



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1325 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

THIS IS THE END OF MUR # 1091

Date Filmed 5/14/80 Camera No. --- 2

Cameraman bpc

176
APR 19 1980
FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

30740184177

PS Form 3811, Aug. 1978

● SENDER: Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
Add your address in the "RETURN TO" space on reverse.

The following service is requested (check one):
 Show to whom and date delivered _____
 Show to whom, date, and address of delivery _____
 RESTRICTED DELIVERY
 Show to whom and date delivered _____
 RESTRICTED DELIVERY.
 Show to whom, date, and address of delivery \$ _____
 (CONSULT POSTMASTER FOR FEES)

2. ARTICLE ADDRESSED TO:
Steven Mudd
17597 Arroyo Way
Fontana, California 92335

3. ARTICLE DESCRIPTION:
 REGISTERED NO. | CERTIFIED NO. | INSURED NO.
 | *944153* | |

(Always obtain signature of addressee or agent)

I have received the article described above.
 SIGNATURE Addressee Authorized agent
Steven Mudd

4. DATE OF DELIVERY | POSTMARK
3-15-80 |

5. ADDRESS (Complete only if requested)

6. UNABLE TO DELIVER BECAUSE: | CLERK'S INITIALS

RETURN RECEIPT REGISTERED, INSURED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

☆ GPO: 1978-272-382

MU 1091

Perce

PS Form 3811, Aug. 1978

● SENDER: Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
Add your address in the "RETURN TO" space on reverse.

1. The following service is requested (check one):
 Show to whom and date delivered _____
 Show to whom, date, and address of delivery _____
 RESTRICTED DELIVERY
 Show to whom and date delivered _____
 RESTRICTED DELIVERY.
 Show to whom, date, and address of delivery \$ _____
 (CONSULT POSTMASTER FOR FEES)

2. ARTICLE ADDRESSED TO:
Mark Haxford
6743 E. Cox Dr.
Paramount, California 90723

3. ARTICLE DESCRIPTION:
 REGISTERED NO. | CERTIFIED NO. | INSURED NO.
 | *944158* | |

(Always obtain signature of addressee or agent)

I have received the article described above.
 SIGNATURE Addressee Authorized agent
Frank Haxford

4. DATE OF DELIVERY | POSTMARK
 | *MAR 15 1980* |

5. ADDRESS (Complete only if requested)

6. UNABLE TO DELIVER BECAUSE: | CLERK'S INITIALS
 | *Ray* |

RETURN RECEIPT REGISTERED, INSURED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

☆ GPO: 1978-272-382

MU 1091

D Perce



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

March 6, 1980

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mark Hannaford
6743 E. Caro Street
Paramount, California 90723


Re: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Hannaford:

On January 16, 1980, the Commission notified you of a complaint alleging that you may have violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended or Chapters 95 and 96 of Title 26, U.S. Code.

The Commission, on March 6, 1980, determined that on the basis of the information in the complaint and information provided by you, that there is no reason to believe that a violation of any statute within its jurisdiction has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission has closed its file in this matter. This matter will become a part of the public record within 30 days.

Sincerely,


Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

30040184178

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mark Hannaford
6743 E. Caro Street
Paramount, California 90723

Re: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Hannaford:

On January 16, 1980, the Commission notified you of a complaint alleging that you may have violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended or Chapters 95 and 96 of Title 26, U.S.C. Code.

The Commission, on _____, 1980, determined that on the basis of the information in the complaint and information provided by you, that there is no reason to believe that a violation of any statute within its jurisdiction has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission has closed its file in this matter. This matter will become a part of the public record within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Charles M. Steele
General Counsel

3/6
MSJ

30040104179



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

March 6, 1980

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Steven Mudd
17597 Orange Way
Fontana, California 92335

Re: MUR 1091


Dear Mr. Mudd:

The Federal Election Commission has reviewed the allegations of your complaint dated November 16, 1979 and determined that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint and information provided by the Respondent that there is no reason to believe that a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 as amended "(the Act)" or Chapters 95 and 96 of Title 26, U.S. Code has been committed.

Accordingly, the Commission has decided to close the file in this matter.

Should additional information come to your attention which you believe establishes a violation of the Act, please contact Dolores Pesce, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202)523-4039 on Wednesdays and Fridays.

Sincerely,


Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

30040184130



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

MEMORANDUM TO: CHARLES STEELE *mwe*
FROM: MARJORIE W. EMMONS/MARGARET CHANEY *mc*
DATE: MARCH 6, 1980
SUBJECT: Comments Regarding MUR 1091 - First General
Counsel's Report dated 3-3-80

Attached is a copy of Commissioner Reiche's
vote sheet with comments regarding MUR 1095.

3
1
1
3
1
1
1
0
0
3

ATTACHMENT:
Copy of Vote Sheet



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1325 K STREET N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

30 MAR 4
P 5:04

Date and Time Transmitted: 3-4-80
11:00

Commissioner FRIEDERSDORF, AIKENS, TIERNAN, MCGARRY, REICHE, HARRIS

RETURN TO OFFICE OF COMMISSION SECRETARY BY: 3-6-80
11:00

MUR No. 1091 First General Counsel's Report dated 3-3-80

- I approve the recommendation
- I object to the recommendation

COMMENTS: But not without some fear that the filing data may not be as represented.

Date: 3/4/80 Signature: Frank P. Reiche

THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL WILL TAKE NO ACTION IN THIS MATTER UNTIL THE APPROVAL OF FOUR COMMISSIONERS IS RECEIVED. PLEASE RETURN ALL PAPERS NO LATER THAN THE DATE AND TIME SHOWN ABOVE TO THE OFFICE OF COMMISSION SECRETARY. ONE OBJECTION PLACES THE ITEM ON THE EXECUTIVE SESSION AGENDA.

3004101134

KT
5

March 3, 1980

MEMORANDUM TO: Marjorie W. Emmons
FROM: Elissa T. Garr
SUBJECT: MUR 1091

Please have the attached First General Counsel's Report on MUR 1091 distributed to the Commission on a 48 hour tally basis.

Thank you.

