

PRELIMINARY INVENTORY  
OF THE  
RECORDS OF THE  
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1960  
86TH CONGRESS

Compiled by  
Charles E. South

The National Archives  
National Archives and Records Service  
General Services Administration

Washington: 1970

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction .....	1
Inventory.....	8
Appendix I .....	10
Appendix II .....	12

## INTRODUCTION

As it customarily does in each Congressional election year, the House of Representatives created a special committee to examine expenditures and campaign practices of candidates for the House in the general election of 1960. This committee, the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1960, was created by the adoption of House Resolution 589, 86th Congress 2nd Session, on June 30, 1960. On July 2, 1960, the House adopted House Resolution 595, which authorized the Special Committee to expend a sum not exceeding \$35,000 in its investigations. By the terms of the resolution creating it, the committee was directed to investigate and report to the House, not later than January 3, 1961, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.
2. The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobile and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purposes of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1960 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.
3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise of use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.
4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:
  - (a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.
  - (b) The Act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.
  - (c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.
  - (d) Any statute or legislative Act of the United States, or the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or election to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article 1, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.
  
6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1960, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

In carrying out its investigations, the committee was authorized:

to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned period of the 86th Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any such chairman or member.

The committee was further authorized to report any violation of Federal or State statutes to the Attorney General of the United States for proper action.

On July 1, 1960, the Speaker of the House appointed the following Representatives to the committee: Clifford Davis, of Tennessee (chairman); Robert E. Jones, of Alabama; Leo W. O'Brien, of New York; William C. Cramer, of Florida; and Samuel L. Devine, of Ohio. In regard to the investigation of specific campaigns, the committee at once adopted the policy that it would conduct such investigations "only upon receipt of a complaint in writing and under oath by any person, candidate, or political committee containing sufficient and definite allegations of fact to establish a prima facie case requiring investigation by the committee." The committee also decided that in general it would not conduct investigations in complaints when adequate remedy was available under State laws, although it reserved the right to act on its own motion in any way it believed would better enable it to carry out the duties imposed by House Resolution 589.

The committee decided that its responsibilities under House Resolution 589 could best be carried out within the time available by a three point program:

1. Furnish all candidates in the general election with copies of the pertinent Federal legislation to assist them in conducting their campaigns pursuant to law, and to advise them of the purpose of and laws regarding the questionnaire forms that each received from the Clerk of the House.
2. Inform all candidates in the general election of the existence of the committee, its jurisdiction, and the policy it had adopted regarding investigations of particular campaigns.
3. Investigate particular campaigns where the policy of the committee had been met or where it was determined that the committee should act upon its own motion to carry out the duties imposed upon it by House Resolution 589.

To carry out the first two phases of this program the committee staff, headed by Chief Counsel Gillis W. Long, prepared a committee print entitled "Information of Importance to Candidates for Office of United States Representative in the 87th Congress," which was mailed to every Congressional candidate in the 1960 election. This publication contained summaries and extracts of Federal statutes concerning elections, and also detailed information on the committee's jurisdiction and policies. In carrying out the third phase of its program, the investigative function, the committee considered formal sworn complaints in connection with the elections in the Second Congressional District of Idaho, the Fifth Congressional District of Indiana, the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the Eleventh Congressional District of Missouri, and the Fifteenth Congressional District of Illinois.

The complaint from the Second Idaho District was made by the incumbent Representative, the Honorable Hamer H. Budge, on November 30, 1960. Mr. Budge stated that printed materials, of a nature false and derogatory to him, had been circulated in great numbers in the District, that no identification was given of those persons causing the material to be distributed, and that he believed the distribution of this material had caused his defeat. The committee considered the matter in executive session and referred <sup>the complaint</sup> to the Attorney General of the United States, inasmuch as it alleged violation of Federal law.

The complaint which resulted in the committee's most intensive investigation came before it in two affidavits of November 18 and 26, 1960, from the Honorable J. Edward Roush, Member of Congress from the Fifth Indiana District. Mr. Roush alleged that his opponent, George O.

