

RECORD

ADVISORY OPINIONS

AO 1986-19: Primary Contribution Limit for Unopposed Candidates in States with No Primaries

Unopposed candidates in Florida and South Carolina do not run in primary elections. They may nevertheless accept primary election contributions. A separate limit applies, respectively, to the primary and general elections.

Florida and South Carolina state laws eliminate primaries for unopposed candidates in those states. Under the Act and FEC Regulations, however, candidates have a separate contribution limit for the primary regardless of whether they are unopposed and even if they are not involved in a primary election. 11 CFR 110.1(j)(2). For purposes of the primary limit, the date on which the primary was originally scheduled is considered the primary election date. 11 CFR 110.1(j)(3). Furthermore, in a recent advisory opinion, the Commission determined that an unopposed primary candidate had to file a pre-primary report. (For a summary of this opinion, AO 1986-21, see page 6 of the August 1986 *Record*.)

Since the advisory opinion request did not cite specific Florida or South Carolina laws which prohibit a federal candidate from accepting contributions for a primary election that is not held, the Commission did not address the issue of whether the Act preempted such laws. The Commission noted, however, that Commission Regulations specifically provide that the Act supersedes state laws with respect to limits on contributions to federal candidates and political committees. See 2 U.S.C. §453; 11 CFR 108.7(b)(3) and 112.1(b). (Date issued: July 11, 1986; Length: 3 pages)

AO 1986-22: Rebates Offered by T.V. Station to Candidates

WREX-TV, an incorporated television station, may offer rebates (i.e., cruise tickets or their cash equivalent) to political committees who increase their advertising spending by a fixed amount over the previous year. Under the Act and FEC Regulations, goods and services provided by corporations to political committees and candidates are viewed as prohibited contributions only if they are

continued on p. 4

REPORTS

OCTOBER REPORTING SCHEDULE

The chart and paragraphs on pages 2 and 3 explain the reporting schedule for the various types of filers.

continued on p. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 ADVISORY OPINIONS

REPORTS

1 October Reports Due

4 FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

COURT CASES

- 5 Antosh v. FEC (Sixth Suit)
- 5 Orloski v. FEC (Second Suit)
- 6 FEC v. Dramesi for Congress
- 7 FEC v. Walsh for Congress
- 7 FEC v. Jimmy Carter Committee for a Greater America
- 7 New Litigation

STATISTICS

8 Party Activity Declines

PUBLICATIONS

9 Order Information

10 INDEX

COMPLIANCE

11 Nonfilers

OCTOBER REPORTING SCHEDULE**Quarterly Report**

Due by October 15, the report should cover all activity from July 1 (or from the closing date of the last report filed in 1986) through September 30.

Pre-Primary Report

The report is due 12 days before the primary election and must be complete as of the 20th day before the election. If sent by registered or certified mail, the report must be postmarked no later than the 15th day before the election.

Last-Minute Contributions

Any contribution of \$1,000 or more received by a candidate's committee between two and 20 days before an election must be reported in writing by the recipient committee within 48 hours after it is received. 11 CFR 104.5(f).

Last-Minute Independent Expenditures

Any independent expenditures aggregating \$1,000 or more and made between one and 20 days before an election must be reported within 24 hours after the expenditure is made. 11 CFR 104.4(b) and (c).

Monthly Report

The monthly report must be filed by October 20. It should cover all activity from September 1 (or from the closing date of the last report filed in 1986) through September 30.

Pre-General Election Report

Due by October 23, the report should cover all activity from October 1 (or from the closing date of the last report filed in 1986) through October 15.

Change in Filing Frequency

PACs and party committees which plan to change their reporting schedule (e.g., from quarterly to monthly) must notify the Commission of their intention. The committee may notify the Commission by submitting a letter with the next report due under its current reporting schedule. A committee may not change its filing frequency more than once a year. 11 CFR 104.5(c). The FEC requests that Presidential committees also inform the Commission in writing if they decide to change their reporting schedule.

WHERE REPORTS ARE FILED

Committees must file all reports and statements simultaneously with the appropriate federal and state officials. 11 CFR 108.5.