3
1
1
0
1
0
0
1
0
0
1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
1325 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20400

FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

DATE AND TIME OF TRANSMITTAL
BY OGC TO THE COMMISSION 3-3-80

MUR # 1091
DATE COMPLAINT RECEIVED
BY OGC 11-27-79

STAFF MEMBER D. Pesce

COMPLAINANT'S NAME: Steven Mudd

RESPONDENT'S NAME: Mark Hannaford

RELEVANT STATUTE: 2 U.S.C. §§ 431(b), 432(e)(1), 437g(a)
(3)(A) 11 C.F.R. § 100.2, § 101.2(a)

INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED: Mark Hannaford for Congress' files
Congressman Charles H. Wilson's files

FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED: None

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

Steven Mudd, acting on behalf of Charles H. Wilson of the 31st Congressional District in California, filed a complaint alleging that Mark Hannaford has violated certain FECA provisions. (Attachment I). Specifically, the complaint contends that Mr. Hannaford is a declared 1980 Congressional Candidate in the 31st District with an established political committee, Mark Hannaford for Congress. Accordingly, Mr. Hannaford would be in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1), 11 C.F.R. § 101.2(a) for failing to file a Statement of Candidate for Nomination or Election to Federal Office within 30 days after attaining candidate status.^{1/}

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1), 11C.F.R. § 101.2(a) Violation

The Act defines a candidate as "an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election, to Federal office." An

^{1/} P.L. 96-187 has amended this provision to require filing within 15 days after attaining candidate status. However, since the possible violation occurred before the new law took effect, the 30 day provision of the earlier Act will be considered relevant to our analysis. Similarly, while P.L. 96-187 altered the indicia for candidate status, the indicia provided by the earlier Act will be stated here.

individual is a candidate for Federal office, whether or not elected, whenever any of the following events occur:

- 1) The individual has taken the action necessary under the law of a state to qualify himself for nomination for election or election, to federal office; or
- 2) The individual has received contributions or made expenditures, or has given his consent for any other person to receive contributions or make expenditures, with a view to bringing about his nomination for election, or election, to such office;

2 U.S.C. § 431(b),
11 C.F.R. § 100.2.

30010131137
In providing evidence for Mark Hannaford's candidate status, the complaint includes an October 5, 1979 Los Angeles Times news clipping which reports the announcement of Hannaford's candidacy "on Thursday" - presumably October 4 (Attachment 1, Exhibit A). In addition, the complaint provides a letter dated October 22, 1979, sent by Hannaford to various PACs in solicitation of funds, in which he states that he made a loan of \$17,000 in personal funds to the campaign (Attachment 1, Exhibit B). Personal loans are considered "contributions" pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 431(e)(1). It thus appears that, no later than October 22, Hannaford was a candidate for federal office.

11 C.F.R. § 101.2(a) provides that:

Within 30 days after attaining candidate status an individual is required to file a Statement of Candidate for Nomination or Election to Federal Office on FEC Form 2, or file by a letter containing the same information in which such candidate shall -

- (1) Designate a principal campaign committee in accordance with § 102.11, and
- (2) Designate at least one national or State bank as a campaign depository under § 103.1.

See also 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1).

Since it appears that Mr. Hannaford was a candidate no later than October 22, he should have filed a Statement of Candidate within 30 days of that date.

The Commission notified Mr. Hannaford of its receipt of the Mudd/Wilson complaint (Attachment 2), and on February 6, Mr. Hannaford's response to the notification was received (Attachment 3).

The response states that the campaign requested and obtained the proper FEC filing forms in mid-October. After sending the forms to the Clerk of the House and a copy to the Secretary of State's office in Sacramento, the organization failed to receive confirmation of the filing from Washington. On January 8, 1980, Mrs. Wechsler of the campaign committee telephoned the FEC to inquire if we had received the forms. She was told that the forms had not been received and was advised by an analyst in RAD to send a new filing to the Clerk of the House. The Commission has since received the filing and the Committee's first required finance report.

It is the respondent's contention that the original filing to the Clerk of the House was lost in the mail. Evidence as to the dating of that original filing lies in the copy sent to the Secretary of State in Sacramento: the form is dated October 26 and was received on November 23.^{2/} There is no way to ascertain to what degree a mail delay might account for the near month-long period for delivery. Assuming normal mail service and posting on the date of the form (October 26), the filing would have been received in Washington within the 30 day period allowed by § 432(e)(1), 11 C.F.R. § 101.2(a).

The evidence thus indicates that Mr. Hannaford acted in a timely fashion with regard to FEC registration; moreover, having received no confirmation of its filing, the Committee initiated action to rectify the situation. Therefore, the Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe that Mark Hannaford violated 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1), 11 C.F.R. § 101.2(a) by failing to file a Statement of Candidate for Nomination or Election to Federal Office within 30 days after attaining candidate status.

^{2/} This information was provided in a telephone conversation with a staff member at the Secretary of State's office on February 8, 1980.

Section § 437g(a)(3)(A)^{3/}

This section provides that, in the case where the complainant is a candidate, there be an investigation of the complainant's reports and statements filed with the FEC. Since this matter was generated by Steven Mudd on behalf of Congressman Charles H. Wilson, we have looked to Mr. Wilson's reporting record with the Commission. He has properly filed a statement of organization for the 1980 election, and his previous reporting record is clear of violations.

Recommendation

1. Find no reason to believe that Mark Hannaford violated 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1), 11 C.F.R. § 101.2(a) by failing to file a Statement of Candidate for Nomination or Election to Federal Office within 30 days after attaining candidate status.
2. Approve and send the attached letters.
3. Close the file.

Attachments

1. Complaint
2. Notification letter
3. Letter from respondent
4. Letters to respondent and complainant.

^{3/} P.L. 96-187 has eliminated this requirement under the enforcement procedures. However, since the complaint was filed before P.L. 96-187 took effect, we have included a § 437g(a)(3)(A) analysis here.

30011134139

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

GCC# 11736 MUR1091

November 16, 1979 79 NOV 26 PM 2 03

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

005128

Dear Mr. Steele:

This letter will constitute an official inquiry as to whether Mr. Mark Hannaford is in violation of the Federal Election Commission rules and regulations contained in Title 18, United States Code Section 443. You should be aware that I am filing this citizen's complaint on behalf of Congressman Charles H. Wilson.

I am enclosing various documents showing that Mr. Hannaford has announced his official candidacy as a Congressional candidate in the 31st Congressional District in the State of California.

The October 5, 1979 issue of the Los Angeles Times stated in an article that Mark Hannaford officially announced his candidacy as a Congressional candidate in the 31st Congressional District. On October 22, 1979, he sent a letter to various PAC's soliciting funds. This past week additional letters were received in the mail, again soliciting funds, and you will note from the enclosed copies, that one of these letters announced a fundraising reception to be held on November 15, at Club 116 in Washington, D.C.

I understand that such a candidate must file a Statement of Organization with the FEC within 10 days of his first announcement as a candidate. I have checked with your Commission, and have been advised that as of this date no such report has been filed -- so you may also consider this a letter of complaint, as well as an official inquiry.

I feel that as a former Congressman, Mr. Hannaford should be clearly aware of the FEC rules and regulations, and I will, therefore, appreciate a report from you on this matter at the earliest possible date.


