ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, we are all so happy and so pleased and delighted to be here today that I do not think I will say anything to add to the joy involved in this conversational exchange.

Let us leave that to those who wished to be present today. I speak as one who did not.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am glad to see that the minority leader is wearing the badge of merit over his heart today.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I wear it over my heart in recollection of my sins and hope for a better life from now on. [Laughter.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Time is now under control.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time will be equally divided between the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. MANSFIELD).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a quorum has not been established. That would come first.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The establishment of a quorum is not required at this point.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of a quorum until the end of the hour—who yields time? Who yields time?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may not be recognized until time is yielded to him.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a member of the Judiciary staff be present during this debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Packet of the Judiciary staff be allowed the privilege of the floor during this debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. The pending question is on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to disagree to the amendments to H.R. 39078. The time thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to close the debate.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield myself 6 minutes. The issue presented to the Senate today is whether the House shall be placed above the fiscal integrity of the United States. The question is on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to agree to H.R. 39078. Mr. Mansfield. I ask unanimous consent that the time on the Senate debate be extended to June 30, 1974.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is he going to press the cloture motion today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; this is for tomorrow.

Mr. ALLEN. You anticipate it is going to fail today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; just in case.

Just insurance. [Laughter.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?
He talks about undercutting the Watergate Committee. As a matter of fact, it was the Watergate Committee which helped to generate the question of contributions by corporations and others in Presidential campaigns.

In my opinion—and I may be wrong—I have an idea that the distinguished Senator from Alabama would not even vote for a Presidential proposal of this nature, even if it were proposed by the Watergate Committee.

He says, also, that we are attempting to undercut the committee system. The distinguished Senator from Alabama knows better than that. He knows that the committees are the servants of the Senate as a whole, and the Senate as a whole is now and has been and will be, if need be, considering this measure. After all, when we think of committees, we think of them as the creatures and the servants of the Senate. They are nothing special. They are subordinate to this body. That is the way it is, and that is the way it will be, because no Congress is going to allow the Senate to do the work of the Senate as a whole is now going to vote.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senate has expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield 2 additional minutes.

As a practical matter, I ask the Senator, is it not the Committee on Finance that would have jurisdiction of this matter, not the Watergate Committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

Mr. LONG. The fact is that the Committee on Finance has considered this topic in several of its work sessions, and we in the committee had the proposal before us. If one looks at the rollcall votes, he will see that the committee would be closely divided on this matter, even more closely divided than the Senate.

It would be appropriate to say—as the committee did—that no matter what advice we may give the Senate about this matter, the Senate is still going to reach the decision it has made. The Senate has rejected the debt limit bill, reserving the right to every Senator on that committee—as we would expect every Senator who has heard this issue debated time and again for weeks and months in the Senate—to take a position on this issue.

Basically, I am persuaded that it is the issue we are talking about, not the precise details of how it is to be done. It is a question of whether one wants to remove the funds of private money to dictate the decisions rather than the consciences of private people. It is an issue that is far bigger, in my judgment, than the Finance Committee, the all committees, or any others. It was here with us, and may I say that the Senator had taken a position on it, long before we had ever heard of the Watergate Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. The Watergate Committee can do is to recommend legislation; and if legislation is recommended in this area, it would, of course, go to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee has held hearings on this proposal. The Senate has discussed it on 3, 4, or 5 days, and the majority of the Senate will. I do not think that this is a "half-baked" proposal, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), who I thought had signed the cloture motion yesterday, be included in yesterday's cloture motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 4 minutes of the Senate have expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), who I thought had signed the cloture motion yesterday, be included in yesterday's cloture motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 4 minutes?

Mr. LONG. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the last time the Senate met in extraordinary Sunday session this morning on what we hope is the eve of the most important action the House of Representatives is taking, at least of two major parts of that legislation now—the prohibition on private financing in the general election for President, so that all candidates will be required to use the public financing option now available; and the matching grant provisions for partial public financing of Presidential primaries.

Last week, a strong bipartisan majority in the Senate enacted far-reaching legislation to establish public financing of all elections for Federal office—President, House and Senate. Since that action, we have received strong indications that the House of Representatives is ready to pass, at least as a major part of that legislation now—the prohibition on private financing in the general election for President, so that all candidates will be required to use the public financing option now available; and the matching grant provisions for partial public financing of Presidential primaries.

