

rangements, one could, of course, be drafted to take into account every possibility that the mind of man could conceive.

If someone had an idea that perhaps the President should not be permitted to say something nice about a Senator or a Representative, or even something that might hurt him in some areas, that could be suggested as a refinement.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] who is a cosponsor of the proposal thinks that all private contributions to major parties in a presidential campaign should be outlawed. That might very well be a good suggestion; but we need not cross that bridge just now. We

[P. 27596]

can take a good look at it and let the committees of the Senate and House consider it, knowing that we have initiated a plan to improve election campaigns by eliminating improper influence and permitting income-tax payers to make a contribution.

It is felt by the administration and by a majority of Members of the Senate and House that this is the most constructive step that has been made along this line in a great number of years. It is one thing we will have done to help to prevent improper influence in government.

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator from Louisiana well knows my views on the subject, but I should like, once again, to commend him for having taken the initiative in this particular matter. It is a proposal that has been discussed for years in an effort to determine how we can remove suspicions of bad influence from presidential campaigns.

Different people have come in with different ideas. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as I remember, several years ago, had a suggestion along this line. I had one. Hearings were held, but on that day I was unable to be present so I presented a statement as to how I thought it should be done. Other Senators presented their views. The distinguished Senator from Delaware was one of those most enthusiastic about a tax incentive approach. He adopted the same approach which the President himself had sent over. After much give and take, the Senator from Louisiana came in with what everyone finally concluded was a most workable and a most practical solution to the problem. It was to be totally voluntary, yet it would do the job and make it possible for men running for high office to be absolutely free from the suspicion that some one individual or some segment of the economy, or some person—if I may be permitted to suggest it—with an ulterior motive had come in and contributed a large sum of money

and made it possible, because of that contribution, to influence the outcome of an election.

That can no longer happen with this kind of legislation.

Thus, I highly commend the Senator from Louisiana. In all candor, I think that this is almost the most important part of the bill. If we had not done it this way, it is my humble judgment we would be debating this kind of thing for the next 10 years.

For years, the Senate has been talking about the need to change the electoral college system, which everyone knows is outmoded and outdated and leads to all kinds of injustices. Every Senator thinks it should be changed according to his way of thinking, and I think that if this situation prevails, we will never get it corrected.

It will be my prediction that if we did not pass this campaign financing proposal now, we would be debating it for the next two generations, and probably would never accomplish anything along that line. So I am happy that it is being done. If, in practice, evidence develops that it is not working as well as we like, then, on the basis of experience, we can correct it. I happened to be the chairman of Democratic campaigns on three occasions for a period of 6 years, and I can testify to the fact that we need something in this field. This is a major start. While it does not yet go down to the areas of the congressional level, nevertheless, when it goes into effect at the highest level, the No. 1 level, the level of a presidential campaign, I think it will give us experience so that in time we might be able to place it into the law with respect to other political campaigns.

Thus, I want to commend the Senator from Louisiana again for his energy in pursuing this particular program, and I know that it will redound to the betterment of this Republic.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator very much. Let me just make a few brief references to what I believe to be the completely erroneous statements which have been made here. I would like to say that the rules require me to accord Senators due consideration in this regard as to their being in error.

A Senator said that those of us voting for the bill admitted that everything in it was special privilege. We do not admit any such thing.

As a practical matter, we could say that every facet in life has its special privilege. If we do something only for women, we discriminate against men. That involves them, but not everyone. If we are doing something to limit the tax liability of a particular industry, that involves a special group. There is no way to draw up any tax laws which do not involve one group or another. There are married couples who have children and