FEC RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW

On February 8, 1977, the Federal Election Commis­sion approved for Congressional review a list of suggested changes in the Federal Election Campaign Act (the Act). Grouped under seven categories, these recommendations attempt to provide a more simplified, effective system of regulating campaign financing. Commissioners did not endorse each recommendation unanimously; rather, they offered this list as a general guide to areas Congress might wish to examine and revise. Major recommendations are summarized below:

I. SIMPLIFICATION

The following suggestions would simplify the Act and reduce the number of reports by between 50 and 90 per­cent, while enhancing the public’s ability to glean impor­tant data from the reports.

A. Candidate and Principal Campaign Committee Reporting

Eliminate double reporting by candidate and his/her principal campaign committee by allowing one or the other to file complete campaign reports.

B. New Filing Dates: Reduced Number of Reports

In nonelection years, require all political commit­tees and candidates to file only two reports: July and year-end. Permit multicandidate committees to file on monthly basis.

During election years, eliminate post-election reports and:

1. Require House and Senate candidates and committees to file quarterly (including year-end) reports and 12-day pre-election report.

2. Permit Presidential candidates and committees to file monthly reports (in lieu of pre-primary report for each primary), 12-day pre-general election report and year-end report.

3. Permit multicandidate committees to file either on a monthly basis or on a quarterly basis, including 12-day pre-primary, pre-general election and year-end reports.

C. Multicandidate Committee Registration

Eliminate requirement that multicandidate committees file amendments to their registration statements each time they support a new candidate.

D. Contribution Limitations

Change contribution limits from a “per election” basis to an “annual” or “election cycle” basis.

E. Point of Entry

Make Commission the sole point of entry for disclosure documents filed by Federal candidates and political committees.

F. Written Pledges

Modify requirements so that candidates and commit­tees keep records of written pledges, but do not report them.

(Continued on p. 2)
G. Independent Expenditures
Raise threshold for the reporting of independent expenditures from $100 to $250.

H. Contributors to Those Making Independent Expenditures
Eliminate requirement that contributors report contributions given to those making independent expenditures; instead, require persons disclosing their independent expenditures to report sources of any contributions (exceeding $100) they receive to support their independent expenditures.

I. Trade Associations
Permit a trade association which has received approval from a member corporation to solicit its executive and administrative personnel to continue such solicitations until the corporation revokes its approval.

II. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

A. Delegate Selection
1. Bring delegates under the Act.
2. Exempt the following disbursements from reporting requirements and limitations on contributions and expenditures: delegate travel and subsistence costs related to attending a caucus or convention; and State and local party disbursements for meetings, caucuses or conventions related to delegate selection.
3. Require delegates formally "authorized" by a Presidential candidate to function as the candidate's agents, for purposes of reporting and complying with contribution and expenditure limitations.
4. Require delegates "not authorized" by any candidate to report to the FEC when they receive contributions or make expenditures in excess of $1,000.
5. Allow contributors to give up to a total of $1,000 ($5,000 in case of multicandidate committees) to all delegates together.

B. Incidental Support of Presidential Nominees
Give Congressional candidate separate spending limit for including in campaign materials the support, listing or mention of a (publicly funded) Presidential nominee.

C. State-by-State Expenditure Limits in Primary
Apply retroactively the State-by-State expenditure limits to Presidential candidates who request public matching funds after they have campaigned in several primaries, with the result that a candidate exceeding the limits in the early primaries would not be eligible for matching funds.

D. Issue-Oriented Candidacies
Require that "written instruments" submitted in support of matching fund requests include name of candidate in order to weed out attempts to use public funds to promote issue-oriented groups.

E. Fundraising Exemption
Eliminate the 20 percent fundraising exemption for Presidential campaigns and raise the expenditure limit accordingly.

III. CONTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE LIMITATIONS AND THE ROLE OF THE POLITICAL PARTY

A. State Party Spending on Behalf of Presidential Nominee
Allow State party committees to expend up to the greater of $20,000 or $.02 times the voting age population on behalf of their party's Presidential nominee.

