The amendment is as follows:

On page 16, after line 18, Insert the following new paragraph:

"(3) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting 'and', if a person's contributions aggregate more than $100, the account shall include occupation, and the principal place of business (If any)."

On page 21, strike out paragraphs (2), (3), and insert in lieu thereof paragraphs (9) and (10).

On page 21, strike out lines 4 through 8, and insert in lieu thereof:

The amendment being read, objections are waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A CORRECTED EXPLANATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a corrected version of the Mondale-Schweiker Presidential Campaign Financing Act of 1973 (S. 2238) which originally appeared on page 25603 of the July 24 Record, be printed in the final bound version of the July 24 Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
and why they were made will have a very
sobering impact on the conscience of those giving and those taking contribu-
tions for political purposes.
If 20 executive of a large corporation all contribute on the same day to a
candidate, is not their corporation affiliation
important? If a corporation gets a
favorable government decision in a con-
traversial case, is not the public entitled
to know how much its executives con-
tributed and to whom?
There is much in S. 372 that I think
bears strong support, and I support the
general thrust of the campaign reform
provisions that the Senate Committee has
developed, and I commend it for its work, but
this one particular step I think was un-
wise, and it has been so viewed among
independent commentators.
The editorial reaction to this provi-
sion of S. 372 has been uniformly nega-
tive.
The Wall Street Journal—which I
think we can concede is a source of
probable responsible in America—
said this on July 11:
We now learn that the Senate Rules Com-
mittee has moved to water down [the dis-
closure requirements of the 1971 Act], a
provision that could scarcely seem less ap-
propriate. If anything, the requirements
should be strengthened.
We know the Wall Street Journal
speaks for the American business com-
munity.
On the same day, the New York Times
called the committee action "astound-
ing," saying:
Undoubtedly, the existing requirement is
now somewhat burdensome to campaign
treasurers, but once it is widely known, it
will become a matter of simple routine. It is
no more onerous for the contributor than
providing identification to get a check cashed.
If addresses and occupations are not listed,
the reports on contributions become much
less meaningful.
An editorial in the July 13 Washing-
ton Post referred to the weakening of the disclosure laws as "astonishing" in the
light of the American Airlines revela-
tions.
Mr. President, this amendment, as I
pointed out earlier, is cosponsored by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Szeven-
sow) and the Senator from Maryland
(Mr. Mathias). They, too, have pointed
out that this amendment is essential if the
American public is to be given the information they need to illuminate
them as to the sources and the amounts of
campaign contributions accepted by
citizens seeking public office.
I note that the floor manager is not
on the floor at this time. I understand he
is testifying before a committee. I won-
der if it is the wish of the leadership that we
withhold further action on this amend-
ment until the floor manager re-
turns.
Mr. Mansfield. Yes, indeed. May I
say to the Senator that the distinguished
manager of the bill and the ranking Re-
publican member are both absent be-
cause of official commitments before
committees and in committees in which
they have to be at the present time. So
the leadership would appreciate the Sena-
or's withhold any action at this time
until the manager of the bill and his as-
semble on the other side can be given
a chance to answer.
Mr. Mondale. Very well. Mr. Presi-
dent, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. 
James Verder, of my staff, have the
privileges of the floor during the course
of this bill.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Not including
roll calls.
Mr. Mondale. Not including roll calls.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL
OF THE CHAIR
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. Presi-
dent, I move that the Senate stand in
cess, subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion was agreed to; and at
11:39 a.m. the Senate took a recess sub-
ject to the call of the Chair; whereupon,
at 11:54 a.m. the Senate reassembled
when called to order by the Presiding
Officer (Mr. Clark).

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN
ACT: AMENDMENTS OF 1973
The Senate continued with the con-
sideration of the bill (S. 372) to amend
the Communications Act of 1934 to re-
lieve shippers of the equal time re-
quirement of sec. 315 with respect to
Presidential and Vice Presidential can-
didates and to amend the Campaign
Communications Reform Act to provide
further limitation on expenditures in
election campaigns for Federal elective
office.

AMENDMENT NO. 453
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. President,
I have an amendment which I send to
the desk for printing.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
amendment will be received and printed,
and will lie on the table.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Having dis-
cussed this amendment with the distin-
guished chairman of the Republican Member (Mr. Cook), I ask unanimous consent
that tomorrow morning, immediately up-
on the resumption of the unfinished busi-
ess by the Senate, my amendment be
called up, and that there be a 30-minute
time limitation thereon, to be equally
divided in accordance with the usual
form.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there
objection? Mr. Cook. No objection.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL
OF THE CHAIR
Mr. Cook. Mr. President, I move that
the Senate stand in recess subject to the
call of the Chair.
The motion was agreed to; and at
11:55 a.m. the Senate took a recess, sub-
ject to the call of the Chair.
The Senate reassembled at 11:58 a.m.,
when called to order by the Presiding
Officer (Mr. Clark).