Filing with the Federal Government

- o The principal campaign committees of House candidates and committees supporting or opposing only House candidates file with the Clerk of the House, Office of Records and Registration, 1036 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. 11 CFR 104.4(c)(3) and 105.1.
- o The principal campaign committees of Senate candidates and committees supporting or opposing only Senate candidates file with the Secretary of the Senate, Senate Public Records, Hart Senate Office Building, Room 232, Washington, D.C. 20510. 11 CFR 104.4(c)(2) and 105.2.
- o All other committees, including the principal campaign committees of Presidential candidates, file with the Federal Election Commission, 999 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. 11 CFR 105.3 and 105.4.

Filing with State Governments

- o The principal campaign committees of Congressional candidates must file a copy of every report and statement with the Secretary of State or the appropriate elections official of the state in which the candidate seeks federal office. 11 CFR 108.3.
- o PACs and party committees making contributions or expenditures in connection with House and Senate races file in the state in which the candidate seeks election. The law requires a copy only of that portion of the report applicable to the candidate(s) being supported. Committees supporting Presidential candidates must file in the state(s) in which the Presidential committee and donor committee have their respective headquarters. See the June 1986 Record for the names and addresses of state offices.

HOW TO OBTAIN MORE INFORMATION

Questions and requests for forms should be addressed to the Information Services Division, 202/376-3120 or, toll free, 800/424-9530.

The Record is published by the Federal Election Commission, 999 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. Commissioners are: Joan D. Aikens, Chairman; John Warren McGarry, Vice Chairman; Lee Ann Elliott; Danny Lee McDonald; Thomas E. Harris; Thomas J. Josefiak; Jo-Anne L. Coe, Secretary of the Senate, Ex Officio; Benjamin J. Guthrie, Clerk of the House of Representatives, Ex Officio. For more information, call 202/376-3120 or toll-free 800/424-9530.

Type of Filer	Report			
	Quarterly October 15	Pre-Primary ^{1/}	Monthly October 20	Pre-General Election ^{2/} October 23
Congressional Candidates Active in 1986 Primaries Only	X	X		
Congressional Candidates Active in the 1986 Primaries and General Elections	X	X		X
Presidential Candidate Committees: Monthly Filers ^{3/}			X	
Presidential Candidate Committees: Quarterly Filers	X			
PAC/Party Committees: Monthly Filers ^{4/}			X	X
PAC/Party Committees: Quarterly Filers	X	X ^{5/}		X ^{6/}
Connected Organizations: Communications ^{7/}	X			X

^{1/}Required of candidates active in September or October primaries. See pages 2 through 3 of the January 1986 Record for primary filing deadlines.

^{2/}The pre-general election report must be postmarked no later than October 20, 1986 (i.e., three days before the filing date). 11 CFR 104.5(c)(1)(i) and (e).

^{3/}All Presidential committees are required to file on either a monthly or a quarterly basis during 1986. 11 CFR 104.5(b)(2).

^{4/}All corporate and labor PACs, nonconnected committees and party committees are required to file on either a monthly or a quarterly basis in 1986.

^{5/}Required only if the committee makes contributions or expenditures (including independent expenditures by a PAC) in connection with a primary which have not been previously disclosed.

^{6/}Required only if the committee makes contributions or expenditures in connection with the general election which have not been previously disclosed. Reportable activity includes independent expenditures by PACs and coordinated expenditures by party committees.

^{7/}Report required if aggregate costs for partisan, internal communications for all 1986 primaries have exceeded \$2,000.

OPINIONS

continued from p. 1

offered at less than the usual and normal charge. 11 CFR 100.7(a)(1)(iii)(A). Because WREX-TV will offer the rebates on the same terms and conditions to both political and nonpolitical advertisers, it is providing the services at the usual and normal charges. Thus, the rebates would not be considered prohibited corporate contributions.

Under the Act and FEC rules, WREX-TV will not be subject to any specific reporting requirements.

The Commission expressed no opinion on the application of the Communications Act and FCC rules to the proposed rebate plan because those issues are beyond its jurisdiction. (Date issued: July 24, 1986; Length: 2 pages)

AO 1986-28: Use of Candidate's Residence for Campaign Headquarters

Bob Ryan, a Nevada House candidate, may headquarter his campaign in his home, which he jointly owns with his wife; use of the house would not be subject to contribution limits or reporting requirements. Mr. Ryan and his wife are using their residence to provide volunteer services to his campaign, with Mrs. Ryan acting as both treasurer and bookkeeper for Mr. Ryan's principal campaign committee, the Committee to Elect Bob Ryan (the campaign).

