

other public figure wish to run for President again in 1968 on the Dixiecrat ticket, or some other ticket, there would be this situation: Whoever is the nominee of the Republican Party, and President Johnson, if he be the nominee of the Democratic Party, I assume would be the beneficiaries of this vast amount of money. But the other candidate or candidates would be penniless except for dependence upon private sources.

I do not wish to be sectional in this presentation.

Suppose there is a Bull Moose movement in the Republican Party. I think it would be a good thing for the Republican Party. They need a little new life. At least, they had such a movement at one time, and a candidate for President on that ticket. Suppose there is another Burton K. Wheeler from the Senate, from the Rocky Mountain region, who wants to run for President. But he will find we have passed a bill to finance the campaigns of President Johnson and Mr. Romney or Mr. Nixon, but which would render penniless and place at great disadvantage any other man who might aspire to the Presidency of our country. Is this the kind of immobility that we wish to freeze into our political system?

What do we think the Supreme Court would hold in this regard? Is this fair protection of the laws, or is this discrimination? I say to the Senate that we are dealing with something fundamental to the Republic, something basic to the conduct of our system of government.

We are asked to pass this bill on a Saturday afternoon just before adjournment. I have not suggested the absence of a quorum, and under the arrangements I have worked out with the majority leader, it is going to be unnecessary for me to do that, I think. At least, this subject deserves careful and serious consideration because once the step is taken, it may be irreversible except by the Supreme Court.

That brings up several questions, to one of which I have already referred, the equal protection of the laws. We would protect two candidates for President, with all the millions of dollars of a political slush fund out of the public Treasury, but we would deny any support at all to the candidate of a new party or of an independent group. How can a liberal support that political philosophy? How can a conservative? How can a Republican who believes in the republican form of government? How can a Democrat, dedicated to the tenets of our society?

Equal opportunity for political advancement is as fundamental to our political system as is equality of opportunity for employment, education, or other rights and privileges which we seek to promote.

I started to refer to one other of the several questions of legality and constitutionality that come to mind with respect to this unusual proposal. This amendment proposes to permit a private citizen to appropriate public funds for a purpose of his own choosing.

I hold in my hand a tax form. For years we have sought to simplify the income tax return. Now we propose to start on a course which would surely complicate it further.

To get to the question of appropriation, here is a tax return, and let us make it simple—suppose that John Doe owes \$1 of income tax to the U.S. Government. That is his total tax liability, but it is his liability and he owes it. He attaches \$1 in currency to his tax form and posts it to the Internal Revenue Service.

Is that his dollar, or is that the property of the U.S. Government?

That is a dollar owed the U.S. Treasury, and constitutes public funds. Yet by this amendment he would have the privilege of appropriating that dollar for a political purpose.

Under the Constitution, the appropriation of funds is the responsibility of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If a taxpayer is given the right by statute to designate how his dollars shall be spent, and has the right to direct that it shall be spent in political operations, would it not follow that at some subsequent time Congress would enact a law giving the taxpayer the right to designate how his money shall be spent for other purposes? Therefore, if we embark upon that kind of program, where are we likely to end?

Assume someone comes into the Senate next year and proposes a similar procedure to designate how his tax money shall be spent, not related to elections but related to some other operation of the Government. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] mentions designating that the money should be applied to retirement on the national debt.

I ask, what is the danger of establishing this kind of precedent?

Mr. GORE. If the precedent should be held constitutional, which I doubt, then it would be a dangerous one and, ere long, this tax form which we have sought to simplify would have a number of boxes on it. Suppose we had a box giving a taxpayer the election of whether any part of his funds could be used in the Vietnam war? There are a number of pacifists in this country who stoutly contend that it is immoral and illegal to require them to pay taxes to support a war which is contrary to their religious or their moral concepts.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr.