PACs: 35.1% Spent: \$4,459 % Spent: 189.7%
61st	<u>Brad Miller</u> Raised: \$25,039 From PACs: \$9,999 % From PACs: 39.9% Spent: \$29,545 % Spent: 118.0%	David S. Robinson Raised: \$11,343 From PACs: \$1,975 % From PACs: 17.4% Spent: \$11,343 % Spent: 100.0%
62nd	<u>Larry M. Jordan</u> Raised: \$31,116 From PACs: \$17,359 % From PACs: 55.8% Spent: \$27,430 % Spent: 88.2%	<u>David Miner</u> Raised: \$89,544 From PACs: \$3,875 % From PACs: 4.3% Spent: \$102,188 % Spent: 114.1%

63rd	<u>Peggy Stamey</u> Raised: \$17,301 From PACs: \$9,000 % From PACs: 52.0% Spent: \$6,869 % Spent: 39.7%	Doug Biddy Raised: \$18,196 From PACs: \$4,000 % From PACs: 22.0% Spent: \$25,199 % Spent: 138.5%
64th	<u>Bob Hensley</u> Raised: \$19,505 From PACs: \$11,539 % From PACs: 59.2% Spent: \$18,417 % Spent: 94.4%	Bobby Pippin Raised: \$3,947 From PACs: \$325 * % From PACs: 8.2% Spent: \$3,712 % Spent: 94.0%
65th	<u>Aaron E. Fussell, Sr.</u> Raised: \$16,165 From PACs: \$9,279 % From PACs: 57.4% Spent: \$17,213 % Spent: 106.5%	William M. Draper Raised: \$6,668 From PACs: \$2,175 % From PACs: 32.6% Spent: \$6,872 % Spent: 103.1%
66th	<u>Annie Brown Kennedy</u> Raised: \$1,663 From PACs: \$1,413 % From PACs: 85.0% Spent: \$218 % Spent: 13.1%	
67th	<u>Warren C. (Pete) Oldham</u> Raised: \$1,313 From PACs: \$1,063 % From PACs: 81.0% Spent: \$1,963 % Spent: 149.5%	
68th	John R. Huggins Raised: \$7,650 From PACs: \$2,035 % From PACs: 26.6% Spent: \$7,445 % Spent: 97.3%	<u>W.M. (Bill) Ives</u> Raised: \$13,267 From PACs: \$4,850 % From PACs: 36.6% Spent: \$14,939 % Spent: 112.6%
69th		<u>J. Shawn Lemmond</u> Raised: \$27,435 From PACs: \$6,400 % From PACs: 23.3% Spent: \$22,854 % Spent: 83.3%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

70th	<u>Milton F. (Toby) Fitch, Jr.</u> Raised: \$11,470 From PACs: \$10,945 % From PACs: 95.4% Spent: \$3,962 % Spent: 34.5%	
71st	<u>Joe Mavretic</u> Raised: \$14,775 From PACs: \$10,475 % From PACs: 71.0% Spent: \$19,323 % Spent: 130.8%	Danny Worley Raised: \$6,565 From PACs: \$2,775 * % From PACs: 42.3% Spent: \$10,366 % Spent: 157.9%
72nd	<u>Edward L. McGee</u> Raised: \$16,371 From PACs: \$6,850 % From PACs: 41.8% Spent: \$17,271 % Spent: 105.5%	<u>Gene Arnold</u> Raised: \$28,802 From PACs: \$7,125 % From PACs: 24.7% Spent: \$23,307 % Spent: 80.9%
73rd	James A. Collins Raised: \$8,630 From PACs: \$2,750 % From PACs: 31.9% Spent: \$8,630 % Spent: 100.0%	<u>Peggy Wilson</u> Raised: \$18,513 From PACs: \$11,990 % From PACs: 64.8% Spent: \$12,777 % Spent: 69.0%
74th		<u>Julia C. Howard</u> Raised: \$8,500 From PACs: \$7,850 % From PACs: 92.4% Spent: \$7,805 % Spent: 91.8%
75th	<u>Alex Warner</u> Raised: \$7,610 From PACs: \$5,600 % From PACs: 73.6% Spent: \$5,765 % Spent: 75.8%	Darryl M. Davis Raised: \$1,732 From PACs: \$925 % From PACs: 53.4% Spent: \$1,732 % Spent: 100.0%
76th		<u>W.W. (Dub) Dickson</u> Raised: \$3,975 From PACs: \$3,600 % From PACs: 90.6% Spent: \$2,440 % Spent: 61.4%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

77th	<p>Emily H. Moore Raised: \$26,523 From PACs: \$5,325 % From PACs: 20.1% Spent: \$26,523 % Spent: 100.0%</p>	<p><u>Carolyn B. Russell</u> Raised: \$23,939 From PACs: \$10,900 % From PACs: 45.5% Spent: \$25,253 % Spent: 105.5%</p>
78th	<p><u>James P. Green, Sr.</u> Raised: \$5,956 From PACs: \$4,356 % From PACs: 73.1% Spent: \$5,953 % Spent: 99.9%</p>	
79th	<p><u>William Wainwright</u> Raised: \$16,440 From PACs: \$6,625 % From PACs: 40.3% Spent: \$15,498 % Spent: 94.3%</p>	<p>Floyd White Raised: \$835 From PACs: \$275 * % From PACs: 32.9% Spent: \$4,531 % Spent: 542.6%</p>
80th		<p><u>W. Robert Grady</u> Raised: \$3,990 From PACs: \$2,700 % From PACs: 67.7% Spent: \$11,845 % Spent: 269.9%</p>
81st	<p>Carolyn B. Williams Raised: \$11,772 From PACs: \$2,000 % From PACs: 17.0% Spent: \$11,872 % Spent: 100.8%</p>	<p><u>Timothy N. Tallent</u> Raised: \$13,575 From PACs: \$12,550 % From PACs: 92.4% Spent: \$14,669 % Spent: 108.1%</p>
82nd		<p><u>Bobby H. Barbee</u> Raised: \$4,947 From PACs: \$3,650 % From PACs: 73.8% Spent: \$3,890 % Spent: 78.6%</p>
83rd	<p>Larry C. Brown Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%</p>	<p><u>Eugene McCombs</u> Raised: \$14,927 From PACs: \$3,625 % From PACs: 24.3% Spent: \$13,416 % Spent: 89.9%</p>

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

84th

Michael Decker

Raised: \$11,950
From PACs: \$5,765
% From PACs: 48.2%
Spent: \$11,833
% Spent: 99.0%

