

step in the right direction. I say it would be a dangerous step to our elective process.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does this bill guarantee at all that there will be less money spent privately to win an election?

Mr. GORE. Not at all.

Mr. LAUSCHE. All that it does is state that the Federal Government shall provide about \$70 million a year, \$35 million for each of the parties, to conduct a presidential election after the parties have nominated their candidates in June or July of the election year. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does it in any manner prohibit the parties that have received the \$35 million each in the election year from continuing the solicitation of contributions from private sources?

Mr. GORE. That subject has not even been touched. I believe it will result in pouring many millions of dollars into the major political parties' pots.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And if money impliedly wins elections, all this bill will do is give to the parties \$35 million in an election year and allow them to go out and solicit, with all their ardor and efforts, additional private contributions. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is true, and there are no safeguards as to its use.

Suppose we were in a presidential year now and these funds were available and the Democratic Party felt very strongly that a candidate for Governor on the Republican ticket, in a pivotal State, must be defeated, or that the Republican Party felt that a Democratic candidate for Governor, who had great prospect for being President in the future, or that a particular Senator, must be defeated. They could spend the entire amount of the slush fund in one State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in what the Senator has stated. His description of what might be done is an illustration of the lack of consideration and study which has been given to the broad ramifications involved in such a program.

Mr. GORE. It illustrates the need for careful consideration of the enactment of a measure so new and revolutionary as this is and so big and important as this is.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the proponents of this measure state, "Allow us to spend about \$70 million of the taxpayers' money in an election year, and take our word that we will support needed reforms at a later time"?

Is it the thought of the Senator that the reforms ought to be adopted concurrently with the proposal that we spend \$70 million of the taxpayers' money before we go forward?

Mr. GORE. If we do not achieve reforms and protection concurrently with the extension of the use of public funds for our elections, then the difficulty of achieving reforms is increased, if not made almost impossible.

I am one who believes in the principle of one man, one vote. I have resisted amendments here to overturn the reapportionment decision, even though my State legislature passed resolutions asking me to vote the other way. I believe in the dignity of man and in the equality of man, the equality of opportunity, rights, and privileges. One of the rights which I believe should be equal is the right to aspire to political preferment, to which I have already referred. Another is the right to have an equal influence on the selection of public officials.

We know, of course, that a man with vast financial means, under our present system, can exercise far more influence upon the outcome of an election by the use of his pocketbook than can the lowly citizen by the use of his one ballot. I think that argues well for the use of public funds. But, ah, Mr. President, when we but add public funds to and commingle them with the campaign money now obtained from special interest sources, we make the situation worse instead of better, and we will lose, perhaps, the opportunity of making necessary corrections.

In my view, this Congress has not dealt with a subject more fundamental to our society and to our system of government than that which is under consideration now. I trust that this expression on my part will indicate to my fellow Senators why I have insisted upon the right to debate this subject, and the right to have the Senate—well, it is not my right to have the Senate reconsider, I suppose, but it is my right to seek reconsideration, on the part of the Senate, of a measure on which I think it acted too hastily, and a measure which received no public hearings in the House of Representatives, but was carried there in a conference report to be voted up or down.

If this provision is enacted, I do not know just how one conflict is to be resolved. We have an existing law which limits the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee to an expenditure of \$3 million. Yet we are asked here to write into law a provision that will give each of them an estimated \$30 million to \$35 million in a presidential year.

How can the Senate do that? How can we do so without amending the Corrupt Practices Act, unless by so doing we condone illegal practices, and encourage and entice our two major political parties to violate the Corrupt Practices Act?

Of course, \$3 million is inadequate; we recognize that. I have said it many times. But it is the law. We condemn