

Record

September 1995

Federal Election Commission

Volume 21, Number 9

Table of Contents

Reports

- 1 Pilot Program for Electronic Filing Gets Underway

Publications

- 1 Disclosure Directory Now on Disk

Conferences

- 2 Three FEC Conferences to be Held in Washington, DC

Court Cases

- 2 FEC v. Christian Action Network

Advisory Opinions

Statistics

- 7 Midyear PAC Count

Public Funding

- 7 Convention Funding

Compliance

- 7 MURs Released to the Public

Federal Register Notices

Information

- 9 Flashfax Menu

10 Index

Reports

Pilot Program for Electronic Filing Gets Underway

The FEC has invited a number of PACs, party committees and candidate committees to participate in a voluntary pilot program to develop an electronic filing system for campaign disclosure reports. Ultimately, committees would be able to submit reports via computer, either on disk or through telecommunications technology. Pilot program invitees were chosen for their proximity to the FEC and to include committees of various types and sizes with disclosure reports of varying complexity.

In letters dispatched recently to the Democratic National Committee, the Republican National Committee, 24 members of the House and Senate, and selected political action committees, FEC Chairman Danny L. McDonald wrote:

"[We] want to acquire some practical, real world knowledge of what [electronic filing] means to the political committees who file with us." He asked the committees, "to advise us about their current report preparation and records maintenance practices."

(continued on page 2)

Publications

Combined Federal and State Disclosure Directory 1995 Now Available on Disk

The *Combined Federal and State Disclosure Directory 1995* is now available on a 3.5" disk for only \$5. This electronic version of the *Directory* may be purchased for use with both IBM and MacIntosh versions of the following word processing software: Microsoft Word, WordPerfect and Microsoft Write.

The *Directory* lists the federal and state offices responsible for disclosing and dispensing information on a variety of election-related topics, as well as lobbying and corporate registration information. See page 6 of the May 1995 *Record* for a more detailed description of the *Directory*.

Disk packages of the *Directory* may be purchased at the FEC's Public Records Office. They may also be ordered by telephone (800/424-9530, extension 3, or 202/219-4140) or by mail (Public Disclosure Division, Federal Election Commission, 999 E Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20463).

A one-page, descriptive and instructive flyer on the *Directory* disk package is available through the automated Flashfax system. To receive it via fax, just dial 202/501-3413 and request document 308. ♦

Reports

(continued from page 1)

This information will assist the FEC in developing a uniform electronic filing system that is user friendly, efficient for the FEC and cost effective for the taxpayers. At a later stage, committees may be asked to provide a representative sampling of data.

Invitees who volunteer for the program will have the opportunity to help shape the structure of the automated process that will ultimately emerge from the project. Participant committees, it should be noted, will still need to submit paper copies of their FEC disclosure reports to the appropriate federal and state offices. ♦

Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, NW
Washington, DC 20463

800/424-9530
202/219-3420
202/501-3413 (Flashfax Service)
202/219-3336 (TDD)

Danny L. McDonald, Chairman
Lee Ann Elliott, Vice Chairman
Joan D. Aikens, Commissioner
John Warren McGarry,
Commissioner
Trevor Potter, Commissioner
Scott E. Thomas, Commissioner

John C. Surina, Staff Director
Lawrence M. Noble, General
Counsel

Published by the Information
Division

Louise D. Wides, Director
Dario Bard, Editor

Conferences

Three FEC Conferences to Be Held in Washington, DC

FEC conferences offer basic and advanced workshops on the federal campaign finance law and provide attendees the opportunity to discuss problems and questions with FEC Commissioners and staff, and representatives of the Internal Revenue Service. For 1995 and early 1996, the FEC has scheduled the following three conferences at the Madison Hotel, Washington, DC:

- December 11-12, 1995: Corporate/Labor Conference; \$165* registration fee;
- January 11-12, 1996: Membership/Trade Association Conference; \$165* registration fee; and
- March 8, 1996: Candidate Conference; \$110* registration fee.

Additionally, the FEC is hosting regional conferences in San Antonio, TX (September 7-8 at the La Mansion del Rio Hotel), San Francisco, CA (October 23-24, at the Miyako Hotel) and Chicago, IL (April 11-12, 1996, at the Drake Hotel). See page 1 of the July 1995 *Record* for details on the San Antonio and San Francisco conferences.

To receive registration materials and further information on these and other conferences, call 800/424-9530 or 202/219-3420. ♦

*This fee includes the cost of all conference materials and two or three meals (two continental breakfasts and a lunch), depending on the length of the conference. Hotel accommodations are extra.

Court Cases

FEC v. Christian Action Network

On June 28, 1995, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Lynchburg Division, dismissed this case. The FEC had brought suit against the Christian Action Network (CAN) for making independent expenditures¹ with corporate funds, for failing to include the proper disclaimer on its political communications and for failing to file the required reports with the FEC. (See page 7 of the December 1994 *Record* for a summary of the FEC's original suit.)

The communications in question—a television advertisement and two newspaper advertisements that ran during the weeks leading up to the 1992 Presidential general election—assailed then-candidate Bill Clinton's alleged position on homosexual issues.

The court ruled that the communications were outside the Commission's jurisdiction because they did not expressly advocate the election or defeat of Bill Clinton.