Under Commission Regulations, the value of using the candidate's residence as a campaign headquarters is considered neither: 1) an in-kind contribution from Mr. Ryan and his wife to his campaign nor 2) a campaign expenditure for which the campaign must reimburse the Ryans. Accordingly, the value of using their residence for campaign activities is not reportable or subject to the Act's contribution limits.

Commission Regulations provide that a candidate may make unlimited campaign expenditures from personal funds, which include any shared or exclusive ownership in personal assets such as real estate holdings. 11 CFR 110.10. See AOs 1977-12 and 1984-60. Moreover, both Mr. Ryan and his wife are using their residence for volunteering their services to the campaign, and Commission Regulations specifically provide that the value of this use would not result in either a campaign contribution to or an expenditure on behalf of his campaign. 11 CFR 100.7(b)(4) and 100.8(b)(5). Commissioner Thomas E. Harris filed a dissent. (Date issued: August 8, 1986; Length: 4 pages, including dissent)

ADVISORY OPINION REQUESTS

The following chart lists recent requests for advisory opinions (AORs). The full text of each AOR is available to the public in the Commission's Office of Public Records.

AOR	Subject
1986-28	Candidate's campaign headquartered in residence jointly owned with spouse. (Date made public: July 28, 1986; Length: 1 page)
1986-29	Slate mailing sponsored by House candidate's campaign. (Date made public: August 7, 1986 ; Length: 2 pages, plus 11-page supplement)
1986-30	Congressmen's reporting requirements for use of houseboat. (Date made public: August 11, 1986; Length: 4 pages)

FEDERAL REGISTER

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

Copies of notices are available in the Public Records Office.

Notice	Title
1986-3	Filing Dates for Hawaii Special Election (51 <u>Fed. Reg.</u> 27457, July 31, 1986)
1986-4	11 CFR Part 110: Contribution and Expenditure Limits and Prohibitions; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (51 <u>Fed. Reg.</u> 27183, July 30, 1986)
1986-5	11 CFR Part 9001 et al.: Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Candidates and 11 CFR 100.7(b)(11) and 100.8(b)(12): Bank Loans; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (51 <u>Fed. Reg.</u> 28154, August 5, 1986)
1986-6	Dates of North Carolina Special Elections (51 <u>Fed. Reg.</u> 27599, August 1, 1986)

COURT CASES

ANTOSH v. FEC (Sixth Suit)

On July 15, 1986, the U.S. District Court for District of Columbia issued an order which granted the FEC's motion for summary judgment in Antosh v. FEC and which dismissed with prejudice plaintiff Edward Antosh's complaint. (Civil Action No. CA86-179) The court held that, under Article III of the Constitution, Mr. Antosh lacked standing to seek judicial review of the FEC's dismissal of his administrative complaint.

Background

Mr. Antosh filed suit against the FEC on grounds that, in two complaints, the agency's failure to order refunds of respondents' excessive contributions was contrary to law. The administrative complaints concerned excessive contributions made respectively by two labor organizations to Senators Edward Kennedy (MUR 1637) and Paul Sarbanes (MUR 1696) in 1984. The contributing committees were the Engineers Political Education Committee (EPEC), the Sheet Metal Workers International Association Political Action League (SMWIA) and the American Federation of Government Employees' Political Action Committee (AFGE). Having found that the respondents violated the law, the Commission required the labor organizations to pay civil penalties for their violations. Refunds by the candidates, however, were not required.

District Court Ruling

In ruling that Mr. Antosh lacked standing to seek judicial review of the FEC's determination, the court referred to recent decisions in two "virtually identical" suits filed by Mr. Antosh.* In those rulings, the court held that Mr. Antosh had failed to meet the eligibility requirement for standing under Article III of the Constitution. Under this requirement, an aggrieved party must "show that he personally has suffered some actual or threatened injury as a result of the putatively illegal conduct of the respondent...." Noting that the excessive contribution alleged in Mr. Antosh's suit had been made to Senatorial candidates in Massachusetts and Maryland, the court

*The district court's decision in one of these suits (CA No. 85-2036) was summarized on page 8 of the June 1986 Record. The court's decision in the other Antosh suit was issued on May 21, 1986. In this suit (CA No. 85-1410), Mr. Antosh claimed that the FEC had arbitrarily dismissed an administrative complaint he had filed concerning excessive contributions EPEC had made to the reelection campaign of Congressman Fernand J. St. Germain of Rhode Island.

concluded that "plaintiff thus fails to satisfy the constitutional requisite of 'injury-in-fact.'"

