

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress,

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 30

NOVEMBER 30, 1973 TO DECEMBER 6, 1973

(PAGES 38795 TO 40138)

titled "The Human Rights Protection" contained in the Editorial Research Report Series, refutes this objection. In one concise passage, he traces the evolution of human rights in international treaties and demonstrates its vital role today. The Senate can carry this evolution one step further by giving its consent to the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, in the Declaration of Independence our Founding Fathers set forth their dedication to the principles of human dignity. We must do no less than to reaffirm those principles to the world by speedy ratification of this treaty.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11104 to provide for a temporary increase of \$10.7 billion in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary debt limit applies to June 30, 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to insist on the Senate amendments to H.R. 11104 and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Under the previous order the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from South Carolina without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate Select Committee on Presidential Campaign Activities in November, 1973, published a volume entitled "Election Reform—Basic References." This appears to be a very interesting publication and looking through it I observed several interesting articles. One article is entitled "Campaign Financing and Political Freedom" by Ralph K. Winter, Jr., in association with John R. Bolton.

I might say that Ralph K. Winter, Jr., is a professor of law at Yale Law School and an adjunct scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. John R. Bolton is a member of the Yale Law School Class of 1974 and an editor of the Yale Law Journal.

In reading this article, it seems to me it brings out some points that should be of interest to the Senate at this time, and therefore I should like to read the article into the Record:

The conviction that something has gone awry in our political process is again growing stronger in the United States Congress. In particular, the view that wealth has ex-

cessive influence on election results and that election campaigns are too costly seems almost a routine assumption. These claims come on the heels of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, a restrictive law regulating the contribution and use of campaign money. That act has been greeted by constitutional authorities with comments ranging from "would seem to violate the First Amendment"¹ to "flatly unconstitutional"² and has been challenged by lawyers for the *New York Times* as "shot through with constitutional deficiencies."³ Hence considerable caution would seem warranted before federal regulation of campaign financing is expanded. Nevertheless, the Congress is seriously considering even more drastic legislation.

The principal proposals now under debate are relatively old and deceptively simple. In general outline they include a substantial subsidy from public funds to be given to federal candidates to pay all or part of their campaign costs.⁴ This subsidy would be complemented by legal limits on (1) the amount spent by a candidate or those furthering a candidacy and (2) the size of individual financial contributions to a candidate's campaign.

Such proposals are of critical importance. If adopted, they will alter the political process and may have results transcending the issue of campaign financing. Moreover, because they regulate campaign advocacy, they may interfere with freedom of expression.

The proposals ought, therefore, to be implemented only after a persuasive demonstration of necessity and after a weighing of all potentially undesirable effects. The position taken here is that the case for further regulation, when scrutinized, seems based on speculation rather than demonstrated fact, ignores the grave dangers to a free society such regulation threatens, and emanates in part from groups which have political interests of their own to further.

1. CAMPAIGN MONEY IN PERSPECTIVE

The functions of private campaign money

Much of the doomsday rhetoric accompanying discussions of campaign finance can be discounted as political exaggeration. Candidates seem never to lose because the public is indifferent to them or to their platforms; they seem to lose because they cannot raise enough money. Tom Wicker tells us that Fred Harris and Paul McCloskey saw their campaigns founder "for want of means to wage a primary campaign,"⁵ a statement that is true in the same sense that if a mayoral candidate in New York City were exposed as Martin Bormann, his withdrawal statement would mention only difficulties in raising campaign funds.

Lack of campaign money provides a face-saving exit from a delicate (losing) situation. Thus, many attributed Senator Humphrey's loss in the California primary to Senator McGovern's money, and his loss to President Nixon to Nixon's money.

