FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

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

THIS IS THE END OF MUR # 2155

Date Filmed 6/2/86 Camera No. --- 2

Cameraman AS

8604059021 1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

Duplicate Documents, Routing Slips, Comment Sheets, 12 Day Reports

The above-described material was removed from this file pursuant to the following exemption provided in the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. Section 552(b):

X	(1) Classified Information	___	(6) Personal privacy
X	(2) Internal rules and practices	___	(7) Investigatory files
___	(3) Exempted by other statute	___	(8) Banking Information
___	(4) Trade secrets and commercial or financial information	___	(9) Well Information (geographic or geophysical)
X	(5) Internal Documents		

Signed John K. Drury

date May 23, 1986

FEC 9-21-77

TRW 7/28/86

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 1 2

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

May 22, 1986

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director
Life Amendment Political Action
Committee, Inc.
P.O. Box 1804
Medford, OR 97501

Re: MUR 2155
Bob Packwood for U.S.
Senate Committee
Senator Robert Packwood

Dear Mr. Woodrow:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations of your complaint dated March 24, 1986, and determined that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, there is no reason to believe that a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act") has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission has decided to close the file in this matter. The Federal Election Campaign Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Should additional information come to your attention which you believe establishes a violation of the Act, you may file a complaint pursuant to the requirements set forth in 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1) and 11 C.F.R. § 111.4.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

By Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

8604059021 3

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

May 22, 1986

Jan W. Baran, Esquire
1776 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: MUR 2155
Bob Packwood for U.S.
Senate Committee
Senator Robert Packwood

Dear Mr. Baran:

On April 3, 1986, the Federal Election Commission notified your clients of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.

The Commission, on May 14, 1986, determined that on the basis of the information in the complaint there is no reason to believe that a violation of any statute within its jurisdiction has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission 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

By Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

8604059021 4

BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

In the Matter of	)	
	)	MUR 2155
Senator Robert Packwood	)	
Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate	)	
Committee	)	

CERTIFICATION

I, Marjorie W. Emmons, Secretary of the Federal Election Commission, do hereby certify that on May 14, 1986, the Commission decided by a vote of 6-0 to take the following actions in MUR 2155:

1. Find no reason to believe that Senator Robert Packwood and the Bob Packwood for Senate Committee violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.

2. Close the file.

3. Approve and send the letters as attached to the First General Counsel's Report signed May 8, 1986.

Commissioners Aikens, Elliott, Harris, Josefiak, McDonald and McGarry voted affirmatively for this decision.

Attest:

5-15-86
Date

Mary W. Dove for
Marjorie W. Emmons
Secretary of the Commission

Received in Office of Commission Secretary:	Mon.,	5-12-86,	10:21
Circulated on 48 hour tally basis:	Mon.,	5-12-86,	4:00
Deadline for vote:	Wed.,	5-14-86,	4:00

86040590215

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
999 E. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

SENSITIVE

FIRST GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

12 A10:21

MUR # 2155
DATE COMPLAINT RECEIVED
BY OGC: 3/27/86

DATE OF NOTIFICATION TO
RESPONDENTS: April 3, 1986

STAFF MEMBER: John Drury

COMPLAINANT'S NAME:	Rick Woodrow Executive Director Life Amendment Political Action Committee, Inc.
RESPONDENTS' NAMES:	Senator Robert Packwood Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate Committee
RELEVANT STATUTE:	None
INTERNAL REPORTS CHECKED:	None
FEDERAL AGENCIES CHECKED:	None

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

On March 27, 1986, the attached complaint arrived at the Office of General Counsel. (See Attachment I). As complainant, Rick Woodrow - Executive Director of the Life Amendment Political Action Committee, Inc. of Medford, Oregon - alleges that the Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate Committee ("the Committee") and Senator Robert Packwood violated federal election law by making alleged misrepresentations in a fund-raising letter sent out by the Committee, and by purportedly offering to distribute money to other candidates.

86040590216

FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

In item 1, the complainant alleges that the statement "Today I learned that the Conservative Caucus -- a powerful right-wing group - has targeted me for defeat in 1986." is untrue. Mr. Woodrow remarks, "I have personally spoken with Mr. Howard Phillips of the Conservative Caucus and this organization has not targeted Packwood, nor have they spent any money on the Oregon 1986 Senate race." The response from Senator Packwood and his committee cites two news articles which quote Howard Phillips as listing Packwood as a Senator who should be targeted for defeat in 1986. Even if the allegation were true, it would not give rise to a violation of the Act.

In item 2, Mr. Woodrow alleges that the following statement by Packwood is a misrepresentation: "With the armies of the Right mobilizing against me, I can do nothing less than match them dollar for dollar. That means raising at least $170,000 by February 20th." Woodrow contends that "[t]he truth of the matter is that Senator Packwood and his committee have in fact raised more than $6,000,000. The statement that Packwood must raise $170,000 is a blatant lie. The fact of the matter is that the only organization actively working to defeat Packwood is our organization, and our 1985 year end report shows we have raised less than $75,000." In response, Senator Packwood and his committee submitted an excerpt of a press conference in which Mr. Woodrow is quoted as saying that his organization will

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 1 7

devote an unlimited amount of money to defeat Senator Packwood. In any case, a purported misrepresentation of this kind is not a violation of the Act.

As his third contention, Woodrow alleges that "Packwood was already attempting to diffuse some of the criticism he has received by offering to give some of it away to other candidates." Assuming that complainant intends the word "it" in this sentence to refer to money and not to criticism, the allegation does not reveal a violation of the Act. The respondents state: "The Committee has supported the Oregon Republican Party and Republican candidates as alleged. There is nothing in the Act to prohibit this."

As his final allegation, Mr. Woodrow asserts that "[a]t the same time this letter was being sent out, the Packwood campaign was attempting to 'buy out' his opposition by offering the Oregon Republican Party and the Lutz for Senate [sic] large sums of money if Lutz would drop out." Such a matter would be within the Justice Department's jurisdiction. However, inasmuch as the allegation is merely a bald assertion without any foundation, there appears to be an insufficient basis to justify a referral to that agency. Senator Packwood and his committee state, "For the record, respondents deny this unsubstantiated claim."

An examination of the complaint and the accompanying correspondence from the Committee fails to reveal a violation of

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 1 8

the Act. This is confirmed by the respondents' reply. (See Attachment II). Therefore, this Office recommends that the Commission find no reason to believe that the respondents violated the Act, close the file in this matter, and approve the attached letters.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Find no reason to believe that Senator Robert Packwood and the Bob Packwood for Senate Committee violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.

2. Close the file.

3. Approve and send the attached letters.

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

May 8, 1986
Date

BY: Kenneth A. Gross
Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Attachments
Complaint
Respondents' Reply
Proposed Letters (2)

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 1 9

GCC#76

HAND DELIVERED

LIFE AMENDMENT POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.

P.O. BOX 1884 • GARRISONVILLE, VA 22463 • (703) 659-6129 or (703) 659-1530
Box 1804 Medford, Or. 97501 (503) 773-2832

Robert Sassone
Chairman

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director

March 24, 1986

Mr. Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel
Federal Elections Commission
Washington, D.C. 22463

Dear Mr. Gross:

Based on information we have obtained, (Exhibit A) we have reason to believe that the Packwood for Senate Committee and Senator Robert Packwood have violated federal election laws, as well as other federal statutes. We hereby request an immediate investigation into this matter.

Statement of Case

In a fund raising letter sent out by the Packwood for Senate Committee, and signed by Senator Bob Packwood the following misrepresentations were made:

(1) The letter states "Today I learned that the Conservative Caucus--a powerful right-wing group--has targeted me for defeat in 1986." I have personally spoken with Mr. Howard Phillips of the Conservative Caucus and this organization has not targeted Packwood, nor have they spent any money on the Oregon 1986 Senate race.

(2) His letter further states, "With the armies of the Right mobilizing against me, I can do nothing less than match them dollar for dollar. That means raising at least $170,000 by February 20th." The truth of the matter is that Senator Packwood and his committee have in fact raised more than $6,000,000. The statement that Packwood must raise $170,000 is a blatant lie. The fact of the matter is that the only organization actively working to defeat Packwood is our organization, and our 1985 year end report shows we have raised less than $75,000.

(3) At the same time that this letter was being sent out, Packwood was already attempting to diffuse some of the criticism he has received by offering to give some of it away to other candidates.

(4) At the same time this letter was being sent out, the Packwood campaign was attempting to "buy out" his opposition by offering the Oregon Republican Party and the Lutz for Senate large sums of money if Lutz would drop out.

86040590220

Please be advised that, in addition to the complaint we are filing with your agency, we are also filing complaints of amil fraud with the U.S. Postmaster's office, as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The address we have for the respondents, namely the Packwood for Senate Committee and Senator Robert Packwood, are as follows:

Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate
P.O. Box 309
Portland, Or. 97207

Senator Robert Packwood
259 RSOB
Washington, D.C. 20510

We would appreciate your handling of this in an expeditious manner.

Sincerely yours,

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director

RW/ncb

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of March 1986.

My commission expires:

8-5-89

Notary Public

86040590221

AIR XPRESS

URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT

EXHIBIT A

Dear Friend,

Today I learned that the Conservative Caucus -- a powerful Right Wing group -- has targeted me for defeat in 1986.

Their claim?

That I am "out of step" with the conservative movement in America.

And this group of right wing zealots have pledged to do whatever it takes, spend whatever they must to deny my reelection to the United States Senate.