85th

Ronnie Sutton

Raised: \$14,155
From PACs: \$3,550
% From PACs: 25.1%
Spent: \$12,342
% Spent: 87.2%

Bob Brewington

Raised: \$125
From PACs: \$0
% From PACs: 0.0%
Spent: \$125
% Spent: 100.0%

86th

Raymond M. (Pete) Thompson

Raised: \$5,525
From PACs: \$4,900
% From PACs: 88.7%
Spent: \$3,722
% Spent: 67.4%

87th

Frances M. Cummings

Raised: \$20,763
From PACs: \$6,607
% From PACs: 31.8%
Spent: \$19,768
% Spent: 95.2%

88th

Pat Sheppard

Raised: \$22,743
From PACs: \$250 *
% From PACs: 1.1%
Spent: \$22,743
% Spent: 100.0%

Theresa Esposito

Raised: \$17,960
From PACs: \$12,100
% From PACs: 67.4%
Spent: \$37,547
% Spent: 209.1%

89th (2 seats)

Mary Jarrell

Raised: \$25,370
From PACs: \$16,845
% From PACs: 66.4%
Spent: \$28,234
% Spent: 111.3%

John A. Cocklereece

Raised: \$5,337
From PACs: \$1,625
% From PACs: 30.4%
Spent: \$7,237
% Spent: 135.6%

Maggie Jeffus

Raised: \$14,142
From PACs: \$10,213
% From PACs: 70.2%
Spent: \$13,182
% Spent: 93.2%

Tom Sawyer

Raised: \$2,011
From PACs: \$475
% From PACs: 23.6%
Spent: \$2,458
% Spent: 122.2%

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

90th	<u>G. Max Harris</u> Raised: \$8,542 From PACs: \$3,650 % From PACs: 42.7% Spent: \$8,598 % Spent: 100.7%	<u>Robert C. (Robin) Hayes</u> Raised: \$4,979 From PACs: \$1,625 % From PACs: 33.9% Spent: \$4,672 % Spent: 97.4%
91st	<u>Marjorie O. Strawn</u> Raised: \$15,844 From PACs: \$6,050 % From PACs: 38.2% Spent: \$15,145 % Spent: 95.6%	<u>George S. Robinson</u> Raised: \$30,008 From PACs: \$20,000 % From PACs: 66.6% Spent: \$29,499 % Spent: 98.3%
92nd	<u>Erin J. Kuczmariski</u> Raised: \$41,205 From PACs: \$7,125 % From PACs: 17.3% Spent: \$36,355 % Spent: 88.2%	<u>Ed Moherek</u> Raised: \$10,610 From PACs: \$7,950 % From PACs: 74.9% Spent: \$10,313 % Spent: 97.2%
93rd	<u>Billy Joye</u> Raised: \$8,370 From PACs: \$2,200 % From PACs: 26.3% Spent: \$7,956 % Spent: 95.1%	<u>Ray McKenney</u> Raised: \$125 From PACs: \$0 % From PACs: 0.0% Spent: \$125 % Spent: 100.0%
94th		<u>Jerry C. Dockham</u> Raised: \$6,150 From PACs: \$5,975 % From PACs: 97.2% Spent: \$4,214 % Spent: 68.5%
95th	<u>Allen Wellons</u> Raised: \$29,586 From PACs: \$1,300 % From PACs: 4.4% Spent: \$30,678 % Spent: 103.7%	<u>N. Leo Daughtry</u> Raised: \$22,252 From PACs: \$9,440 % From PACs: 42.4% Spent: \$35,050 % Spent: 157.5%
96th	<u>Edd Nye</u> Raised: \$7,050 From PACs: \$3,600 % From PACs: 51.1% Spent: \$6,712 % Spent: 95.2%	

97th Jerry Braswell
Raised: \$6,190
From PACs: \$2,675
% From PACs: 43.2%
Spent: \$5,814
% Spent: 93.9%

98th Thomas E. Wright
Raised: \$10,932
From PACs: \$6,212
% From PACs: 56.8%
Spent: \$10,191
% Spent: 93.2%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

SECTION VI

Table B-1
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Candidates

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alexander	\$22,855	\$5,400	23.6%	\$18,877	82.6%
Alphin	7,950	3,750	47.2	15,941	200.5
Arnold	28,802	7,125	24.7	23,307	80.9
Baddour	43,384	8,200	18.9	41,048	94.6
Balmer	21,670	10,125	46.7	4,350	20.1
Barbee	4,947	3,650	73.8	3,890	78.6
Barnes	8,517	3,550	41.7	3,468	40.7
Barnhill	6,025	2,900	48.1	10,261	170.3
Beall	3,438	2,800	81.4	2,194	63.8
Berry	10,191	3,975	39.0	10,078	98.9
Black	48,475	12,600	26.0	33,804	69.7
Blue	86,778	53,206	61.3	60,186	69.4
Bowen	7,325	4,650	63.5	6,510	88.9
Bowie	21,465	2,900	13.5	13,230	61.6
Bowman	15,336	6,300	41.1	15,163	98.9
Braswell	6,190	2,675	43.2	5,814	93.9
Brawley	16,625	11,400	68.6	16,917	101.8
Brown, D.	9,633	6,525	67.7	6,969	72.3
Brown, J.	9,650	8,250	85.5	9,052	93.8
Brubaker	12,800	12,300	96.1	12,200	95.3
Burton	3,483	1,650	47.4	2,863	82.2
Church	200	200	100.0	0	0.0
Cole	16,573	7,850	47.4	15,622	94.3
Colton	30,536	12,500	40.9	29,778	97.5
Crawford	39,304	18,475	47.0	25,367	64.5
Creech	23,826	13,000	54.6	21,206	89.0
Culp	7,500	6,575	87.7	5,789	77.2
Cummings	20,763	6,607	31.8	19,768	95.2
Cunningham	4,904	2,500	51.0	2,734	55.8
Daughtry	22,252	9,440	42.4	35,050	157.5
Decker	11,950	5,765	48.2	11,833	99.0
DeVane	4,020	2,850	70.9	2,022	50.3
Diamont	26,284	18,509	70.4	17,729	67.5
Dickson	3,975	3,600	90.6	2,440	61.4
Dockham	6,150	5,975	97.2	4,214	68.5
Easterling	3,575	1,800	50.3	2,535	70.9
Edwards, Z.	9,476	1,725	18.2	11,521	122.0
Ellis	8,597	6,075	70.7	7,204	83.8
Esposito	17,960	12,100	67.4	37,547	209.1