Although the third major provision of the amendment passed by the Senate last Tuesday—public financing for Senate and House elections—may not be enacted now, it is still of great significance that the full Senate is so squarely on record in support of this provision. I believe its enactment will come swiftly, as soon as the President and representatives has had the opportunity to consider more fully the application of public financing to its own elections.

But Congress is ready now, on the Debt Ceiling Act, to take a giant step toward restoring the shattered confidence of the people in the integrity of their Government. Those who seek to frustrate the will of the majority of the Senate by maintaining this unconscionable filibuster are also frustrating a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the American people and they cannot be allowed to prevail.

If Watergate means anything, it means that the time has come to end the corrosive power of private money in public life. The corruption of the 1972 election has inserts beyond any doubt that campaign financing laws are hopelessly inadequate to stem the tide of abuse that flows from the power of giant political contributors and those who seek their contributions.

If we realize the moment we now have, we can shut off forever the underground flow of cash in political campaigns. We can ring down the curtain on the role of big campaign contributors. For too long, they have profaned the proud profession of politics. The time has come to end the corruption and the appearance of corruption that always travel in their wake. Public financing is the best single answer Congress can provide to the evils symbolized by Watergate. At a single stroke, by enacting the bill before us, we can take the Presidential election off the auction block, and give it back to the American people.

I hope this filibuster marks the last stand of those who would ignore the lesson of Watergate and preserve the status quo. There is no wiser investment the hard-pressed and long-suffering American taxpayer can make than to spend his hard-earned tax dollars on public financing of elections, and I hope that Congress will vote today to let this measure pass.

Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Louisiana a very brief question. He has served in the Senate for, I believe, 24 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twenty-five years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Twenty-five years. The Senator from Louisiana has seen filibusters come and go. I would be interested to know, with this one, what kind of a filibuster could really take place and continue without the support and encouragement, or at least the acquiescence, of the White House.

Does the Senator, who is the manager of the Senate's action on this bill, consider one of the real pioneers in campaign reform, think we should have a statement from the President of the United States on the issue that has brought the Senate to an extraordinary session at this time? The President has stated in the past that he is for campaign reform legislation. The former Vice President said he believes in public financing. We have had a clear expression by the Senate. A strong majority of the Senate is on record in favor of this legislation. Why is the President silent?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me for 1 additional minute?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. A strong majority of the Members of this body has voted in support of this legislation, and I believe that a majority of the House would do so as well.

Does the Senator agree with me that it
would be appropriate for the American people, as the Senate meets in this dead-
lock situation, to receive some clear ex-
pression from the President on this issue, which has brought us to this extraordin-
ary session.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am con-
vinced that a successful filibuster cannot be sustained against this proposal which, from the point of view of those of us who favor it, is to remove the influence of big money from the political decision-
making system above and beyond the pow-
er of money or any improper forces to corrupt. He should be willing to accept the judgment of others who have better credentials than he in this area. It seems to me that he would want to go along today with those who have be-
ter credentials than he in this area. It seems to me there is a very strong pos-
sion passed by a majority of this Congress who think this will have a pronounced cleansing effect on our Government. If not, we would have to consider whether we have the votes to sustain a voice vote and if we do not, we will have to yield even-
tually to the President on this matter. But we should have a chance to find out. These supporting a filibuster today should be willing to permit the Senate to take its proposal to the President so that he can either agree with those who are conducting the filibuster or those who have been among his strongest sup-
porters in the past.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield 4 minutes to the
Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate that we meet this morn-
ing for the first time in 112 years on a Sabbath morning because I believe what we have before us truly is the Lord's work. If it was necessary once to force the moneychangers out of the temple, it is necessary once more to force those who would compromise and corrupt politics and the American political system out of the system this morning and seek to do so by adopting cloture and going on to adopt the underlying measure.

Mr. President, let us be clear about what is going on here today.

An administration which has done more than any other in the history of this Nation to illustrate the defects in America's system of financing political campaigns apparently would prefer to have American Government grind to a halt rather than clean it up.

The Halls of the Senate are haunted by White House lobbyists attempting to kill this reform of Presidential cam-
paigns. And high White House officials are twisting the arms of Members of Congress with the threat that the debt limit bill will be vetoed if our reforms are accepted.

It is a final irony that this administra-
tion—which is above all responsible for dramatizing the corrupting influence of massive campaign contributions on our political life—has now mustered such a flimsy lobbying effort to preserve the very system which has led to their corruption and possible downfall. In their despera-
tion, they seem bent on preserving the very system that has nearly destroyed them.

