any chance to have peace," he said repeatedly in recent years. "If there is any chance of having peace we must do everything for it." But in the spring of 1973, he was in no mood for taking any chances.

It was to the Bible that Ben-Gurion turned for his views and this motivation is one of the passages that he always carried with him was the closing declaration of the prophet Amos: "And I will turn the captivity of my people Israel from all the lands, and will gather them unto the land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God." Through Ben-Gurion's extraordinary life and work came the fulfillment of that ancient prophecy.

ELECTION FUND BILL

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. President, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an interesting article by David Broder in yesterday's Washington Post in which he analyzes some of the implications of public financing of Federal campaigns. The article points to "consequences that have barely been examined in the brief congressional debate."

However, even if the ultimate merits of this approach to campaign funding, I believe the article argues the need for a fuller consideration of the measure than has yet been possible, given the attempt to shortcut normal legislative procedures.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1973]

ELECTION FUND BILL WOULD BRING SHIFT TO POLITICAL SCENE
(By David S. Broder)

The campaign finance provisions that Congress is considering in the pending elections bill would cause the biggest change in American politics since the application of the one-man-one vote doctrine to virtually all elections in 1962.

By providing public financing for presidential campaigns and drastically reducing the role of private contributors, the legislation would be the most significant step in 20 centuries toward reducing the influence of the wealthy and the press relations and who has access to large numbers of volunteer workers would increase.

Many presidential hopefuls with minimal labor support (like Barry Goldwater and George McGovern) have been able to recruit masses of volunteers, but the big membership of the unions and their well-developed recruiting and subdividing techniques may give the union leaders' favorites a larger advantage over the candidates who have previously enjoyed in presidential politics.

While public financing's relative effects on labor, business and the press may be debateable, there is little question that the institution would become vastly more powerful in its influence on campaigns—the government itself.

The pending provision calls for appropriation of sufficient funds to fill the gap between the spending ceilings and the amount raised voluntarily. Appropriations are, of course, subject to liberal pressures from Congress and the President. They are not subject to an emergency or veto. Critics of public financing have warned that incumbent politicians of either party should not be given the power to decide how much the President's challenger will be able to spend.

Proponents of public financing say they are aware of the risk, but believe that Congress and the President will act responsibly and not choke off funds for an opponent.

Other questions involved in the legislation are a matter of debate among the handful of people who have analyzed the bill's effects, but have not yet reached public discussion. Here are some of them:

What is the effect of subsidizing presidential primary campaigns on the kind of candidates who participate? In the legislation is the provision of matching grants from the Treasury for contributions of $100 or less to contenders in the presidential primaries. This provision would have to raise the first $100,000 in units of less than $100 himself. After that, he would be subsidized up to a spending limit.

Advocates of public financing would open the presidential field to candidates who are not wealthy themselves or who lack wealthy sponsors, increasing the voters' choice and reducing the influence of money on presidential politics.

Critics point out that it would also have the effect of encouraging more candidates, and that, in large, multi-candidate primary fields, the winner can easily be an extreme advocate of some emotional position who can "win" with as little as one-third of the total vote.

What is the effect on the party system? The legislation says the federal subsidy will go to "any political committee" designated by the candidate for the election. That provision was designed, its proponents say, to fix personal responsibility on the candidate for the way his money is spent. Critics of the bill contend that it will never whatever fragile bonds now exist between the presidential candidate and his party. They note that if it had been in effect in 1972, Mr. Nixon could have designated the Committee for the Re-election of the President to receive $21 million in public funds.

What is the effect on minor-party candidates? The legislation says that minor parties will be subsidized in proportion to their showing in the previous election and that new candidates may be reimbursed, retroactively, on a proportional basis if they draw more than 5 per cent of the vote.

Proponents argue that this provision keeps the door open to minor-party and new candidates, without encouraging their proliferation.

Critics contend that it may, in fact, encourage such splinter candidates. In an example provided by the sponsors of the legislation, a third-party candidate who draws 10 per cent of the vote in the 1976 presidential primaries would get $4.6 million. The prospect of that kind of subsidy might, critics argue, encourage any number of "10 per cent candidates" to enter the race.

RECESS UNTIL 12:55 P.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12:55 p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and at 12:15 p.m., the Senate took a recess until 12:55 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the PRESIDING OFFICER.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUBBLETON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived 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:

CH. 1. 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 I now request a conference on the disagree-
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HELMS. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. To place passage of this campaign subsidy bill under the fiscal responsibility of the U.S. Government, let them take the consequences.

From their lofty and august positions, they know the effect that their holding up passage of the bill is having on the country.

I am hopeful that when the motion to recede is made, they will join in support of this measure and not hold up on it any longer.

Had they voted yesterday on the motion that the Senator from Alabama made, this matter would have been resolved. They saw fit to hold up the bill.