They are not alone.

The Life Amendment Political Action Committee -- a group whose goal is to deny to women the right of free choice -- plans to raise $600,000 in rallies across the country to defeat me.

"If we defeat Bob Packwood," says their Executive Director, it will send a message to every other pro-abortion Senator...Right now, he is worth all twelve of the deadly dozen by himself."

I will not be intimidated.

There is no way that I will back down from my support for the fundamental rights of Americans, for a strong and secure Israel and for the strict separation of Church and State.

And I want these groups to know that theirs is not the first hit list on which my name has appeared.

Have you ever heard of a group called the Aryan Nations?

This is a neo-Nazi organization whose program calls for the eradication of "Jews, Blacks, Hispanics and their supporters." On taking power, they say, they will use "nuclear bombs to destroy Israel."

The Aryan Nations do more than talk.

They kill.

Their members have been involved in several bloody shoot-outs with police and federal agents.

(over, please)

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 2

AIR XPRESS REPLY MEMO IN ENVELOPE ON OUTSIDE

Aryan Nations members are suspected of having murdered Alan Berg, a Denver talk show host and a Jew, who used his program to denounce groups that preach racial and religious hatred.

And last December, the F.B.I. learned that Aryan Nations thugs had decided to make an example of me -- an example of the fate they had in store for the non-Jewish supporters of Israel and of the American Jewish community.

I must admit, it was a frightening episode.

My family had to be guarded around the clock.

And unfortunately, this was not the first time.

In an earlier incident in 1977, my family required police protection when radical Arabs -- outraged over my support for Israel -- threatened to retaliate by kidnapping my children.

I know -- and history bears me out -- that if you stand for principle, you make enemies.

But I will continue -- as long as I'm in the Senate -- to fight for the principles in which I believe.

In a political sense, for example, a Senator from Oregon has little to gain from supporting the cause of Israel.

But for me the issue is not political gain. It is doing what is right.

That's why I:

-- led the successful fight to prevent the sale to Jordan of Stinger anti-aircraft missiles.

-- was the floor leader in the fight against the sale to Saudi Arabia of AWACS electronic surveillance aircrafts.

-- was the prime mover of the Israel Free Trade bill, a leading advocate of moving our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and an unfailing supporter of providing Israel with vitally important military and economic assistance.

And I will continue to take the lead -- regardless of the consequences -- in fighting against any arms sales that may be in the offing to Arab states that refuse to make peace with Israel.

Those are the principles I'm fighting for. Those are the things I stand for. Those are the things I will seek to promote and protect as long as I am in the United States Senate.

(next page, please)

86040590223

But to stay in the Senate, I urgently need your help.

Faced with a coalition of right-wingers and hate groups, my reelection campaign has just gotten much tougher.

And my enemies know they have one advantage -- I will never change or compromise on the basic principles of fairness and equality.

That is why I'm turning to you -- someone who I believe shares these principles and ideals.

I need you -- today -- to stand with me by contributing $500, $250, $100 or even $25 to my reelection campaign.

With the armies of the Right mobilizing against me, I can do nothing less than match them dollar-for-dollar.

That means raising at least $170,000 by February 20th.

So please, while this letter is still in your hands, join the fight.

I am counting on you.

Sincerely,

Bob Packwood

Bob Packwood

P.S. I've been in politics long enough to know that threats are a part of being a public figure. And I have enough faith in the American people -- and the police -- to think that my family will get the best protection possible. That same faith, the faith in the people, is what makes me believe that this campaign and the principles it will be run on will be successful. Your immediate help can justify that belief and that faith. Thank you.

Paid For By Packwood For Senate.

AE EXPRESS REPLY MEMO IN PLASTIC ON OUTSIDE ENVELOPE

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 4

GCC# 265.

WILEY & REIN

1776 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

JAN W. BARAN
(202) 429-7330

April 21, 1986

86 APR 21 P2:57

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION

Charles N. Steele, Esq.
General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 2155

Dear Mr. Steele:

This office represents Senator Bob Packwood and the Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate committee ("Committee") in the above-captioned matter. Enclosed please find an executed Statement of Designation of Counsel confirming our representation.

Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1) and 11 C.F.R. § 111.6(a) we hereby submit this letter in response to the complaint of March 24, 1986, filed by Rick Woodrow, Executive Director of the Life Amendment Political Action Committee, Inc. ("LAPAC"). For the reasons stated below the Federal Election Commission ("FEC") should find no reason to believe that Respondents have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended ("Act").

8604059025

DISCUSSION

LAPAC's complaint alleges that a fundraising letter by the Committee, a copy of which is attached to the complaint as Exhibit A, contains four "misrepresentations." Without citing any specific statute, complainant further alleges that Respondents "violated federal election laws, as well as other federal statutes." As will be demonstrated, Respondents have not violated any law and the fundraising letter does not contain misrepresentations. Each of the four claims are addressed separately.

1. The Conservative Caucus Has Targeted Senator Packwood.

The Committee's fundraising letter accurately states that Senator Packwood has been targeted by a political organization named the Conservative Caucus. LAPAC claims this is not true. Enclosed please find copies of two newspaper stories dated March 2, 1985, from the Baltimore Sun and in particular the Milwaukee Journal in which Howard Phillips, head of the Conservative Caucus cites Senator Packwood, among others, as a Senator who "should be targeted for defeat in 1986."

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 6

2. The Committee Needed $170,000.

The complaint alleges that the Committee's statement that it needed $170,000 in response to its letter was a "blatant lie." Enclosed please find a copy of a transcript from a January 23, 1985 press conference conducted by complainant Woodrow. On pages 16 and 17 Mr. Woodrow is quoted as saying that LAPAC will do "whatever it takes to defeat Senator Packwood and that it is "not going to put a lid on the expenditure." Mr. Woodrow also stated in July 1985 that LAPAC had committed $500,000 to $600,000 to defeat Senator Packwood. Klamath Falls Herald & News, July 14, 1985 (copy enclosed).

In light of Mr. Woodrow's threats of unlimited spending against the Senator, it truly is ironic that he now suggests that the Committee does not need all the money it can raise, let alone $170,000, to defend Senator Packwood's outstanding legislative record. LAPAC, by virtue of its frivolous complaint and political threats, demonstrates the justifiable need for substantial funding for Senator Packwood's re-election campaign.

3. The Committee has Contributed to the Oregon Republican Party and Republican Candidates.

The Committee has supported the Oregon Republican Party and Republican candidates as alleged. There is nothing in the

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 7

Act to prohibit this. FEC regulations permit contributions by a principal campaign committee to federal candidates up to $1,000 per election. 11 C.F.R. § 102.12(c)(2). There are no federal limits on contributions to candidates for state or local office. Unlimited transfers may be made to party committees. Id. § 113.2(c). There is no suggestion that any applicable limit has been exceeded.

4. Senator Packwood Has Not Attempted to "Buy-out" Any Opponent.

The Complaint makes an unsubstantiated claim that the Packwood campaign has attempted to "buy-out" an opponent in the Republican primary election campaign. For the record, respondents deny this unsubstantiated claim.

CONCLUSION

None of the allegations contained in the complaint constitute a violation of any provision of the Act. As shown above, the allegations themselves are false. For these

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 8

reasons the FEC should find no reason to believe that Senator Packwood and the Committee have violated the Act.

Sincerely,

WILEY & REIN

by: Jan W. Baran
Counsel for Senator
Bob Packwood
and Bob Packwood for
U.S. Senate

cc: The Honorable Bob Packwood

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 2 9

SUN
BALTIMORE, MD
M-180,000 S-370,00(

MAR-2 -85

Head of Conservative Caucus seeks ouster of Mathias, 4 other senators

Washington Bureau of The Sun

WASHINGTON — The chairman of the Conservative Caucus, declaring that the conservative movement was more important than maintaining GOP control of the Senate, yesterday urged the ouster of Maryland Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., and four other moderate Republicans.

During a panel discussion at the 12th annual Conservative Political Action conference being held here, Howard Phillips urged that Mr. Mathias and four colleagues be targeted for defeat when they come up for reelection in 1986.

"The politics of conservative victory requires not that we be faithful Republicans . . . but rather that we be uncompromising conservatives," the Conservative Caucus chairman asserted. "Conservative victory in 1986 is not necessarily defined as preserving the Republican majority in the U.S. Senate."

> *"Conservative victory requires not that we be faithful Republicans . . . but . . . uncompromising conservatives."*
> **HOWARD PHILLIPS**

Republicans currently outnumber Democrats in the Senate by 53 to 47.

"It sounds like a broken record," Mr. Mathias said of Mr. Phillips's remarks. "It's the kind of thing he's been saying for years."

Mr. Phillips specifically castigated Senator Mathias "as the last holdout in permitting a Senate expression of support for aid to the freedom fighters in Afghanistan."

"Oh, that little creep," exclaimed Ann Pincus, a spokesman for Mr. Mathias.

She said Mr. Phillips was referring to a resolution introduced two years ago by former Senator Paul Tsongas (D, Mass.) that Mr. Mathias objected to because it implied the United States would send troops to fight alongside the Afghan rebels.

The other moderate Republicans attacked by Mr. Phillips were Senators Bob Packwood of Oregon, Warren B. Rudman of New Hampshire, Mark Andrews of North Dakota and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

Broadsides from the conservative wing of his party are nothing new to Senator Mathias. Last summer, John T. Terry Dolan, chairman of the National Conservative Political Action Committee, suggested that the best service Mr. Mathias could perform for the GOP would be to bow out.