This is a tawdry spectacle to place be-
fore the American people in the year of Watergate. If the administration achieves the one-third minority needed to frustrate the will of the Senate and the people, it will be a national tragedy.

The American people are tired of clever and dishonorable maneuvering by poli-
ticians.

They are fed up with the filth and cor-
rup tion of our present system of financ-
ing political campaigns.

They want an end to the cynical busi-
ness of putting American Government up for sale to the highest bidder.

They want an end to the "Buy Amer-
ica" system of financing campaigns.

By an overwhelming majority of 59 to 36 the Senate of the United States—Democrats and Republicans alike—voted the week before this one to make a start on ending this system for good, through combined pub-
lic and private financing in all campaigns for Federal office—for the Presidency, the House, and the Senate.

I believe the American people are here to understand by the leadership of the House of Representatives that the House is willing to join with us to provide a comprehensive system of public financing for at least Presidential elections.

And this is the argument today. The question is whether we will join with the House to reform Presidential campaign financing, or allow this critical reform to founder on the rocks of parliamentary maneuvering.

The provisions which the House is will-
ing to accept are essentially those intro-
duced by Senator SCHWEIKER and myself last July.

And they were overwhelmingly ap-
proved by the Senate in the comprehen-
sive amendment adopted last week under the leadership of the distinguished Sen-
ator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Under this plan:

Any candidate in the Presidential primaries would be entitled to matching payments of public funds for the first $100 received from each individual con-
tributor, but candidates must first ac-
cumulate $100,000 in contributions of
$100 or less.

Treasury matching payments in the primary period would be limited to $7 million per candidate, and no candidate could spend more than $15 million over-
all in the primaries.

In Presidential general elections, public financ-
ing through the voluntary dol-
lar checkoff is made mandatory instead of permitting candidates to forgo pub-
lic funds and use all private money, as the present law allows. This effectively limits each candidate to spending no more than $21 million in the general election.

Now, the administration, supported by a minority of Senators, is trying to de-
stroy our chance to achieve this funda-
mental reform of Presidential campaign financing.

The plan for public financing of Presi-
dential campaigns is, we are told, "a raid on the Federal Treasury for the polit-
icians of the country."

This is the kind of distorted rhetoric we have already heard far too often in this year of Watergate.

For under the guise of legislation to stop the success of a candidate in securing financial support, at the primary level, will be proportional to his or her ability to first secure broad-
based support from thousands of small and moderate contributors.

The success of this proposal for both primary and general elections depends on the willingness of millions of Amer-
icans to check off dollars on their tax forms.
And our public financing proposals will cost less than one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget.

For this small price, we can free the American Presidency from the stench and corruption of our present system of campaign financing. It is the best investment the taxpayers of this country could possibly make.

Let us look for a moment at some of the costs of our present system of financing campaigns:

In 1970, President Nixon rejected his Cabinet’s recommendation to abolish oil import quotas, which were costing the American people billions a year, higher oil prices, and forcing us to consume our own badly needed reserves. The oil industry, which strongly favored retention of the quotas, gave at least $500,000 to President Nixon’s 1968 campaign.

The oil industry receives over $2 billion a year in special tax subsidies which go virtually unchallenged, and additional billions in monopoly profits which go untouched by price controls and antitrust laws.

A congressional study a year or two ago found that the total cost of all Federal subsidies—cash payments, tax subsidies, and other special benefits—comes to over $60 billion a year. Many of these subsidies go to industries and special interests that contribute large amounts to political campaigns.

Many of these provisions serve legitimate purposes. But they are surrounded with an air of special advantage that tinges even the most worthwhile with suspicion. And it is clear that other equally worthy causes—supported by ordinary voters—cannot begin to command the interest and sympathy from our Government that is given to the financially powerful.

But it is not just these direct costs that are harmful. What is far more damaging is the harm that is done by our present system to the trust and confidence American citizens must have in their Government.

The erosion of this trust in recent years is reflected in public opinion polls. A recent Gallup poll showed that only 25 percent of Americans are satisfied with the way this Nation is being governed—a drop of 11 percentage points in just 2 years.

It is not hard to understand why this has happened. We can expect when people hear about things like:

Financier Robert Vesco giving $200,000 to the Nixon campaign and then getting an appointment 2 hours later with the head of the SEC to discuss his financial programs.

