



THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

RECORD

1325 K Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463

Volume 5, Number 11

November 1979

PUBLIC FINANCING

DISCLOSURE OF MATCHING FUND SUBMISSIONS

On September 6, 1979, the Commission approved procedures for the public disclosure of information from the submissions of Presidential candidates seeking public matching funds for the 1980 election.

For each contribution submitted to the FEC for matching fund payments, candidates must provide a check or other written instrument as well as other information required by the Commission. Additionally, each submission must contain an alphabetical listing of the contributors and the amounts of their contributions.

Under the recently adopted procedures, the alphabetical listing will be forwarded to the Commission's Public Records Office for microfilming on the last day of the week the submission is received. The alphabetical listing will then be available to the press and the public, although copies of the checks and other written documentation will not be. In certain instances, the listing will be released before the Commission has certified that the candidate is eligible for matching funds. The alphabetical listing, therefore, will merely identify the contributions for which a candidate has requested matching payments. The list will not, in itself, represent a Commission determination that the candidate is entitled to receive matching funds in the amount of the listed contributions.

REPORTS

SPECIAL ELECTIONS IN ILLINOIS

Illinois has scheduled special elections for December 11 (primary) and January 22 (general) to fill the seat vacated by Federal Judge Abner Mikva, former Representative from the 10th Congressional District. Candidates in these special elections must file ten-day pre-election and 30-day post-election reports. The Federal Election Commission will send notices to all candidates on the ballot with more information on reporting dates. Political committees that plan to contribute to, or make expenditures on behalf of, one of these candidates are also required to file pre- and post-election reports. For more information on required reports or other matters, they should contact the Public Communications Office at the Commission by calling toll free (800)424-9530 or 523-4068 in Washington, D.C. Multicandidate committees that file on a monthly basis need not file pre- and post-election reports. Instead, their monthly reports are due on the 20th of each month.

FORMS FOR ETHICS ACT REPORTS

Presidential and Vice Presidential candidates may obtain forms for reports required under the Ethics Act (see *Record*, August 1979, p.2) from the FEC. Contact the Information Office at the Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20463; or call 202/523-4068, toll-free 800/424-9530.

Senate and House candidates, however, must obtain forms and information from the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, as appropriate. Ethics Act forms for House and Senate candidates are *not* available from the FEC or the Office of Government Ethics.

Questions about completing and filing the reports required under the Ethics Act should be addressed to the Office of Government Ethics, 1900 E Street, N.W., Room 5315, Washington, D.C., 20415; telephone, 202/632-7642.

REGULATIONS

FEC HEARING ON PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Following the Senate's disapproval, on September 17, 1979, of the FEC's proposed regulations on candidate debates (See *Record*, August 1979, p. 1), the FEC held hearings on October 23 and 24, 1979, on the funding of candidate debates. The Commission requested public comments on several specific issues, including the types of organizations that could sponsor candidate debates, the role of the news media in the sponsorship and coverage of debates, and payments by corporations and labor unions in connection with the staging and covering of debates. (See *Federal Register* Notice 1979-17, 44FR 59162.)

OPINIONS

ADVISORY OPINION REQUESTS

The following chart lists recent Advisory Opinion Requests (AOR's), with a brief description of the subject matter, the date the requests were made public and the number of pages of each request. The full text of each AOR is available to the public in the Commission's Office of Public Records.

AOR	Subject	Date Made Public	No. of Pages
1979-54	Appearance of Senatorial candidate in commercial television advertisement.	9/21/79	1
1979-55	Status of committee promoting uncommitted slate of delegates to national nominating convention.	9/27/79	1
1979-56	PAC of company that is joint venture of two other corporations.	9/28/79	2
1979-57	Use of money orders to transfer mass collections to PAC.	10/2/79	1

ADVISORY OPINIONS: SUMMARIES

Designated as AO's, Advisory Opinions discuss the application of the Act or Commission Regulations to specific factual situations. Any qualified person requesting an Advisory Opinion who in good faith acts in accordance with the opinion will not be subject to any sanctions under the Act. The opinion may also be relied upon by any other person involved in a specific transaction which is indistinguishable in all material aspects from the activity discussed in the Advisory Opinion. Those seeking guidance for their own activity should consult the full text of an Advisory Opinion and not rely only on the summary given here.