B. Local Party Spending on Behalf of Presidential Nominee
Allow local and subordinate party committees to make unlimited distribution of campaign materials and paraphernalia normally connected with volunteer activities (e.g., pins, bumper stickers and pamphlets, but not billboards, mass mailings or media advertising). Require disclosure of such disbursements.

C. Contribution Limits
No specific recommendations. Commission urged Congress, however, to set new limitations which neither "strangle citizen participation and reduce the flow of information to the voters" because they are too low nor "reduce public confidence and open the door to special interest influence" because they are too high.

D. Expenditure Limits
Commission offered no specific recommendations, but suggested Congress establish limits for publicly funded candidates at sufficiently high level to allow candidates and political parties to wage vigorous campaigns.

E. Contributions by Minors
Consider contributions by children under 16 as contributions made by the parent and subject to the parent's contribution limits, if the minor's contributions to one candidate aggregate over $100.

F. Multicandidate Committee Status
Require a political committee to contribute a threshold amount to each of five candidates before it becomes a "qualified multicandidate committee" (entitled to make contributions of $5,000 per candidate, per election).

IV. CORPORATE AND UNION ACTIVITY

A. Honorariums
Prohibit corporations and labor organizations from giving honorariums to Federal candidates.

B. Registration and Get-Out-the-Vote
Allow corporations and labor organizations to conduct (without sponsorship by a nonpartisan organization) nonpartisan registration and get-out-the-vote activities aimed at the general public.

V. CLARIFICATION

A. Legislatively Appropriated Funds
Commission recommended that Congress clarify use of appropriated funds in connection with Federal elections. Issues include use of government cars and airplanes, materials produced by the House and Senate recording studios and government-paid staff.

B. Voluntary Services
Commission suggested Congress circumscribe campaign use of volunteer professional services when they are not donated directly to the candidate or his campaign committee.
VI. MISCELLANEOUS

A. Draft Movements
   Extend the Act's restrictions and limits on contributions and its reporting requirements to committees organized to persuade an individual to become a Federal candidate.

B. 48-Hour Reports
   Require multicandidate committees making contributions to disclose contributions of $1,000 or more if made after the 15th day, but more than 48 hours, before an election.

C. Conciliation Period
   Shorten mandatory conciliation period from 30 to 15 days.

D. Legislative Days
   Reduce the 30 legislative days required for Congressional review of Commission regulations to 15 legislative days.

E. Private Benefit
   Impose strict controls on campaign activities conducted for the private profit of the candidate or committee, particularly in cases involving conversion of political funds to personal use.

F. Multiyear Authorization
   Give Commission multiyear authorization of appropriations.

   Clarify and review 18 U.S.C. 592-607 to resolve ambiguities and jurisdictional conflicts.

VII. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

FIRST QUARTER REPORT

Any candidate for Federal office or any one of his or her authorized committees must file a quarterly report by April 10, 1977, if the candidate alone, or all the authorized committees collectively or the candidate and the committees together, have raised and spent a total of more than $5,000 between January 1 and March 31, 1977. All other political committees must file the quarterly report if either contributions or expenditures exceed $1,000 during the quarter. Quarterly reports must be filed on FEC Form 3 or FEC Form 6 (short form). If the candidate or committee is not required to file a report because it is not financially active, it must nevertheless file FEC Form 3a (postcard form) or a letter with the same information.

SPECIAL ELECTIONS

Three special elections have been scheduled to fill Congressional seats left vacant by Congressmen Robert Bergland of Minnesota (7th district), Brock Adams of Washington (7th district) and Andrew Young of Georgia (5th district). The special election dates are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Run-Off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>February 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>April 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>April 5</td>
<td>May 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these and any future special elections, the Information Office will inform candidates, by mail and telephone, of their registration and reporting requirements and provide them with necessary forms.