Chambers, had been declared the winner by five votes, and that in one precinct in Grant County 31 absentee votes were counted although only 19 had been applied for. Mr. Roush also alleged that there was no adequate provision for a recount under State law. The committee directed its staff to investigate, and accordingly the majority and minority counsel of the committee visited Marion, Indiana, the county seat of Grant County. Subpoenas were served on the board of elections and the absentee ballots in question were recounted. The net result was to indicate Mr. Roush as the winner by two votes. The committee held hearings on this matter on December 16, 1960, and the hearings were printed as part of its report. Further allegations were made by both parties, and the committee felt that it could not fairly decide the winner. Chairman Davis submitted a resolution (House Resolution 1) at the beginning of the 87th Congress to refer the matter to the Committee on House Administration, and this resolution was adopted. The Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration issued a report on June 13, 1961 (House Report 513, 87th Congress 1st Session) recommending the seating of Mr. Roush.

On November 15, 1960, the committee received a sworn complaint from the unsuccessful Democratic candidate in the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania, Mr. William D. Patton. Mr. Patton charged that a large number of sample ballots had been distributed in the District, the ballots being marked to show a vote for the Republican candidate, Representative John P. Saylor, and a vote for the Democratic candidates for all other offices. Mr. Patton further stated that no indication was given on these ballots of the person or persons responsible for their publication and distribution. The committee considered this complaint in executive

session on November 29, 1960. Inasmuch as the complaint alleged violation of Federal law, the committee, pursuant to the terms of House Resolution 589, referred the complaint to the Attorney General of the United States.

On December 12, 1960, the committee received the sworn complaint of Mr. Robert A. "Bob" Bartel, Republican candidate in the Eleventh District of Missouri. Mr. Bartel charged that numbers of illegal votes were counted for his Democratic opponent, Morgan Maulder, in two counties of the District, and that except for those allegedly illegal votes he was substantially in the lead. The committee considered Mr. Bartel's request for an investigation and decided that insufficient time remained before January 3, 1961, the date on which the final report of the committee was due. The committee therefore decided to refer Mr. Bartel's complaint to the Committee on House Administration without recommendation.

A sworn complaint was received on December 12, 1960, from the unsuccessful Democratic candidate for the Fifteenth Illinois District, Dorothy G. O'Brien, who charged "discrepancies, inaccuracies, errors, and seemingly fraudulent practices in both casting and counting of ballots" in the District, and asked for a full-scale inquiry. As it had in the Bartel complaint, the committee decided that it lacked time to make an investigation and voted to refer the complaint to the Committee on House Administration without recommendation.

Another element of the committee's work was a broad inquiry it conducted into existing laws and practices in Federal elections, fulfilling that provision of House Resolution 589 calling on it to aid the House in enacting remedial legislation. Hearings were held on December 15, 1960, with testimony from Members of Congress, representatives of the news media,

and representatives from civic organizations; emphasis was primarily on the problems of financing increasingly costly political campaigns and on the length of time necessary for campaigns. These hearings were printed as part of the committee report.

The committee concluded its work and submitted its report (House Report 2236, 86th Congress, 2d Session) to the House on December 30, 1960. The report included, in addition<sup>to</sup> the hearings previously mentioned, the complaints made to the committee; copies of exhibits related to the complaints; and observations and recommendations in regard to proposed remedial legislation.

The records described in this inventory, amounting to two cubic feet, are the records of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1960<sup>A</sup> <sup>that were in the National Archives on Jan 26, 1970.</sup> They are part of Record Group 233, Records of the United States House of Representatives. No person may have access to, or receive information from, the committee's records, without the permission of the House of Representatives.