The court reached this conclusion on the basis of the Supreme Court's decision in *Buckley v. Valeo*. In that case, the Supreme Court said that, for a communication to be considered an independent expenditure and thus subject to FEC regulation, it must expressly advocate the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate.² In reviewing relevant

¹ An independent expenditure is an expenditure made without any coordination with a candidate's campaign for a communication which expressly advocates the election or defeat of a clearly identified candidate for federal office.

² The Court listed the following examples of words that constitute express advocacy: "vote for," "elect," "support," "cast your ballot for," "Smith for Congress," "vote against," "defeat," "reject."

court decisions since *Buckley*, the court found that “political expression, including discussion of public issues and debate on the qualifications of candidates, enjoys extensive First Amendment protection” and that the courts “have adopted a strict interpretation of the ‘express advocacy’ standard Thus, courts generally have been disinclined to entertain arguments made by the Commission that focus on anything other than the actual language used in an advertisement.”

In arguing the case, the FEC had relied on the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *FEC v. Furgatch*. In that case, the appeals court considered the timing and context of a communication in determining the existence of express advocacy. The FEC stressed that those elements were important here as well: the CAN television advertisement aired in the weeks leading up to the 1992 general election, and, although the ad did not contain words that expressly advocated Bill Clinton’s defeat, its imagery, music, editing, coloring, etc. clearly conveyed that message.

The FEC also pointed out that the newspaper ads—both of which referred to the “voting public” and one of which referred to a Presidential debate scheduled for that day—conveyed a message identical to that of the television ad. Viewed collectively, the FEC contended, the three ads sent voters the message to vote against Bill Clinton and his policies in the November elections.

The court recognized the validity of the *Furgatch* approach but noted that the *Furgatch* court stated that the context and timing of a communication were peripheral to the actual words themselves, and therefore should be given only limited weight when determining the presence of express advocacy.

Focusing on the words contained in the ads, the court said there was no call for electoral action. The newspaper ads’ reference to the

“voting public” “does not *per se* translate into an exhortation to vote.”

Finding that express advocacy was absent from the ads, the court concluded that “the Defendants’ advertisements represent the very type of issue advocacy the *Buckley* Court sought to exempt from government regulation.”

U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Lynchburg Division, No. 94-0082-L, June 28, 1995. ♦

Advisory Opinions

AO 1995-16 Attaining National Party Status

The National Committee of the U.S. Taxpayers Party (the party) qualifies as a national party committee for purposes of the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) because it has placed candidates for various federal offices on the ballots of numerous states and engaged in party-building as well as other types of activities characteristic of a national party.

A national party committee may make coordinated party expenditures under 2 U.S.C. §441a(d) and enjoys higher contribution limits than other committees.

Political Party Status

Before a party committee can qualify as a national party committee the party must qualify as a political party under the Act. To qualify as a political party, a party must successfully place a candidate for federal office on a ballot, and the ballot must identify that candidate as the party’s nominee. 2 U.S.C. §431(16). In past elections, the U.S.

Taxpayers Party’s Presidential and Congressional candidates appeared on the ballot as the nominees of parties identified or affiliated with the U.S. Taxpayers Party. This accomplishment earned the U.S. Taxpayers Party political party status under the Act.

National Party Status

To attain national party status, a committee of a political party must do more than focus its activities solely on Presidential elections (AOs 1980-131 and 1978-58); it must do more than engage in activities that are limited to only one state (AO 1976-95); and it must have more than a limited number of federal candidates on state ballots (AOs 1992-44 and 1988-45).

In the past, the Commission has considered a number of factors when determining whether a political party qualified as a national party committee. Specifically, the Commission has looked at whether the party:

- Succeeded in placing candidates for various federal offices on the ballot in numerous states;
- Conducted party-building activities such as voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives on an ongoing basis (rather than with respect to a particular election);
- Publicized issues of importance to the political party and its adherents throughout the nation;
- Held a national convention;
- Established a national headquarters office ; and
- Established state party affiliates.

The U.S. Taxpayers Party previously sought national status in AO 1992-44. In that opinion, the Commission concluded that the Party had not yet reached a level of activity to qualify as a national committee. (See page 5 of the June 1993 *Record* for a summary of the opinion.) Since then, the Party has shown significant development.

(continued on page 4)

Advisory Opinions

(continued from page 3)

Specifically, the Party held a voter registration drive in Delaware; previously, its party-building efforts were only in the planning stages. On the financial side, during the 1993-94 election cycle the Party took in \$60,000 in receipts and made \$58,000 in disbursements; before, it was unclear whether the Party had even opened a bank account. Also of note, the Party held several national committee meetings throughout the nation following its 1992 convention.

Finally, the Party made progress in obtaining ballot access for non-Presidential candidates, an important element in achieving national committee status. At the time of the previous request, the Party had gained ballot access for 9 candidates for the U.S. Congress in 3 states. By contrast, in the 1994 election cycle, the Party had 14 Congressional candidates on the ballot in 6 states located in several sections of the country.

These factors, taken collectively, qualify the U.S. Taxpayers Party as a national party committee.

This opinion did not address any public funding issues, since they were not raised in the advisory opinion request.