No one denies that elections are expensive, but the importance of money is almost universally exaggerated. Although allegations about the high campaign costs of recent years are repeatedly made, we really do not know how much was spent before the days of television when campaign expenditures were neither open nor easily regulable. Even now, the estimated amount spent for all elective offices in 1972, national, state and local, was less than was spent by each of two commercial advertisers.⁶

Still, since campaigns are expensive, large contributions seem an easy way to gain favor. Potential donors may be reminded of their dependence on governmental decisions by public officials or their representatives; some individuals give seemingly inordinate

amounts; finally, continued allegations seem to have generated considerable skepticism about the financing of campaigns and to have eroded confidence in the political process.

Given all this, the case for regulation cannot be summarily dismissed, and the roles played by private campaign money must be carefully weighed. Certain functions are undesirable. Some donors doubtless make contributions hoping to obtain personal favors ranging from the trivial, for example, dinner invitations, to the malevolent. Awarding ambassadorships in return for large contributions is not the most desirable method of choosing American representatives to foreign nations. To exercise administrative discretion in favor of larger political contributors, for example, in awarding a government contract, is not only undesirable but in most cases illegal. Where the contribution follows a pointed reminder from a public official, governmental power is misused. Similarly, we feel uneasy when an otherwise undistinguished individual makes a serious stab at high office by expending a family fortune.

Horror stories illustrating the misuses of campaign money abound; but precisely because they horrify, they may obscure more than they illuminate. Many of the roles played by private campaign money are desirable, indeed, indispensable to a free and stable society.

Our threshold question must be whether money ought to play any role in politics. If we value freedom, the question can safely be answered affirmatively. All political activities make claims on society's resources. Speeches, advertisements, broadcasts, canvassing, and so on, all consume labor, newsprint, buildings, electrical equipment, transportation and other resources. Money is a medium of exchange by which individuals employ resources to put to personal use, to work for others, or to devote to political purposes. If political activities are left to private financing, individuals are free to choose which activities to engage in, on behalf of which causes, or whether to do so at all. When the individual is deprived of this choice, either because government limits or prohibits his using money for political purposes or takes his money in taxes and subsidizes the political activities it chooses, his freedom is impaired.

FOOTNOTES

¹ A. Rosenthal, *Federal Regulation of Campaign Finance: Some Constitutional Questions* (Princeton, N. J.: Citizens' Research Foundation (ed.), 1972), p. 63.

² Statement of Alexander Bickel, *ibid.*, p. 66.

³ Brief for *New York Times* as amicus curiae, p. 16, *American Civil Liberties Union v. Jennings*, Civil No. 1967-72 (D.D.C., 1972).

⁴ See, for example, S. 1103, 93d Congress, 1st session (1973); hereinafter referred to as the Hart bill, after its author, Senator Hart.

⁵ Tom Wicker, "Subsidizing Politics," *New York Times*, June 8, 1973, p. 39, col. 5.

⁶ Statement of Herbert E. Alexander, *Hearings on S. 372 before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Committee on Commerce*, 93d Congress, 1st session (1973), p. 219; hereinafter referred to as *Hearings*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without my losing the floor, that we may have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina if he would agree that on the calling off of the quorum call the Senator from Alabama be recognized for the purpose of introducing a motion to re-

cede. I might state that this request is made with the knowledge and at the suggestion of the majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, would that be a similar motion to that which was made last night, as stated in the press?

Mr. ALLEN. It was filed after the Senate adjourned.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It would allow the Senate to pass the bill and get the debt ceiling behind us and allow the Senate on some other occasion to consider campaign financing in the regular and orderly way.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am willing to yield to the Senator from Alabama for that purpose. I ask unanimous consent that after the quorum call is had, I may be allowed to yield to the Senator from Alabama for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I understand that what the Senator is asking is that he be recognized after the motion is made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the disposition of the quorum call.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I will state it over so that there will be no misunderstanding. I ask unanimous consent that we have a quorum call, and that upon the disposition of the quorum call, the Senator from Alabama be permitted to make a motion, and that after that motion, I may resume.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, on the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Alabama, is full debate permissible?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a debatable motion. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, would the Senator from South Carolina allow the quorum call to go for 6 or 7 minutes?

