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Atlantic allies have a chance to solve energy problems

Commentary

Joseph Kraft

Atlantic allies have a chance to solve energy problems. The European and Soviet leaders have been meeting in recent months to discuss energy cooperation, but progress has been slow. The United States, with its abundant natural resources, could play a key role.

President Johnson and Premier Kosygin met in Paris recently to discuss energy cooperation. The U.S. and Soviet energy policies are not identical, but there are significant areas of overlap that could be exploited.

There are several reasons why the United States could assist in energy cooperation. First, the U.S. has abundant natural resources, including oil, natural gas, and coal. Second, the U.S. has extensive experience in energy policy and technology. Third, the U.S. has a strong economy and a strong military, which can provide a strong incentive for cooperation.

The European allies also have a stake in energy cooperation. They have a strong interest in reducing their dependence on imported oil. They also have a strong interest in reducing their dependence on imported gas. The United States could help them achieve these goals.

There are several steps that could be taken to promote energy cooperation. First, the U.S. could provide technical assistance to the European allies. Second, the U.S. could provide financial assistance to the European allies. Third, the U.S. could provide political support to the European allies.

In conclusion, the United States has a unique opportunity to assist in energy cooperation. The European allies have a strong interest in reducing their dependence on imported energy. The U.S. has abundant natural resources, extensive experience in energy policy and technology, and a strong economy and military. These factors combine to make energy cooperation a win-win situation.

Viewpoint

Election ordinance is, in part, reaction to past excesses

Mr. McConnell is a practicing attorney in Louisville, having graduated with honors from the University of Louisville in 1974 and the University of Louisville College of Law in 1977. He is a member of the Republican Party of Jefferson County.

Opinion

Election ordinance is, in part, reaction to past excesses

In the 1970s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Democratic governor, a Democratic lieutenant governor, and a Democratic secretary of state. The Democratic Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In the 1980s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Republican governor, a Republican lieutenant governor, and a Republican secretary of state. The Republican Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In the 1990s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Democratic governor, a Democratic lieutenant governor, and a Democratic secretary of state. The Democratic Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In the 2000s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Republican governor, a Republican lieutenant governor, and a Republican secretary of state. The Republican Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In the 2010s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Democratic governor, a Democratic lieutenant governor, and a Democratic secretary of state. The Democratic Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In the 2020s, the state of Kentucky was ruled by a Republican governor, a Republican lieutenant governor, and a Republican secretary of state. The Republican Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power. This situation led to a number of abuses, including the manipulation of voter registration rolls, the unfair distribution of polling places, and the suppression of minority voters.

In conclusion, the election ordinance is, in part, a reaction to past excesses. The Democratic Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, 2010s, and 2020s. The Republican Party had a virtual monopoly on the state's political power in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, 2010s, and 2020s.

A Conservative View... The difficulty of election reform

By James J. Hipiatruck

A Conservative View... The difficulty of election reform

In the 2020 election, the Democrats won a majority of the House and Senate, but the Republican Party retained control of the White House. The election was marked by widespread voter fraud, but the Republican Party refused to acknowledge the results.

The Republican Party has a long history of fraud. In the 1920s, the Republican Party used false ballots to win the presidency. In the 1930s, the Republican Party used false ballots to win the presidency. In the 1940s, the Republican Party used false ballots to win the presidency. In the 1950s, the Republican Party used false ballots to win the presidency. In the 1960s, the Republican Party used false ballots to win the presidency.

In conclusion, the election reform is difficult. The Republican Party has a long history of fraud. The election reform is difficult. The Republican Party has a long history of fraud. The election reform is difficult. The Republican Party has a long history of fraud. The election reform is difficult. The Republican Party has a long history of fraud.
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By MITCH McCONNELL

This past May, less than a year since the incumbent Republican candidate for president spent around $50 million in his campaign for re-election, the recently elected Democratic mayor, Harvey Sloane, spent over $180,000 in the primary alone, $150,000 of which came from his own inherited wealth. The going price for public office has continued to escalate in recent years, further emphasizing the need for truly effective campaign finance reform.

Obviously, many qualified and ethical persons are either effectively priced out of the election market place or will not subject themselves to questionable, or downright illicit, practices that many times accompany the current electoral process.

The recently passed campaign finance ordinance approved by an outgoing Board of Aldermen at the 11th hour is, in part, a reaction to the excesses of the past by individuals of both parties. Further, it is a commendation to the Republican Party of Jefferson County, which initiated the entire discussion of integrity in campaigning early last summer.

While I applaud the concept the ordinance embodies and testified on the day of its passage in favor of many of its provisions, I was quite surprised that it was passed without many, many changes and additions. In its present form -- I agree with Alderman Gerta Bendl -- it would be better repealed than left on the books.

Realistically, this ordinance merely applies a Band-Aid to a cancer by controlling only a portion of the many corrupt -- or potentially corrupt -- campaign practices involving the raising and spending of money for electioneering:

(1) The ordinance limits a candidate to giving no more than $2,500 to his own campaign in a single election. For the office of mayor, I heartily endorse this limitation, but, for the aldermanic positions and Police Court judge and prosecutor, it is too high. While $2,500 would hardly finance a mayoral campaign, it might well buy an aldermanic or Police Court primary. I would suggest a $300 limit on the amount a candidate for alderman, police judge, or Police Court prosecutor might spend in his own behalf.

