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ceilings in Section 1108 were established in 1967. They did not take into account the requirements that have been placed on Puerto Rico, as well as on the States, since that time. Examples of new conditions in such programs of income earned by public assistance recipients, effective July 1, 1972; mandatory registrations and certification of needed services as child care services, for individuals involved in the WIN program, effective July 1, 1972, under amendments enacted in January 1972; and rising caseloads and costs for years subsequent to fiscal year 1972.

EARNED INCOME DISREGARDS

Effective July 1, 1972, Puerto Rico is required under the Social Security Act to disregard a portion of any earned income of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) in determining the amount of the assistance payment. The Federal statute provides that Puerto Rico, with HEW approval, might modify the amount of the disregards specified in the Act, or one-third of the remainder. The Department of Social Services elected to disregard the first $15 and one-fifth of the remainder for individuals but lacked the funds necessary to make the disregards effective on July 1, 1972.

A side effect of the failure to put income disregards into effect is that persons referred to the WIN program may, if they receive any income in connection with their participation, become ineligible for further assistance, and thus ineligible for further participation in WIN.

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

Puerto Rico is the only jurisdiction without specified legislation for this purpose. Social and Rehabilitation Service representatives have discussed this need in the past and will discuss it again. The present child protection system is not adequate.

WORK INCENTIVE PROGRAMS (WIN)

Puerto Rico has been allotted $889,920 for costs of child care, other services and administration for the WIN program during fiscal year 1973. The $2 million ceiling in Section 1108(b) of the Social Security Act applies.

Participants in work training programs in Puerto Rico face the following problems. Training programs of participants in such programs as Manpower Development and Training (MDTA) often exceed the welfare grant that the individual earns and is ineligible for welfare. WIN participants are being denied social services thirty days after termination from welfare. This means that needed child care can no longer be provided and consequently the individual is unable to continue in the training program. A cycle of welfare/WIN/cutoff of supportive services and return to welfare begins again. This cycle also occurs in on-the-job training programs where in some cases the participant is receiving more in on-the-job training than would be provided by the income maintenance grant.

The above situations seem to be contrary to both the spirit of the WIN legislation and the Federal guidelines as well. (Note the relevant section on Earned Income Disregards above.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately, there is neither the time nor the detailed information available to remedy this situation on this bill, but I would ask the chairman to direct the committee's attention to the problem perhaps at least through hearings and will request HEW to prepare detailed recommendations for amendments to appropriate statutes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state whether he is yielding time from the amendment, or is it general debate? A unanimous-consent request is in order that it not be charged at all, or it can be charged against the 10-minute limitation on debate.

Mr. LONG. I will speak on the limitation for the moment, if I must, I do have time on general debate available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment has a time limitation of 1 hour to be equally divided.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without prejudice to the time allotted to both sides, I might be allotted 10 minutes to discuss the parliametary situation with regard to the Public Debt Limit bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 10 minutes reserved at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, may I ask the indulgence of both Senators to have the unanimous-consent request to call a quorum at the end of their remarks so I can come back and deal with the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Alabama is to be recognized for 10 minutes after the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the House yesterday returned to the Senate H.R. 11104, the public debt limit bill without amendments. Now, it is in order for anyone to move to recommit the Senate amendments; or I believe a motion would take precedence to concur in the Senate amendments, or at least to insist on the Senate amendments, in which event it would go back to the House with the Senate amendments on it; or we could engage in a number of other parliamentary methods to settle this issue.

If we could not resolve it in any other way, we have on the calendar a revenue bill which has a number of amendments that, if they were up to the mark, would strike everything after the number of the bill and simply substitute the debt limit bill with the amendments we wanted to add and send that to the House in a fashion that we believe the House would accept. So I have several possibilities available to us.

It is my understanding, based on discussions I have had with Members of the House, including the Speaker and major leader of the House, that the House would be willing to accept the Senate amendment which would provide financial assistance to candidates participating in Presidential primaries leading up to the Presidential nomination and eventual election of the President; that, in fact, on that basis they would suggest certain amendments which would improve some technical points of the bill and perhaps in several minor ways the substance of the bill that make it a proposal from the legislative point of drafting; and that in general they would accept the Senate view and philosophy with regard to the financing of primary elections for candidates for Presidency.

