

# \$14-MILLION READY FOR '74 ELECTIONS

MAR 29 1974

## Common Cause Study Finds \$11.6-Million Set Aside by Special Interest Groups

NYTimes

By ANTHONY RIPLEY  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 28—Political treasuries for this fall are already filled with at least \$14.2-million in cash for the election campaigns of members of the House and Senate, according to a study released today by Common Cause.

Of the total, \$11.6-million is set aside in committees formed by special interest groups, such as labor unions, medical associations, business political action committees and dairy industry groups.

The largest single amount listed in the reports was \$1.4-million in the political arm of the Associated Milk Producers, Inc., which is under investigation for contributions made by it in previous campaigns.

### 'Take a Close Look'

Another \$1-million was listed by nine maritime related groups and unions. The United Automobile Workers listed \$717,000 and the American Medical Association and related groups listed \$889,000, the study showed.

"Anyone who thinks the Watergate scandals have put special interest givers out of business had better take a close look at these figures," said Fred Wertheimer, director of the campaign finance monitoring project for Common Cause, the public affairs lobby.

He said he could see "no way to restore confidence in this system when the same old thing is still going on."

In total, business, agriculture, health and professional groups listed \$5.9-million on hand as of Feb. 28 this year. Labor listed just slightly over \$5-million.

National Republican party committees that support House

Continued on Page 16, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

and Senate races reported \$2.1-million on hand, while similar Democratic committees reported \$522,000.

Another \$679,000 was listed as held ready by miscellaneous groups.

Among these are such sub-groupings as the National Edu-

cation Association and affiliated state groups that listed \$116,000; six conservative groups with \$71,000 on hand; six liberal groups with \$218,000 on hand and 11 rural electric cooperative associations with \$96,000.

### Figures on '72 Races

At the time of today's announcement by Common Cause, figures on spending for House and Senate races two years ago were also made public.

These figures show that at the last election for Congress, at least \$14-million was spent on would-be Senators and Representatives.

However, this study was only a partial one, since it covered the period from April 7, 1972, to Dec. 31, 1972. In many cases, money was purposely given before April 7 to avoid the new reporting system that went into effect that day.

Some idea of the magnitude of the donations before April 7 comes from President Nixon's reports, which were not included in the Common Cause study. Figures of the Finance Committee to Re-elect the President show that Mr. Nixon's backers collected \$20-million before April 7 and an estimated \$43-million after April 7.

John W. Gardner, chairman of Common Cause, said the figures from 1974 and 1972 "makes clear that the old system of financing elections is not about to reform itself voluntarily."

Mr. Gardner's group has been lobbying for reform in the area of campaign financing.

### Democrats Criticized

He again attacked the Democratic leadership in the House, charging them with "stalling" on campaign reform bills.

"The Democratic leadership has had no problems with an

independent special prosecutors office to enforce the laws against President Nixon and his associates.

"But they refuse to support an independent elections commission to enforce the campaign finance laws against themselves and their Congressional colleagues.

In charting the \$14-million spent on the last Congressional elections, the Common Cause study noted that all but \$500,000 was spent on general elections, rather than primaries.

The three-volume study noted these contributions in the last Congressional election:

¶\$368,000 from the political arm of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

¶\$411,000 from the political arm of the National Association of Manufacturers.

¶\$344,000 from groups affiliated with the American Medical Association.

¶\$1.2-million from three of the controversial dairy industry groups, the Committee for Thorough Agricultural Political Education, Trust for Special Political Agricultural Community Education and the Agricultural and Dairy Educational Political Trust.

¶Business groups heavily favored incumbents and Republicans. They spent \$6.04 on incumbents for each dollar spent on challengers. Republicans got \$1.2-million while Democrats got \$533,000 from them.

¶Dairy groups heavily favored Democrats as candidates giving them 72 per cent of the \$592,000 spent on candidates. But in giving to party organizations \$557,000, they favored Republican groups giving them 66 per cent of the total.

¶Labor's money, \$3.6-million went "almost exclusively" to

Democrats with more money spent on challengers — \$2 for incumbents for each \$1 for challengers.

### Unrecorded Spending

Though the new election law has provided more precise figures than ever before in American politics, it still leaves much spending unrecorded.

The Common Cause report notes that a "large amount" of special interest money never appears on the reports by com-

mittees. Instead, it is given in the form of contributions from individuals.

"The oil industry, for example, is a heavy investor in political campaigns. But only one political committee representing oil interests registered and reported contributions in 1972," the study states.

"It gave \$37,000 to Congressional candidates."

However gifts from individual oil company executives are scattered through the reports. Representative Les Aspin, Democrat of Wisconsin, has estimated that oil company officers gave almost \$5-million to President Nixon alone.

There are still other devices, as reported this week in a study commissioned by Associated Milk Producers, Inc., of its own political operation.

These devices include assigning staff men to work full time for a political candidate, a common practice in both industry and labor; paying "bonuses" to employees, which are then given as political donations and paying fees to lawyers, public relations men and advertising agencies that are really political contributions to be passed on to a candidate.