AO 1979-31: Solicitations by Independent Committee

If Western Enterprise Political Action Committee (WEPAC) is, as it claims, an independent, unaffiliated committee with no connected organization, it may solicit and receive contributions from individuals employed by Hilton Hotels Corporation as well as other individuals and political committees. The contributions it receives must be within the limits of 2 U.S.C. §441a and otherwise lawful under the Act.

The Commission noted that the Act prohibits WEPAC from receiving any contribution of goods, services or anything of value from Hilton Hotels Corporation or any other corporation (2 U.S.C. § 441b), and emphasized that WEPAC's receipt of a mailing list of Hilton Hotels Corporation employees would constitute a prohibited contribution, unless WEPAC paid the "usual and normal charge" for such a list. 11 CFR 114.9(d) and 100.4(a)(1)(iii)(B). (Date Issued: September 13, 1979; Length: 3 pages)

AO 1979-41: Registration and Reporting Requirements of Political Committee

The National Committee for a Democratic Alternative (the Committee) is a political committee within the meaning of the Act and is subject to the Act's registration and reporting requirements.

The Committee's purpose is to stimulate debate on certain policies of the present administration and to seek an alternative Democratic candidate for President in 1980. To accomplish this end, the Committee intends to sponsor advertisements to express its views and solicit funds. A prototype of the Committee's intended ads specifically identifies President Carter as the Democrat to whom an alternative is needed, and includes a solicitation for contributions.

The RECORD is published by the Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463. Commissioners are: Robert O. Tiernan, Chairman; Max L. Friedersdorf, Vice Chairman; Joan D. Aikens; Thomas E. Harris; John W. McGarry; Frank P. Reiche; J.S. Kimmitt, Secretary of the Senate, Ex Officio; Edmund L. Henshaw, Jr., Clerk of the House of Representatives, Ex Officio. For more information, call 202/523-4068 or toll-free 800/424-9530.

The Committee's proposed activity, as represented by the ad, is to influence the 1980 election. And, since the Committee has stated that it anticipates receiving contributions or making expenditures totaling more than \$1,000 during 1979, it is a political committee within the meaning of the Act. 2 U.S.C. §431(d) and 11 CFR 100.14. The Committee is therefore subject to all provisions of the Act. (Date Issued: September 13, 1979; Length: 4 pages)

AO 1979-42: Administration of Separate Segregated Fund

The South Carolina National Bank may pay premiums on liability insurance to protect the officers and members of its separate segregated fund, the South Carolina National Bank Political Action Committee (BANK-PAC), against liability arising from the direction of BANK-PAC.

Although national banks are prohibited from making contributions or expenditures in connection with any election, the Act specifically allows banks (and other corporations and labor organizations) to establish, administer and solicit funds to a separate segregated fund, from which political contributions and expenditures may be made. Since the Bank's payment of the insurance premiums is a cost of establishing and administering a separate segregated fund rather than a contribution, it is permissible under the Act. (Date Issued: September 14, 1979; Length: 2 pages)

AO 1979-44: Solicitation of Executive and Administrative Personnel

The Public Affairs Fund, the separate segregated fund of United Carolina Bank, Whiteville (Whiteville), a wholly owned subsidiary of United Carolina Bankshares Corporation (UCB), may solicit the executive and administrative personnel of UCB and each of UCB's three wholly owned subsidiaries after an internal corporate reorganization is completed. Commission Regulations permit a corporation and/or its separate segregated fund to solicit the executive and administrative personnel (and their families) of the corporation's subsidiaries, branches, divisions and affiliates. 11 CFR 114.5(g)(1). Since UCB and its three subsidiaries will become affiliated entities, the Public Affairs Fund may lawfully solicit the executive and administrative personnel of the parent corporation and its wholly owned subsidiaries.

The Commission noted that all separate segregated funds established by a corporation, its affiliates, subsidiaries, branches and divisions are treated as a single political committee and are subject to a single contribution limitation. 2 U.S.C. §441a(a)(5). Commissioner Thomas Harris filed a dissenting opinion. (Date Issued: September 21, 1979; Length, including dissenting opinion: 3 pages)

AO 1979-46: Permissible Contributions After Conversion To Multicandidate Committee

Americans Organized for Responsibility (Americans) expects to qualify for status as a multicandidate committee after the primary election. Once it qualifies for multicandidate status, Americans may contribute up to \$4,000 to retire the primary election debt of a candidate to whom it contributed \$1,000 during the primary campaign provided that the candidate has a primary debt of at least \$4,000 when he/she receives the post-primary contribution. The contribution must be designated in writing as a contribution to the primary.