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Fitch	11,470	10,945	95.4	3,962	34.5
Flaherty	15,021	10,336	68.4	16,998	113.2
Fussell	16,165	9,279	57.4	17,213	106.5
Gamble	10,190	7,850	77.0	12,762	125.2
Gardner	17,705	11,925	67.4	18,263	103.2
Gist	6,810	5,400	79.3	6,930	101.8
Gottovi	31,274	5,401	17.3	36,013	115.2
Grady	3,990	2,700	67.7	11,845	296.9
Gray	54,864	13,200	24.1	26,017	47.4
Green	5,956	4,356	73.1	5,953	99.9
Griffin	6,380	2,125	34.7	5,346	83.8
Hackney	9,530	5,633	59.1	5,371	56.4
Hall	19,570	3,950	20.2	10,136	51.8
Hayes	4,797	1,625	33.9	4,672	97.4
Hensley	19,505	11,539	59.2	18,417	94.4
Hightower	5,250	3,350	63.8	10,265	195.5
Hill	7,300	5,600	76.7	64,240	880.0
Holmes	13,625	13,000	95.4	8,685	63.7
Holt	10,153	7,025	69.2	7,311	72.0
Howard	8,500	7,850	92.4	7,805	91.8
Hunt, Jack	7,710	6,725	88.5	9,129	118.4
Hunt, Judy	14,898	12,958	87.0	12,627	84.8
Hunter, H.	3,275	3,150	96.2	3,259	99.5
Hunter, R.	48,753	18,362	37.7	55,180	113.2
Ives	13,267	4,850	36.6	14,939	112.6
James	7,750	7,350	94.8	5,483	70.7
Jarrell	25,370	16,845	66.4	28,234	111.3
Jeffus	14,142	10,213	72.2	13,182	93.2
Jenkins	24,253	9,110	37.6	23,751	97.9
Joye	8,370	2,200	26.3	7,956	95.1
Justus	11,461	3,500	30.5	8,011	69.9
Kennedy	1,663	1,413	85.0	218	13.1
Kinney	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kuczmariski	41,205	7,125	17.3	36,355	88.2
Lee, Hugh	1,450	1,250	86.2	1,464	101.0
Lemmond	27,435	6,400	23.3	22,854	83.3
Luebke	19,070	4,690	24.6	19,878	104.2
Lutz	3,919	3,200	81.7	3,919	100.0
Mavretic	14,775	10,475	71.0	19,323	130.8
McAllister	4,205	350	8.3	2,887	68.7
McCombs	14,927	3,625	24.3	13,416	89.9
McCrary	20,216	3,980	19.7	13,598	67.3
McLaughlin	10,675	7,500	70.3	8,706	81.6
McLawhorn	8,055	6,550	81.3	7,459	92.6
Mercer	9,840	3,000	30.5	9,713	98.7
Michaux	6,750	6,600	97.8	6,077	90.0
Miller, B.	25,039	9,999	39.9	29,545	118.0
Miller, G.	47,179	28,258	59.9	48,158	102.1
Miner	89,544	3,875	4.3	102,188	114.1
Mitchell	7,585	4,675	61.6	6,748	89.0
Moore, R.	41,869	12,025	28.7	37,501	89.6
Morgan	39,647	17,216	43.4	43,340	109.3

continued

Nesbitt	49,864	28,412	57.0	43,066	86.4
Nichols	19,613	6,675	34.0	18,846	96.1
Nye	7,050	3,600	51.1	6,712	95.2
Oldham, Pete	1,313	1,063	81.0	1,963	149.5
Preston, C.	17,138	5,125	29.9	17,108	99.8
Preston, J.	30,379	13,188	43.4	36,254	119.3
Ramsey, L.	12,203	7,650	62.7	14,063	115.2
Redwine	35,149	22,700	64.6	33,518	95.4
Richardson, B.	30,563	0	0.0	30,775	100.7
Robinson, G.	30,008	20,000	66.6	29,499	98.3
Rogers	2,975	2,800	94.1	3,562	119.7
Russell	23,939	10,900	45.5	25,253	105.5
Smith, R.	29,345	19,975	68.1	25,981	88.5
Spears	15,775	3,650	23.1	32,843	208.2
Stamey	17,301	9,000	52.0	6,869	39.7
Stewart	18,937	8,650	45.7	19,874	104.9
Sutton	14,155	3,550	25.1	12,342	87.2
Tallent	13,575	12,550	92.4	14,669	108.1
Thompson, Gregg	13,346	2,200	16.5	13,381	100.3
Thompson, R.	5,525	4,900	88.7	3,722	67.4
Wainwright	16,440	6,625	40.3	15,498	94.3
Warner	7,610	5,600	73.6	5,765	75.8
Weatherly	14,998	5,835	38.9	17,110	114.1
Wilkins	36,496	8,550	23.4	16,794	46.0
Wilmoth	18,148	11,708	64.5	21,268	117.2
Wilson, C.	32,380	9,575	29.6	31,336	96.8
Wilson, P.	18,513	11,990	64.8	12,777	69.0
Wood	9,990	8,750	87.6	10,980	109.9
Wright	10,932	6,212	56.8	10,191	93.2
Total:	\$2,099,396	\$951,468		\$2,013,802	
Average:	\$17,495	\$7,929	54.4%	\$16,782	100.4%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-2
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Losing House Candidates

<u>Name of Candidate</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Allen	\$2,647	\$525 *	19.8%	\$3,588	135.5%
Anderson	26,554	16,450	61.9	34,918	131.5
Beaver	7,065	1,500	21.2	7,251	102.6
Biddy	18,196	4,000	22.0	25,199	138.5
Blackwell	2,350	825	35.1	4,459	189.7
Brewington	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Brown, L.	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Byrd	1,335	150 *	11.2	1,335	100.0
Cansler	37,706	4,725	12.5	52,357	138.9
Chapin	13,075	7,350	94.8	5,483	70.7
Cheney	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Cocklereece	5,337	1,625	30.4	7,237	135.6
Collins	8,630	2,750	31.9	8,630	100.0
Coplon	14,821	2,200	14.8	19,757	133.3
Cox	8,775	4,950	56.4	8,767	99.9
Davis, Darryl	1,732	925	53.4	1,732	100.0
Draper	6,668	2,175	32.6	6,872	103.1
Elmore	21,807	3,375	15.5	21,807	100.0
Ethridge	16,606	10,851	65.3	18,544	111.7
Hall	1,770	1,675 *	94.6	1,737	98.1
Harris, G.M.	8,542	3,650	42.7	8,598	100.7
Hege	15,635	12,830	82.1	15,083	96.5
Hiatt	9,599	5,525	57.6	9,599	100.0
Hincher	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Hodge	4,985	625	12.5	4,619	92.7
Hoffman	2,460	525 *	21.3	2,460	100.0
Holden	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Hoyle, R.	1,635	150 *	9.2	4,828	295.3
Huggins	7,650	2,035	26.6	7,445	97.3
Hunter, J.	15,464	4,525 *	29.3	15,464	100.0
Jones	2,122	1,025 *	48.3	2,774	130.7
Jordan, Larry	31,116	17,359	55.8	27,430	88.2
Kahl	6,420	5,350	83.3	5,862	91.3
Kimsey	27,593	11,787	42.7	25,509	92.4
Lee, Alex	11,084	3,450	31.1	19,410	175.1
Linney	2,050	1,550	75.6	2,214	108.0
McCoy	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
McGee	16,371	6,850	41.8	17,271	105.5
McKenney	125	0	0.0	125	100.0