The House Members have indicated that they are not willing to accept at this time the Senate's suggestion with regard to election of candidates for the Senate and House of Representatives.

That is what would appear to those of us who have tried to resolve the impasse in which the Congress finds itself on the debt limit bill.

The best way to proceed with this, Mr. President, if the Senate and the House are to do what I believe the two bodies would be willing to agree upon, would be for the Senate and the House to accept the Senate amendment which the Senate could amend the bill, or at least could limit its amendments on the bill to the one which the Senate had been led to believe that the House would accept. I say the Senate; I speak my view as just one Senator expressing his opinion about this matter.

For that reason, Mr. President, it would seem to me appropriate to ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the fashion in which I would suggest. I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) is strongly opposed to the amendment with regard to Presidential primaries and that he would expect to object. I see he is present, and certainly would not make the request if he were not present. But in order that the amendments on this matter might be limited to that one amendment agreed to by the Senate rather than several that were agreed to by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that, in the consideration of Senate amendments to H.R. 11104, the debt limitation bill, the amendment by the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be treated as a separate and independent
amendment as set forth in the engrossed amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the objection?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and now, if I may use the 10 minutes allotted to me, I will state that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has outlined some four or five or 6 months, and I think that if he had any options as a matter of right, he would be using them, rather than coming in and asking unanimous consent that he follow a certain right.

Mr. President, I object to several aspects of this request, and I would point out that the time limitation of this bill before the Senate at this late time during which the debt limit retains its present limitations. I feel that it is unwise to have this matter come up every 4 or 5 or 6 months, and I think it certainly does violence to the legislative process to hold this bill hostage to putting on another measure having no reference whatsoever to the debt limit, and then sending it over to the House and forcing the Senate to work on it and then forcing the President to sign the bill.

The debt limit is such that some $65 billion is temporary, and obviously it has to be renewed every so often. If we had just one debt limit, a permanent debt limit, it is possible that the administration could live within that debt limit: but the temporary debt limit of some $65 billion, of course, expires every few months and has to be renewed.

The parliamentary situation on this bill is rather delicate, and it is back to us stripped entirely of the Senate amendments. If they wanted to keep the Senate amendments alive, all they needed to do would have been to amend our amendments with just a one-liner, keep anything to keep the amendments alive and keep the process of amendment open and available. They did not do that. They sent it back to us stripped clean of the Senate amendments.

I do not believe it right, at the last minute of the day, for the debt limit expires and it goes back to its permanent $400 billion limitation, that we are to bring in something entirely new, subsidizing the candidacies of many public officials, many in the Congress, many Governors, financing their campaigns up to the tune of a possible $7 million apiece.

The newspapers have been very guarded in what they have been saying. They have not been letting the public in on what is involved in this measure. They have not been letting the public in on what is involved in these elections. Well, it applies to a whole lot more than that. It applies to the candidates of everybody seeking the nomination of a major party for the Presidency. All they have to do is to qualify for the Federal election, to get the nomination, to believe the public understands that.

There is another option available to the Senate, and I believe that along about 11 o'clock tonight we are going to come to it, and that is to recede from our amendments, raise the debt limit, and send it to the President for his signature. It is not a question of holding up the debt limit: what this is is a question of holding up a raid on the Federal Treasury for the politicians of this country. That is what it is, and we might as well face that right now.

Mr. PRESIDENT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question, if he will yield.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to know whether any of the suggested procedures by the chairman of the Finance Committee would not put a Senator like myself, who is opposed to increases in the debt limit, and who at the same time thinks that a study should be made by the proper committee of the question whether there should be public financing of Presidential elections, rate the Senator has adopted as a rider to this bill, in an impossible position to vote in a manner which reflects his honest beliefs on that question?

Mr. ALLEN. It would certainly make it difficult.

If this idea of financing campaigns for the Presidency is an idea whose time has come, as has been stated on the floor of the Senate, let such a measure stand on its own two feet. Let them put in a bill to that effect, and if everybody is for it, or if a majority are for it, let them vote for it; but do not put it on a necessary bill and let it ride piggyback on this bill. That is what is sought here.