Date Issued: July 14, 1995;
Length: 6 pages. ♦

AO 1995-17 Trade Association Federation and Affiliated State and Local Units; Donation of Raffle Prizes and One-Third Rule

The National Association of Realtors (NAR) qualifies as a federation of trade associations composed of state and local trade associations. RPAC is NAR's separate segregated fund. Because the national, state and local associations are affiliated with one another,

individuals qualifying as "members" of state and local units may be solicited for donations of funds to underwrite costs of soliciting contributions to RPAC and for donations of merchandise for RPAC fundraisers sponsored by the state and local associations. The value of the items donated for a particular event may be aggregated for purposes of determining whether any reimbursement is required under the "one-third rule."

Associations as Trade/ Membership Associations with Qualified Members

NAR and the state and local associations qualify as trade associations under 11 CFR 114.8(a) because they are composed of persons in a related line of commerce (real estate) who are organized to promote and improve business in that line of commerce. The associations appear neither to be organized to operate at a profit nor to have their net earnings inure to the benefit of any member.

The associations each have members (REALTORS and those REALTOR-ASSOCIATES with voting rights) who qualify as "members" under FEC rules because (1) they have an obligation to pay regular dues and (2) are entitled to vote directly for at least one member of the highest governing body or, alternatively, to vote for those who select at least one member of the governing body. This is one way an association's members may qualify as "members" for purposes of federal election law, 11 CFR 114.1(e)(2)(ii).

NAR as Federation of Trade Associations

Under 11 CFR 114.8(g)(1), a federation of trade associations is an organization that is composed of trade associations united in a similar or allied line of commerce.

In the case at hand, the state and local associations participate as units of a national body bound by

the rules of that body. Although each state and local trade association has its own governance mechanism, NAR prescribes model bylaws that result in consistent rules, organizational structures and goals across national, state and local levels. State associations are collectively represented on NAR's board of directors and local associations are collectively represented on the boards of the state associations. NAR collects dues from the state and local associations, and the state associations collect dues from the local associations. As another unifying factor a local association must belong to a state association in order to be a NAR member. Taken together, these factors create an interactive relationship among the three tiers of organizations. As the national entity, NAR qualifies as a federation of trade associations.

Affiliation

NAR and the state and local associations are affiliated with each other because:

- The state and local entities have the power to participate in NAR's governance through the selection of NAR Directors and the membership of their officials on the NAR Board;
- NAR controls key aspects of the governance of the state and local entities;
- NAR has virtually complete membership overlap with the state and local entities; and
- The state and local entities have ongoing dues-paying obligations to NAR.

These factors constitute affiliation for purposes of federal election law. 11 CFR 100.5(g)(4)(i) and (g)(4)(ii), and 11 CFR 110.3(a)(3)(i) and (a)(3)(ii). See also Advisory Opinion (AO) 1994-19.¹

¹ Under other FEC rules, NAR and the state and local associations are per se affiliated. See 11 CFR 100.5(g)(3)(iv) and 110.3(a)(2)(iv).

Fundraising Prizes and the One-Third Rule

A corporation, including an incorporated trade association, may pay for the solicitation expenses of its separate segregated fund. 11 CFR 114.5(b). In the past, the Commission has permitted corporate members of trade associations to help defray the solicitation expenses of the association's separate segregated fund by donating funds and merchandise, such as raffle prizes. Similarly, the individual members of NAR's state and local affiliates may be solicited for, and donate funds and merchandise to, their associations for the purpose of defraying RPAC's solicitation expenses.

NAR's state and local affiliates plan to conduct fundraising social events for RPAC that involve the sale raffle or auction of items solicited and donated by individual members. The proceeds collected from these fundraisers should be compared with the value of the prizes contributed under the one-third rule at 11 CFR 114.5(b)(2). That rule states that a reasonable practice to follow is for the PAC to reimburse the membership association for the costs which exceed one-third of the money contributed.

Any reimbursement owed by the PAC per the one-third rule should be given to the association sponsoring the event, which may then decide how to distribute the reimbursed amount among the donors. See AO 1982-36.

Since the reimbursement under the one-third rule is to be made to the membership organization, the amount of the reimbursement may be ascertained by aggregating the value of the items. This includes the value of all prizes and entertainment provided for the event by the association and the individual donors. In calculating the value of these items, the membership organization may omit solicitation costs

and costs for food, drinks and the use of facilities. See AOs 1980-50 and 1979-72.

Date Issued: July 28, 1995;
Length: 13 pages. ♦

AO 1995-19 Discovering Illegal Contributions in a Committee's Treasury

Mr. Subodh Chandra, treasurer of the Indian-American Leadership Investment Fund (the Fund) must undertake best efforts to confirm the legality of contributions he now suspects were made in the name of another; he deposited these contributions because they appeared lawful at the time of receipt. To confirm a suspect contribution's legality, Mr. Chandra may request written or oral confirmation from each contributor. He must keep a written memorandum on a confirmation made orally. Contributions that remain questionable must be disgorged, as described below.

This advisory opinion does not require the Fund to take any action contrary to any advice it receives from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). However, should the Fund choose not to contact contributors based on DOJ advice, it may not use the questionable contributions for any of its expenses; these monies must be disgorged as described below.