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

Miller, K.	3,945	1,775 *	45.0	4,765	120.8
Miller, R.	4,515	725	16.1	4,525	100.2
Moherek	10,610	7,950	74.9	10,313	97.2
Moore, E.	26,523	5,325	20.1	26,523	100.0
Nicholson	2,562	350 *	13.7	2,562	100.0
Oldham, W.	11,509	2,400	20.9	11,509	100.0
Oliver	780	163	20.9	780	100.0
Pippin	3,947	325 *	8.2	3,712	94.0
Rector	3,055	375 *	12.3	4,939	161.7
Robinette	13,225	1,300	9.8	13,208	99.9
Robinson, D.	11,343	1,975	17.4	11,343	100.0
Sawyer	2,011	475	23.6	2,458	122.2
Scotton	3,110	910 *	29.3	3,126	100.5
Sharpe	1,685	350	20.8	1,693	100.5
Shearin	13,092	125	1.0	13,092	100.0
Sheppard	22,743	250 *	1.1	22,743	100.0
Sherrill	41,750	1,825	4.4	40,824	97.8
Shubert	4,788	1,125	23.5	4,493	93.8
Steuer	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Strawn	15,844	6,050	38.2	15,145	95.6
Sturgis	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Tetterton	16,528	4,470	27.0	18,246	110.4
Tilghman	3,487	1,625	46.6	3,487	100.0
Walen	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Watson	9,142	4,925	53.9	9,314	101.9
Wellons	29,586	1,300	4.4	30,678	103.7
White	835	275 *	32.9	4,531	542.6
Williams, C.	11,772	2,000	17.0	11,872	100.8
Williams, J.	2,226	625 *	28.1	2,227	100.1
Wilson, G.	3,625	3,225	89.0	4,684	129.2
Withrow	6,265	2,050	32.7	6,193	98.9
Worley	6,565	2,775 *	42.3	10,366	157.9
Total:	\$646,118	\$200,330		\$698,750	
Average:	\$9,100	\$2,822	29.7%	\$9,842	116.8%

©N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs;

Table B-3
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Incumbents

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Balmer	\$21,670	\$10,125	46.7%	\$4,350	20.1%
Barbee	4,947	3,650	73.8	3,890	78.6
Barnes	8,517	3,550	41.7	3,468	40.7
Barnhill	6,025	2,900	48.1	10,261	170.3
Beall	3,438	2,800	81.4	2,194	63.8
Black	48,475	12,600	26.0	33,804	69.7
Blue	86,778	53,206	61.3	60,186	69.4
Bowen	7,325	4,650	63.5	6,510	88.9
Bowie	21,465	2,900	13.5	13,230	61.6
Bowman	15,336	6,300	41.1	15,163	98.9
Brawley	16,625	11,400	68.6	16,917	101.8
Brown, J.	9,650	8,250	85.5	9,052	93.8
Brubaker	12,800	12,300	96.1	12,200	95.3
Colton	30,536	12,500	40.9	29,778	97.5
Crawford	39,304	18,475	47.0	25,367	64.5
Creech	23,826	13,000	54.6	21,206	89.0
Culp	7,500	6,575	87.7	5,789	77.2
Cunningham	4,904	2,500	51.0	2,734	55.8
Decker	11,950	5,765	48.2	11,833	99.0
DeVane	4,020	2,850	70.9	2,022	50.3
Diamont	26,284	18,509	70.4	17,729	67.5
Dickson	3,975	3,600	90.6	2,440	61.4
Dockham	6,150	5,975	97.2	4,214	68.5
Easterling	3,575	1,800	50.3	2,535	70.9
Esposito	17,960	12,100	67.4	37,547	209.1
Fitch	11,470	10,945	95.4	3,962	34.5
Flaherty	15,021	10,336	68.4	16,998	113.2
Fussell	16,165	9,279	57.4	17,213	106.5
Gamble	10,190	7,850	77.0	12,762	125.2
Gardner	17,705	11,925	67.4	18,263	103.2
Gist	6,810	5,400	79.3	6,930	101.8
Gottovi	31,274	5,401	17.3	36,013	115.2
Grady	3,990	2,700	67.7	11,845	296.9
Gray	54,864	13,200	24.1	26,017	47.4
Green	5,956	4,356	73.1	5,953	99.9
Hackney	9,530	5,633	59.1	5,371	56.4
Hensley	19,505	11,539	59.2	18,417	94.4
Hightower	5,250	3,350	63.8	10,265	195.5
Holmes	13,625	13,000	95.4	8,685	63.7