Top Nixon fundraisers shaking down scores of businessmen for contributions of what amounted to protection money.

A convicted felon in Florida paroled early from Federal prison at around the same time he makes a secret $30,000 cash contribution to the Nixon campaign.

The $600,000 contributed to the Nixon campaign by the carpet industry at the same time it is fighting a government proposal to increase competition in highway shipping.

The Chairman of the Board of a major auto company being approached for a contribution by Nixon fundraisers at the same time the industry is planning an aggressive campaign to water down Federal auto emission standards.

A $2 billion contribution to the Nixon campaign by carpet manufacturers at the same time the carpet lobby is desperately trying to postpone enforcement of new flammability regulations.

A $100,000 contribution to the Nixon campaign by a man named shortly thereafter as Ambassador to the Netherlands, and $300,000 from a woman later named as Ambassador to Luxembourg.

A secret $46,000 cash contribution from the chairman of Occidental Petroleum Co., which later announced an $8 billion, 20-year fertilizer agreement with the Soviet Union, and a $10 billion natural gas project in Siberia.

The $30,000 in secret cash contributions from executives of a Houston pipeline company, which later announced a project to bring natural gas from Russia to the east coast of the United States—a deal requiring the approval of the Nixon administration.

A huge contribution from ITT to help underwrite the GOP National Convention mysteriously coinciding with an antitrust settlement between ITT and the Justice Department—a settlement highly beneficial to ITT.

This is what the public has seen. Heaven knows what it has not seen, in both political parties.

We cannot be sure in any single case that the direct connection between the contribution and the benefit received or the harm avoided.

But what is more important is that millions of Americans believe, with justification, that there is a direct connection in many cases. And that is what is so corrosive and damaging to public trust in government.

Our form of government simply cannot continue to function if millions of Americans believe that it is being bought and corrupted by rich and powerful special interests.

Abraham Lincoln once said that—

With public sentiment, nothing can fail. Without it, nothing can succeed.

What is at stake here today is nothing less than the future of our democracy. It is a test of whether government of the people, by the people, and for the people can, as Lincoln said, long endure.

It is a test which we cannot fail.

We must act now—to clean up American government and make certain that a Watergate never again disgraces our democracy.

I urge the Senate to invoke the rule of cloture, to bring this filibuster to an end, and to act now to stem the corrosion of our political process.

The Acting President pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 2 minutes. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that the bill we passed permits contributions of $3,000 per individual?

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The people about whom we are talking have large connections. They have banking connections all over the United States and in many foreign nations. They have connections with contractors and subcontractors’ groups to the extent that, as a practical matter, any one of these major committees could have financed the entire campaign of any one of these people, if they had to do it that way, and find it to their advantage.

Mr. MONDALE. I think it is obvious to most persons who have bothered to study this subject that it is impossible to cleanse the present system of private financing and make it possible for a person to raise enough money to run for President. Therefore, if we cleanse the system, we must either back a system of public financing—this is what we are trying to do—to do away with a record of pervasive corruption which both parties are subject to—

The Acting President pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 minute.

Mr. MONDALE. Several top officers testified that Government, which had given them ever greater power, came to them and said, “Either we get this money from you”—we used to call it extortion in law school—“or other things might happen to you that you won’t like.”

The question is, Do we want to end that system? We all know about it. We are all in politics. There is no mystery about it. There is no one here who does not hate the private system. It demeans one. It sometimes corrupts him. The marvel is that it has been possible for us to do something about it this Sunday morning and throw the money changers out of the temple.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, first I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), then I shall yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and then 2 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The Acting President pro tempore. The Senators will be recognized in that order.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama.

I have been sitting here on this good
Sunday morning listening to the plous speeches from the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota, most of which have been based on the fact that you have to throw the private givers out of a Presidential campaign.

As a matter of fact, listening to the speeches, I thought perhaps we were talking about a different bill, because the bill which is before us requires that one get private contributions before he can even get any money out of the Federal Treasury. No matter how far one reaches in, he still has to have $100,000 to start with. This is different. The idea of this is that nobody is trying to kill this bill forever. There is no reason why it cannot go to the committee, be reported out of the committee, and be debated in the ordinary course like any other bill; but to attach it to the public debt limit seems to me to be deliberately trying to stall the whole economy of this country.