## INVENTORY

GENERAL SUBJECT FILE. August 1960-January 1961. 7 in. 1

Included are administrative records of the committee, such as applications for employment, copies of vouchers drawn by members and staff of the committee, correspondence with members concerning meeting times, and correspondence with airlines concerning travel arrangements; lists of all 1960 Congressional candidates, furnished by the Congressional campaign committees; copies of letters to the Chairman from the staff on the progress of work; letters from citizens with suggestions for the committee's hearings on remedial legislation; copies of House Resolutions 589 and 595; newspaper clippings concerning the committee's activities and Chairman Davis's campaign appearances in Tennessee in 1960; copies of telegrams sent to complainants and to committee members by the staff (filed under Western Union); correspondence with the administrative assistant to Representative George Kasem of California concerning the residential eligibility of John Rousselot to run for Congress in that State; correspondence with prospective witnesses at the committee hearings; list of reference books checked out from the Library of Congress by the staff; and typed drafts of Part II of the committee report and of a proposed speech to be made in the House by Chairman Davis. Arranged alphabetically by subject. For a list of the folder titles in this series, see Appendix I.

COMPLAINT CASE FILE. September-December 1960. 5 in. 2

Records of the specific election complaints brought to the committee's attention, including those which did not meet the committee's policy with respect to the necessity for action. Records are present relating to 14 elections in addition to the five formal sworn complaints made to the committee. The records include correspondence with complainants and affidavits submitted by them and by others as to alleged election improprieties; copies of campaign literature, news clippings, and similar material submitted as exhibits; memoranda from staff members who investigated complaints; and acknowledgments from the Department of Justice of complaints referred to that Department for consideration. Arranged alphabetically by State. For a list of the folder titles in this series, see Appendix II.

HEARINGS AND PUBLICATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE. December 1960. 5 in. 3

Four volumes of typewritten transcripts of the hearings held by the committee on December 15-16, 1960, concerning the Roush-Chambers election in Indiana and proposed remedial legislation; 11 printed copies of the committee's final report, House Report 2236, 86th Congress 2d Session; and six copies of the committee print, "Information of Importance to Candidates for Office of United States Representative in the 87th Congress." Arranged by type of record.

MISCELLANEOUS RECORDS. September 1958-June 1961. 5 in.

4

Consist of a copy of House Report 513, 87th Congress 1st Session, the report of the Committee on House Administration on the Roush-Chambers contest; certified mail receipts for copies of the committee print on Federal election laws sent to all Congressional candidates, arranged alphabetically by State; copies of several publications issued by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and other groups interested in campaign practices and finance; and a folder of records of the 1958 Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, consisting mainly of vouchers drawn for committee expenses. Arranged by type of record.

## APPENDIX I

List of the folder titles in the General Subject File (entry 1)

A

Airlines

B

C

Campaign committee print-1960

Candidates 1960

C. and P. Telephone Co. 1960

Committee resolutions

Cramer, Hon. William C.

Credit cards 1960

D

Davis, Hon. Clifford (chairman)

Devine, Hon. Samuel

E

Election-1960

F

G

Government Printing Office

H

Hearings, suggestions for

Heritage Mrs. Ruth (clerk)

Hertz rental cars

I

Invitations to hearings

J

Jobs (applications)

Jones, Hon. Robert E.

K

L

Long, Gillis W. (Chief Counsel)

Mc

M

Miscellaneous 1960

N  
Newspaper clippings 1960  
Nunez, Robert F. III (counsel)

O  
O'Brien, Hon. Leo W.  
O'Hare, Richard C. (counsel)

P

Q

R  
Requests for hearings and reports  
Requests for 1960 committee print

S  
Stationery room

T  
Travel regulations

U

V  
Vouchers-campaign committee 1960  
Vouchers-Gillis W. Long  
Vouchers-Robert F. Nunez III  
Vouchers-Richard C. O'Hare

W  
Western Union

X

Y

Z

## APPENDIX II

List of the folder titles in the Complaint Case File (entry 2)

Alaska Airlines--Seattle, Washington  
(Agenda-1960)  
Arizona--2nd District

California--21st District  
California--22nd District  
California--28th District

Florida--1st District

Georgia--1st District

Idaho--2nd District

Illinois--15th District  
Indiana--5th District  
Iowa--5th District

Kansas-1st District  
Kansas--4th District

Massachusetts--13th District  
Minnesota-5th District  
Missouri--11th District

New Jersey--6th District  
New York--26th District

Ohio--10th District  
Ohio--17th District  
Oklahoma--6th District

Pennsylvania--22nd District

Texas--5th District

Virginia--10th District