Mr. THURMOND. I have no objection. I want it understood that I am yielding to the Senator from Alabama but that I have the floor when all of this is completed.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 542 Leg.]		
Allen	Ervin	Pastore
Bayh	Fannin	Pearson
Beall	Griffin	Fell
Bible	Hansen	Roth
Buckley	Hart	Stafford
Byrd, Robert C.	Long	Stevens
Clark	Mansfield	Thurmond
Curtis	Mondale	Tower
Dole	Muskie	Williams
Dominick	Nunn	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After some delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatfield	Randolph
Bennett	Hathaway	Ribicoff
Bentsen	Hruska	Schweiker
Biden	Jackson	Scott,
Brock	Kennedy	William L.
Brooke	Magnuson	Sparkman
Case	McClellan	Taft
Church	McIntyre	Talmadge
Domenici	Metcalf	Tunney
Eastland	Moss	Weicker
Fong	Nelson	
Gravel	Proxmire	

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) 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), the Senators from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). A quorum is present.

Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) has the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I do not plan to discuss this issue at great length because we have already discussed it somewhat. But I do want to point out again the predicate for offering the motion that I intend to offer in just a moment.

The fact is that the House sent us a simple debt limit bill consisting of 13 lines. It came over to the Senate and the Senate added 122 pages of amendments. It went back to the House and the Senate requested a conference and the House ignored that request. The House refused to dignify our amendments by amending them and sending them back. They just sent back their bill again.

The motion that the Senator from Alabama wishes to make is the motion which he made last night.

By the way, I noticed no reference whatsoever in the press to the fact that that motion was made, even though it was the key motion that was made throughout the entire proceedings on this bill.

A motion to recede from the Senate amendments, if that motion is carried, will result in final passage of the bill. So that it is not the Senator from Alabama and those who are opposed to this campaign subsidy bill who are keeping the debt limit bill from passing, but those who favor the campaign subsidy bill.

This motion constitutes final passage of the bill. It is the hope of the Senator from Alabama that those who favor campaign spending will not do as they did last night and, by parliamentary maneuver and a motion to table, prevented the Senate's taking action up or down on that motion.

I hope that, now that we have a quorum present, the Senate will face up to its responsibility of voting up or down on whether the bill shall pass.

I am not trying to throw any obstructions in the way of passage of the bill. I advocate passage of the bill and am going to offer a motion in just a moment that would allow the Senate to pass the bill if it wants to. I hope it will not be filibustered. I hope that by parliamentary tactics or motions to table, the consideration of this bill by the Senate will not be prevented.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. GRIFFIN. I wish to make a unanimous-consent request and I ask that Senators listen carefully.

Let me point out that, if the unanimous-consent request should be agreed to, I would not make the motion contemplated at this time but would make it following the vote on the motion which the Senator from Alabama is about to make.

I believe agreement to my request would open up another way—a fair way—of resolving the problem in which the Senate is embroiled. Accordingly, I hope there will be no objection.

My suggestion in the form of a request is this:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to move to recede from the Senate amendments except the Senate amendment relating to the public financing of Presidential campaigns, and with respect to that motion Senators prominently regarded as candidates for President be recorded as voting "present" in recognition of their obvious conflict of interest, with the understanding that any Senator prior to the vote may file a statement with the clerk of the Senate declaring that he is not, and will not be a candidate for President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Senator from Louisiana is objecting?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am not aware that I am being prominently considered for the office of President of the United States, but one can never tell when lightning might strike. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Regular order is called for.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the motion at the desk will give the Senate an opportunity to pass the debt limit bill in a matter of 30 seconds, if it so desires. I hope the press will give notice of the fact that an opportunity is being given for the passage of this bill by 11:15 a.m., with no filibuster on the part of the Senator from Alabama. If this motion is going to be filibustered at all or if parliamentary tactics are to be used against it, it will be by those who favor the campaign subsidy.