Nor was the court persuaded by plaintiff's claim that he had suffered "injury-in-fact" in making contributions to nonconnected political committees which had, in turn, made expenditures in connection with the Sarbanes and Kennedy reelection campaigns "because he is not eligible to vote in either Massachusetts or Maryland."

ORLOSKI v. FEC (Second Suit)

On July 11, 1986, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit affirmed a district court decision that the Commission's dismissal of an administrative complaint filed by Mr. Richard Orloski in June 1983 was not arbitrary or capricious. The district court ruling had been handed down in December 1984 in Orloski v. FEC (Civil Action No. 85-5012).

Background

On June 11, 1983, Mr. Orloski filed a complaint with the Commission concerning a picnic sponsored by a senior citizens group to allegedly influence the election of Mr. Orloski's general election opponent, Congressman Donald L. Ritter. Mr. Orloski claimed that the picnic was a political event and thus: 1) corporate funding of the picnic constituted prohibited contributions to Mr. Ritter's reelection campaign and 2) the senior citizens group's sponsorship of the event caused it to become a political committee subject to the Act.

The Commission had dismissed a similar complaint from Mr. Orloski a year earlier. While challenging the FEC's dismissal of his first complaint in the district court, Mr. Orloski made factual allegations that were not contained in the original complaint. Accordingly, in May 1983, the district court issued an order and stipulation which dismissed the case but which allowed Mr. Orloski to file a second complaint with the FEC. The FEC considered Mr. Orloski's second complaint and, on October 4, 1983, once again found no reason to believe that the respondents named in the complaint had violated the election law. As a result of the FEC's action, Mr. Orloski decided to file a second suit against the Commission. In its December 6, 1984, ruling on Mr. Orloski's second suit, the district court found that the FEC's dismissal of Mr. Orloski's administrative complaint was not contrary to law. (For a summary of this ruling, see page 5 of the February 1985 Record.)

On January 9, 1985, Mr. Orloski appealed the district court's second ruling on his case.

Appeals Court's Ruling

To determine whether the picnic sponsored by the senior citizens group was a political event, subject to the prohibitions and requirements of

continued

the election law, the FEC had applied a two-part test, i.e., 1) whether any communications at the picnic expressly advocated Representative Ritter's election and 2) whether contributions to Representative Ritter's campaign were either solicited or accepted at the picnic.

In deferring to the FEC's use of this two-part test for determining whether such events are political, the court held that:

- o "The FEC's interpretation represents a 'reasonable accommodation' between the Act's objectives and administrative exigencies."
- o "The FEC has consistently adhered to this interpretation without Congressional objection, for at least eight years."
- o "The recent history of the Act leads us to believe that Congress would approve of the line drawn by the FEC" between political and non-political events. In particular, in amending the election law in 1979, Congress did not modify the FEC's interpretation of a campaign-related event.

The court then affirmed as reasonable the FEC's use of this two-part test to dismiss Mr. Orloski's administrative complaint. While noting that one part of the test (i.e., whether contributions were solicited) was not relevant to the picnic, the court held that the respondents had "strictly adhered to the FEC's narrow guidelines" for the second part of the test. None of the communications made in conjunction with the picnic expressly advocated Congressman Ritter's reelection. Accordingly, since the FEC properly determined that the picnic was not a political event, the court also confirmed the FEC's determination that corporate funding of the picnic did not constitute prohibited contributions to Mr. Ritter's reelection effort.

Finally, the court rejected Mr. Orloski's procedural challenges to the FEC's dismissal of his complaint. Specifically, Mr. Orloski claimed that, after giving the respondents an opportunity to reply to the allegation in his administrative complaint, the FEC should either have: 1) allowed Mr. Orloski to answer the respondents' replies or 2) made its "reason to believe" determination solely on the basis of Mr. Orloski's allegations.