We have this measure before the Senate. We will not have to send it back to the House for a fresh version, our amendments, accept the House version, send it down to the President, and let us go home for the weekend.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I object to the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have before the Senate the measure to which the Senator from Alabama with great a deal of interest, I am sure he recognizes the fact that the Senate, by a strong majority, did pass the debt ceiling limitation with amendments which were agreed to separately by strong majorities. I would assume also that the distinguished Senator would be in favor of a conference between the House and Senate on a debt ceiling bill so that differences, if any, could be worked out. If the President, through a conference, would have a chance to express their views.

The House has turned down the possibility of a conference on this measure and has sent back to us a clean bill, without affording us the courtesy of a conference. I would appreciate, if the President, through a conference, would have a chance to express their views.

Everything that was done in relation to the debt ceiling bill—the amendments, the appointment of the conferences, and the request for a conference—was done with the approval of the Senate and, in the last two instances, unanimous approval. I would assume, because having been on the floor, I heard no nays.

Would the Senate be opposed to move at this time on the part of the manager of the bill and the majority of the Senate to ask for a conference, and in that way try to seek an accommodation of ideas with the House?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the House message is not even before the Senate. We will have to cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We can cross that bridge right now if the Senator is in favor of doing it. All it takes is a motion. And I would hope that the distinguished manager of the bill would consider this because then we would be working within the norms of the combined legislative bodies.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message on H.R. 11104.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 11104 which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11104) providing for a temporary increase of $7,000,000,000 in the public debt limit; and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives 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.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not favor sending this matter to a conference. As the distinguished majority leader has said, the House turned down a request of the Senate for a conference. What assurances do we have that they would now be willing to proceed to a conference?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator yield there?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I can see, with all due respect to the distinguished Senator, we will never know unless we ask for a conference, and then it will be a new ball game. But I have an idea that this time the House may agree to a conference. I am just guessing on that. I do not know.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for the information he has imparted to me on this matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that the House did not decline to go to conference on this matter without communicating, at least to me
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and to the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, and perhaps on the Republican side, the concern that the House felt about some of these amendments and at least some indication of what the House might be willing to do. At least those would be a very good start for the House leadership on the Democratic side, were not ad

vant. They would not take the attitude that the Senate is not entitled to amend a revenue bill or to be germane in amendments to a revenue bill. However, their view was that there were amendments on which they do not agree to go to conference. And frankly, they have been willing to be reasonable and to talk with the Senate.

As the Senator well knows, they are not willing to accept anything in the Senate bill, including the amendment of the Senate from Alabama, whose amendment is probably most of what is in conference.

Mr. ALLEN. It is a very sound amendment.

Mr. LONG. So, the House is willing, at least up to this point, to be at least flex

ible to amend a bill. However, they do not wish to do so.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, these assurances are most reassuring to the Senator from Alabama. He will take them into account as time goes on.

One option that the distinguished Senator mentioned—and he had a number of them, and I hope that he will use some of those options rather than the option he is insisting on, and that is to go to conference and immedi

ately consider some of these various amend

ments—was an option of taking up a revenue bill on the calendar, amending it with these Kennedy-Scott amendments, and then sending it to the House and requesting a conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 20 minutes allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, since we laid this measure down, it was my thought that we were now debating H.R. 11104.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. We had a unanimous-consent agreement to consider and debate the pending amend

ment to the pending bill. That agreement has expired. The time is now on the pending amendment and not on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now pro

ceed to consider the House message on H.R. 11104.

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

The Senate proceeded to consider the House message which is as follows:

Resolved, That the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11104) to provide for a temporary increase of $10,700,000,000 in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary limit applies (June 30).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, as the Chair will note, the Senator from Alabama interposed no objection to the unanimous-consent request that we stay on the message from the House.

I think it is something that we should stay on until we dispose of it. I realize what disposition we make of it. And while the Senate has this most important bill, I do not believe that it should release control of it until it finally enacts it by receding from its amendments.

What is the use of sending it over to the House? They turned down one request for a conference. They may turn down another. If they do not turn down another request, what sort of measure will ever come from the conference?

They say that a compromise has been reached. A compromise as between whom? I know that in some of these highly emotional issues we have had on the Senate floor, we have been locked. Then we would receive in the paper early one morning that a compromise had been reached that would allow the Senate to go ahead.