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL Saturday, March 2, 1985

Conservatives must move on issues, Reagan says

Washington, D.C. —AP— As conservatives ponder a post-Reagan political landscape, the president is telling them that they represent the mainstream of American thought, saying "now we must move" on issues ranging from taxes to Nicaragua.

"I believe we conservatives have captured a moment, captured the imagination of the American people," President Reagan said in a speech Friday night to the 12th annual dinner of the Conservative Action Political Conference, an umbrella organization of conservative groups.

"And what now? What are we to do with our success? Right now, with conservative thought accepted as mainstream thought, and with the people of our country leading the fight to freedom — now we must move," he said in a 30-minute speech interrupted 35 times by applause.

"The moment is ours, and we must seize it. There is work to do."

The president said he was against sending troops to Central America, but added that the rebels fighting Nicaragua's leftist government "need to know that the US supports them with more than just pretty words and good wishes."

Reagan saluted the Nicaraguan rebels as "the moral equal of our Founding Fathers and the brave men and women of the French resistance."

"We cannot turn away from them," he said.

Other conservatives at the conference also were looking to the future, considering what happens after Reagan's current term, which must be his last.

"The question is can we nominate and elect a conservative successor to the president," former White House aide Morton Blackwell said. "I say, yes, we can, but we can do so only if we have a candidate who can put together the entire Reagan winning coalition."

Howard Phillips, chairman of the Conservative Caucus, cited five GOP senators he said should be targeted for defeat in 1986 because they are too out of step with the conservative movement. He named Sens. Robert Packwood of Oregon, Warren Rudman of New Hampshire, Charles Mathias of Maryland, Mark Andrews of North Dakota and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

Other political developments:

Sen. Jesse Helms, throwing another roundhouse right at the nation's press, says the news media are composed of people with a "sneering contempt" for American values and suggests such organizations "are a real threat to our constitutional system." He also appealed to the Conservative Political Action Conference Friday to support the efforts of a conservative group to buy stock in CBS.

A team led by Prime Minister David Lange of New Zealand, who has barred US nuclear warships from his country's ports, narrowly defeated a team led by Moral Majority founder Rev. Jerry Falwell Friday in a debate at Oxford University in England over the morality of nuclear weapons.

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 3 1

PRESS CONFERENCE

Q & A FROM LIFE AMENDMENT PAC -- JANUARY 23, 1985

Q -- Do you have a sense of how much you'll spend? What's in the package?

A -- We'll spend whatever it takes. Right now, preliminary estimates are probably in the neighborhood of half a million dollars. We may go higher, we may go lower.

Q -- Are you looking at the primary or general election?

A -- We're looking at both. We're going to make every effort to defeat him in the primary. Obviously that will depend on the caliber of opposition opposed to it. I believe our greatest opportunity to defeat Bob Packwood is to beat him in the primary as opposed to the general election.

Q -- Would you have second thoughts if a pro-choice Democrat opposed him?

A -- No, we wouldn't because, basically, Packwood's record is so bad. He prides himself in his position on abortion. We feel that anyone in there would be better than Bob Packwood. If for no other reason than a rookie Senator serving would not have the clout that Bob Packwood has now

as Chairman of the Finance Committee and being in office since 1968. We would have no second thoughts, but we would obviously be much more enthused about it if there were a strong pro-life for his opposition.

Q -- What exactly do you plan to spend the money on?
A -- We will be doing, first of all, extensive training of volunteers throughout the state. We will be into the state extensively during the next two years. In addition, we will make use of the media - radio, television advertising, newspaper advertising. We are seriously considering, which is why we handed out a book that we put out in 1982 on Ted Kennedy, producing a similar book in relation to Bob Packwood.

Q -- What was the name of your booklet?

A -- "Every Family Has One"

Q -- Do you know what Packwood's margin of victory was in 1980?

A -- Yes, it was 8%. Bob Packwood, in 1980, only got 52% of the vote, which, for the kind of Republican year that it was, was a very poor showing. Since that time, because of his opposition to the President and lack of act in going about it, you know he has been removed as Chairman of the

Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. We feel he has "fallen from grace" considerably since 1980. We certainly aren't going to say it will be easy to beat Bob Packwood -- it won't be, but only getting 52% of the vote after being in the Senate since 1968 -- he had rather a weak year in 1980.

Q -- Do you have any specific candidates that you would like to see run against him?

A -- We'd like to see any strong, solid pro-lifer, Republican or Democrat. Obviously we'd like to see a pro-life Republican challenger in the primary. If that doesn't come to be, then certainly in the general election. We have no preferences of who that would be so long as they're pro-life.

Q -- Will you be contributing money to whoever that person is?

A -- It really would depend on who it is. Under federal election laws, we will be running an independent expenditure-type campaign which means we have no limit on what we can spend, so that whoever Packwood's opposition turns out to be, by law, we will not be allowed to have any contact with them whatsoever once they announce, but that does not preclude us from making a donation to a political campaign. We rarely make contributions to political

8604059023 4

campaigns. The history of LAPAC has been that we generally do a lot of independent work (unintelligible). We feel anybody can write a check. We'd rather go in and do the work

Q -- In doing the work, you're talking about what?

A -- Training the volunteers and mobilizing the forces. We have an entire political training system -- when people complete our training program, they are equipped to actually set up their own campaigns. We will be going into the state and training local people to do that.

Q -- Have you done that already?

A -- We've done that in numerous locations in the past.

Q -- But not in Oregon?

A -- No, this will be the first time in Oregon.

Q -- And how many people are you anticipating training?

A -- I'd suspect that by next fall, we will probably train in the neighborhood of three to five thousand volunteers.

Q -- How can you afford to go after one single candidate? Surely, there are a number of other pro-choice candidates that are up in 1986.

A -- True, there are, but none of them , first of all, prided themselves in their position as strongly as Packwood has. I believe as the Washington Post , a while back , they said that Bob Packwood is to the pro-abortion movement what Jesse Helms is to the pro-life movement.

Q -- Do you just not have the financial resources to launch campaigns against other candidates also?

A -- No, at this point, we're going to put all our resources in this Senate race. Now it may be that come next year, we'll decide there are some other races that we want to get into. We feel that if we can cut the power base -- if we can beat Bob Packwood in 1986 -- it's going to send the message out to every other pro-abortion Senator, particularly some of them that may walk the fence and fall on either side from time to time. We'll send a message loud and clear. Basically, what we want to do is cut the power base.

Q -- Is there anybody up in 1986 that is as critical to re-elect as Helms was?

A -- Of the Senators that are up for re-election, 15 are solidly pro-life, 15 are solidly pro-abortion, and the remaining few fall somewhere in between. I don't think they're as vocal as spokesmen as Senator Helms.

Q -- So you don't have to worry about protecting anybody?

A -- Right, there are some who are certainly going to try to protect and encourage their people back home, but it's going to be a strange election in 1986 because, traditionally, off-presidential-year elections are in favor of the party in power, so it's going to be a thing to look at. We're just going to kind of see what falls in place. We're pretty comfortable that the majority of the Senators who are pro-life will probably not have serious trouble.

Q - How much money did you raise in this last election?

A -- In this last election, just around $200,000. I don't have an exact figure from our account.

Q -- This is from the Senate and Congressional?

A -- Congressional, right, and Presidential we were also involved in. In 1982, another committee of LAPAC, which was organized to replace Kennedy, quoted that between the two organizations, they spent about $572,000. Last year it was

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 3 7

down some for several reasons. First of all, we got an incredible number of letters from our supporters saying they were sending money directly to Senator Helms, which we encouraged. And, secondly, I think most of the conservative PACs would say the same thing, once it became apparent that President Reagan was going to be re-elected easily, I think there was a let up in the conservative caucus and pro-life caucus because they felt secure. We've already been doing some preliminary contacts around the country, letting some of our supporters know what we're up to and letting them know in advance that we have received nothing but promises of solid support and I feel that raising half a million dollars against Bob Packwood is going to probably be the easiest task I've had since I came to LAPAC a year ago.

Q -- You're critical of Packwood in the statement of raising so much money for him out of state, yet you talk about raising $500,000. Are you going to do that in Oregon?

A -- I'm simply saying ...no, we're not going to raise it all in Oregon. We are a national PAC. We are not a U.S. Senator. It would seem to me that a U.S. Senator's greatest source of income would normally be by his constituents. In Packwood's case, I think it is by his constituents, unfortunately he does not represent the people of Oregon, he represents Gloria Steinem, Judy Goldsmith and some of the

other left wing radicals that are running loose in the country.

Q -- What do you intend to do with this coffin?

A -- I'm going to bring that to Senator Packwood's office today.

Q -- You alone?

A -- Yes, plus any press that decides to come with us. If any of you would like to come with me, I'd appreciate it. We basically want to let him know, very clearly, that we're very serious.

Q -- Are you going to invite arrest?

A -- No, we're not doing anything illegal whatsoever in this. There's nothing in it, so we're certainly not doing anything illegal. It will be interesting when we go through the security gate in the office building to see the reaction.

Q -- You don't have anything inside the coffin?

A -- No. We've considered some things, but we wanted to present a decent case.

Q -- Why would you deliver a coffin to the Senator's office?