79 NOV 26 P 2: 56

RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE
GENERAL COUNSEL

ATTACHED 1

0011011000

EXHIBIT A



The Papagos call the 250-year-old pilgrimage 100 to 200 miles from their reservation homes in Arizona across the international border to this tiny village "Ma-toe-he-e Magdalena"—"the long journey to Magdalena."

There are families here from Topawa, Ak Chut, Vaya Chin, Quijotoa, Hickiwan, Kots Kug and all 74 Papago villages on the big Arizona reservation.

Men and women weeping openly and unashamedly filed by the statue of St. Francis lying on his back in an alcove of the church. One Indian lifted the statue and shook it, pleading in Papago: "St. Francis, please. I pray to you, make my wife well again."

Similar emotional outcries occurred time and again.

There is no other Indian tradition comparable to "Ma-toe-he-e." Each year most of the 10,000 Papagos living on the reservation in southwest Arizona embark en masse for the long journey south to this village, the cradle of their faith.

Papago reservation schools close. Men and women leave their jobs to be in Magdalena Oct. 4, the day of the

major patron saint.

most important religious and social event of the year for the Papagos.

In years gone by it was a tradition for the entire population of Papagos to make the long trek across the hot, barren Sonora Desert on foot or in horse-drawn wagons.

Now, most come in caravans of cars, vans and pickups. Many also come by bus and train from Nogales, Mex. And scores of Indians still spend days walking in family groups to be here Oct. 4.

It was here in Magdalena in 1690 that the Jesuit priest Eusedio Kino founded the mission Santa Maria Magdalena in ancestral Papago country. Today the village of Magdalena is populated by Mexicans, not Papagos.

Kino, who established 25 missions in northwestern Sonora, Arizona and California—none of which is standing today—administered to the Papagos for 40 years.

He brought the Indians Christianity

Please Turn to Page 28, Col. 3

But that approach to reducing the state Medi-Cal budget has failed to win the approval of the Legislature.

The staff report points out that it would at least take a year to put into effect a lid on hospital Medi-Cal payments.

Federal approval is necessary for any change in the current system that reimburses hospitals for their reasonable costs in the care of Medi-Cal and Medicare patients.

The staff paper also discusses putting a limit on the amount that hospitals could charge their private patients as well.

The health facilities commission is scheduled to look at the cost containment proposal, or some variation of it, at its meeting on Oct. 15 in San Diego.

Hannaford in House Race

Former Democratic Rep. Mark Hannaford, defeated last year for reelection in the Long Beach area, officially announced Thursday that he is moving into an adjacent district to the north to challenge Democratic Rep. Charles H. Wilson in the next year's Democratic primary.

The formal announcement came as no surprise, since Hannaford last month said he was strongly considering the move.

The 54-year-old former congressman said Wilson, a nine-termer, has grown bored with Congress, has a poor attendance record and often travels the world at taxpayer expense. By contrast, Hannaford said, he is anxious to serve.

The man who defeated Hannaford, Republican Rep. Dan Lungren, is widely believed to be politically invulnerable to a challenge, so Hannaford was drawn to the race against Wilson.

LATE PESTICIDE RULES ORDERED

Mandate of Environmental Quality Act, Official Says

and ambiguous." Regulations had from farmers as too consuming and from as inadequate to

the Board of Agricul-

Losses

actor-Obesity Pro- e direction of Dr. al and Dr. Leslie

while these results achieved by con- t least five years ore the study will f the data that he for a thorough

however, the pre- good, he said.

hat the vast ma- high blood pres- sional if they suc- Vertes said. In

ture, Director Richard E. Rominger said, "The original proposals do not meet the mandates of the California Environmental Quality Act." He did not outline alternatives.

However, he said the revised regulations will be more harsh on chemical companies, which will be required to provide information on the effects of various pesticides on the environment.

The regulations are intended to determine what pesticides will be used, under what conditions they will be used, who will monitor their effects and how.

At a news conference, Rominger acknowledged that the regulations will increase the cost of agricultural products in the long run, but he noted that consumers also want more controls over the use of pesticides.

A controversial attorney general's opinion some time ago held that to comply with the CEQA, farmers had to prepare cumbersome environmental impact reports when they intended to use pesticides, a task they said was nearly impossible.

Legislation enacted last year required the department to develop a pesticide regulatory program which was intended to substitute for the environmental impact report in pesti-

cides were "unclear and ambiguous and did not provide adequate direction to registration applicants."

"I have ordered my staff to rewrite these provisions to make them clear and specific," the director said, "and to require chemical companies to provide the department with all information that they have available relevant to registration decisions."

"In addition, the standards for Please Turn to Page 28, Col. 6

CHP CALLS OFF GAME BENEFITING GAY CENTER

A softball game between off-duty California Highway Patrol officers and a gay team was canceled here last weekend after a CHP commander learned that profits from the game would go to the Gay Community Services Center, the commander said Thursday.

Capt. Ray Johnson of the CHP Central Area said he had not taken part in arrangements for the game between his area team and the Los Angeles Gay All-Stars at Hollywood High School but that "it was my understanding that it was to raise money for kids."

When Johnson learned that the proceeds would go to the center, he said, he canceled CHP participation.

Johnson said the CHP team plays in games for charity only when the CHP can designate where the money goes. Usually, he said, institutions such as Childrens Hospital or the Orthopaedic Hospital are the beneficiaries.

"We are a government organization and we work for the state of California," Johnson said.

October 22, 1979

This letter will explain why I am running against Charlie Wilson in the 1980 primary and why I know I can beat him.

Charlie is extremely vulnerable and for several reasons that we all understand. I have the benefit of a benchmark poll that says he has low name identification, low voter approval, and that each and all of his several transgressions are dynamite issues. He was identified as being highly vulnerable in the next primary by the California Journal. He has been targeted by BIPAC, though in a 4 to 1 district.

He got only 40% of the vote in the last primary with only 23,000 votes and ran substantially behind the Democratic registration in the general.

Since that time he has not improved his status. He has been reprimanded by his colleagues in the House and has suffered various other unfavorable publicity.

Of course they will try to use the carpetbag issue. I can deal with it. The new home I bought in the district is a five minute drive from my home of the past 25 years. I will have the endorsement of many public officials and community leaders and will walk precincts like no-one else can. He doesn't own a house in the district, is never there, and hails from outside the district.

I have taken the following steps that illustrate my level of commitment to the campaign:

1. Quit an excellent job in Washington to return to my college teaching job.
2. Bought a home in the new district.
3. Made a loan of \$17,000 in personal funds to the campaign.
4. Contracted for the services of Larry Levine, of "The Campaign Organization" to run the campaign. He's good. He's a winner, and he knows the district.
5. Begun plans for a series of early fund raisers from over 1,000 individual contributors.
6. Made many phone calls to major supporters and received unanimous positive response. Some have sent checks.
7. Solicited the support of many community leaders in the district.
8. Appointed a finance chairman and bookkeeper.
9. Drawn up a lean but winnable campaign plan which involves a six-hour a day personal walking program starting the first of the year. My health is such that I can do so and I am committed to it.