Now, Mr. President, as the Senator from Alabama stated yesterday, not only is this undercut the Watergate committee by taking action ahead of its recommendations; not only, Mr. President, as the Senator from Alabama analyzes it, are five or seven members of the Senate giving their support to the grab bag provision, but this bill undercuts the committee system.

We saw the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) vote against this provision because it should go to the committee. It should be considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, undercuts the committee system, it undercuts the Senate's position, Mr. President, because on July 30 of this year, by a vote of 62 to 6, the Senate sent a strong campaign reform bill to the House of Representatives which was widely acclaimed as a great forward step in regulating campaign receipts and expenditures.

Are we going to reverse that position? It also undercuts the constitutional question of giving the President the right to veto unsound legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. President, more important than any other consideration is the precedent that is going to be established if we allow this bill to go to conference and be forced on the American taxpayers, and that is that each time this debt limit bill comes up—and it will have to come up every 5 or 6 months, the way Congress does—it can put some horrendous provision into it—strikes at the foundation of our American system and our governmental institutions and governmental processes, without the bill ever going to a committee, without the President being given a fair opportunity to consider it and veto it if he thinks it is unsound, because it is attached to must legislation. Such a bill could be forced on the American public without ever being considered.
considered in a committee, without 1 day of hearing ever being held, and that would establish a most dangerous precedent. So we are standing here for a principle.

I am not sure that the Senate not only will vote against invoking cloture but also that, soon thereafter, the Senator from Alabama will be permitted to make a motion to recede from the Senate amendment and send this bill to the White House for signature.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG. I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. President, I am convinced that, while filibusters sometimes serve a purpose, as a main, they do not really accomplish much. I think that in the long run they tend to defeat their own purpose.

My mind goes back to the many years during my tenure in the Senate when some of us from Southern States filibustered against the various civil rights proposals, preventing those measures from coming to a vote. In the end, it resulted in the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which went far beyond the original proposals, by including practically all of them and a great number of other measures. I believe it would have served our purpose better if we had insisted that the Senate understand these measures and settled for a less extreme proposal at a much earlier date.

This issue regarding public financing of the Presidential primaries—and that, after all, is what we would propose to settle with the bill we are currently considering—is a matter which the public, in increasing degree, is insisting should be the order of the day. When this matter was first brought before the Senate in the early stages, we were able to muster a majority of about one in long weeks of debate that occurred back in 1966 and 1967. Since that date, those of us, who believe this is the only way you are ever going to be able to make this kind of a proposal, that people rather than a government of the money and the Congress has gained a great deal of support. Those of us who have supported this position have had a great deal more success at the polls than those who took the other view.

Furthermore, we have had the success of persuading more and more of our colleagues that this is the direction in which this Government will have to go, if we are ever going to recognize that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, in which the decision should be dictated by the number of people who are convinced in their hearts that one side or the other is right about an issue, rather than by the size of some special interest group or his willingness to put up large sums of money to dictate the outcome.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. It is the whole political system that is going to be judged by the American people. The article goes on to say:

Americans remain confident that the system can work . . . but they have confidence in the system only so long as they see the strength and demand honesty and integrity.

Of course, central to the chief objective is a system which does not tempt public officials, in their desperate need for huge campaign funds, to respond in a way which prefers those who have big money as legislators. I think it seems to me that that is precisely what is involved in this financing legislation; namely, the need to change the way in which we finance campaigns, so that it is possible for a person, once elected, to serve the office and to be in a position to serve his conscience and his country, rather than a long list of campaign contributors who probably had something in mind when they give so generously.

Mr. LONG. A short time ago I was privileged to address a group of boys at Louisiana Boys State, at Baton Rouge, La. I made the point that decisions of the Government should be dictated by the needs of the people, rather than by some group of persons who might have a large amount of money to put into a campaign. That statement received tumultuous applause from those young people.

I challenge anyone to explain to a group of high-class men and women why those having large amounts of money should be able to use that money to unduly influence candidates. The public should not be forced to accept the principle of one man, one vote. Then, having made the issue clear to the public, I am satisfied that a system where money dictates the answer could not succeed. Quite apart from the Watergate scandal, I think that the American people are aggrieved by the fact that they are being asked.

One will find that when people understand this, they are going to see it to that the election of a President and the decisions of Government should not be dictated by those who have great wealth and its money and its economic power to overcome the judgment of the majority of the people. This, unfortunately, has happened too often.

Mr. MONDALE. The President, if the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. There is another part to this: It is the way in which big money corrupts government. But it is also the way in which big government can extort money from those who support it. As I stated for the Record a day or so ago, some top businessmen have testified that in the last campaign they were approached by representatives of the Incomes Department in a way which suggested that, if they did not contribute, the government might act in a way which was adverse to their interests. So, out of fear, they contributed vast amounts in order to protect themselves from adverse decisions by the Government. That is somewhat like the old days of the big machines, when one would have to pay money to protect himself from trouble.