MONTHLY REPORTING PERMITTED IN 1977

Political committees which make contributions or expenditures to support Federal candidates in more than one State and plan to participate in special elections conducted in 1977 (to date, special elections are scheduled in Minnesota, Georgia and Washington) may prefer to report on a monthly basis. Any committee operating in more than one State may request and receive Commission approval to file monthly reports in 1977, instead of quarterly and pre- and post-election reports. Due by the 10th of the month, reports must be complete as of the last day of the preceding month.

Committees reporting monthly may at any time, upon request and Commission approval, revert to reporting on a quarterly basis. Once quarterly (and pre- and post-election) reporting is resumed, however, a subsequent request by the same committee for monthly reporting in 1977 would normally be rejected to avoid administrative confusion.

All political committees which filed on a monthly schedule in 1976 (other than Presidential campaign committees) will be sent a special form for requesting monthly reporting and information pertinent to monthly reporting in 1977.

ADVISORY OPINIONS: SUMMARIES

Until Commission regulations are officially promulgated, the Commission will continue to issue two types of opinions:

1. Advisory Opinions, designated as AO's, concern the application of the Act to specific factual situations. Any person requesting an advisory opinion who in good faith acts in accordance with the findings of the opinion will not be penalized under the Act. The opinion may also be relied upon by any other person involved in a specific transaction which is indistinguishable in all material aspects from the activity discussed in the advisory opinion.

2. Informational Responses to Advisory Opinion Requests, designated as Re: AOR's, differ from AO's in that they are based in part on the Commission's proposed regulations and they offer no legal protection to recipients until the regulations on which they are based go into effect.
Requests for advisory opinions are made public at the Commission and described in the Federal Register. All the opinions issued January 18 - February 7, 1977, are summarized below. Those seeking guidance for their own activity should consult the full text of an opinion and not rely on the synopsis given here. Copies of AO's and Re: AOR's are available from Public Records, Federal Election Commission, at a cost of 10 cents per page. Please identify opinions by number as, for example, AO 1976-83 or Re: AOR 1976-98.

Re: AOR 1976-94: Payroll Deduction Plan Used by Trade Association PAC

Section 114.8(e)(3) of the Commission's proposed regulations (submitted to Congress on August 3, 1976, and published in the Federal Register August 25, 1976) explicitly prohibits a corporation which belongs to a trade association from using a payroll deduction plan to facilitate contributions from its executive and administrative personnel to the trade association's political action committee (PAC). However, in the specific case of the Connecticut Insurance Political Action Committee (CIPAC), established by the Insurance Association of Connecticut (a trade association), otherwise proper contributions made by payroll deduction on or before August 25, 1976, are permissible since an earlier draft of proposed regulations (published in the Federal Register May 26, 1976, to elicit public comment, but never adopted) permitted member corporations to use such a payroll deduction system. Following public hearings, the Commission formally approved the proposed regulations prohibiting the use of payroll deductions to facilitate contributions to a trade association PAC. (Length: 3 pages.)

Re: AOR 1976-105: Activity of Political Action Committee Established by Membership Organization

The advisory opinion procedure may not be used to obtain Commission approval of the Articles of Organization proposed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) to govern the operations of its political action committee (the committee). The Commission may, however, respond to specific, factual issues addressed in that statement. Eligibility to participate in the committee's activities and membership in the committee expand beyond the class of individuals to whom AICPA may make partisan communications funded from its general treasury, nor the class of individuals who may be solicited by either AICPA or the committee. (Length: 4 pages.)

AO 1976-108: National Party Committee Expenditures on Behalf of Congressional Candidates

Specified party campaign committees, such as the National Republican Congressional Committee (NRCC), are considered national party committees. Funds may be transferred between party committees without limitation. If, therefore, the Republican National Committee (RNC) designates the NRCC as its agent for making general election expenditures on behalf of House candidates, funds of either the NRCC or the RNC may be expended on behalf of a candidate for Congress. The limit on national party expenditures for Congressional candidates applies, however, to the national party as a whole (including all its committees), not to each committee separately. If the RNC designates as its spending agent a committee which is not a committee of the Republican Party, the RNC would have to provide the funding since transfers by a nonparty agent to the RNC would be limited to $20,000 or $15,000 per year. (Length: 3 pages.)