The distinguished Senator—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, would the Senate yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I would yield for a question. I am anxious to proceed with my discussion. However, I do yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator made a state

ment a moment ago that I would like to pose to the Senate, if the Senator is willing to do so. He proposed that we take up some other revenue measure and add the debt limit amendment and the campaign financing amendment to it and send it to the House.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Senator did not say that I would have to correct the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I did not say that we should put the debt limit bill on it. I said we should put the campaign expenditures provision on the bill. That would not be sufficient to look at the revenue bill that the Senator is talking about and agreement could be made to send the debt limit bill without excess baggage and subject to agreeing on the revenue measure if the campaign measure is put on.

It could well be—I do not definitely commit myself, and I cannot commit my colleagues who are interested—but it might well be that a compromise could be worked out in this regard. Do not hold the debt limit hostage because that is what the Senator from Alabama is speaking to. But on some of these highly explosive issues, we read that a compromise has been reached, and then we come on up here to the Senate and do something as I am not committed to a degree. And as far as I am concerned, I do not say that we are right or wrong or anything about it. The Senator from Alabama was not. I think it is something that we should stay on until we dispose of it. But what disposition we make of it. And while the Senate has this most important bill, I do not believe that it should release control of it until it finally enacts it by receding from its amendments.

I just say that at this moment we have a compromise has been reached, in some fashion.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, these assurances are most reassuring to the Senator from Alabama, whose amendment is probably most of what is in conference.

I have not seen the result of their work. I have not seen this compromise. I suppose it has been reduced to writing. I would like to see it. If I could study it, it might be that I could find something in there that I could be for. But these compromises that are not compromises accomplish a great deal, and do not convince anyone as far as I know.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senate yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, just as a point of in

formation, does the Senator expect to be talking about a compromise and lack of a compromise between now and 11:30 this evening? Would the Senator enlighten us, so that we might be able to know what the intention of the Senator from Alabama is, if that is appropriate?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I will be glad to. I will resort to Operation Candor, and tell the Senator that I intend to discuss this matter until 12 o'clock this afternoon to keep the Presidential primary subsidy bill from going into effect, yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Then the Senator will have a good chance to examine that compromise in detail.

Mr. ALLEN. Does he have a copy of it?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator from Massachusetts is aware of at least some of the proposals that have been talked about, but I would rather hear the Senator discuss it.

Mr. ALLEN. As far as discussing the compromise is concerned, I do not have a copy of it, so I wish the Senator would furnish me with a copy as soon as he gets one.

Mr. President, there is a question involved here that is most important, and that is taking must legislation here in the Senate and putting on it a measure that would have no chance of passing on its own as a separate bill, putting it on a must piece of legislation, and then writing that must legislation into enacted law, and I am sure that I am one Senator who thinks that is not in the interest of good government. That is what the Senator from Alabama tries to stand for, whether he succeeds or not.

One thing I want to make completely clear, and that is that while having voted against all debt limit increases since I have been in the U.S. Senate, I plan again to vote against this debt limit increase, I have no quarrel with that matter being enacted into law. And we can enact it into law, insofar as Congress can act, in 1 minute. That is how long it will take.

So is the Senator from Alabama stand-
ing in the way of enactment of this debt limit proposal?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield? I ask unanimous consent that the Senator might yield without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not object to losing the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection heard.

Mr. LONG. I do not mind the Senator asking a question, but I object to passing the floor around, Mr. President. I think we ought to maintain the regular order.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will assure me that he will immediately seek recognition, I will yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, how can the Senator assure him that? I might want recognition myself.

Mr. ALLEN. All right, if the Senator from West Virginia wants recognition I have no objection to someone else having the floor. I solicit others taking over the floor. All I ask is that the pending question might be put.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it would be my hope that we could accept the House version of the bill on the debt limit, pass that bill, do it quickly, send it on for the President, and look to some other legislation to offer such amendments as the various Senators would like to propose. The amendments already on the debt limit measure having had—

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. AlLEN. I do not object to losing my right to the floor. I am taking this at present as the various Senators would like to bring order to the Chamber by dispersing in time of great stress we are flirting with a pipeline to run a few days, but the chaos is created. It is very important from the standpoint of sound fiscal and financial management that the debt ceiling bill be passed, and that it be passed today. If the authority carried in this proposal expires, it means that all over the land individuals and institutions authorized to issue Government bonds have no authority to do it. It jeopardizes the situation where individuals are buying bonds under a payroll savings plan.

