ping the FEC of its power and its independence. I want no part in giving one interest group an unfair advantage over another interest group. I want no part in an effort to make this measure an incumbent’s bill. S. 3065 would accomplish these unintended consequences to vote against it and vote in favor of the simple reconstituting of the Commission. However, if the Senate should adopt S. 3065 as reported out of the Committee on Rules, I would hope that the President of the United States will see fit to veto the measure. To do otherwise, to subject the Federal Election Commission to such restraints, would be a disservice to the American people.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that it be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will please call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Andrew Loewi from my staff be allowed the privileges of the floor during the consideration of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. Cannon, I yield myself 1 minute. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of S. 3065, the Federal Election Campaign Act Amendments of 1976, Mr. Roy Greenway, and Jan Mueller of Senator Cranston’s staff be given the privileges of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, with the understanding that at 2 o’clock when the Senate adjourns, if following a recess, the time between the hour of 2 o’clock and 3 o’clock today be equally divided between Mr. Hatfield and Mr. Cannon, and that the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m. today.

There being no objection, the Senate at 1 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon the Senate ressembled as called to order by the President of the Senate (Mr. STAFFORD).

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3065) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for its administration by a Federal Election Commission appointed in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Senate that the pending amendment is the Griffin amendment to S. 3065. Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, for all the reasons set forth in the Washington Post editorial of this morning entitled “Changing the Campaign Law,” the substitute which I have offered should be adopted by the Senate. There are other reasons in addition to those set forth in the Washington Post editorial. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial and another one that appeared to-day’s Washington Star be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1976]

CHANGING THE CAMPAIGN LAW

When we last looked in on the question of amending the campaign laws, Rep. Wayne L. Hays (D-Ohio) and some allies were busy cementing a deal. Under this plan, the Federal Elections Commission would be reconstituted as mandated by the Supreme Court, but the commission’s independence would be limited—and Congress would also take the opportunity to write new rules for political action committees, giving business groups, labor unions, and other political forces a little more room.

Well, a familiar thing happened on the way to the floor. Members of both the House Administration Committee and the Senate Rules Committee had some further thoughts, primarily on ways to make compliance with the law less of a bother and investigations less of a threat. As a result, the bills now before the Senate and awaiting House debate are bulky, odd-shaped packages that contain some useful provisions, some undesirable ones and some that are downright misleading.

To start with, many legislators are worried that the political action committees, or PACS, their staff could become too free-wheeling or too strict, so that candidates might face criminal prosecution for minor mistakes, or be hurt by endless investigations of a politically correct or malicious complaint. Thus the pending bills would reduce criminal sanctions for minor violations, emphasize conciliation and civil penalties, and require complaints to be signed and sworn. Moreover, any official action—an investigation, rule-making or even the design of a form—would have to clear the FEC, and chairs of the 6 commissioners. These changes are generally constructive. However, it is too restrictive to require, as the Senate bill does, that two commissioners from each party must agree to anything.

The bills also invite trouble by cloaking crucial fundraising laws in secrecy. This would be done by imposing criminal penalties on any FEC official who discloses any information about any pending case without the consent of the candidate involved. Meanwhile the candidate would be free to say anything he wished in any case or the FEC. Surely some less heavy-handed and more even-handed way can be found to enforce discipline and inspire some semblance of responsibility on the part of PACS.

From there, the bills go rapidly downhill. Congressional influence over the commission is intensified. Public disclosure of campaign financial statements would be curtailed. Under the Senate bill, contributors would no longer have to make reports of “banquet” or “chit-chat” or “friend” payments, thus making it harder to find out who has given how much to whom. The House measure, meanwhile, would raise the ceiling on cash contributions to PACS to $10,000, a lower limit which is obviously inviting abuse. Finally, the House committee, which is quite shameless where the campaign laws are concerned, even adopted an amendment that would block the FEC from looking into the activities of any congressman’s staff—as long as the legislator says that his aides are doing official business.

Such provisions are so cynical that it is hard to believe they may survive. Yet most members of Congress are concerned in one way or another with other aspects of the bills. The most intricate dickering has been over what political committees, especially labor and management, may or may not do. Some Republicans are suggesting, for instance, that President Ford may veto the bill if it bars corporate political action committees from soliciting funds from middle-level nonunion employees as well as stockholders and executives. Such intense interest in the flow of money may be inevitable in an election year. In the current political climate, however, maneuvers that obviously favor one special-interest group could cost a candidate a large amount of general public regard.

It is also un timel y. In our view, for the self-styled champions of “campaign reform” to make a major push for public financing of congressional campaigns. Regardless of the appeal of such a plan, consideration of it ought to be deferred until the impact of contribution limits and public funding of presidential campaigns can be evaluated properly next year. For now, those legislators who do vote for a serious effort to make campaign laws more effective may have quite enough to do in terms of cleaning up the measures that the two committees have devised.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 16, 1976]

WHAT IS MR. HAYS UP TO?

It’s hard to tell whether Rep. Wayne Hays is working for or against legislation to keep the Federal Election Commission in business.

You will recall that Mr. Hays had wanted to kill the commission but was turned around by George Meany of the AFL-CIO and House leaders who wanted the commission kept alive.

Mr. Hays’s House Administration Committee has completed work on legislation ostensibly aimed at saving the Election Commission from legal infirmities found by the Supreme Court. But while fixing the flaws, the Administration Committee has added appendages, at least one of which is highly controversial and might result in a presidential veto.

The Administration Committee has decreed that corporations that have organized political action committees to collect funds for candidates cannot solicit donations from employees; they could solicit from business executives and management officials. No similar restriction was put on political action committees of labor organizations.

Candida tes for the on the Senate floor (Mr. Hays & Co. to give labor an upper hand over management in raising political funds and electing candi-
dates. A Republican member of the Administration Committee argued, to no avail, that limiting the right of solicitation to a certain class or group was unwise and unconstitutional.

The White House has indicated that President Ford may veto the bill if it contains the restrictive provision when it reaches his desk. Mr. Keating has attempted to block requested appropriations for the U.S. Information Service unless Mr. Ford signs the bill—which smacks of political blackmail.

But wait. There may be more to this than meets the eye. Perhaps the foxy Mr. Hays is trying to pull a fast one on the administration colleagues who want to keep the Election Commission in business. Could he be deliberately courting a presidential veto, hoping that the Electoral College will cast its vote for Mr. Ford?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, this clearly is not the appropriate time to pass the bill that has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Under the circumstances existing at this time it would not be the right thing to do.

The proposal the Senator from Tennessee and I have offered as a substitute would simply, cleanly, and clearly re-establish the Federal Election Commission in a constitutional way and allow it to do its job.

The kind of proposal we have offered, and which will be voted on at 3 o’clock, can become law. There is no question but that the President would sign it. Everyone knows there is serious doubt as to whether this President would sign the kind of bill that has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration and is before the Senate or the kind of bill that has been reported in the House.

It is imperative that the Federal Election Commission be allowed to continue in existence, and that we meet our responsibilities to continue its life before the deadline set by the Supreme Court. It is not necessary to re-elect those candidates in the Presidential election, not President Ford, incidentally, but the other candidates, will receive the funds to which they are entitled under the existing law.

It would put the President in a very awkward situation, of course, to place on his desk a monstrosity of this nature and, in effect, require him to veto it.

I can hear the charges now: "Well, he does not want the other candidates to receive Federal funds." I want to reject that kind of charge right now, and label it for what it is, because this Senate does have another choice. It has a responsible choice, and that is to pass a simple bill extending the Federal Election Commission as separate legislation, and then deal later with these other so-called reforms, which are not reforms at all but which, in effect, seriously weaken the powers of the Federal Election Commission. The Senate can let those issues be submitted to the President on their own merits and in a separate bill.

This is no time to be tampering with the rest of the law. This is not the time to attempt to change the rules of the game, and we are in the middle of an election contest. The candidates have announced and are running on the basis of certain rules, and now the Committee on Rules and Administration comes along and wants to make major changes in those rules.

I do not argue that the present rules are perfect or that the present rules do not need changing, but I do say that this is not the time to change them. The time for such changes is after the election and after we have had the experience of this election. Then Congress, in a deliberative way and in an atmosphere free from the pressures of the election, should address itself again to the matter of the election financing laws and how to improve them. Without a doubt, there are many ways in which the existing laws can be improved.

I think one of the most interesting questions of the day is, why do we not hear the voice of John Gardner and Common Cause saying something about the bill that is before us, which cripples and weakens the Independence of the Federal Election Commission? Why are we not hearing the voice of John Gardner and Common Cause in support of what the President is trying to do, and which is embodied in the substitute that is at the desk. The substitute extends the life of the Commission for another two years, with all its authority and powers undiminished, and re-establishes it in a way that will be constitutional under the Supreme Court decision?

Perhaps we will hear from John Gardner and Common Cause and, perhaps, we will know they do support this approach. But so far they have been strangely silent.

I am not surprised, of course, that the heads of the big labor organizations are in favor of this bill. It is pretty clear what this bill seeks to do in terms of giving them even more power than they have now. But I am disappointed in the silence of some others who claim to be, and ought to be, nonpartisan and who claim to be, and ought to be, working for the public interest and not for special interests.

So, Mr. President, I hope at 3 o’clock the Senate will have the wisdom to put this subject in a posture that will, I think, be applauded by the American people.

I believe that most Americans believe that the simple idea we have is that the Federal Election Commission would be the right thing to do at this time. We will see where the votes are, where the lines are drawn, and we will proceed from there.

I yield the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee such time as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan.

I am privileged to coauthor this amendment with him, and I appreciate his leadership in this matter.

I hope in the next 50 minutes we will keep our eyes focused on the basic issue. The issue is the continuation of an independent election commission to insure that the elections in the United States are conducted without fraud, bias or some governmental impediment to equity to all parties concerned.

We have operated under a different law for these 200 years. In the last 50 years we operated under the Corrupt Practices Act, which has worked to the advantage of the incumbents. It is obvious since no person has been indicted under this Act, to the best of my knowledge, where the Clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House were hired by the incumbents and then were in charge of enforcing the campaign statutes.

That is a nice cozy arrangement and it meant that incumbents simply did not have to abide by the same rules as everyone else. So when we got into a debate about reform, I think almost everybody in this body, Democrat, Republican, so-called liberals, so-called conservatives—if those words mean anything, and I do not know whether they do or not any more—agreed that the essential ingredient of a reform would be an independent commission to oversee the electoral process in these United States to insure equity for the American people in the process of acquiring representation.

The Supreme Court found our efforts wanting in certain areas and declared certain parts of that reform effort unconstitutional—and I think they probably were right.

They left us with a problem, what do we do now to see that the elections are run in an unbiased fashion.

The challenger and incumbent alike have a right to protection under the law so that the American people may have equal protection under the law, and they left us with the responsibility of recreating the independent commission or not.

The bill that has been brought to us by the Rules Committee is a charade. It is not an independent election commission. The bill that is being proposed in the House is a charade. It is not an independent election commission.

So the Senate and the House of Representatives in this decision they make would be resubmitted to the Congress so we know whether or not it would help our candidacy, incumbent or not, and the challengers have no rights whatsoever.

The bill is an effort to enlarge the rights of certain vested interests in the population and to diminish the rights of others.

Ultimately, the diminishment would apply to most people in this country.

I yield the Senator and I offer a substitute which says with as much clarity and as much simplicity as we are capable of commanding, "Let's extend the existence of this commission as it was originally intended in an independent status, let's do it simply and straightforwardly, let's do it honestly, let's don't try to con anybody, let's don't build anybody's castle and let's don't try to tear anybody's castle down, let's simply extend the commission so that we can have an independent body to oversee the elections of these United States in a fair and unbiased fashion and nothing else."

It is straightforward. It avoids any complex, new problem. It assumes no
additional constitutional question. As a matter of fact, it allows none because the court has already acted on the other parts of the bill and asked us to act on this section. It does not attempt to judge the merits of the arguments which can be taken by the courts, such as the rights of labor to solicit nonunion members, the rights of management to solicit union members.

That is not the question before us. The question is not whether we are going to have an election supervisory, but an independent body under one's control. That is the issue. Are we going to have a strong, Independent election commission, or are we not?

Mr. CANNON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BROCK. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I do not quite follow the Senator when he says the Commission would not be an independent commission. It can stop the act that is proposed. Will he spell out precisely what he is talking about?

It seems to me we made the commission if anything, more independent. We even agree with respect to election, then that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows, when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.

Mr. BROCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that will tie them up in courts. The Senator also knows when we say, in effect, they cannot issue an opinion on a specific case and create, in effect, sham the act that is proposed, that it takes at least two of the same political party to constitute a majority in making their decision.

I do not know how more independent he can have it.
submits does have the expiration provision in it.
I ask a parliamentary inquiry: Is it in order for me to modify my amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised it would take unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that section 3 of the substitute amendment as proposed be amended.

Mr. CANNON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. CANNON. I yield such time as the Senator from Tennessee was trying to do with the Senator from Michigan is to have at least one honest election this year. That is all.

The fact that this amendment contains a section that, if it is not stricken, if it were not stricken, it, but, if we did not, fine. That does not change the fact that we still deserve an honest election in 1976. That does not change the merit of the argument. That should not change a single vote. Let us do these things one at a time. If we cannot have it for the next 5 years let us at least do it for 1 year. Let us have an independent commission that will oversee these elections in a totally unbiased, nonpartisan fashion to be sure that the American people have representation. For gosh sakes, just one time let us try and see if it will work. We have been 50 years with the other way and it sure has not protected the American people. Let us try it 1 year, just once, and see if we cannot get an independent election commission that will do a decent job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to read the article Mr. Cannon has prepared, and I find that it is a thoughtful and comprehensive fashion to be sure that the American people have representation. For gosh sakes, just one time let us try and see if it will work. We have been 50 years with the other way and it sure has not protected the American people. Let us try it 1 year, just once, and see if we cannot get an independent election commission that will do a decent job.

Mr. CANNON. I yield such time as the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to read the article Mr. Cannon has prepared, and I find that it is a thoughtful and comprehensive fashion to be sure that the American people have representation. For gosh sakes, just one time let us try and see if it will work. We have been 50 years with the other way and it sure has not protected the American people. Let us try it 1 year, just once, and see if we cannot get an independent election commission that will do a decent job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to read the article Mr. Cannon has prepared, and I find that it is a thoughtful and comprehensive fashion to be sure that the American people have representation. For gosh sakes, just one time let us try and see if it will work. We have been 50 years with the other way and it sure has not protected the American people. Let us try it 1 year, just once, and see if we cannot get an independent election commission that will do a decent job.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, even with the Senate's efforts to avoid ambiguities, they creep into legislation and often lead to misunderstanding and difficult administration of laws. To avoid conflicts and confusion, it would be in the interest of the Congress and the Supreme Court decision in Buckley v. Valeo that the Federal Election Commission may not constitutionally include the role of the Secretary as an ex officio member. At the moment, it has been my intention that the Secretary serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity and to serve only in an advisory capacity. The idea that the Secretary of the Senate could serve in an advisory capacity is that he would have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other Commissioners, except the right to vote.
process, and then just simply not vote on it, or attempt to influence other Commission members. So right now I would not necessarily agree that that is correct, that an ex officio member should have all rights and privileges and responsibilities of the other members except the right to vote.

The rest of it I find no problem with, but I think this may go a little far, and might get into a question of whether the Supreme Court decision might really limit us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, what we had in mind was the fact that as an ex officio member, he would not just remain mute, that he could give advice and consent, that he would in effect, represent the Senate's point of view; that he could have a voice but not a vote.

Mr. CANNON. I think certainly if the Commission calls on him for advice and consent he would be obligated to give them the benefit of his best judgment, but when we say all the rights and privileges and responsibilities of other commissioners except the right to vote, I would find some problem with that. I think that perhaps is a little broader than an ex officio member is entitled to be.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If he had to wait for the commissioners to call on him, and something came up which affected the rights, duties, and privileges of the Senate, I would think that, as the Secretary of the Senate, representing all the Senate, he would have the right to express an opinion, so that the rights of the Senate could be safeguarded, as I would assume the rights of the House of Representatives would be in the person of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Cannon. Yes. But I think to debate and discuss policy issues and decision-making problems that arise that did not relate, necessarily, directly to the Senate might go beyond what was intended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be as related to the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. That, I think, would be proper.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be the intent of the words which the distinguished chairman of the committee has brought to the attention of the Senate, and that would be the matter which I would have in mind, because then we would have a protector down there which we would look after our interests, and should be allowed to speak up in our behalf if events would warrant it.