Re: AOR 1976-109: Activity by National Bank's Separate Segregated Funds

The Society National Bank of Cleveland (Society National), the Society Corporation which owns the stock of Society National, and other banks also owned by Society Corporation may each participate in the establishment and maintenance of two separate segregated funds: 1) SOPAC, created to support candidates for Federal office and 2) the Association, established to support candidates for State and local office only. Such participation may include the defraying of expenses incurred in the establishment and administration of the separate segregated funds and in the solicitation of voluntary contributions to them. SOPAC, as a registered, political committee, would fulfill its reporting obligations under the Act by filing reports with the FEC and copies of such reports with appropriate State officers. As long as the Association does not contribute to Federal candidates or political committees, and none of its receipts or disbursements are "contributions" or "expenditures" under the Act, the Association would not be a political committee and therefore would not be subject to the Act's reporting requirements. (Length: 5 pages.)

Re: AOR 1976-114: Use of Excess Campaign Funds

Congressman Joseph Early may use excess campaign funds to defray telephone costs incurred in the ordinary course of his official duties. If the disbursements for phone calls are made from an office account, to which the excess campaign funds were first transferred, they would be subject to the reporting requirements set forth in the Commission's proposed regulations on office accounts, section 113.4. (Length: 2 pages.)

AO 1976-116: Expenditures by Principal Campaign Committee

Congressman Mario Biaggi's principal campaign committee may make expenditures in 1977 for a book and screenplay about the Congressman's life, intended to influence the Congressman's future election. These expenditures must be reported, as must all disbursements by a political committee. (Length: 2 pages.)
SUMMARIES

Information letters, designated as O/R’s, are responses from the legal staff to queries from individuals who lack legal standing to obtain an advisory opinion. While they do not offer the legal protection afforded by formal advisory opinions, they nevertheless demonstrate how the Act works in specific situations. O/R’s are available from Public Records, Federal Election Commission, at a cost of 10 cents per page. Please identify the information letter by number as, for example, O/R 714.

O/R B47: Raffle As Permissible Fundraising Method

A Republican county committee in Vermont may use a raffle (if permissible under State and local laws) to raise funds to support Federal candidates and political committees. The price of the ticket is considered a “contribution” by the purchaser to the county committee (or the State committee if the committees are affiliated) and counts against the purchaser’s $5,000 annual limit on contributions to a political committee, and against his or her $25,000 annual limit on aggregate campaign contributions.

The county committee must report total ticket proceeds as well as the name, address, occupation and principal place of business of any person whose ticket purchases, combined with other contributions to the county committee during the calendar year, exceed $100.

Incorporated businesses may not donate raffle prizes to any committee which raises funds related to Federal elections. Noncorporate businesses and merchants, however, may do so. Receipt of such a donation would be subject to the Act’s contribution limits and reporting requirements. (Length: 3 pages.)

REGULATIONS

AMENDED REGULATION PERMITS LIMITED POST-ELECTION MATCHING PAYMENTS FOR PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY CANDIDATES

The Commission adopted on February 2, 1977, an amendment to the proposed matching fund regulation submitted to Congress on January 11, 1977 (originally submitted to Congress on August 26, 1976). The amendment will be formally submitted to Congress if the proposed primary matching fund regulation sent to Congress on January 11 is not disapproved by either house during the 30-day legislative review period.

The substance of the amendment was published for public comment in the Federal Register on October 18, 1976 (41 FR 45952), along with the original version. As adopted by the Commission on February 2, section 134.3(c)(2) now permits the Commission to match post-primary election contributions (received and deposited by December 31, 1976) to the extent that the total of contributions and matching funds received after the ineligibility date (i.e., the date on which the Presidential primary candidate ceases to be a candidate) does not exceed the candidate’s outstanding net debt on the date of ineligibility.