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Holt	10,153	7,025	69.2	7,311	72.0
Howard	8,500	7,850	92.4	7,805	91.8
Hunt, Jack	7,710	6,725	88.5	9,129	118.4
Hunt, Judy	14,898	12,958	87.0	12,627	84.8
Hunter, H.	3,275	3,150	96.2	3,259	99.5
Hunter, R.	48,753	18,362	37.7	55,180	113.2
James	7,750	7,350	94.8	5,483	70.7
Jarrell	25,370	16,845	66.4	28,234	111.3
Jeffus	14,142	10,213	72.2	13,182	93.2
Justus	11,461	3,500	30.5	8,011	69.9
Kennedy	1,663	1,413	85.0	218	13.1
Luebke	19,070	4,690	24.6	19,878	104.2
Lutz	3,919	3,200	81.7	3,919	100.0
Mavretic	14,775	10,475	71.0	19,323	130.8
McAllister	4,205	350	8.3	2,887	68.7
McLaughlin	10,675	7,500	70.3	8,706	81.6
McLawhorn	8,055	6,550	81.3	7,459	92.6
Michaux	6,750	6,600	97.8	6,077	90.0
Miller, G.	47,179	28,258	59.9	48,158	102.1
Morgan	39,647	17,216	43.4	43,340	109.3
Nesbitt	49,864	28,412	57.0	43,066	86.4
Nye	7,050	3,600	51.1	6,712	95.2
Oldham, Pete	1,313	1,063	81.0	1,963	149.5
Ramsey, L.	12,203	7,650	62.7	14,063	115.2
Redwine	35,149	22,700	64.6	33,518	95.4
Robinson, G.	30,008	20,000	66.6	29,499	98.3
Rogers	2,975	2,800	94.1	3,562	119.7
Russell	23,939	10,900	45.5	25,253	105.5
Smith, R.	29,345	19,975	68.1	25,981	88.5
Stamey	17,301	9,000	52.0	6,869	39.7
Stewart	18,937	8,650	45.7	19,874	104.9
Tallent	13,575	12,550	92.4	14,669	108.1
Thompson, R.	5,525	4,900	88.7	3,722	67.4
Wainwright	16,440	6,625	40.3	15,498	94.3
Warner	7,610	5,600	73.6	5,765	75.8
Wilmoth	18,148	11,708	64.5	21,268	117.2
Wilson, P.	18,513	11,990	64.8	12,777	69.0
Wood	9,990	8,750	87.6	10,980	109.9
Total:	\$1,290,225	\$730,297		\$1,158,338	
Average:	\$16,756	\$9,484	64.8%	\$15,043	93.2%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-4
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
New House Members

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alexander	\$22,855	\$5,400	23.6%	\$18,877	82.6%
Alphin	7,950	3,750	47.2	15,941	200.5
Arnold	28,802	7,125	24.7	23,307	80.9
Baddour	43,384	8,200	18.9	41,048	94.6
Berry	10,191	3,975	39.0	10,078	98.9
Braswell	6,190	2,675	43.2	5,814	93.9
Brown, D.	9,633	6,525	67.7	6,969	72.3
Burton	3,483	1,650	47.4	2,863	82.2
Church	200	200	100.0	0	0.0
Cole	16,573	7,850	47.4	15,622	94.3
Cummings	20,763	6,607	31.8	19,768	95.2
Daughtry	22,252	9,440	42.4	35,050	157.5
Edwards, Z.	9,476	1,725	18.2	11,521	122.0
Ellis	8,597	6,075	70.7	7,204	83.8
Griffin	6,380	2,125	34.7	5,346	83.8
Hall	19,570	3,950	20.2	10,136	51.8
Hayes	4,797	1,625	33.9	4,672	97.4
Hill	7,300	5,600	76.7	64,240	880.0
Ives	13,267	4,850	36.6	14,939	112.6
Jenkins	24,253	9,110	37.6	23,751	97.9
Joye	8,370	2,200	26.3	7,956	95.1
Kinney	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kuczmariski	41,205	7,125	17.3	36,355	88.2
Lee, Hugh	1,450	1,250	86.2	1,464	101.0
Lemmond	27,435	6,400	23.3	22,854	83.3
McCombs	14,927	3,625	24.3	13,416	89.9
McCrary	20,216	3,980	19.7	13,598	67.3
Mercer	9,840	3,000	30.5	9,713	98.7
Miller, B.	25,039	9,999	39.9	29,545	118.0
Miner	89,544	3,875	4.3	102,188	114.1
Mitchell	7,585	4,675	61.6	6,748	89.0
Moore, R.	41,869	12,025	28.7	37,501	89.6
Nichols	19,613	6,675	34.0	18,846	96.1
Preston, C.	17,138	5,125	29.9	17,108	99.8
Preston, J.	30,379	13,188	43.4	36,254	119.3
Richardson, B.	30,563	0	0.0	30,775	100.7

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Spears	15,775	3,650	23.1	32,843	208.2
Sutton	14,155	3,550	25.1	12,342	87.2
Thompson, Gregg	13,346	2,200	16.5	13,381	100.3
Weatherly	14,998	5,835	38.9	17,110	114.1
Wilkins	36,496	8,550	23.4	16,794	46.0
Wilson, C.	32,380	9,575	29.6	31,336	96.8
Wright	10,932	6,212	56.8	10,191	93.2
Total:	\$809,171	\$221,171		\$855,464	
Average:	\$18,818	\$5,144	35.9%	\$19,895	113.4%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-5
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Democrats

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alexander	\$22,855	\$5,400	23.6%	\$18,877	82.6%
Alphin	7,950	3,750	47.2	15,941	200.5
Baddour	43,384	8,200	18.9	41,048	94.6
Barnes	8,517	3,550	41.7	3,468	40.7
Barnhill	6,025	2,900	48.1	10,261	170.3
Beall	3,438	2,800	81.4	2,194	63.8
Black	48,475	12,600	26.0	33,804	69.7
Blue	86,778	53,206	61.3	60,186	69.4
Bowen	7,325	4,650	63.5	6,510	88.9
Bowman	15,336	6,300	41.1	15,163	98.9
Braswell	6,190	2,675	43.2	5,814	93.9
Brown, D.	9,633	6,525	67.7	6,969	72.3
Burton	3,483	1,650	47.4	2,863	82.2
Church	200	200	100.0	0	0.0
Cole	16,573	7,850	47.4	15,622	94.3
Colton	30,536	12,500	40.9	29,778	97.5
Crawford	39,304	18,475	47.0	25,367	64.5
Cummings	20,763	6,607	31.8	19,768	95.2
Cunningham	4,904	2,500	51.0	2,734	55.8
DeVane	4,020	2,850	70.9	2,022	50.3
Diamond	26,284	18,509	70.4	17,729	67.5
Easterling	3,575	1,800	50.3	2,535	70.9
Fitch	11,470	10,945	95.4	3,962	34.5
Fussell	16,165	9,279	57.4	17,213	106.5
Gamble	10,190	7,850	77.0	12,762	125.2
Gist	6,810	5,400	79.3	6,930	101.8
Gottovi	31,274	5,401	17.3	36,013	115.2
Green	5,956	4,356	73.1	5,953	99.9
Griffin	6,380	2,125	34.7	5,346	83.8
Hackney	9,530	5,633	59.1	5,371	56.4
Hall	19,570	3,950	20.2	10,136	51.8
Hensley	19,505	11,539	59.2	18,417	94.4
Hightower	5,250	3,350	63.8	10,265	195.5
Hill	7,300	5,600	76.7	64,240	880.0
Holt	10,153	7,025	69.2	7,311	72.0
Hunt, Jack	7,710	6,725	88.5	9,129	118.4
Hunt, Judy	14,898	12,958	87.0	12,627	84.8
Hunter, H.	3,275	3,150	96.2	3,259	99.5
Hunter, R.	48,753	18,362	37.7	55,180	113.2