Mr. Cannon. If that were conditioned upon matters related to the Senate, then I would agree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, it would be with reference to the Senate.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. BROCK. Was there any consideration of minority representation in this addendum to the Commission in an ex officio capacity?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was stated in the law that the clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate would be the only two ex officio members, that I could recall, and as long as both those people represent, really, not a party but the Senate and the House of Representatives that the two sides would be assured that they would be given full representation.

Mr. BROCK. I think we would under the current leadership of the Senate, may I say, but I am not sure we would in the future. I am certainly sure we would not have the same circumstances in the past. I wonder if it would not make more sense to have two representatives of the Senate, one of the majority and one of the minority, just to be sure this protection would be available to all Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would think that would add to the difficulty, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, because when a person becomes the Secretary of the Senate, he represents the Senate. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate represents the Senate. I would hate to see minority and majority representation, especially in view of the fact that I have such high confidence in the present Secretary of the Senate, who has done a remarkably good job under extremely difficult circumstances.

Mr. BROCK. I have great confidence, may I say to the majority leader, in the present incumbent of that office and his employer, the Senator from Montana. I have no qualms about the equity that would be received under present circumstances. I just wonder, you know, what might happen in the future.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

Mr. BROCK. I think the law should provide for any and all circumstances. That would be my only point.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROCK. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I would point out to the Senator from Tennessee that that is precisely the same provision that is in the law now.

Mr. BROCK. That is why the question the Senator from Nevada raised was important, because he was trying to limit all of the areas where this ex officio person could speak.

Mr. CANNON. I was just trying to delineate what my belief was as to the meaning of ex officio in that regard. Part of that, of course, has been eliminated as unconstitutional, but the specific part and the Clerk of the House was not addressed by the Court, according to my recollection.

It reads:

There is established a commission to be known as the Federal Election Commission, composed of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives ex officio, without the right to vote, and of six members appointed as follows:

And then the appointing provision is the part the Court struck down because Congress retained a part of the power of appointment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is where you have your division of the parties on a three by three basis on the Commission.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield me time? I understand the Senator from Michigan is not here.

Mr. BROCK. I yield the Senator from New York 4 minutes.

Mr. BUCKLEY. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, first of all, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hammond of my staff be accorded the privilege of the floor throughout the course of the deliberations on this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a similar request?

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I just wanted, at the outset of this debate, to make a couple of observations.

My friend from Tennessee has stated that the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Buckley versus Valeo left us with a problem. I believe those are his exact words. Actually, it left us with a whole carload of problems, which I suggest none of the proposals before us even attempt to cope with.

I shall quote from one of the initial paragraphs of Chief Justice Burger's opinion in that case. He said:

The courts rule does violence to the intent of Congress in its comprehensive scheme of campaign financing.

He then goes on to say:

What remains after today's holding leaves no more than a shadow of what Congress contemplated. It leaves no program.

I tried to offer some suggestions. I introduced legislation that would have dealt with the effects of the Supreme Court's decision as a whole. I do not have any illusions that it will be enacted because the public, at large, and this Congress, in particular, have failed to focus on any aspect other than the fact that the FEC, as currently constituted, was declared to be unconstitutional. But what the decision also did was to give extraordinary advantages to candidates who are either incumbents or independently wealthy or who have the support of well organized, well financed special interest political action groups, such as the AFL-CIO. Congress and individuals and groups can spend unlimited funds in support of their own candidates or of candidates they favor whereas nonincumbent candidates who are of modest means or who do not have the support of well financed political action groups are subject, in that fundraising, to the limit-
MONEY AND SANCTimony

We do not recall ever sharing the general muggwump enthusiasm for John Gardner, certainly not since that day long ago when in a thick of it we sentenced him to a minor predication book on Excellence. From the moment, moreover, when, in.upperclass living rooms across the country, he launched Common Cause, his opponents were taken aback by an enterprise so unfocused that it was his estimation of himself as a political leader, as a keeper of public morals, though rather in the eldering way of people who, proclaiming themselves servants of God, insist also that they are "humble." Watergate was made for the man who had come to believe in his own credentials as a political leader, of a kind, to think that the problems of the nation were so serious that he, as the ruler of a nation's destiny, might channel the rage for some orderly purgative of the Stockade. Gardner's greatest legislative accomplishment is the monstrous arcane campaign finance reform bill, not being tested before the Supreme Court. Passed in the shadow of Nixon's worst per­fidies, it is a curious compromise, at least a bit apprehensive that the passion for reform may have led Congress to infringe on the first amendment guarantees of free expression. Nonetheless, it is important legislation that promises to salvage the political clout of Gardner's mission. A fort­night ago, his organization announced that all but two of the Horde now running for President had pledged themselves to abide by rules that are either so vague as to be meaningless, so obvious as to be redundant, or so onerous as to make one wonder why any dignified person would think of com­plying at all. It is the last category which concerns us.

The contenders promise to make "public a statement of personal financial holdings, including assets and debts, sources of income, honoraria, gifts and other financial transactions over $1000, covering candidate, spouse and dependent children." What right does John Gardner have to information about the earnings of a candidate's teenage children? Doesn't it seem too rich to the candidate's friends, or more so to those to whom the candidate's public disclosure of personal financial holdings. One of the two who has not signed on Gardner's dotted line is Ronald Reagan, though his spokesman did tell the Gridiron dinner that he had received an In­duction of the polltical culture. It is now, we suppose, his way of answering. His campaign manager, however, wrote Gardner directly, not feebly but expressing a sen­timent with which we fully sympathize.

"Take your enclosed standards and stuff them in your ear."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. President, In the immortal words of the senior Senator from Rhode Island, we ran like rats in the wake of Water­gate. Yes, we ran like rats. In 1974, Mr. Pastore, No. the statement was we created a monster and we ran like scared rats.

Mr. Buckley. Scared rats. Thank you.

I totally agree with his estimation of the situation and we ran as scared. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Buckley, May I have 1 more minute?

Mr. Brocx. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 more minute.

Mr. Buckley. We ran like scared rats in part as a result of the enormous campaign launched by Common Cause. There were other indications that presumption would be his badge; demonstrably, he had come to be­lieve in his own credentials as a keeper of public morals, though rather in the eldering way of people who, proclaiming themselves servants of God, insist also that they are "humble." I ask unanimous consent that that editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

That being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES L. BUCKLEY, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Senator Buckley, Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to discuss my bill, which was introduced yesterday. It is now 2 1/2 weeks since the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the case of Buckley versus. Visionary number of bills have been introduced more or less as emergency measures that are in-
tended to deal with only the most obvious of the gaps left by the decision.

None of these measures, I submit, addresses the full range of problems created by the Supreme Court decision, especially in congressional races.

We need to do substantially more than simply reconstitute the Federal Election Commission so that public sent committees can continue to flow to Presidential candidates. The Supreme Court’s elimination of limits on individual contributions for Congress running this year will face the danger of losing substantial control over their own campaigns. The $1,000 and $5,000 contribution limitations will no longer keep individuals on political committees from spending as much as they want on behalf of candidates they want to support. It will merely permit candidates to arrange their expenditures with the candidate’s campaign.

In other words, each one of us running for elective office that could see chaos in their promotion of a single issue.

2. THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Aside from the fact that the Supreme Court has found the method of appointing the Federal Election Commission to be unconstitutional, the Commission in practice has been found to reflect all the deficiencies that are to be found in too many other agencies that rule-making and enforcement responsibilities. Arbitrary and at times capricious requirements impose excessive legal and bookkeeping costs on candidates for public office. We have also vested in the Commission extraordinarily broad powers over a most sensitive area of national life.

I suppose there is some sort of poetic justice in having Members of the Congress finally made subject to the kind of bureaucratic, cumbersome, bureaucratic regulations and costs to which the Congress routinely has subjected so many others in American society. Nevertheless, our bill seeks to remedy this situation by allowing the functions currently vested in the FEC to be reallocated between a reconstituted commission and a new election law section to be established in the Department of Justice.

Our bill would vest the enforcement powers for the Federal election laws not with an independent election czar, but rather with a new political officer within the traditional enforcement arm of the Federal Government. The election officer, a Director and Deputy Director of different political parties who would be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would serve for 4-year terms and could be removed only for cause.

We believe, in short, that this mechanism would insulate this section from political direction by an incumbent President.

This arrangement would leave audit, review, and certification responsibilities with the new Federal Election Commission while assigning the functions of enforcement, the issuance of advisory opinions, and the conduct of civil actions to the new election law section of the Justice Department. This is the more normal arrangement, and we believe it represents better policy.

3. RECORDKEEPING AND DISCLOSURE

The current disclosure and bookkeeping provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act impose costs that cannot be justified by any consideration of public policy. I speak of the current requirements that a record be kept of each contributor giving over $10 and that disclosure be made of each contribution in excess of $100.

With respect to the recordkeeping provisions, it is simply irrational to suppose that any candidate for national office will be influenced by a $100 contribution, let alone an $11 contribution. The only possible effect of the current provision is to discourage contributions by individuals reluctant to be identified with minor parties or candidates who does not in any way affect the problem of candidates for national office. Our bill would substantially lighten the current recordkeeping burden by limiting such records to contributions in excess of $100.

It is just as irrational to assume that candidates for national office could be bribed with an $800 or $1,000 contribution. The only possible effect of the current law would be to add to the ills of recordkeeping and enforcement.

Our bill would not only remove these troubling requirements, it would also reduce the number of people reporting to the FEC, and it would reduce the amount of paperwork required of candidates for national office. Our bill would also provide a unique opportunity to correct the deficiencies in the current provisions.

4. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The current law appears unduly restrictive with respect to contributions and expenditures from political parties and committees. There is also a great deal of uncertainty as to what constitutes a contribution to a particular candidate. Our bill incorporates language which will (a) remove some of the arbitrary restrictions that have been placed on the traditional role of parties and committees, thereby broadening the diversity of groups that can have an input on the electoral process, and (b) provide for necessary statutory guidelines for determining what constitutes a contribution. This will serve to remove many of the uncertainties that now exist in the law, and will facilitate the conduct of campaigns as well as the work of the election law section that would be charged under our bill with the enforcement of Federal election law.

As I stated at the outset, the Supreme Court’s decision in Buckley v. Valeo requires corrective action that is significantly broader in scope than the reconstitution of the Federal Election Commission. Inequities have been magnified which the Congress must address if we are not to establish two classes of candidates facing vastly different problems in financing and launching their political campaigns. Furthermore, the fact that a majority of the candidates at this time provides us with a unique opportunity to correct the deficiencies that have been widely noted, deficiencies which add materially to the cost and complexity of political campaigns without serving any identifiable public purpose.

The American people have a right to expect that we will utilize this opportunity to effect something more than incremental improvements in our present system. This is the moment to act.

They have a right to expect their representatives in Congress to enact real election reform that will remove provisions whose net effect is to protect the wealthy or special-interest candidates from successful challenge to say nothing of Incumbent Members of Congress.
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I thank you, Mr. Chairman. There has been distaste among members of the legislation we introduced yesterday. And I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Chair states that the Senator from Nevada has 11 minutes remaining and the Senator from Tennessee 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask that time be taken out of both sides.

Mr. BROCK. I ask that the Senator not make such a request. We only have 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

Who yields time?

If nobody yields time, the clock will be charged equally against both sides.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. PASTORE. Charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, we are some 11 minutes shy of a vote on the pending amendment, and I shall just summarize very quickly the arguments of the proponents.

It is my strong feeling that the bill, as presented to us by the Committee on the so-called President's Commission, as I stated earlier, was something more than an extension bill, and yet that is the way it has been presented. It is, in fact, a Christmas tree, designed to advantage certain very important groups of high privilege and power in this country. It is designed to disadvantage certain other groups, but more than anything else, because those are not the points of contention, the bill as presented to us is a bill to destroy the independence of the Federal Election Commission, to pervert its basic purpose and to reconstitute the good old days where the Senate and House of Representatives were the judge of their own election process and no one else. That was the fight for reform some several years ago and is a bill to perpetuate the independence of the Republican and the Constitution; because we have no right to advantage ourselves by device, by law, by circumstance.

The President correctly stated that it would simply extend the life of the Commission, but he already has seen many instances in which we believe the Commission has erred in the proposal of regulations that they had sent up here, in the interpretation of existing law, and many other areas.

The amendment that we have before us is simply to strike section 3, the self-destruct provision, and to look at it again in a calmer atmosphere and try to come up with a new bill. In any event, if the distinguished Senator from Michigan wants to oppose his President and some of the Senators opposite him, I am inclined to go along with him on that point at present.

I see that the Senator has returned to the Chamber. I will be glad to yield some time to him, if he desires, within the very few minutes I have remaining, inasmuch as the time of the minority has expired.

Recapitulate for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan: I have just stated that if the Senator from Michigan desires to oppose his leader, the President, who recommended that we have a self-destruct provision, and to look at this bill in a calmer atmosphere early next year, I will not object if he moves to strike section 3, the self-destruct provision, from his substitute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, while I will not accept the characterization of the Senator from Nevada, I am glad that he has changed his position and will cooperate to that extent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that section 3 of the substitute be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BROCK. Section 3, on page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. CANNON. I take it that we are all talking about the same issue, inasmuch as we had two earlier.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I simply wish to speak during the time that we have before the vote. I commend the distinguished floor manager of the bill, Senator Cannon, for the outstanding job he has done in bringing this much-needed attention to the floor of the Senate. I hope we will be able...
to pass S. 3065 in the near future, and it certainly appears that we will.

No one can contest the urgent need for a comprehensive revision of the Federal Election Commission, so that the administration and enforcement of the law can continue without disruption. But S. 3065 does more than simply reconstitute the Commission, and that is what the pending amendment is all about. It establishes strict new limits on the proliferation of so-called political action committees which are set up by special interest groups, both business and labor, to funnel campaign dollars to candidates. Certainly if we adopt the pending substitute, we will be ignoring that problem.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in the Record some material which was prepared by Common Cause. It dramatically illustrates the massive special interest contribution and proliferation of committees that already has taken place. I ask unanimous consent to have this material printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:


**BUSINESS-RELATED COMMITTEES**

Almost 75 percent of the 242 new committees have been formed by business-related interests, according to the study. One hundred seven and seventy corporations and 22 banks have registered political committees in the last year, more than doubling the number of corporations and banks with registered committees prior to the 1974 elections.

Dairy-related committees are the most active in the new registration drive. Eight steel companies have registered subsidiaries for the first time, including Atlantic Richfield Co., Cities Service Co., Montgomery Ward & Co., Pan American Airlines, PepsiCo Inc., R. J. Reynolds Industries and Sears, Roebuck.

In all, the 14 major corporate committees listed collected $16.4 million in total contributions. According to Common Cause, the $35 million to $600,000 from special interest groups. The $35 million to $600,000 from special interest groups.

**SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS ACCUMULATE $16.4 MILLION FOR 1976 POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, UP MORE THAN 40 PERCENT OVER SIMILAR PERIOD IN 1974, COMMON CAUSE STUDY REVEALS**

Special interest groups have accumulated $16.4 million for the 1976 political campaigns, according to a new study released by Common Cause. The $16.4 million political war chest—cash on hand as of January 1976—represents an increase of more than 40 percent over the $11.7 million held by interest groups at a similar early stage of the 1974 elections (February, 28, 1974), said Wertheimer.

"The $16.4 figure doesn't even begin to tell the story," according to Fred Wertheimer, Common Cause Vice President and Director of its Campaign Finance Monitoring Project. "In fact, it is only a down payment on the mass of political funds and campaign spending that have been generated by the passage of the 1974 campaign finance law, 242 new political giving committees have been established by special interest groups during the past year." (See Appendix A for complete list."

Most of these new interest group committees have just begun their drive to accumulate funds for the 1976 elections. This means that many millions of additional political dollars will be raised by the new committees in the months ahead," Wertheimer said.

According to the study, the 242 new committees now constitute thirty percent of all Interest group committees registered under the federal law. The cash the new committees have accumulated at this stage, however, amounts to only six percent of the $16.4 million total funds accumulated by all interest group committees.

The new committees so far have raised only $928,000 with $496,000 accumulated by just one group, a new committee connected with the American Trial Lawyers Association.

