

ture years to the extent designations are made.

This is a provision about which I was originally somewhat apprehensive. The more I listened to it, the more I became convinced that something needed to be done. I say this despite the fact that it was an amendment added by the Senate that was not related to the subject matter of the bill. Though this amendment does apply to the Internal Revenue Code, the bill itself has to do with the question of the foreign investors' tax treatment here in the United States.

After a thorough consideration of the many proposed solutions to the problem of how to finance presidential election campaigns, I have concluded that this provision is at least a good starting point. I cannot assure the Members of the House that this, in all respects, is the final solution to the problems of funding a presidential election campaign. However, I believe it, at the least, is a good beginning and I believe it is important that we start now.

We are all, particularly at this time, aware of the soaring costs of political campaigns. The dependence on wealthy contributors for substantial portions of needed funds tend to leave candidates of modest means encumbered with debts of loyalty to a wealthy few, rather than to the voting public as a whole. Certainly we should do something about a system which tends to obligate presidential officeholders to wealthy contributors and taxes them with difficulties in maintaining the independence which all of us want them to have. Although candidates other than the President and the Vice President will not directly benefit from this provision, it may be that taking the pressure off from raising funds for the presidential elections will lessen the problems of others in raising funds for their elections. In any event, it seems appropriate to try this proposal in this limited area before making any decisions as to whether it should be broadened.

As I have said, it seems to me that the enactment of this provision will be an important factor in removing the potential for possible improper influence in Government. Political parties and their presidential candidates will be assured that they need not rely on the large contributions of a relatively few wealthy contributors to meet the heavy financial demands of political campaigns. Under this system of campaign financing, the man elected President will be obliged equally to every taxpayer and every voter. In other words, the man elected President will be in debt to all American voters and taxpayers and this would seem to be quite close to the ideal of the American system.

Frankly, I do not know how many people will use the system. I am not neces-

sarily concerned at this point about how many people would do it. But I am concerned that we have not yet found a way to provide for the expensive financing of presidential campaigns other than through the present methods that are followed by both major parties of getting most of their moneys in amounts much larger than a dollar.

I have heard a whole lot of complaints recently about the possibility that somebody who belongs to a presidential \$1,000 club might get some special favor from Government. The impression is abroad, although I doubt whether there is any truth in it, that this may sometimes be the situation: that some people make large campaign contributions to either of the political parties expecting to exercise some degree of influence upon either of the political parties greater than that which they normally would exercise without the making of that sizable contribution.

The President, when he sent his state of the Union message, I believe this year, in January, asked the Congress to enact a provision that would allow a person to make a political contribution of up to \$100 to an individual party, from the presidential level down to the township level.

Under that proposal if a person made a political contribution to any Member, to me, to a county judge or to anybody else, he could deduct it from his income tax up to \$100. That in effect would be his act of appropriating whatever the amount was under the rate applicable in his case to that \$100. This is true since otherwise this amount would go into the Federal Treasury.

Under the Senate amendment also the taxpayer, when he makes this X on his return indicating that he wants \$1 out of, say, the \$61 he is taxed not to go to the general fund of the Treasury but rather to go to this special fund to help the campaigns of those who aspire to be President, is making an appropriation of Federal money by his own act. He would do that in either instance. The difference is that under the Senate amendment the appropriation is equal for all taxpayers.

But what is wrong with it? What is wrong with the effort here being made to induce 70 million people over a 4-year period to provide \$70 million so that 7,000 or 70,000 or whatever the number would be, would not have to provide the same amount of money?

Is it wrong to create a circumstance wherein every voter in the United States, if he wants to, can of his own volition make available \$1 a year or \$4 every 4 years, not to help his political party necessarily but to go into a fund which will be divided between the two major political parties?