Monies donated by Americans for noncampaign officeholder activity are not "contributions" under the Act and, therefore, do not count against the Act's contribution limitations. Such monies are, however, "funds donated" (11 CFR 113.1), which must be reported by Americans on Schedule B, with an explanation that the amount is to support officeholder expenses rather than campaign activities. 11 CFR 104.2(b). Furthermore, the recipient must report those funds as a receipt on his/her biannual report on office accounts. 11 CFR 113.4.

The Commission expressed no opinion on the possible application of the Standing Rules of the Senate or possible tax ramifications. Those issues are not within the Commission's jurisdiction. (Date Issued: September 21, 1979; Length: 3 pages)

ADVISORY OPINION REQUESTS WITHDRAWN

Since October 1979, the following Advisory Opinion Request was withdrawn by its requester:

— AOR 1979-47

COMPLIANCE

SUMMARY OF MUR's

Selected compliance cases, which have been closed and put on the public record, are summarized in the *Record*. Compliance matters stem from possible violations of the Act, which come to the Commission's attention either through formal complaints originating outside the Commission or by the FEC's own monitoring procedures. The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the Act) gives the FEC the exclusive primary jurisdiction for the civil enforcement of the Act. Potential violations are assigned case numbers by the Office of General Counsel and become "Matters Under Review" (MUR's). All MUR investigations are kept confidential by the Commission, as required by the Act.

MUR's may be closed at any one of several points during the enforcement process, including when the Commission:

continued

- Determines that no violation of the Act has occurred;
- Determines that there is no reason to believe, no reasonable cause to believe or no probable cause to believe a violation of the Act has occurred;
- Enters into a conciliation agreement with the respondent;
- Finds probable cause to believe a violation has occurred and decides to sue; or
- Decides at any point during the enforcement process to take no further action.

After the MUR is closed and released by the Office of General Counsel, the Commission makes the MUR file available to the public. This file contains the complaint, the findings of the General Counsel's Office and the Commission's actions with regard to the case, including the full text of any conciliation agreement. The Commission's actions are not necessarily based on, or in agreement with, the General Counsel's analysis.

Selection of MUR's for summary is made only from MUR's closed after January 1, 1979. The *Record* article does not summarize every stage in the compliance process. Rather, the summary provides only enough background to make clear the Commission's final determination. The full text of these MUR's and those which were closed between 1976 and 1978 are available for review and purchase in the Commission's Public Records Office.

**MUR 700: Independent Expenditures;
Candidate Authorization**

On March 6, 1979, the Commission entered into a conciliation agreement with an individual who had violated 2 U.S.C. §434(e) by failing to report independent expenditures, and 2 U.S.C. §441d(2) by failing to include the required authorization notice on a publication.

Complaint: On September 6, 1978, a former Federal candidate filed a complaint alleging that an individual's distribution of a brochure advocating his defeat in a Congressional primary election was in violation of the Act. Although the brochure did not endorse his opponent, it expressly advocated the former candidate's defeat because of his position on the legalization of marijuana and the decriminalization of homosexuality. Styled as an open letter to concerned citizens, the brochure contained no notice of authorization or nonauthorization from any candidate. Furthermore, the distributor of the brochure had not reported his expenditures to the FEC.

General Counsel Reports: The subsequent Commission investigation revealed that 25,000 copies of the brochure had been distributed to 22,000 people immediately before the primary election. The costs for printing and distribution amounted to \$2,493.58; of that amount, \$100 had been received in contributions. Since the respondent had failed to report independent expenditures in excess of \$100, the General Counsel recommended that the Commission find reasonable cause to believe he had violated §434(e). The General Counsel also recommended that the Commission make the same

finding with the respect to the violation of §441d, since the brochure failed to include a notice stating that it was not authorized by any candidate.

Commission Determination: On December 12, 1978, the Commission found reasonable cause to believe that the respondent had violated 2 U.S.C. §§434(e) and 441d(2) and entered into a conciliation agreement with the respondent on March 6, 1979. Civil penalties were levied.

**MUR 916: Use of Federal Facilities
by Incumbent**

On February 16, 1979, the Commission found no reason to believe a campaign committee had violated 11 CFR 104.3(a)(1) and 11 CFR 104.1(a) by failing to report contributions or expenditures.

