

hearing I have heard about on this particular subject was that conducted by the Senator in 1956, and I think that the recommendations that he made at that time are excellent. The Senator knows a great deal about this subject. The point is that that was 10 years ago. I am afraid that if we do not pass some sort of legislation which all of us will agree is at least a step in the right direction, we will be debating for another 10 years on this matter, before we will ever get it enacted into law. Ten years later, after the Senator's thorough and lengthy and excellent hearings, we still do not have anything. I think we have to take this as a step in the right direction, hoping that after we have tried it for some time, we might be able to steer it forward, if it needs to be steered to a higher ground.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous comments.

I must say that I cannot feel, after careful consideration, that this would be taking a step in the right direction, if this is the only step we take. Indeed,

[P. 27599]

this step, taken without safeguards, in my opinion would be a very bad step. It would make the situation far worse.

Just as tax reform, from a practical standpoint, can only successfully be coupled with tax reduction, I think that if we provide Government funds for campaign expenses, without tying to those benefits to our political process the necessary safeguards and protection, then protection is out the window, the benefits are in hand, and the cause of election reform and clean elections will have been dealt a death blow.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I, too, have a great deal of sympathy with the point of view which has just been expressed by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to election reform. I, too, should like to assure that the Record is straight.

While I do not purport to be the expert on the subject that the Senator from Tennessee is, I have, nonetheless, done a good deal of research work on the subject. Election reform, to be adequate, requires the collaboration of three committees of the Senate.

The first is the Committee on Finance, where provisions must be passed which, unfortunately, must originate in the House or, in the alternative, be tacked onto some other bill, as was done with the current proposal, by which the financing aspects of campaigns, insofar as there may be any participation by the Government, must be worked out and determined. With regard to that, there was at least 1 full day of hearings, I think, before the Committee on Finance.

Some time ago, the President of the United States did me the great honor of

asking me to introduce his bill dealing with clean elections and campaign financing, and I did so. The bill was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, the second committee concerned. For reasons best known to themselves, that committee refused to hold hearings on the President's bill, and I must say that I can find little favor with their decision. Instead, they reported to the calendar an utterly inadequate bill, on which no hearings have been held for 6 years, and which was clearly obsolete, inadequate, and inappropriate for the purpose. That is the bill which is now on the calendar, to which the Senator referred. It was not brought up on the floor, and I rather regret that, because, inadequate as the bill is, it would have given us the opportunity to amend it on the floor and provide some kind of decent vehicle for campaign financing and election reform. However, the leadership, in its wisdom, did not see fit to bring that bill up.

A third aspect of campaign reform and financing, in my opinion, is in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. That has to do with the extent to which the communications media, primarily radio and television, should be called upon to contribute some part of the cost to conduct an honorable financial campaign. Next year, I propose to introduce separate bills:

First, a bill which will be referred to the Committee on Finance, for financing along the lines which the Senator from Tennessee is now discussing.

Second, a bill to be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which will deal with the administrative aspects of campaign practices, the Corrupt Practices Act, and the other aspects of campaign financing which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration under our rule 25.

Third, a bill to be referred to the Committee on Commerce, which will deal with the part that radio and television should be called upon to play in this area.

The reason why I make these statements is that I was a witness before the Committee on Finance on this measure and said in substance what I have said just now on the floor of the Senate in this regard.

When the bill that is now under consideration first came before the Senate for consideration, I felt that it was a half-baked measure. I still think it is a half-baked measure. But I voted for it. Why did I vote for it? Because it seemed to me that it was one foot in the door in an area where many honorable Senators, including particularly the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], had been laboring for 10 years, and we had not got to first base. We had not, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] said, come to the point where Congress had seriously considered how to remedy one of the great failures in our democracy.