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

James	7,750	7,350	94.8	5,483	70.7
Jarrell	25,370	16,845	66.4	28,234	111.3
Jeffus	14,142	10,213	72.2	13,182	93.2
Jenkins	24,253	9,110	37.6	23,751	97.9
Joye	8,370	2,200	26.3	7,956	95.1
Kennedy	1,663	1,413	85.0	218	13.1
Kinney	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Kuczmariski	41,205	7,125	17.3	36,355	88.2
Lee, Hugh	1,450	1,250	86.2	1,464	101.0
Luebke	19,070	4,690	24.6	19,878	104.2
Lutz	3,919	3,200	81.7	3,919	100.0
Mavretic	14,775	10,475	71.0	19,323	130.8
McAllister	4,205	350	8.3	2,887	68.7
McCrary	20,216	3,980	19.7	13,598	67.3
McLaughlin	10,675	7,500	70.3	8,706	81.6
McLawhorn	8,055	6,550	81.3	7,459	92.6
Mercer	9,840	3,000	30.5	9,713	98.7
Michaux	6,750	6,600	97.8	6,077	90.0
Miller, B.	25,039	9,999	39.9	29,545	118.0
Miller, G.	47,179	28,258	59.9	48,158	102.1
Moore, R.	41,869	12,025	28.7	37,501	89.6
Nesbitt	49,864	28,412	57.0	43,066	86.4
Nye	7,050	3,600	51.1	6,712	95.2
Oldham, Pete	1,313	1,063	81.0	1,963	149.5
Ramsey, L.	12,203	7,650	62.7	14,063	115.2
Redwine	35,149	22,700	64.6	33,518	95.4
Richardson, B.	30,563	0	0.0	30,775	100.7
Rogers	2,975	2,800	94.1	3,562	119.7
Smith, R.	29,345	19,975	68.1	25,981	88.5
Spears	15,775	3,650	23.1	32,843	208.2
Stamey	17,301	9,000	52.0	6,869	39.7
Stewart	18,937	8,650	45.7	19,874	104.9
Sutton	14,155	3,550	25.1	12,342	87.2
Thompson, R.	5,525	4,900	88.7	3,722	67.4
Wainwright	16,440	6,625	40.3	15,498	94.3
Warner	7,610	5,600	73.6	5,765	75.8
Wilkins	36,496	8,550	23.4	16,794	46.0
Wilmoth	18,148	11,708	64.5	21,268	117.2
Wright	10,932	6,212	56.8	10,191	93.2
Total:	\$1,315,313	\$615,923		\$1,250,980	
Average:	\$16,863	\$7,896	54.9%	\$16,038	100.7%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-6
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Republicans

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Arnold	\$28,802	\$7,125	24.7%	\$23,307	80.9%
Balmer	21,670	10,125	46.7	4,350	20.1
Barbee	4,947	3,650	73.8	3,890	78.6
Berry	10,191	3,975	39.0	10,078	98.9
Bowie	21,465	2,900	13.5	13,230	61.6
Brawley	16,625	11,400	68.6	16,917	101.8
Brown, J.	9,650	8,250	85.5	9,052	93.8
Brubaker	12,800	12,300	96.1	12,200	95.3
Creech	23,826	13,000	54.6	21,206	89.0
Culp	7,500	6,575	87.7	5,789	77.2
Daughtry	22,252	9,440	42.4	35,050	157.5
Decker	11,950	5,765	48.2	11,833	99.0
Dickson	3,975	3,600	90.6	2,440	61.4
Dockham	6,150	5,975	97.2	4,214	68.5
Edwards, Z.	9,476	1,725	18.2	11,521	122.0
Ellis	8,597	6,075	70.7	7,204	83.8
Esposito	17,960	12,100	67.4	37,547	209.1
Flaherty	15,021	10,336	68.4	16,998	113.2
Gardner	17,705	11,925	67.4	18,263	103.2
Grady	3,990	2,700	67.7	11,845	296.9
Gray	54,864	13,200	24.1	26,017	47.4
Hayes	4,797	1,625	33.9	4,672	97.4
Holmes	13,625	13,000	95.4	8,685	63.7
Howard	8,500	7,850	92.4	7,805	91.8
Ives	13,267	4,850	36.6	14,939	112.6
Justus	11,461	3,500	30.5	8,011	69.9
Lemmond	27,435	6,400	23.3	22,854	83.3
McCombs	14,927	3,625	24.3	13,416	89.9
Miner	89,544	3,875	4.3	102,188	114.1
Mitchell	7,585	4,675	61.6	6,748	89.0
Morgan	39,647	17,216	43.4	43,340	109.3
Nichols	19,613	6,675	34.0	18,846	96.1
Preston, C.	17,138	5,125	29.9	17,108	99.8
Preston, J.	30,379	13,188	43.4	36,254	119.3
Robinson, G.	30,008	20,000	66.6	29,499	98.3
Russell	23,939	10,900	45.5	25,253	105.5

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Tallent	13,575	12,550	92.4	14,669	108.1
Thompson, Gregg	13,346	2,200	16.5	13,381	100.3
Weatherly	14,998	5,835	38.9	17,110	114.1
Wilson, C.	32,380	9,575	29.6	31,336	96.8
Wilson, P.	18,513	11,990	64.8	12,777	69.0
Wood	9,990	8,750	87.6	10,980	109.9
Total:	\$784,083	\$335,545		\$762,822	
Average:	\$18,669	\$7,989	53.5%	\$18,162	99.9%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-7
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Men