Under the old formula (which did not contemplate the situation where a candidate would receive sufficient post-ineligibility private contributions to retire his primary debt), the Commission would match contributions up to the amount of the outstanding debt on the date of ineligibility, regardless of the funds raised privately after that date. A partial repayment would be required, however, if the candidate accumulated a surplus. The following examples illustrate the difference between the originally proposed regulation (January 11) and the amended version (February 2, 1977):

1. Presidential candidate X has a primary debt of $100. He raises $100 in contributions (by December 31, 1976). Under the old formula, he is eligible to receive an additional $100 in matching funds. (Any contributions exceeding the amount of his debt would not be matched.) Subsequently, candidate X is required to repay the U.S. Treasury a portion of his cash surplus, corresponding to the proportion which his total matching funds bare to his total receipts (all contributions and matching payments). Under this procedure, candidate X cancels his $100 debt with the contributions, but still receives an additional $100 in matching funds, only a portion of which he must repay. The remainder may be used for any lawful purpose.

2. Under the amendment adopted February 2, this is not possible. If, for example, candidate X has a $100 debt on the date of ineligibility and receives (by December 31, 1976) $100 in contributions, he would not be entitled to any matching funds since his cash on hand is sufficient to retire his debt. If he raised only $60, the Commission would match up to $40, just enough to extinguish his $100 debt.

RAMSEY CLARK et. al., v.
FRANCIS R. VALEO et. al.

Ramsey Clark, former candidate in the New York Senate primary election, asked the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia for declaratory and injunctive relief against the operation of those provisions in the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended (the Act) governing legislative review of rules, regulations and advisory opinions of the FEC. Under these provisions, regulations proposed by the Commission may not be promulgated until they have lain before Congress for 30 legislative days during which time either house may veto them.

Clark argued that the “one-house veto” violated the constitutional principle of “separation of powers.” Further, he asserted, regulations would be tainted by Congressional influence on the Commission’s decision-making process. He also claimed the procedure delayed promulgation of Commission regulations, thereby denying him, as voter and as candidate, protection of the Act.
Intervening as a plaintiff on behalf of the Executive Branch, the Attorney General also requested an injunction against the “one-house veto,” arguing that it intrudes “upon those areas reserved by the Constitution of the United States to the Executive Branch....”

The Federal Election Commission asked the Court to dismiss the complaint, arguing, inter alia, the case was not ripe for Court action since Congress had not disapproved any regulation and the plaintiff had claimed no hardship resulting from compliance with the substance of a proposed regulation.

The District Court certified a number of constitutional questions to the U.S. Court of Appeals. Concluding that the matter was not “ripe” for adjudication, the U.S. Court of Appeals returned the certified questions to the District Court unanswered, with instructions to dismiss. The 6-2 decision was made on January 21, 1977. The Court said that Clark’s case, as a candidate, vanished when he failed to win the primary in New York. As a voter, Clark had neither protested a specific veto action by Congress nor identified any proposed regulation tainted by the threat of veto or review. With respect to the constitutional issue raised by the one-house veto, the Court held the case was “unripe” because Congressional disapproval of a proposed regulation had not yet occurred. “Until Congress exercises the one-house veto,” the Court said, “it may be difficult to present a case with sufficient concreteness as to standing and ripeness to justify judicial resolution of the pervasive constitutional issue which the one-house veto provision involves.”

SOCIALIST WORKERS 1976 NATIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE et. al., v. JENNINGS et. al.

