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## Compliance

### MUR 3637
Kentucky Committee Agrees to $75,000 Civil Penalty

The Kentucky State Democratic Central Executive Committee agreed to pay a $75,000 civil penalty to the FEC after a review of its actions during the 1992 election cycle turned up numerous violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) and Commission regulations.

Several of the violations revolve around the committee’s failure to pay for the federal portion of allocable expenses resulting from joint activity with permissible funds. Specifically:

- During the 1992 election cycle, the Committee made $415,446 in disbursements for allocable expenses from its nonfederal accounts that should have initially been paid for from the federal accounts. This violated 11 CFR 102.5(a)(1)(i) and 106.5(g)(1)(i).
- The Committee made $127,522 in disbursements for federal activity from its nonfederal accounts, which contained impermissible funds, in violation of 2 U.S.C. §§441a(f) and 441b(a) and 11 CFR 102.5(a)(1)(i).

(continued on page 2)

## Court Cases

### Clark v. FEC and the Commission on Presidential Debates

On March 10, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in the FEC’s favor, granting its motion for summary affirmance in this case and denying the motion of John P. Clark and the Green Party USA for emergency summary reversal. The ruling upholds the district court’s denial of a motion by Mr. Clark, other individual voters and the Green Party to intervene in a suit brought by the Natural Law Party (NLP) and its presidential and vice-presidential candidates against the FEC and the Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD).

This case stemmed from an October 4, 1996, ruling from this same court that upheld a lower court ruling and dismissed lawsuits filed against the FEC and the CPD by the NLP and the presidential and vice presidential candidates running under the Reform Party banner. Both the NLP and the Reform Party candidates had sought to participate in the presidential debates being sponsored by the CPD. The CPD excluded the candidates—the NLP’s...
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- The Committee also accepted and placed $11,000 in impermissible contributions into its federal account, in violation of 2 U.S.C. §441b(a), which, in part, bars contributions from corporate and labor organizations.
- In making two transfers totaling $59,185 from its nonfederal accounts to its federal accounts, the committee failed to comply with FEC regulations that establish the time limits in which such transfers are to be made—in this case, no more than 10 days before or 30 days after the federal payments for which they were designated were made. 11 CFR 106.5(g)(2)(ii)(A) and (B). The nonfederal accounts contained funds that were considered impermissible for the federal account. Thus, the transfer also violated 2 U.S.C. 441b(a).
- The Committee reported $884,576 in disbursements for joint activity as coming from their federal accounts when that was not the case. 11 CFR 104.10(b)(4) and 2 U.S.C. §434(b).
- The Committee reported $458,756 in fictitious transfers from their nonfederal accounts to their federal accounts. 11 CFR 104.10(b)(3) and 2 U.S.C. §434(b).
- Finally, the Committee did not report to the FEC within 10 days that a new treasurer had been appointed. 2 U.S.C. §433(c). The Committee also failed to have the signature of the designated treasurer on all reports, violating 2 U.S.C. §434(a)(1).

In addition to the penalty, the Committee agreed to refund the $11,000 of impermissible funds it received in its federal accounts and to refund from its federal accounts to its nonfederal accounts $59,185 that was not transferred in a timely manner.

This MUR, or Matter Under Review, was initiated as the FEC carried out its normal supervisory duties and after the Commission received a complaint from the Republican Party of Kentucky. After a review of the complaint and other pertinent facts, but prior to finding probable cause to believe the Committee had violated the law, the Commission entered into a conciliation agreement with the Committee.

Federal Register

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

Notice 1997-5
Filing Dates for Texas Special Elections (62 FR 15482, April 1, 1997)

Notice 1997-3 (Correction)
Final Rule: Adjustments to Civil Monetary Penalty Amounts (62 FR 18167, April 14, 1997)

Publications

1997 Federal/State Disclosure Directory Available on Web Site

The Combined Federal/State Disclosure Directory 1997, which lists the national and state offices responsible for public disclosure of a variety of financial- and election-related filings for candidates and officeholders, is now available. The publication contains information about campaign finances, candidates on the ballot, election results, lobbying, personal finances, public financing, spending on state initiatives and other financial filings.

New this year are a number of E-mail addresses for the various agencies and their staffs, as well as the agencies’ home page addresses on the Internet. The agencies with on-line access to the FEC’s database are noted.