Perhaps there is enough cash in the pipeline to run a few days, but the chaos is created. If we fail to enact this legislation, we send word to our own people, and we send word around the world, that in time of great stress we are flirting with a pipeline to run a few days, but the chaos is created. It is very important from the standpoint of sound fiscal and financial management that the debt ceiling bill be passed, and that it be passed today. If the authority carried in this proposal expires, it means that all over the land individuals and institutions authorized to issue Government bonds have no authority to do it. It jeopardizes the situation where individuals are buying bonds under a payroll savings plan.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska yields to no one in the Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAVERNER assumed the chair.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks—I was looking around to see whether the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LON0) was in the Chamber—I hope that someone will ask him to come in—I am going to move to postpone the pending motion to the next legislative day, but before doing so I should like to comment a little further on the situation we find ourselves in.

We do not need to seize a piece of legislation and make a motion to force legislation onto the other body or onto the Executive that is so lacking in merit that we cannot sell it to them.

Mr. President, I appeal to the leadership of the body of this Congress, let us do the responsible thing and send the debt ceiling bill without amendment to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Now what do we do when we pass the so-called debt ceiling? All we do is give the President the authority to go out and borrow enough money to pay the bills that we have already created.

Unfortunately, the term "debt ceiling" is a misnomer. It is not a debt ceiling at all. It is the authority to borrow enough money to pay the bills that have already been created.

To jeopardize this legislation, to slow it up, to cause a nervousness about it, is not in the interests of the United States. To add amendments to it that we know are displeasing to the House of Representatives and objectionable to the Executive, is a disservice to our country.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I like to feel that politics is an honorable profession. I like to feel that legislators not only act responsibly but also play according to the rules of the game.

Mr. President, I am urging such an arrangement that must go through and must eventually be signed by the President and used that as a vehicle to pass legislation and get it through just is not cricket. It is not playing the game according to the rules.

If legislation is meritorious, if it meets a need in the country, by proper persuasion it can be sold to the House of Representatives and to the Executive.

Perhaps there is enough cash in the pipeline to run a few days, but the chaos is created. If we fail to enact this legislation, we send word to our own people, and we send word around the world, that in time of great stress we are flirting with a pipeline to run a few days, but the chaos is created. It is very important from the standpoint of sound fiscal and financial management that the debt ceiling bill be passed, and that it be passed today. If the authority carried in this proposal expires, it means that all over the land individuals and institutions authorized to issue Government bonds have no authority to do it. It jeopardizes the situation where individuals are buying bonds under a payroll savings plan.

Now, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska yields to no one in his concern about the national debt. If anyone has any doubt about that, just look at the rollcalls on yesterday. I long ago came to the conclusion that the debt ceiling bill has nothing to do with holding down the national debt. We increase the national debt when we vote to increase expenditures and authority to spend. By our day-to-day procedures, by our activities, for the agencies of what agency, we set in motion all the spendmg of the Government. If the sum total of that spending exceeds the tax receipts, the debt has been increased.

Now what do we do when we pass the so-called debt ceiling? All we do is give the President the authority to go out and borrow enough money to pay the bills that we have already created.

Unfortunately, the term "debt ceiling" is a misnomer. It is not a debt ceiling at all. It is the authority to borrow enough money to pay the bills that have already been created.
The troubles that on July 1, 1974, the President of the Senate would have been to keep the Senate within the limit, because $400 billion is permanent and $78 billion is just temporary, just lasting until July 1 of next year. So matter how an administration would economize, we would come to another crisis on July 1.

Along about that time, there will be another reason on that could not pass on its own. It is the Senate's work on this matter, this 132 pages of effort on the part of the Senate. They disagree. This took place yesterday. It did not take them long to act. We sent it over on November 27, and they replied November 29.

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11104) to provide for a temporary increase of $10,700,000,000 in the public debt limit and which temporary limit applies to June 30, 1974.

There is no mention of the conference requested by the Senate. As I stated earlier in remarks, if the House had wanted to keep the Senate amendments alive, all they would have to do is delay it. The Senate would have done that in this action: amended the Senate with just a one-line amendment.