Background

Mr. Chandra first learned of the suspect contributions in a meeting with a *Baltimore Sun* reporter who alleged that certain of the Fund's contributors in Maryland made sizable contributions although they "did not appear to have the financial means" to make them. The reporter's subsequent article contained assertions by some of the individuals that they had been reimbursed for their contributions. All of the contributions from Maryland were transmitted to the Fund by a Baltimore attorney.

Handling Suspect Contributions

The specificity of the reporter's allegations, as manifested in the article and his meeting with Mr. Chandra, raise genuine questions as to the legality of certain contributions. The Fund is therefore obligated to take some form of ameliorative action with respect to these genuinely questionable contributions. The Fund's proposal to seek confirmation from its contributors complies with the requirements at 11 CFR 103.3(b)(1).

In his advisory opinion request, Mr. Chandra asked the Commission to offer further guidance. Accordingly, the Commission suggests that under the circumstances Mr. Chandra consider seeking confirmations for all contributions received from Maryland.

In instances where the Commission has investigated and determined that there is culpability on the part of the recipient committee, the Commission often views the expeditious refund or disgorgement of unlawful contributions as a mitigating factor in determining an appropriate civil penalty.

Contributions made illegally are normally returned to the contributor, but in this case the individual suspected of reimbursing others' contributions denies having done so. Therefore, contributions that are not confirmed to be legal must, within 30 days of this opinion, be disbursed for any lawful purpose unrelated to a federal campaign. Appropriate payees are federal, state and local government entities and qualified charitable organizations described in 26 U.S.C. §170(c). See AO 1991-39. 11 CFR 103.3(b)(2).

Furthermore, the Fund may have credible information indicating, despite any contributor explanation and assertion of legality that might be offered, that a certain contribution was made in the name of another. In this situation, the Fund

(continued on page 6)

Advisory Opinions

(continued from page 5)

should disgorge the amount of the contribution as described above.

Date Issued: July 28, 1995;
Length: 6 pages. ♦

AO 1995-21 Campaign's Use of Funds Awarded in Law Suit

The Larson for U.S. Senate Committee (the committee) may use the \$1,500 it was awarded in a campaign-related law suit to pay attorney's fees in that case. On the next FEC report due, the committee must disclose the court award under the "other receipts" category of the Detailed Summary Page and itemize it on Schedule A.

A North Dakota court awarded the committee the \$1,500 in a law suit the committee had filed against the local Sheriff's office for damages arising from the seizure of the committee's campaign videotapes from local television stations.

Applicability of the Contribution Limits

The Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) defines a contribution as money or anything of value given for the purpose of influencing an election for federal office. 2 U.S.C. §431(8)(A). Certain funds received by a political committee are not considered contributions and thus do not count against the contribution limits. For example, interest earned on a committee's bank account balance is not considered a contribution—nor is a vendor rebate or refund, if made in the ordinary course of business. See Advisory Opinions 1994-10, 1986-1 and 1981-6. Similarly, the \$1,500 legal award is not considered a contribution and may therefore be accepted in full by the committee since the contribution limits are not applicable.

Paying Legal Fees with Court Awarded Monies

FEC regulations state that the Commission will consider on a case-by-case basis whether the use of campaign funds to pay legal expenses violates the personal use ban. 11 CFR 113.1(g)(1)(ii)(A). The personal use ban forbids: "any use of funds in a campaign account of a present or former candidate to fulfill a commitment, obligation or expense of any person that would exist irrespective of the candidate's campaign or duties as a Federal officeholder." 11 CFR 113.1(g).

The law suit in this case arose from circumstances that are clearly attributable to the campaign. The committee may therefore pay the attorney's fees with its campaign funds, including the \$1,500 award money.

The committee should disclose payments for the legal costs as operating expenditures.

The Commission expresses no opinion on the tax ramifications of the proposed transaction; that issue falls outside the FEC's jurisdiction.

Date Issued: July 28, 1995;
Length: 4 pages. ♦

AO 1995-23 Paying Legal Expenses with Campaign Funds

Congressman Christopher Shays may use campaign funds to pay for legal costs arising out of a law suit brought against him by one of his opponents for office in 1994; he is accused of having removed plaintiff's campaign signs. The personal use ban does not bar Congressman Shays from using campaign funds for this purpose.

The regulations banning personal use of campaign funds forbid: "any use of funds in a campaign account of a present or former candidate to fulfill a commitment, obligation or expense of any person that would exist irrespective of the candidate's campaign or duties as a Federal

officeholder." 11 CFR 113.1(g).¹ FEC regulations further state that the Commission will consider on a case-by-case basis whether the use of campaign funds for legal expenses constitutes personal use. 11 CFR 113.1(g)(1)(ii)(A).

In this case, Congressman Shay's legal expenses arise directly from his campaign activity and his position as a candidate. They are therefore clearly attributable to the campaign and may be paid with campaign funds.

In its FEC reports, the committee should disclose these legal costs as operating expenditures.

The Commission expresses no opinion on the tax ramifications of the proposed transaction; that issue falls outside the FEC's jurisdiction.

Date Issued: July 20, 1995;
Length: 4 pages. ♦

Advisory Opinion Requests

Advisory opinion requests (AORs) are available for review and comment in the Public Records Office.