The disclosure directory is available free at the FEC’s web site—http://www.fec.gov—and on Macintosh- and IBM-formatted diskettes for $3. Paper copies of the 1997 edition are also available free of charge. For more information, call the Public Records office at 800/424-9530 (Press 3) or 202/219-4140.
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Dr. John Hagelin and Mike Tompkins and the Reform Party’s H. Ross Perot and Pat Choate—from the debates, saying that the minor party candidates did not meet the criteria for participation.

Background

On September 6, 1996, the NLP filed an administrative complaint with the FEC and, on September 13, filed suit in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, contending that the CPD had violated FEC rules governing nonpartisan candidate debates. 11 CFR 113.10. Specifically, the NLP suit asked the court to impose a temporary restraining order and issue preliminary and permanent injunctions to prevent the CPD from using any debate selection criteria that did not comply with FEC rules. In the alternative, it asked the court to order the FEC to take action on its administrative complaint. See the November 1996 Record.

The Green Party, Mr. Clark and seven other individuals, all independent voters or supporters of the Green Party USA and its 1996 presidential candidate Ralph Nader, filed a motion for intervention on September 27, 1996. The district court found that Mr. Clark and the others “show[ed] their curiosity in the case, but…fail[ed] to demonstrate sufficient grounds for intervention.” On September 30, the court therefore denied the motion for intervention. However, it did grant Clark leave to file a brief as a friend of the court.

On November 22—more than a month after the appeals court had ruled in this case and weeks after the debates and 1996 elections had taken place—Mr. Clark filed a notice of appeal of the district court ruling. Mr. Clark had not participated as a friend of the court in the appeals process, nor in a subsequent and unsuccessful petition from Mr. Hagelin for an expedited rehearing and rehearing en banc.

FEC Arguments and Appeals Court Order

First, the FEC argued that the appellants had failed to demonstrate a common question of law, a requirement for permissive intervention under Fed. R. Civ. P. 24.1 Among other things, Mr. Clark’s complaint claimed that the CPD’s debate selection criteria violated unspecified sections of the U.S. Constitution. Mr. Hagelin’s complaint, on the other hand, had claimed that the CPD’s criteria violated FEC regulations at 11 CFR 110.13. Further, the FEC argued that there were no common “questions of fact,” as required by Rule 24(b), between Mr. Clark’s and Mr. Hagelin’s complaints. In addition, the FEC said that the Clark appellants had not shown an independent jurisdictional basis for their claims. The would-be plaintiffs did not even include a presidential or vice-presidential candidate who might have claimed exclusion from the debates.

Timeliness was also at issue, the FEC argued. Rule 24(b) states that a court must consider “whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original parties.” Because the debates were to begin shortly after the original complaints were filed, the district court set about adjudicating the matter on an expedited schedule, but Mr. Clark’s motion was not filed until the last day of the briefing schedule.

Finally, the FEC argued that because the district court granted Mr. Clark the option of filing a brief as a friend of the court, it did not abuse its discretion in denying his initial motion to intervene. The appeals court found that the merits of the parties’ positions were so clear that they warranted summary action. It held that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the appellants’ motion to intervene.


FEC v. Kalogianis

On March 25, 1997, the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire ordered Anastasios Kalogianis to pay a $37,500 civil penalty to the FEC for making $249,000 in excessive contributions to the Tsongas for President Committee during the 1992 election cycle. Both parties to this suit agreed to the judgment and consent order.

Mr. Kalogianis made six loans to the Tsongas Committee. Although one of the checks was made payable to Nicholas Rizzo, the committee’s chief fundraiser, the money was given with the intention that it be used in the Tsongas campaign. See the October 1996 Record.

The Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) states that no person may make contributions to any federal candidate or his or her authorized candidate committee which, in the aggregate, exceed $1,000. 2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(A). A contribution includes anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing a federal election, including loans. 2 U.S.C. §431(8)(A)(i). Further, Commission regulations state that a loan that exceeds the contribution limits of the Act is unlawful whether or not it is repaid. 11 CFR 100.7(a)(1)(i)(A).

1 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) states that would-be intervenors must timely file their applications and demonstrate that their claim or defense and the “main action” have a question of law or fact in common. In addition, they must show an independent jurisdictional basis for their claims.
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In addition to the civil penalty, Mr. Kalogianis was permanently enjoined from making similar violations of the Act.
U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire, 96-427-JD.