It will be a hard hitting but honest campaign, pulling no punches in exposing the record of two Congressmen: Mark Hannaford and Charlie Wilson. I am devoted to Congressional service and am in splendid physical and mental condition for a tough campaign.

But frankly I am going to have to scratch to meet our budget. I estimate that I can raise \$75,000 from my individual donors. I have some encouragement from some PAC's. Many agree that it's a great idea but are afraid to come out in front with me and that is the reason that the Charlie Wilsons of this world survive.

October 22, 1979

Page 3

Of course, I should be able to raise significant funds from those in the 31st District who have contributed to Wilson's opponents in the past, which was over \$100,000 in 1978.

In short, I can certainly win if a few PAC's will step forward with me, and when I do win I'm going to be around for a long and active career. I hope your Committee will be able to help me do so.

If you need any further information, don't hesitate to call me at (213) 925-3983.

Warm regards,



MARK W. HANNAFORD

MWH/be

Mark

HANNAFORD

for Congress

6743 E. Caro St.,
Paramount, CA 90723

30071104175

EXHIBIT C

Dear Friends:

As one who has been a generous financial supporter in my previous campaign, you should know why I am now running against a fellow Democrat in the 1980 primary and why I know I can win that contest.

Be assured that I have not undertaken this without careful study. This election is decided in the Democratic primary since the registration is 75.5% Democratic to 18.2% Republican. The incumbent, Charles Wilson, is extremely vulnerable and for many good reasons. I have the benefit of a benchmark poll that spells out that vulnerability in no uncertain terms. He was identified as being highly vulnerable in the next primary by the California Journal. He got only 40% of the vote in the last primary with only 23,000 votes and ran substantially behind the Democratic registration in the general election.

The new home I bought in the district is a five minute drive from my home of the past 25 years. I will have the endorsement of many public officials and community leaders and will walk precincts like no one else can.

The campaign is now well organized. I have contracted with one of the most successful campaign firms in the state, committed substantial personal funds, and organized a series of fundraisers from over 1,600 previous contributors. Early response has been very good. In a word, we are off and running and we are going to win.

It will be a hard hitting but honest campaign, pulling no punches in exposing the record of two Congressmen: Mark Hannaford and Charlie Wilson. I am devoted to Congressional service and am in splendid physical and mental condition for a tough campaign.

I am totally committed to this campaign. I am equally committed to the same kind of dedication to problem solving and personal attention that has won your generous support in the past, and when I return, I'm going to be there for a long and active career.

Early funds are extremely important in attracting later support. I hope that I can count on you again when my committee contacts you.

Warm regards,

MARK HANNAFORD
MH/be

1
50
100
200

9
6
1
3
0
1
1
0
0
6

EXHIBIT D

First, let me thank you for your support in my previous campaigns. I have tried always to be worthy of that trust.

As you may know, I am contesting Charles E. Wilson for the Democratic nomination in the 31st Congressional District. It is a worthy cause and I hope you can support it.

You know the case that I can make in this campaign. The only question is whether or not I can raise sufficient funds to make that case. In my last campaign I raised \$145,000 in individual donations alone and I have every indication that a substantial amount of that support will be with me in this campaign, which is a good starting point.

The enclosure explains the campaign and fundraising prospects. All is going well, but obviously early funds are important.

Some friends are having a reception on November 15, at the 116 Club, 224 - 3rd Street, N.W. from 5:30 to 7:30. I hope that you can make a contribution in the enclosed envelope and stop by the reception. If you are not in a position to contribute at this time, I hope you will stop by for a drink and a visit anyway. Please R.S.V.P. in either event.

I hope to see you on the 15th

Warm regards,



MARK W. HANNAPORD
MWH/be

Lucy



As always, Mark, I want to help with your election campaign.
Here is my contribution.

\$ _____ \$50 _____ \$100 _____ \$200 _____ \$ _____

Yes! I will be able to attend the event at ~~your~~
~~home.~~ *the 116 Club*

Sorry. I can't be with you this time but please let
me know where the victory party will be.

Please help us comply with the Political Reform Act by providing the following information:

Name _____

Home address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Business address _____


City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Firm _____ Occupation _____

Home phone _____ Business phone _____

Authorized by Mark Hannaford for Congress committee. A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

Please make checks payable to: Mark Hannaford for Congress



Mark Hannaford
Page Two

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please have such counsel so notify us in writing.

If you have any questions, please contact Dolores Pesce, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202) 523-4039 on Wednesdays and Fridays. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedure for handling complaints.

Sincerely,



Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

Enclosures

Complaint
Procedures

3001131277

Mark

400 293

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

HANNAFORD
for Congress

'80 FEB 5 PM 12:24

January 30, 1980

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

008188

RE: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Steele,

There is a tendency, when faced with a letter such as yours of January 16, 1980, and a complaint such as that of Mr. Mudd in this matter, to want to respond item by item to the matters addressed in the complaint.

On reflection, however, I have decided not to do so in this matter because such a response is most probably the exact action Mr. Mudd sought in his clearly politically-motivated letter.

Rather, what I shall do here is provide for you the facts necessary for final disposition of this matter and then I shall present those facts which prove the clear political motivation of Mr. Mudd's letter.

In mid-October, 1979, Shirley Wechsler, bookkeeper of the Hannaford for Congress campaign phoned the Federal Election Commission offices in Washington, D.C., to request that forms for filing a Committee Statement of Organization be sent to her along with other material pertinent to filing of reports for a federal election campaign. At the time of that request, Mr. Hannaford and the Hannaford campaign committee had not solicited nor received any campaign contributions. However, in response to various inquiries from the news media Mr. Hannaford had declared that he intended to become a candidate for the 31st Congressional District. The next logical extension of that decision would be to begin to seek support and contributions and having decided to move on to that next step, the campaign contacted the Commission to request the necessary forms.

Those forms arrived in short order and were completed and mailed to the Federal Election Commission in Washington, D.C. with copies sent to the Secretary of State's office in Sacramento, California. Concurrently, we began to schedule fundraising activities and to solicit and accept campaign contributions. By mid-December we had received no confirmation that our Statement of Organization had been received in Washington and no notification of our federal

cont'd...

ATM... VT 3

identification number. We recognized that the ID number would not be used until filing our first finance report after the end of December. For that reason and because we recognize that many offices operate with reduced staffs during the holiday season, we waited until after the start of the New Year to see if we might receive a communication from the Commission. Having received no such communication, Mrs. Wechsler phoned Commission offices on January 8, 1980 and spoke with Beverly White, a report Analyst with the Federal Election Commission. Ms. White said she would log the call and recommended we send a new filing to the Clerk of the House with a cover letter explaining the situation. That was done immediately. I might point out here that it was our campaign which initiated this communication and that we did so because we know what the law requires, because we had complied with that law and because we realized something was amiss when we had received no reply by the end of December.