So it works both ways. That is why many top businessmen, who contributed, have now said, “Let us save our system.” Let us have a system that is clean, a system in which we can go where we please and contribute to whom we please; but let us not have a system by which people can exert improper pressure on Government.

I think this is the other part of it. Not just the donees but also the donors are being extorted. For both reasons we need to clean up the system.

Mr. LONG. It was not my suggestion that this amendment should be added to the debt limit bill. It was the view of the sponsors of the amendment, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MANKIN), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and various other Senators that this should be added. The argument has been made that it does not belong on this bill. However, we have legislated in this area before. That was the bill to octroy the investment tax credit, and not one of those times has the amendment been on a bill that was relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. As I just said, the amendment has never been on a bill to which it was not relevant. If memory serves me correctly, I think it was the Revenue Act of 1971 that was related to this proposal.

Mr. President, it is important to keep in mind that the Constitution does not permit the Senate to originate a revenue bill. Revenue bills must originate in the House. But the Senate has the right to amend those revenue bills, and the power of the Senate to amend is unlimited. The only thing the Senate cannot add to a revenue bill is a constitutional amendment, and it should be that way because to accept any other course would be to have the Senate act as if it were a special area because it has more power than the House. Mr. President, it is important to keep in mind that the Senate has that power and that the Senate can do anything that the House can do.
solved, and it seems to me that the way to resolve it is by the conventional legislative process. In my judgment the only orderly process under these circumstances would be for the measure to proceed to the House, for the House and the Senate to work out an agreement on what we send to the President. Still, the President for the President to act in whatever fashion his conscience might dictate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. LONG. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. LONG. I presume the President does not favor the measure and if he does not he can veto it. If there are not enough votes to override the veto, which might be the case in view of the difficulty we are having getting a cloture of debate on the issue, I would be willing to yield to the administration and send the measure to the House with an amendment. Orderly procedure should permit this measure to proceed on its way, the Senate having expressed its position, and let the House express its position also. We want the President to decide what he wants to do about it.

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to yield first to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Weicker), who has an appointment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Very well.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, I have been somewhat concerned over some of the attitudes that have developed as a result of the Watergate scandal. The Senator from Connecticut is right. We are in the process of getting a few individuals to understand the abuses are what they are.

But I do not think any of us are in a position to say in a hurried fashion what they are. I understand the abuses are what they are. I understand full well. One does have to be in a position of knowing what is going on, of being a member of the Watergate committee, in order to find the facts.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the Senator. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the Senator. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield 2 minutes. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the Senator. I yield 1 additional minute to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WEICKER. Far better than saying "The Federal Government ought to foot the bill."

I repeat this. I want to say it on the floor, because how many are getting pressure from lobby groups to the effect that those of us who are fighting this amendment are against reform. I am fighting it, because it is sloppy. It is lazy. It is not a well-reasoned solution this problem requires.

You want reform? Believe me, you will get it when you get the facts in February. They are going to the hardnosed and they are going to cut across all sides. We are going to propose legislation that will give no loopholes. It means all of us are going to have to leg it and think hard to get contributions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Has the Senator from Connecticut received a report from the Watergate committee, without having had the benefit of that report, already dismissed the idea of public financing of campaigns?

Mr. WEICKER. I have not dismissed it, but I am so concerned, when you cut the cost of campaigning in the United States, you do not need public funding. I do not dismiss it. When we get the facts, maybe the Senator will change his mind. Maybe I will...
Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. The most obvious fact about Watergate is the corrosive influence of private money in public life. I do not think the people have to see what the Watergate committee’s report is saying to be to know that fact. We already know the result of the Watergate committee’s work on campaign financing.

I watched my colleague in an interesting debate over television last evening, and I think he carried the burden very well of establishing that fact. That is already a fact. We do not have to get into a lot of anticipation of the details the report is going to show.

In like fashion in the description of the Senator from Connecticut, I did not even recognize the amendment we are considering today. He was talking about S. 372 as being a part of the solution. I voted for that. I think it is an important part of the solution. An individual can give $25,000 to various political campaigns during a year—a total of $25,000, with a $3,500 limit on contributions to particular candidates.

What are we talking about in this amendment here? One hundred dollars. A candidate must obtain a contribution of $100 in order to get an additional $100 in public funds. Contributions up to $100 will be matched, but there will be no matching for contributions over $100. That’s the limit.

It seems to me, if the Senator is talking about a “lazy” program, the way we do things today fits that description better. The lazy way is to call the big businessmen and wealthy lawyers and groups that are going to make the contributions. That is the lazy way of doing it. That is what is going to continue unless we come to grips with the issue of Watergate.