Common Cause v. FEC (96-5160)

On March 21, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that Common Cause lacked standing to litigate certain claims against the Commission, and the court therefore dismissed those claims. Common Cause had appealed a lower court ruling that upheld the Commission’s dismissal of several allegations in an administrative complaint filed by Common Cause.

Background

The lawsuit concerns Montana’s 1988 senatorial race. Common Cause alleged that the National Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC) and the Montana Republican Party (MRP) violated the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act) by making contributions and expenditures in excess of the legal contribution limits for Republican candidates. Common Cause alleged that the Republican Senatorial Committee (NRSC) and the Montana Republican Party (MRP) violated the Act by making contributions and expenditures in excess of the legal contribution limits for Republican candidate Conrad Burns. Common Cause also alleged that the national and state parties failed to accurately report these contributions and expenditures to the FEC. Common Cause and James K. Addy, Mr. Burns’s Democratic opponent in the race, filed administrative complaints with the FEC. After investigating these allegations, the FEC’s Office of General Counsel recommended that the Commission find probable cause to believe that the NRSC and MRP had violated the Act. However, because none of the proposed probable cause findings garnered the required four affirmative votes, the Commission voted 5-0 to dismiss the complaints and close the matter.

Common Cause and Mr. Addy challenged the FEC’s dismissal in U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. The district court ruled in the FEC’s favor, finding “that deference is owed to the views of the ‘declining-to-go-ahead’ Commissioners when reviewing a Commission decision to dismiss a complaint based on a deadlock.” It granted partial summary judgment to the FEC and remanded one reporting violation to the Commission for review.

Common Cause appealed the decision (except for the portion that was favorable to it) and claimed that deference is not owed to the “declining-to-go-ahead” Commissioners when its members decide to dismiss a complaint based on a previous deadlock. The appeals court did not address this argument because it found that Common Cause lacked standing.

Analysis for Standing

In order to show standing, a plaintiff must have suffered an injury in fact, or an actual wrong against a legally protected interest, that is traceable to the challenged act and is likely to be redressed by a favorable decision from a court. Organizations may have standing to sue in order to vindicate the rights and immunities it enjoys or, under certain conditions, on behalf of its members. When an organization sues on its own behalf, it must show a concrete injury to its activities with a resulting drain on its resources in order to attain standing. In the case of an organization suing on behalf of its members, the organization must show that its members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right, that the interests it seeks to protect are germane to the organization’s purpose and that neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires individual members to participate in the lawsuit.

The appeals court rejected all three of Common Cause’s theories as to why it had standing.

• Member Standing. The court found that Common Cause was unclear on exactly what “political information” was denied its members. However, in the court’s view, the nature of the information was crucial to the injury-in-fact analysis. If the information allegedly withheld was simply that a violation of the Act had occurred, then Common Cause’s members did not suffer the type of injury that the court had previously held to be sufficient for standing. To allow a plaintiff to establish the required injury in fact in those circumstances, the court concluded, would be “tantamount to recognizing a justiciable interest in the enforcement of the law. This we cannot do.”

• Organizational Standing. The court also said Common Cause itself did not have standing in this case. It found that the organization was asserting an interest in knowing whether the NRSC and MRP had violated the Act’s contribution and expenditure limits. Just as this was an inadequate interest to establish standing when Common Cause asserted it on behalf of its members, it was inadequate to establish Common Cause’s own standing. The court stated that, in contrast, if Common Cause had asserted “an interest in knowing how much money a candidate spent in an election, infringement of such an interest may...constitute a legally cognizable injury.” While Common Cause also alleged that the NRSC and MRP had violated the Act’s reporting requirements,
DNC v. FEC (96-2506)

On February 20, with the agreement of both parties, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dismissed this case without prejudice and ordered the FEC to periodically update the Democratic National Committee (DNC) on the status of an administrative complaint it filed against Bob Dole’s 1996 presidential campaign. See the January 1997 Record.

In June 1996, the DNC filed an administrative complaint with the Commission alleging that Mr. Dole’s presidential committee, Dole for President, Inc., disregarded the limit on expenditures during the preprimary season. The administrative complaint was designated MUR 4382. Under the Presidential Primary Matching Payment Account Act, presidential candidates may receive matching payments for their primary campaigns if they agree to limit their expenditures to a set amount—in this case, a little more than $37 million. 2 U.S.C. §441a(b)(1)(A).