A -- Because 18 million babies have never had the opportunity to even be placed in a coffin; they were placed in garbage bags. We want Senator Packwood to get the message very clearly that we are serious and we want him to take a look at the coffin and realize that we've heard figures all week between 15 and 18, I believe it's closer to 18, million babies have died. So this is something that's not gory, but it's in tact. I don't believe in splattering blood all over walls and some of the things that groups like the National Organization of Women have done in the past, but it's something I believe is tactful, some would question tasteful, but it gets the point across. We are dead serious because 18 million babies are seriously dead.

Q -- When did the National Organization of Women splatter blood all over the walls?

A -- I don't know the exact year, but it was back during the ERA battles in some of the state legislatures when they were demanding passage of their bill. There was blood splattered on the state assembly caucuses. In the state of Delaware, where I come from, just two years ago, the National Organization of Women delivered coat hangers to all the State Senators and State Representatives. I would think

that a coffin is in a little better taste than a coat hanger to get the point across on abortion rights.

Q -- You said that LAPAC is the largest and oldest pro-life group. When was it formed and how big are you?

A -- We were founded in 1977. Measuring size, and I don't have the exact figures, but by size we go by total expenditures -- last year we spent $200,000; the year before we spent $572,000; and I'm not sure what they spent in 1980. $200,000 was on various races throughout the country. Last year, also, we put tremendous emphasis into developing the training programs in the states. We trained approximately 3,000 pro-life volunteers in elections. Of the four races that we were directly and actively involved in, we won three.

Q -- These were races where you were supporters, right?

A -- No, these were races where we were targeting. The only race we lost of those four was the one we were supporting. We had targeted 12 people initially and many dropped off the list, for various reasons, by late summer. There were four campaigns we got involved in. Three of them we were going against the campaign; one of them we were working in support of the campaign. We won three out of four, which I thought was an extremely decent effort.

8604059024 1

Q -- So, you named 12 at the beginning?

A -- Right. We named 12 on Good Friday, which is extremely early, based on how we thought some developments were going happen and a lot of things changed on the political field from April until fall. One example is Ron Dellums, a Representative from California. We were going to target Dellums against Eldridge Cleaver, which would have made a three way race and all kinds of possibilites. When Cleaver dropped out, it became clear to us that it was not a winable race, and therefore, we didn't feel right taking our supporters' expenditures and putting them into a no-win situation.

Q -- Refresh my memory on the three you finally targeted.

A -- Clarence Long -- Maryland

Ike Andrews -- North Carolina

Jerry Patterson -- California

Clarence Long had been in the House of Representatives forever. Ike Andrews had been there a while. Jerry Patterson had been there not quite as long.

Q -- Was it because it was an off year that you had $200,000 as opposed to $572,000?

A -- I think there were a lot of circumstances. I think the presidential race ceased to be a race probably in September and that had something to do with it. Many of our supporters felt so strongly that they sent all their money to Jesse Helms, but we didn't care how Jesse Helms won as long as he won, so we had no problems with that. We had the money to do what we'd set out to do on it, so I felt that we took in what we needed to beat three out of four.

Q -- Who was the fourth?

A -- Vic Fazio from California. Vic Fazio is a master politician.

Q -- Are there any circumstances under which you think abortion is ok?

A -- No. The only one that I would even say is the life of the mother. I think the bill that was talked about yesterday "Equal Care" -- I support that. The life of the mother obsession is basically nonexistant in today's society with today's medical technology. So I think equal concern, equal care for both is vital. There are some situations, like ectopic pregnancies, which I personally do not consider an abortion, and I'm not speaking for all pro-lifers. There is absolutely no possibility for survival with an ectopic pregnancy. I don't consider that an abortion. The life of

the mother, the equal care, has settled the question of life of the mother. I can't perceive any other circumstances where we can justify abortion.

Q -- How many people are in your organization?

A -- We don't have membership. We have approximately, and this is a wild guess now because we're trying to tally up everything from last year, about 35,000 active supporters that we can pretty well count on consistently. Some of those will be supporters financially, some will be supporters who work for us in the area, but we don't have a membership.

Q -- What's your position?

A -- Executive Director.

Q -- And you're in the Garrison Building?

A -- Right. We're 35 miles south of Washington, we consider ourselves a Washington-based PAC; it's just that rent is a lot cheaper 35 miles south than it is in D.C. Really, I'm on the Hill only once or twice a week.

Q -- What is your name again?

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 4 4

A -- It's Rick Woodrow.

Q -- You said you've been Director for a year. What did you do before that?

A -- Before I came down to LAPAC, I was the president of the Parents' Action Committee/Christian Action Council in Wilmington, Delaware. They were basically a volunteer kind of business. I was active in the pro-life movement for about five years. It was a year ago yesterday that I accepted the position that I have now.

Q -- What about Katharine Hepburn? Do you target her in any way?

A -- No. When I was in Delaware, we did some work in the state legislature, but in Delaware I was not primarily involved politically, it was more in the education sense. Most of what I did in Delaware was working in the education light, which I feel as pro-life, we need to be working on what I call the three-fold appraoch: we need to be educated, we need to be working politically and we need to be in service organizations. In meeting the needs, it's not enough just to say to women, "You shouldn't have an abortion," we can't stand for the vile alternatives. At one time or another, I've been involved in all three aspects. I was delighted when I learned yesterday that Crisis Pregnancy

care centers, which go by different names, now outnumber abortion clinics by three to one. When Judy Goldsmith and some of the others say to us, "We're only concerned about the fetus," I think all we can do is prove that we are concerned about not just the baby, but we are also concerned about the mother and her welfare. We're putting our money where our mouth is.

Q -- You said LAPAC was formed in 1977. In 1980, did you spend money against Packwood?

A-- No, we didn't. In 1980, he was on our target list, but we did not spend money at that point. In 1980, we kept 10 of the 12 on the target.

Q -- Why didn't you spend money against Packwood in 1980?

A -- I think because we saw at that point in time that George McGovern and Birch Bayh and Frank Church were much more winable situations. Had we known Packwood was only going to get 52% of the vote in 1980, we may have spent some money up there, too. Basically, we got so heavily involved in these other elections. I don't have all the names here for you, but the three standouts of course were McGovern, Bayh and Church, who were three very national leaders - well known senators that were defeated. We put an awful lot of resources in there and in 1980, I think we reached a point

where we could only do so much. Again, hindsight is 20/20 when you look at Packwood only getting 52% of the vote. (Couldn't discern the last sentence but it sounded something like, "Boy, what we could've done.")

Q -- (I could not hear this question at all, but the answer had something to do with how much money was spent in 1980. He guessed that close to a half million was spent.)

Q -- Do you coordinate with other similar PACs in achieving your _____?

A -- No, we don't. That's totally illegal. If you get arrested for demonstrating, I don't know what they'd do if we were in collusion with other PACs. Under federal election laws, each PAC must come to their people that they're targeting, or working for, totally independently. Now if other PACs decide independently to jump on the band wagon, then the law certainly allows us to work with them. I hope they do.

Q -- You're spending all $500,000 that you raise on Packwood this time and nobody else?

A -- Right. At this point in time, that's correct. We will do whatever it takes to defeat Bob Packwood. If we have to raise $600,000 to defeat him, we'll do it; if we can do it

with $300,000, we'll do it. Right now he is worth all 12 of the deadly dozen. Bob Packwood is a deadly dozen in himself. That's why we call him Senator Death. So we will really do whatever it takes, and we're getting an almost two year running start on it. We're basically going to say we're not going to put a lid on the expenditure. We'll spend everything we have and just a little more.

Q -- Have you tested the political waters in Oregon? With his newfound power, is it going to be harder for you now?

A -- We have talked to a number of people in the state. In fact, I have a meeting tomorrow with someone from the state who is out here. We feel that Packwood has fallen in popularity somewhat. We have not seen with this new appointment as Finance Chairman any great cry out there that it's that significant -- there are certain committee positions that become relevant to the state such as Jesse Helms on the Agriculture Committee is a big deal for people in North Carolina -- Bob Packwood on the Finance Committee is no big thing for the people in Oregon -- they're just down-to-earth, normal people. They don't need a Senator with a big ego to flaunt that he's on the Finance Committee. I don't think most of the people out there really care and I wonder even how many even know.

END OF QUESTIONS

uly 14, 1985

Anti-Packwood drive starts

PORTLAND (UPI) — Abortion foes Friday unveiled a $1 million fund-raising campaign aimed at unseating Sen. Bob Packwood, R-Ore., due to his pro-choice stand and said they have a candidate who will run in the 1986 GOP primary.

"I came in to fire up some of the troops," Joe Scheidler of the Pro Life Action League in Chicago said upon arriving in the state for a four-day visit.

"I'm working on the pro-lifers, Christian community that opposes Packwood's stand on abortion," Scheidler said.

Scheidler said he planned to form the Pro-Life Action League Political Action Committee to receive funds for the drive in support of a candidate who would announce after Labor Day. He refused to disclose the person's name.

"All our eggs are in one basket, the Packwood basket," Scheidler said of the effort to defeat Packwood, who has amassed a multi-million dollar re-election campaign warchest of his own. "That will send a message to other pro-abortion senators and representatives that they are vulnerable."

Rick Woodrow, Garrisonville, Va., executive director of Life Amendment Political Action Committee, said his organization already had $300,000 to $500,000 committed to the campaign to defeat Packwood.

"We'll have at least 5,000 volunteers across the state, a very heavy commitment. Right now, we have 1,000 connected with us, whereas our original goal was 800 people by the end of July."

Woodrow said the groups realize Packwood has had a lot of success in the past in getting campaign funds from women's rights groups and others around the country.