On January 18, 1980, Mrs. Wechsler again called the Commission office in Washington and received verification that the new filing had been received. I believe a check of your records will verify the facts as stated above.

It is clear that our original filing went astray in the mail. as evidence of this, may I point out that we sent a copy of the original filing to the Secretary of State of California at the same time we mailed the original to Washington. The records of the Secretary of State show receipt of our Statement of Organization prior to the date on which you received the complaint from Mr. Mudd.

In summary: 1) upon deciding to seek this federal office, Mr. Hannaford's campaign contacted your office by phone to ask for the appropriate forms; 2) upon receipt of those forms they were completed and copies mailed to the Clerk of The House in Washington and the Secretary of State in California; 3) having received no confirmation of receipt of our filing in Washington and no notification of assignment of an ID number, the campaign phoned the Commission to find out what was happening; 4) upon learning that the filing had not been received by the Clerk of the House, the campaign immediately filed a new form with the Clerk and has now received all appropriate confirmations and ID numbers; 5) the campaign has filed its first required finance report with the commission on time and has reported accurately all receipts and expenditures required on that report; 6) upon receipt of your letter notifying us of the complaint in this matter, we checked with the Secretary of State of California and learned that her office had in fact received the copy of the Statement of Organization we mailed to her at the same time as the original mailing to the Clerk of the House.

As for the political nature of Mr. Mudd's complaint, may I point out the following: 1) in his letter Mr. Mudd states that he is complaining on behalf of Congressman Charles H. Wilson, our opponent in this campaign; 2) our first knowledge of this complaint came when we received your certified letter on January, 23, 1980 -- six days after some of the papers in our district carried stories in


cont'd...

which Mr. Wilson, somewhat dramatically, accused us of violating federal campaign law by not registering as a committee; 3) in that story a Fred Eiland of the Federal Election Commission is quoted as saying he had no record of a complaint against the Hannaford campaign and Mr. Wilson's aide is quoted as saying a complaint would be filed by a citizen in the district; 4) Mr. Mudd gives his address as being in San Bernardino county and says in his letter of November 16, 1979 that he is writing to complain on behalf of Mr. Wilson.

What is going on couldn't be more clear. Mr. Wilson is a cornered and desperate politician, already reprimanded by the House of Representatives for his Koreagate involvement and now under investigation for 15 charges of bribery, perjury, and payroll kickbacks. In a frantic effort to divert attention from his own sad record, he and his lackies are pointing fingers at everyone else. The net effect of all this will be a waste of some staff time at the Federal Election Commission to look into a complaint that is motivated purely by politics and, I suppose, a couple of newspaper stories that Mr. Wilson's campaign will reproduce and mail to voters in an attack on his campaign opponents.

I hope this provides sufficient information for your swift resolution of this matter. If there is anything else we can do to assist your efforts, or any other information we can provide, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,



Richard DeBie
Treasurer

P.S. -- Since this whole problem seems to have arisen because our original filing was lost in the mail, I might point out a twist of irony in that Mr. Wilson is a member of the House postal committee. Mr. Wilson has traveled all over the world at taxpayers expense in recent years and has justified some of those travels by saying he was inspecting how foreign postal systems work. Perhaps, he should stay home and keep his eyes on how our own postal system is working. Someone more cynical than I might be tempted to draw a less humorous conclusion regarding our lost mail and Mr. Wilson's committee assignment.



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mark Hannaford
6743 E. Caro Street
Paramount, California 90723

Re: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Hannaford:

On January 16, 1980, the Commission notified you of a complaint alleging that you may have violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended or Chapters 95 and 96 of Title 26, U.S. Code.

The Commission, on _____, 1980, determined that on the basis of the information in the complaint and information provided by you, that there is no reason to believe that a violation of any statute within its jurisdiction has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission has closed its file in this matter. This matter will become a part of the public record within 30 days.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20463

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Steven Mudd
17597 Orange Way
Fontana, California 92335

Re: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Mudd:

The Federal Election Commission has reviewed the allegations of your complaint dated November 16, 1979 and determined that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint and information provided by the Respondent that there is no reason to believe that a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 as amended "(the Act)" or Chapters 95 and 96 of Title 26, U.S. Code has been committed.

Accordingly, the Commission has decided to close the file in this matter.

Should additional information come to your attention which you believe establishes a violation of the Act, please contact Dolores Pesce, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202)523-4039 on Wednesdays and Fridays.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

3001191075

Mark ●

200#
293

FEDERAL
C

HANNAFORD
for Congress

'80 FEB 12 24

January 30, 1980

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

00188

RE: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Steele,

There is a tendency, when faced with a letter such as yours of January 16, 1980, and a complaint such as that of Mr. Mudd in this matter, to want to respond item by item to the matters addressed in the complaint.

On reflection, however, I have decided not to do so in this matter because such a response is most probably the exact action Mr. Mudd sought in his clearly politically-motivated letter.

Rather, what I shall do here is provide for you the facts necessary for final disposition of this matter and then I shall present those facts which prove the clear political motivation of Mr. Mudd's letter.

In mid-October, 1979, Shirley Wechsler, bookkeeper of the Hannaford for Congress campaign phoned the Federal Election Commission offices in Washington, D.C., to request that forms for filing a Committee Statement of Organization be sent to her along with other material pertinent to filing of reports for a federal election campaign. At the time of that request, Mr. Hannaford and the Hannaford campaign committee had not solicited nor received any campaign contributions. However, in response to various inquiries from the news media Mr. Hannaford had declared that he intended to become a candidate for the 31st Congressional District. The next logical extension of that decision would be to begin to seek support and contributions and having decided to move on to that next step, the campaign contacted the Commission to request the necessary forms.

Those forms arrived in short order and were completed and mailed to the Federal Election Commission in Washington, D.C. with copies sent to the Secretary of State's office in Sacramento, California. Concurrently, we began to schedule fundraising activities and to solicit and accept campaign contributions. By mid-December we had received no confirmation that our Statement of Organization had been received in Washington and no notification of our federal

cont'd...

identification number. We recognized that the ID number would not be used until filing our first finance report after the end of December. For that reason and because we recognize that many offices operate with reduced staffs during the holiday season, we waited until after the start of the New Year to see if we might receive a communication from the Commission. Having received no such communication, Mrs. Wechsler phoned Commission offices on January 8, 1980 and spoke with Beverly White, a report Analyst with the Federal Election Commission. Ms. White said she would log the call and recommended we send a new filing to the Clerk of the House with a cover letter explaining the situation. That was done immediately. I might point out here that it was our campaign which initiated this communication and that we did so because we know what the law requires, because we had complied with that law and because we realized something was amiss when we had received no reply by the end of December.