AOR 1995-26

Use of campaign funds to pay dues of club whose facilities are used for campaign fundraisers (Senator Frank Murkowski; July 19, 1995; 1 page)

AOR 1995-27

Solicitation of restricted class of business trust members of trade association (National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts; August 1, 1995; 5 pages plus 4-page attachment) ♦

¹The regulations became effective April 5, 1995. They are not in the 1995 edition of FEC regulations, but the final rules are available as reprints of the Federal Register notice (60 FR 7826, February 9, 1995). Call the FEC to order a copy, or use Flashfax (202/501-3413) to order document #228.

Statistics

1995 Midyear PAC Count

As of July 1, 1995, there were 3,982 PACs registered with the FEC. This represents an increase of 28 PACs since January 1, 1995, and an increase of 49 PACs over last year's midyear total. (The number of PACs does not necessarily correspond with PAC financial activity, since many registered PACs have little or no activity.)

The table below shows the midyear and year-end PAC counts over the past half decade by PAC type. An August 2, 1995, FEC press releases contains similar figures dating back to 1974's year-end PAC count. This press release may be ordered through the Flashfax system; dial 202/501-3413 and request document 626. ♦

Midyear and Year-End PAC Counts, July 1990-July 1995

	Corporate	Labor	Trade/ Member/ Health	Coop- erative	Corp. w/o Capital Stock	Non- connected ¹	Total
Jul. '90	1,782	346	753	58	139	1,115	4,193
Dec. '90	1,795	346	774	59	136	1,062	4,172
Jul. '91	1,745	339	749	57	137	1,096	4,123
Dec. '91	1,738	338	742	57	136	1,083	4,094
Jul. '92	1,731	344	759	56	144	1,091	4,125
Dec. '92	1,735	347	770	56	142	1,145	4,195
Jul. '93	1,715	338	767	55	139	1,011	4,025
Dec. '93	1,789	337	761	56	146	1,121	4,210
Jul. '94	1,666	336	777	53	138	963	3,933
Dec. '94	1,660	333	792	53	136	980	3,954
Jul. '95	1,670	334	804	43	129	1,002	3,982

¹ Nonconnected PACs must use their own funds to pay fundraising and administrative expenses, while the other categories of PACs have corporate or labor "connected organizations" that are permitted to pay those expenses for their PACs. On the other hand, nonconnected PACs may solicit contributions from the general public, while solicitations by corporate and labor PACs are restricted.

Public Funding

Major Parties Receive \$12 Million Public Funding Grant for '96 Conventions

In early July, the Democratic and Republican 1996 convention committees each received \$12,024,000 from the U.S. Treasury. The money is to be used to plan and conduct each party's 1996 Presidential nominating convention.

The Democrats will hold their national convention in Chicago, August 26-29, 1996. The Republicans will hold their national convention in San Diego, August 10-16, 1996.

Federal election law permits eligible national parties to receive public funds to pay the official costs of their Presidential nominating

conventions. The FEC certified that both committees met all the eligibility requirements for public funding.

Committees accepting public funding agree to certain conditions, including abiding by spending limits, filing periodic disclosure reports and undergoing a detailed FEC audit.

Reflecting inflationary trends, the 1996 convention grant is nearly \$1 million more than the 1992 grant of \$11.048 million. The 1996 funding will be further adjusted in March of 1996, when the committees will receive an additional payment based on this year's inflation.

Public funding of Presidential elections is financed by the Presidential Election Campaign Fund, which receives its monies from taxpayers participating in the voluntarily \$3 "check off" on federal income tax forms. ♦

Compliance

MURs Released to the Public

Listed below are summaries of FEC enforcement cases (Matters Under Review or MURs) recently released for public review. This listing is based on the FEC press releases of July 13 and 31, and August 2, but it does not include 30 MURs in which the Commission took no action. Files on closed MURs are available for review in the Public Records Office.

MUR 3191/3226

Respondents: (all in NH): (a) Friends of Bill Zelfiff Committee; (b) Christmas Farm Inn, Inc.; (c) Representative William H. Zelfiff, Jr.; (d) Sydna T. Zelfiff; (e) First NH-White Mountain Bank

Complainant: Joseph F. Keefe, Keefe for Congress 1990 Committee

(continued on page 8)

Compliance

(continued from page 7)

(NH) (3191); FEC initiated (3226)
Subject: Corporate contributions (loans and advances); failure to file 48 hour notices (two candidate loans totalling \$97,000); excessive contributions
Disposition: (a-b) \$30,000 civil penalty; (c) insufficient votes to find probable cause to believe; (d-e) no reason to believe

MUR 3375

Respondents: (a) Paul Simon for President, James C. Rosapepe, treasurer (IL); (b) Jader Fuel Co., Inc. (IL); (c) Groves Printing Co., Inc. (NC); (d) Watchell, Lipton, Rosen, & Katz (NY)
Complainant: FEC initiated (1988 Presidential audit)
Subject: Failure to itemize receipts and disbursements; misstating financial activity; excessive contributions; corporate contributions
Disposition: (a) Reason to believe, but took no further action (all of the above); (b) reason to believe, but took no further action (corporate contributions); (c) no probable cause to believe; (d) reason to believe, but took no further action (excessive contributions)

MUR 3682/3655

Respondents: (all in PA): (a) Fox for Congress Committee, Frank Jenkins, treasurer; (b) Jon D. Fox; (c) Jewish Exponent
Complainant: Kenneth Smukler,

Federal Register

Federal Register notices are available from the FEC's Public Records Office.