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTA-
TION APPROPRIATIONS—UNAN-
IMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. President,
I ask unanimous consent that on Satu-
day next, immediately following the
recognition of the two leaders on their
designees under the standing order, the
Senate proceed to the consideration of
the Department of Transportation ap-
propriation bill.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. I ask unani-
mous consent that upon the disposition
of that bill on Saturday, the Senate
resume its consideration of the unfinished
business (S. 372), if that business has not
been disposed of prior to that time.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered.

QUORUM CALL
Mr. Cook. Mr. President, I suggest
the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose
time? Mr. Cook. The time to be equally di-
vided, on the bill.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without
objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will
call the roll.
The second assistant legislative clerk
proceeded to call the roll.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. President,
I ask unanimous consent that the order
for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Szeven-
sow). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. President,
I move that the Senate go into executive
session for not to exceed one hour.
The motion was agreed to, and the
Senate proceeded to the consideration of
executive business.
Mr. Goldwater. Mr. President,
I ask that the following nominations:
Major General Elvy Benton Roberts to be
lieutenant general in the Army.
Lieutenant General Patrick Cassidy, USA,
to be retired in that grade.
Major General Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr.,
to be lieutenant general in the Army.
Brigadier General William McGilvery Buck
and Brigadier General Evan Albert Turnage
to become major generals in the Army Na-
tional Guard.
Rear Admiral Oliver H. Perry, Jr., to be vice
admiral as Chairman, Inter-American De-
defense Board.
J. William Middendorf II, of Connecticut,
to be Under Secretary of the Navy.
Mr. President, the Armed Services
Committee unanimously reported these
nominations, and I ask for their imme-
diate consideration.
Mr. Robert C. Byrd. Mr. President,
in my understanding that the distin-
guished chairman of the committee, the
senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. Sym-
ing), approves the immediate consider-
ation and approval of these nominations?
Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct. The committee is still sitting in session, and I broke away to put these in so that we could get the nominations confirmed at a time proper.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes. I believe I understood the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) to say that all these nominations have been unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct. They are routine.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I have no objection to the immediate consideration of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations which the Senator from Arizona has just reported will be stated.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE SENATE TO CONVENE AT 10 A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate meets on Monday next, it meet at the hour of 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the recognition of the two leaders or their designees under the standing order, there be a period for the transaction of Senate business of not to exceed 10 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 8070.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8070) to authorize grants for vocational rehabilitation services, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I move that the Senate agree to the request of the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferences on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President appointed Messrs. RANDOLPH, CRANSTON, WILLIAMS, PELL, KENNEDY, MONDALE, HATHAWAY, STAFFORD, TAFT, SCHWEIKER, and BEALL confer on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1973

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 372) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to re¬ land core broadcasters of the equal time requirement of section 315 with respect to presidential and vice presidential candidates, to and to amend the Campaign Communications Reform Act to provide for limitation on expenditures in election campaigns for Federal elective office.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, No. 385, be placed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 385

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, one of the major problems in recent national elections has been the proliferation of committees to raise campaign funds on behalf of presidential and Vice Presidential nominees of the respective political parties.

The establishment of such an infinite number of campaign committees has made the enforcement of our existing campaign laws virtually impossible.

It was for this reason that I offered in the Commerce Committee an amendment to S. 372, the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1973, which provided that all expenditures of more than $100 made on behalf of a candidate for President or Vice President must be approved by the national committee of the candidate's respective political party. I was very much pleased that the amendment was approved unanimously by the Commerce Committee and was included as section 314 of the bill S. 372 which was referred by the Commerce Committee to the Rules Committee.

During the deliberation of the Rules Committee this provision was deleted. The amendment as modified which we are now considering would return the provision to the bill except that the amount has been changed from $100 to $1,000.

This amendment will require that regardless of how many political committees are set up to influence the election of a nominee for President or Vice President, the party's national committee must approve all expenditures in excess of $1,000 regardless of which campaign committee seeks to make the expenditure.

Mr. President, I believe that the final responsibility for how the campaign funds are spent must rest with one national committee rather than the many obscure campaign committees that are now created to receive and expend funds. It is my opinion that if the campaign spending restrictions and reporting requirements are ever to be truly effective, this must be the one committee which is ultimately responsible for campaign expenditures. All of us have
been living with a situation which was created last year when a requirement of this nature was nonexistent. It is hoped that by adopting this amendment we can preclude the recurrence of such activities as those which evolved last year with regard to the Committee To Reelect the President.