After no apparent action had taken place on the complaint, the DNC, on October 31, filed suit asking the court to order the FEC to move forward on its allegations against the Dole campaign. The DNC said that in failing to act on its complaint within 120 days after it was filed—the original administrative complaint was filed June 12 and a supplemental complaint was filed on July 22—the FEC was acting contrary to law. 2 U.S.C. §437g(a)(8)(A).

The court said that the FEC should give lawyers for the DNC confidential, updated chronologies on the Commission’s actions in MUR 4382. The first was to be delivered at the end of March with subsequent chronologies presented at 12-month intervals until the matter was resolved or there was further court action.

The contents of the chronologies may not be disclosed to anyone not involved in the administrative complaint. Additionally, DNC counsel may use the information only in preparation for litigation that may result from the MUR. To ensure that there is no unauthorized dissemination of the chronologies, DNC counsel must inform in writing each person who sees the information that it may not be shared with others. The DNC must maintain a list of those people, what information they have seen and a written statement from each person acknowledging that he or she understands the confidentiality provisions that are part of this court action.

U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 96-2506.

FEC v. Christian Action Network

On April 7, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit granted a request from the Christian Action Network (CAN) that the FEC pay its attorney fees and other costs associated with this case. The court remanded the case to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia, Lynchburg Division, to set the amount to be awarded. The appeals court had previously upheld the lower court’s ruling to dismiss and, in this opinion, included a lengthy analysis of express advocacy and corporate communications.

The Commission had filed suit against CAN in 1994, charging that it made independent expenditures with corporate funds and failed to comply with election laws that govern reporting and disclaimers. See the December 1994, September 1995 and October 1996 issues of the Record.

this was a small part of its complaint. Further, Common Cause asked only for an investigation and, if its allegations were proven, monetary penalties against the two Republican committees. The court specifically noted that Common Cause did not ask for any kind of disclosure of the allegedly undisclosed financial information.

• Dismissal of Complaint. The court also rejected Common Cause’s final argument—that it had standing because the FEC had dismissed its complaint in a manner contrary to law. The organization relied on a section of the law that grants any person who has filed an administrative complaint with the FEC the right to seek review in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia if the Commission dismisses that complaint. 2 U.S.C. §437g(a)(8)(A). Based on the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife1, the court said that “absent the ability to demonstrate a ‘discrete injury’ flowing from the alleged violation of FECA, Common Cause cannot establish standing merely by asserting that the FEC failed to process its complaint in accordance with law.” Section 437g(a)(8)(A), the court explained, “does not confer standing; it confers a right to sue upon parties who otherwise already have standing.” Because Common Cause did not demonstrate an injury as a result of the alleged violations of the Act, it could not assert standing under this provision.


Party Committees Raise, Spend Millions During 1996 Election Cycle

Republican committees continued to outpace their Democratic counterparts in fundraising during the 1995-1996 election cycle. However, both parties showed substantial increases in their collection efforts on Year-End reports filed with the FEC. The reports covered financial activity from January 1, 1995, through December 31, 1996.

Republican committees on the national, state and local levels reported $416.5 million in federal receipts, a 57 percent increase from the last presidential election cycle that ended in 1992. Those same committees spent $408.5 million in connection with federal elections during the election cycle, a 62 percent increase. National, state and local Democratic committees raised $221.6 million for their federal accounts and spent $214.3 million, a 36 percent increase in both categories over the same reporting period in 1992.

Soft money, or nonfederal dollars, also showed increases for both parties in receipts and disbursements. Republican national party committees\(^1\) raised $138.2 million in soft dollars and spent $149.7 million. Both totals were more than double the figures from the last presidential election cycle. Democratic national party committees\(^2\) more than tripled the amount of soft money raised and spent in the 1992 cycle. The committees raised $123.9 million in soft money and spent $121.8 million.

This election cycle marked the first time that party committees could make independent expenditures. Only the senatorial campaign committees and some state and local party committees took advantage of this option. Republican party committees spent $10 million on independent expenditures, while Democratic party committees spent $1.5 million.

The charts above and on the right provide additional information about the Year-End reports. Information about the financial activities of the major parties found in the Year-End reports is available in a March 19 news release. The release is available:

- At the FEC’s web site at http://www.fec.gov (click on “News Releases and Media Advisories” or “Financial Information for Candidates, Parties, and PACs” at the main menu); and
- From the Public Records office by calling 1-800-424-9530 (press 3).

---

\(^1\) These are the Republican National Committee, National Republican Senatorial Committee and National Republican Congressional Committee.