I do not happen to like the debt limit. I have said so on many occasions. It is a matter that has been very much involved in Congress— and we are the ones doing it— to increase the debt, then we move the finish line by increasing the debt limit, and we say to ourselves this has to be done because the economy of the country is going to go to pot unless we do, and then we go ahead and add that to an increase in the debt limit so we will not ruin that economy. We put on it this type of bill, which is not only controversial to start with, but which no one, as the Senator from Alabama has so clearly said, really understands.

I would say that, in listening to all this conversation about the Presidential political scene in the last election, wholly overlocked in the arguments has been the fact that the bill as it stands before us not only covers Presidential campaigns but also covers senatorial and congressional campaigns, so that everyone who will be affected by later congressional campaign from this bill becomes effective, at that time has a personal interest in this bill, so that they can reach into the taxpayers' money and start getting some campaign funding for their own campaign.

The time is strong, I happen to be lucky in this situation, because I do not come up in 1976; I come up in 1974. So it will not benefit me one way or the other. But I will say, whether it did or not, I cannot conceive of a worse situation than what we have here when we are trying to preserve the economy at a time of energy shortages and a lot of other problems, to be able to say we cannot raise the debt limit because we are more interested in getting into the taxpayer's pocket in order to finance political campaigns. It just makes no sense to me at all.

I am happy to say, whether we have an administration that is against this bill or for it, I am the Senator from Alabama, and I will be happy to sit and argue it and talk against this bill as long as he will give me time to do it.

It just makes no sense whatsoever for the Senate, which is supposed to be a different appoint and to sit on some of these issues in which they do not have before it, which we know is nothing more than a measure to cover the financing of political campaigns at a Federal level in 1976 or thereafter, and then get up and make pious speeches about what has been going on in Federal campaigns probably a year before the election started. It makes no sense at all.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama for yielding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I think the vital question before us now is not the question of how we should finance Presidential campaigns, but rather it is not to this issue that I intend to speak. Rather, I think what we are confronted with is a corruption of the legislative process through the use of so-called veto-proof bills as a vehicle for facing the adoption of totally unrelated measures. This practice constitutes a perversion of the Constitution of the United States. It is a practice that ought not to be tolerated in this Chamber.

The Constitution states that the majority of the Congress will work its will, and that if the President disapproves, he may exercise his right of veto. However, the Congress may vote to override that veto and the bill then becomes law. The attempt to lack on unrelated legislation to a measure vital to the fiscal integrity of the United States is, to me, unconscionable—especially when there is not even the excuse of urgency.

We have heard a lot of talk in this Chamber about the low esteem into which the Executive has fallen. We should take cognizance of the fact that, if anything, the Congress of the United States has fallen to an even lower level.

The people of the United States are well aware of this appalling exercise of legislative irresponsibility on the part of Congress.

I believe we should be ashamed of ourself and that we should allow the Senator from Alabama to have a vote on his motion to have the Senate recede from this Chamber. The attempt to tack on unrelated legislation to a measure vital to the fiscal integrity of the United States is, to me, unconscionable—especially when there is not even the excuse of urgency.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, first and foremost, I would like to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama for leading the fight on this matter. The Senator from Alabama is in his first term as a U.S. Senator.

First, I would like to say that I understand the question is whether we are going to apply cloture here. In many instances when some of us have tried to carry on debate, there has been objection.

A few years ago I remember the satellite bill, and I could refer to others, when the so-called liberal element of this Senate was determined to debate this matter. However, they are now taking the opposite view. They now say how horrendous and how terrible a thing it is. It is my judgment that the Senate has a right to carry on extended debate under the rules of the Senate. It is proper to do so. I do not criticize any Member of the Senate and would not, but I do not like it when the so-called liberal element of this Senate seems to be determined to debate the matter. However, they are now taking the opposite view. They now say how horrendous and how terrible a thing it is.

I realize that some people do not wish to extend the debt limit. I have voted against extending the debt limit because we cannot keep on spending more than we take in year after year. However, we have been doing this for a very long time. For instance, in the last 30 years, I believe that we have not balanced the budget except for one year.

Congress might attempt to pass this off on whatever administration is in power. However, we cannot do this. Congress is responsible for authorizing appropriations. Congress is responsible for appropriating money. Presidents can recommend.

We can go back for the last 30 years, and all of the Presidents that we have had could recommend. However, they make a mistake when they recommend budgets that contain expenditures greater than our income.

Congress has to make this system work. It is a tripartite system of government. The Executive merely administers and executes the laws passed by Congress. And if Congress spends more than it takes in, it is only itself to blame. We are responsible.

