

MEMORANDUM

SENATOR MORGAN

OCTOBER 30, 1978

Some years ago, Congressman Morris Udall of Arizona, writing in the Readers Digest, talked of the cost of being a Congressman. He talked about the requisites for being a member of the United States Congress and the tremendous expense of being elected and how the money had to<sup>be</sup> raised to get there.

After serving in the United States Senate for four years, I am especially concerned about the cost of being a United States Senator. That is, how one can become a United States Senator and still be free to represent the total interest of his constituents. Fortunately, when I was elected I had the backing of a great many of my constituents across North Carolina because of the role I had played as Attorney General of the State. During my tenure, the Attorney General's office became the spokesman for the people in many areas. We established the first consumer protection division, or one of the first in the entire country. Time and time again we intervened as public advocates before the Utilities Commission in opposition to proposed rate increases by the power, telephone, and gas companies. Quite often, we appeared before the Commission of Insurance in opposition to proposed insurance rate increases. Many times

we took the North Carolina Milk Commission to task for what I contended to be price fixing in the cost of retail milk. We did considerable work in law enforcement by strengthening and improving the State Bureau of Investigation, establishing the police information network (a computerized system connecting more than 250 law enforcement agencies across the State) established a criminal justice academy for the training of law enforcement officers, and many other things in the criminal justice area. Therefore, because of this work, for six years as Attorney General, I had a constituency that is not often available to a candidate for the United States Senate - and one that is not often available even for an incumbent United States Senator, who because of the distance that he must operate <sup>from</sup> ~~for~~ his constituents and the relatively little known work that he does seldom builds a broad base constituency. Because of this constituency, I was able to raise nearly a million dollars to pay the cost of the primary and general election campaign through the contributions of more than 17,000 contributors. The vast majority of these contributions were relatively small.

What I <sup>am</sup> ~~was~~ trying to point out ~~was~~ that when I left the Attorney General's office, I had a broad base of support and therefore was able to get elected without soliciting large contributions from any particular source. But now that I have been in Washington four years and because I have been

away from the people (you naturally loose contact with individuals throughout the state and also there are few, if any, major issues around which Senators can muster the kind of broad support that I had as Attorney General), I am therefore faced with the dilemma of getting reelected and having to raise large sums of money. The natural inclination is to turn to the larger contributors and the political action committees of industry and labor.

What does it cost to be a Senator? Well, in addition to ~~without~~ a certain amount of ability, intelligence, wisdom, and experience, the monetary costs are enormous. North Carolina is approximately 600 miles from the western most tip at the Tennessee boarder to the north eastern corner near Virginia. There are 100 counties with  $5\frac{1}{2}$  million people. There are 20 T.V. stations, either within the state or that cover large areas of the State from outside its boarders. There are something like 150 weekly newspapers plus several large daily newspapers, and literally hundreds of local radio stations. All of the media has to be utilized in order to communicate with the people of the State during a political campaign. During the 1974 campaign, a 30 second ad during prime time on Sunday night on channel 3 in Charlotte was \$800 and the same time on Thursday night, during prime time was \$120. A full page of advertisement of the Raleigh News and Observer was approximately \$1200. Due to inflation, the cost has increased substantially. So,

even a modest campaign now would certainly cost more than the campaign of 1974.

Where do you get the money? Well there are some people, some candidates, who can afford to run their own campaigns, but those are few. For instance, the records with the Federal Election Commission in Washington showed that Senator Jack Heinz, of Pennsylvania, who was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1976, spent more than 2-1/2 million of his own money. In the present campaign for governor of Florida, the nominee Graham, the Scion of the Washington Post family, spent more than \$1/2 million of his own money just to win the Democratic nomination. Now he is being opposed by Republican Echard, of the Echard Drug Chain, who has already spent more than \$1.2 million dollars of his own money. In the State of Tennessee, the candidate opposing Senator Howard Baker refuses to accept any contributions and at her last filing had spent more than \$400,000 of her own money. And so the story goes. It's well and good that we have some candidates who are of such wealth that they can afford to carry on campaigns of this magnitude. But it would be a catastrophe for this country if the time comes when only persons of such wealth are able to represent the people of the country in the United States Congress.

If you can't depend upon your own money, where else

does one turn. In the past, labor has contributed substantially to campaigns of many public officials. The records of the Federal Election Commission reflect that labor contributed more than \$250,000 to the campaign of Senator John Glenn in 1974. Business political action committees have contributed in the past and because of the proliferation of such committees now, it is anticipated that they will be involved heavily in the campaigns in the future. But at what cost?

Just recently in the reelection campaign of Senator Dick Clark of Iowa, the (tape blank) suddenly announced that they were withdrawing their support to Senator Clark and had fewer men throughout the State working on his behalf even though they had contributed substantially in the past. The leader of the Union stated that never again would Clark get a penny from the union. Why? Because he voted for the energy compromise bill that recently came out of the Senate. In other words, the first time that Senator Clark refused to follow their instructions, they withdrew all of their support, their money, and publically denounced him.

Senator Dick Clark told me later that he was being vigorously opposed by the Catholic Church an hour because he had voted for the compromise proposal in the Senate which would allow federal public funds to be used for abortion in

those cases where the mother's health was in danger. This, of course, was contrary to the position of the Catholic church and therefore the Church has denounced Senator Clark from the pulpit during his reelection campaign. Clark told me that throughout his public career, he had been interested in almost all of the things that the Catholic Church had been interested in - food for peace, world hunger, and nutrition. Clark, by his nature, is extremely liberal in these matters and yet on this one occasion, did not vote the line of the church and they broke with him.

During the last Congress, single issue interests groups have almost dominated the Congress all the way from the pro-labor to anti-labor forces, pro-abortion, anti-abortion, pro-ERA, anti-ERA, pro-Panama Canal, anti-Panama Canal, and so the list goes. Unfortunately, these are the people who are interested in only how the candidate votes on those issues.