"We already know 90 percent of his money came from out of state in 1980," he said of Packwood's last campaign. "New York City alone gave him 4½ times more than the whole state of Oregon."

Woodrow described Packwood as a "left-winger" who got support from people of a similar political leaning. He also said he expects the Oregon Republican Party to stay out the primary race.

"If the Republican hierarchy stays out of the race, it will let the primary fight be a primary," he said.

Woodrow said the candidate who they will back is "not holding office at this time."

There is one candidate who has announced he will try to keep Packwood from winning the GOP nomination for a fourth term next May.

Robert McDaniel, 45, a Klamath Falls certified public accountant, predicted last month he would raise $500,000 from national right-to-life groups.

"I'm very much a pro-life person, and Packwood does not represent my views at all," said McDaniel.

McDaniel, who is on the board of the Klamath Christian Academy and is a member of the Full Gospel Business Mens Fellowship, was reported by a fellow member of his firm Friday to be on the road seeking support. He said McDaniel had taken a 2-week vacation from his job to make the tour of the state.

K. Falls Herald + News
Sunday - July 14 '85
p. 16

JUL.16 '85 18:35 SEN PACKWOOD PORTLAND OREGON

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director
Life Amendment Political Action
Committee, Inc.
P.O. Box 1804
Medford, OR 97501

Re: MUR 2155
Bob Packwood for U.S.
Senate Committee
Senator Robert Packwood

Dear Mr. Woodrow:

The Federal Election Commission reviewed the allegations of your complaint dated March 24, 1986, and determined that on the basis of the information provided in your complaint, there is no reason to believe that a violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act") has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission has decided to close the file in this matter. The Federal Election Campaign Act allows a complainant to seek judicial review of the Commission's dismissal of this action. See 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(8).

Should additional information come to your attention which you believe establishes a violation of the Act, you may file a complaint pursuant to the requirements set forth in 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1) and 11 C.F.R. § 111.4.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

By Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Enclosure
General Counsel's Report

Attachment III Page 1

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

Jan W. Baran, Esquire
1776 K Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: MUR 2155
Bob Packwood for U.S.
Senate Committee
Senator Robert Packwood

Dear Mr. Baran:

On April 3, 1986, the Federal Election Commission notified your clients of a complaint alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended.

The Commission, on , 1986, determined that on the basis of the information in the complaint there is no reason to believe that a violation of any statute within its jurisdiction has been committed. Accordingly, the Commission 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

By Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Attach III Page 2

GCC# 265

WILEY & REIN

1776 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

JAN W. BARAN
(202) 429-7330

April 21, 1986

86 APR 21 P2:57
RECEIVED
OFFICE OF THE
GENERAL COUNSEL

Charles N. Steele, Esq.
General Counsel
Federal Election Commission
999 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20463

Re: MUR 2155

Dear Mr. Steele:

This office represents Senator Bob Packwood and the Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate committee ("Committee") in the above-captioned matter. Enclosed please find an executed Statement of Designation of Counsel confirming our representation.

Pursuant to 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a)(1) and 11 C.F.R. § 111.6(a) we hereby submit this letter in response to the complaint of March 24, 1986, filed by Rick Woodrow, Executive Director of the Life Amendment Political Action Committee, Inc. ("LAPAC"). For the reasons stated below the Federal Election Commission ("FEC") should find no reason to believe that Respondents have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended ("Act").

8604050252

DISCUSSION

LAPAC's complaint alleges that a fundraising letter by the Committee, a copy of which is attached to the complaint as Exhibit A, contains four "misrepresentations." Without citing any specific statute, complainant further alleges that Respondents "violated federal election laws, as well as other federal statutes." As will be demonstrated, Respondents have not violated any law and the fundraising letter does not contain misrepresentations. Each of the four claims are addressed separately.

1. The Conservative Caucus Has Targeted Senator Packwood.

The Committee's fundraising letter accurately states that Senator Packwood has been targeted by a political organization named the Conservative Caucus. LAPAC claims this is not true. Enclosed please find copies of two newspaper stories dated March 2, 1985, from the Baltimore Sun and in particular the Milwaukee Journal in which Howard Phillips, head of the Conservative Caucus cites Senator Packwood, among others, as a Senator who "should be targeted for defeat in 1986."

2. The Committee Needed $170,000.

The complaint alleges that the Committee's statement that it needed $170,000 in response to its letter was a "blatant lie." Enclosed please find a copy of a transcript from a January 23, 1985 press conference conducted by complainant Woodrow. On pages 16 and 17 Mr. Woodrow is quoted as saying that LAPAC will do "whatever it takes to defeat Senator Packwood and that it is "not going to put a lid on the expenditure." Mr. Woodrow also stated in July 1985 that LAPAC had committed $500,000 to $600,000 to defeat Senator Packwood. Klamath Falls Herald & News, July 14, 1985 (copy enclosed).

In light of Mr. Woodrow's threats of unlimited spending against the Senator, it truly is ironic that he now suggests that the Committee does not need all the money it can raise, let alone $170,000, to defend Senator Packwood's outstanding legislative record. LAPAC, by virtue of its frivolous complaint and political threats, demonstrates the justifiable need for substantial funding for Senator Packwood's reelection campaign.

3. The Committee has Contributed to the Oregon Republican Party and Republican Candidates.

The Committee has supported the Oregon Republican Party and Republican candidates as alleged. There is nothing in the

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 5 4

Act to prohibit this. FEC regulations permit contributions by a principal campaign committee to federal candidates up to $1,000 per election. 11 C.F.R. § 102.12(c)(2). There are no federal limits on contributions to candidates for state or local office. Unlimited transfers may be made to party committees. Id. § 113.2(c). There is no suggestion that any applicable limit has been exceeded.

4. Senator Packwood Has Not Attempted to "Buy-out" Any Opponent.

The Complaint makes an unsubstantiated claim that the Packwood campaign has attempted to "buy-out" an opponent in the Republican primary election campaign. For the record, respondents deny this unsubstantiated claim.

CONCLUSION

None of the allegations contained in the complaint constitute a violation of any provision of the Act. As shown above, the allegations themselves are false. For these

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 5 5

reasons the FEC should find no reason to believe that Senator Packwood and the Committee have violated the Act.

Sincerely,

WILEY & REIN

by: _____
Jan W. Baran
Counsel for Senator
Bob Packwood
and Bob Packwood for
U.S. Senate

cc: The Honorable Bob Packwood

R 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 5 6

SUN
BALTIMORE, MD
M-180,000 S-370,00(

MAR-2 -85

Head of Conservative Caucus seeks ouster of Mathias, 4 other senators

Washington Bureau of The Sun

WASHINGTON -- The chairman of the Conservative Caucus, declaring that the conservative movement was more important than maintaining GOP control of the Senate, yesterday urged the ouster of Maryland Senator Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., and four other moderate Republicans.

During a panel discussion at the 12th annual Conservative Political Action conference being held here, Howard Phillips urged that Mr. Mathias and four colleagues be targeted for defeat when they come up for reelection in 1986.

"The politics of conservative victory requires not that we be faithful Republicans . . . but rather that we be uncompromising conservatives," the Conservative Causcus chairman asserted. "Conservative victory in 1986 is not necessarily defined as preserving the Republican majority in the U.S. Senate."

> *"Conservative victory requires not that we be faithful Republicans . . . but . . . uncompromising conservatives."*
> **HOWARD PHILLIPS**

Republicans currently outnumber Democrats in the Senate by 53 to 47.

"It sounds like a broken record," Mr. Mathias said of Mr. Phillips's remarks. "It's the kind of thing he's been saying for years."

Mr. Phillips specifically castigated Senator Mathias "as the last holdout in permitting a Senate expression of support for aid to the freedom fighters in Afghanistan."

"Oh, that little creep," exclaimed Ann Pincus, a spokesman for Mr. Mathias.

She said Mr. Phillips was referring to a resolution introduced two years ago by former Senator Paul Tsongas (D, Mass.) that Mr. Mathias objected to because it implied the United States would send troops to fight alongside the Afghan rebels.

The other moderate Republicans attacked by Mr. Phillips were Senators Bob Packwood of Oregon, Warren B. Rudman of New Hampshire, Mark Andrews of North Dakota and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

Broadsides from the conservative wing of his party are nothing new to Senator Mathias. Last summer, John T. Terry Dolan, chairman of the National Conservative Political Action Committee, suggested that the best service Mr. Mathias could perform for the GOP would be to bow out.

THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL Saturday, March 2, 1985

Conservatives must move on issues, Reagan says

Washington, D.C. —AP— As conservatives ponder a post-Reagan political landscape, the president is telling them that they represent the mainstream of American thought, saying "now we must move" on issues ranging from taxes to Nicaragua.

"I believe we conservatives have captured the moment, captured the imagination of the American people," President Reagan said in a speech Friday night to the 12th annual dinner of the Conservative Action Political Conference, an umbrella organization of conservative groups.

"And what now? What are we to do with our success? Right now, with conservative thought accepted as mainstream thought, and with the people of our country leading the fight to freedom — now we must move," he said in a 30-minute speech interrupted 35 times by applause.

"The moment is ours, and we must seize it. There is work to do."

The president said he was against sending troops to Central America, but added that the rebels fighting Nicaragua's leftist government "need to know that the US supports them with more than just pretty words and good wishes."

Reagan saluted the Nicaraguan rebels as "the moral equal of our Founding Fathers and the brave men and women of the French resistance."

"We cannot turn away from them," he said.