Mr. President, I call up the motion at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments on H.R. 11104.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, there is an underlying motion before the Senate which would permit the Senate and Congress to deal with the question of extending the temporary debt ceiling in a way that would permit the Government to manage its financial business and at the same time face up to what I consider to be the most compelling, profound, and moral issue arising out of Watergate—namely, the clear disclosures of the compromise and corruption which arise out of the present system of uncontrolled, private financing of Presidential campaigns.

Any person who listened at all to the disclosures in Watergate realizes that democracy itself is threatened by a continuation of the present system, which permits persons who wish to do so, and who have sufficient wealth, to compromise and sometimes corrupt the decisions of American Government, in exchange for large and sometimes massive campaign gifts.

It also shows that an incumbent President who is willing to do so can use the enormous powers of Government over every aspect of American life and business to force and even extort from Americans vast quantities of money for purposes of funding a campaign, and possibly for other purposes, by threatening governmental decisions which could adversely affect a commercial or some other interest.

This is not speculation. It is a matter of record. These are conclusions which have been made by, among others, businessmen who themselves have been shaken down and asked to make massive contributions in circumstances where they felt compelled to make such contributions; otherwise, harsh Government actions against their interests would be forthcoming.

Because of this threat to American democracy, which had become opposed by an overwhelming majority of American citizens, the Senate acted, after long and serious debate, to adopt a strong, comprehensive public financing proposal dealing with Presidential and congressional campaigns.

It is a blended system, which permits limited private campaign contributions under carefully controlled circumstances, to make certain that it is clear and uncompromising. It is also a system which permits and requires public funding of congressional and Presidential campaigns. It is a proposal which passed the Senate by a very strong margin. It was attached as a mandate to the debt ceiling bill, also by a very strong margin. I think the Senate acted wisely and responsibly, by very strong margins, in doing so.

This is the time to act. The public now sees that corruption and compromise are almost inevitable under the present system. The public realizes that the problem is getting worse, not better, and that if we fail to act now, there is a good chance that what we have seen in Watergate will not be an end, but the beginning, of a sordid picture by which the American Government is put up for sale to the highest bidder—what we might call a Buy America campaign. This must stop, and must stop now, if we are to do anything to restore public confidence at this time.

Mr. President, there was a time when many conservative columnists and others opposed this proposal; but I think that under the pressure of the present system, we now see a dramatic change.

Mr. Spater, president of American Airlines, testified that he wants public financing. He did so on the basis of his experience, which was that fund raisers for the administration came to him and demanded that he make a contribution of \$100,000. The person who approached him was a personal lawyer to the President and, more than that, counsel for an opposing airline. The president of American Airlines testified that, under the circumstances, he felt he had no choice. He felt that he had no choice but to contribute in order to prevent a Government decision which might be very serious and adverse to American Airlines. He then concluded that we could not continue with this present form of extorted, pri-

ate giving; that we needed to change to some system of public financing.

Mr. Spater has been joined in his position by such people as Henry Ford, and others. We see columnists such as James Kilpatrick, who said in a recent column that he had opposed public financing for a good part of his lifetime, but had come to the conclusion that public financing was essential if we wanted a government which was the best of democracy, and not open to a system of enormous private financing, designed to twist and compromise the decisions of American Government.

So increasingly the American public realizes that what is at stake here is nothing less than the objective of a government which is by the people, of the people, for the people. Either we clean up our present system of financing American campaigns or we are going to be in the position where our Government will be up for sale. I think increasingly that is the situation today.