1995-11

11 CFR 106, 9002-9004, 9006-9008, 9032-9034, 9036 and 9038-9039: Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Candidates; Final Rule, Announcement of Effective Date (60 FR 42429, August 16, 1995)

Campaign Manager, Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky for Congress (PA)
Subject: Disclaimers
Disposition: (a) \$950 civil penalty; (b-c) no reason to believe

MUR 3787

Respondents: (a) Georgia Republican Party Committee, Marvin H. Smith, treasurer; (b) Arthur L. Williams, Jr. (GA)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Excessive contributions; corporate contributions; unauthorized §441a(d) expenditures on behalf of Presidential nominee; failure to maintain receipt records
Disposition: (a) Reason to believe but took no further action (all of the above); (b) \$5,000 civil penalty (excessive contributions)

MUR 3973/Pre-MUR 284

Respondents: Bob Davis (MI) and the Bob Davis for Congress Committee, Kathleen J. O'Leary, treasurer (MI)
Complainant: Referral by U.S. Department of Justice
Subject: Failure to use designated depository and to maintain records for petty cash disbursements
Disposition: Reason to believe but took no further action

MUR 4005/Pre-MUR 301

Respondents: (all in CT): (a) General Dynamics Corporation; (b) Neil D. Ruenzel and Craig B. Haines, Jr., General Dynamics Corporation Electric Boat Division; (c) Sam Gejdenson Re-election Committee, Patricia Tedisco Lagrenga, treasurer
Complainant: Sua sponte (Pre-MUR 301); Thomas J. Diascro, Jr., Campaign Manager, Munster for Congress '94 (CT) (4005)
Subject: Corporate contributions; contributions by government contractor
Disposition: (a) \$8,500 civil penalty; (b) reason to believe; (c) no reason to believe

MUR 4043

Respondents: (a) Paul Barden (WA); (b) Barden for Congress,

Sylvia Barnes, treasurer (WA); (c) Vickie Schmitz (WA)
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Excessive contributions; exceeding \$25,000 annual limit
Disposition: (a-c) \$25,000 civil penalty; (b) refund \$1,500 in excessive contributions

MUR 4109

Respondents: (a) Thomas M. Barrett (WI); (b) Barrett for Congress, Catherine Shaw, treasurer (WI)
Complainant: Matthew Olson Brumbaugh (WI)
Subject: Disclaimers
Disposition: (a) No reason to believe; (b) reason to believe but took no further action; sent admonishment letters.

MUR 4213

Respondents: Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, William J. Davis, treasurer
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Unauthorized §441a(d) expenditures on behalf of Presidential nominee; impermissible transfer from nonfederal account to federal account; use of nonfederal funds to pay federal expenses and expenditures on behalf of Presidential ticket; failure to itemize contributions from political committees; failure to disclose contribution and disbursement information
Disposition: Reason to believe but took no further action; sent admonishment letter

MUR 4214

Respondents: North Carolina Democratic Victory Fund, Jim Young, treasurer
Complainant: FEC initiated
Subject: Unauthorized §441a(d) expenditures on behalf of Presidential nominee; use of nonfederal funds for federal activity; inaccurate disclosure of joint fundraising receipts
Disposition: Reason to believe but took no further action; sent admonishment letter ♦

Information

Flashfax Menu

To order any of these documents, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, call **202/501-3413** on a touch tone phone. You will be asked for the numbers of the documents you want, your fax number and your telephone number. The documents will be faxed shortly thereafter.

Disclosure

- 301. Guide to Researching Public Records
- 302. Accessibility of Public Records Office
- 303. Federal/State Records Offices
- 304. Using FEC Campaign Finance Information
- 305. State Computer Access to FEC Data
- 306. Direct Access Program (DAP)
- 307. Sale and Use of Campaign Information
- 308. Combined Federal/State Disclosure Directory 1995 on Disk
- 309. Selected Political Party Organizations and Addresses

Limitations

- 315. Contributions
- 316. Coordinated Party Expenditure Limits
- 317. Advances: Contribution Limits and Reporting
- 318. Volunteer Activity
- 319. Independent Expenditures
- 320. Local Party Activity
- 321. Corporate/Labor Facilities
- 322. Corporate/Labor Communications
- 323. Trade Associations
- 324. Foreign Nationals
- 325. The \$25,000 Annual Contribution Limit
- 326. Personal Use of Campaign Funds

Public Funding

- 330. Public Funding of Presidential Elections
- 331. The \$3 Tax Checkoff
- 332. 1993 Changes to Checkoff
- 333. Recipients of Public Funding
- 334. Presidential Fund Tax Checkoff Status
- 335. Presidential Spending Limits

Compliance

- 340. Candidate Registration
- 341. Committee Treasurers
- 342. Political Ads and Solicitations
- 343. 10 Questions from Candidates

- 344. Reports Due in 1995
- 345. Primary Dates and Deadlines for Ballot Access
- 346. Filing A Complaint
- 347. 1995 FEC Regional Conferences