They could just use any innocuous statement. They could have taken a couple of lines out of any portion of the bill and amended it to this effect. They could have amended it back so amended; and then in this interplay between the House and the Senate, without a conference, the Senate then could have put its amendment back in and sent it back to the House. But apparently the House did not want to hear any more of this. They did not amend it, as they had a right to do. They just did not agree to a conference. They just sent it back—13 lines.

Mr. Speaker, I talked of sending something back over there, or conferring, having a conference between the House's 13 lines and the Senate's 122 pages. That would be some conference. Senators know what would come out of that and how much chance there would be of stopping a conference report, where there would be practically no alternative except to vote the conference report up or down. But the matter is presented in well-nigh perfect form now, thanks to the wisdom of the House of Representatives in sending this back to us in this fashion, because it does not require any further action of the House if the Senate will merely recede from its 122 pages of amendments.

So the issue is not whether we are going to hold up the passage of the debt limit bill. It is a question of whether those who are insisting on financing many Presidential campaigns or candidates seeking party nominations are going to insist on that, to the possible sacrifice of passing the debt limit bill.

It is not those who are talking against the Presidential campaigns provisions who are preventing a vote on final passage of this measure. If the Senate wants to pass the debt limit bill, all it has to do is, by unanimous consent or by motion made, to recede from this 132-page document, which has no business on here in the first place, and say: "All right, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, we will accept your greater wisdom and discretion in this matter. We will agree to some compromise legislation, and if it is good it can stand on its own two feet, and if it is bad, it is just going to have to be defeated. We will accept your greater wisdom and discretion and not seek to hold hostage the debt limit bill to force acceptance of this monstrosity," of which there is not yet, as far as the Senator from Alabama knows, a copy of the compromise.

Mr. President, I wish I had a clipping from a newspaper that I read referring to a compromise of this thing, and that all it had left in it was the presidential campaign matter, and it was just fine. The article did not state anything about the Presidential campaigns provisions.

Mr. President, do you not know that that would inspire a lot of fellows who thought maybe they would retire from the Presidential picture; do you not suppose that would inspire them to try again and get $7 million out of the Federal Treasury? They could get $7 million out of the public debt limit and $7 million from the Government, and they would really have a lot of money to spend. Talk about a proliferation of candidates, why, there would be 25 or 30 people running for both Presidential nominations.

Mr. President, I stated a few moments ago that at the conclusion of my remarks I was going to make a motion to postpone to the next day the pending motion, and at this time I want to make a motion to table. So, in order to table the pending motion, I would recommend a conference report, where there would not be a sufficient number of Senators in the Chamber, to be able to have a conference. Senators know, a copy of the compromise. Senators know what would come out of that and how much chance there would be of stopping a conference report, where there would be practically no alternative except to vote the conference report up or down.

But the matter is presented in well-nigh perfect form now, thanks to the wisdom of the House of Representatives in sending this back to us in this fashion, because it does not require any further action of the House if the Senate will merely recede from its 122 pages of amendments.

So the issue is not whether we are going to hold up the passage of the debt limit bill. It is a question of whether those who are insisting on financing many Presidential campaigns or candidates seeking party nominations are going to insist on that, to the possible sacrifice of passing the debt limit bill.
that any person holding a Government check should run to the bank this afternoon if possible to be sure that it is made good.

For that reason, plus the fact that the proper use of the check is to frustrate the will of the Senate and paralyze the opportunity of cleaning up Federal elections, after yielding to the Senator from Alabama, I intend to move to table his motion.

Mr. ALLEN. I must say that the Senator from Alabama is deeply impressed with the unfounded concern on the part of the Senator from Minnesota with Federal financing. I think it is very refreshing that he has turned his interests toward protecting the Federal Treasury, and I hope that he will continue his efforts and his interests in that regard.

But I say to the distinguished Senator, if he is so worried about the Federal Treasury and the debt limit, all we have to do is to move to recede from the Senate position, and that will be final enactment of this legislation, and it will go to the President, I assume, for signature; and if we have the override, he is so concerned with the state of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. MONDALE. But the terms of the motion offered by the Senator from Alabama laying the debt ceiling matter over until the Treasury was notified would result in the expiration of the temporary debt ceiling at midnight tonight.