On January 18, 1980, Mrs. Wechsler again called the Commission office in Washington and received verification that the new filing had been received. I believe a check of your records will verify the facts as stated above.

It is clear that our original filing went astray in the mail. as evidence of this, may I point out that we sent a copy of the original filing to the Secretary of State of California at the same time we mailed the original to Washington. The records of the Secretary of State show receipt of our Statement of Organization prior to the date on which you received the complaint from Mr. Mudd.

In summary: 1) upon deciding to seek this federal office, Mr. Hannaford's campaign contacted your office by phone to ask for the appropriate forms; 2) upon receipt of those forms they were completed and copies mailed to the Clerk of The House in Washington and the Secretary of State in California; 3) having received no confirmation of receipt of our filing in Washington and no notification of assignment of an ID number, the campaign phoned the Commission to find out what was happening; 4) upon learning that the filing had not been received by the Clerk of the House, the campaign immediately filed a new form with the Clerk and has now received all appropriate confirmations and ID numbers; 5) the campaign has filed its first required finance report with the commission on time and has reported accurately all receipts and expenditures required on that report; 6) upon receipt of your letter notifying us of the complaint in this matter, we checked with the Secretary of State of California and learned that her office had in fact received the copy of the Statement of Organization we mailed to her at the same time as the original mailing to the Clerk of the House.

As for the political nature of Mr. Mudd's complaint, may I point out the following: 1) in his letter Mr. Mudd states that he is complaining on behalf of Congressman Charles H. Wilson, our opponent in this campaign; 2) our first knowledge of this complaint came when we received your certified letter on January, 23, 1980 -- six days after some of the papers in our district carried stories in


cont'd...

which Mr. Wilson, somewhat dramatically, accused us of violating federal campaign law by not registering as a committee; 3) in that story a Fred Eiland of the Federal Election Commission is quoted as saying he had no record of a complaint against the Hannaford campaign and Mr. Wilson's aide is quoted as saying a complaint would be filed by a citizen in the district; 4) Mr. Mudd gives his address as being in San Bernardino county and says in his letter of November 16, 1979 that he is writing to complain on behalf of Mr. Wilson.

What is going on couldn't be more clear. Mr. Wilson is a cornered and desperate politician, already reprimanded by the House of Representatives for his Koreagate involvement and now under investigation for 15 charges of bribery, perjury, and payroll kickbacks. In a frantic effort to divert attention from his own sad record, he and his lackies are pointing fingers at everyone else. The net effect of all this will be a waste of some staff time at the Federal Election Commission to look into a complaint that is motivated purely by politics and, I suppose, a couple of newspaper stories that Mr. Wilson's campaign will reproduce and mail to voters in an attack on his campaign opponents.

I hope this provides sufficient information for your swift resolution of this matter. If there is anything else we can do to assist your efforts, or any other information we can provide, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,


Richard DeBie
Treasurer

P.S. -- Since this whole problem seems to have arisen because our original filing was lost in the mail, I might point out a twist of irony in that Mr. Wilson is a member of the House postal committee. Mr. Wilson has traveled all over the world at taxpayers expense in recent years and has justified some of those travels by saying he was inspecting how foreign postal systems work. Perhaps, he should stay home and keep his eyes on how our own postal system is working. Someone more cynical than I might be tempted to draw a less humorous conclusion regarding our lost mail and Mr. Wilson's committee assignment.

Mark

HANNAFORD

for Congress

6743 E. Caro St.,
Paramount, CA 90723

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

REGISTERED
NO. 11379

**RETURN RECEIPT
REQUESTED**



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

January 16, 1980

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Mr. Mark Hannaford
6743 E. Caro St.
Paramount, CA 90723

RE: MUR 1091

Dear Mr. Hannaford:

This letter is to notify you that on November 26, 1979, the Federal Election Commission received a complaint which alleges that you may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The relevant provision is 2 U.S.C. § 432(e)(1) which provides that:

Each candidate for Federal office (other than the nominee for the office of Vice President) shall designate in writing a political committee in accordance with paragraph (3) to serve as the principal campaign committee of such candidate. Such designation shall be made no later than 15 days after becoming a candidate...

A copy of the complaint is enclosed.

We have numbered this matter MUR 1091. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have an opportunity to demonstrate, in writing, that no action should be taken against you in connection with this matter. Your response must be submitted within 15 days of receipt of this letter. If no response is received within 15 days, the Commission may take further action based on the available information.

Please submit any factual or legal materials which you believe are relevant to the Commission's analysis of this matter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath.

Mark Hannaford
Page Two

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please have such counsel so notify us in writing.

If you have any questions, please contact Dolores Pesce, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202) 523-4039 on Wednesdays and Fridays. For your information, we have enclosed a brief description of the Commission's procedure for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

Enclosures

Complaint
Procedures

3 0 0 1 0 1 3 4 2 1 1

● SENDER: Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Add your address in the "RETURN TO" space on reverse.	
1. The following service is requested (check one). <input type="checkbox"/> Show to whom and date delivered. <input type="checkbox"/> Show to whom, date, and address of delivery. <input type="checkbox"/> RESTRICTED DELIVERY Show to whom and date delivered. <input type="checkbox"/> RESTRICTED DELIVERY Show to whom, date, and address of delivery. \$ (CONSULT POSTMASTER FOR FEES)	
2. ARTICLE ADDRESSED TO: <i>Mark Hannaford</i>	
3. ARTICLE DESCRIPTION: REGISTERED NO. <i>189576</i>	INSURED NO.
(Always obtain signature of addressee or agent)	
I have received the article described above. SIGNATURE: <input type="checkbox"/> Addressee <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Authorized agent <i>Mark Hannaford</i>	
4. DATE OF DELIVERY: <i>62 JAN 28 1977</i>	POSTMARK
5. ADDRESS (complete only if requested) <i>MISSISSIPPI</i>	
6. UNABLE TO DELIVER BECAUSE: <i>NOT IN OFFICE</i>	
CLERK'S INITIALS <i>DL</i>	

75 Form 3874, Apr. 1977 RETURN RECEIPT, REGISTERED, INSURED AND CERTIFIED MAIL

★GPO: 1977-0-249-595

Mark. 10/1 - Pesce



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

November 28, 1979

Mr. Steven Mudd
17597 Orange Way
Fontana, California 92335

Dear Mr. Mudd:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your complaint of November 16, 1979, alleging violations of the Federal Election Campaign Laws. A staff member has been assigned to analyze your allegations and a recommendation to the Federal Election Commission as to how this matter should be handled will be made shortly. You will be notified as soon as the Commission determines what action should be taken. For your information, we have attached a brief description of the Commission's preliminary procedures for the handling of complaints.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Hal Ponder".