What are we attempting to do by this amendment, which passed by an overwhelming vote in the Senate? We want to match $100 contributions. We want to increase the tax deduction for a joint return up to $50, from $25 to $50. We want to increase the tax deduction up to $200. That is not the lazy way. In order to get that $50 or $200, you are going to have to get somebody busy on the phone or someone knocking on the door in order to get a positive answer.

That builds on the sound system developed by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee going back to 1966—the dollar checkoff. That is what we are building on. It is not a new idea. It is not a new proposal.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield on the Senator’s time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 3 more minutes.

Let the President of the United States express his view, and then we can act in our orderly procedure. If this filibuster is allowed to proceed, it is going to make the whole thing worse. This fundamental concept that anything in the way of basic reform will need a wide spectrum of support, and the votes last week in the Senate proved that we already have such support. I hope continuing to get the support so the Senate will approve the measure.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I understood from the comments of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut that it was his belief that the ordinary private contribution can be cleansed so that they are fully honest and may be used in campaigns.

I reject that notion, and I think that most people reject it.

A prior Senate bill was an attempt to clean up the private system of campaign contributions. I think it did a pretty good job.

The fact that, when we clean things up and limit the amount of money contributed, it is impossible to run an adequate campaign makes a second argument for public financing, because unless we add a decent public financing system to the measure, we create an incentive for people to cynically avoid its terms.

In the Senate, we passed in the Senate to clean up private funds, most of the scholars who have studied this matter that I know of are convinced that we cannot clean up private financing to the extent that one can both have an adequate campaign and protect against corruption.

So we absolutely must have some system of public financing which works, which is what the underlying proposal of S. 372 is. It is not a new proposal. It is not a sloppy program. It is the result of 75 years of study, including several weeks of debate in the Senate.

This effort is right. It is ready. It is ripe. It is seasoned. It is ready to be adopted.

The Senator from Connecticut said that we do not want the Federal Government to run our campaigns. Our whole idea of putting reform in the hands of the Comptroller General by letting individuals check off the money is to get it out of the hands of the Federal Government.

The Watergate committee has shown that government is up to its eyeballs in the financing of campaigns. It is big government. It is the result of 75 years of study, including several weeks of debate in the Senate.

Second, this is a measure which would save the American people, the American businessmen, the American laborers, any offenders from this kind of blackmail and restore the American Government to the American people.

We are ready. This is a good reform measure. We do not need any more. I urge the Senate to support the measure.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama, is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, if this is such a good bill and if it is a bill that represents an idea whose time has come, I do not know why the proponents of public financing bill do not introduce a bill, let it go through the committee process, and then come to the floor and have it passed.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield on the Senator’s time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Very well. On my own time, would the Senator from Alabama support this exact measure if it had a separate title? That is the point.
Mr. ALLEN. No, I would not support it.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

[Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will be in order.

Mr. ALLEN. But that would give the Senate an opportunity to discuss this. This bill should stand on its own merits and not to pass the debt ceiling bill. The debt ceiling bill is past due. The other measure applies to 1976.

What is the hurry about it? I see no need for taking it up at this time when we already have filibustered about a bill that is past due for passage. I see no need for taking it up without something that will not be operable until 1976.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to say first of all that the story of Watergate is not first a story of how private financing was used in a corrupting way. It is clearly a story of how the power of the Government was used to corrupt.

The General Accounting Office for the purpose of reform would involve the Government in an increasing way. The General Accounting Office, as far as I know, is not something that belongs to State or local government. It is a part of the Federal Government.

Let me say that the Senator can demagog all he wants to. I will be glad to explain to Connecticut my stand on campaign reform. I think they understand what this Senator stands for.

I have an intelligent constituency and, quite frankly, I do not think they want some measure that is thrown together. They want reform. However, they want intelligent reform that will work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the colloquy has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield the additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, all of us will have to go out and earn the respect of the American people and not just get money with which to wage our campaigns. Government should not subsidize political mediocrity.

It is like anything else where subsidy is involved. It cannot stand on its own two feet. I do not want our election process subsidized.

I think we should be here in 3 to 4 months' time, with no slipshod, quickly put together solution, but rather with an intelligent, well-thought-out plan to reform our political process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yielded time?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will yield on the Senator's time after I make a few remarks. I am surprised at the remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that this is not in any way a partisan effort.

It has strong bipartisan support, including some of the most distinguished Senators, a minority of the Senate. I believe that almost every major reform measure, whether congressional or Presidential, has bipartisan support. The measure introduced last week had such support, and it passed the Senate. As its sponsor, I believe it is a well thought out and effective amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute so that I might ask the distinguished Senator a question.

The Senator from Massachusetts asked the Senator from Alabama if he would support the same provision in a separate bill. The Senator from Alabama said that he would not.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator, since he sets so much store by that question, if the Senator from Alabama had said he would support a Senate bill, would the Senator from Massachusetts have been willing to withdraw this amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. It would not have been up to me to withdraw it. It would have been up to all its sponsors.