Complaint: On January 31, 1979, an individual filed a complaint alleging that a Federal officeholder had violated the Act during his recent campaign for reelection to the House of Representatives. The notarized complaint, based on a newspaper report that the incumbent used his Congressional district office as sole headquarters for his 1978 reelection campaign, alleged that:

1. The House Administration Committee provided the funds to maintain the district office. Therefore, since a political campaign is not an official duty, use of the office for this purpose constitutes a violation of 31 U.S.C. §628;
2. The unreimbursed use of the office facility is a contribution as defined by 11 CFR 100.4(a) and 11 CFR 100.4(a)(1)(iii)(A), and should be reported as an in-kind contribution under 11 CFR 104.3(a)(1); or
3. The campaign committee must reimburse the House of Representatives for the value of the office facility; such payment would be an expenditure as defined by 11 CFR 100.7(a)(1) and should be reported according to 11 CFR 104.1(a).

The complaint alleged that a review of the reports on file with the Commission did not disclose any contributions or expenditures for use of the office space.

General Counsel Reports: The General Counsel pointed out that, although the Commission had no jurisdiction over the first allegation, the second and third allegations were similar to those before the Commission in another MUR (MUR 672). In that matter, the Commission confirmed that "the United States is not a 'person' within the meaning of the Act's contribution reporting provisions," and the use of government facilities or services could not be deemed a campaign expenditure. Furthermore, the General Counsel pointed out that in two earlier Advisory Opinions (1976-34 and 1976-44), the Commission had established the general principle that Congress did not intend legislatively appropriated funds to be considered contributions under §431(e). Finally, the Commission had found no reason to believe, in previous MUR's, that a violation of the Act had occurred when there was no reporting of services and

goods allegedly provided by the Federal government and State government to Federal candidates. Therefore, the General Counsel concluded that failure to report the use of Federal office space as a contribution or expenditure was not a violation of the Act, and recommended that the Commission find no reason to believe the committee had violated the Act.

Commission Determination: On February 16, 1979, the Commission found no reason to believe the respondent committee had violated 11 CFR 104.3(a)(1) and 11 CFR 104.1(a), and voted to close the file.

MUR 592: Use of FEC Reports for Commercial Purposes

On March 16, 1979, the Commission entered into a conciliation agreement with a publication that had used information copied from FEC reports for a commercial purpose, a violation of 2 U.S.C. §438(a)(4).

Complaint: On March 16, 1979, an individual requested copies of a specific committee's reports from the Commission's Public Records Office. The individual stated that he wished to obtain contributor names to create a mailing list for the publication with which he was associated. The publication intended to solicit the listed contributors for magazine subscriptions. The Public Records Office informed the individual that §438(a)(4) prohibited the use of FEC reports for commercial purposes, but he stated that the publication was exempt from the prohibition. The order was filled and the matter was referred to the Office of General Counsel. On June 7, 1979, the Commission found reason to believe that the publication had violated § 438(a)(4).

The publication had compiled a list of 25,000 names from FEC reports. It had already solicited 2,500 of the group when it received notification of the Commission's reason to believe finding. The publication agreed it would not mail the additional solicitations until the matter had been resolved, and it then submitted a memorandum of law disputing the Commission's finding.

General Counsel Reports: The respondent's memorandum maintained that since 11 CFR 104.13 exempted the sale of newspapers, magazines, books and similar communications from the definition of "commercial purpose," the publication had not violated the Act. The

General Counsel pointed out that the Act prohibits the use of information taken from FEC reports for commercial purposes and that, when 11 CFR 104.13 was transmitted to Congress, it was explained that the Regulation "defines commercial use to exclude use to *in* news media and books." The exemption was not intended and had never been interpreted, despite the respondent's assertions to the contrary, to include solicitations for subscriptions. Furthermore, legislative history showed that the prohibition was not aimed exclusively at listbrokers, as the respondent maintained, but at any person who would use the information for any commercial purpose. Therefore, the General Counsel recommended that the Commission find reasonable cause to believe that the respondent had violated the Act.

Commission Determination: On December 15, 1978, the Commission found reasonable cause to believe the respondent publication had violated 2 U.S.C. §438(a)(4) and sent a proposed conciliation agreement to the publication. The respondent then requested that the conciliation agreement be revised to allow the publication to use its remaining solicitation materials to solicit the unused FEC names. The Commission refused. In the conciliation agreement, which the respondent and the Commission entered into on March 16, 1979, the respondent agreed not to solicit the unused names and not to use information from FEC reports for any commercial purpose in the future.