The study notes that the huge difference between funds available for all committees and those available for new committees will change dramatically over the course of 1976, as the new committees carry out their initial fundraising drives.
Labor organizations have on hand $1.6 million more than the $8 million they had at a similar stage in 1974. In addition, the AFL-CIO'sCOPE fund reports a balance of only $173,000 as of January 1976. (In 1974 the AFL-CIO CCOPE funds contributed $1.2 million to Congressional candidates.)

Health groups have on hand approximately $1 million more than the $1.5 million they had in 1974, with the AMA accounting for $786,000 of the increase.

The leading groups with funds available as of January 1976 were the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., $1,611,702; the American Medical Association, $1,616,076; the maritime unions, $1,347,332; UAW, $988,652; and the American Dental Association, $612,792. (See Appendix B.)

1974 DATA TO BE PUBLISHED IN SERIES OF VOLUMES

Common Cause also announced that it would publish within the next month a series of volumes setting forth comprehensive campaign finance data for the 1974 Congressional elections. The volumes will present, for each Congressional candidate in the 1974 general election a complete list of interest group contributions, and individual contributions of $500 or more. The volumes will also provide complete listings of the 1974 Congressional contributions made by each significant special interest group.

Common Cause said it will continue to monitor campaign finances in the 1976 elections, with particular focus on the activities of special interest groups. Since its inception in early 1971, the Common Cause Campaign Finance Monitoring Project has been directed by Fred Wertheimer, John J. Conway, and Neil Umprey serve as Associate Directors of the Common Cause Project specializing in special interest activities, and candidate and individual contributor activities, respectively.

APPENDIX A

SPECIAL INTERESTS REGISTERING POLITICAL ACTION COUPS SINCE JANUARY 1976

("Denotes groups that previously had registered political committees and are registering additional committees.")

BUSINESS (176)

Aerospace (4 committees):
- Grumman Corp.
- Lockheed Aircraft Corp.
- McDonnell Douglas Corp.
- United Technologies Corp.

Apparel (1):
- Kellwood Co.

Chemicals and Metals (25):
- Aluminum Co. of America
- AMAX Inc.
- Anaconda Co.
- ARMCO Steel Corp.
- Dow Chemical Co. (7 committees)
- FMC Corp.
- Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.
- Kerr-McGee Corp.
- Lone Star Steel Co.
- Lycoming-Youngstown National Steel Corp.
- NL Industries
- Owens-Illinois, Inc.
- Phillips Dodge Corp.
- PPG Industries, Inc.
- Republic Steel Corp.
- U.S. Steel
- W. B. Grace & Co.
- Wheeling-Pittsburgh Steel Corp.
- Coal, Oil and Gas (20):
- Atlantic Richfield Co.
- Cities Service Co.
- Continental Oil Co.
- Enserch Corp.

Halliburton Co.
- Houston Oil & Minerals Corp.
- Marathon Oil Co.
- J.F. PCO Inc. (Okla.)
- Peoples Natural Gas Co.
- SEDCO Inc., Dallas
- Skelly Oil Co.

Small Producers for Energy Independence
- Standard Oil Co. (Calif.) (SOCAL)
- Standard Oil Co. (Ohio) (SHEOH)
- Texaco Inc.
- Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.
- Texas Gas Transmission Corp.
- True Oil Co.

Universal Oil Products Co.
- Source: Campaign Finance Monitoring Project, copyright by Common cause 1976.

Communications (4):
- California Community TV Assn.
- Gen. Tel. & Electronics, Conn.
- Gen. Tel. & Elecronics, Ill.
- Gen. Tel. & Electronics, Ind.

Construction (7):
- Assoc. General Contractors, Colo.
- Brown & Root
- Construction Industry PAC, Tex.
- Flour Corp.
- Metal Building Industry
- Nati. Limestone Institute, Inc.

Electronics (1):

Financial Institutions (32)
- *Commercial Bank Groups (2):
  - Arizona Bankers
  - *Lombard Bank
- Commercial Banks (22):
  - Bank of Everett (WA)
  - Bank of Hawaii
- Commercial Security Bancorp. (UT)
- Crocker Bank (CA)
- CT & B Bancshares (GA)
- Detroit Bank Co.
- Fidelity Bank (PA)
- First City Natl. Bank, Houston (TX)
- First Natl. Bank (AZ)
- First Security Corp. (UT)
- First Wisconsin Corp.
- Marine Natl. Bank (PA)
- Merchants Nati. Bank & Tr. Co. (IN)
- Nati. Bank of Detroit
- Pittsburgh Natl. Bank
- Security Pacific Corp. (CA)
- Union Planters Corp. (TN)
- Valley Natl. Bank of Arizona
- Waccamaw Bank & Tr. Co. (NC)
- *Wells Fargo & Co. (CA)

Savings and Loans (5):
- *Savings & Loan League Florida
- Citizens Savings & Loan Assn., San Fran.
- Citizens Savings Assn. (Canton, OH)
- City Federal Savings & Loan, N.J.
- Credit Unions (2):
  - Assoc. Credit Bureaus Inc., Texas
  - Consumer Bankers Assn.

Miscellaneous (2):
- Am. Collectors
- Household Finance Corp.

Food and food processing (14)
- Beverages (3):
  - Coors Adolph Co.
  - Distilled Spirits Institute
  - PepsiCo Inc.
- Retail (4):
  - Handy Andy Inc.
  - Piggly Wiggly Southern
- Natl. Assn. of Retail Grocers
- Winn-Dixie Stores Inc.

Others (7):
- Cane Sugar Refiners Assn.
- Dillingham Corp.
- Flowers Industries Inc.

Gerber Products Co.
- Natl. Broiler Council
- Pillsbury Co.
- Quaker Oats Co.
- Forest Products (6):
  - Boise Cascade
  - Crown Zellerbach Corp.
- Integrity Paper Corp.
- Potlatch Corp.
- Union Camp Corp.

Insurance (6):
- American Family Corp.
- Am. General Ins. Co., Texas
- Kansas City Life Insurance Co.
- *Life Underwriters, Texas
- Utica Mutual Insurance Co.

Machinery (3):
- Deere & Co.
- Martin Tractor Co.
-Pullman Inc.

Utilities (2):
- *Columbus & S. Ohio Electric Co.
- Florida Power Light Co.

Other (31):
- Alton Box Board Co.
- Am. Assn. of Nurserymen
- Am. Express Co.
- Am. Retail Federation
- Arthur Young
- Broyhill Furniture Industries
- Continental Bank
- Continental Can Co.
- Corner Glass Works
- Dow Corning Corp.
- Eaton Corp.
- Evergreen Associates, Everett, Wash.
- First Class Mailers Assn.
- Franklin Electric Co., Inc.
- John W. Graham Co.
- L. M. Berry & Co.
- Lilton Industries, Inc.
- Marco Comm. for Effect. Gov't. (Balti)
- Marlor Inc.
- Montgomery Ward & Co.
- Producers Cotton Oil Co. (CA)
- R. J. Reynolds Industries Inc.
- R. R. Donnelly & Sons
- Rexroad Inc.
- Sears, Roebuck & Co.
- Square D Co.
- TVB
- Wheelerabr-Frye Inc.
- Wellman Industries, Johnsville, SC (2)

Agriculture and Dairy (2)
- Am. Feed Mfrs. Assn.
- United Fruit & Vegetable Assn.

Lawyers (4)
- Am. Trial Lawyers Assn.
- Doherty, Rumble & Butler (MN) (3)
American Dental Association (9):
*Am. Dental Assn., Idaho
*Am. Dental Assn., Illinois
*Am. Dental Assn., Indiana
*Am. Dental Assn., Kansas
*Am. Dental Assn., Louisiana
*Am. Dental Assn., Maine
*Am. Dental Assn., Minnesota
*Am. Dental Assn., Nebraska
*Am. Dental Assn., Wyoming

Miscellaneous Associations (5):
Assn. of Am. Physicians & Surgeons
Group Practice Pol. Comm. (VA)
Group P. Comm. (TX)

New Jersey Health Group
Oregon Health Group

Labor (36)

AFL-CIO (4):
* AFL-CIO, Connecticut (Senate Camp.)
* North Caro, (Nash-Edgecombe-Wilson Cty.)
* AFL-CIO, Ohio (Franklin Cty.)

Building and Construction trades (4):
*Carpenters—California
*Electrical Workers (IEBEW)—Oregon
*Electrical Workers (IEBEW)—Conn.
*Laborers #330—Ohio

Government: (1):
Letter Carriers

Industrial (5):
*AFL-CIO Am. Fed. (4)—
*Machinists #146—Texas
*Machinists—Washington
*Machinists—Wisconsin
*Machinists Dist. 10—Wisconsin

United Auto Workers: Independent (1):
*Unite Auto Workers, Independent

(Orty. Plint)

*Meatcutters #225 (NC)
*Retail Clerks #428 (CA)
*Retail Clerks #460 (MD)
*Retail Clerks #1993 (PA)

Utility Workers

Transportation (3):
Amalgamated Transit Union

Total contributions of $500 or more to 1974 congressional candidates by occupation of contributor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$414,857</td>
<td>$221,928</td>
<td>$736,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil, gas, and other natural resources</td>
<td>682,397</td>
<td>1,424,520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/real estate</td>
<td>1,170,461</td>
<td>2,267,651</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>131,125</td>
<td>268,035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>311,177</td>
<td>711,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>225,077</td>
<td>644,833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial industry</td>
<td>988,207</td>
<td>2,289,434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General business</td>
<td>2,145,636</td>
<td>4,458,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business total</td>
<td>6,455,329</td>
<td>13,512,669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Campaign finance monitoring project by Common Cause 1975.

APPENDIX C

Special interest group political committees

Total contributions to 1974 congressional candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Professional</td>
<td>$2,800,940</td>
<td>$931,040</td>
<td>$3,731,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Dairy</td>
<td>336,010</td>
<td>1,930,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4,804,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>6,315,408</td>
<td>723,410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6,600,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>328,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interest group</td>
<td>12,525,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual interest groups largest contributors to 1974 congressional candidates

1. American Medical Assn. $1,462,972
2. AFL-CIO CPEs $1,178,638
3. UAW $843,938
4. Maritime Unions $739,314
5. Machinists $470,353
6. Financial Institutions $438,428
7. National Education Assns $398,991
8. Steelworkers $381,235
9. Retail Clerks $291,065
10. BIPAC (National Assn. of Mfrs) $272,000
11. National Assn. of Realtors $260,870

Source: Campaign Finance Monitoring Project, copyright by Common Cause 1976.

APPENDIX D

Special interest group political committees

[Cash on hand, December 31, 1975]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business/Professional</td>
<td>$3,055,494</td>
<td>$1,528,809</td>
<td>$4,584,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Dairy</td>
<td>2,692,704</td>
<td>1,591,287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2,542,933</td>
<td>976,725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>614,638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,805,859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>6,600,237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>678,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>322,704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interest group</td>
<td>16,417,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual interest groups with most funds available, December 31, 1975

1. Associated Milk Producers, Inc $1,811,702
2. American Medical Assn $1,616,978
3. Maritime Unions $1,542,933
4. UAW $988,652
5. Financial Institutions $635,765
6. American Dental Assn $612,792
7. Trial Lawyers $496,978
8. National Education Assn $487,465
9. Steelworkers $465,791
10. Transportation Union (UTU) $411,705
11. Natl. Assn. of Realtors $376,870

Source: Campaign Finance Monitoring Project, copyright by Common Cause 1976.
### Campaign Fund of Special Interest and Political Party Committees

#### Cash on Hand as of December 31, 1975, Summary by Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation or interest</th>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>Grumman PAC</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Grumman Corp.</td>
<td>Hughes Act Citizenship Fund</td>
<td>38,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Aircraft Corp.</td>
<td>Lockheed Act Citizenship Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lockheed Aircraft Corp.</td>
<td>LTV Act Corp Citizenship Comm</td>
<td>21,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV Aerospace Corp/Vought Corp.</td>
<td>McDonnell Douglas GGovt Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*McDonnell Douglas Corp.</td>
<td>United Technologies Corp PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*United Technologies Corp.</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>59,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td>American Apparel Mfrs PAC</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Apparel Mfrs Assn.</td>
<td>Footwear Industry PAC</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Footwear Industries Assn.</td>
<td>*Kellwood Co.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menswear Retailers of America.</td>
<td>Menswear Pub Aff Comm</td>
<td>11,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's groups:</td>
<td>Business-Industry PAC (BIPAC)</td>
<td>192,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's groups:</td>
<td>DC Comm of Businessmen to assist Cong Cands</td>
<td>1,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's groups:</td>
<td>The Loose Group</td>
<td>5,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessmen's groups:</td>
<td>Delta Fund</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and metals:</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>201,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AMAX Inc.</td>
<td>AMAX Concerned Citizens Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Aluminum Co of America</td>
<td>ALCOA Emp Pol Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Anaconda Co.</td>
<td>Anaconda Concerned Citizens Fund</td>
<td>6,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ARMCO Steel Corp.</td>
<td>ARM PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Brown Co.</td>
<td>Dow Eastern Emp PAC (OH)</td>
<td>1,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dow Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Dowell Emp PAC (DEPAC) (TX)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dow Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Emp PAC Cent Reg Dow (EMPAC) (TX)</td>
<td>6,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dow Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Emp PAC of Govt Affairs, SE Region of Dow (LA)</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dow Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Health &amp; Consumer Prod Emp PAC (IN)</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dow Chemical Co.</td>
<td>Midwest Area PAC (MI)</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*FMC Corp.</td>
<td>Western Dow Emp Comm for Free Enterprise (CA)</td>
<td>2,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kennecott Copper Corp.</td>
<td>FMC GGovt Program</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Kellwood Co.</td>
<td>Kennecott Execs Citizenship Assn</td>
<td>14,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lykes-Youngstown</td>
<td>Lykes-Youngstown PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Menswear</td>
<td>Chemical Distributors PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*National Coal Mfrs Assoc</td>
<td>Olin Exec Vol NP Pol Fund</td>
<td>23,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*North American Steel</td>
<td>Phillips Dodge Emp for GGovt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*U.S. Steel</td>
<td>USS Emp GGovt Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*W.R. Grace &amp; Co.</td>
<td>Grace GGovt Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal, oil and gas:</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>62,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*N/A</td>
<td>Small Producers for Energy Independence PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Atlantic Richfield Co.</td>
<td>Atlantic Richfield Civic Act Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bituminous coal industry</td>
<td>Comm on Amer Leadership (COAL)</td>
<td>5,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Natural Gas Co. (PA)</td>
<td>CONPAC, Pittsburgh</td>
<td>7,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Natural Gas Co. (NY &amp; NJ) (9-30)</td>
<td>Consolidated Vol NP Pol Fund</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Natural Gas Co. (NY &amp; NJ) (9-30)</td>
<td>Consolidated Exec Vol NP Pol Fund</td>
<td>4,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ohio Gas Co. (sub. of Consol Nat Gas)</td>
<td>East Ohio Gas Emp Vol GGovt Assn</td>
<td>5,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Enserch Corp.</td>
<td>Enserch Emp Pol Support Assn</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Halliburton Co.</td>
<td>Halliburton PAC (HALPAC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Gas Co.</td>
<td>Meridian Pub Aff Comm</td>
<td>9,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MAPCO Inc. (Oklahoma).</td>
<td>MAPCO PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl Council of Coal Lessees (8-31)</td>
<td>Coal Landowners Comm (VA)</td>
<td>1,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Retailers.</td>
<td>Gas Employees PAC</td>
<td>3,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Lighting Corp—natural gas</td>
<td>Pacific Lighting Pol Assistance Comm</td>
<td>44,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SEDCO Inc. Dallas.</td>
<td>SEDCO PAC</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skelly Oil Co.</td>
<td>Skelly Oil Co PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Standard Oil Co (CA) (SOCAL)</td>
<td>Chevron Comm for Pol Particip</td>
<td>14,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Standard Oil Co (OH) (SOHIO)</td>
<td>Sohioans Civic Contrib Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sun Oil Co.</td>
<td>SUNPAC</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Texaco Inc.</td>
<td>Texas Emp Pol involvement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.</td>
<td>Texas Eastern PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Texas Gas Transmission Corp.</td>
<td>Vol NP Pol Fund (Owensboro, Ky)</td>
<td>2,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Oil Co of California.</td>
<td>Political Awareness Fund</td>
<td>94,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Universal Oil Products Co.</td>
<td>UOP Emp Pol Act Fund</td>
<td>4,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>139,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asterisk (*) denotes committee registering after January 1, 1975.
### Affiliation or Interest

**Communications:**
- California Community TV Assn.
- Gen Tel & Electronics:
  - California.
  - *Conn.*
  - *Illinois.*
  - *Indiana.*
  - Hawaii Telephone Co (sub of GTE).
  - Meredith Corp (TA)—publishing.
  - N A of Broadcasters.
  - Natl Cable TV Assn.
  - Natl Telephone Coop Assn.
  - Recording Industry of America.
  - US Independent Telephone Assn.