Today the Members of the Congress have spent more than we have been taking in. It is unsound. We cannot keep on as we are going now. No individual can spend more than he earns. We educate them more than he takes in. No company can stay in business when it spends more than it takes in. No government can succeed when it spends more than it takes in. And that is what we have been doing for a long time.

I am anxious that this matter come to an end. However, on the other hand, I think that it is not proper to attach this measure on a bill that is of tremendous and paramount importance.

Mr. President, in my judgment, Congress will make a mistake if it applies cloture rather than letting the debt limit bill be acted upon separately.

It is a great mistake, I think, to attach to a fiscal matter a very important fiscal matter, a very important piece of legislation.

The political campaign matter is important enough in itself to constitute an important piece of legislation.

I hope that cloture will not be applied. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself to the Senator from Alabama, and pass to Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I intend to vote against cloture, for two reasons. In the first place, I think it is time to abolish debt ceilings or to adopt a realistic debt ceiling which will be honored and observed.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, would the Senator use his microphone?

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator use his microphone?

Mr. ERVIN. Very well. Ever since I have been in the Senate, Congress has been engaging in the futility and the hypocrisy of trying to deceive the American people that we are going to limit expenditures by putting a cap upon them. I say, let us be done with that hypocrisy.

I agree with those who advocate the Kennedy amendment that something drastic must be done to regulate campaign contributions and expenditures. We ought not to try to do it on the Senate floor on the spur of the moment without affording Senators a reasonable opportunity to consider whether the remedy proposed would work fairly upon the American people. If we would get a hundred different candidates who would get $7 million each out of the Federal coffers.

No reform of magnitude should be made without having the appropriate committee study all relevant proposals, take evidence and views relating to them, and report to the Senate a bill after all the implications of the various proposals are known.

The Rules Committee was studying the Kennedy-Scott proposals and other related proposals on this subject and had not completed its study of them at the time the Kennedy amendment was abruptly and unexpectedly offered as an amendment to the wholly nongermane debt ceiling bill.

Americans can finance campaigns in an honest and honorable manner, if they want to. I think, without going to the extreme this amendment would require. We should not take money out of the Federal Treasury to finance campaigns; we should finance campaigns with voluntary tax-exempt contributions from the American people. The hypocrisies of trying to deceive the American people by holding their hand out of corporate funds. Why should the Senator from Alabama and the others aligned with him prevent that issue from coming to a vote on the floor of the Senate. Therefore, I issue this challenge: that after the vote on the floor on the spur of the moment without affording Senators a reasonable opportunity to consider whether the remedy proposed would work, we go forward with it. There are over 60 million voters in the United States, political fundraisers should be encouraged to raise campaign funds by obtaining voluntary tax-exempt contributions from citizens and be deterred by drastic criminal law, from coercing large contributions from corporations or individuals.

By the act of the Senate, the.Reset would eliminate political campaigns in the United States without reaching into the Federal Treasury and without encouraging a multitude of candidates to seek nominations and the Presidency on the basis of the purpose of getting their hands on millions of dollars of Federal funds.

I expect to vote against cloture. I would vote for a motion to recommit. I think this whole proposition needs substantial study in the Rules Committee, because I know the Senate has not been able to give it any adequate consideration during the few hours we have discussed it on the Senate floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before doing that, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is the Senator willing to abide by a vote of the Senate? Would the Senator permit a majority of the Members of this body and the House of Representatives to express the will of the American people? If the Senator is issuing a challenge, will he abide by a similar challenge?

Mr. ALLEN. Of course, we will abide by the will of the Senate.

Mr. KENNEDY. If a majority of the Senators vote against it, will the Senator abide by the result?

Mr. ALLEN. Let us give Senators an opportunity to express themselves.

Now, Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the chairman of the Watergate Committee.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I intend to vote against cloture, for two reasons. In the first place, I think it is time to abolish debt ceilings or to adopt a realistic debt ceiling which will be honored and observed.

Second, to make it certain that all of these contributions will be reported, establish a commission, a bipartisan commission, to supervise Federal elections.

Third, Require the man who receives the contribution or the committee which receives the contribution to report its receipt forthwith to that commission, and require the man who makes the contribution to notify the Internal Revenue Service that he has made the contribution and expects to claim it as an exemption on his income tax return.

Fourth. Increase the penalties for violations of election laws, and enforce such penalties.

