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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 clock shall state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11104 to provide for a temporary increase of $10.5 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 require a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferences 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. In it they state 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 from the Campaign Finance Act of 1974, a restrictive law regulating the contribution and use of campaign money. That act has been greeted by concerned observers ranging from "would seem to violate the First Amendment" to "flatly unconstitutional" and has been challenged by lawyers for the New York Times and others with constitutional deficiencies. Hence considerable caution would seem warranted before the Supreme Court rules on this 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. This subsidy would be complemented by legal limits on (1) the amount spent by a candidate or those furthering a candidate's interest and (2) contributions. The proposals are based on a campaign finance structure the United States and has been long played by private campaign money to be.irksome and indispensable to a free and stable society.

The principal question must be whether money ought to play any role in political campaigns, if we value freedom, the question can safely be answered affirmatively. All political activities make claims on scarce 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 contribute to campaigns for the purpose of. 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.
Mr. ALLEN. It was filed after the Senate adjourned.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If 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 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 then 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 complete.

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:
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 Senator McGovern is unanimously regarded as candidate 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. 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 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.

The legislative clerk reads as follows: Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendments on H.R. 1104.

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 power he wields not 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 government 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, businesses who have been shamed 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 due deliberation, to adopt a comprehensive public financing proposal dealing with Presidential and congressional campaigns.

It is a blended system, which permits voluntary 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 not the amount of the money, but the way in which it is being used. 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 up put 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 he was required 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, private giving; that we needed to change to some system of public financing.

Mr. Spater has been joined in his position by other people such as Jerry 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 see the system of private 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.

My suggestion in the form of a request is this: 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 Senator McGovern is unanimously regarded as candidate 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.
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 determine the best course of action 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. LUCAS. 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 financial campaign is largely based on means of contributions from individuals and officers of corporations has led in the past—and in the future—unless the public is fortunate, unhealthy, and sometimes pernicious results. This is because many of those who make these contributions do so in the hope that there will be given 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 model 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 overheard. The Senate and House discussions have been had with the Senate leadership. It is my understanding that no matter how the leadership is concerned, they are prepared to accept a compromise proposal for public financing of Presidential elections in the next Congress. We can go on and study further the question of congressional public financing.

The Senate in 1967, I think that it is the year, adopted the dollar cookbook. I think we debated it for 8 weeks. We debated the whole question 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 are not 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. MONDALE. Under the resolution, 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 Denver, Mr. Mondale and the Delegate from 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 American dream. 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 even 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.

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

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

The legislative clerk read the closure motion as follows:

CLOSURE 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 subject of the political campaign, and, in pursuance of amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferences on the House H. J. Res. 1104, 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

December 1, 1973

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

Claiborne Pell
Charles Percy
Edmund S. Muskie
Woodrow Wilson
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. MONDALE. 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].

Take Cray 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. Bentsen), 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. Harrison), 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 Minnesota (Mr. Hatfield), 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. 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), 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. MANGUS), 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. HARRIMAN), the Senators 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. MCCURDY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDIN) is absent because of illness in his family.

President Nixon called Congressman Arends to the White House and personally asked him to stay on the job because "I need you and what you do is so important that we can't afford to send a 76-year-old Congressman out to beat a 33-year-old city councilman from Aurora, who challenged him in the 1972 primaries. On him depends a lot of what the future of the world is going to be."

Those who knew the Congressman well believed that if the Congressman's commitment to President Nixon was that he would stay on the job through 1976—although it meant another campaign for reelection in 1974. For the last few days the Congressman had been involved in Watergate and other events of the last year which have shaken many a man half his age. Could he still do his job? 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 change his mind.

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 reached?

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

A newcomer, 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 Mr. 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."