The court rejected these procedural challenges on grounds that:

- o "Section 437g(a)(1) requires the FEC to notify parties charged in a complaint and to give them the opportunity to respond";
- o Since none of the facts of the case were in dispute, the FEC's conclusion would not have been affected by Mr. Orloski's replies; and
- o Finally, before filing his first district court suit, Mr. Orloski did, in fact, have an opportunity to respond to the respondent's replies concerning the allegations in his administrative complaint.

FEC v. DRAMESI FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE

On July 25, 1986, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey granted the FEC's motion for summary judgment in FEC v. John A. Dramesi for Congress Committee (Civil Action No. 85-4039). The court found that the John A. Dramesi for Congress Committee's treasurer, Russell E. Paul, had violated 2 U.S.C. §441a(f) by knowingly accepting an excessive contribution from the New Jersey Republican State Committee (the State Committee) and ordered Mr. Paul to pay a \$5,000 civil penalty to the U.S. Treasurer.* The court had previously entered a \$5,000 default judgment against the Dramesi Committee. (For a summary of the court's May 2, 1986, ruling, see page 7 of the July 1986 Record.)

Background

In 1982, when the State Committee made a \$5,000 contribution to the Dramesi Committee, the State Committee had not achieved multicandidate status because it had not yet satisfied the six-month registration requirement.** Consequently, the State Committee was only eligible to make a contribution of up to \$1,000 per election to each Republican Congressional candidate in New Jersey, and the Dramesi Committee could legally receive only \$1,000 for the primary election.

On learning of the State Committee's excessive contributions to Republican House candidates, the FEC initiated enforcement proceedings against the State Committee. When the Commission failed to reach a settlement with the Dramesi Committee, the agency filed a suit against the Committee and its treasurer. (For a summary of the FEC's complaint, see page 4 of the November 1985 Record.)

The Court's Ruling

The court observed that, under the FEC Regulations, the treasurer of a political committee

*On June 16, 1986, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that another New Jersey House incumbent campaigning for reelection in 1982 had not knowingly accepted an excessive contribution from the New Jersey Republican State Committee. For a summary of that suit (FEC v. Re-Elect Hollenbeck to Congress Committee; Civil Action No. 85-2239), see page 7 of the August 1986 Record.

**Multicandidate committees may contribute up to \$5,000 per election to a candidate's authorized committee(s) or any other political committee. To achieve multicandidate status, a committee must have more than 50 contributors, have been registered for at least six months and, with the exception of state party committee, have made contributions to five or more candidates for federal office. 2 U.S.C. section 441a(a)(4); 11 CFR 100.5(e)(3).

has to "make his or her best efforts to determine the legality of a contribution."*

The court therefore found that "Mr. Paul...had a duty to determine [the contribution's] propriety. Instead, he merely assumed from the source of the contribution that it was legal."

Nor did the court find any merit to defendant's contention that he had no way of knowing the contribution was illegal. The court noted that the defendant could have consulted the Index of Multicandidate Political Committees, an "exhaustive list of such eligible [multicandidate] committees, compiled by the FEC, [which] was readily available to the defendants."

The court therefore found that "Mr. Paul, as Treasurer of the Dramesi Committee, acted intentionally in accepting the \$5,000 contribution in question, and was fully aware of the facts rendering his conduct unlawful." Accordingly, the court ruled that defendant "knowingly accepted" the State Committee's excessive contribution, in violation of 2 U.S.C. §441a(f).

FEC v. WALSH FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE

On July 28, 1986, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, issued an order requiring the Kirk Walsh for Congress Committee (the Committee) and its treasurer, Kirk Walsh, to:

- o Provide the FEC with accurate reports of campaign finance activity from 1980 through 1986; and
- o Pay a \$5,000 civil penalty to the U.S. Treasurer, in addition to the \$5,000 civil penalty the court had assessed against the Committee in September 1985.

The court also ordered the Committee and Mr. Walsh to comply with its order by August 28, 1986. (Civil Action No. CA84-CV-9802) In the event that the Committee failed to meet the deadline, the court would assess a fine of \$200 per day, beginning August 15, 1986, and continuing until the defendants had fully complied with the court's order.