I might suggest that on my own motion I made a modification of my amendment to increase the figure of $100 to a figure of $1,000. This was done in consultation with a number of Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

I think it is a fine amendment, and I hope that it will be accepted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I want the record to show that when the amendment was advanced to our committee—that is, the Committee on Commerce—it was exhaustively discussed, and, really, it was a good idea. I hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The amendment actually, in essence, will make the national committee responsible for the money once a candidate receives the nomination of his convention or of the party for the office of President or Vice President. It is as simple as that, Mr. President. I think it concentrates it, and the experience we had with the so-called Committee to Reelect the President of the United States has embarrassed everyone in Washington and everyone else in the country.
one could bet his bottom dollar that that person wants the world to know that he made that contribution.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, he wants the candidate to know. However, he does not always want the world to know.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from now on, after the Watergate situation, he wants the world to know it, or he should.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator makes a good point. I published out earlier today that when the chairman of the board of the American Airlines publicly disclosed an illegal contribution, he pointed out, in effect, that he was almost shaken down because he had a merger pending.

He said: Not only do I regret this, but as a business man, I think it is time for the business world to demand that something be done, because we are being victimized, along with everyone else.

There is a growing consensus in America that this is needed to protect the country.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota were to yield, I would agree with the Senator from Minnesota if he would conclude the word “almost.” The Senator said that this was almost a shaken down of the American Air Lines. I think that it was a shaken down.

I think this is the sort of thing we want to avoid. The reason the committee took the language out, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky pointed out, was that people had had experience with the law, and we found a lot of difficulties, as reported by a number of candidates, where for $10 or more—with a $20 contribution, for example—you had to get the occupation and business address of a man.

Well, a $10, $20, or $100 contribution are not the ones that really should be looked at with suspicion, if any of them should.

But if you have a fundraising dinner, and you are trying to sell tickets, the candidate is trying to sell tickets to his dinner, maybe it is a $50 fundraiser dinner, and the person trying to sell the tickets says, “I cannot sell you this ticket unless I have your occupation and your principal place of business.”

It really serves no useful purpose. It does accumulate a lot of useless information that we have stored in rooms downstairs, as chairman of the Rules Committee I am trying to find room right now to store a lot of this information that no one in the world ever look at in the future.

I agree that there should be a cutoff date. This was not suggested in the committee. As long as the Senator has proposed his amendment now to make it over $100, I would be willing to accept that amendment. I think it is a good idea. I think these are the types of contributions we ought to be concerned about, and have the necessary information on. But as I say, unfortunately no one presented such a suggestion to us in the hearings before the committee. Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. This whole thing boils down to the matter of identity, so that in the future a candidate is not determined whether or not the candidate is being influenced in any way. That is the purpose of this bill to begin with. Anyone who is contributing less than $100 is not apt to do it because he wants to influence anyone. But when they collect over $100, I think the public ought to be entitled to know who gave it, with his name, his address, his business location, if he has one, and his occupation if it can be determined.

Mr. MONDALE. And under this amendment we require that the public records disclose the business occupation, because we want the information presented in such a way that newsmen covering the story or anyone in the public wishing to check it quickly and find out the source of the contribution, the address of the donor, and his business; occupation can do so, so that if there is some connection between a donation and a business of a corporation, or whatever, or there is suspicion about it, the public would be free to obtain that information, and it would be presented in a way so that the public would know immediately.

Mr. PASTORE. To go a step further—and I think the Senator is correct—he mentioned the case of American Airlines. Of course, what they did was absolutely wrong, and was in violation of the law, because that was a contribution made by the corporation, which is prohibited by law.

But let us assume that the President of American Airlines, whoever he happens to be, John Doe, lives at such and such an address. I do not think that is sufficient identification, but if you see John Doe, who is president of American Airlines, and his office address is such and so and his home address is such and so, then you find that the president of American Airlines is making the contribution, and not John Doe, period.

Mr. MONDALE. We keep referring to American Airlines; perhaps we are being a little bit too specific. Let us take another situation. Suppose we take the president of Corporation A. He calls in his 100 top executives, and says, “I would like each of you to give $100 to this candidate, Candidate B.” We are going to have this, and when we have the distinguished firm manager has pointed out—and the ranking minority member also agrees with it—it would be possible for those hundred executives simply to file their name and address; and if you looked at the public record, and as the distinguished firm executive is named, or with that corporation, you would not know that all of them worked for the same company.

