

suaded to begin my address by a discussion of this part of the bill which, according to the junior Senator from Florida, constitutes the most important part of the bill.

In the beginning, I state that I recognize that I believe the suggestion of the use of public funds to defray the cost of the conduct of our elections merits careful consideration.

I have suggested in previous speeches modes of such consideration.

I have always felt though, Mr. President, that the provision of public funds for campaign expenses must be tied closely and intimately with amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act and with a carefully considered bill for election reform.

Indeed, Mr. President, I doubt if any Member of either body of the Congress has devoted the time and study to the question of clean elections that the senior Senator from Tennessee has.

I wish to approach the subject on this basis. It is said that money is the root of all evil. Money is the root of political corruption. Money is the root of political influence. The use and volume of that money constitute the greatest danger in our elective system.

There is nothing evil per se about the expenditure of funds on elections. Indeed, if the electorate is to make a wise choice, then the issues, the records, and views of opposing candidates in a contest should receive wide dissemination.

This requires money in increasing amounts as our population increases and as mass communication media for hire become more widely used.

The evil which threatens our elective processes arises from the improper use of money, money in excessive amounts, sometimes from questionable sources and heavily in favor of special interest candidates or without full disclosure to the public.

If we are to eliminate or even minimize this evil and danger, then existing law affecting the use of money in Federal elections must, in my view, be substantially revised. Existing law is wholly inadequate, outmoded, and unrealistic. For the most part, it was enacted more than 40 years ago.

The inadequacies of existing law were fully illustrated by the report of the elections subcommittee on the 1956 general election campaign.

Earlier today reference was made to the investigation of that subcommittee, of which I was chairman, and the report which was filed. I have a copy of the report. Copies are no longer available. More than 1,000 requests for copies came after the supply was exhausted. It is the largest committee report that the Government Printing Office has ever printed, and it is factual.

We tabulated \$33 million, the source of the money, the recipient of the money,

and the purposes for which the money was expended.

So, Mr. President, I speak on this subject with some experience and knowledge and, even more, with conviction that reform of our election laws, amendment of our Corrupt Practices Act, now more than 40 years old, is urgent.

The freedom and the sanctity of the ballot box is at the very heart of our system of self-government.

One of our goals in world affairs is to assure to people the right of self-determination. We had better look about ourselves and assure our own people of a right of untrammelled determination without the undue influence of money.

The need for election law reform is widely recognized. The senior Senator from Tennessee is by no means the only one who recognizes this. While there is substantial agreement as to the need for election reform, there are differing views as to the details of what should or can be done.

In view of the failure of Congress to act in this field in more than a quarter of a century, I think it fair to say that the sense of urgency for measures to protect our elective process from corrupt practices, which I feel so keenly, must not be shared by all. As I see it, the cause of clean elections is a very important cause, indeed.

Mr. President, despite the studies that have been made, despite the fact that a clean elections bill is now dying on the calendar, we are here on Saturday afternoon, October 22, asked finally to approve, to take the last step, and to send to the White House, a bill containing a provision on which there has not been one day of hearings, on which not one witness testified, but which, instead of being accompanied with safeguards and protection, adequate amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act, merely pours more millions of dollars into the political pot. Does this make for clean elections?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to straighten out the record?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would the Senator not agree that there was a public hearing on this particular proposal, on which the Under Secretary of the Treasury testified, and on which several Senators testified with respect to their own proposals? I offered one proposal. The matter was pretty well discussed. There was considerable public discussion about it.

Mr. GORE. I agree that the Committee on Finance had a day of hearing on the general subject of campaign contributions and election reform. Indeed, there have been many such hearings, one of which, as I have said, I conducted over a period of months.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to commend the Senator. I stated earlier that I think that the most thorough