Now, in terms of the posture of the present parliamentary situation, I believe it is obvious that we have a filibuster under way. Yesterday when the question was asked of the distinguished Senator from Alabama as to whether he intended to let the Senate vote on the motion of the manager of the bill (Mr. Long) the Senator from Alabama said, "Well, in the spirit of Operation Candor, I will say no." Mr. President, you might be able to explain it in other words, but it is a filibuster. It is designed to prevent the Senate from voting on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana and the reason it is designed to prevent us from voting is that it is known that a majority of the Senate clearly supports the action we took this week, and wishing to act not only on the question of the debt ceiling, but at the same time on the honesty and integrity of American elections. That strategy is still in effect here, in my opinion, and that is why it has been necessary to file a cloture motion, which is returnable Sunday, and probably another will be filed today returnable Monday, if necessary.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BIDEN. Is it the Senator's understanding that one of the additional reasons justifying the actions being taken today and yesterday to force us to relent with regard to public financing is that we need more study of this subject? I have heard that mentioned by the opposition a number of times. Is that part of the understanding? Has the Senator heard that?

Mr. MONDALE. I have heard that again and again, but I am somewhat unimpressed by that.

Mr. BIDEN. I was concerned about that yesterday when I heard it. I have been here only about 11 months. I have heard it. Yesterday when I returned to my office I was querying my administrative assistant about this matter. He did a little research. He came up with an interesting resolution. I refer to Senate resolution No. 132, in the Senate, July 6, 1949. The resolution was submitted by Henry Cabot Lodge, and I would like to read it:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of obtaining such information with respect to the problems involved in financing with governmental funds Presidential election campaigns in the United States as may be necessary to enable the committee to formulate and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date a bill providing for such method of financing Presidential election campaigns.

In submitting that resolution, there were remarks by Mr. Lodge. He said:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which requires the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate to study, formulate, and report to the Senate legislation providing for the public financing of presidential campaigns to the exclusion of all other methods of financing, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me, together with three newspaper articles may be printed in the RECORD.

I will read one further paragraph from Senator Lodge's statement:

There is probably not a man in public life today who does not realize that our system of financing presidential campaigns by means of contributions from individuals and officers of corporations has led in the past—and continues to lead today—to most unfortunate, unhealthy, and sometimes pernicious results. This is because many of those who make these contributions do so in the expectation that there will be value received in return for their generosity. This may take differing forms, one of which is an appointment to some executive post in the Government.

Mr. MONDALE. What year was that resolution?

Mr. BIDEN. That was 1949. As I said, I am a young man and I guess I am a little impatient; but I think we should not wait another 20 or 30 years before we get down to the issue.

Mr. MONDALE. As the Senator from Delaware knows, President Theodore Roosevelt called for public financing of Presidential elections in 1902 and 1903. I forget the exact date. His statement is a matter of record. Measures of this kind have been introduced and hearings have been held. There have been discussions among private groups, such as Common Cause and many, many others involved in this subject. The labor movement and leadership in the business community is increasingly calling for it.

The Senate had a debate and had several votes on this measure this week. It was very seriously considered and overwhelmingly adopted by the Senate. Discussions have been had with the House leadership. It is my understanding that insofar as the leadership is concerned, they are prepared to accept a compromise proposal for public financing of Presidential elections and we can go on and study further the question of congressional public financing.

The Senate in 1967, I think that is the year, adopted the dollar checkoff. I think we debated it for 6 weeks. We debated the whole principle of public financing and that was adopted at that time.

Mr. BIDEN. I hope if we get by this, and it gets to the position of compromise in the House, it is not suggested,

as the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from Michigan, suggested that only those who will not be candidates for President be able to vote on it. I daresay I would be the only Senator in this body who would be able to vote, since I am the only one who is constitutionally unable to run for that office in 1976.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask most respectfully when he believes we will have an opportunity to vote on the motion. We are ready.

Mr. MONDALE. I think it will be very shortly. We wanted to develop these positions.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the response.

Mr. MONDALE. We already have one or two votes. We are not trying to delay a vote, but we think some of these issues should be amplified.

I would say further to the Senator from Delaware that the other day in Disneyland, the President of the United States said he would like to spend some of his time cleaning up American politics; and, if you really want to clean up American politics, you have to begin with the question of money. This is the dark side of the political moon. Every Member of the Senate knows it. We all know it is an issue that has to be dealt with, and that is what we are trying to do here; deal with the question of cleaning up American politics. If we do not do it now, the public mood could change, and it could be many, many years, such as happened following the introduction of the resolution by Senator Lodge, before we can again seriously take up this question of cleaning up American politics, and by that time I think the nature of this trend would be so serious that democracy itself could be threatened.