\(^2\) These are the Democratic National Committee, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.
Hard Dollars and Soft Money Collected by Party Committees During 1996 Election Cycle
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Looking for Back Issues of the Record?

Whether you’re researching a range of campaign finance issues or looking for specific information from 1996 and 1997, look to the FEC’s official web site to find issues of the Record. The web site—http://www.fec.gov—includes issues dating from January 1996 to the present. Go to the web site and click on “Help for Candidates, Parties and PACs” to see back issues. Also click on “What’s New” to find the most current issue of the Record.

Newly available is a hypertext version of the 1996 Record index. The index features alphabetical links that can be used to search for information by topic. Each topic listing is linked to the first page of the Record issue in which that topic was discussed. Clicking on a topic link will download the selected newsletter issue to your computer.

For each of the issues available at the web site, you will need Adobe® Acrobat Reader software to view or print the publication. The FEC’s web site has a link that will take you to Adobe’s web site, where you can download the latest version of the software for free.
AO 1997-1
Use of Excess Campaign Funds for Charitable Foundation

Former Alabama Congressman Tom Bevill may donate the remaining cash balance of his principal campaign committee, Friends of Tom Bevill, to the newly created Bevill Foundation provided the Foundation does not use the funds to compensate the candidate, his family or former campaign staff.

The Foundation would make grants solely to various educational, charitable, literary, scientific and religious organizations. None of its funds would be used to influence a federal election, and no person associated with Mr. Bevill’s former congressional staff or family would be employed at the Foundation. Mr. Bevill, his wife and daughter, Susan B. Livingston, would act as the board of directors of the foundation. While Ms. Livingston intends to provide some legal services to the Foundation, she would not be compensated for that work. The Foundation plans to seek tax-exempt status under IRS statutes (26 U.S.C. §§170(c) and 501(c)(3)).

Candidate committees may not convert campaign funds to the personal use of the candidate or any other person. 11 CFR 113.1(g) and 113.2(d). FEC guidelines define personal use as “any use of funds in a campaign account…that would exist irrespective of the candidate’s campaign or duties as a federal officeholder.” The rules also state that none of Mr. Bevill’s former staff members will be compensated.

Date Issued: March 17, 1997;
Length: 4 pages.

AO 1997-2
Use of Campaign Funds for Travel to Congressional Retreat

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives could use campaign funds to pay travel expenses and attendance for themselves, their spouses and their children in connection with the Bipartisan Congressional Retreat.

Democratic and Republican leaders in the House, along with the Congressional Institute and The Aspen Institute, planned the bipartisan retreat for early March at the Hershey Lodge and Convention Center in Hershey, PA. House members were invited in an attempt to establish a more constructive spirit and ethic for member-to-member relations.

The legislators and their families attended plenary sessions that covered topics ranging from public policy matters to the impact of congressional duties on personal and family lives. In addition, congressional members and their spouses participated in small group sessions to expound on those issues that impact on House members. Children had their own programs provided by the lodge. The weekend also included a special dinner for the members and their families.

Retreat organizers charged an attendance fee of $60 for each House member, $30 for each spouse and $10 for each child. The principal cost of the retreat was paid for by a grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts. Members were responsible for their own travel expenses.

Candidate committees may not convert campaign funds to the personal use of the candidate or any other person. 11 CFR 113.1(g) and 113.2(d). FEC guidelines define personal use as “any use of funds in a campaign account…that would exist irrespective of the candidate’s campaign or duties as a federal officeholder.” An exemption to the ban on the personal use of campaign funds, however, permits the use of campaign funds to defray any ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in connection with a person’s duties as a federal officeholder. This includes travel costs for the officeholder and spouse so long as the function they are attending is directly connected to bona fide official responsibilities.

Because the express purpose of the retreat was to improve the effectiveness of the legislative environment in the House of Representatives, the outing was directly related to members’ official responsibilities as officeholders. The Commission based this conclusion on several facts: the event would be bipartisan; it had the support of congressional leaders; and it was expected to draw a large number of members from both major political parties.

Moreover, under 11 CFR 113.1(g), the personal use of funds refers to any use of campaign funds that would exist irrespective of the candidate’s campaign or duties as a federal officeholder. In this case, the
cost of travel and attendance occurred only because of the House members’ duties as federal officeholders. Consequently, members could use campaign funds to pay the expenses. This also held true for members’ spouses, who are covered under 11 CFR 113.2(a)(1).