FEC PUBLISHES NAMES OF NONFILERS

On September 18, 1979, the Federal Election Commission published the names of 376 nonfilers who failed to file the required July 10 quarterly campaign finance report. Nonfilers included Federal candidates, their principal campaign committees and other political committees from 46 States and the District of Columbia.

Under Commission procedures, three notices are sent to candidates and committees reminding them of their reporting obligations and urging compliance. If a candidate or committee does not file the required report(s) following the receipt of these notices, the name of that "nonfiler" is made public, as required by law. In addition to publishing the names of nonfilers, the Commission has the authority to take further enforcement action under the statute, including civil court enforcement and imposition of civil penalties.

Forms for candidate and committees to register and report are available at any time by contacting: Office of Public Communications, Federal Election Commission, 1325 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20463 (Telephone: 202/523-4068; Toll-Free 800/424-9530).

Candidates and committees should use the revised form for reporting receipts and expenditures, which is designated in the upper left hand corner as: **FEC Form 3 REVISED, January 1978**. All Presidential candidates must file on **FEC Form 3P**, even if they do not receive public funds. Filers must submit legible reports which can be reproduced clearly; **candidates or committees who file illegible or barely legible reports will be required to refile.**

AUDITS

REVIEW OF FEC AUDIT PROCEDURES

On June 7, 1979, the Commission authorized a review of existing FEC audit practices and procedures to identify problem areas and develop recommendations to substantially reduce the time required to complete and release audits. The review was conducted by Arthur Andersen and Co., a private firm with extensive experience in the area of campaign financing. Since Arthur Andersen's clients include members of both major political parties, the Commission decided that the Andersen review should be conducted in conjunction with Accountants in the Public Interest (API). API was selected to monitor the findings from a public interest viewpoint and to determine whether the results were without bias.

On September 13, 1979, both Arthur Andersen and API presented their findings to the Commission. The Andersen review identified a number of problem areas and presented a series of recommendations to assist the Commission in conducting audits on a timely basis and with minimal disruption to political committees. API concluded that the Andersen review and recommendations were without bias.

The Andersen report included recommendations that the FEC:

- 1. Change the Objective of the Audit Process:** Arthur Andersen recommended that, rather than expecting its auditors to verify each transaction of every political committee, the FEC consider a more limited audit objective, i.e., to verify committees' compliance in areas with the greatest risk of non-compliance. Andersen recommended, accordingly, the establishment of valid risk criteria and the concentration of limited audit resources on identified risk areas, so that the Commission could maximize its verification of compliance with the Act by expanding its audit coverage to more committees. This new procedure would not, however, apply to committees receiving public funds.
- 2. Establish Thresholds:** Andersen pointed out that the required resolution of minor discrepancies had proven time consuming for both campaign staffs and FEC auditors. Therefore, Andersen recommended that thresholds be established so that only significant problems would be included in audit reports and/or referred to the General Counsel.
- 3. Eliminate Categorization of Audit Reports; Issue Audit Findings Letters:** Andersen pointed out that, although the current practice of assigning one of three possible audit opinions (clean, qualified or adverse) to each audit report had been designed to

help the public understand the degree of a specific committee's compliance with the Act, the public was not able to make that distinction. To improve disclosure, Andersen recommended that audit findings letters, indicating the scope and findings of the audit, be issued within two weeks of completion of the field work. The audited committee would be given a reasonable period for response. At the end of that period, the findings letter, together with a summary of issues resolved by the FEC and the committee, would be released as the final report.

- 4. Separate Audit Reports from Compliance Matters (MUR's):** Andersen noted that many audit reports are delayed for weeks and months pending the resolution of MUR's (potential compliance actions against committees) in the General Counsel's

FEC PUBLIC APPEARANCES

In keeping with its objective of making information available to the public, the Federal Election Commission regularly accepts invitations to address public gatherings on the subject of campaign finance laws and the Commission itself. This regular column lists scheduled Commission appearances, detailing the name of the sponsoring organization, the location of the event and the name of the Commission's speaker. For additional information on any scheduled appearance, please contact the *sponsoring organization*.

