

# Tight Limit On Political Costs Voted

By Spencer Rich

Washington Post Staff Writer

Spurred by the Watergate scandal, the Senate voted yesterday to clamp tight new limits on campaign spending and to require full public disclosure of the outside income of members of Congress and congressional candidates.

The action came as the Senate completed its fourth day of debate on the political campaign reform bill. With a final vote scheduled Monday, the Senate adopted these amendments designed to curb the influence of "big money" on federal elections and candidates for Congress:

- A proposal by Adlai E. Stevenson III (D-Ill.), approved by voice vote, reducing to \$25,000 the aggregate any individual may give to all federal candidates and political committees combined. At present there is no limit and some contributors have given millions. The bill, as reported by the Rules Committee, recommended a \$100,000 limit for a man, his wife and minor children combined. The Stevenson amendment uses a \$25,000 individual limit, which Stevenson said would be more effective since a man without an immediate family would be limited to \$25,000, while under the committee version he could use the whole \$100,000.

Supporters said any contributions by a minor child under the new \$25,000 limit would have to be made by the child himself, and not simply by a parent on behalf of the child.

- An amendment by Robert W. Packwood (R-Ore.), adopted 73 to 8, limiting contributions to an individual candidate from voluntary committees like COPE (AFL-CIO), BIPAC (the National Association of Manufacturer's voluntary

See CAMPAIGN, A12, Col. 7

# Senate Votes Tight Lid On Campaign Spending

CAMPAIGN, From A1  
committee), AMPAC (medical profession voluntary committee) or CAP (United Auto Workers) to \$3,000 in the primary, \$3,000 in a runoff and \$3,000 in a general election.

This would mean a total limit of \$9,000 to any one candidate and would apply to both presidential and congressional candidates. At present there aren't any limits. The Rules Committee had proposed a higher limit—\$5,000 at each of the three stages for a congressional candidate (for a \$15,000 total) and \$15,000 at each stage for a presidential candidate.

- A proposal by Thomas F. Eagleton (D-Mo.), approved 70 to 11, limiting spending by a congressional candidate to 10 cents in the primary for each voting-age person in his state or district, and 15 cents in the general election. At present there are no limits but the Rules Committee had proposed 15 cents for the primary and 20 cents for the general election, so Eagleton's plan reduces each figure a nickel.

The limits on presidential campaign spending under the bill are based on the congressional limits, so the net effect of the Eagleton amendment is to reduce presidential limits as well — to 10 cents for the primary and 15 cents for the general election. The limits are to be effective in 1975.

Based on present population figures plus a special minimum already in the bill, the Eagleton amendment means a Senate or presidential candi-

date in Maryland couldn't spend more than \$288,000 on his primary or \$403,000 on his general election; in Virginia, \$319,700 and \$479,550.

- A plan by Frank Church (D-Idaho), approved 64 to 16 when a move to kill it failed, to require all members of Congress and candidates for Congress to file public statements detailing all income, all gifts over \$100, listing all assets and describing all security and real estate dealings in the year before filing. Present rules require only partial disclosure, and Church said, "What with Watergate I think the public has become fully aware of the dangers of government by concealment and cover-up."

There were some suggestions during Senate debate that senators might be loading up the bill with so many restrictions on spending, or with so much help for incumbents (because low spending limits would harm an unknown challenger to well-known incumbents), that its ultimate approval by Congress and the President might be endangered. It already faces a rocky road in the House.

Sen. Russell B. Long (D-La.), expressing the sense of confusion over the measure's complexity felt by many, told the Senate, "This thing is getting so complicated that I don't think everyone understands it. I hope the chairman of the committee understands it."

Rules Committee Chairman Howard Cannon (D-Nev.) said with a laugh that he had a pretty good grasp but there were certain aspects even he found confusing.