As the retreat organizers stressed the importance of full family participation to the success of the retreat—this was reflected in planned group activities—the Commission concluded in this specific circumstance that campaign funds could be used to pay for the travel expenses and attendance fees of the children of participating House members.

Campaign committee disbursements for this retreat should be reported as “other disbursements” on FEC forms.

Date Issued: March 17, 1997: Length: 5 pages.

**Alternative Disposition of Advisory Opinion Requests**

**AOR 1996-47**

The Commission voted unanimously to close the file on AOR 1996-47 without issuing an opinion. The request, submitted on November 3, 1996, sought the Commission’s opinion on whether the National Reform Party Steering Committee would qualify as a national committee of a political party under the Federal Election Campaign Act. The heads of reform parties in five states disassociated themselves from the request. Also, the requesters failed to respond to or clarify a number of questions that came about in response to the AOR. Commission regulations at 11 CFR 112.1(c) require a complete description of all relevant facts pertaining to each AOR. The steering committee may resubmit this AOR when it can provide all necessary documentation and clarifications.

**Advisory Opinion Requests**

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

**AOR 1997-4**

Application of contribution limits to PA limited liability company that was formerly a partnership (Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, March 19, 1997; 1 page plus 44-page attachment)

**AOR 1997-5**

Qualification of lessee of trading “seat” on Exchange as member (Chicago Mercantile Exchange, April 1; 7 pages plus 199-page attachment)

---

**Information**

**Update on Electronic Filing**

The FEC has heard from a number of committee treasurers who are interested in learning more about the agency’s new electronic filing process. As the FEC reported in the February issue of the Record, it is now possible to file disclosure reports electronically on computer disk. The required formats have been established and are available from the Commission’s web site (http://www.fec.gov) and by request (call the Data Division at 800/424-9530 or 202/219-3730).

**First Steps**

During this first year, the agency is focusing on committees that have their own internal computer systems and software companies that offer products currently used by committees. This will allow the FEC to gain experience with the electronic filing system. The agency will publish on a regular basis a list of companies that have said they are developing electronic filing software, and the agency will be happy to add them to the list. Call the Data Division at 1/800-424-9530 (press 1).

**FEC Software**

For small committees not currently using a comprehensive software program, the FEC is developing very basic program that will be available in early 1998. This software will allow committees to keep reportable information on receipts and disbursements and automatically prepare the electronic filing. It will not, however, have the added features that most commercially-available programs currently contain.

The Record will continue to publish details on the progress of electronic filing, and the Commission looks forward to hearing from committees as it moves forward on this important project.

(Information continued on page 10)
Information
(continued from page 9)

Flashfax Menu
Flashfax documents may be ordered 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, by calling 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.
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343. 10 Questions from Candidates
344. Filing a Complaint
345. 1996 Reporting Dates
346. 1996 Congressional Primary Dates
347. 1996 Special Election Reporting Dates

Federal Election Commission
401. The FEC and the Federal Campaign Finance Law
402. La Ley Federal relativa al Financiamiento de las Campañas
403. Federal and State Campaign Finance Laws
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 1995 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 Regulations
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
525. 1991-2 Political Money
526. 1995 Mid-Year PAC Count
527. 1993-4 Congressional
528. 1993-4 National Party
529. 1993-4 PAC Finances
530. 1995-6 Congressional
531. 1995-6 National Party
532. 1995-6 PAC Finances

1996 Presidential Election
550. 1996 Presidential Primary Dates
551. Selected 1996 Campaign Names and Addresses
552. Selected 1996 Campaign Finance Figures
553. 1996 Matching Fund Certifications and Convention Fund Payments
554. 1996 Presidential General Election Ballots