Federal Election Commission

- 401. The FEC and the Federal Campaign Finance Law
- 402. La Ley Federal relativa al Financiamiento de las Campañas
- 403. State and Local Elections and the Federal Campaign Law
- 404. Compliance with Laws Outside the FEC's Jurisdiction
- 405. Biographies of Commissioners and Officers
- 406. Telephone Directory
- 407. Table of Organization
- 408. Index for 1994 *Record* Newsletter
- 409. Free Publications
- 410. Personnel Vacancy Announcements
- 411. Complete Menu of All Material Available

Clearinghouse on Election Administration

- 424. List of Reports Available
- 425. Voting Accessibility for the Elderly and Handicapped Act
- 426. National Voter Registration Act Regulations
- 427. National Voter Registration Act of 1993
- 428. The Electoral College
- 429. Organizational Structure of the American Election System
- 430. Primary Functions of an Electoral System

Money in Politics Statistics

- 625. 1991-92 Political Money
- 626. 1995 Midyear PAC Count
- 627. 1993-94 Congressional
- 628. 1993-94 National Party
- 629. 1993-94 PAC Finances

1996 Presidential Election

- 650. 1996 Preliminary Presidential Primary and Caucus Dates
- 651. Selected Campaign Names and Addresses
- 652. Selected Campaign Finance Figures

Regulations (11 CFR Parts 100-201)

- 100. Part 100, Scope and Definitions
- 101. Part 101, Candidate Status and Designations
- 102. Part 102, Registration, Organization and Recordkeeping by Political Committees

- 103. Part 103, Campaign Depositories
- 104. Part 104, Reports by Political Committees
- 105. Part 105, Document Filing
- 106. Part 106, Allocations of Candidate and Committee Activities
- 107. Part 107, Presidential Nominating Convention, Registration and Reports
- 108. Part 108, Filing Copies of Reports and Statements with State Offices
- 109. Part 109, Independent Expenditures
- 110. Part 110, Contribution and Expenditure Limitations and Prohibitions
- 111. Part 111, Compliance Procedure
- 112. Part 112, Advisory Opinions
- 113. Part 113, Excess Campaign Funds and Funds Donated to Support Federal Officeholder Activities
- 114. Part 114, Corporate and Labor Organization Activity
- 115. Part 115, Federal Contractors
- 116. Part 116, Debts Owed by Candidates and Political Committees
- 200. Part 200, Petitions for Rulemaking
- 201. Part 201, Ex Parte Communications

Recent Actions on Regulations, Including Explanations and Justifications

- 227. Presidential Nominating Conventions
- 228. Personal Use of Campaign Funds
- 229. Express Advocacy; Independent Expenditures; Corporate and Labor Organization Expenditures

Forms

- 361. Form 1, Statement of Organization
- 362. Form 2, Statement of Candidacy
- 363. Form 3 and 3Z, Report for an Authorized Committee
- 364. Form 3X, Report for Other Than an Authorized Committee
- 365. Form 5, Report of Independent Expenditures
- 366. Form 6, 48-Hour Notice of Contributions/Loans Received
- 367. Form 7, Report of Communication Costs
- 368. Form 8, Debt Settlement Plan
- 369. Form 1M, Notification of Multi-candidate Status

Schedules

- 370. Schedule A, Itemized Receipts
- 371. Schedule B, Itemized Disbursements

(continued on page 10)

Information*(continued from page 9)*

- 372. Schedules C and C-1, Loans
- 373. Schedule D, Debts and Obligations
- 374. Schedule E, Itemized Independent Expenditures
- 375. Schedule F, Itemized Coordinated Expenditures
- 376. Schedules H1-H4, Allocation
- 377. Schedule I, Aggregate Page Nonfederal Accounts

U.S. Code (Title 2)

- | | |
|------------------|------------------|
| 431. Section 431 | 441. Section 441 |
| 432. Section 432 | 442. Section 442 |
| 433. Section 433 | 451. Section 451 |
| 434. Section 434 | 452. Section 452 |
| 437. Section 437 | 453. Section 453 |
| 438. Section 438 | 454. Section 454 |
| 439. Section 439 | 455. Section 455 |

Advisory Opinions

- 701. AO 1995-1
- 702. AO 1995-2
- 703. AO 1995-3
- 704. AO 1995-4
- 705. AO 1995-5
- 706. AO 1995-6
- 707. AO 1995-7
- 708. AO 1995-8
- 709. AO 1995-9
- 710. AO 1995-10
- 711. AO 1995-11
- 712. AO 1995-12
- 713. AO 1995-13
- 714. AO 1995-14
- 715. AO 1995-15
- 716. AO 1995-16
- 717. AO 1995-17
- 718. AO 1995-18
- 719. AO 1995-19
- 720. AO 1995-20
- 721. AO 1995-21
- 722. AO 1995-22
- 723. AO 1995-23
- 801. AO 1994-1
- 802. AO 1994-2
- 803. AO 1994-3
- 804. AO 1994-4
- 805. AO 1994-5
- 806. AO 1994-6
- 807. AO 1994-7
- 808. AO 1994-8
- 809. AO 1994-9
- 810. AO 1994-10

