

fully done in order not to conflict with the limitation in the law.

The bill before us is also carefully drafted so that the amounts paid into the treasury of political parties do not become "contributions" which might make them subject to the \$3 million limit.

The special limitations on the amounts paid into the treasury of political parties under this bill were drafted in full recognition of the \$3 million limit.

We wrote our limitation in terms of amounts spent by a political party for two reasons. First, to make sure that it was different from the limitation now in the law, and second to provide an after-enacted limitation which would have to be interpreted apart from the \$3 million limit.

This special limitation in the bill, indeed the bill itself, has nothing to do with contributions at all. The purpose of the bill is to free presidential candidates from having to seek contributions—to free political parties from having to create a plethora of political committees in order to get around the \$3 million limit.

The \$3 million limit now in the law is not affected by this bill. It will continue to apply to the cases to which it applies today. However, it will not limit the disbursements made under the bill because these disbursements do not involve "contributions" and they are not made by "political committees."

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, this would wipe out the limitation which presently exists?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, as I indicated I think this provision avoids any conflict with present law. Let me say that the limitation in present law doesn't work in any case. I will tell the Senator why.

Mr. MURPHY. I was not questioning whether it was a farce or a fraud. I just asked the question as to whether that would—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No, as I have said, this provision of the bill does not affect the limitation.

Mr. MURPHY. It does not affect the limitation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not in my judgment.

[P. 27583]

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] compiled a "best seller" on this subject. He did quite a bit of investigating on this subject. I wish I could be favored with a copy of it. Perhaps additional copies should be reprinted—I do not have one of them.

Mr. GORE. We have had that request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am having difficulty getting reprints. I should like to have a copy of the lists published in his document because inasmuch as it deals with private financing, I might find a few prospects myself when I run again for office.

The Senator from Tennessee has kindly handed me a list which he compiled of those who contributed to President Eisenhower's campaign and also to Adlai Stevenson's campaign. If the Senator will pardon me for saying it, I do not find it all here, I find about only half.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. \$33 million. I asked the Senator for an educated guess on what he thought President Eisenhower's supporters had spent in the Republican campaign, and how much he would guess Adlai Stevenson had spent. I must say that at that time the Democratic Party was the loser. We did not do too well. The Senator's guess, as I recall it, was that the Republicans spent about \$40 million in the campaign and the Democrats about \$12 million.

Mr. MURPHY. Does that include expenditure of union funds?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Union funds?

Mr. MURPHY. I am talking about the figure the Senator just quoted, \$12 million opposed to \$40 million.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was the best guess of the Senator from Tennessee. The Democratic Party finds itself in the position of being for the poor man, the common man—so that it does not always have sufficient funds, which was true in that campaign.

With expenses going up, it was estimated that as an educated guess about \$52 million was spent by the two parties. I heard an estimate that in the last presidential election for all candidates, everyone running for office from constable up to President, about \$250 million was spent that year. I would assume that about \$55 million to \$60 million was spent in the Johnson-Goldwater campaigns.

Mr. MURPHY. Has there been consideration—because campaigns are sensitive to rising costs—to possibly using television?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me talk about that for a moment, because I think that the bill helps that. I will tell the Senator why. There is a provision in law which states that if a television network donates free time, it has to provide equal time for all. So that if President Johnson and the fine gentleman whom the Republicans will nominate for President at the next election, are put on television, the TV networks have to include the minority parties as well, unless the law is amended.

If we bypass those small parties, there would still be the problem that while it might be all right to request one big television network to provide equal time, it would seem to me to be unfair to require it of a little television station, because such a station would lose needed revenues by having to provide to other political candidates free time which it otherwise could have sold to paying sponsors.