Hal Ponder
Assistant General Counsel

Enclosure

3001101212

GCC#
11736
MVR 1091

FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION

November 16, 1979 79 NOV 26 PM 2 03

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

005128

Dear Mr. Steele:

This letter will constitute an official inquiry as to whether Mr. Mark Hannaford is in violation of the Federal Election Commission rules and regulations contained in Title 18, United States Code Section 443. You should be aware that I am filing this citizen's complaint on behalf of Congressman Charles H. Wilson.

I am enclosing various documents showing that Mr. Hannaford has announced his official candidacy as a Congressional candidate in the 31st Congressional District in the State of California.

The October 5, 1979 issue of the Los Angeles Times stated in an article that Mark Hannaford officially announced his candidacy as a Congressional candidate in the 31st Congressional District. On October 22, 1979, he sent a letter to various PAC's soliciting funds. This past week additional letters were received in the mail, again soliciting funds, and you will note from the enclosed copies, that one of these letters announced a fundraising reception to be held on November 15, at Club 116 in Washington, D.C.

I understand that such a candidate must file a Statement of Organization with the FEC within 10 days of his first announcement as a candidate. I have checked with your Commission, and have been advised that as of this date no such report has been filed -- so you may also consider this a letter of complaint, as well as an official inquiry.

I feel that as a former Congressman, Mr. Hannaford should be clearly aware of the FEC rules and regulations, and I will, therefore, appreciate a report from you on this matter at the earliest possible date.

79 NOV 26 P 2: 56


RECEIVED
NOV 26 1979

Mr. Charles Steele
Federal Election Commission
November 16, 1979
Page Two

If you need to contact me, my address and phone number is as follows:

17597 Orange Way
Fontana, California 92335
(714) 822-6741

Very truly yours,




Steven Mudd

Enclosures

Subscribed and sworn to before me this

23 day of November, 1979



NOTARY PUBLIC in and for the State of California

30010134214



onor patron saint.

The Papagos call the 200-year-old pilgrimage 100 to 200 miles from their reservation homes in Arizona across the international border to this tiny village "Ma-toe-he-e Magdalena"—"the long journey to Magdalena."

There are families here from Topawa, Ak Chut, Vaya Chin, Quijotoa, Hickiwan, Kots Kug and all 74 Papago villages on the big Arizona reservation.

Men and women weeping openly and unashamedly filed by the statue of St. Francis lying on his back in an alcove of the church. One Indian lifted the statue and shook it, pleading in Papago: "St. Francis, please, I pray to you, make my wife well again."

Similar emotional outcries occurred time and again.

There is no other Indian tradition comparable to "Ma-toe-he-e." Each year most of the 10,000 Papagos living on the reservation in southwest Arizona embark en masse for the long journey south to this village, the cradle of their faith.

Papago reservation schools close. Men and women leave their jobs to be in Magdalena Oct. 4, the day of the

Times map

most important religious and social event of the year for the Papagos.

In years gone by it was a tradition for the entire population of Papagos to make the long trek across the hot, barren Sonora Desert on foot or in horse-drawn wagons.

Now, most come in caravans of cars, vans and pickups. Many also come by bus and train from Nogales, Mex. And scores of Indians still spend days walking in family groups to be here Oct. 4.

It was here in Magdalena in 1690 that the Jesuit priest Eusedio Kino founded the mission Santa Maria Magdalena in ancestral Papago country. Today the village of Magdalena is populated by Mexicans, not Papagos.

Kino, who established 25 missions in northwestern Sonora, Arizona and California—none of which is standing today—administered to the Papagos for 40 years.

He brought the Indians Christianity

—Please Turn to Page 28, Col. 3

But that approach to reducing the state Medi-Cal budget has failed to win the approval of the Legislature.

The staff report points out that it would at least take a year to put into effect a lid on hospital Medi-Cal payments.

Federal approval is necessary for any change in the current system that reimburses hospitals for their reasonable costs in the care of Medi-Cal and Medicare patients.

The staff paper also discusses putting a limit on the amount that hospitals could charge their private patients as well.

The health facilities commission is scheduled to look at the cost containment proposal, or some variation of it, at its meeting on Oct. 15 in San Diego.

Hannaford in House Race

Former Democratic Rep. Mark Hannaford, defeated last year for reelection in the Long Beach area, officially announced Thursday that he is moving into an adjacent district to the north to challenge Democratic Rep. Charles H. Wilson in the next year's Democratic primary.

The formal announcement came as no surprise, since Hannaford last month said he was strongly considering the move.

The 54-year-old former congressman said Wilson, a nine-term, has grown bored with Congress, has a poor attendance record and often travels the world at taxpayer expense. By contrast, Hannaford said, he is anxious to serve.

The man who defeated Hannaford, Republican Rep. Dan Lungren, is widely believed to be politically invulnerable to a challenge, so Hannaford was drawn to the race against Wilson.

LATE PESTICIDE RULES ORDERED

at Mandate of Environmental Quality Act, Official Says

and ambiguous." Regulations drafted from farmers as too consuming and from as inadequate to

the Board of Agricul-

Losses

actor-Obesity Pro- direction of Dr. and Dr. Leslie

while these results achieved by con- at least five years fore the study will f the data that he for a thorough

however, the pre- good, he said.

that the vast ma- high blood pres- normal if they suc- Vortex said. In

ture, Director Richard E. Rominger said, "The original proposals do not meet the mandates of the California Environmental Quality Act." He did not outline alternatives.

However, he said the revised regulations will be more harsh on chemical companies, which will be required to provide information on the effects of various pesticides on the environment.

The regulations are intended to determine what pesticides will be used, under what conditions they will be used, who will monitor their effects and how.

At a news conference, Rominger acknowledged that the regulations will increase the cost of agricultural products in the long run, but he noted that consumers also want more controls over the use of pesticides.

A controversial attorney general's opinion some time ago held that to comply with the CEQA, farmers had to prepare cumbersome environmental impact reports when they intended to use pesticides, a task they said was nearly impossible.

Legislation enacted last year required the department to develop a pesticide regulatory program which was intended to substitute for the environmental impact report in pesti-

icides were "unclear and ambiguous and did not provide adequate direction to registration applicants."

"I have ordered my staff to rewrite these provisions to make them clear and specific," the director said, "and to require chemical companies to provide the department with all information that they have available relevant to registration decisions."

"In addition, the standards for

—Please Turn to Page 28, Col. 6

CHP CALLS OFF GAME BENEFITING GAY CENTER

A softball game between off-duty California Highway Patrol officers and a gay team was canceled here last weekend after a CHP commander learned that profits from the game would go to the Gay Community Services Center, the commander said Thursday.