**Construction:**
- Architects & Consulting Engineers.
- Assoc Builders & Contractors Inc.
  - Assoc General Contractors:
    - National.
    - Iowa.
    - Michigan.
    - St. Louis (3-10).
    - Missouri.
    - Ohio (6-30).
    - Pennsylvania.
    - Texas (6-30).
    - Vermont.
    - Black & Veatch.
  - Brown & Root.
  - Construction Equipment Industry.
  - N/A.
  - Detroit Piping Industry.
  - General Portland Cement.
  - N A of Home Builders.
  - *Natl Limestone Institute Inc.
  - *Metal Building Industry.
  - SM & AC Contractors Assn.

**Electronics:**
- General Electric Co, Conn.
- *Watkins-Johnson Co, Palo Alto CA.

### Financial Institutions—A. Commercial Banks

1. Political Action Committees:
- Am banking interests.
  - *Arizona bankers.
  - California bankers.
  - Florida bankers.
  - Indiana bankers (1/10/76).
  - Kansas bankers.
  - *Louisiana bankers.
  - Minnesota bankers.
  - Pennsylvania bankers.
  - Texas bankers.
  - Washington bankers.

2. Commercial banks:
- Am Fletcher Corp (IN).
- Associated Management Corp (IN) (6-30).
  - *Bank of Everett (WA).*
  - *Bank of Hawaii.
  - Chemical Bank (NY).
  - *Crocker Bank (CA).*
  - *CT & B Bancshares (GA).*
  - *Fidelity Bank (PA).*
  - First Bank System Inc (IN).
  - First Bank System Inc (ND).

### Committee Name and Closing Cash

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Cable TV PAC</td>
<td>1,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tel Emp (California) G Govt Club</td>
<td>61,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTE Stamford Emp G Govt Club</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tel Co of Illinois Emp G Govt Club</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Tel Emp G Govt Club (Indiana)</td>
<td>3,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Tel Emp G Govt Club</td>
<td>14,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Corp Emp for Better Govt</td>
<td>16,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television &amp; Radio PAC (TARPAC)</td>
<td>7,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl Cable TV PAC</td>
<td>10,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephonic Ed Comm Org (TECO)</td>
<td>2,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Arts PAC</td>
<td>2,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications PAC (COMPAC)</td>
<td>6,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>130,913</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poil Comm for Design Professionals</td>
<td>1,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Shop Action Comm</td>
<td>9,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Free Enterprise PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Action (WA)</td>
<td>90,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Action Comm</td>
<td>7,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Industry Mgmt PAC</td>
<td>2,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Industry PAC</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGC of St Louis Pol Comm</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Contractors PAC</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assn for Pol Ed in Construction</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big 8 PAC</td>
<td>5,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Construction Ind PAC</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; Veatch G Govt Fund</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownbuilders PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Equipment PAC</td>
<td>11,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Industry PAC (CIPAC) (TX)</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Piping Ind PAC (PIPAC)</td>
<td>3,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens for Representative Govt</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builders Pol Camp Comm (BPPO)</td>
<td>19,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,477</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partisan Pol Support Comm, Conn</td>
<td>28,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partisan Pol Comm of Mass</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins-Johnson PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,760</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking Profession PAC (BANKPAC)</td>
<td>83,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Bankers PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALBANK-FED PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Bankers PAC</td>
<td>5,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Bankers PAC</td>
<td>20,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Bankers PAC</td>
<td>6,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Bankers PAC</td>
<td>2,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Bankers PAC</td>
<td>13,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Bankers Pub Aff Acom</td>
<td>17,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BALLOT—Bankers Leg Lg of Texas</td>
<td>14,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Bankers PAC</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>165,038</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooiser Govt Comm (Indianapolis)</td>
<td>23,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Employment PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of Everett Vol PAC (BEVPAC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Pol Ed Comm (Honolulu)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for G Govt (New York)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocker Indiv Vol Inv in Ctt (CIVIC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens for Quality Govt-P (Columbus)</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200 Committee (Philadelphia)</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Bk Syst Minn G Govt Comm</td>
<td>1,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Bk Syst ND G Govt Comm</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Financial Institutions—B. Savings & Loans

**1. Political Action Committees:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Bk Syst SD - G Govt Prog</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl G Govt Fund (Houston)</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Int'l Bancshares Good Govt Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIBA G Govt Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Better Govt (Atlanta)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens for G Govt (Topeka)</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citicorp Emp Vol Pol Fund</td>
<td>1,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Security Corp PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Fed Govt Comm (Memphis)</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Associates &quot;F&quot; Fund</td>
<td>23,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Wisconsin Civic Aff Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INOPAC</td>
<td>2,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litco Govt Club</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assn for Responsible Govt (NY)</td>
<td>3,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514 Committee (Pittsburgh)</td>
<td>5,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants Comm for Camp Contrib</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific BANKEPAC (Seattle)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Associates Natl</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Pacific Act Cit Today Comm</td>
<td>5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Govt Group (Atlanta)</td>
<td>21,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Planters Comm Govt Aff</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNB Good Govt Comm (Phoenix)</td>
<td>3,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PublicAff Fund (Whiteville)</td>
<td>4,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Govt Comm (San Francisco)</td>
<td>17,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees for G Govt (F) (San Francisco)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 128,854 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Century Club Pasadena</td>
<td>12,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Assn PAC CO</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings &amp; Loan PAC FL</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Assn Pub Aff Comm MI</td>
<td>9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPEO NJ</td>
<td>4,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Assn PAC NY</td>
<td>14,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings &amp; Loan PAC OHIO (SALPA-O)</td>
<td>28,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Comm of Savings Assns</td>
<td>39,648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 200,280 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Savings PAC, San Fran</td>
<td>8,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City FedPAC (Elizabeth)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP G Good Govt Fund (Los Angeles)</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Bankers NP PAC</td>
<td>9,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati League PAC</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 19,585 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Reporting &amp; Collection Executives PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Bankers Assn PAC (CONPAC)</td>
<td>2,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Union Legisital Act Council</td>
<td>9,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Credit Union League Inc</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C-U Legisital Act Fund</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 14,402 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage Bankers PAC (MORPAC)</td>
<td>27,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Bankers NP PAC</td>
<td>9,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 39,682 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Govt Assn</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Hutchins Vol Pol Fund</td>
<td>13,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paine Webber Fund for Better Govt</td>
<td>3,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities Industry Camp Comm</td>
<td>50,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Better Govt Comm</td>
<td>2,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 70,324 |
# Campaign Funds of Special Interest and Political Party Committees—Continued

## Cash on Hand as of December 31, 1975, Summary by Committee—Continued

### Business—continued

**Affiliation or interest**

**Food and food processing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-partisan Comm for Good Govt (GA)</td>
<td>$30,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coors Emp PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distilled Spirits Public Affairs Council</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepsi Co PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>30,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation or interest</th>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail Grocers PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy Andy PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWS Good Govt Comm (Vidalia)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern GOvtt Comm</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation or interest</th>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest products:

- Boise Cascade
- Crown Zellerbach Corp.
- Forest Products (6-30)\
- Forest Products Industry
- Fort Vancouver Plywood Co. (1-30-76)\
- Georgia Pacific Corp.
- *Intl. Paper Co.
- Kirby Lumber Co.
- Mountain Fir Lumber Co.
- Weyerhaeuser Co. Interests.
- Weyerhaeuser Co.
- *Union Camp Corp.

**Subtotal** 79,725

### Hotel, motel and restaurants:

- Am. Hotel and Motel Assn.
- Convenient Industries of Am.
- Natl. Restaurant Assn.

### Insurance:

- CNA Financial Corp. (9-30).
- Independent insurance agents.
- Independent insurance agents, GA (6-30).
- *Kansas City Life Insurance Co.
- Kemper Insurance Co., Illinois.
- Life Underwriters—National.
- *Life Underwriters—Texas.
- Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., N.Y.
- Mortgage Insurance Companies of America (3-15).
- N.A. of Insurance Agents.
- *N/A.
- *Utica Mutual Insurance Co.

**Subtotal** 201,672
### Affiliation of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machinery:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Deere &amp; Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Dealers Natl. Assn. (6-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Martin Tractor Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Die Industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmaceuticals:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Laboratories Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*N. A. of Pharmacists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Proprietary Assn., The Smith, Kline &amp; French</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railroads:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atchison, Topeka &amp; Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington Northern Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago &amp; Northwestern RR Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul &amp; Pacific RR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Am. Transp. Corp.—RR cars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Central Gulf RR Co. (sub of I. C. Industries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. C. Industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville &amp; Nashville RR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis-San Francisco RR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaboard Coastline RR.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Pacific Co.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Railway System.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Railway System.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Real Estate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Am Land Title Assn.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natl Apartment Assn (4-8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N A Realtors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska (6-30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia (6-30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Natl Realty Comm. DC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation

| Alaskan Skies Assn, Natl. |  |
| Allegheny Airlines |  |
| Am Export Lines Inc. |  |
| *Am Public Transit Assn. |  |
| *Budd Co. |  |
| Freight Forwarders Institute, DC. |  |
| Genl Aviation Manufacturers Assn. |  |
| *Metro Services, Texas. |  |
| *Matson Navigation (sub of Alex & Baldwin). |  |
| N A of Motor Bus Owners. |  |
| N A of Schli Bus Contr Operators. |  |
| Natl Automobile Dealers Assn. |  |
| *Natl Auto Dealers Assn, Natl. |  |
| Natl Auto Dealers Assn, Texas. |  |
| Natl Auto Dealers Assn, Wisc. |  |
| *Pan American Airlines. |  |
| *Pullman Inc. |  |
| Texas Good Roads Assn. |  |
| Trucking Industry |  |
| Am Imported Auto Dealers Assn. |  |

### Committee Fund Closes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Fund</td>
<td>$8,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Dealers PAC</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Econ. Educ. Pol. Club.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooling &amp; Machining Ind. PAC</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>9,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson Govt. Fund</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-America Comm. for Sound Govt</td>
<td>7,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Drug Stores PAC</td>
<td>3,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl. Assn. of Pharmacists PAC</td>
<td>1,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Industry PAC</td>
<td>2,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKF Vol. NP Pol. Fund.</td>
<td>1,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>16,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Trust 80 Santa Fe Emp. for Govt</td>
<td>13,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Off. Trust Acct.</td>
<td>180,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Off. Trust Acct.</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Civic Assn.</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG Good Govt. Fund.</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries Civic Trust</td>
<td>3,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partisan Vol. Pol. Fund.</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisco Emp. Comm. for Govt</td>
<td>8,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects Group</td>
<td>15,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Pac. Mgmt. Officers GG Fund.</td>
<td>11,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ry. Govt. Fund.</td>
<td>16,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ry. Tax Elig. GG Fund.</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for Effective Govt.</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>258,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Industry PAC</td>
<td>27,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment PAC</td>
<td>813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtors PAC (RPAC)</td>
<td>310,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minn Real Estate PAC</td>
<td>33,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Real Estate PAC</td>
<td>9,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Real Estate PAC</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Real Estate PAC</td>
<td>11,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Real Estate PAC (VAREPAC)</td>
<td>2,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natl Realty PAC.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>403,013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Contributions

| Total | 219,165 |
CAMPAIGN FUNDS OF SPECIAL INTEREST AND POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES—Continued

CASH ON HAND AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975, SUMMARY BY COMMITTEE—Continued

BUSINESS—continued

Affiliation or interest  Committee name  Closing cash

Utilities:
*Columbus & S. Ohio Electric Co.
*Florida Power & Light Co.
Pacific Gas & Electric Co (CA).
Southern CA Edison Co.

*Am Assn of Nurserymen.
Am Cotton Shippers Assn.
*Am Express Co.
Am Importers Assn (11-29).
Am Society of Executives.
*Am Retail Assn.
*Am Textile Mfrs Assn.
Boating Information Council.
*Broyhill Furniture Industries.
*Continental Can Co.
*Corning Glass Works.
Cotton Warehouse Assn of Am (TN).
N/A.
*Evergreen Associates, Everett WA.
Gould Inc.
*John W. Graham Co (1-10-76).
*N/A.
*Marcor Inc.
Mobile Homes Mfrs Assn.
*Montgomery Ward & Co.
Natl Home Furnishings Assn.
Norgren CA Co.
*Producers Cotton Oil Co (CA).
*B&J Reynolds Industries Inc.
Texas Instruments Co.
Tobacco Industry.
*TBW.
*Wheelabrator-Frye Inc.
*Wellman Industries, Johnsonville, SC.
*Wellman Industries, Johnsonville, SC.

Other:
*Am Assn of Nurserymen.
*American Book Publishers PAC.
Comm Org for the Trading of Cotton (COTCO).
American Expr Off Comm for Responsible Govt.
American Int Trade Pol Aff (AIRPAC)
Effective Govt Group.
Retail PAC.
American Textile Ind Comm for G Govt.
Boating Info Council PAC.
Broyhill PAC (Lancir, NC).
Continental Can Civic Assn.
Corning Glass Works Emp PAC.
Comm of One Hundred.
Comm for Advancement of Cotton.
Evergreen Associates PAC.
Responsible Govt Assn.
Comm for a Sensible Govt.
Wellman Ind GGovt Fund.
Wellman Ind Tax Elig GGovt Fund.

Subtotal 29,330

Subtotal 132,894

Total Agriculture and Dairy 3,055,494

AGRICULTURE AND DAIRY

Dairy:
Assoc Milk Producers Inc.
Dairymen Inc: Georgia.
Kentucky (1-31-76).
Louisiana.
Mississippi.
Tennessee.
Virginia.
Land O'Lakes Inc.—Dairy.
Mid-America Dairymen Inc.
Northwest Dairymen's Assn. (6-30).

Other agriculture:
Alexander & Baldwin, Hawaii.
Am Natl Cattlemen's Assn.
Am Rice Growers Co-op Assn.
California-Arizona Citrus League.
California Canning Peach Assn.
California Agriculture.
California Rice Fund.
Florida Agriculture.
National Council of Farmer Co-ops.
National Council of Farmer Co-ops.
National Council of Farmer Co-ops.
Rice & Soybean Growers.

*United Fruit & Vegetable Assn.

Hickory Street Fund
Constructive Congress Comm.
Good Govt Fund, San Francisco.

Subtotal 132,894

Subtotal 2,506,773

A & B Emp Vol Pol Comm for Fed Cands
Cattlemen's Act Leg Fund (CALF).
Rice Producers PHC.
Calif-Ariz Citrus League Fund.
Growers for Effective Govt.
Comm on Agri Policy (Calif).
Calif Rice Fund.
Florida Agri Educ Comm.
PAC-Pol Act for Co-op Effectiveness.
PAC-Two for Co-op Effectiveness KS.
Rice & Soybean PAC.
United PAC (UNIPAC).