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator have been willing that it be withdrawn?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, I would not support it.

Mr. ALLEN. But that would give the Senate an opportunity to discuss this. This bill should stand on its own merits and not to pass the debt ceiling bill. The debt ceiling bill is past due. The other measure applies to 1976.

What is the hurry about it? I see no need for taking it up at this time when we already have filibustered about a bill that is past due for passage. I see no need for taking it up without something that will not be operable until 1976.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to say first of all that the story of Watergate is not first a story of how private financing was used in a corrupting way. It is clearly a story of how the power of the Government was used to corrupt.

The General Accounting Office for the purpose of reform would involve the Government in an increasing way. The General Accounting Office, as far as I know, is not something that belongs to State or local government. It is a part of the Federal Government.

Let me say that the Senator can demagog all he wants to. I will be glad to explain to Connecticut my stand on campaign reform. I think they understand what this Senator stands for.

I have an intelligent constituency and, quite frankly, I do not think they want some measure that is thrown together. They want reform. However, they want intelligent reform that will work.

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator have been willing that it be withdrawn?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, I would not support it. It has strong bipartisan support, including some of the most distinguished Senators, a minority of the Senate. I believe that almost every major reform measure, whether congressional or Presidential, has bipartisan support. The measure introduced last week had such support, and it passed the Senate. As its sponsor, I believe it is a well thought out and effective amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute so that I might ask the distinguished Senator a question.

The Senator from Massachusetts asked the Senator from Alabama if he would support the same provision in a separate bill. The Senator from Alabama said that he would not.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator, since he sets so much store by that question, if the Senator from Alabama had said he would support a Senate bill, would the Senator from Massachusetts have been willing to withdraw this amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. It would not have been up to me to withdraw it. It would have been up to all its sponsors.

Mr. ALLEN. Would the Senator have been willing that it be withdrawn?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, I would not support it.

Mr. ALLEN. But that would give the Senate an opportunity to discuss this. This bill should stand on its own merits and not to pass the debt ceiling bill. The debt ceiling bill is past due. The other measure applies to 1976.

What is the hurry about it? I see no need for taking it up at this time when we already have filibustered about a bill that is past due for passage. I see no need for taking it up without something that will not be operable until 1976.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, in response to the remarks of my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, I wish to say first of all that the story of Watergate is not first a story of how private financing was used in a corrupting way. It is clearly a story of how the power of the Government was used to corrupt.

The General Accounting Office for the purpose of reform would involve the Government in an increasing way. The General Accounting Office, as far as I know, is not something that belongs to State or local government. It is a part of the Federal Government.

Let me say that the Senator can demagog all he wants to. I will be glad to explain to Connecticut my stand on campaign reform. I think they understand what this Senator stands for.

I have an intelligent constituency and, quite frankly, I do not think they want some measure that is thrown together. They want reform. However, they want intelligent reform that will work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the colloquy has expired.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield the additional minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, all of us will have to go out and earn the respect of the American people and not just get money with which to wage our campaigns. Government should not subsidize political mediocrity.

It is like anything else where subsidy is involved. It cannot stand on its own two feet. I do not want our election process subsidized.

I think we should be here in 3 to 4 months' time, with no slipshod, quickly put together solution, but rather with an intelligent, well-thought-out plan to reform our political process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yielded time?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will yield on the Senator's time after I make a few remarks. I am surprised at the remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut. I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that this is not in any way a partisan effort.

I have understood—and I have looked this up once before—that since this Nation was founded and George Washing­ton was sworn in, there has not been a single instance when an obligation of the Government was not paid on time if properly demanded. Until I am corrected, I shall reiterate that statement in the real point:

But getting back to the real point: The time has already run out, and once we establish a precedent of going by default, then who knows when the next example will be, and what will be the outcome?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 4 minutes have expired.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Alabama very much. I did not intend to use all his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am sure that my distinguished friend and colleague the Senator from Mississippi, when he counseled that young grand­son of his, also counseled him about the legislative process of this country, because this is the only, I think, Senator who understands it and believes in it more deeply than the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I am sure he counseled that we are a government in which the majority rules, and I am sure that he understands, as all Members of the Senate do, that a majority of the Members of the U.S. Senate have voted for this amendment, and that all the proponents of the amendment are really attempting to do is permit the people's elected representatives, the Members of Congress who have been elected by the people of Mississippi as well as all the other States, to exercise their right to vote. But we are being denied that opportunity here by a parliamentary maneuver which has been written into the rules of this body, and by which the will of this body has been defied for many years. I think all of us understand that.

But what we are asking, Mr. Pres­ident, is that if we get to a situation where those bonds are not paid, the bur­
den should not be placed on those who support this amendment, but squarely upon those who are participating in this filibuster and frustrating the majority will of the U.S. Senate.