Mr. ALLEN. That is the only motion we can make, as the Senator knows.

Mr. MONDALE. I will yield in a moment.

This means that, at midnight tonight, everyone in this country will realize that somewhere around Tuesday noon the American Government will come to a halt, Federal checks cannot be written, and we will be in a totally untenable position.

The Senator from Alabama seems to be taking the position that, unless he can have his way, that must be the condition of the American Government. I realize the strength, and the ability that he brings to bear in this matter. I realize the strength and the ability that he brings to bear in behalf of his cause, but it is a fact that the Senate has already dealt with this matter. We spent several hours and days in the consideration of this legislation, and it will go to the President, I assume, for signature, and he will be in a position where he will not have another congressional vote.

The principle of public financing is widely supported now. Public opinion polls show that over 60 percent of the American public wants to remove the influence of big money on American politics and American Government. Conservative columnists such as James Kilpatrick, who had for long periods of time opposed public financing, now have written columns saying that we simply must have public financing of Presidential campaigns to protect against the compromise and corruption of American Government. Even the former Vice President, Mr. Agnew, in his farewell address, called for public financing of American campaigns.

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

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

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, did not the Senate and Congress recognize that when we adopted the legislation on the checkoff?

Mr. MONDALE. Absolutely.

Mr. PASTORE. The purpose of which was to allow the taxpayers of this country to designate $1 of their tax payments—not an additional dollar, but $1 of the tax they owed—toward a fund that would be used as a public fund to support a campaign on the part of a Presidential candidate?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. We have done that. Because naturally there was a little bit of reluctance on the part of the administration when we passed that legislation—we knew at the time that the administration was not amenable to it—what did they do? They inaugurated a system whereby you would have to have a special form, and I received hundreds of letters from people telling me that they even went to the post office and could not get the form.

So naturally, of course, the result was not an encouraging one, for the simple reason that the proper education had not been stimulated in order to acquaint the people with what the issue was.

So, in view of that, now we are coming along all right; let us do it another way. The principle is still the same. It is the public financing of a Presidential campaign. In order to obviate the $1,000 dinners, the scandalous situations that we read about every day whereby large contributors are influenced in their decision as to who they will support, that the President of the United States becomes beholden, that he has to go to cocktail parties in order to make sure that he shakes hands with the right people—all that is going to be done with it. Let the President be a free and independent man. Let him not be beholden to anyone. Let us use about $400 million out of the U.S. Treasury in order to make sure that we have an independent, honest, uncorruptible President, who is the leader of the country and in fact possibly the guiding light of the entire free world.

All we are saying is, "Let's put this in the clear daylight. This is what the Government of the United States will do in order to insure the people of this country, as the Senator has said, of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." I want to thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is absolutely correct. And the realization of the American people, I think, that the American people are coming to is, that they are paying for elections now. Increasingly we do not have a system of private financing of campaigns, at least as disclosed through the Watergate hearings. The public pays for it through the compromising of governmental decisions made at the behest of large contributors.

For example, in the ITT case, it was alleged that $400,000 was given to a campaign fund, or a guarantee, and shortly thereafter a huge antitrust lawsuit was settled in favor of the company. If that was why it was done we do not know, but if it were done for that purpose, it could well be that the American people as consumers will pay hundreds of millions of dollars indirectly as a consequence of failure to fully enforce the Antitrust Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from American Airlines, Mr. Spater, testified directly as to what happened to him. He was approached and ordered to deliver $100,000, and he knew that he was in the middle of a serious airline merger in which his airline could either get something that they thought they needed or lose disastrously, and he in effect said:

We paid protection money to protect ourselves from what we thought was going to be a judicial decision that we didn't agree about, not based on justice or law, but on who gave and who did not give in a political campaign.

So naturally, of course, the result was not an encouraging one, for the simple reason that the proper education had not been stimulated in order to acquaint the people with what the issue was.

Mr. PASTORE. We have done that. Because naturally there was a little bit of reluctance on the part of the administration when we passed that legislation—we knew at the time that the administration was not amenable to it—what did they do? They inaugurated a system whereby you would have to have a special form, and I received hundreds of letters from people telling me that they even went to the post office and could not get the form.