Subtotal 186,021

Total Agriculture and Dairy 2,692,794
### American Dental Association:

- National
- Arizona
- Arkansas (9-30)
- California
- D.C.
- Florida
- Idaho (9-30)
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Kentucky (9-30)
- Louisiana
- Maine (9-30)
- Minnesota
- Nebraska
- Nevada (7-10)
- New Hampshire
- New York
- North Carolina
- Ohio
- Oklahoma (7-9)
- Pennsylvania
- Tennessee
- Utah
- Washington
- Wyoming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region</th>
<th>Affiliation or interest</th>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Dental PAC</td>
<td>American Dental Association</td>
<td>$218,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Dental PAC</td>
<td>Arizona Dental Association</td>
<td>943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Dental PAC</td>
<td>Arkansas Dental Association</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Dental PAC</td>
<td>California Dental Association</td>
<td>116,822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Dentists for Effective Govt.</td>
<td>DC Dentists for Effective Govt.</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Dental PAC</td>
<td>Florida Dental Association</td>
<td>91,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Dental PAC</td>
<td>Idaho Dental Association</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Int Com of Illinois Dentists</td>
<td>Illinois Int Com of Illinois Dentists</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Dental PAC</td>
<td>Indiana Dental Association</td>
<td>4,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Dental PAC</td>
<td>Iowa Dental Association</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Dental PAC</td>
<td>Kansas Dental Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Dental PAC</td>
<td>Kentucky Dental Association</td>
<td>2,978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Dental PAC</td>
<td>Louisiana Dental Association</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Dental PAC</td>
<td>Maine Dental Association</td>
<td>835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Dental Health Pub Aff Com</td>
<td>Minnesota Dental Health Pub Aff Com</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Dental PAC</td>
<td>Nevada Dental Association</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire Dental PAC</td>
<td>New Hampshire Dental Association</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Dental PAC</td>
<td>Empire Dental Association</td>
<td>24,398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Dental PAC</td>
<td>North Carolina Dental Association</td>
<td>19,831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Dental PAC</td>
<td>Ohio Dental Association</td>
<td>26,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Dental PAC</td>
<td>Oklahoma Dental Association</td>
<td>15,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Dental PAC</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Dental Association</td>
<td>21,093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee Dental PAC</td>
<td>Tennessee Dental Association</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Dental PAC</td>
<td>Utah Dental Association</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Dental PAC</td>
<td>Washington Dental Association</td>
<td>36,531</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming Dental PAC</td>
<td>Wyoming Dental Association</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### American Medical Association:

- National
- D.C. Exec (9-30)
- Alabama (9-30)
- Alaska (9-30)
- Arizona
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut (3-10)
- D.C.
- Florida
- Georgia
- Hawaii
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Kentucky
- Louisiana (8-31)
- Maine (9-30)
- Maryland
- Massachusetts (6-30)
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Mississippi
- Missouri
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Jersey (2-28)
- New Mexico
- New York (2-28)
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Ohio (9-30)
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Region</th>
<th>Affiliation or interest</th>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Medical PAC (AMPAC)</td>
<td>American Medical Association</td>
<td>712,812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians Comm for Gov't</td>
<td>Physicians Comm for Gov't</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Medical PAC</td>
<td>Alabama Medical Association</td>
<td>17,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Medical PAC</td>
<td>Alaska Medical Association</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Medical PAC</td>
<td>Arizona Medical Association</td>
<td>10,696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas Medical PAC</td>
<td>Arkansas Medical Association</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Medical PAC (CALPAC)</td>
<td>California Medical Association</td>
<td>67,398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm for Gov't Improvement</td>
<td>Comm for Gov't Improvement</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. County Physicians Comm</td>
<td>L.A. County Physicians Comm</td>
<td>29,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Medical PAC (COMPAC)</td>
<td>Colorado Medical Association</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Medical PAC (COMPAC)</td>
<td>Comm Medical Association</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia PAC (DOCPAC)</td>
<td>District of Columbia PAC</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Medical PAC (FLAMPAC)</td>
<td>Florida Medical Association</td>
<td>50,488</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Medical PAC</td>
<td>Georgia Medical Association</td>
<td>31,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Medical PAC</td>
<td>Hawaii Medical Association</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Medical PAC</td>
<td>Idaho Medical Association</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Medical PAC</td>
<td>Illinois Medical Association</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana Medical PAC</td>
<td>Indiana Medical Association</td>
<td>41,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Medical PAC</td>
<td>Iowa Medical Association</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas Medical PAC (KANPAC)</td>
<td>Kansas Medical Association</td>
<td>7,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Ed Med PAC (KENVAC)</td>
<td>Kentucky Ed Med PAC</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Medical PAC (LAMPAC)</td>
<td>Louisiana Medical Association</td>
<td>12,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Medical PAC</td>
<td>Maine Medical Association</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Medical PAC</td>
<td>Maryland Medical Association</td>
<td>38,129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay State Physicians PAC (BAYPAC)</td>
<td>Bay State Physicians Association</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Doctors PAC</td>
<td>Michigan Doctors Association</td>
<td>11,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Medical PAC</td>
<td>Minnesota Medical Association</td>
<td>30,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi PAC</td>
<td>Mississippi Medical Association</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri Medical PAC</td>
<td>Missouri Medical Association</td>
<td>16,382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana PAC (MONTPAC)</td>
<td>Montana Medical Association</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Medical PAC</td>
<td>Nebraska Medical Association</td>
<td>9,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada Medical PAC (NEMPAC)</td>
<td>Nevada Medical Association</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Medical PAC (JEMPAC)</td>
<td>New Jersey Medical Association</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico Medical PAC</td>
<td>New Mexico Medical Association</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Medical PAC</td>
<td>Empire Medical Association</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Medical Pol &amp; Act Comm</td>
<td>North Carolina Medical Pol &amp; Act Comm</td>
<td>12,312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota Comm on Med Pol Act</td>
<td>North Dakota Comm on Med Pol Act</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Medical PAC</td>
<td>Ohio Medical Association</td>
<td>57,926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Medical PAC</td>
<td>Oklahoma Medical Association</td>
<td>12,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Medical PAC</td>
<td>Oregon Medical Association</td>
<td>14,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Medical PAC</td>
<td>Pennsylvania Medical Association</td>
<td>55,385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island Medical PAC (RIMPAC)</td>
<td>Rhode Island Medical Association</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina PAC (SOPAC)</td>
<td>South Carolina Medical Association</td>
<td>4,937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE**
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**CAMPAIGN FUNDS OF SPECIAL INTEREST AND POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES—Continued**

**CASH ON HAND AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975, SUMMARY BY COMMITTEE—Continued**

**HEALTH—continued**

### Affiliation or interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Group</th>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Closing Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>South Dakota PAC (SODAPAC)</td>
<td>$1,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Independent Medicine's PAC</td>
<td>19,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Texas Medical PAC (TEXPAC)</td>
<td>159,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Utah Medical PAC (UMPAC)</td>
<td>5,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Vermont Education Medical PAC</td>
<td>1,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Virginia Medical PAC (VAMPAC)</td>
<td>9,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>AMPAC—State of Washington</td>
<td>7,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin Physician's PAC</td>
<td>12,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Wyoming PAC</td>
<td>4,327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** 1,616,973

### American Nursing Home Association:

- California
- Texas
- Virginia
- Colorado

### Miscellaneous:

- Am Academy of Family Physicians
- Am Nurses Assn.
- Am Optometric Assn.
- Am Podiatric Assn.
- Am Society of Oral Surgeons
- Am Society of Oral Surgeons
- Federation of American Hospitals
- *N/A (6-30)
- *N/A
- Illinois Dentists
- Minnesota Health Group (6-30)
- *New Jersey Health Group
- *Oregon Health Group
- Opticians Assn of Am.

### AFL-CIO:

- National
- Arkansas
- California
- Connecticut
- *Connecticut (3-10)
- Kentucky
- Michigan
- Missouri (1-10-76)
- North Carolina
- Ohio (2-28)
- Ohio (6-30)
- Ohio
- *Ohio (7-10)
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Texas
- Utah
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wisconsin (6-30)

### LABOR:

- AFL-CIO COPE PAC
- **51,431**
- Arkansas COPE
- **635**
- L A County COPE Vol PAC
- **9,797**
- Volunteers for VLPEC, L A County
- **2,254**
- COPE Santa Clara County
- **7,945**
- COPE Colorado
- **675**
- AFL-CIO Conn COPE
- **0**
- Conn State AFL-CIO Sen Camp Comm
- **0**
- Kentucky State AFL-CIO COPE
- **1,884**
- Michigan State AFL-CIO COPE Vol Fund
- **22,685**
- Missouri State Labor Council COPE
- **3,771**
- North Carolina State COPE AFL-CIO
- **0**
- Ohio AFL-CIO COPE
- **61**
- Cleveland AFL-CIO COPE
- **1,060**
- Toledo Area AFL-CIO Council
- **12,749**
- Franklin County PAC Vol Fund
- **22**
- Oklahoma State AFL-CIO Free Pol Camp Fd
- **1,170**
- Oregon COPE AFL-CIO
- **6,903**
- Texas COPE
- **25,507**
- Utah State AFL-CIO
- **0**
- Washington State COPE
- **1,762**
- West Virginia AFL-CIO COPE
- **2,337**
- Wisconsin State AFL-CIO COPE
- **10,333**
- Appleton Fed of Labor AFL-CIO
- **1,656**

**Subtotal** 173,577
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

CASH ON HAND AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975, SUMMARY BY COMMITTEE—Continued

LABOR—continued

Affiliation or interest

Building and construction trades:
- boilermakers
- bricklayers
- building & construction trade
- carpenters
  * carpenters—California (9-10)
  * carpenters—Ohio
- electrical workers (ibew)
  * electrical workers (ibew)—Iowa (1-31)
  * electrical workers (ibew)—Conn (6-30)
- ironworkers
- laborers
  * laborers—Ohio
- operating engineers
- operating engineers—Calif
- operating engineers—N.J
- plumbers
- plumbers & pipe fitters

Government:
- firefighters
  * firefighters—Virginia (7-10)
  * firefighters—New York
- government employees (afge)
- government employees (nage) (9-30)
  * letter carriers
- postal workers
- state-county municipal employees
  * state-county municipal employees
- teachers (aft)
  * teachers (aft)—national
  * teachers (aft)—minn
  * teachers (aft)—New York (uft)
- new York state united teachers

Industrial

A. AFL-CIO Affiliated:
- chemical workers (icwu)
- clothing workers
  * national
  * illinois
  * maryland
  * massachusetts (7-10)
  * minnesota
  * new york
  * new York (9-10)
- clothing workers—New York
- clothing workers—Pennsylvania
- clothing workers—Pennsylvania (9-30)
- electrical workers (iue)
- garment workers, ladies
- glass bottle blowers assn
- industrial unions dept
- machinists
  * national (1-31-76)
  * California
  * Colorado
  * Iowa
  * michigan
  * Michigan
  * minnesota
  * Minnesota
  * Missouri
  * Missouri
  * Ohio
  * Oregon
  * Pennsylvania (6-30)
  * Texas

Committee name

Legislative Education Action Program (LEAP)
Bricklayers Action Comm
PEP of the Bldg & Constr Tr
Carpenters Legal Improvement Comm
Carpenters Comm on Pol Act
State Cncil of Carpenters PAF
Ohio St Council of Carpenters
IBEW COPE (Electrical Workers)
IBEW COPE Local 1363
Local #35 Pol Comm Ntl
Iron Workers Pol Act Lg
Laborers Pol League
Local Union 880 Laborers Pol Lg
Engineers Pol Ed Comm
Supporters of Eng Loc 3 Fed Endorsed Candidates
O E Local 825 Pol Act & Ed Comm
Local 292 Yol Pol Fund, Seattle
Pol Act Together Pol Comm
U A Political Education Comm

Subtotal

Fund Summary

Subtotal

Committee name

Fire Fighters COPE
Fairfax City Firefighters PAC
Schenectady Firefighters PAC
Comm on Fed Emp Pol Ed
Govt Emp Pol Research Institute
Comm on Letter Carriers Pol Ed
Pol Fund Comm on Am Postal Wkr
PEOPLE—Public Employees Organized
People Qualified Contrib Comm
Social Serv Emp Un 371 (NY)
American Fed of Teachers
Minnesota Fed of Teachers COPE
UFT COPE (NY)
VOTE COPE (Voice of Teacher Ed)

Subtotal

Labor Investment in Voter Ed

Committee name

Amalgamated Pol Ed Comm (APEC)
Chicago & Midwest PEC (CAMPEC)
Baltimore Rgn Jt Bd PEC
Boston Jt Bd Amalg PEC
Minnesota Jt Bd PEC
New York Jt Bd Pol Act Fund
Rochester Jt Bd PEC
Amalg Serv and Allied Ind Jt Bd PEC
Clothing Wkrs Pol Comm for Eastern PA
Amalgamated Pol & Ed Comm of Phila
UFE COPE
ILGWU Camp Comm
GHBA Pol Ed League
IUD Voluntary Funds

Subtotal

INFL

Committee name

Match NP Pol League
District 727 Chap, Burbank
Colorado
of Iowa Ccncil of Mach
of Michigan (Machinists)
District Lodge 117 Reading
of Minnesota
Beam Fedd Comm St. paul
Twin City Ares St. paul
Dist 9, Bridgerton
Dist 71, Kansas City
Ohio State Council
of Oregon
Penn State IAM
Texas State Council

Subtotal

375,464

March 16, 1976
Committee name

Texas (9-30).
*Texas.
Washington.
*Washington.
*Wisconsin.
Wisconsin.
Oil Chemical & Atomic Workers.
Pulp & Papermill Workers.
Rubber Workers.
Rubber Workers—Colorado.
Rubber Workers—Kansas (9-30).
Sheet Metal Workers.
Steelworkers (1-1-76).
Steelworkers—Pennsylvania.
Textile Workers (TWU).

Industrial

B. United Auto Workers, Independent:
United Auto Workers, Independent.
United Auto Workers, Independent (2-28).
*United Auto Workers, Independent (12-31).

Maritime related:
Longshoremen.
Longshoremen (Masters Mates).
Marine Engineers.
Marine Engineers.
Marine Engineers (Air Traffic Controllers).
Maritime (NMU).
Seafarers.
Seafarers (Marine Cooks).
Seafarers (Marine Firemen).
Seafarers (Sailors-Pacific).

Service:
Motel & Restaurant Empl.
Meatcutters.
*Meatcutters, North Carolina.
Retail Clerks—National.
Retail Clerks—California (11-3).
Retail Clerks—California.
Retail Clerks—New Jersey.
Retail Clerks—New York.
Retail Clerks—New York (3-28).
Retail Clerks—Ohio.
Retail Clerks—Pennsylvania.
Retail Wholesale (7-10).
Retail Wholesale (9-30).
Retail Wholesale.
Service Employees.
Plant Guard Workers, Ind.
*Utility Workers.

Transportation—A. Railway:
Brohood of Railway Carmen.
Brohood of Railway Carmen NY (3-10).
Firemen & Oilers.
Railway Clerks Illinois.
Maintenance of Way Employees.
Railway Clerks.
Railway Labor Exec Assn.
Railroad Signalmen.