I think that the American people will perhaps be living closer to their homes in the coming months and years and will find these suggested remedies of value.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read the cloture motion as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the motion to insist on the Senate amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the bill H.R. 11104, an act 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 to June 30, 1974.

Mike Mansfield
Robert C. Byrd
Edward M. Kennedy
Mike Gravel
Walter F. Mondale
John O. Pastore
Gaylord Nelson
Alan Cranston
Hubert H. Humphrey

Claiborne Pell
Charles Percy
Edmund S. Muskie
William D. Hathaway
Lloyd Bentsen
James Abourezk
Abraham Ribicoff
Henry M. Jackson
Daniel K. Inouye

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today it adjourn to 1 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at the same time that the cloture vote occur at 2 o'clock or thereabouts, approximately.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? [putting the question]. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn. 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 South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) 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), the Senators from Oklahoma (Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT) are necessarily absent.

Also, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. CLARK), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLD-

WATER) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 34, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 543 Leg.]

YEAS—34

Bayh	Jackson	Pearson
Bentsen	Kennedy	Pell
Bible	Long	Promire
Biden	Magnuson	Randolph
Brooke	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Byrd, Robert C.	McIntyre	Schwelker
Case	Metcalfe	Sparkman
Church	Mondale	Stafford
Clark	Moss	Tunney
Gravel	Muskie	Williams
Hart	Nelson	
Hathaway	Pastore	

NAYS—28

Aiken	Domenici	Hatfield
Allen	Dominick	Hruska
Beall	Eastland	McClellan
Bennett	Ervin	Nunn
Brock	Fannin	Roth
Buckley	Fong	Scott,
Curtis	Griffin	William L.
Dole	Hansen	Stevens

Taft
Talmadge

Thurmond
Tower

Weicker

NOT VOTING—38

Abourezk	Fulbright	Mathias
Baker	Goldwater	McCure
Bartlett	Gurney	McGee
Bellmon	Hartke	McGovern
Burdick	Haskell	Montoya
Byrd,	Helms	Packwood
Harry F., Jr.	Hollings	Percy
Cannon	Huddleston	Saxbe
Chiles	Hughes	Scott, Hugh
Cook	Humphrey	Stennis
Cotton	Inouye	Stevenson
Cranston	Javits	Symington
Eagleton	Johnston	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). On this vote, there are 34 yeas and 28 nays. The motion to adjourn having been agreed to, the Senate stands in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Whereupon, at 11:58 a.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Sunday, December 2, 1973, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING LES ARENDS

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, November 30, 1973

Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the resignation announcement of our colleague, the leader of the Illinois Republican delegation and the Republican whip, LES ARENDS, was shocking to all of us.

But, we understand his reasons and wish him well, knowing that his service will be available to us as a friend.

A newsmen who has known LES ARENDS many, many years, Mr. Ed Borman, the news editor of the News-Gazette in Champaign, Ill., authored an article that puts the service of LES ARENDS in proper perspective.

The full text of the article follows:

SIX U.S. PRESIDENTS KNEW LES ARENDS

(By Ed Borman)

Many neighbors, friends and constituents never fully understood the importance of Les Arends of Melvin, Ill. (population 550), in Washington.

Six presidents of the United States—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—understood it better.

Ever since President Roosevelt wanted a draft law because he realized the United States soon would be involved in World War II, every president has had to deal with Congressman Arends when national security was involved. He has been on the Armed Services Committee since he was first elected to Congress in 1934. He said it wasn't easy to do, but Congressman Arends cast the deciding vote when the draft law was passed shortly before Pearl Harbor.

In 1969, astronauts planted on the moon a disc that listed Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen and Congressman L. C. Arends among the congressional leaders who made it possible for Americans to reach the moon.

