

Following are excerpts from a transcript of President Nixon's broadcast address on campaign reform yesterday afternoon, as recorded by The New York Times, through the facilities of A.B.C. News:

Good afternoon. The centerpiece of American democracy is our process of electing men and women to public office. That process is now the subject of a spirited national debate. From the Congress, from election analysts and most importantly from the people themselves have come a steady stream of proposals. They are varied in nature but unified in purpose. All of them call for reform.

We need sensible reforms, reforms that perform instead of preach, reforms that will work because they are workable and reforms that will last because they make good common sense to people.

Ten months ago, I spoke out on the need for campaign reform. I asked the Congress to create a commission to fashion the remedies that we need.

The Congress has failed to act on that proposal.

Consequently, today, I am sending to the Congress a comprehensive set of proposals to get the job done. These proposals present reform that will work, not reform that will sugar-coat our problems with the appearance of change or rob our people of their basic freedoms.

Major Areas Listed

These proposals address four major areas: Campaign finances, campaign practices, campaign duration and encouragement of candidate participation.

Of all of these, campaign financing is the central concern with which we must deal as we move to improve our electoral process.

Each year, elections become more expensive. In nine months of 1972 alone, it has been estimated that the Presidential campaign cost \$100-million spent by the two candidates and their committees. Many millions more were spent on Congressional races.

The answer to this is not artificial limits on campaign expenditures by candidates. These limits would not only raise constitutional questions, they would also be unrealistic and in many situations unfair.

In a free society, we should never put a ceiling on the open and vigorous communication of ideas, specifically when that communication helps to inform the voters choice.

Instead, we should deal with the growing influx of money into politics by establishing broad and rigorously reinforced financial disclosure requirements. With expanded disclosure, our voters would then have the necessary information to assess the philosophy, the personal associations, the political and economic allegiances of the candidates.

Only One Committee

To this end, I have proposed that each candidate have only one political committee as his or her authorized campaign organization. And that committee would have to designate one depository for all campaign funds.

Now this measure would insure full accountability for campaign finance and eliminate the unhealthy proliferation of political committees which are used to conceal campaign donations.

I have also proposed that each individual donor be specifically tied to his campaign contribution. By linking donations to the original donor, the influence of special interest groups in election campaigns would be sharply reduced.

Beyond requiring greater public disclosure of campaign contributions, I also asked for limits on the size of donations to Federal election campaigns. No contribution

above \$3,000 could be made by an individual donor to a House or Senate election campaign. For Presidential elections, a ceiling limit of \$15,000 would apply. And the need for small contributions would rise accordingly.

We would also put an end to contributions from organizations which are hidden in the form of services, such as the donated use of private aircraft, the loan of campaign workers whose salaries are paid by third parties and other types of nonmonetary contributions.

We should stop the large flow of cash in campaigns by requiring that all donations over \$50 be made by check or other negotiable instrument.

A Ban on Loans

We should ban all political loans in order to end the practice of disguising donations as loans and, finally, I have proposed that all campaign contributions from foreign accounts and foreign citizens be flatly prohibited.

I'm also taking this opportunity today to share with you my reasons for opposing a raid on the public Treasury to pay for political campaigns.

This is popularly called public financing. In reality, it is compulsory financing by the American taxpayer of political campaigns. It is unhealthy. It reduces our freedoms, and it would have the affect of undermining the very foundation of our democratic process.

Underwriting political campaign from the United States Treasury would not only divert tax dollar from pressing national needs, but would also require taxpayers to sponsor political candidates and parties with which they might totally disagree.

I have also proposed reform in the area of campaign practices. We must firmly move to prohibit the organized and intentional disruption of a candidate's cam-

paigned by his opponent as well as to prevent the use of tactics which impede or deny entry at a campaign rally.

The third general area of reform in which I have submitted proposals to the Congress deals with the length of campaigns.

To shorten Presidential campaigns, I have recommended moving primary elections later into the election year, and I have urged both national parties to schedule their 1976 nominating conventions in September instead of in July or August. Now that would still provide for a national campaign of approximately two months.

Good People Wanted

Finally, we must take steps to encourage more good people to run for public office.

While closely observing constitutional requirements, I believe that we can reaffirm a public figure's private rights so that people interested in running for public office can have greater assurance of recourse against slanderous attacks on them or their families.

We have here, incidentally, a constitutional problem which must eventually probably be decided by the courts. But, unfortunately, some libel lawyers have interpreted recent Supreme Court decisions, particularly the decision in Sullivan v. New York Times, as being virtually a license to lie where a political candidate, a member of his family or one of his supporters or friends is involved.

This is wrong. It is necessary that a change be made so that a candidate who runs for public office knows that he has recourse in case of such an attack which is totally untrue and would other-

wise give him a right to sue for libel.

Other measures which would encourage a wider choice for the voters by reducing the costs of campaigning include the repeal of the equal time provision of the Communications Act allowing for more free broadcast coverage of candidates.