Central Campaign Funds of Special Interest and Political Party Committees—Continued

Cash on Hand as of December 31, 1975, Summary by Committee—Continued

Labor—continued

Affiliation or interest

Closing cash

Local Lodge 15, Houston ........................................... 64,960
Texas Airline District 146 .......................................... 627
Dist 751 Seattle ................................................... 2,312
Washington State .................................................. 918
of Wisconsin ....................................................... 970
Dist 10 Milwaukee .................................................. 13,973
OCAW Pol & Legisl League ......................................... 20,111
United Paper Workers Intl Union ................................. 17,118
COPE of UTD Rubber Wkrs ........................................ 48,844
United Rub Wkrs Local 154 PEC Denver ......................... 815
COPE Vol Contr Fund UTD Rubber #307 ........................ 0
Pol Act League—Sheet Metal ...................................... 89,610
United Steelworkers of Am PAF .................................. 405,382
United Steel Wkrs of Am Dist 7 Ptsbg ......................... 409
TWUA Pol Fund ..................................................... 25,382

Subtotal .......................................................... 1,427,113

Comm for Good Gvt (Detroit) ...................................... 294,278
UAW-V-PAC ........................................................ 683,804
COPE of UTD Rubber Wkrs ........................................ 405,382
Greater Flint Comm VCt Cncl Vol Fund ......................... 4,761

Subtotal .......................................................... 988,652

Brooklyn Longshrm Pol Act & Ed Comm .......................... 81,308
Masters, Mates & Pilots Pensioners Action Fund ............... 401,293
MEBA Pol Act Fund ................................................ 273,113
District 2 MEBA—AMO Pol Act Fund .............................. 194,461
MEBA Retirees Group Fund ........................................ 76,781
PACTO PAC .......................................................... 9,151
NMU Pol & Leg Organ On Watch (PLOW) .......................... 50,213
Seafarers Political Activity Donation ........................... 69,353
Marine Cooks & Stewards Pol Def Fund ........................... 61,380
marine Firemen's Union Pol Act Fund ............................ 7,359
Sailers Pol Fund ................................................... 77,907

Subtotal .......................................................... 1,347,332

H & RE & BIU COPE .................................................. 87,344
AMCOPE .............................................................. 68,869
Local 525 Vol Pol Act Fund, Ashevllle ......................... 0
Active Ballot Club .................................................. 278,210
Active Ballot Club #48 San Francisco ......................... 880
Active Ballot Club #428 San Jose ............................... 208
Active Ballot Club #533 Baltimore .............................. 2,227
Active Ballot Club #1262 Clifton ................................ 16,373
Active Ballot Club #1506 Queens Vl ......................... 6,196
Active Ballot Club #6 Queens Vl ............................... 2,659
Active Ballot Club #280 Cleveland ............................. 4,017
Active Ballot Club #1360 Reading ............................... 0
Local #2 Pol Act Fund (NYC) .................................... 1,447
District 65 Pol Act Fund (New York) ......................... 2,524
Dist. 1169 Pol Act Fund (NYC) ................................ 14,728
SEIU-COPE PCC ...................................................... 49,086
PAC UPGWA .......................................................... 1,810
Utility Workers of Am Pol Contrib Comm ........................ 0

Subtotal .......................................................... 365,597

Railway Carmen Pol League ....................................... 16,104
Brohood of RWY Carmen Lodge 886 PAC ......................... 16,104
Int'l Brohood Fire & Oilers Pol League ......................... 2,306
Illinois Stateg Legis Com (BAC) Pol Ed Pnce .............. 1,905
Maintenance of Way Pol League ................................ 20,162
Railway Clerks Pol League ....................................... 132
Railway Labor Exec Assn Pol League ......................... 25,320
Signalmen's Pol League ......................................... 3,288

Subtotal .......................................................... 79,107

Committee name

Closing cash
### Cash on Hand as of December 31, 1975, Summary by Committee—Continued

#### Labor—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATU COPE Pol Contrs Comm</td>
<td>$8,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Workers Union FCC</td>
<td>99,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Pol Ed League</td>
<td>411,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Am Pilot Engineers PAC</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal | 510,989 |

| DRIVE Dem Rep Ind Voter Education | 5,950 |
| DRIVE Jt Council 88 Birmingham | 3,727 |
| DRIVE Alaska ALIVE Vol Comm | 28,765 |
| DRIVE Little Rock | 10,050 |
| DRIVE #42 Los Angeles | 31,788 |
| DRIVE #559 Newtonington | 2,709 |
| DRIVE Atlanta | 2,357 |

Subtotal | 6,886 |

| DRIVE Joint Council 65 Springfield | 5,222 |
| DRIVE Local Union 364 Voter Ed Pol Fund | 76 |
| DRIVE Sports Award | 476 |
| DRIVE #238 Cedar Rapids | 2,745 |
| DRIVE #508 Shreveport | 500 |
| DRIVE #340 South Portland | 2,861 |
| DRIVE #557 Baltimore | 13,610 |
| DRIVE Joint Council 10 Boston | 19,684 |
| DRIVE Local Union #23 Boston | 5,421 |
| DRIVE Political Fund Detroit | 315 |

Subtotal | 18,562 |

| DRIVE Minnesota | 6,642 |
| DRIVE Joint Council 33 St Louis | 459 |
| DRIVE New Jersey | 531 |
| DRIVE Carolina Chapt 1 Greensboro | 5,236 |
| DRIVE Ohio | 1,622 |
| DRIVE Local 115 Philadelphia | 12,733 |
| DRIVE Texas | 635 |
| DRIVE Local 745 Dallas | 49,995 |
| DRIVE #908 Houston | 504 |
| DRIVE #941 El Paso | 1,169 |
| DRIVE #47 Fort Worth | 5,834 |
| DRIVE #902 Richmond | 5,934 |

Subtotal | 299,811 |

#### MISCELLANEOUS

| Labor Comm for Pol Act in NY State | 2,580 |
| American Radio Assn COPE PCC | 635 |
| CWA—COPE PCC | 178,910 |
| CWA Dist #1 PAC, NYC | 5,491 |
| CWA Dist #2 PAC, DC | 30,934 |
| CWA Dist #3 PAC, Georgia | 994 |
| CWA Dist #4 PAC, Ohio | 7,552 |
| CWA Dist #5 PAC, Illinois | 10,551 |
| CWA Dist #6 PAC, Missouri | 22,995 |
| CWA Dist #7 PAC, Nebraska | 2,538 |
| CWA Dist #8 PAC Colorado | 252 |
| CWA Dist #9 PAC, CA—SanFran | 1,539 |
| CWA Dist #10 PAC, Alabama | 530 |
| CWA Dist #11 PAC, CA—LosANG | 1,379 |
| CWA Dist #12 PAC, Texas | 34,949 |
| Farmworkers Pol Ed Fund | 15,275 |
| UFWA COPE | 1,284 |
| Graph Arts Int'l Union COPE | 13,300 |
| Int'l Molders & Allied Wkrs Un COPE | 5,526 |
| Voice of the Electorate “VOTE” | 3,006 |
| OPEIU Local 153 VOTE Comm | 7,184 |
| Coal Miners Pol Act Contrs Comm | 17,485 |

Subtotal | 337,859 |

Total labor | 6,600,237 |
CASH ON HAND AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1975, SUMMARY BY COMMITTEE—Continued

MISCELLANEOUS—continued

Affiliation or interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters Camp Fund</td>
<td>$4,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>1,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon League of Conservation Voters</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters GA (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>League of Conservation Voters OR (1-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati. Rural Electric Coop Assn.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado (9-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri (3-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio (6-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Assn. of Electric Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati Women's Political Caucus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6-30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati Right to Work Comm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood School Assn, Claymont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Seniors for Better Govt</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Victory Comm</td>
<td>2,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Gun Owners of America (CA)</td>
<td>17,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Club Pol. Comm.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Education Group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nati Womens Pol Caucus Camp Sup Comm</td>
<td>7,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw City Public Affairs Council (MI)</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate-House Assn for Resp Elections (SHARE)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Bear &amp; Keep Arms Pol Vict Fd.</td>
<td>25,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsman PAC (NY)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxpayers Action Fund</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women For</td>
<td>20,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Campaign Fund (DC)</td>
<td>20,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence '76 (VT)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Rights Camp Comm (VA)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for a Representative Congress Inc</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm for a New Majority/Freedom of Choice Inc</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Comm for Pol Action (NY)</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Congress of Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>84,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party Committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Republican Congressional Committee</td>
<td>$348,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Congressional Boosters Club</td>
<td>376,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Republican Senatoral Committee</td>
<td>182,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Candidates Conference (2-28)</td>
<td>61,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Campaign Committee (transf 252,926 to RNO)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Conservative Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am for Constitutional Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am Conservative Union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am for Constitutional Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Coalition of IOWA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Party Committees:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (6-30)</td>
<td>64,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Congressional Dinner Committee</td>
<td>30,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Senatoral Campaign Committee (9-30)</td>
<td>11,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic National Congressional Committee (6-30)</td>
<td>110,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Congressional Finance Committee</td>
<td>9,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONGRESSIONAL LEVEL PARTY COMMITTEES

Conservative Groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee name</th>
<th>Closing cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Conservation Union</td>
<td>3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans for Constitutional Action</td>
<td>11,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm for Responsible Youth Politics</td>
<td>3,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm for Survival of a Free Congress</td>
<td>95,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm of Nine</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Campaign Comm</td>
<td>2,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Victory Fund</td>
<td>2,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*National Conservative PAC</td>
<td>50,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Congressional Appeal</td>
<td>9,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young America's Campaign Comm</td>
<td>18,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of Freedom Rally Fin Comm</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>204,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to make absolutely clear to my colleagues that the provision requested by the White House has been stricken. The substitute, as it is now proposed, simply would reconstitute the Federal Election Commission. It would provide for the appointment of two members every other year. It would not continue the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House as ex officio members.

I would do nothing about the actions or interpretations of the commission which many Members of Congress believe the commission has erroneously interpreted so far. It would simply provide for the matching funds to be received by Presidential candidates and disbursed by the Commission to the candidates who are in the race. It would permit the Federal Election Commission to go ahead with what limited powers were retained to it under the Supreme Court decision in this matter. I suggest to my colleagues that what we need here is a revision of law to conform completely to the Supreme Court decision and to try to make a campaign reform bill work. We have been working at this for a long time. I believe we have the opportunity now to make a success of it.

I hope my colleagues will defeat the substitute amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, because a campaign committee which I have authorized has obtained matching funds under the Federal Election Campaign Act, I believe that casting my vote on legislation to amend the act after that fact could be seen as a conflict of interest. Therefore, I am refraining from voting for or against any amendments to the pending bill, or the bill itself.

I would add, Mr. President, that I do believe, on the merits, that the act should be amended to meet the objections raised by the Supreme Court, and that I find great merit in many of the amendments that are proposed. But in order to avoid the appearance of any possible conflict of interest, I shall vote "present" on the amendments offered, as well as on final passage.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of Senator from Michigan. Mr. PHILIP A. HART, the Senator from Florida (Mr. CARRIE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARKER), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 47, as follows:

Ripon Society.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I ask the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay that motion on the table. There is a sufficient second.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan in the nature of a substitute, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CHURCH (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CARRIE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARKER), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Young) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would vote "aye."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 47, as follows:
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1436

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1436, and ask unanimous consent that its reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

TITLE IV—COMMISSION TO STUDY PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING PROCESS

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Sec. 401. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to improve the system of nominating candidates for election to the office of the President of the United States by studying such system in a broad manner never before attempted in the two-hundred-year history of this Nation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 402. (a) There is established the Bi-cameral Commission to study Presidential nominating process (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty members to be appointed as follows:

(1) apportion and fix the number of appointments under paragraph (1),

(2) seven members of the Senate shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom at least one shall be elected or appointed State officials;

(3) six members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom at least two shall be Members of the House and at least two shall be elected or appointed State officials;

(4) six members shall be appointed by the President; and

(5) two members shall be the chairman of the two national political parties and shall be subject to Senate confirmation.

(c) At no time shall more than three members appointed under paragraph (1), (3), or (4) of subsection (b) be individuals who are of the same political affiliation.

(d) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, and shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made, subject to the same limitations with respect to party affiliations as the original appointment.

(e) Two members shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings. The Chairman of the Commission shall select from among the members, other than ex officio members.

FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 403. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation with respect to the Presidential nominating process. Such investigation shall include but be not limited to a consideration of:

(1) the manner in which States conduct primaries for the expression of a preference for the nomination of candidates for election to the office of President of the United States and caucuses for the selection of delegates to the national nominating conventions of political parties;

(2) State laws and the rules of national political parties which govern the participation of voters and candidates in such primaries and caucuses;

(3) the financing of campaigns for the nomination of candidates for election to the office of the President of the United States;

(4) the manner in which candidates are nominated for election to the office of the President of the United States and the news media, including how candidates achieve public recognition and whether such candidates should be guaranteed access to the television media; and

(5) the interrelationship of the elements described in paragraphs (1) through (4) of this section.

The Commission shall consider alternative nominating systems, including but not limited to a national or regional primary system for the expression of a preference for the nomination of candidates for the office of President of the United States and variations on the present nominating system; and the manner in which candidates are nominated for election to the office of Vice President of the United States.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress interim reports as it deems advisable, and not later than one year after the enactment of this resolution, a final report of its study and investigation based on a full consideration of alternatives to our current Presidential nominating system, including an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of all such alternatives studied, together with its recommendations as to the best system to establish for the 1980 Presidential elections. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after its final report is submitted.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Sec. 404. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution and interim and final reports, employ such personnel and take such action as may be necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification in the competitive service, and, in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5323 of such title, prescribe temporary and intermittent services to the extent authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Sec. 405. (a) Members of the Commission who are otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall serve without compensation but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission not otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall receive per diem at the maximum daily rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule when they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and allowed reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

TIMELINESS OF APPOINTMENTS

Sec. 406. It is the sense of the Congress that the appointments of individuals to serve as members of the Commission be completed...
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within ninety days after the enactment of this resolution.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sect. 407. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry--

Mr. BUMPERS. Is there a time limitation on the Mondale amendment? Mr. MONDALE. There is none.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be recognized for not to exceed 5 minutes.

CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representa­
tives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS) laid before the Senate the amendments in the House of Representa­
tives to the bill (H.R. 12122) to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes. (The amendments of the House are printed in the Record of March 11, 1976, beginning at page 6148.)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have a brief statement on H.R. 12122.

Mr. President, H.R. 12122 was amended by the Senate, which amendment the House has agreed to with further amendments. The House amendments would accomplish two objectives contained in the original version of H.R. 12122. The House amendments would reauthorize the appropriation of $6 million for fiscal year 1977 to the Finance Committee to give grants allowing the Northern Marianas to complete their land survey and to begin the construction of facilities for a 4-year college to serve the Micronesian community, but provides that no appropriation may be made until the President has conducted a study to determine the educational need and the most suitable educational concept for such a college and has transmitted that study to the Senate and House Interior Com­mittees, which will have 90 calendar days to review the study recommendations. The Senate amendment would reauthorize the appropriation of $8 million for fiscal year 1977 to the Finance Committee to give grants allowing the Northern Marianas to complete their survey and to begin the construction of facilities for a 4-year college to serve the Micronesian community, but provides that no appropriation may be made until the President has conducted a study to determine the educational need and the most suitable educational concept for such a college and has transmitted that study to the Senate and House Interior Committees, which will have 90 calendar days to review the study recommendations.

On March 11, therefore, Senator Long as chairman of the Committee on Finance introduced legislation which would provide for the establishment in the Northern Marianas Commonwealth of the Social Security Act assistance programs applicable to other territories. At the time that bill was introduced, the Senate had voted to strike from H.R. 12122 the provision extending the sup­plemental security income program and the special benefits program from H.R. 12122. Subsequently, the House has again added to H.R. 12122 the provision op­posed by the Finance Committee and the amendment I am offering would again strike it from the bill.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. METCALF. I concur in the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF: I do not have the floor.

Mr. MONDALE: I have the floor. I have an amendment pending. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Does the Senator have an amendment to the legislation being presented by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MONDALE: No, I have an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Before we proceed to that, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MONDALE: I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. May I say to the Senator from Montana that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARY HART) has been very much interested in this subject, and he is not here at the mo­ment. I am wondering whether the Sen­ator from Montana would agree to lay this matter aside temporarily until the amendment could be examined and Senator Hart could be notified.

Mr. METCALF: I would be delighted to lay it aside, but I am informed that this amendment as passed by the House of Representatives has the concurrence of Senator Gary Hart.

We tried to touch all the bases. We tried to meet with the Senator from Montana, Senator McClure, and many other Senators who were concerned with this legisla­tion on this specific amendment. The bill has passed both the House and the Senate. The amendment came over from the House, and we feel that we can concur in the House amendment and the bill as amended by the House.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield, maybe I can clarify it for the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MONDALE: I yield.

Mr. FANNIN. This amendment is one being offered on behalf of the Finance Committee so we will not be giving privileges to Guam that were in the bill for the Northern Marianas. The first bill that came over to the Senate from the House gave it to all territories. The second one that came back over gave it to Guam. This was taken up in the com­mittee and we felt that this should not be done, and that this provision would be deleted from it.

So this limits the amount Guam would be entitled to, in accordance with the bill from the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. That is what the Fannin amendment did?

Mr. FANNIN: That is what the Fannin amendment did, yes.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. The only other question I have is this: When the bill was before the Senate, it was amended in four particular places, as I recall. I am taking it from memory. Would one of the Senators indicate to me how the House proposal reads, now that it has
been amended by the Fannin amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the various Senate amendments were agreed to by the House, except for the two now before the Senate. One of them is an amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona which I think all of us are in agreement. The other amendment is the one we agreed to for $8 million for the President for the President's Office. We are calling up before the Senate. One of them is an amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona which I think all of us are in agreement. The other amendment is the one we agreed to for $8 million for the President for the President's Office. We are calling up before the Senate.

We concurred in that amendment.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator. That clears up the points in which I was interested.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT
AMENDMENTS OF 1976

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3065) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for its administration by a Federal Election Commission appointed in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am going to speak briefly to my amendment, but first yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Michael Scully and Robert Dolchin of my staff be accorded the privilege of the floor.

