

May 7, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL

*of  
Campaign  
Spending*

MEMORANDUM FOR: CHUCK COLSON  
FROM: KEN COLE  
SUBJECT: Campaign Spending

Per our discussion, here is the memo you can play with.

It seems to me that there are three areas where we can begin to build a case with the press that the Congress is currently considering a weak campaign spending bill.

1. Currently the bill calls for a repeal of Section 315 as it applies to candidates for President only. There is no reason why this should not be extended to candidates for other Federal office as well, and the only reason the Congress is not doing this is that they want to protect themselves.
2. The present bill does not contain any regulation of union contributions. Here again the Democrats are working on a weak bill that has loopholes in it which are beneficial to them.
3. Reporting and disclosure, under the current bill, is to be handled by the Clerk of the House and Secretary of the Senate - both Democrats. The Administration has proposed a neutral authority - an independent commission - to handle reporting and disclosure. This kind of organization would be able to handle campaign spending regulation in a manner that would not be subject to the special pressures that the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate would get. Here again is another example of the Democrats weakening the bill to protect themselves.

I have attached for your information a brief analysis of the most significant provisions of the campaign reform legislation.

## Campaign Reform Legislation

This is how the campaign reform bill (S 382) looks after the Senate Commerce Committee has completed action. It probably will not file its report officially until next week. At that time the Rules Committee has 45 days in which to act.

The bill contains the following which are apparently within the jurisdiction only of the Commerce Committee.

### 1. Spending Limits

- a. Broadcast. 5¢ times the estimated "population of voting age." Based upon 140 million people, this would make available about \$7 million for radio and TV in 1972.

We would very much have preferred higher limits.

- b. Non-Broadcast. The same limits for newspapers, magazines and billboards.

Here again, we would have preferred higher limits. The broadcast and non-broadcast limits are not interchangeable. We would have preferred that they be interchangeable.

- c. These limits would increase slightly because of provisions for cost-of-living changes and increased population by 1972.

### 2. Equal time provisions suspended for Presidential campaigns only.

We oppose that provision because we want the suspension, if it is enacted at all, to apply to all campaigns.

### 3. Lowest unit rate for all media.

We support that provision.

\* \* \* \* \*

(more)

The following are apparently within the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee. Here is where Rules Committee members can be of most help.

4. Contributions Limits. \$5,000 per contributor (including his whole family) to any campaign.

Any contributions limit is unacceptable.

5. Reporting and Disclosure.

We are generally support of this provision except for strong opposition to the following: The Democrats' bill now provides for the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House to oversee these provisions.

We want an independent Federal Elections Commission, to remove the Secretary and Clerk from the influence of the Democratic majority.