They are the ones who should bear the burden, Mr. President, because the Senate of the United States has taken, and a strong majority of the people's representatives have voted in favor of election reform. I think the people ought to understand where that burden lies. It lies with those who are frustrating the will of the people's representatives.

Mr. President, I feel, myself, that this is perhaps the most important measure that this Congress will have an opportunity to vote on as a lesson to be gained from the Watergate experience. This debate which has taken place has been, I think, devoid of partisanship. There has been an active attempt by Members on both sides of the aisle to construct a procedure by which the corrosive and corrupting influence of private money can be eliminated from public life in this country. This is one lesson that can be learned and understood, I believe, by the grandson of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. It is a lesson that has been stood by old and young alike in all parts of this country. There are those who believe that this is the way in which Congress can best respond to the challenge of the American people, and to restore the fundamental integrity of the electoral processes of this country.

Mr. President, I yield whatever time I have remaining to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to make one point.

In my opinion, the reason why we are presented with a filibuster, above all, and a successful filibuster, is because the administration is supporting it. It is well known that White House lobbyists have been active in this campaign to frustrate the will of the majority of the Senate. It was reliably reported in this morning's Washington Post that Members of the U.S. Senate were flown by Government planes to the Senate to vote against cloture, and while the President of the United States has remained publicly silent, those who work for him have been active trying to persuade the Senate to prevent the majority of this body from working its will and from cleaning up American campaigns. I think that is a tragedy. Not only that, it shows who is responsible for delaying the extension of the debt ceiling. We could have worked our way a long time ago and the debt ceiling bill could have been on the President's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUBBLESTON). The time of the Senator has expired.

All time for debate having expired, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The second assistant legislative clerk read 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 Senate to agree to the House amendment 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
Edward M. Kennedy
Alan Cranston
Hubert H. Humphrey
Cliborne Pell
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

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

Abourezk Eastland Mondale l
Allen Ervin Montoya
Bartlett Fairbank Pearson
Bayh Gravel Percy
Beall Griffin Ribicoff
Bellmon Gurney Pell
Bennett Hansen P
Benison Hattie
Bible Hartke
Biden Hatfield
Brock Hathaway Roth
Brooke Holm
Burcky Hollings
Buricht Byrd
Byrd, Robert C. Jackson
Case Jayne
Chiles Kennedy
Church Long
Clark Magnuson
Clayton Mathias
Cotton Mathias
Cranston McClellan
Curtois McClure
Dole McIntyre
Domenici McNairy
Dominick Metcalf

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Haskell), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Hughes), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee) are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) is absent on official business.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows:

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Haskell), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Hughes), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) is absent on official business.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows:
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Abourezk Eastland Mondale
Allen Ervin Montoya
Bartlett Fairbank Pearson
Bayh Gravel Percy
Beall Griffin Ribicoff
Bellmon Gurney Pell
Bennett Hansen P
Benison Hattie
Bible Hartke
Biden Hatfield
Brock Hathaway Roth
Brooke Holm
Burcky Hollings
Buricht Byrd
Byrd, Robert C. Jackson
Case Jayne
Chiles Kennedy
Church Long
Clark Magnuson
Clayton Mathias
Cotton Mathias
Cranston McClellan
Curtois McClure
Dole McIntyre
Domenici McNairy
Dominick Metcalf

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators in agreement with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and authorize the Senate to agree to the House amendment on the bill, H.R. 11104, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Fulbright), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Haskell), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Hughes), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee) are necessarily absent.

The Chair now announces that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Symington) is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Eagleton) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Haskell) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) is absent on official business.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows:
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Dominick Metcalf

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Baker), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Percy) are necessarily absent.

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

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood) is absent on official business.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 39, as follows:
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Abourezk Eastland Mondale
Allen Ervin Montoya
Bartlett Fairbank Pearson
Bayh Gravel Percy
Beall Griffin Ribicoff
Bellmon Gurney Pell
Bennett Hansen P
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Bible Hartke
Biden Hatfield
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McClure). On this vote there are 49 yea and 39 nays. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting not having voted in the affirmative, the cloture motion is not agreed to.

Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McClure). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might yield to the majority leader without prejudice to my right to the floor hereafter.

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

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 assistant legislative clerk read the 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. 1104, an act to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit and to extend the period to which this temporary debt limit applies to June 30, 1974.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1104) to provide for a temporary increase of $10.7 billion and to extend the period to which this temporary debt limit applies to June 30, 1974.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe it appropriate to appeal to those on all sides to temper their differences and to seek to be conciliatory toward one another with regard to an impending crisis that faces this Government, which at this moment, would appear to be of the making of the Senate, with whatever participation those in or out of the Senate might have contributed.