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alphin	\$7,950	\$3,750	47.2%	\$15,941	200.5%
Arnold	28,802	7,125	24.7	23,307	80.9
Baddour	43,384	8,200	18.9	41,048	94.6
Balmer	21,670	10,125	46.7	4,350	20.1
Barbee	4,947	3,650	73.8	3,890	78.6
Barnhill	6,025	2,900	48.1	10,261	170.3
Beall	3,438	2,800	81.4	2,194	63.8
Black	48,475	12,600	26.0	33,804	69.7
Blue	86,778	53,206	61.3	60,186	69.4
Bowen	7,325	4,650	63.5	6,510	88.9
Bowman	15,336	6,300	41.1	15,163	98.9
Braswell	6,190	2,675	43.2	5,814	93.9
Brawley	16,625	11,400	68.6	16,917	101.8
Brown, D.	9,633	6,525	67.7	6,969	72.3
Brown, J.	9,650	8,250	85.5	9,052	93.8
Brubaker	12,800	12,300	96.1	12,200	95.3
Burton	3,483	1,650	47.4	2,863	82.2
Church	200	200	100.0	0	0.0
Cole	16,573	7,850	47.4	15,622	94.3
Crawford	39,304	18,475	47.0	25,367	64.5
Creech	23,826	13,000	54.6	21,206	89.0
Culp	7,500	6,575	87.7	5,789	77.2
Cunningham	4,904	2,500	51.0	2,734	55.8
Daughtry	22,252	9,440	42.4	35,050	157.5
Decker	11,950	5,765	48.2	11,833	99.0
DeVane	4,020	2,850	70.9	2,022	50.3
Diamont	26,284	18,509	70.4	17,729	67.5
Dickson	3,975	3,600	90.6	2,440	61.4
Dockham	6,150	5,975	97.2	4,214	68.5
Edwards, Z.	9,476	1,725	18.2	11,521	122.0
Ellis	8,597	6,075	70.7	7,204	83.8
Fitch	11,470	10,945	95.4	3,962	34.5
Flaherty	15,021	10,336	68.4	16,998	113.2
Fussell	16,165	9,279	57.4	17,213	106.5
Gamble	10,190	7,850	77.0	12,762	125.2
Gist	6,810	5,400	79.3	6,930	101.8
Grady	3,990	2,700	67.7	11,845	296.9
Gray	54,864	13,200	24.1	26,017	47.4

continued

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Green	5,956	4,356	73.1	5,953	99.9
Griffin	6,380	2,125	34.7	5,346	83.8
Hackney	9,530	5,633	59.1	5,371	56.4
Hall	19,570	3,950	20.2	10,136	51.8
Hayes	4,797	1,625	33.9	4,672	97.4
Hensley	19,505	11,539	59.2	18,417	94.4
Hightower	5,250	3,350	63.8	10,265	195.5
Hill	7,300	5,600	76.7	64,240	880.0
Holmes	13,625	13,000	95.4	8,685	63.7
Hunt, Jack	7,710	6,725	88.5	9,129	118.4
Hunter, H.	3,275	3,150	96.2	3,259	99.5
Hunter, R.	48,753	18,362	37.7	55,180	113.2
Ives	13,267	4,850	36.6	14,939	112.6
James	7,750	7,350	94.8	5,483	70.7
Jenkins	24,253	9,110	37.6	23,751	97.9
Joye	8,370	2,200	26.3	7,956	95.1
Justus	11,461	3,500	30.5	8,011	69.9
Kinney	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Lee, Hugh	1,450	1,250	86.2	1,464	101.0
Lemmond	27,435	6,400	23.3	22,854	83.3
Luebke	19,070	4,690	24.6	19,878	104.2
Mavretic	14,775	10,475	71.0	19,323	130.8
McCombs	14,927	3,625	24.3	13,416	89.9
McCrary	20,216	3,980	19.7	13,598	67.3
McLaughlin	10,675	7,500	70.3	8,706	81.6
McLawhorn	8,055	6,550	81.3	7,459	92.6
Mercer	9,840	3,000	30.5	9,713	98.7
Michaux	6,750	6,600	97.8	6,077	90.0
Miller, B.	25,039	9,999	39.9	29,545	118.0
Miller, G.	47,179	28,258	59.9	48,158	102.1
Miner	89,544	3,875	4.3	102,188	114.1
Mitchell	7,585	4,675	61.6	6,748	89.0
Moore, R.	41,869	12,025	28.7	37,501	89.6
Morgan	39,647	17,216	43.4	43,340	109.3
Nesbitt	49,864	28,412	57.0	43,066	86.4
Nichols	19,613	6,675	34.0	18,846	96.1
Nye	7,050	3,600	51.1	6,712	95.2
Oldham, Pete	1,313	1,063	81.0	1,963	149.5
Preston, C.	17,138	5,125	29.9	17,108	99.8
Ramsey, L.	12,203	7,650	62.7	14,063	115.2
Redwine	35,149	22,700	64.6	33,518	95.4
Richardson, B.	30,563	0	0.0	30,775	100.7
Robinson, G.	30,008	20,000	66.6	29,499	98.3
Rogers	2,975	2,800	94.1	3,562	119.7
Smith, R.	29,345	19,975	68.1	25,981	88.5
Spears	15,775	3,650	23.1	32,843	208.2
Stewart	18,937	8,650	45.7	19,874	104.9
Sutton	14,155	3,550	25.1	12,342	87.2
Tallent	13,575	12,550	92.4	14,669	108.1
Thompson, Gregg	13,346	2,200	16.5	13,381	100.3
Thompson, R.	5,525	4,900	88.7	3,722	67.4

continued

Wainwright	16,440	6,625	40.3	15,498	94.3
Warner	7,610	5,600	73.6	5,765	75.8
Weatherly	14,998	5,835	38.9	17,110	114.1
Wilkins	36,496	8,550	23.4	16,794	46.0
Wilmoth	18,148	11,708	64.5	21,268	117.2
Wood	9,990	8,750	87.6	10,980	109.9
Wright	10,932	6,212	56.8	10,191	93.2
Total:	\$1,667,988	\$763,678		\$1,599,218	
Average:	\$17,375	\$7,955	55.4%	\$16,659	103.4%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-8
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning House Women

