

# A Report on 1974 Campaign Financing

## Washington

House and Senate candidates spent more than \$88 million in their 1974 election campaigns and received more than 40 per cent of their funds from special interest groups and in large donations from individuals, Common Cause reported yesterday.

The citizens lobby, releasing a five-volume, 2102-page election finance study, also found that labor and business groups heavily favored incumbents with their contributions and that 24 individual donors contributed more than \$25,000 each to congressional candidates.

The study is based on reports filed by the candidates with the House and Senate clerks for the period from Sept. 1, 1973 to Dec. 31, 1974.

Fred Wertheimer, the Common Cause vice president, said the study and particularly the finding that special interest groups and individual contributors of \$500 or

more dominated the campaign financing scene, "gives a sense of the fact that we don't have a campaign finance system that is broadly based."

"It is based among people who can afford to give money or who have special financial interests they want to protect," he said.

He also said that the number of special interest committees contributing to campaigns has apparently doubled in the last 18 months, jumping from 500 to 1000, with a substantial increase in the number of committees representing businesses.

Common Cause also reported that:

- Business groups gave \$1.9 million to incumbents and \$182,000 to challengers.

- Health groups gave \$1.4 million to incumbents and \$137,000 to challengers.

- Labor groups gave \$2.8 mil-

lion to incumbents and \$1.7 million to challengers.

- Individual donors of \$500 or more contributed a total of \$22.5 million and other special interest groups gave a total of \$12.5 million.

Common Cause also found that labor groups gave more than \$5.4 million to Democrats and \$400,000 to Republicans, while business groups gave \$1.4 million to Republicans and \$900,000 to Democrats. Health groups, generally representing physicians and dentists, gave \$1.3 million to Republicans and \$500,000 to Democrats.

The study did not deal with financing presidential elections. Public financing pays for that general election campaign and a combination of public financing and private contributions pays for primary campaign expenses.

Wertheimer said that no violations of the law were found in preparing the study.

*Associated Press*

nearly 40 hours a week on matters in which the bureau is seriously interested."

FBI inspectors consistently classed Redfearn as either "excellent" or "very good," the two highest marks in the rating system for informers.

The Denver bureau estimated that between 80 and 95 per cent of the information he provided was "reliable."

On June 20, 1973, Redfearn filed this report: "Enclosed are items stolen from the YSA local office . . . all three by five cards will be returned to proper places so that no suspicion will be aroused."

This was the only time Redfearn used the word "stolen." But on June 27, 1973, he told the bureau: "The enclosed information was removed from the Militant Bookstore . . . it will not need to be returned."

On July 5, 1973, Redfearn reported: "Some interesting facts learned from a 'borrowed' book of finances . . . Book had to be returned a little later so no one would suspect its removal. Everything cool, book returned, no one noticed."

It was against this background that Redfearn arrived at the Denver field office July 8 with four cartons of Socialist files in the trunk of his car. He told agent John V. Almon that he needed money and he assumed he would be in for a raise.

In a sworn statement later, Almon said he did not know at the time that the Socialist headquarters had been broken into.

The FBI did not inform Denver police of Redfearn's involvement in the burglary until a week later. By that time, Redfearn had been arrested in the apartment house burglary.

On July 22, agent O'Connor, who had recruited Redfearn six years earlier, wrote him a letter informing him that his relationship with the bureau had been terminated.

The FBI went easier on Redfearn after earlier scrapes with the law.

In September, 1973, Redfearn admitted writing letters threatening with bodily harm a rival for a girl's affections. He was arrested and charged with extortion. But after Redfearn's identity as an FBI informant was learned, the case was not prosecuted.

In February, 1975, Redfearn got into more serious trouble. He was arrested for a burglary unrelated to his duties as an informant. He told the bureau he needed money.

Redfearn's lawyer asked the bureau to intercede on his behalf with the district attorney. The FBI refused.

Redfearn eventually was released under a "deferred prosecution" system that the bureau said was similar to probation. Redfearn kept secret from the prosecutors his association with the bureau.

As a result of the burglary, Redfearn was suspended by the FBI until Oct. 10, 1975, when the Denver office asked to reinstate him.

In a message to Washington, the Denver office said, "Source expressed deep regret concerning his criminal activities over the recent past and has strongly insisted he would never become involved in any illegal activities in the future."