Other conservatives at the conference also were looking to the future, considering what happens after Reagan's current term, which must be his last.

"The question is can we nominate and elect a conservative successor to the president," former White House aide Morton Blackwell said. "I say, yes, we can, but we can do so only if we have a candidate who can put together the entire Reagan winning coalition."

Howard Phillips, chairman of the Conservative Caucus, cited five GOP senators he said should be targeted for defeat in 1986 because they are too out of step with the conservative movement. He named Sens. Robert Packwood of Oregon, Warren Rudman of New Hampshire, Charles Mathias of Maryland, Mark Andrews of North Dakota and Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania.

Other political developments:

Sen. Jesse Helms, throwing another roundhouse right at the nation's press, says the news media are composed of people with a "smug contempt" for American values and suggested such organizations "are a real threat to our constitutional system." He also appealed to the Conservative Political Action Conference Friday to support the efforts of a conservative group to buy stock in CBS.

A team led by Prime Minister David Lange of New Zealand, who has barred US nuclear warships from his country's ports, narrowly defeated a team led by Moral Majority founder Rev. Jerry Falwell Friday in a debate at Oxford University in England over the morality of nuclear weapons.

PRESS CONFERENCE

Q & A FROM LIFE AMENDMENT PAC -- JANUARY 23, 1985

Q -- Do you have a sense of how much you'll spend? What's in the package?

A -- We'll spend whatever it takes. Right now, preliminary estimates are probably in the neighborhood of half a million dollars. We may go higher, we may go lower.

Q -- Are you looking at the primary or general election?

A -- We're looking at both. We're going to make every effort to defeat him in the primary. Obviously that will depend on the caliber of opposition opposed to it. I believe our greatest opportunity to defeat Bob Packwood is to beat him in the primary as opposed to the general election.

Q -- Would you have second thoughts if a pro-choice Democrat opposed him?

A -- No, we wouldn't because, basically, Packwood's record is so bad. He prides himself in his position on abortion. We feel that anyone in there would be better than Bob Packwood. If for no other reason than a rookie Senator serving would not have the clout that Bob Packwood has now

as Chairman of the Finance Committee and being in office since 1968. We would have no second thoughts, but we would obviously be much more enthused about it if there were a strong pro-life for his opposition.

Q -- What exactly do you plan to spend the money on?
A -- We will be doing, first of all, extensive training of volunteers throughout the state. We will be into the state extensively during the next two years. In addition, we will make use of the media - radio, television advertising, newspaper advertising. We are seriously considering, which is why we handed out a book that we put out in 1982 on Ted Kennedy, producing a similar book in relation to Bob Packwood.

Q -- What was the name of your booklet?

A -- "Every Family Has One"

Q -- Do you know what Packwood's margin of victory was in 1980?

A -- Yes, it was 8%. Bob Packwood, in 1980, only got 52% of the vote, which, for the kind of Republican year that it was, was a very poor showing. Since that time, because of his opposition to the President and lack of act in going about it, you know he has been removed as Chairman of the

Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. We feel he has "fallen from grace" considerably since 1980. We certainly aren't going to say it will be easy to beat Bob Packwood -- it won't be, but only getting 52% of the vote after being in the Senate since 1968 -- he had rather a weak year in 1980.

Q -- Do you have any specific candidates that you would like to see run against him?

A -- We'd like to see any strong, solid pro-lifer, Republican or Democrat. Obviously we'd like to see a pro-life Republican challenger in the primary. If that doesn't come to be, then certainly in the general election. We have no preferences of who that would be so long as they're pro-life.

Q -- Will you be contributing money to whoever that person is?

A -- It really would depend on who it is. Under federal election laws, we will be running an independent expenditure-type campaign which means we have no limit on what we can spend, so that whoever Packwood's opposition turns out to be, by law, we will not be allowed to have any contact with them whatsoever once they announce, but that does not preclude us from making a donation to a political campaign. We rarely make contributions to political

campaigns. The history of LAPAC has been that we generally do a lot of independent work (unintelligible). We feel anybody can write a check. We'd rather go in and do the work

Q -- In doing the work, you're talking about what?

A -- Training the volunteers and mobilizing the forces. We have an entire political training system -- when people complete our training program, they are equipped to actually set up their own campaigns. We will be going into the state and training local people to do that.

Q -- Have you done that already?

A -- We've done that in numerous locations in the past.

Q -- But not in Oregon?

A -- No, this will be the first time in Oregon.

Q -- And how many people are you anticipating training?

A -- I'd suspect that by next fall, we will probably train in the neighborhood of three to five thousand volunteers.

Q -- How can you afford to go after one single candidate? Surely, there are a number of other pro-choice candidates that are up in 1986.

A -- True, there are, but none of them , first of all, prided themselves in their position as strongly as Packwood has. I believe as the Washington Post , a while back , they said that Bob Packwood is to the pro-abortion movement what Jesse Helms is to the pro-life movement.

Q -- Do you just not have the financial resources to launch campaigns against other candidates also?

A -- No, at this point, we're going to put all our resources in this Senate race. Now it may be that come next year, we'll decide there are some other races that we want to get into. We feel that if we can cut the power base -- if we can beat Bob Packwood in 1986 -- it's going to send the message out to every other pro-abortion Senator, particularly some of them that may walk the fence and fall on either side from time to time. We'll send a message loud and clear. Basically, what we want to do is cut the power base.

Q -- Is there anybody up in 1986 that is as critical to re-elect as Helms was?

A -- Of the Senators that are up for re-election, 15 are solidly pro-life, 15 are solidly pro-abortion, and the remaining few fall somewhere in between. I don't think they're as vocal as spokesmen as Senator Helms.

Q -- So you don't have to worry about protecting anybody?

A -- Right, there are some who are certainly going to try to protect and encourage their people back home, but it's going to be a strange election in 1986 because, traditionally, off-presidential-year elections are in favor of the party in power, so it's going to be a thing to look at. We're just going to kind of see what falls in place. We're pretty comfortable that the majority of the Senators who are pro-life will probably not have serious trouble.

Q - How much money did you raise in this last election?

A -- In this last election, just around $200,000. I don't have an exact figure from our account.

Q -- This is from the Senate and Congressional?

A -- Congressional, right, and Presidential we were also involved in. In 1982, another committee of LAPAC, which was organized to replace Kennedy, quoted that between the two organizations, they spent about $572,000. Last year it was

down some for several reasons. First of all, we got an incredible number of letters from our supporters saying they were sending money directly to Senator Helms, which we encouraged. And, secondly, I think most of the conservative PACs would say the same thing, once it became apparent that President Reagan was going to be re-elected easily, I think there was a let up in the conservative caucus and pro-life caucus because they felt secure. We've already been doing some preliminary contacts around the country, letting some of our supporters know what we're up to and letting them know in advance that we have received nothing but promises of solid support and I feel that raising half a million dollars against Bob Packwood is going to probably be the easiest task I've had since I came to LAPAC a year ago.

Q -- You're critical of Packwood in the statement of raising so much money for him out of state, yet you talk about raising $500,000. Are you going to do that in Oregon?

A -- I'm simply saying ...no, we're not going to raise it all in Oregon. We are a national PAC. We are not a U.S. Senator. It would seem to me that a U.S. Senator's greatest source of income would normally be by his constituents. In Packwood's case, I think it is by his constituents, unfortunately he does not represent the people of Oregon, he represents Gloria Steinem, Judy Goldsmith and some of the

other left wing radicals that are running loose in the country.

Q -- What do you intend to do with this coffin?

A -- I'm going to bring that to Senator Packwood's office today.

Q -- You alone?

A -- Yes, plus any press that decides to come with us. If any of you would like to come with me, I'd appreciate it. We basically want to let him know, very clearly, that we're very serious.

Q -- Are you going to invite arrest?

A -- No, we're not doing anything illegal whatsoever in this. There's nothing in it, so we're certainly not doing anything illegal. It will be interesting when we go through the security gate in the office building to see the reaction.

Q -- You don't have anything inside the coffin?

A -- No. We've considered some things, but we wanted to present a decent case.

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 6 6

Q -- Why would you deliver a coffin to the Senator's office?

A -- Because 18 million babies have never had the opportunity to even be placed in a coffin; they were placed in garbage bags. We want Senator Packwood to get the message very clearly that we are serious and we want him to take a look at the coffin and realize that we've heard figures all week between 15 and 18, I believe it's closer to 18, million babies have died. So this is something that's not gory, but it's in tact. I don't believe in splattering blood all over walls and some of the things that groups like the National Organization of Women have done in the past, but it's something I believe is tactful, some would question tasteful, but it gets the point across. We are dead serious because 18 million babies are seriously dead.

Q -- When did the National Organization of Women splatter blood all over the walls?

A -- I don't know the exact year, but it was back during the ERA battles in some of the state legislatures when they were demanding passage of their bill. There was blood splattered on the state assembly caucuses. In the state of Delaware, where I come from, just two years ago, the National Organization of Women delivered coat hangers to all the State Senators and State Representatives. I would think

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 6 7

that a coffin is in a little better taste than a coat hanger to get the point across on abortion rights.

Q -- You said that LAPAC is the largest and oldest pro-life group. When was it formed and how big are you?

A -- We were founded in 1977. Measuring size, and I don't have the exact figures, but by size we go by total expenditures -- last year we spent $200,000; the year before we spent $572,000; and I'm not sure what they spent in 1980. $200,000 was on various races throughout the country. Last year, also, we put tremendous emphasis into developing the training programs in the states. We trained approximately 3,000 pro-life volunteers in elections. Of the four races that we were directly and actively involved in, we won three.