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alexander	\$22,855	\$5,400	23.6%	\$18,877	82.6%
Barnes	8,517	3,550	41.7	3,468	40.7
Berry	10,191	3,975	39.0	10,078	98.9
Bowie	21,465	2,900	13.5	13,230	61.6
Colton	30,536	12,500	40.9	29,778	97.5
Cummings	20,763	6,607	31.8	19,768	95.2
Easterling	3,575	1,800	50.3	2,535	70.9
Esposito	17,960	12,100	67.4	37,547	209.1
Gardner	17,705	11,925	67.4	18,263	103.2
Gottovi	31,274	5,401	17.3	36,013	115.2
Holt	10,153	7,025	69.2	7,311	72.0
Howard	8,500	7,850	92.4	7,805	91.8
Hunt, Judy	14,898	12,958	87.0	12,627	84.8
Jarrell	25,370	16,845	66.4	28,234	111.3
Jeffus	14,142	10,213	72.2	13,182	93.2
Kennedy	1,663	1,413	85.0	218	13.1
Kuczumarski	41,205	7,125	17.3	36,355	88.2
Lutz	3,919	3,200	81.7	3,919	100.0
McAllister	4,205	350	8.3	2,887	68.7
Preston, J.	30,379	13,188	43.4	36,254	119.3
Russell	23,939	10,900	45.5	25,253	105.5
Stamey	17,301	9,000	52.0	6,869	39.7
Wilson, C.	32,380	9,575	29.6	31,336	96.8
Wilson, P.	18,513	11,990	64.8	12,777	69.0
Total:	\$431,408	\$187,790		\$414,584	
Average:	\$17,975	\$7,825	50.3%	\$17,274	88.7%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

Table B-9
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Winning Open Seat Candidates

<u>Name of Representative</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Alexander	\$22,855	\$5,400	23.6%	\$18,877	82.6%
Alphin	7,950	3,750	47.2	15,941	200.5
Arnold	28,802	7,125	24.7	23,307	80.9
Baddour	43,384	8,200	18.9	41,048	94.6
Berry	10,191	3,975	39.0	10,078	98.9
Braswell	6,190	2,675	43.2	5,814	93.9
Brown, D.	9,633	6,525	67.7	6,969	72.3
Burton	3,483	1,650	47.4	2,863	82.2
Cole	16,573	7,850	47.4	15,622	94.3
Cummings	20,763	6,607	31.8	19,768	95.2
Daughtry	22,252	9,440	42.4	35,050	157.5
Ellis	8,597	6,075	70.7	7,204	83.8
Griffin	6,380	2,125	34.7	5,346	83.8
Hall	19,570	3,950	20.2	10,136	51.8
Hayes	4,797	1,625	33.9	4,672	97.4
Hill	7,300	5,600	76.7	64,240	880.0
Ives	13,267	4,850	36.6	14,939	112.6
Jenkins	24,253	9,110	37.6	23,751	97.9
Joye	8,370	2,200	26.3	7,956	95.1
Kuczmariski	41,205	7,125	17.3	36,355	88.2
Lee, Hugh	1,450	1,250	86.2	1,464	101.0
Lemmond	27,435	6,400	23.3	22,854	83.3
McCombs	14,927	3,625	24.3	13,416	89.9
McCrary	20,216	3,980	19.7	13,598	67.3
Mercer	9,840	3,000	30.5	9,713	98.7
Miller, B.	25,039	9,999	39.9	29,545	118.0
Miner	89,544	3,875	4.3	102,188	114.1
Mitchell	7,585	4,675	61.6	6,748	89.0
Moore, R.	41,869	12,025	28.7	37,501	89.6
Preston, C.	17,138	5,125	29.9	17,108	99.8
Richardson, B.	30,563	0	0.0	30,775	100.7
Spears	15,775	3,650	23.1	32,843	208.2
Sutton	14,155	3,550	25.1	12,342	87.2
Thompson, Gregg	13,346	2,200	16.5	13,381	100.3
Wilkins	36,496	8,550	23.4	16,794	46.0
Wilson, C.	32,380	9,575	29.6	31,336	96.8
Wright	10,932	6,212	56.8	10,191	93.2
Total:	\$734,505	\$193,548		\$771,733	
Average:	\$19,851	\$5,231	35.4%	\$20,858	119.6%

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Table B-10
N.C. House Campaign Financing, 1992 Elections
Losing Open Seat Candidates

<u>Name of Candidate</u>	<u>Amount Raised</u>	<u>Amount From PACs</u>	<u>% From PACs</u>	<u>Amount Spent</u>	<u>% Spent of Amount Raised</u>
Brewington	\$125	\$0	0.0%	\$125	100.0%
Brown, L.	\$125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Cheney	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Coplon	14,821	2,200	14.8	19,757	133.3
Elmore	21,807	3,375	15.5	21,807	100.0
Harris, G.M.	8,542	3,650	42.7	8,598	100.7
Hoffman	2,460	525 *	21.3	2,460	100.0
Holden	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Hoyle, R.	1,635	150 *	9.2	4,828	295.3
Huggins	7,650	2,035	26.6	7,445	97.3
Lee, Alex	11,084	3,450	31.1	19,410	175.1
McKenney	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Miller, R.	4,515	725	16.1	4,525	100.2
Moherek	10,610	7,950	74.9	10,313	97.2
Nicholson	2,562	350 *	13.7	2,562	100.0
Rector	3,055	375 *	12.3	4,939	161.7
Robinette	13,225	1,300	9.8	13,208	99.9
Robinson, D.	11,343	1,975	17.4	11,343	100.0
Shearin	13,092	125	1.0	13,092	100.0
Shubert	4,788	1,125	23.5	4,493	93.8
Walen	125	0	0.0	125	100.0
Watson	9,142	4,925	53.9	9,314	101.9
Williams, J.	2,226	625 *	28.1	2,227	100.1
Total:	\$143,307	\$34,860		\$161,071	
Average:	\$6,231	\$1,516	17.9%	\$7,003	115.5%

© N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Note: Figures shown include all money raised and spent by candidates during the 1992 calendar year. PAC (Political Action Committee) category includes political parties.

* Political party contributions only; no other PACs.

N.C. Center for Public Policy Research

Board of Directors

Chairman

Keith Crisco

Vice Chairman

Wade H. Hargrove

Secretary

Beverly Blount Smith

Treasurer

Daphne T. Copeland

Linda Ashendorf
Ron Bogle
Kelvin Buncum
William R. Capps
Ruth Cook
George Daniel
Allyson Duncan
Ann Duncan
Charles Evans
Margot Flood
Virginia Ann Foxx
Randy Fraser
Thomas C. Hardaway
Katherine Harrelson
V.B. (Hawk) Johnson
Philip J. Kirk, Jr.
William (Cliff) Oxford
Harry E. Payne, Jr.
Fran Preston
Mary Joan Pugh
Johnathan Rhyne, Jr.
Ruth Shaw
Patricia J. Shore
Geraldine Sumter
Nancy Temple
Ed Williams
John Winters

Executive Director

Ran Coble

Center Staff

Mary Fant
Sharon Gibson
Tom Mather
Mike McLaughlin
Danita Morgan
Nancy Rose