The court issued its order after the Committee and Mr. Walsh had failed to comply with the Court's September 20, 1985, contempt order. This contempt order resulted from the defendants' failure to comply with a default judgment entered against them in April 1985. For a summary of these district court actions, see page 4 of the November 1985 Record.

FEC v. JIMMY CARTER COMMITTEE FOR A GREATER AMERICA

On July 21, 1986, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia approved a consent order between the Commission and the Jimmy Carter Committee for a Greater America, a nonconnected political committee, and the Committee's treasurer, Chip Carter. The consent order provides that defendants violated section 434(a)(4)(A)(i) and (iii) of the election law during the 1983-84 election cycle by failing to meet the filing deadline for 1984 post-general election and year-end reports.

Within 30 days of filing the consent order, the defendants agreed to pay a \$250 civil penalty to the U.S. Treasurer.

The consent order concluded a suit filed by the FEC on April 7, 1986 (CA No. C86-774A).

NEW LITIGATION

FEC v. Campaign Resource Technologies, Inc.

During the 1983-84 Presidential election cycle, the Bergland for President Committee (the Committee), the principal campaign committee for David Bergland's 1984 Presidential campaign, contracted with Campaign Resources Technologies, Inc. (CRT) for certain campaign services. This company, in turn, subcontracted certain campaign services to John Kaur, who was doing business as Digitgraph Computer Systems Company (Digitgraph).

The FEC asks the court to:

- o Declare that Campaign Resource Technologies, Inc. and John Kaur violated section 432(b) of the election law by failing to forward to the Committee's treasurer, within 10 days of their receipt, approximately \$6,000 in campaign contribution checks received by CRT and Digitgraph on behalf of the Committee; and
- o Assess a civil penalty against each defendant amounting to the greater of \$5,000 or 100 percent of the total amount involved in the alleged violation.

U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, Tucson Division, CA No. Civ. 86-448 TUC ACM, August 7, 1986.

Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee v. FEC (Second Suit)

The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC), a national committee of the Democratic Party, seeks the court's review of an FEC determination dismissing an administrative complaint which DCCC had filed with the agency on December 20, 1985.

The DCCC claims that, in the administrative complaint, it had asked the FEC to find that the National Republican Congressional Committee

continued

*See 11 CFR 103.3(b)(1).

(NRCC), a national committee of the Republican Party, had violated section 441a(d) of the election law by failing to allocate to its coordinated spending limits certain media expenditures critical of Democratic Congressman Fernand St. Germain. (Congressman St. Germain was campaigning for reelection in Rhode Island.)

The DCCC asks the court to:

- o Declare that the FEC's dismissal of its administrative complaint was contrary to law; and
- o Direct the FEC to initiate expedited enforcement proceedings concerning the allegations contained in DCCC's administrative complaint.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Civil Action No. 86-2075, July 29, 1986.

Ameritrust Company National Association v. FEC

The Ameritrust Company National Association, a national banking association, and three other national banking associations (BancOhio National Bank; Bank One, Columbus, NA; and Huntington National Bank) state that they made campaign loans to the John Glenn Presidential Committee, Inc. (the Committee), Senator Glenn's principal campaign committee for his publicly funded Presidential primary campaign in 1984.

In a suit seeking expedited review of their case, plaintiffs ask the court to declare that the loans were made to the Committee on a basis which assured repayment.

U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Eastern Division, CA No. C2-86-0841, July 14, 1986.

STATISTICS

1983-84 PARTY ACTIVITY DECLINES

The financial activity of both major parties during the current election cycle has declined, thus reversing the steady increase in each major party's activity over the past four election cycles. The activity of all Democratic and Republican party committees registered with the FEC is depicted in the summary chart below.

As an exception to the parties' overall decline in activity during the current cycle, the activity of several national party committees increased slightly.

More detailed information on the financial activity of the major parties may be obtained from the FEC's August 10, 1986, press release, which is available from the FEC's Public Records Office. Call: 376-3140 locally or, toll free, 800/424-9530.