Capt. Ray Johnson of the CHP Central Area said he had not taken part in arrangements for the game between his area team and the Los Angeles Gay All-Stars at Hollywood High School but that "it was my understanding that it was to raise money for kids."

When Johnson learned that the proceeds would go to the center, he said, he canceled CHP participation.

Johnson said the CHP team plays in games for charity only when the CHP can designate where the money goes. Usually, he said, institutions such as Children's Hospital or the Orthopaedic Hospital are the beneficiaries.

"We are a government organization and we work for the state of California," Johnson said, "and we got people jumping all over me."

October 22, 1979

This letter will explain why I am running against Charlie Wilson in the 1980 primary and why I know I can beat him.

Charlie is extremely vulnerable and for several reasons that we all understand. I have the benefit of a benchmark poll that says he has low name identification, low voter approval, and that each and all of his several transgressions are dynamite issues. He was identified as being highly vulnerable in the next primary by the California Journal. He has been targeted by BIPAC, though in a 4 to 1 district.

He got only 40% of the vote in the last primary with only 23,000 votes and ran substantially behind the Democratic registration in the general.

Since that time he has not improved his status. He has been reprimanded by his colleagues in the House and has suffered various other unfavorable publicity.

Of course they will try to use the carpetbag issue. I can deal with it. The new home I bought in the district is a five minute drive from my home of the past 25 years. I will have the endorsement of many public officials and community leaders and will walk precincts like no-one else can. He doesn't own a house in the district, is never there, and hails from outside the district.

51210110001

October 22, 1971

Page 2

I have taken the following steps that illustrate my level of commitment to the campaign:

1. Quit an excellent job in Washington to return to my college teaching job.
2. Bought a home in the new district.
3. Made a loan of \$17,000 in personal funds to the campaign.
4. Contracted for the services of Larry Levine, of "The Campaign Organization" to run the campaign. He's good. He's a winner, and he knows the district.
5. Begun plans for a series of early fund raisers from over 1,000 individual contributors.
6. Made many phone calls to major supporters and received unanimous positive response. Some have sent checks.
7. Solicited the support of many community leaders in the district.
8. Appointed a finance chairman and bookkeeper.
9. Drawn up a lean but winnable campaign plan which involves a six-hour a day personal walking program starting the first of the year. My health is such that I can do so and I am committed to it.

It will be a hard hitting but honest campaign, pulling no punches in exposing the record of two Congressmen: Mark Hannaford and Charlie Wilson. I am devoted to Congressional service and am in splendid physical and mental condition for a tough campaign.

But frankly I am going to have to scratch to meet our budget. I estimate that I can raise \$75,000 from my individual donors. I have some encouragement from some PAC's. Many agree that it's a great idea but are afraid to come out in front with me and that is the reason that the Charlie Wilsons of this world survive.

Of course, I should be able to raise significant funds from those in the 31st District who have contributed to Wilson's opponents in the past, which was over \$100,000 in 1978.

In short, I can certainly win if a few PAC's will step forward with me, and when I do win I'm going to be around for a long and active career. I hope your Committee will be able to help me do so.

If you need any further information, don't hesitate to call me at (213) 925-3983.

Warm regards,



MARK W. HANNAFORD
MWH/be

Mark

HANNAFORD

for Congress

6743 E. Caro St.,
Paramount, CA 90723

Dear Friend:

As one who has been a generous financial supporter in my previous campaign, you should know why I am now running against a fellow Democrat in the 1980 primary and why I know I can win that contest.

Be assured that I have not undertaken this without careful study. This election is decided in the Democratic primary since the registration is 75.6% Democratic to 18.2% Republican. The incumbent, Charles Wilson, is extremely vulnerable and for many good reasons. I have the benefit of a benchmark poll that spells out that vulnerability in no uncertain terms. He was identified as being highly vulnerable in the next primary by the California Journal. He got only 40% of the vote in the last primary with only 23,000 votes and ran substantially behind the Democratic registration in the general election.

The new home I bought in the district is a five minute drive from my home of the past 25 years. I will have the endorsement of many public officials and community leaders and will walk precincts like no one else can.

The campaign is now well organized. I have contracted with one of the most successful campaign firms in the state, committed substantial personal funds, and organized a series of fundraisers from over 1,600 previous contributors. Early response has been very good. In a word, we are off and running and we are going to win.

It will be a hard hitting but honest campaign, pulling no punches in exposing the record of two Congressmen: Mark Hannaford and Charlie Wilson. I am devoted to Congressional service and am in splendid physical and mental condition for a tough campaign.

I am totally committed to this campaign. I am equally committed to the same kind of dedication to problem solving and personal attention that has won your generous support in the past, and when I return, I'm going to be there for a long and active career.

Early funds are extremely important in attracting later support. I hope that I can count on you again when my committee contacts you.

Warm regards,

MARK HANNAFORD
MH/be

10
12
20

HANNAFORD

for Congress

First, let me thank you for your support in my previous campaigns. I have tried always to be worthy of that trust.

As you may know, I am contesting Charles E. Wilson for the Democratic nomination in the 31st Congressional District. It is a worthy cause and I hope you can support it.


You know the case that I can make in this campaign. The only question is whether or not I can raise sufficient funds to make that case. In my last campaign I raised \$145,000 in individual donations alone and I have every indication that a substantial amount of that support will be with me in this campaign, which is a good starting point.

The enclosure explains the campaign and fundraising prospects. All is going well, but obviously early funds are important.

Some friends are having a reception on November 15, at the 116 Club, 234 - 3rd Street, N.W. from 5:30 to 7:30. I hope that you can make a contribution in the enclosed envelope and stop by the reception. If you are not in a position to contribute at this time, I hope you will stop by for a drink and a visit anyway. Please R.S.V.P. in either event.

I hope to see you on the 15th

Warm regards,



MARK W. HANNAFORD
MWH/be

Lucy



As always, Mark, I want to help with your election campaign.
Here is my contribution.

\$ _____ \$50 _____ \$100 _____ \$200 \$ _____

Yes! I will be able to attend the event at ~~your~~
~~home.~~ *the 116 Club*

Sorry. I can't be with you this time but please let
me know where the victory party will be.

Please help us comply with the Political Reform Act by providing the following information:

Name _____

Home address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Business address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Firm _____ Occupation _____

Home phone _____ Business phone _____

Authorized by Mark Hannaford for Congress committee. A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

Please make checks payable to: **Mark Hannaford for Congress**



Steven Mudd
17597 Orange Way
Fontana, CA 92335



80040184222

Mr. Charles Steele
Office of General Council
Federal Election Commission
1325 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

RETURN RECEIPT
REQUESTED

CERTIFIED
P07
MAIL