In 1974, the Socialist Workers Party 1974 National Campaign Committee filed suit in United States District Court of the District of Columbia against the chief administrative officers of the U.S. Senate, the House of Representatives and the General Accounting Office (GAO), charging that the disclosure provisions of the 1971 Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended (the Act) were unconstitutional as applied to the Socialist Workers Party because of alleged harassment directed against it. In October 1974, Common Cause intervened as a defendant in the case. Subsequently, in August 1976, the Socialist Workers Party amended its claim to add the Federal Election Commission and the U.S. Attorney General as defendants. In October 1976, all three defendants filed motions to dismiss the case; intervening defendant Common Cause did not. On January 17, 1977, the U.S. District Court:

1. Denied the Federal Election Commission’s motion to dismiss the case. The Court remanded the matter to the FEC, asking it to develop a full factual record and make specific findings of fact concerning the “... present nature and extent of any harassment suffered...” by the Socialist Workers as a result of the disclosure provisions of the Act. The findings are to be submitted to the Court within six months.

2. Granted Attorney General Levi’s motion to dismiss because he had expressly indicated no intention to enforce criminal sanctions against the Socialist Workers Party while the matter was still pending before the Courts and because the Federal Election Commission has exclusive primary jurisdiction over civil enforcement.

3. Granted the administrative officers’ motion to dismiss since their supervisory duties had been transferred to the Federal Election Commission, but allowed the Socialist Workers the right to pursue and complete discovery against these defendants as though they remained parties to the action.

BRIAN A. HAMPTON v. FEC

In a suit filed in U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia against the FEC, candidate Brian A. Hampton charged the Commission with failing to enforce the Federal Election Campaign Act, as amended (the Act) against his opponent who allegedly failed to report contributions to and expenditures from an office account (maintained to support his activities as a state legislator).

In a reply brief, the FEC asked that the case be dismissed on grounds that Hampton had failed to state a claim upon which the Court can grant relief. The Commission argued that the FEC has discretionary power as to whether to prosecute. “The Commission’s decision under the Act to dismiss complaints is not reviewable except for abuse of [that] discretion,” the FEC said. Since no claim of abuse had been made, the FEC argued, the case should be dismissed.

STATISTICS

PREPARATION AND RELEASE OF STATISTICS

On January 21, 1977, the Federal Election Commission approved a report of the Task Force on Statistics, establishing guidelines for the preparation and release of campaign finance statistics on the 1976 elections. By publicizing the areas in which the FEC will gather data, the Commission hopes to facilitate rational planning by other groups engaged in research on campaign financing and preclude unnecessary duplication of Commission studies.

Under these new guidelines, the Commission will collect statistics in five categories: Presidential candidates (and their supporting committees); Senate candidates (and their supporting committees); House candidates (and their supporting committees); Nonparty Committees; and Party Committees. Five teams of analysts in the Disclosure Division, who are also responsible for routine review of reports, will gather data for each of these categories. Collection of statistics will be made according to specific priorities designated for each category, as listed below:

Presidential Campaigns
- Figures from candidates receiving primary matching funds.
- Figures from candidates on the general election ballot in at least 10 States.
Senate Campaigns
- Figures from candidates on the general election ballot.

House Campaigns
- Figures from candidates on general election ballot.

Nonparty Committees
- Figures from those committees with receipts or expenditures exceeding $100,000.

Party Committees
- National party committees.

For each category, the analyst teams will collect the following types of statistics:
- Total adjusted receipts (receipts less transfers, refunds, rebates and loan repayments).
- Total amount of contributions $100 or under (itemized and unitemized).
- Total number and amount of contributions $101-$499.
- Total number and amount of contributions $500 and over.
- Total personal funds expended by candidates.
- Total receipts from nonparty committees.
- Total receipts from party committees.
- Total adjusted expenditures (expenditures less transfers, refunds, rebates and loan repayments).
- Total expenditures for fundraising (by Presidential campaigns only).
- Total expenditures for legal and accounting fees (by Presidential campaigns only).
- Total expenditures for direct contributions to Federal candidates (by party and nonparty committees only).
- Total independent expenditures on behalf of Federal candidates (by party and nonparty committees only).
- Total other expenditures for Federal candidates (by party committees only).