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 11/27-28 | Federal Bar Association
Conference on Congressional
Campaigns and Campaign Law
House and Senate Code of Ethics
and Campaigns
Doug Patton, Special Deputy to
the Clerk of House of
Representatives |
| 12/2-4 | Clearinghouse Northeast Regional
Seminar
Conference on Election
Administration
Philadelphia, PA
FEC Commissioners and Staff |
| 12/3 | FEC Campaign Finance Seminar
Philadelphia, PA
FEC Commissioners and Staff |
| 12/9-11 | Clearinghouse Southwest Regional
Seminar
Conference on Election
Administration
Austin, TX
FEC Commissioners and Staff |
| 12/10 | FEC Campaign Finance Seminar
Austin, TX
FEC Commissioners and Staff |

office. In those cases where a MUR is opened, Andersen suggested that the Audit Division issue an audit findings letter that does not address the MUR issue, but states that the General Counsel is reviewing a matter uncovered during the audit.

5. **Limit Commission Review of Audits:** Andersen recommended that the current policy of requiring Commission review of *all* audit reports be modified so that Commission approval would be necessary only for audits which contained unusual findings or serious violations of the Act.
6. **Establish Proper Campaign Accounting Systems:** Andersen noted that political committees with adequate record keeping systems produced more accurate disclosure reports. Andersen recommended, therefore, that the Commission develop a simple bookkeeping system specifically tailored to the needs of small part-time campaign committees. Such a manual would supplement the existing FEC manuals for political committees and Presidential campaigns.
7. **Perform Systems Review on Presidential Candidates:** For Presidential campaigns that receive public funds, Andersen recommended that the FEC Audit Division perform a systems review prior to a Presidential Committee's first request for primary matching funds. Such a review would confirm that the Committee has adequate systems to properly safeguard and control public funds and to assure compliance with the Act.
8. **Continue the Random Audit Process:** Andersen recommended that some type of random audit program would be necessary to validate risk criteria (see Number 1), and would serve as an incentive to campaign treasurers to maintain good records and proper documentation.
9. **Establish an Audit Advisory Committee:** Andersen recommended the creation of a small, well qualified audit advisory committee. The proposed committee would confine its advice to policy matters and would not become involved in individual audit decisions.

In addition to the above recommendations, Andersen also suggested that strict deadlines be established for the audit process, that timeliness of audit reports be improved and that a stronger personnel program (e.g., recruiting and formalized training programs) be instituted for the Audit Division.

The Commission has begun consideration of steps to implement recommendations contained in the report.

AUDITS RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC

The Federal Election Campaign Act requires the Commission to periodically conduct audits and field investigations with respect to reports and statements filed under the Act. The Commission is also required to conduct audits of all campaigns of Presidential candidates who receive public funds. Audit reports that have been approved by the Commission either through a tally vote or after discussion in open session, are released as *final audit reports*. If an audit report has been discussed in open session, but has not been approved by the Commission, the report is available as an *interim audit report*. Both final and interim reports are available through the Office of Public Records and Press Office. In the list below, interim reports are designated by an asterisk (*). All others are final audit reports. (Note that, with the release of the Wallace report, the Commission has now completed the audits of all 1976 Presidential candidates who received public matching funds.) The following is a chronological listing of audits released between September 4, 1979, and October 6, 1979:

Audit Report	Date Made Public
1. George C. Wallace The Wallace Campaign, Inc.	9/4/79
2. Transportation Political Education League (TPEL)	9/5/79
3. Republican National Hispanic Assembly	9/19/79
4. Committee to Preserve the National Republican Center	9/19/79
5. James Russell Kirby Kirby for Congress Committee, NC/2	9/19/79
6. Democratic Executive Committee of Florida	9/27/79
7. Write-In McCarthy Committee '76	9/27/79

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

The following list identifies all FEC documents which appeared in the *Federal Register* between September 5, 1979, and October 4, 1979:

Notice	Title	Federal Register Publication Date	Citation
1979-12	Opinion and Regulation Index Available	9/17/79	44 FR 53800
1979-13	Proposed Regulations: Access to Public Records	9/17/79	44 FR 53923
1979-14	Transfer of Regulations to New Chapter (Reorga- nizing and Renumbering of FEC Regulations)	9/27/79	44 FR 55781
1979-15	Proposed Regulations: Presidential Primary Matching Fund (eligibility of candidates who ex- ceed expenditure limit)	9/27/79	44 FR 55594

STAFF

FISCAL YEAR 1981 BUDGET

On September 6, 1979, the Commission approved its proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1981. The budget request of \$11,530,160 contains 21 program packages and provides for 312 permanent employees.

The Commission submitted its proposed budget to the President, the Congress and the Office of Management and Budget on September 17, 1979.

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
1325 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20463

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

FIRST CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID

FEC
WASHINGTON, D.C.
PERMIT NO. G-31