CURRENT STATUS OF TREASURY CASH POSITION

At the close of business on Friday, November 30, the outstanding amount of the public debt subject to the limitation was over $469.98 billion. The Treasury's operating cash balance on that same time was $4.6 billion. This will be increased by the normal flow of receipts from tax payments during the first week of December. Predictions about the amount of receipts we expected during this week, of course, vary with respect to a number of different factors, but it would be reasonable to expect receipts of about $3.7 billion between now and the close of business on Thursday. These receipts and the cash balance left after making payments this week. In addition, the Treasury and the Export-Import Bank have taken steps which will provide the Treasury with $1.3 billion as a payment by the Export-Import Bank on its outstanding debt to the Treasury. Finally, the Treasury expects to receive $3 billion from the sale of tax anticipation bills. In sum, the cash balance, the estimated tax receipts, the payment by the Export-Import Bank, and the sale of tax anticipation bills will provide the Treasury with about $13.1 billion in cash through Thursday of this week.

The Treasury has acted to delay or avoid incurring new debt this week until this bill is passed. It has instructed issuing agents for series E and H savings bonds to suspend temporarily the sale of those bonds until after the temporary debt ceiling is extended. The expected short delay in the issuance of these bonds will not cause a loss in interest to the purchasers because all bonds issued this month will earn interest from December 1. Special series Treasury securities that have been held by foreign mono-entities which were scheduled to mature this week were refunded in advance on Friday in order to avoid potential cash drain this week. In addition, the Treasury has postponed the regular weekly auction of $4.3 billion of Treasury bills that were scheduled for today. The postponement will continue in effect until Congress has completed action on the debt limit extension. Treasury has also suspended issuance of special series obligations to the Government trust fund, such as the social security trust fund, until a new debt limit is enacted.

There are three payments to be made this week which might exhaust the anticipated $13 billion in cash that the Treasury is expected to have available through Thursday. These consist of $4.5 billion in benefit payments to social security beneficiaries, the checks for whom are in the mails and probably are being delivered today; $1.25 billion for Government payroll checks to be paid today; and $4.3 billion for repayment of regular Treasury bills that will become due on Thursday.

There are, in addition, other benefit payments of approximately $1.5 billion that also become due this week. These consist of $800 million in Veterans Administration benefits, $500 million in civil service retirement payments, and $200 million in payments under the railroad retirement plan. To the extent that the timing of the payments makes it necessary, the Treasury Department plans to make these benefit payments, and, if necessary, try to expedite the payments with the remaining cash available on Thursday to the holders of the $4.3 billion in Treasury bills becoming due then.

In addition, Secretary Shultz and other appropriate agency heads are subjecting prospective expenditures during this week to intensive review in order to determine their relative priorities for payment from the normal flow of receipts that come in every day.

Mr. President, in brief, it would appear that unless the Treasury can apply some sort of fiscal legerdemain that is not known to this Senator or to anyone else with whom I have consulted on this matter, beginning after Thursday the Government will have extreme difficulty in paying its debts falling due, including bonds which the Government has issued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table entitled "Present Status of the U.S. Cash and Debt Position," which sets forth in outline form a summary of our situation, plus the steps that have been taken by the Government to meet this mounting crisis, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A. Public debt subject to limit outstanding at the close of business, Nov. 30, 1973

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Billion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Estimate of cash available through Thursday, Dec. 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treasury operating cash balance</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment on debt by Export-Import Bank</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate will of cash available through Thursday</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of tax anticipation bills</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimate of cash on hand through Thursday, Dec. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr. Aiken. My next question is: how long would that take? Mr. Long. If the President would veto the bill, I would urge the Senate to act on the veto as soon as the bill gets back from the President.

Mr. Aiken. How long would that take? Mr. Long. How long would that take? The Senator first gave us a deadline by which time, if action is not taken by the Congress, the United States would be in trouble.

Mr. Aiken. Does the Senator see any possibility of enacting legislation before Friday? Does the Senator see any indication of considering the veto, should the bill be vetoed?

Mr. Long. No, I do not see any likelihood of overriding a veto of the bill, but I think it is proper legislative procedure. Mr. Aiken. My last question is: if the Senate refuses from the very, very controversial amendment, how long would it take to get the debt ceiling enacted into law so that the obligations of the United States could be met, so that bonds could be sold, and so that employees of the Government could get their checks in time to buy Christmas presents? How long would it take to withdraw from this?

Mr. Long. If the Senate recedes from its amendments, the bill would go directly to the President.

Mr. Aiken. I am afraid the Congress does not look good on this matter. Suppose the Senate recedes from this controversial amendment today. The bill would go to the President immediately. Could the Government start writing checks tomorrow?

Mr. Long. Yes. The Senate can surrender at any time it wants to, I am not sure the Senate would be wise to do so, but it has the privilege if its wants to do so.