Mr. HASKELL. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Cevett, of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Cevett, of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HASKELL. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Cevett, of my staff, be accorded the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mickey Barnett of Senator Domenici's staff and Alan Holmer and Debbie Robertson of my staff be accorded the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be accorded to Mr. Walter Nolan of his staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the amendment just called up is cosponsored by many Senators, including the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Stevenson), and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), as well as 19 other cosponsors.

This amendment would set up a commission to study the Presidential nomination process in this country. It is one of the few failures of the Founding Fathers that in the development of our Constitution 200 years ago, they failed to perceive what would be necessary for a rational system to nominate the President. And let us ask today who is the President of the United States.

They believed that this country would not have political parties. They believed instead that, through the electoral system, distinguished citizens would gather together each 4 years and elect the best qualified person to be President of the United States. Because they did not accurately perceive how the system would evolve, it never worked out in the way they intended. Politicis, and the kind of a schedule they called factions—immediately arose.

Now there is not a single system of nominating a President, but literally 55 different systems, each with a welt of differing rules, often conflicting. The system is so flawed that it is obvious to all, and the system has arrived at the point where it is utterly ludicrous. It undermines the physical capacity of the candidates, it destroys the ability for rational debate, and it is a guaranteed chaos for a critical election, the President of the United States.

Never once in the 200 years of American history has the Presidential nomination system been subjected to a comprehensive study. That is what this proposed legislation seeks to do.

It would be a bipartisan commission, with 18 members, to be equally appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, after advice from the majority and minority leaders, the Speaker of the House, and the minority leader of the House, with the chairmen of the two national political parties serving ex officio. This commission would be asked to look into all aspects of the nominating process, including the manner in which States conduct Presidential primaries, caucuses, and conventions to select delegates to the national nominating conventions. It would look into State laws and rules of national political parties, which govern the participation of voters and candidates in such primaries and caucuses. It would look into Presidential campaign financing, and the relationship between the candidate for President and the media. It would look into alternative nominating systems that we have in our national and regional primary systems. Finally, it would look into the manner in which candidates are nominated for Vice President.

Mr. President, the nominating process desperately needs a comprehensive review of these areas and the relationship of each area to the others, in a way which seeks to resolve the problems consistent with clearly defined and broadly accepted principles.

The present system of nominating Presidential candidates is close to anarchy. There are 55 separate and different systems. This year 30 States will hold separate primaries, each without any relation to the others, and they will account for approximately three-fourths of the delegates to attend the national conventions. Thus, we virtually have a de facto national primary, albeit in a fragmented form, without ever having that kind of consensus, however, and the cosponsors of this resolution and the entire system is badly in need of review.

There is always considerable interest in reforming the process during a Presidential election year, but it quickly fades after the election. Even though we believe this interest is higher now than ever before, we fear the same thing could happen again. The Commission we adopt this year and the recommendations early in 1977, giving Congress the unique and compelling opportunity to act well in advance of the 1980 elections.

Whatever alternative system may be recommended by this Commission and adopted by Congress, I think we could do much better than the present system. We also believe there is no more fitting effort we could undertake in this Bicentennial year than to try to improve one of the most fundamental elements of our democracy.

Mr. President, I yield.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Minnesota in cosponsoring this resolution and amendment of this bill.

Four years ago I introduced a bill, with several other Senators, to establish regional primaries. The bill did not receive editorial and academic support I think than any other bill that I have ever introduced. It had almost no opposition, except from those who preferred a national primary. And while a national primary is not my preference, it is an alternative to consider. The bill had one hearing, fell on deaf ears in the Senate and made no progress in the House of Representatives.

I have reintroduced it in each Congress since I first introduced it, and Congress has not acted.

As the Senator from Minnesota has said, if there is ever any time to pass a bill like this, one would think it would be at a time of heat and passion when we are all in the midst of primaries, and I have frankly found that is when there seems to be the most interest. About the time we get to the first of May, maybe the first of June, at the latest, the candidates who remain are tired. They have been working nonstop from Florida to California, and it is time to consider, making campaign speeches every place they go, being expected to sound rational. I think that kind of a schedule is training for the job of President, but not training to be President. About that time there becomes a great hue and cry that we should do something to reform the primaries, but this is not the time to do it. Let us wait; it is too late now. Let us wait until this primary season is over.
and then in the cool and calm of 1973, was the last cry—now it is the cool and calm of 1977—let us look at this with dispassionate objectivity and pass a rational reform.

But then what inevitably happens is that we fall short of this ideal, and for this reform cools, as the primaries are over, and as the Presidential election is decided in November, this is put on a back shelf, nobody thinks about it, nobody is disturbed, and there is not much thought about it until the next primary season when again this issue bubbles to the top, is moved to the front burner about November of the year preceding the Presidential election year, and there is again great consternation, but it is no more endorsement, but then it is too late to do anything for that Presidential year.

I, therefore, have joined the Senator from Minnesota in endorsing this idea of a commission which will report early, and of an amendment, in the hopes that this commission will come up with something that is preferable to the present hodgepodge Barnum and Bailey traveling sideshow we have that we call our Presidential primary system. It is a rational way of selecting the nominees for our major and I might add minor parties, so that in 1980 we will not have to go through instead of 30 or 31 primaries, 35, 40, or 45 primaries throughout this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.
Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my legislative aide, Henry Poole, and the legislative aide of Senator Nunn, Gordon Griffin, be allowed floor privileges during the discussion and debate of the Federal election matter pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia for the same purpose.

Mr. HARRY P. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Philip Reberger of my staff be granted privileges of the floor during consideration of the pending legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, a Presidential candidacy today triggers a thousand skirmishes, a welter of detail, a morass of regulation and devising-like activity all largely beyond the control and comprehension of the exhausted candidate. Today's contender is pressured to compete in 30 State elections and hundreds of district elections and caucuses and is forced to spend months of his time in order to raise money in order to qualify for Federal election subsidies.

Then the strength of the Presidential candidates is measured by their bankrolls and the applause levels at joint appearances. The substance disappears from the hallowed American political system. Television offers episodes and spectacles; serious comment by serious figures on complex issues is ignored or misunderstood.

The press, exhausted and bewildered, is spread too thin by the profusion of candidates, and the public is hard put to fathom the significance of the episodes and spectacles that now pass for Presidential politics.

Mr. President, this process has demonstrated that it can eliminate men well qualified to occupy the Presidency and I count as one the senior Senator from Minnesota, (Mr. Mondale) with whom I am privileged to cosponsor this amendment. This process has also demonstrated to me, and it has, thoughtful men ill-suited for a process which subsists upon sensation. I cite former Governor Sanford. It has not demonstrated that it will produce only the wisest and strongest in America to occupy the Presidency. It could become a process which only the unfitness can survive.

This system, Mr. President, is not an exercise in American democracy. It is a taxpayer supported monopoly of the positions we profess to celebrate in 1976. If there is no better way than this, then the experiment begun 200 years ago could fall. There is a better way. We simply do not choose it.

The commission proposed by this amendment would recommend better ways to select the American President. A myriad of possibilities exist. If created now, its recommendations would be before the Presidential elections of 1980. If we wait, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from Oregon mentioned, it could be too late.

Indeed, I would add to what they say that it could be awkward for a President produced by this process to support changes in it.

So, for all these reasons and those expressed by my colleagues, Mr. President, I urge the Members to approve this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARN). Who yields time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to support this amendment, and I congratulate the distinguished principal sponsors of the amendment for their foresight and wisdom in proposing it at this time.

I think it has been a supporter of any reasonable effort to try to rationalize the Presidential nominee selection system. I have watched at close range for almost 10 years, as a Member of the Senate—and for somewhat longer as an interested observer of the general political process—and I believe that the adequate pressures and the convention mechanism are fairly summarized by a remark that was made to me recently by one of our Democratic colleagues who was a candidate, who returned from the field of battle to say, "Howard, we simply can't continue having an election every Tuesday."

Mr. President, that is true so, I think we are grinding up good men and women in the machinery of political combat at an unconscionable rate. We are placing burdens and demands on our leaders and potential leaders of the country that are beyond that which should be required of them, and we require no particular evidence of their future competence to serve in the positions to which they aspire.

Mr. President, I do not know the final answer; that is why I am glad that this process is for the first time supported the early first utterances, I believe, of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, that we should try to figure out something, perhaps a regional primary system. But that has problems. For example, do you draw the lines for the regions north and south or do you cut a slice east and west and try to gather together States that are similar or States that are dissimilar? Good arguments could be made in both cases. Do you have a single national primary or if that case, do you have a runoff? Who pays the cost? What is the qualifying requirement? Perhaps you even call on Congress to participate in the selection of party nominees. That might very well strengthen the party responsibility and even the attractiveness of congressional service to party members. Perhaps you rejuvenate the electoral college. Perhaps that is the better way to choose the Vice President, in my opinion.

There are 100 variations on these and other things that suggest themselves in the debate that has been going on for a long time, at least the last decade, when it began to be heard the suggestions that we had better look at the problems that are dissimilar? Good arguments could be made in both cases. Do you have a single national primary or if that case, do you have a runoff? Who pays the cost? What is the qualifying requirement? Perhaps you even call on Congress to participate in the selection of party nominees. That might very well strengthen the party responsibility and even the attractiveness of congressional service to party members. Perhaps you rejuvenate the electoral college. Perhaps that is the better way to choose the Vice President, in my opinion.

There are 100 variations on these and other things that suggest themselves in the debate that has been going on for a long time, at least the last decade, when it began to be heard the suggestions that we had better look at the problems that are dissimilar? Good arguments could be made in both cases. Do you have a single national primary or if that case, do you have a runoff? Who pays the cost? What is the qualifying requirement? Perhaps you even call on Congress to participate in the selection of party nominees. That might very well strengthen the party responsibility and even the attractiveness of congressional service to party members. Perhaps you rejuvenate the electoral college. Perhaps that is the better way to choose the Vice President, in my opinion.

It is sometimes said, in an unkindly way that Congress does nothing so well as trying to regulate politics and setting its own salaries. That really is not so. I do not think Congress is very good at either of these things, and I believe that is additional reason for constituting the commission to support and help us on how we should proceed on this matter.

It is an extraordinarily important problem, Mr. President.

As some of my colleagues have heard me say from time to time, the importance and the relevance of the two-party system in the American scheme of things is often underrated or even overlooked. The two-party system is an instrumentality that came late to the Republic. It is a very young system. I believe, that will go on into the future, that is not mentioned in the Constitution. It is not even memorialized in the statute law of the United States. The two-party system is unique in that it has served as the sensing mechanism by which the people of the country express the range of their desires and their dissent to the structures and the engines of Government. In that way, it becomes effectively the equivalent of a fourth department of Government, ranking in importance with the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary.

If that is true, and I believe it is true: if partisan politics is that important; if
two-party politics is that unique and special in the American scheme of things; if it is essential, as I believe, to the sensing out and determining of the future policies of America, drawing on the collective genius of the people of this country—then it is also important that we modernize and update the method by which we select our nominees for President and Vice President.

I am not reluctant to say that I do not have the answers. I am in a position, however, to say that this is a step in the right direction.

I believe that a commission can do a good service for the country in this respect, and I look forward to their recommendations. I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted. I commend the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Maryland for their cooperation.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the chief sponsor of this amendment, if he is willing to accept an additional recommendation. I hope very much that the amendment will be adopted. I commend the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Maryland for their cooperation.

Mr. MATHIAS. It would be section 8, appearing on page 4.

Mr. MONDALE. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified. The modification is as follows:

On page 4 add the following subsection (8) after line 14:

"(8) the extent to which State laws and the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended, promote or retard independent candidacies for election to the office of President."

Mr. MONDALE. I also modify the amendment to add the following language on page 2, line 8, following the word "Senate":

So that it would read:

Six members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the recommendation of the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?

Mr. MONDALE. I so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified. The modification is as follows:

(1) six members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on recommendation of the majority and minority leaders, of whom at least two shall be members of the Senate and at least two shall be elected or appointed State officials;

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I find much merit to the amendment proposed by Senator Mondale, for himself and others.

I believe that this type of study is long overdue. I have a question as to the size of the commission. A 12-member commission, with 12 members necessary to constitute a quorum, would indicate that it might be some kind of problem to get the commission together. Chairman Packwood took up this matter. That would be my only question about it.

I also wondered to myself about the advisability of including it in this bill. I am sort of reluctant to see additional words added to this amendment, other than to give the President some reason to veto it; although I certainly hope he would not have any reason to veto this.

Mr. MONDALE. May I say that the President, at a recent session with reporters—I do not have his precise language—expressed interest in the establishment of a commission of this kind. So I believe it is probable that the President would not have an objection to this. We have tried to establish a way that gives him a strong appointive role in the selection of some of its members.

In terms of the timing of this amendment, what I am afraid of is this: We now have a deadline each on different days, established, as the chairman of the committee well knows, with no sense of relationship at all. I think that, on June 3, there will be Presidential primaries in California, Ohio, and New Jersey on the same day. In the previous week, there are three other Presidential primaries. A candidate would need a super-sonic jet and maybe Skylab to fly over all of them, let alone campaign in them and be understood by the voters in those States.

The system is beyond human proportions. It is no longer rational. No one knows that better than the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has for many years been trying to make election laws work for the people of this country. This Commission is established in a way that I hope will help the committee prepare such reform measures as are needed before the next Presidential election in 1980. What I am afraid of is that if we do not act now, when practically everybody who has looked at the nomination system is crying out for reform, including the candidates, we shall do as we have done for the previous 200 years: Just come up to the next election, when it is too late for reform and go through the same crazy-quilt system that we see today.

I think this is a modest proposal. It has received very wide-ranging support from editorialists around the country. I know of no opposition to it. The President commented favorably about the need for such a commission a few weeks ago.

While I greatly sympathize with the chairman's desire not to load this bill down, I do not think this adds much. If any, weight to the burden that the bill carries. As a matter of fact, it may make it more attractive.

One point on the number of members: It was our desire here to make certain that the Commission was representative of the Senate, of the House, of State and local officials, of the unions, of the collective genius of the people of this country, and of the general public, as seen by the Presidential appointments. I think the Commission will have no trouble getting a quorum because, based on the reaction we have had around the Nation, there are many people interested in getting down to the study of this matter.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I would be willing to accept the amendment of the distinguished Senator. I think it is a very worthy amendment, although I had a question as to whether or not it should be in this bill, and the second question is the size of the Commission, which seems to be a bit unwieldy. But if the Senator tells me that is a proper size, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. We do not need a rollcall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to the desk that does not have a number, but I want to call it up. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 37, line 6, after "subject" insert the following: 

"except that expenditures for any such communications which expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate must be reported to the Commission in accordance with section 304(e)"

On page 37, line 10, after "families" insert the following: "except that expenditures for any such nonpartisan registration activities or campaigns must be reported to the Commission under section 304(e)"

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to carry further the efforts at disclosure that have started in this Congress in the last few years. This is aimed both at business and at the unions. Under the present law, and under this bill, corporations are free to use corporate money to appeal to their shareholders or to their corporate officers and administrative personnel, and there are free to use corporate money to communicate with their members—union dues; we are not talking about COPE dues here, or the voluntary contributions. We are talking about union dues. All this amendment does—and let us be frank about it—is require that corporations and unions, when they are using corporate money or union dues, file under section 304(e), which is the disclosure section of the present law, the expenditures with the use of money to—I read specifically the language—"expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate" or—in the second part of the amendment—if they use the expenditures for..."
Mr. GRIFFIN. Now, of course, under the Supreme Court decision, in an unlimited way.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Absolutely unlimited, and both unlimited as to what the corporation or union wants to spend, and the first point I would make about this is that because of what the court has said, have as much as they want, and it is only fair if we are talking about an election is money buying the election. It is not just money that the candidate has, it is money that is spent through the corporation, on behalf of a candidate by a union and, I think, at a minimum the people in this country, the voters of this country, are entitled to know how much money from whatever source is spent on behalf of or against a candidate.

Mr. President, I will yield the floor.

THE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I feel that the changes that are really covered in the present proposal that we have reported from the committee.

The Senate has proposed a change on page 37, both of the changes.

The first is to page 14 of the bill, and "person" is defined:

Every person who makes contributions or expenditures expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate, in an aggregate amount in excess of $100 within a calendar year shall file with the Commission, on a form prepared by the Commission, a statement containing the information required of a person who makes a contribution in excess of $1,000.

So I would just say to the Senator, I believe it is required in the law at the present time.