Q -- These were races where you were supporters, right?

A -- No, these were races where we were targeting. The only race we lost of those four was the one we were supporting. We had targeted 12 people initially and many dropped off the list, for various reasons, by late summer. There were four campaigns we got involved in. Three of them we were going against the campaign; one of them we were working in support of the campaign. We won three out of four, which I thought was an extremely decent effort.

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 6 8

Q -- So, you named 12 at the beginning?

A -- Right. We named 12 on Good Friday, which is extremely early, based on how we thought some developments were going happen and a lot of things changed on the political field from April until fall. One example is Ron Dellums, a Representative from California. We were going to target Dellums against Eldridge Cleaver, which would have made a three way race and all kinds of possibilites. When Cleaver dropped out, it became clear to us that it was not a winable race, and therefore, we didn't feel right taking our supporters' expenditures and putting them into a no-win situation.

Q -- Refresh my memory on the three you finally targeted.

A -- Clarence Long -- Maryland

Ike Andrews -- North Carolina

Jerry Patterson -- California

Clarence Long had been in the House of Representatives forever. Ike Andrews had been there a while. Jerry Patterson had been there not quite as long.

Q -- Was it because it was an off year that you had $200,000 as opposed to $572,000?

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 6 9

A -- I think there were a lot of circumstances. I think the presidential race ceased to be a race probably in September and that had something to do with it. Many of our supporters felt so strongly that they sent all their money to Jesse Helms, but we didn't care how Jesse Helms won as long as he won, so we had no problems with that. We had the money to do what we'd set out to do on it, so I felt that we took in what we needed to beat three out of four.

Q -- Who was the fourth?

A -- Vic Fazio from California. Vic Fazio is a master politician.

Q -- Are there any circumstances under which you think abortion is ok?

A -- No. The only one that I would even say is the life of the mother. I think the bill that was talked about yesterday "Equal Care" -- I support that. The life of the mother obsession is basically nonexistant in today's society with today's medical technology. So I think equal concern, equal care for both is vital. There are some situations, like ectopic pregnancies, which I personally do not consider an abortion, and I'm not speaking for all pro-lifers. There is absolutely no possibility for survival with an ectopic pregnancy. I don't consider that an abortion. The life of

8 5 0 4 0 5 4 0 2 7 0

the mother, the equal care, has settled the question of life of the mother. I can't perceive any other circumstances where we can justify abortion.

Q -- How many people are in your organization?

A -- We don't have membership. We have approximately, and this is a wild guess now because we're trying to tally up everything from last year, about 35,000 active supporters that we can pretty well count on consistently. Some of those will be supporters financially, some will be supporters who work for us in the area, but we don't have a membership.

Q -- What's your position?

A -- Executive Director.

Q -- And you're in the Garrison Building?

A -- Right. We're 35 miles south of Washington, we consider ourselves a Washington-based PAC; it's just that rent is a lot cheaper 35 miles south than it is in D.C. Really, I'm on the Hill only once or twice a week.

Q -- What is your name again?

R 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 7 1

A -- It's Rick Woodrow.

Q -- You said you've been Director for a year. What did you do before that?

A -- Before I came down to LAPAC, I was the president of the Parents' Action Committee/Christian Action Council in Wilmington, Delaware. They were basically a volunteer kind of business. I was active in the pro-life movement for about five years. It was a year ago yesterday that I accepted the position that I have now.

Q -- What about Katharine Hepburn? Do you target her in any way?

A -- No. When I was in Delaware, we did some work in the state legislature, but in Delaware I was not primarily involved politically, it was more in the education sense. Most of what I did in Delaware was working in the education light, which I feel as pro-life, we need to be working on what I call the three-fold appraoch: we need to be educated, we need to be working politically and we need to be in service organizations. In meeting the needs, it's not enough just to say to women, "You shouldn't have an abortion," we can't stand for the vile alternatives. At one time or another, I've been involved in all three aspects. I was delighted when I learned yesterday that Crisis Pregnancy

9504059027 2

care centers, which go by different names, now outnumber abortion clinics by three to one. When Judy Goldsmith and some of the others say to us, "We're only concerned about the fetus," I think all we can do is prove that we are concerned about not just the baby, but we are also concerned about the mother and her welfare. We're putting our money where our mouth is.

Q -- You said LAPAC was formed in 1977. In 1980, did you spend money against Packwood?

A-- No, we didn't. In 1980, he was on our target list, but we did not spend money at that point. In 1980, we kept 10 of the 12 on the target.

Q -- Why didn't you spend money against Packwood in 1980?

A -- I think because we saw at that point in time that George McGovern and Birch Bayh and Frank Church were much more winable situations. Had we known Packwood was only going to get 52% of the vote in 1980, we may have spent some money up there, too. Basically, we got so heavily involved in these other elections. I don't have all the names here for you, but the three standouts of course were McGovern, Bayh and Church, who were three very national leaders - well known senators that were defeated. We put an awful lot of resources in there and in 1980, I think we reached a point

8604059027 3

where we could only do so much. Again, hindsight is 20/20 when you look at Packwood only getting 52% of the vote. (Couldn't discern the last sentence but it sounded something like, "Boy, what we could've done.")

Q -- (I could not hear this question at all, but the answer had something to do with how much money was spent in 1980. He guessed that close to a half million was spent.)

Q -- Do you coordinate with other similar PACs in achieving your _____?

A -- No, we don't. That's totally illegal. If you get arrested for demonstrating, I don't know what they'd do if we were in collusion with other PACs. Under federal election laws, each PAC must come to their people that they're targeting, or working for, totally independently. Now if other PACs decide independently to jump on the band wagon, then the law certainly allows us to work with them. I hope they do.

Q -- You're spending all $500,000 that you raise on Packwood this time and nobody else?

A -- Right. At this point in time, that's correct. We will do whatever it takes to defeat Bob Packwood. If we have to raise $600,000 to defeat him, we'll do it; if we can do it

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 7 4

with $300,000, we'll do it. Right now he is worth all 12 of the deadly dozen. Bob Packwocd is a deadly dozen in himself. That's why we call him Senator Death. So we will really do whatever it takes, and we're getting an almost two year running start on it. We're basically going to say we're not going to put a lid on the expenditure. We'll spend everything we have and just a little more.

Q -- Have you tested the political waters in Oregon? With his newfound power, is it going to be harder for you now?

A -- We have talked to a number of people in the state. In fact, I have a meeting tomorrow with someone from the state who is out here. We feel that Packwood has fallen in popularity somewhat. We have not seen with this new appointment as Finance Chairman any great cry out there that it's that significant -- there are certain committee positions that become relevant to the state such as Jesse Helms on the Agriculture Committee is a big deal for people in North Carolina -- Bob Packwood on the Finance Committee is no big thing for the people in Oregon -- they're just down-to-earth, normal people. They don't need a Senator with a big ego to flaunt that he's on the Finance Committee. I don't think most of the people out there really care and I wonder even how many even know.

END OF QUESTIONS

8604057027 5

uly 14, 1985

Anti-Packwood drive starts

PORTLAND (UPI) — Abortion foes Friday unveiled a $1 million fund-raising campaign aimed at unseating Sen. Bob Packwood, R-Ore., due to his pro-choice stand and said they have a candidate who will run in the 1986 GOP primary.

"I came in to fire up some of the troops," Joe Scheidler of the Pro Life Action League in Chicago said upon arriving in the state for a four-day visit.

"I'm working on the pro-lifers, Christian community that opposes Packwood's stand on abortion," Schiedler said.

Scheidler said he planned to form the Pro-Life Action League Political Action Committee to receive funds for the drive in support of a candidate who would announce after Labor Day. He refused to disclose the person's name.

"All our eggs are in one basket, the Packwood basket," Scheidler said of the effort to defeat Packwood, who has amassed a multi-million dollar re-election campaign warchest of his own. "That will send a message to other pro-abortion senators and representatives that they are vulnerable."

Rick Woodrow, Garrisonville, [illegible] executive director of Life [illegible]endment Political Action [illegible]mittee, said his organization [illegible]dy had $300,000 to $400,000 [illegible]ated to the campaign to [illegible]t Packwood.

"We'll have at least 5,000 volunteers across the state, a very heavy commitment. Right now, we have 1,000 connected with us, whereas our original goal was 800 people by the end of July."

Woodrow said the groups realize Packwood has had a lot of success in the past in getting campaign funds from women's rights groups and others around the country.

"We already know 90 percent of his money came from out of state in 1980," he said of Packwood's last campaign. "New York City alone gave him 4½ times more than the whole state of Oregon."

Woodrow described Packwood as a "left-winger" who got support from people of a similar political leaning. He also said he expects the Oregon Republican Party to stay out the primary race.

"If the Republican hierarchy stays out of the race, it will let the primary fight be a primary," he said.

Woodrow said the candidate who they will back is "not holding office at this time."

There is one candidate who has announced he will try to keep Packwood from winning the GOP nomination for a fourth term next May.

Robert McDaniel, 45, a Klamath Falls certified public accountant, predicted last month he would raise $500,000 from national right-to-life groups.

"I'm very much a pro-life person, and Packwood does not represent my views at all," said McDaniel.

McDaniel, who is on the board of the Klamath Christian Academy and is a member of the Full Gospel Business Mens Fellowship, was reported by a fellow member of his firm Friday to be on the road seeking support. He said McDaniel had taken a 2-week vacation from his job to make the tour of the state.