Under my amendment, each of them would have to list the name and address and their business occupation, so that it would be very clear to anyone reading the record that on such and such a date, or within the same period, 100 people, top executives of the same corporation, made these contributions.

Those are hot facts. In other words, there are cold facts and there are hot facts. The hot facts are the meaningful questions: how much is coming from whom, and when?

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator that in the bill we give the commission which we established here—which the Senate approved before and the House did not go along with—the authority to establish such additional rules and regulations with respect to reporting as they may deem advisable, because this will be their responsibility, to be determined where these funds came from. So it is not even precluded by the Senator's amendment, that that is all that has to be done, because we do give the commission additional authority in that area.

Mr. MONDALE. And by centralizing all this information in one spot, and putting it into an independent commission, together with this amendment, we have a much stronger institutional and legal framework for the American public that they will know precisely who gave how much, and from what source.

Mr. President, I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On whose time?

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator is ready to vote, I am willing to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Believe the President (Mr. Stevenson) would like to speak on this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. No, he does not want to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RoBERT C. ByRD). The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON. I stand to object to the President. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) be added as a co-sponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RoBERT C. ByRD). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale). On this question, the yeas and nays having been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. ByRD. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Eastland), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Johnston), the Senator from
from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sparkman) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Abourezk) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre) would vote "yea".

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McIntyre) would vote "yea".

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. Goldwater) is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Curtis) would vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 2, as follows:
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Yeas—88

Allen
Allen
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bentsen
Bible
Biden
Brook
Brooke
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd
Harry F., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Cassidy
Cleary
Clark
Clay
Cranston
Dole
Domino
Domenici
Douglas
Dick
Ellender
Evans
Fannin
Fong
Bellmon
Bennett
Abourezk
Abourezk
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland

Nays—2

Bennett
Abourezk
Cotton
Curtis
Eastland

NOT VOTING—10

Watergate revelations, it was clear that something was wrong with our country's electoral system. The fact that many potential voters stay away from the polls is one sign of popular disaffection. Too, is the continual rise of public lack of confidence and trust in our governmental and political institutions expressed in opinion surveys. The widespread concern—of voter and political system cannot afford any more Watergates. Although I intend to support final passage of this bill, I also plan to continue working in the Select Committee and as an individual Senator to try to design additional legislative measures which will insure fair and competitive elections for every seat in the U.S. Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I understand that the yeas and nays have been ordered on my amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

A $100 CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION LIMIT NEEDED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment would amend the bill to provide that the limit on the amount that could be contributed to any candidate in any calendar year by any one contributor would be $100, not $5,000. It also provides that the amount which could be contributed by an individual to all campaigns would be $1,000, not $100,000.

Mr. President, there is one fundamental argument for this amendment. By confining contributions to political campaigns to less than $100, it would virtually remove the most corrupting element in American life.

CAMPAGN CONTRIBUTION—THE NEW BRIEBRY

Political power in America today is not significantly influenced by outright bribes. Occasional bribes are offered and accepted, but they are rare; and I doubt that any significant legislation in this area has been affected this year, last year, or even in the past 5 years by an outright bought and paid for vote. The people with money who want to buy nominations for candidates who want to secure legislation protecting their special interest—do not have to resort to the criminal, dangerous risk of offering a bribe. They can influence legislation in a perfectly legal, widely noticed way and in a way that gets results.

If there have been few if any outright bribes of Members of the Senate in recent years, it is unlikely that any significant legislation has been affected by bribery over the past year. This is emphatically not the case for campaign contributions.

Mr. President, every year since I have been in this body—and that is 16 years—a great deal of vital legislation has been passed or defeated because of political contributions. Large political contributions have influenced Senators to vote for it or against it, or to water it down or soften its impact to serve a particular heavily contributing interest.

Mr. President, since the Select Committee will investigate the entire area of campaign finance and the allegations of improper financial activities during the 1972 Presidential campaign—so that the full truth will be known. Upon the conclusion of that segment of hearings, the committee will consider legislative remedies to prevent future occurrences of such activities. I would assume that some legislative recommendations will be forthcoming from the committee in the area of campaign financing.

I wish to put my colleagues on notice today that I do not believe we will solve all of our problems in the area of campaign financing today. I believe that we need more information in a number of areas before we can make much of our actions, especially concerning the potential of public financing of campaigns. I do not mean to suggest that solutions can be forestalled indefinitely. Our political system cannot afford any more Watergates. Although I intend to support final passage of this bill, I also plan to continue working in the Select Committee and as an individual Senator to try to design additional legislative measures which will insure fair and competitive elections for every seat in the U.S. Congress.