MAJOR PARTY ACTIVITY

January 1985 through June 30, 1986

(figures in millions of dollars)

Election Cycle	1977-78	1979-80	1981-82	1983-84	1985-86
Democratic Party Committees					
Raised	\$ 14.40	\$ 17.50	\$ 24.80	\$ 59.70	\$ 35.10
Spent	\$ 13.60	\$ 15.50	\$ 24.20	\$ 52.10	\$ 33.60
Cash-on-Hand	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.70	\$ 3.00	\$ 9.80	\$ 3.20
Republican Party Committees					
Raised	\$ 49.60	\$ 96.10	\$ 161.20	\$ 207.70	\$ 186.10
Spent	\$ 42.40	\$ 83.10	\$ 134.10	\$ 171.10	\$ 158.50
Cash-on-Hand	\$ 8.50	\$ 17.90	\$ 33.80	\$ 44.60	\$ 32.30

PUBLICATIONS

FREE PUBLICATIONS

The FEC offers the following free publications. To order, return the completed form below.

Federal Election Campaign Laws

Complete compilation of Federal election campaign laws prepared by FEC.

FEC Regulations (11 CFR)

FEC regulations; subject indexes prepared by FEC.

FEC Record

Monthly newsletter covering reporting, advisory opinions, litigation, legislation, statistics, regulations, compliance, Federal Register notices, FEC procedures and staff, and publications.

Campaign Guides

Clear explanation and illustration of election law requirements. Separate Guide for:
 Congressional Candidates and Committees
 Party Committees
 Corporations and Labor Organizations
 Nonconnected Political Committees

House and Senate Bookkeeping Manual

Recommended method of bookkeeping and reporting for Federal candidates and their committees.

FEC and Federal Election Law

Brief overview of major provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act and the Commission's role in administering it.

Using FEC Campaign Finance Information

Brochure explaining how to gather information on financial activity of political committees and candidates by using reports and FEC's computer indexes.

Brochures

- Advisory Opinions
- Candidate Registration
- Committee Treasurers
- Contributions
- Corporate/Labor Communications
- Corporate/Labor Facilities
- Independent Expenditures
- Local Party Activity
- Political Ads and Solicitations
- Public Funding of President Elections
- State Elections & Federal Campaign Law

Trade Associations
 Using FEC Campaign Finance Information
 Volunteer Activity

Annual Report

Report to President and Congress, summarizing agency's activities, advisory opinions and litigation; and presenting Commission's legislative recommendations.

Order Form

NAME	
STREET	
CITY, STATE, ZIP CODE	
CONNECTED ORGANIZATION	PHONE (Optional)

Please indicate quantity in box to left of each item.

General

Federal Election Campaign Laws	Bookkeeping Manual for Candidates
FEC Regulations	Annual Report
FEC Record (subscription)	

Campaign Guides

Congressional Candidates	Corporations and Labor Organizations
Party Committees	Nonconnected Committees

Brochures

Advisory Opinions	Local Party Activity
Candidate Registration	Political Ads and Solicitations
Committee Treasurers	Public Funding of Presidential Elections
Contributions	State Elections & Federal Campaign Law
Corporate/Labor Communications	Trade Associations
Corporate/Labor Facilities	Using FEC Campaign Finance Information
FEC and Federal Election Law	Volunteer Activity
Independent Expenditures	

Mail to: Federal Election Commission
 Information Services
 Washington, D.C. 20463

Phone: Toll Free: 800/424-9530
 Local: 202/376-3120

INDEX

This cumulative index lists advisory opinions, court cases and 800 Line articles published in the Record during 1986. The first number in the citation refers to the "number" (month) of the Record issue; the second number, following the colon, indicates the page number in that issue.

OPINIONS

- 1985-26: Corporation's distribution of employee's political message, 1:7
- 1985-31: Affiliation between insurance corporation and agencies for purposes of PAC solicitations, 2:2
- 1985-32: Proceeds of reception beyond Act's purview, 1:7
- 1985-33: Personal loans to candidate for campaign, 1:7
- 1985-34: Nonconnected PAC's use of proceeds from life insurance policy, 1:8
- 1985-35: Solicitability of corporate board members, 1:8
- 1985-37: Affiliation of local Chambers of Commerce with State Chamber, 3:1
- 1985-38: Committee established by candidate for state and local candidates, 3:2
- 1985-39: Bank ad in political journal, 2:2
- 1985-40: PAC's spending for Presidential testing-the-waters activities, 3:2
- 1985-41: Contribution for general election accepted prior to primary, 2:3
- 1985-42: Campaign funds used to pay candidate's rent, 3:4
- 1986-1: Vendor's offer to provide free tickets to committee, 4:6
- 1986-2: Candidate's sales campaign, 4:6
- 1986-4: Corporation's program to encourage employee contributions, 4:6
- 1986-5: Excess campaign funds transferred from candidate's federal to local committee, 4:7
- 1986-6: PAC established by Vice President for party building and candidate support, 5:2
- 1986-7: Cooperative PAC's shareholder solicitation program, 4:7
- 1986-8: 1982 contributions refunded by candidate's 1986 campaign, 6:7
- 1986-9: Candidate's use of 1986 campaign funds to reimburse himself for legal expenses, 6:7
- 1986-11: Act's preemption of state election law, 6:8
- 1986-12: Excess campaign funds transferred to 1986 exploratory committee, 7:1
- 1986-13: PAC expenses financed by trade association's corporate members, 7:2
- 1986-14: Proceeds from sale of committee's campaign van, 6:8