K. Falls Herald + News
Sunday - July 14 '85
p. 16

JUL.16 '85 18:35 SEN PACKWOOD PORTLAND OREGON

8 6 0 4 0 : 9 0 2 7 6

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

April 3, 1986

Senator Bob Packwood
Room 259
Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Re: MUR 2155

Dear Sen. Packwood:

This letter is to notify you that the Federal Election Commission received a complaint which alleges that you may have violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 2155. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against you in 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.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a) (4) (B) and § 437g(a) (12) (A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 7 7

If you have any questions, please contact John Drury, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202) 376-8200. For your information, we have attached a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

By: Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Enclosures
Complaint
Procedures
Designation of Counsel

8604050278

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

April 3, 1986

Jeffery Brown, Treasurer
Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate
P.O. Box 309
Portland, OR 97207

Re: MUR 2155

Dear Mr. Brown:

This letter is to notify you that the Federal Election Commission received a complaint which alleges that the Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate Committee and you, as treasurer, may have violated certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). A copy of the complaint is enclosed. We have numbered this matter MUR 2155. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence.

Under the Act, you have the opportunity to demonstrate in writing that no action should be taken against the Bob Packwood for U.S. Committee and you in 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.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. § 437g(a) (4) (B) and § 437g(a) (12) (A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

8 6 0 4 0 5 7 9 0 2 7 9

If you have any questions, please contact John Drury, the staff member assigned to this matter at (202) 376-8200. For your information, we have attached a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

By: Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Enclosures
Complaint
Procedures
Designation of Counsel

86040570280

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

April 3, 1986

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director
Life Amendment Political
Action Committee
P.O. Box 1804
Medford, OR 97501

Dear Mr. Woodrow:

This letter will acknowledge receipt of a complaint filed by you which we received on March 27, 1986, which alleges a possible violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, (the "Act"), by Sen. Bob Packwood and the Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate Committee. The respondents will be notified of this complaint within five days.

You will be notified as soon as the Commission takes final action on your complaint. Should you receive any additional information in this matter, please forward it to this office. We suggest that this information be sworn to in the same manner as your original complaint. For your information, we have attached a brief description of the Commission's procedures for handling complaints. We have numbered this matter under review MUR 2155. Please refer to this number in all future correspondence. If you have any questions, please contact Lorraine F. Ramos at (202) 376-3110.

Sincerely,

Charles N. Steele
General Counsel

By: Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel

Enclosure

8604057028 1

GCC#16

HAND DELIVERED

86 MAR 27 A11:12

LIFE AMENDMENT POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE, INC.

P.O. BOX 1984 • GARRISONVILLE, VA 22463 • (703) 659-6129 or (703) 659-1530
Box 1804 Medford, Or. 97501 (503) 773-2832

Robert Sassone
Chairman

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director

March 24, 1986

86 MAR 27 P3:53

Mr. Kenneth A. Gross
Associate General Counsel
Federal Elections Commission
Washington, D.C. 22463

Dear Mr. Gross:

Based on information we have obtained, (Exhibit A) we have reason to believe that the Packwood for Senate Committee and Senator Robert Packwood have violated federal election laws, as well as other federal statutes. We hereby request an immediate investigation into this matter.

Statement of Case

In a fund raising letter sent out by the Packwood for Senate Committee, and signed by Senator Bob Packwood the following misrepresentations were made:

(1) The letter states "Today I learned that the Conservative Caucus--a powerful right-wing group--has targeted me for defeat in 1986." I have personally spoken with Mr. Howard Phillips of the Conservative Caucus and this organization has not targeted Packwood, nor have they spent any money on the Oregon 1986 Senate race.

(2) His letter further states, "With the armies of the Right mobilizing against me, I can do nothing less than match them dollar for dollar. That means raising at least $170,000 by February 20th." The truth of the matter is that Senator Packwood and his committee have in fact raised more than $6,000,000. The statement that Packwood must raise $170,000 is a blatant lie. The fact of the matter is that the only organization actively working to defeat Packwood is our organization, and our 1985 year end report shows we have raised less than $75,000.

(3) At the same time that this letter was being sent out, Packwood was already attempting to diffuse some of the criticism he has received by offering to give some of it away to other candidates.

(4) At the same time this letter was being sent out, the Packwood campaign was attempting to "buy out" his opposition by offering the Oregon Republican Party and the Lutz for Senate large sums of money if Lutz would drop out.

*"Protecting the American Family and the Preborn Child. . .
Through Political Action!"*

Authorized and paid for by LAPAC, Inc., Rick Woodrow, Treasurer

85040590282

Please be advised that, in addition to the complaint we are filing with your agency, we are also filing complaints of amil fraud with the U.S. Postmaster's office, as well as the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The address we have for the respondents, namely the Packwood for Senate Committee and Senator Robert Packwood, are as follows:

Bob Packwood for U.S. Senate
P.O. Box 309
Portland, Or. 97207

Senator Robert Packwood
259 RSOB
Washington, D.C. 20510

We would appreciate your handling of this in an expeditious manner.

Sincerely yours,

Rick Woodrow
Executive Director

RW/ncb

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of March 1986.

My commission expires:

8-5-89

Fredalene Prather
Notary Public

8 5 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 8 3

AIR EXPRESS
URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT URGENT

EXHIBIT A

Dear Friend,

Today I learned that the Conservative Caucus -- a powerful Right Wing group -- has targeted me for defeat in 1986.

Their claim?

That I am "out of step" with the conservative movement in America.

And this group of right wing zealots have pledged to do whatever it takes, spend whatever they must to deny my reelection to the United States Senate.

They are not alone.

The Life Amendment Political Action Committee -- a group whose goal is to deny to women the right of free choice -- plans to raise $600,000 in rallies across the country to defeat me.

"If we defeat Bob Packwood," says their Executive Director, it will send a message to every other pro-abortion Senator...Right now, he is worth all twelve of the deadly dozen by himself."

I will not be intimidated.

There is no way that I will back down from my support for the fundamental rights of Americans, for a strong and secure Israel and for the strict separation of Church and State.

And I want these groups to know that theirs is not the first hit list on which my name has appeared.

Have you ever heard of a group called the Aryan Nations?

This is a neo-Nazi organization whose program calls for the eradication of "Jews, Blacks, Hispanics and their supporters." On taking power, they say, they will use "nuclear bombs to destroy Israel."

The Aryan Nations do more than talk.

They kill.

Their members have been involved in several bloody shoot-outs with police and federal agents.

(over, please)

EXPRESS REPLY MEMO IN ...TIC ON OUTSIDE ...ELOPE

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 8 4

Aryan Nations members are suspected of having murdered Alan Berg, a Denver talk show host and a Jew, who used his program to denounce groups that preach racial and religious hatred.

And last December, the F.B.I. learned that Aryan Nations thugs had decided to make an example of me -- an example of the fate they had in store for the non-Jewish supporters of Israel and of the American Jewish community.

I must admit, it was a frightening episode.

My family had to be guarded around the clock.

And unfortunately, this was not the first time.

In an earlier incident in 1977, my family required police protection when radical Arabs -- outraged over my support for Israel -- threatened to retaliate by kidnapping my children.

I know -- and history bears me out -- that if you stand for principle, you make enemies.

But I will continue -- as long as I'm in the Senate -- to fight for the principles in which I believe.

In a political sense, for example, a Senator from Oregon has little to gain from supporting the cause of Israel.

But for me the issue is not political gain. It is doing what is right.

That's why I:

-- led the successful fight to prevent the sale to Jordan of Stinger anti-aircraft missiles.

-- was the floor leader in the fight against the sale to Saudi Arabia of AWACS electronic surveillance aircrafts.

-- was the prime mover of the Israel Free Trade bill, a leading advocate of moving our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and an unfailing supporter of providing Israel with vitally important military and economic assistance.

And I will continue to take the lead -- regardless of the consequences -- in fighting against any arms sales that may be in the offing to Arab states that refuse to make peace with Israel.

Those are the principles I'm fighting for. Those are the things I stand for. Those are the things I will seek to promote and protect as long as I am in the United States Senate.

(next page, please)

8 5 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 8 5

But to stay in the Senate, I urgently need your help.

Faced with a coalition of right-wingers and hate groups, my reelection campaign has just gotten much tougher.

And my enemies know they have one advantage -- I will never change or compromise on the basic principles of fairness and equality.

That is why I'm turning to you -- someone who I believe shares these principles and ideals.

I need you -- today -- to stand with me by contributing $500, $250, $100 or even $25 to my reelection campaign.

With the armies of the Right mobilizing against me, I can do nothing less than match them dollar-for-dollar.

That means raising at least $170,000 by February 20th.

So please, while this letter is still in your hands, join the fight.

I am counting on you.

Sincerely,

Bob Packwood

Bob Packwood

P.S. I've been in politics long enough to know that threats are a part of being a public figure. And I have enough faith in the American people -- and the police -- to think that my family will get the best protection possible. That same faith, the faith in the people, is what makes me believe that this campaign and the principles it will be run on will be successful. Your immediate help can justify that belief and that faith. Thank you.

Paid For By Packwood For Senate

AIR EXPRESS REPLY MEMO IN PLASTIC ON OUTSIDE ENVELOPE

8 6 0 4 0 5 9 0 2 8 6

FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

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

THIS IS THE BEGINNING OF MUR # 2155

Date Filmed 6/2/86 Camera No. --- 2

Cameraman AS

8604079287