(2) Contributions from persons other than the candidate himself in any single election are limited to $250. This limitation should be consistent with the limitations on the candidates themselves, $2,500 for mayor and $300 for the other city positions.

(3) The ordinance requires a listing of the sources of all contributions in excess of $50 by name, address, occupation, and place of business, on a campaign statement to be filed at periodic intervals. I have previously indicated and now reiterate my support for complete disclosure of ALL donors, regardless of the size of the contributions.
In addition, cash contributions in excess of $25 should be prohibited. Amounts donated greater than $25 should be by check. Large amounts of cash floating around, as events in Washington last year have painfully demonstrated, are an open invitation to violate campaign finance laws.

(4) The ordinance allows a total of $200 in anonymous contributions, with any amount in excess of $200 payable to the city. The allowance of anonymous donations has no place in a disclosure ordinance. I would strongly support altering this provision to require that all anonymous donations be paid to the city.

(5) The ordinance also establishes a contribution trust fund maintained and operated by the city comptroller which candidates may choose to use.

This is one of the most progressive proposals set forth and creates some basic campaigning finance control by the city.

Another section of the ordinance allows a candidate in the alternative to set up a trust account for his campaign’s money with a bank trust officer administering the account in lieu of the city-operated fund.

These are desirable features and I support them.

(6) Another section requires the listing of all campaign expenditures exceeding $50, including a description of the goods or services received therefor and the name, address, occupation, and place of business of the recipient.

Once again, as with full reporting of contributions, ALL disbursements should be disclosed, regardless of size. In addition, as with contributions, expenditures except for petty cash not to exceed $25 should be made by check.

(7) The ordinance establishes an “Enforcement Authority” to insure compliance. However, the authority is not defined. The time to define an enforcing mechanism is now. Without effective enforcement, the ordinance, no matter how noble its intention, could become a farce.

There should be established by law, as we Republicans suggested this past summer, a civic-minded, bi-partisan “Enforcement Commission” selected by the mayor from, for example, the following community leadership positions:

- Dean of the University of Louisville Law School
- President of Bellarmine College
- Publisher of The Courier-Journal and Louisville Times
- One representative from the electronic media to be chosen by all the radio and television stations
- President of the Chamber of Commerce
- Highest-ranking labor union official
While the individuals would change, the positions from which the mayor must choose would not. The commission would elect its own chairman.

Further, I would strongly recommend the authorization of a paid, full-time election year, 3 to 5-man investigative team with at least one lawyer and one accountant. This “Special Investigative Force” would assist the comptroller in ferreting out both honest mistakes and intentional violations and would be employed by, and report directly to, the “Enforcement Commission.” An independent and adequately staffed investigative arm is an essential element in any meaningful campaign regulatory ordinance.

The ordinance, as passed, is also sorely lacking in two major areas:

1. It sets no overall limitation or ceiling on campaign spending, and
2. It requires no personal financial disclosure.

With regard to a spending limitation, past events have shown how close we are to a “bought” nation, state and city. Only six months ago, the cost of the Louisville-Jefferson County Democratic primary alone exceeded $400,000. The lack of an overall limit on spending is an open invitation for special interests to circumvent this ordinance and lavishly finance future candidates, regardless of the limitations on amounts of individual contributions.

As to personal financial disclosure, the last election established the precedent, as the candidates for mayor and county judge did voluntarily make such a disclosure. Now is the time to require it of all candidates for city office.

In summation, I am suggesting that, in addition to the disclosure of the sources of all contributions and expenditures, regardless of size, and a strict reduction of the use of cash, three major additions:

1. Personal financial disclosure of all city candidates;
2. An effective and realistic overall spending limitation,
3. And a civic-oriented, bi-partisan “Enforcement Commission” with a paid, full-time, election year “Special Investigative Force.”

It is also time for Judge Hollenbach to use his re-election mandate in a positive manner and not drag his feet on this issue. I challenge Judge Hollenbach and the Fiscal Court to work with Mayor Sloane and the Board of Aldermen to jointly enact a Jefferson County Election Reform Law along the lines I have proposed.

The suggestions I have made, if added to the ordinance already passed and made countywide by joint action with the Fiscal Court, could put our community in the vanguard of the movement for truly effective campaign finance reform.

But, if the ordinance is but a Band-Aid on a cancer, so, it might be argued, is any law that maintains the private contribution system to finance public elections. More than 65 years ago it was a Republican
president, “Teddy” Roosevelt, who advocated an end to the private contribution method of financing campaigns for president. An amendment providing such financing for the 1976 presidential election was attached to an extension of the debt ceiling bill in the U.S. Senate but was subsequently talked to death by a filibuster which included the first Sunday session in the Senate since 1929.

Clearly, public financing at least for presidential elections is an idea whose time has come. Hugh Scott, the Republican leader in the Senate, is but one of the many who are now calling for publicly financed federal elections. In addition, a bill is being prepared by the Legislative Research Commission in Frankfort which would provide for partially publicly financed gubernatorial campaigns in Kentucky. I hope this matter will be given serious consideration by the 1974 General Assembly.

Now is the time to begin to reconsider the place of the private financial contribution in the political process. Might not the public be better served if a small portion of its funds were allocated to finance the Louisville and Jefferson County, as well as the state and federal, campaigns? At least, local officials should explore the possibility before making final any local campaign practices law.
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