The proposal before us, however, would provide that whoever could pay for time would pay for it, in order to present his case to the American people.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, it would eliminate the smaller parties, and only those who had an allocation from the contribution of that dollar could use the air?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would not eliminate them. They would have to finance themselves; the way they do now. However, funds are provided for minor parties when they have polled over 5 million votes in the last election.

Mr. MURPHY. Would it not be feasible to allocate time on the air instead of charging the American people \$1 apiece, and allocate the time on the air, which belongs to the people in the first place, on the same basis which the Senator suggests as to dividing up the money?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, the Senator——

Mr. MURPHY. This would eliminate the cost and save the taxpayer a dollar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator would simply make the television stations foot the bill. Does the Senator think it is fair to make a small television station lose money in order to make free time available, when the station could be using that time to make a few dollars to pay off its debts?

It seems to me it is better to provide both sides with money so they can buy time during the campaigns and make their case to the American people. The television station would be required to treat everybody the same way. Some of the small parties would have to finance themselves, but if they obtained 5 million votes they would get financial assistance from the fund. It has been suggested that this is discriminatory. But under the proposal as agreed on in conference, the major parties also will get no reimbursement for the first 5 million votes they garner.

I point out that there are all kinds of deductible items in the law. There is a \$100 deductible allowance for casualty losses; a deduction of 3 percent from the income with regard to medical expenses before any of these expenses are allowed; and a 1 percent deductible in the case of drugs. There are all sorts of exemptions and deductions.

Mr. MURPHY. There are so many and it is so confusing that I am afraid the poor, general citizen has no knowledge of them and needs an accountant, a lawyer, and specialist to tell him what his rights are. I do not know, and I consider myself a normal citizen. I have been around half a century. The longer I stay, the more complicated and confusing it all becomes. That is one reason why I question this part of the bill.

May I say that I voted for the bill, but as it comes back in the condition it was returned, I would have to oppose the bill, because the most eloquent presentation the Senator made with reference to helping the poor folks get medicine was what persuaded me to vote for the bill, and that provision has disappeared.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret to say we could not hold that provision in conference. We expect to get it passed next year. I regret that it failed. But there were other provisions in the bill. There was the self-employed retirement provision, for example, in which doctors. lawyers, and other self-employed have been interested for years. This will help them in their old age when they retire. I have been opposing it, but there are so many good provisions in the bill that each Senator should be able to think that even though there might be one or two items in the bill with which he does not agree, there are enough good provisions that he should vote for it. I am not only interested in seeing that the poor man's party is put above improper influence, but I should like to see the Republican Party put above improper influence also.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Speaking of party, would this provision include deductions for members of the President's Club, or would that be a separate matter?

would that be a separate matter?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say that I am a member of the President's Club and proud to be, but I am not too happy about the \$1,000 a year it costs me. It is hoped that this provision would eliminate the need for such clubs. would hope to get the support of many persons in and around Louisiana who now contribute to the President's Club. I shall be running at the same time the President is. It is always difficult to finance campaigns for Members of the Senate and of the House at a time when the President is running. But now he will have perhaps \$30 million to finance his campaign.

If a presidential candidate can obtain \$30 million to finance his campaign, maybe members of the President's Club, including myself, would be relieved of the \$1,000 contribution, and that money could go to finance the campaigns of candidates for the Senate and the House of Representatives. Some of us have great difficulty raising money to finance our campaigns.

Mr. MURPHY. That does not answer my problem. I ran at the time when everybody was talking about Goldwater and Rockefeller and I could not get anybody on the phone. I financed my campaign at the cost of a package of cigarettes for all of the people who voted for me in the primary. I recommend it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senators and Representatives do not have the terrible problem of financing a campaign that is presented to a man running for the Presidency.