Still, in his native Ford County, he was just "Les"—a tall, ageless man whose father started the bank and the elevator and whose reelection to Congress was just taken for granted long before most voters were born.

As he dropped into the grain elevator in Melvin or hailed people by their first name

on the streets of Gibson City or Paxton, the home folks sometimes were inclined to criticize "Les" because he didn't "get home" as often as they thought he should.

They had to be reminded that, while they were sleeping, he was flying back to Washington—perhaps to have breakfast with the President of the United States.

More than once, this newsmen has driven him to airports in a beatup Chevrolet because the congressman didn't want to use an official car and make a "big deal" about being at the White House the next morning.

Nevertheless, Arends has been Republican whip of the House since 1943—longer than anyone in United States history. No matter what a president's politics, he had to deal with Les Arends when congressional chips were down.

Arends played many rounds of golf with President Eisenhower at Burning Tree Country Club. Those were happy days for him.

In 1946, he took a personal interest in a freshman congressman from California, Richard M. Nixon, and saw him become vice president in 1952.

After Nixon was defeated for president in 1960 and for governor of California, Arends was among a half dozen Republican leaders who convinced Nixon that he was not "through."

Arends' happiest moment came in January 1969 when he watched his close friend sworn in as President. His greatest regret was that he could not deliver a Republican majority in Congress to support President Nixon, but as Republican whip he made the most of the votes he could round up. He had a great knack of picking up Democratic votes, particularly from the South, when he really needed them.

The Illinois legislature did a bad thing to Congressman Arends when it reapportioned the state's congressional districts in 1971. It changed his district so that it extended north to Lake Michigan. Over 86 per cent of the people in this district were "new" to him. He had not sought their votes before.

There aren't many votes in Ford County. In his long career, Arends had built unbeatable strength in population centers like Bloomington, Kankakee, and Danville. When Joliet was added to his district, he took that in stride. But in 1972, he realized he had to win in places like Aurora, Batavia, Geneva, La-Salle, Peru, and DeKalb.

The temptation to retire in 1972 at age 76 after 38 years in Congress was strong.

President Nixon called Congressman Arends to the White House and personally asked him to stay on the job because "I need you." That was all it took to send a 76-year-old congressman out to beat a 33-year-old city councilman from Aurora, who challenged him in the 1972 GOP primary.

"On him depends a lot of what the future of the world is going to be."

Those who knew the Congressman well believed then that Arends' commitment to President Nixon was that he would stay on the job through 1976—even though it meant another campaign for reelection in 1974.

That's why it was hard to believe Thursday morning when the "bulletin" from Washington came over the news wires: "Congressman Leslie C. Arends, 78, announced today he will not seek reelection in 1974."

Close confidantes were as surprised as his congressional colleagues.

Only the week before, Arends was a guest at a reception in his honor at Morris. The affair had all the earmarks of a pre-campaign event for an "old war horse" who was ready to go to the polls again.

Mr. Arends had been about his duties as House whip the night before he made his announcement on the House floor. Many men half his age can't keep up with him, so his decision can hardly be attributed to "health."

Watergate and other events of the last year obviously have troubled him, but the congressman said only that he wants to spend more time with his wife and only daughter. Those who know him well doubt that he'll ever say much more.

After all, when a man is 78 and has served his nation as Mr. Arends has for 40 years, who can quarrel with a decision that he has had enough?

A newsmen can only look back to something he wrote Feb. 28, 1972: "There is a chilling thought these days for Republicans—from President Nixon down to the precinct committeeman of Peach Orchard Township in Melvin, Ford County, Ill. . . . They could lose Congressman L. C. Arends."

A newsmen, who has known Congressman Arends for more than 30 years, can look back to February 1972, when Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan, then Republican leader of the House and now vice president-designate—came to Ford County to campaign with Arends.

Congressman Arends declared that night: One of the real motivating reasons for being in Congress today is that I have such confidence, belief and trust in Dick Nixon.