It was the intent to have it so required, and there is nothing that I find on page 37 that is contrary to that interpretation. So I would say that under the present law, defining who a labor organization means, who is meant by a labor organization, and then goes on to refer to the exclusion of the communications by a corporation to its stockholders and its executive or administrative personnel, to their families or by a labor organization which goes to members or families on any subject. So that it does not do away with any reporting requirements.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I might ask the distinguished chairman, that is the present law the Senator was reading from, is it not? That is the present law the Senatron was reading from on pages 14 and 15 of the bill, is it not?

Mr. CANNON. Would the Senator give me the section reference again?

Mr. PACKWOOD. S. 3065, section 304(e) of the act which is amended. I would have to check the present law and tell the Senator precisely.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Would the chairman do this: so long as the chairman and I are attempting to achieve the same end, would the chairman be willing to accept the same language, so long as the chairman says; it is in the present law, it is in the present law, and that no corporate committees or labor organization committees that was spending its own funds, dues and corporate money, filed such a report in the last election?

Mr. CANNON. I would just note that the second part of the Senator's amendment—the first part is required, there appears to be no question about that, it is required now. The second part is not required where it says except that expenditures for political purposes not to disclose it and expenditures for the purpose of advocating defeat of the opponent of the candidate or money used in nonpartisan campaign and get-out-the-vote campaigns must be reported to the Commission under section 304(e). A nonpartisan drive, election drive, registration drive, has never been required to be reported, and now it may.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Is the chairman aware of any reports that were filed in the last election, by either a corporate or a union committee spending funds for the purposes of advocating the defeat or election of a candidate that were filed in the 1974 elections?

Mr. CANNON. I do not have any information as to whether any were filed or not filed. I have never checked that particular thing. I just am aware of any of election drives on the part of either to defeat a specifically identified candidate. There may have been. I just say I am not aware of any at the moment.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I will not in that case take any issue. I can get—I do not have them here, I have them in my office in Portland—many, many examples, more likely union than business—of union solicitations of members to vote for or against a candidate. Billions were solicited in the New Hampshire election in the last runoff campaign where unions were soliciting their members to vote for a particular candidate, and yet there would be no filing of this as money spent on behalf of a candidate when the filings are in.

Mr. CANNON. I just cannot say, I do not know whether any filings—I have not checked that so I cannot say. But I would say that under the present law and under the bill we have reported to the Senate, if a person does make such on expenditure he would be required to file a report, but he would not be required to file in accordance with the second proposal where it is required it is a nonpartisan registration drive on the part of either one.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I am advised, Mr. President, that under section 431(1) (4) (C) that unions and businesses are exempt from reporting under present laws in their solicitations of members while advocating the election or defeat of a candidate or money used in nonpartisan voter registration drives.

Mr. CANNON. (C) Any communication by any membership organization or corporation to its members or stockholders if such membership organization or corporation is not organized primarily for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or election of any person to Federal office.
Let us talk about advocacy of election or defeat for a moment.

Will the chairman agree to accept this amendment—and I will be willing to put it aside for a moment—if we find the law does not require a corporation or a union using corporate funds or union dues—again, not talking about voluntary contributions—to communicate with their stockholders or administrative personnel, if the present law does not require them to report that as independent expenditures, that the chairman would accept an amendment that would make that correction?

Mr. CANNON. I would like to give some further study to it and then respond to the Senator. I want to be absolutely sure of what I am saying, as long as the Senate wants to talk on the other issue.

Mr. PACKWOOD. All right, I will talk on that a bit because I would like a vote eventually on that.

When talking about nonpartisan voter registration drives, especially as they are put on by corporations or by labor unions, I believe the purpose is probably not the first time.

In voter registration, one does the best he can to register them in the area they will support one, and ignore or give a very low priority to the area where voters will register and likely oppose one.

More often by unions than by business, voter registration drives are conducted in areas that are likely to register overwhelmingly Democrat.

There are some exceptions with other organizations and I compliment such organizations. I compliment the League of Women Voters, quite often the various junior chambers of commerce around the country, who do conduct what I consider genuine nonpartisan voter registration drives.

But, by and large, unions or to a lesser extent, corporations, simply do not conduct them as openly, or too much toward the partisan voter to support their causes.

I think if that is the case, if money is going to be spent to register voters, that we know 70, 80, 90 percent are going to support the candidate of one’s choice, that that is, indeed, an expenditure toward the election of that candidate or that party and that money should be revealed.

I am not asking it be stopped. I am not commenting on whether or not the practice is right or wrong. But I am suggesting to theCHAIRMAN that at the moment corporations and unions do not have to report expenditures for or against a candidate so long as they do not influence the registration of their members, shareholders or executive personnel?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. Mr. President, I am reading now the present law under the definition of expenditure, and this is 431(f)(4)(C):

Expenditure does not include (B) nonpartisan organization or corporation is not organized primarily for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election, or election, of any person to Federal office.

We have simply by the present law eliminated the definition of expenditure as including money spent by a union or corporation from its own funds to influence the outcome in an election. That explains why they have not reported. I think, under present law, even though a person who is a known candidate, the person is. If we eliminate by definition expenditure of a corporation or use for this purpose, I think the amendment I offered would be enough, if we are going to encourage or try to. I agree want to be achieved and requiring this to be reported as an expenditure.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator. I take it that is probably not the first time.

Mr. Packwood. I am unable to give the Senator a second part because I think anything we do to discourage nonpartisan registration drives in this country today we are discouraging full participation in the voting process. We have done everything we could try to encourage the nonpartisan election drives. We have the League of Women Voters who go out and work on a nonpartisan election drives. We have the labor people who go out. We have the corporation who go out and urge their members to vote. If we are going to put a reporting requirement simply to spell out how much they spend in urging people to vote in nonpartisan registration drives. I believe that subtracting the intent of the act and I would oppose the intent of the act and I would be opposed to it. If the Senator wants to divide this, he might feel better about dividing it and having a vote on the issues separately.

Mr. Packwood. The chairman says subtracting the intent of the act. Is not the intent disclosure? I am not saying they cannot do it.

Mr. CANNON. The intent is disclosure of the amount spent to elect a particular candidate or the amount spent to independently defeat a candidate. But to discourage people to register and vote is not the intent of this act.

Mr. Packwood. Apart from this second part, does the chairman agree that at the moment corporations and unions do not have to report expenditures for or against a candidate so long as they do not influence the registration of their members, shareholders or executive personnel?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I believe that is right, under the present law. I am not sure that that is right under the bill that we have presented here.

Mr. Packwood. They are exempt.

Mr. CANNON. They are exempt then, but if they are trying to elect or defeat someone for Federal office they are not exempt.

Mr. Packwood. Will the Senator read that again. It says if they are organized for the principal purpose of not electing, is that not correct?

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Senator from Nevada is a better lawyer than that.

Mr. CANNON. If such membership organization or corporation is not organized primarily for the purpose of influencing the nomination for election or election of any person to Federal office, it is not exempt.

Mr. GRIFFIN. A corporation is organized to make a profit, and a labor organization, a labor union, is organized to represent its members in collective bargaining and, therefore, they are exempt.

Mr. Packwood. They are exempt from the reporting law.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is needed and, as I understand it, this same amendment was offered by Representative WIGGINS over in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PACKWOOD. That is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. For the same purpose, and it was defeated over there on a close vote.

Mr. Packwood. I think the chairman would have no objection to the amendment if what we are trying to do is simply do what the chairman says exist. Although I think a reading of that law indicates they do not have to file and, indeed, they do not, and the chairman would be willing to accept the provisions of the amendment or at least the first part of it relating to the advocating defeat or election of candidates, specifically candidates.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I would want to take a look at this. I think it is already covered.

I would like to say this to the Senator: If a corporation or a labor organization solicits the persons they are entitled to solicit for the defeat or election of a particular candidate, those funds should be reported as an Independent expenditure.

That is my intention.

Mr. Packwood. Would the Senator say that again, they should be reported as a what?

Mr. CANNON. As an independent expenditure. In other words, the Supreme Court held there are no limitations on Independent expenditures that can be made other for or against certain candidates.

Mr. Packwood. Right.

Mr. CANNON. And we have required the reporting of those independent expenditures. I would say that my intent is—and I believe it is in the bill here that we have presented to the Senate—that those people should be required to report if they advocate the election or defeat of a known candidate.

Mr. Packwood. Can I get the chairman’s agreement on this, because I want to talk in addition about the voter registration?
Mr. PACKWOOD. Can the chairman tell me where in the bill this is rectified?

Mr. CANNON. Where we define person on page 14 and say:

Every person (other than a political committee or corporation) making contributions or expenditures expressly advocating the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate, other than by contribution to a political committee or candidate, in an aggregate amount in excess of $100 within a calendar year shall file with the Commission, on a form prepared by the Commission, a statement containing the information required of a person who makes a contribution in excess of $100 to a candidate or political committee and the information required of a candidate or political committee receiving such a contribution.

Mr. PACKWOOD. What happens when we get to section 431 and the expenditures for or against the candidates are simply not counted as an expenditure?

Mr. CANNON. But this is a different section and requires reporting under these conditions.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Where in this bill do we have a contradictory definition of expenditure from that in section 431, which says that expenditures and communications are reportable?

Mr. CANNON. That is simply a definition of the phrase "contribution or expenditure."

Mr. PACKWOOD. But in the context of otherwise legal expenditures of corporate funds.

Mr. CANNON. Page 9 was a separate exclusionary item completely relating to the definition of whether or not legal and accounting services had to be counted as a contribution and had to be reported as a contribution. That was a change in the definition, that is true. It added a specific exemption to say:

This paragraph shall not apply in the case of legal and accounting services rendered or on behalf of the national committee of a political party, other than services attributable to activities which directly further the election of a designated candidate or candidates to Federal office, nor shall this paragraph apply in the case of legal and accounting services rendered or on behalf of a candidate or political committee solely for the purpose of insuring compliance with the provisions of this Act or chapter 95 or 96 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. PACKWOOD. But all the committee has done there is to slightly broaden the exemptions. I am not arguing with that. I am not arguing whether they are right or wrong. They have not changed the present exemption in 431(c). Then on pages 36 and 37 of the bill, again in definition of the phrase "contribution or expenditure," shall not include communications by a corporation to its stockholders and executive or administrative personnel and their families or by a labor organization to its members and their families or any subject.

Mr. CANNON. That is simply a definition of the phrase "contribution or expenditure."

Mr. PACKWOOD. That is my point.

Mr. CANNON. It says that a contribution or expenditure:

Shall not include communications by a corporation to its stockholders or administrative personnel and their families or by a labor organization to its members and their families on any subject; communications by a corporation or labor organization to its members and their families; or the establishment, administration, and solicitation of contributions to a segregated fund to be utilized for political purposes by a corporation or labor organization.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I think we are saying the same thing. It does not include for an expenditure any communication by a union to its members or any corporation to its shareholders or personnel. That is not an expenditure within the definition of this law, is that right, on any subject?

Mr. CANNON. That is not a contribution or expenditure within the definitions of the act on any subject within those parameters.

Mr. PACKWOOD. So that a corporation can spend corporate money to communicate with its shareholders and say, "Vote for Packwood," to its shareholders and it is not a definition of being an expenditure within the present law?

Mr. CANNON. I am sure a corporation would not do it that way. Mr. PACKWOOD. But they can. There is no prohibition. Is that right?

Mr. CANNON. I think the Senator has raised a question there that opens up another part of the law. That is related to contributions. It might constitute an unlawful contribution on the part of a corporation, in violation of the criminal provisions of the code, if it in fact advocated the election or the defeat of a specific candidate under those circumstances.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me on that point?

Mr. PACKWOOD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If we look in our yellow books here on page 45, where section 610 appears, which gives the provision that would be applicable, notice, at the bottom of page 49:

As used in this section, the phrase "contribution or expenditure" shall include—

So and so and so. Then, going over to page 50:

Mr. CANNON. The same language.

Mr. GRIFFIN. On page 50:

but shall not include communications by a corporation to its stockholders and their families or to a labor organization to its members and their families on any subject.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I think that is clear. It is not a criminal violation, and it is not civil violation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And you do not have to report it.

Mr. PACKWOOD. It is unfortunately not a reportable expenditure. I almost wish I could stop it. I wish corporations could not give or unions could not give in this fashion, but at least, if it is going to be done, let us report it. Let us tell the public where the money came from and where the money went, and let it be reported.

I think the chairman was in agreement, because initially the chairman said it was in the law; but I think we are coming to the conclusion that it is not in the law; it is exempt from the criminal statutes, and I ask the chairman if he is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the Senator has it tied in with the nonpartisan registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns, in any event, and the way I would do it is to accept that.

Mr. PACKWOOD. If those two were not tied together, would the chairman accept it?

Mr. CANNON. I am not sure that I would, so we had just as well leave them there.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I wish to amend my own amendment by striking out the latter part of It, which relates to nonpartisan registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns, which reads as follows:

On page 37, line 10, after "families" insert the following; except that expenditures for any such nonpartisan registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns must be reported to the Commission under section 306(e)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. Packwood's amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 37, line 6, after "subject" insert the following; except that expenditures for any such communications which expressively advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate must be reported to the Commission in accordance with section 306(e)."

Mr. PACKWOOD. Now we are talking only about corporate expenditures and union expenditures from corporate funds and union funds to elect or defeat a candidate, and anybody who required to be reported under the law, and literally millions of dollars can be spent to support or defeat a candidate and the public will never be aware of it. Now we are talking about disclosure, just disclosure, and I do not know how the chairman or other Members of this body can oppose the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I think the problem there is, what is a communication with its members? Certainly we have a provision in the law which makes it a criminal offense for a corporation to contribute to campaigns. I would think a communication advocating the election or defeat of a candidate who could come within that provision.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Where do you draw that from, either the present criminal law or this bill, when it says a communication on any subject is not an expenditure?

Mr. CANNON. I just simply suggest that we have a vote on the Senator's amendment. I am not prepared to accept it.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Well, before we——

Mr. CANNON. I think that the law is such that a corporation cannot legally make contributions to a candidate. We have gone through that exercise.
Mr. PACKWOOD. No, wait—do we—wait a minute. Can they give a name to their shareholders under present law?

Mr. CANNON. If a corporation makes a communication to its shareholders expressly advocating the election or defeat of a particular individual, I would say that would be a contribution that is in violation of present law.

Mr. PACKWOOD. And the same if a union uses union funds to make a contribution?

Mr. CANNON. If they use union funds. If we are talking about separate designated funds, that is a different proposition.

Mr. PACKWOOD. I am not talking about COPE funds. But I want to make sure that if the amendment fails, it is the position of the chairman that it is illegal under present law for a corporation to use corporate funds to mail or communicate to a shareholder or its executive or administrative personnel, and it is also illegal under the present law for a union to communicate or mail to its members, in any event, anything advocating the election or defeat of a particular candidate. That is illegal?

Mr. CANNON. That is my understanding. That is the position that I would take, yes.

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I ask for the yea and nay on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yea and nay were ordered.

Mr. PACKWOOD. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senate in present.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PACKWOOD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote occur on this amendment today, at the hour of 11:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, restoring the right to object, what is the program for tomorrow morning? I might want to make some concluding remarks on this amendment, and I do not want to get shut off.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Could we perhaps have 10 minutes to a side?

Mr. PACKWOOD. If we could have 10 minutes to a side before the vote, that would be satisfactory.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. All right, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the hour of 11:25 a.m., tomorrow, there be a time limitation of 20 minutes on the amendment, to be equally divided between the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) and the manager of the bill (Mr. Cannon), and that the vote occur on the amendment at 11:45 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOLDWATER ON THURSDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater) be recognized for not exceeding 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD, AND DESIGNATING A PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the orders which have already been entered for the recognition of Mr. Clark and Mr. Goldwater tomorrow, the Senator from Montana (Mr. Mansfield) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I believe that would take us right up to the hour of 11:25 a.m.

I ask unanimous consent that the period for the transaction of routine morning business not extend beyond the hour of 11:25 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, is there anything further for tonight?

ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF INTEREST PAID ON CERTAIN FUNDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2619.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2620.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was agreed to.

ADJUSTMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF INTEREST PAID ON CERTAIN FUNDS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2619) with an amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 10, of the House engrossed amendment, beginning with "marketable," strike out all through line 13 and insert the following: "long-term marketable obligations of the United States shall be credited on the books of the department as a perpetual trust fund; and the sum of two thousand dollars, being equiva-