So naturally, of course, the result was not an encouraging one, for the simple reason that the proper education had not been stimulated in order to acquaint the people with what the issue was.

So, in view of that, now we are coming along all right; let us do it another way. The principle is still the same. It is the public financing of a Presidential campaign. In order to obviate the $1,000 dinners, the scandalous situations that we read about every day whereby large contributors are influenced in their decision as to who they will support, that the President of the United States becomes beholden, that he has to go to cocktail parties in order to make sure that he shakes hands with the right people—all that is going to be done with it. Let the President be a free and independent man. Let him not be beholden to anyone. Let us use about
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with me that this debate and discussion has been ample in the course of the Senate's consideration of this legislation this past week? Is it not, in effect, those in the Senate who are prohibiting us from moving ahead, who are holding up the social security bill?

Mr. MONDALe. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the Senator from Minnesota not agree with me on that?

Mr. MONDALe. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is this not a situation where the Senate has already considered and approved major provisions on public financing, in order to achieve fundamental reform in our political system?

We had votes on that. We acted. We are in a situation where the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Finance Committee, have come to the Senate and asked if we could work out a way to permit the debt ceiling to be extended and also to act on what has been accepted by the Senate.

In the situation with which we are clearly confronted, the Senate is now frustrated in addressing itself to the social security bill, to the problems of the elderly, the aged, and those receiving social security benefits. At 1 p.m. this afternoon, rather than dealing with an issue which is of such tremendous concern to the Nation's elderly, we are involved in a filibuster here on the floor of the Senate. Those who were involved in leading the fight in opposition to public financing, in effect, are frustrating the will of the Senate in coming to grips with social security. Is that not the practical impact of the impasse we find ourselves in at the present time?

Mr. MONDALe. The Senator is absolutely correct. We spent several days here before that, and many, many more days preparing this legislation to help American politics from being compromised by the present system of private campaign financing. In those debates and votes, we had no time limit, we debated every one of the amendments at length, and by a very strong margin the Senate decided it wanted a system of public financing that would clean up American politics. That vote was taken. The proposal was added as an amendment to the debt ceiling bill, which the Senate did freely and willingly. There is no question in my mind that by a bipartisan and overwhelming margin, the Senate strongly believes in the action it took and, in so doing, represented the American people, because every poll shows the American people want us to do what we did.

What we have now is a situation where the temporary debt ceiling expires tonight at midnight. At some point of our argument, the position is that, in effect, either we frustrate the will of a majority of the Senate by removing public financing, or they will, in effect, bring the American Government to a halt. So that sometimes, maybe Tuesday—

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it come in tomorrow at 10 a.m. for a business session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIDEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM TOMORROW UNTIL 10 A.M. ON SUNDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1973

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of business tomorrow, the Senate come in on Sunday at the hour of 10 a.m. for a business session.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate completes its business on Saturday, tomorrow, it come in at 10 o'clock a.m. on Sunday morning.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate from Montana that the Senate convene in session at 10 a.m. on Sunday next.

On this question the yeas and nays have 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 Indiana (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McKEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONToya), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) is absent because of illness.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) is absent because of illness in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—59

Abourezk Fulbright Moss
Allen Hart Muskie
Bachus Hatcher Nelson
Bentsen Helms Nunn
Bible Huddleston Pasteur
Biden Humphrey Pearson
Brooke Inove Perry
Brock Jackson Proxmire
Byrd, Jr. Jackson Randolph
Byrd, Robert C. Johnston Ribicoff
Case Kennedy Schwarzkopf
Chiles Long Sparkman
Church Magunson Stafford
Clark Mansfield Stevensen
Crabson Mathias Taladge
Dole McIntyre Tunney
Eastland Metcalf Welcker
NAYs—28

Barlett Williams
Beall Young
Bennett
Bentsen
Biden
Bilbo
Blunt
Brodie
Buckley
Bulger
Byrd, John
Byrd, Robert C.
Case
Chiles
Clark
Claytor
Cranston
Dole
Dorgan
Eastland

NOT VOTING—13

Baker Hughes Packwood
Bellmon McClure McCormack
Biden McGovern
Bilbo Montoya

So Mr. MANSFIELD'S motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to table the pending motion of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Mr. ALLEN. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.