The Commission will begin to release these figures in April 1977.

CREATION OF THE OFFICE OF PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

Effective January 17, 1977, a separate Office of Planning and Management was instituted with overall authority for Commission planning and management review, as required of all Federal agencies. Headed by Al Keema, the new office assumes all functions previously assigned to the Planning and Analysis section within the former Disclosure and Compliance Division.

Reporting directly to the Staff Director, the new office will evaluate the consistency of Commission programs with FEC objectives, review FEC reporting forms, determine staff and program requirements for fiscal year 1979 and monitor the impact on the Commission of any future legislative changes in the campaign finance law.

TRANSFER OF INVESTIGATIVE PERSONNEL TO THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

On January 31, 1977, the Investigation Section was transferred from the former Office of Disclosure and Compliance to the Office of General Counsel. The Commission recognizes that efficient enforcement of the Act requires close cooperation between the investigators of compliance cases and staff attorneys.

FEDERAL REGISTER

FEC documents of general applicability are published regularly in the Federal Register. These documents include (but are not limited to) announcements of public hearings, proposed regulations, policy statements, edited requests for advisory opinions, and periodic indexes to advisory opinions.

The Federal Register is available for inspection at any public library which is also a Federal depository or, by subscription, through the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The following list identifies all FEC documents appearing in the Federal Register between January 22 and February 16, 1977:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Federal Register Publication Date</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977-6</td>
<td>Charter of</td>
<td>1-27-77</td>
<td>42 FR 5339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearinghouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-7</td>
<td>Advisory Opinion</td>
<td>1-27-77</td>
<td>42 FR 5338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests 1976-119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and 1977-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-8</td>
<td>Advisory Opinion</td>
<td>1-28-77</td>
<td>42 FR 5395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Request 1977-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-9</td>
<td>Advisory Opinion</td>
<td>2-16-77</td>
<td>42 FR 9507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requests 1977-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and 1977-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW PHONES

The Commission's telephone system will be converted to Centrex in mid-March. All phone numbers beginning with 382 will be changed. New numbers will be published in the RECORD. Note: There will be no change in the toll-free information number, 800-424-9530.
CLEARINGHOUSE PUBLICATIONS

The FEC Clearinghouse announces the availability of several publications pertaining to State elections. Those interested in purchasing one of these publications should identify the report by name and number and mail the appropriate remittance to:

Sales Desk
National Technical Information Service
5285 Port Royal Road
Springfield, Virginia 22161

For information call 703-557-4650

1. Election Law Survey
   A quarterly report issued under agreement with the American Law Division of the Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service, this series compiles and summarizes all Federal and State legislation and litigation relating to elections.

2. Campaign Finance Survey
   This is a semiannual report issued under agreement with the American Law Division of the Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service. It contains summaries of all State and Federal Campaign Finance Legislation.


   Produced under contract with Indiana University's School of Public and Environmental Affairs, this study analyzes the procedural aspects of absentee registration and absentee voting in each of the fifty States. The volume concludes with an analysis of Federal legislation affecting absentee voting and specific recommendations for improving the absentee system.
   As a companion to the above summary, this volume includes a set of legal memoranda describing the absentee registration and voting law in each State with specific State election code citations.

   This report describes, analyzes and compares 11 types of vote-counting equipment and includes data on current research, development efforts and legislation pertaining to State voting equipment.

   Supplementing the preceding study, this report presents data on five experimental voting devices.

   Containing comprehensive data on election administration in the United States, this study is based mainly on an extensive survey questionnaire sent to over 6,000 jurisdictions administering Federal elections (73 percent of which responded).

   Issued under agreement with the Institute for Computer Sciences of the National Bureau of Standards, this report analyzes the use of computers in the vote-counting process in a number of selected jurisdictions.

This 255-page handbook describes the functions of election officials in each State and lists the names and addresses of all Federal and State election officials.