Since there are upward of 60 million voters in the United States, political fundraisers should be encouraged to raise campaign funds by obtaining voluntary tax-exempt contributions from citizens and be deterred by drastic criminal law, from coercing large contributions from corporations or individuals.

By the act of the Senate, this Reset would eliminate political campaigns in the United States without reaching into the Federal Treasury and without encouraging a multitude of candidates to seek nominations and Presidency on the basis of the purpose of getting their hands on millions of dollars of Federal funds.

I expect to vote against cloture. I would vote for a motion to recommit. I think this whole proposition needs substantial study in the Rules Committee, because I know the Senate has not been able to give it any adequate consideration during the few hours we have discussed it on the Senate floor.

The Reset is(encoded in a way where the text is not clearly visible or legible).
the Senate seems to believe this matter to be, naturally we would try to resolve the issue on a bill which the President would be very reluctant to veto, such as this one, and seek a confrontation on a "must" bill, which must become law in one fashion or another.

That is what the Senate has done. The Senate has espoused to initiate the issue in a way that would accomplish its purpose.

If we do not put this measure on a significant revenue bill, as the Senate has done, the attempt would be fruitless. So while I did not advocate it and was not in favor of this amendment, I completely respect the right of Senators to bring the issue to a conclusion in this fashion. They have a right to do it.

I have been looking over the rollcall votes on this issue, both yesterday, the day before, and in years past. When this matter first came up, the people of this Nation had little understanding of it. We were told that those of us who were attempting to finance campaigns at the expense of the taxpayer were wrong, that the public would not understand or approve.

What has happened? Those of us who have taken the position of those who are seeking to move forward in the area of campaign financing by the public have picked up votes; we have won elections; we are picking up States. We are picking up converts. In other words, there are Senators who have not voted with us in the past who are voting with us now.

We are upping the ante. The American people. We have been back for them, and are winning elections.

I submit, Mr. President, that those of us who favor this concept, which the public is coming to understand better and better day by day, are going to have an overwhelming victory at the polls next year. Only time will tell, but the whole trend has been in our favor.

There have been those who said the answer was to have more reporting of more information to the American public, and more accountability. So we give them their reporting and their accountability and we have opened up those doors and let the light shine through.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Moss). The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, and pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll and ascertain the presence of a quorum.

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

Clause 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, to suspend the rules, and to agree to the Senate amendment, except to request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferences on the bill H.R. 16, 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.

1. Mike Mansfield
2. Hugh Scott
3. Walter F. Mondale
4. Robert C. Byrd
5. Edward M. Kennedy
6. Edmund S. Muskie
7. Lawton Chiles
8. Philip A. Hart
9. Alan Cranston
10. John O. Pastore
11. Harrison A. Williams
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If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 545 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Abourezk
Bakay
Bell
Benson
Biden
Bingham
Brooke
Byrd
Clark
Cranton
Gravel
Hart
Hartke
Mansfield
NAYS—33

Allen
Aiken
Allen
Bartlett
Bellmon
Benetich
Bibb
Brock
Bucelas
Byrd
Byrd
Cannon
Curtis

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read the motion, as follows:

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.

Signed by 19 Senators:

1. Mike Mansfield
2. Robert C. Byrd
3. Hubert Humphrey
4. Frank Church
5. Walter D. Mondale
6. Edward M. Kennedy
7. Frank E. Moss
8. Edward W. Brooke
9. John O. Pastore
10. Warren G. Magnuson
11. Walter D.
12. Joe Biden
13. Harrison A.
14. T. J. McIntyre
15. Hubert H.
16. Philip A. Hart
17. Vance Hartke
18. Mike Gravel
19. John V. Tunney

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to address this message to the Senate from the President of the United States.

It seems fairly clear to me that there is a very strong feeling on the part of both the proponents of this proposal for public financing of Presidential campaigns and on the part of the opponents. It is one in which the President, in my judgment, has already taken a very decided interest and one in which the President is going to have to take a public interest.

I would advise the President that he should favor the ordinary legislative process whereby we would be permitted to express the majority view of both the House and the Senate and advance this measure to his desk.

If he vetoes the bill and if we do not have the power to override his veto of the bill with a Presidential campaign funds amendment attached to the bill, then I for one will vote to pass a debt limit bill without any riders on it.

However, it seems to me that the order of legislative process is such that the President and those who support his position at this moment are in a position that the President will not support a filibuster if, by definition, it is an act of policy.

I am not saying that to cast any invid-