Regulations (11 CFR Parts 100-201)
100. Part 100, Scope and Definitions
1007. Part 100.7, Contribution
1008. Part 100.8, Expenditure
101. Part 101, Candidate Status and Designations
102. Part 102, Registration, Organization and Recordkeeping by Political Committees
1021. Part 102.17, Joint Fundraising by Committees Other Than SSFs
103. Part 103, Campaign Depositories
104. Part 104, Reports by Political Committees
1047. Part 104.7, Best Efforts
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
1101. Part 110.1, Contributions by Persons Other Than Multi-candidate Political Committees
1102. Part 110.2, Contributions by Multi-candidate Committees
1103. Part 110.3, Contribution Limitations for Affiliated Committees and Political Party Committees; Transfers
1104. Part 110.4, Prohibited Contributions
1105. Part 110.5, Annual Contribution Limitation for Individuals
1106. Part 110.6, Earmarked Contributions
1107. Part 110.7, Party Committee Expenditure Limitations
1108. Part 110.8, Presidential Candidate Expenditure Limitations
1109. Part 110.9, Miscellaneous Provisions
1110. Part 110.10, Expenditures by Candidates
1111. Part 110.11, Communications; Advertising
1112. Part 110.12, Candidate Appearances on Public Educational Institution Premises
1113. Part 110.13, Nonpartisan Candidate Debates
1114. Part 110.14, Contributions to and Expenditures by Delegates and Delegate Committees
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. Public Financing of Presidential Primary and General Election Campaigns
229. Candidate Debates and News Stories
230. Electronic Filing of Reports by Political Committees
231. DSCC and DCCC Rulemaking Petition

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 Multicandidate Status

Schedules
370. Schedule A, Itemized Receipts
371. Schedule B, Itemized Disbursements
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
442. Section 442
432. Section 432
451. Section 451
433. Section 433
452. Section 452
434. Section 434
453. Section 453
437. Section 437
454. Section 454
4377. Section 437g
455. Section 455
438. Section 438
439. Section 439
441. Section 441
4411. Section 441a
4412. Section 441b
4413. Section 441c
4414. Section 441d
4415. Section 441e
4416. Section 441f

Advisory Opinions
601-45. AOs 1996-1 through 1996-45
700. Brochure
701-49. AOs 1995-1 through 1995-49
801-40. AOs 1994-1 through 1994-40
901-25. AOs 1993-1 through 1993-25

FEC Accepts Visa and Mastercard
FEC customers can now pay for FEC materials with Visa or Mastercard. Most FEC materials are available free of charge, but some are sold, including financial statistical reports ($10 each), candidate indexes ($10) and PAC directories ($13.25). The FEC also has a 5 cents per page copying charge for paper documents and a 15 cents per page copying charge for microfilmed documents.

Paying by credit card has its advantages. For instance, since the FEC will not fill an order until payment is received, using a credit card speeds delivery by four to five days.

Visitors to the FEC’s Public Records Office will also be able to make payments by credit card. Regular visitors, such as researchers and reporters, who in the past have paid for FEC materials out of their own pockets, may now make payments with a company credit card.

The credit card payment system also reduces costs and paperwork associated with check processing, enabling FEC staff to better serve walk-in visitors.
The first number in each citation refers to the “number” (month) of the 1997 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
- 1996-35: Status of Green Party as national committee, 1:10
- 1996-42: SSF disaffiliation following corporate spin off, 1:11
- 1996-45: Use of campaign funds, 1:12
- 1996-46: Continuation of exemption from select FECA reporting provisions, 4:7
- 1996-49: Affiliation between PAC of joint venture partnership and SSF of corporate partner, 3:7
- 1996-50: Disaffiliation of SSFs, 3:9
- 1996-51: Qualification as state committee of political party, 3:9
- 1996-52: Resolicitation of excess campaign funds for nonfederal campaign, 3:10
- 1997-1: Use of excess campaign funds to establish foundation, 5:8
- 1997-2: Use of campaign funds for congressional retreat fees, travel, 5:8

### Court Cases
- **FEC v. _____**
  - Charles Woods for U.S. Senate, 4:6
  - Christian Action Network, 1:5; 5:5
  - DSCC (95-2881), 3:2
  - Fund For a Conservative Majority, 1:5
  - Kalogianis, 5:3
  - McCallum, 2:4
  - Parisi, 1:4
  - Public Citizen, 4:6
  - Williams, 2:3

- _____ v. FEC
- Akins et al., 2:1
- Bush-Quayle ‘92 Primary Committee, 3:5
- Clark, 5:1
- Common Cause (96-5160), 5:4
- DCCC (96-0764), 1:4
- DNC (96-2506), 1:5; 5:5
- DSCC (96-2184), 1:2
- Hooker, 1:5
- NRCC (96-2295), 1:2
- Reilly, 1:4
- RNC (94-5248), 2:5

### Reports
- Electronic Filing, 2:1
- Schedule for 1997, 1:6
- Special Election, New Mexico, 4:3
- Special Election, Texas, 3:6; 4:3

### 800 Line
- Amended Reports, 4:2
- Debt settlement and committee termination, 1:8