

posal came from speeches made by the late Senator Richard Neuberger in the Senate when he would quote something that Theodore Roosevelt said over 60 years ago. Theodore Roosevelt said that the only way to have honest elections is for the Federal Government to find a way to help pay for the expense of a man running for the Presidency of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] carried on investigations in this field to point out the situation was bad. Practically the only source of financing for campaigns had to come from large corporation executives or labor unions, and it would be well if there could be another way devised.

While this proposal is not perfect, after having studied it and discussed it with people who have the responsibility of managing campaigns for the Republican Party and for the Democratic Party, I felt this would probably provide the money it would take to see that both campaigns are adequately financed so that both sides could make their case before the people.

This proposal would authorize every taxpayer to designate \$1 of his tax liability to be placed in a presidential election campaign fund. If he wanted to, he could designate that \$1.50 would go to pay for the Democratic campaign and 50 cents to pay for the Republican campaign. In other words it is financing of good government on a bipartisan basis. Every man elected would be equally obligated to everyone. **This is a clean election bill. It is a good-government bill.**

The President sent down his own election proposal that included a \$100 tax deduction provision. This item has appealed to Senators, including the great Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. We studied it and the committee did not think it would reduce undue influence. But the proposal we approved would help prevent improper influence in Government because the money goes to both sides. It also does not give the wealthy, to whom deductions are worth more, a greater incentive to give than the less fortunate.

When someone runs for office and has to go hat in hand from one group of wealthy individuals to another, pleading for money to help finance the campaign, that candidate is not as free as if his campaign were financed equally by every citizen. Then he will not be obligated to any special group.

There has been discussions of amending the corrupt practices law. If we do pass such amendments, it is not necessarily going to clean up anything. It would compel people to find more sophisticated ways to finance their campaigns than they have to date. After all they must obtain the money from somewhere. The wealthy can finance their own cam-

paigns, but what about candidates of moderate means?

Here in the bill before us is a way to eliminate the need for those running for office to be under the compulsion of making a commitment they do not wish to make in order to get campaign funds.

A fraud provision was suggested for the presidential election campaign fund provisions. I thought about it and had our staff draft one up in case anyone cared to offer it. One was drawn up as tight as "Dick's hatband," but we think that there is no need for it.

Let me read the broad statute that would be applicable under present law, in any event:

§ 1001. Statements or entries generally.

Whoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact, or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. (June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 749.)

The provision before us provides that there is to be a bipartisan board composed of two Republicans and two Democrats, who will proceed to pick three other impartial men—So that the Republicans will watch the Democrats and the Democrats will watch the Republicans. Each party will watch the other party, to make sure that no one receives a distribution of a cent for funds not properly spent.

Every Democrat and every Republican has a responsibility to report on his own candidate and the other candidate, in case anyone uses any of the money improperly, so that every dollar of the campaign fund should be accounted for, both as it comes in and as it is expended.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Is there presently a ceiling on what can be spent by the national committees?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think there is one.

Mr. MURPHY. I think it is \$33 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think it is \$3 million.

Mr. MURPHY. How would we appropriate the money, which, as I understand it, would go to the national committees? How would we get around that?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, let me comment on the question of limitations on receipts of contributions and their expenditures by political committees.

The bill before us is carefully drafted in terms of "political parties," not "political committees." This was purpose-