- 811. AO 1994-11
- 812. AO 1994-12
- 813. AO 1994-13
- 814. AO 1994-14
- 815. AO 1994-15
- 816. AO 1994-16
- 817. AO 1994-17
- 818. AO 1994-18
- 819. AO 1994-19
- 820. AO 1994-20
- 821. AO 1994-21
- 822. AO 1994-22
- 823. AO 1994-23
- 824. AO 1994-24
- 825. AO 1994-25
- 826. AO 1994-26
- 827. AO 1994-27
- 828. AO 1994-28
- 829. AO 1994-29
- 830. AO 1994-30
- 831. AO 1994-31
- 832. AO 1994-32
- 833. AO 1994-33
- 834. AO 1994-34
- 835. AO 1994-35
- 836. AO 1994-36
- 837. AO 1994-37
- 838. AO 1994-38
- 839. AO 1994-39
- 840. AO 1994-40
- 900. Brochure
- 901. AO 1993-1
- 902. AO 1993-2
- 903. AO 1993-3
- 904. AO 1993-4
- 905. AO 1993-5
- 906. AO 1993-6
- 907. AO 1993-7
- 908. AO 1993-8
- 909. AO 1993-9
- 910. AO 1993-10
- 911. AO 1993-11
- 912. AO 1993-12
- 913. AO 1993-13
- 914. AO 1993-14
- 915. AO 1993-15
- 916. AO 1993-16
- 917. AO 1993-17
- 918. AO 1993-18
- 919. AO 1993-19
- 920. AO 1993-20
- 921. AO 1993-21
- 922. AO 1993-22
- 923. AO 1993-23
- 924. AO 1993-24
- 925. AO 1993-25

Index

The first number in each citation refers to the "number" (month) of the 1995 *Record* issue in which the article appeared. The second number, following the colon, indicates the page number in that issue. For example, "1:4" means that the article is in the January issue on page 4.

Advisory Opinions

- 1994-33: Calling card solicitations, 3:5
- 1994-34: Consolidating membership association PACs following a merger, 3:7
- 1994-35: Terminating reporting obligations, 5:5
- 1994-36: Solicitation of stockholders in an employee-owned company, 5:5
- 1994-37: Allocating between federal and nonfederal campaigns, 3:7
- 1994-39: Solicitation of affiliates by a membership organization, 3:8
- 1994-40: Storing records on microfilm, 3:9
- 1995-1: Respondents and the confidentiality provisions, 4:8
- 1995-2: Membership organization's solicitation of representatives of member firms, 6:3
- 1995-3: Running simultaneous Senate and Presidential campaigns, 4:8

- 1995-5: Use of contributor lists derived from FEC reports, 4:9
- 1995-7: Candidate's personal liability for bank loan, 6:4
- 1995-8: Committee's rental of candidate-owned office and equipment, 6:5
- 1995-9: Operating a political committee in cyberspace, 6:6
- 1995-10: Ownership of committee records, 6:7
- 1995-11: Status of limited liability company, 6:8
- 1995-12: Affiliation and cross solicitation between trade association federation and state associations, 8:9
- 1995-13: Definition of member applied to membership association, 8:10
- 1995-14: Operating a PAC booth at a joint convention, 8:11
- 1995-15: Foreign-owned subsidiary: earmarked contributions and payroll deductions, 8:12
- 1995-16: Attaining national party status, 9:3
- 1995-17: Trade association federation and affiliated state and local units; donation of raffle prizes and one-third rule, 9:4
- 1995-18: Campaign funds given for portrait of former House Committee Chairman, 8:13
- 1995-19: Discovering illegal contributions in a committee's treasury, 9:5
- 1995-20: Campaign funds used for travel expenses of candidate's family, 8:14
- 1995-21: Campaign's use of funds awarded in law suit, 9:6
- 1995-23: Paying legal expenses with campaign funds, 9:6

Compliance

- \$25,000 Annual contribution limit, 4:1
- MUR 2884: Reporting misstatements and excessive contributions, 7:2
- MUR 3452: Excessive contributions, 6:8
- MUR 3540: Corporate facilitation, 1:2
- MUR 3650: Loan guarantors, 1:2
- MUR 4016/4076: Reporting earmarked contributions, 7:2

Court Cases

- FEC v. _____
- Branstool, 6:12
 - Christian Action Network, 9:2
 - Citizens for Wofford, 6:13
 - Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee, 8:1
 - Free the Eagle, 8:5
 - Fulani (94-4461), 6:12
 - Michigan Republican State Committee, 5:4
 - Montoya, 2:7; 5:4
 - NRA Political Victory Fund, 2:1
 - National Republican Senatorial Committee (93-1612), 4:4; 8:4
 - Populist Party, 7:9

- RUFFPAC, 8:5
- Williams, 4:5
- _____ v. FEC
- Albanese, 7:8
- Condon, 3:5
- Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (93-1321), 1:10
- Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (95-0349), 4:8
- Dukakis, 7:9
- Freedom Republicans, 2:6
- Froelich, 8:5
- Fulani (94-1593), 4:6
- Lytle, 1:10; 2:7
- National Republican Senatorial Committee (94-5148), 5:4
- Robertson, 4:6
- Simon, 7:9
- Whitmore, 2:7
- Wilson, 2:7; 5:1
- McIntyre v. Ohio, 6:12
- Rove v. Thornburgh, 4:7

Reports

- Pilot program for electronic filing gets underway, 9:1
- Schedule for 1995, 1:4

800 Line Articles

- Administrative termination, 2:9
- Corporate facilitation, 6:1