- 1986-17: State party convention not election; general election contributions spent before primary, 8:4
- 1986-18: Maintaining campaign funds in cash management account, 8:5
- 1986-20: Promotion item prepared and distributed by campaign, 8:5
- 1986-21: Pre-election reporting requirement for unopposed primary candidate, 8:6

800 LINE

- Candidate use of loans and personal assets, 7:5
- Designating a principal campaign committee, 3:5
- Local and state officeholders become federal candidates, 7:4
- Transfer of candidate funds from state to federal committee, 1:8
- Using information in FEC reports, 7:3

COURT CASES

- Antosh v. FEC, 3:8; 6:8
- Common Cause v. FEC (Third Suit), 8:6; Fourth Suit, 8:8
- John Glenn Presidential Committee, Inc. v. FEC, 8:8
- Alwin E. Hopfmann v. FEC, 2:3; 6:9
- FEC v. American International Demographic Services, Inc., 4:8
- FEC v. Beatty for Congress Committee, 6:9
- FEC v. Californians for Democratic Representation, 3:8
- FEC v. Jimmy Carter Committee for a Greater America, 6:10
- FEC v. Citizens Party, 3:8
- FEC v. Dramesi for Congress, 7:7
- FEC v. Eldredge, 1:10
- FEC v. Haley, 1:11
- FEC v. Maggin for Congress, 5:4
- FEC v. MAPAC, 1:10
- FEC v. National Congressional Club, 7:7
- FEC v. NCPAC (Third Suit), 7:6
- FEC v. New Republican Victory Fund, 6:10; 8:7
- FEC v. NRA, 1:11
- FEC v. Pryor for Congress Committee, 5:5
- FEC v. Re-Elect Hollenbeck to Congress Committee, 8:7
- FEC v. Rhoads for Congress Committee, 6:9
- FEC v. Rodriguez, 7:8
- FEC v. Sailors' Union of the Pacific Fund, 2:3
- FEC v. Wolfson, 4:8
- FEC v. 1984 Victory Fund (Second Suit), 6:10
- Gramm v. FEC; FEC v. Gramm, 1:10

COMPLIANCE

FEC PUBLISHES NONFILERS

During August, the Commission published the names of two House campaigns (one in Georgia and one in Tennessee) that had failed to file pre-primary reports. The Georgia campaign had failed to file a report for the Congressional primary held on August 12. The Tennessee campaign had failed to file its pre-primary report for the August 7 Congressional primary.

The election law requires the agency to publish the names of nonfiling candidates. Compliance actions against nonfilers are decided on a case-by-case basis. The law gives the Commission broad authority to initiate enforcement actions resulting from infractions of the law, including civil court enforcement and imposition of civil penalties.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Registered political committees are automatically sent the Record. Any change of address by a registered committee must, by law, be made in writing as an amendment to FEC Form 1 (Statement of Organization) and filed with the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, or the FEC, as appropriate.

Record subscribers (who are not political committees), when calling or mailing in a change of address, are asked to provide the following information:

1. Name of person to whom the Record is sent.
2. Old address.
3. New address.
4. Subscription number. The subscription number is located in the upper left hand corner of the mailing label. It consists of three letters and five numbers. Without this number, there is no guarantee that your subscription can be located on the computer.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20463

Official Business

Bulk Rate Mail
Postage and Fees Paid
Federal Election Commission
Permit Number G-31