Mr. Allen. Mr. President— The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Alabama.

Mr. Aiken. Mr. President, may I ask the pending question is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is 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 therein, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferences on the part of the Senate.

Mr. Allen. Mr. President, the question proposed by the distinguished Senator from Vermont to the distinguished Senator from Alabama just a moment ago is the key question before the Senate at this time, or will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order, so the Senator can be heard. Will the Senate of the floor? The Senator will suspend until we have some order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. Allen. Or it will be just as soon as the Senator from Alabama can make another motion on the floor.

Does the Senator wish me to yield? Mr. Aiken. I was going to ask this question. If the Senator from Alabama does not know the answer, perhaps the Senator from Louisiana does.

Mr. Allen. Will the Senator use his amplifier?

Mr. Aiken. If an agreement is reached by the conferees, do I understand correctly that this agreement, except by a third reading, can be printed and lie over 2 days in the House before it could be acted upon?

Mr. Allen. That is the understanding of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. Aiken. That is my information. A single Member could block the House from taking the conference report up for 2 days after it had been approved by both the Senate and the House committees.

Mr. Allen. I am afraid that is correct in the opinion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. Aiken. Now we have a cloture motion filed, to be taken up on Wednesday. It looks as if the Government could not start writing checks this week under present conditions, unless we receive our poise, or whatever you want to call it, and take action.

I have no objections to considering these controversial amendments. I do not think it is wise, or smart to try to tack them onto this debt ceiling legislation, with all the troubles which it entails. I do not think it is wise of us to undertake to send to the President at this time a bill which we have been promised by the condition he will veto.

Mr. Allen. I agree with the distinguished Senator.

Mr. Aiken. It might be almost Christmas before the employees of the Government could get their checks.

Rather than hear from one single person in my State either for or against these amendments, I understand that many of the other Senators have not heard a thing from their States. I firmly believe that by supporting these amendments, some of our people who will
be running for election even in 1974 or 1976 are missing the
ceiling bill. Perhaps I should not say that. However, that is
what I feel personally. Mr. ALLEN, I agree with the Senator.
And I thank him for his comments.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might yield to the di-

gested Senator from North Dakota without losing my right to the floor.
Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe an explanation of my
vote and position is in order. I am a cosponsor of the pend-
ing election reform bill. I still believe in Federal financing of Presidential
elections, and particularly those of Members of the
Congress.
I think there is a lot wrong with our present system. However, I understand as
far as that part having to do with Con-
gress is concerned, that part would be
passed on to the House.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unani-
mous consent that I may yield to the
Senator from Louisiana without losing
my right to the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without object?
Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe an ex-
planation of my vote and position is in
order. I am a cosponsor of the pend-
ing election reform bill. I still believe in
Federal financing of Presidential elec-
tions, and particularly those of Mem-
bers of the Congress.
I think there is a lot wrong with our present system. However, I understand as
far as that part having to do with Con-
gress is concerned, that part would be
passed on to the House.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unani-
mous consent that I may yield to the
Senator from Louisiana without losing
my right to the floor.
Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the
Senator yield?
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unani-
mous consent that I may yield to the
Senator from Louisiana without losing
my right to the floor.
Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am going to
use my best efforts to try to persuade
both sides to get the right kind of funds.
However, as far as election re-
form is concerned, the reason I am
voting the way I am is because the Presi-
dential election is 3 years off. There is plenty of opportu-

tunity to attach the legislation to some other bill and I would then sup-
port it. It could and should be by separate
legislation. As I said previously, to get
funds that don't compromise your ac-
tions and votes is getting much more
difficult.
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hostage here in the Senate, is that correct?
Mr. LONG. I want to send just one bill over there.
Mr. ALLEN. I see. It would occur to the Senator from Alabama that that is a case of trying to have your cake and eat it, too, and I do not believe the Senator from Alabama would buy that.
Mr. LONG. I do not quite think so. It seems to me the Senator from Louisiana that if we are to send this measure to the House, in cooperation with those who strongly favor public campaign financing, it might prevail on the other side to let the Senator have his way.
Mr. ALLEN. I do not believe you will get what you want by the second bill, you are willing to drop your efforts on the first bill, but if you fail over there on that bill you want to keep on trying over here.
Mr. LONG. I thought I heard the Senator make the statement that if those who favor the campaign financing proposal would send it to the House on some other bill, the Senate would not insist on having the public campaign financing measure up, but would permit it to go to the House.
Mr. ALLEN. No, the Senator must have misunderstood the Senator from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama said the Senator from Louisiana outlined that as one of his options, and I wondered why he did not pursue it.
Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator had made it clear he would filibuster against that, too, because if he had, I would not have made the suggestion.
Mr. ALLEN. I did not state that I would filibuster against it.
Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent that we discharge the committee from further consideration.
Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—
Mr. ALLEN. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.
Mr. TAFT. I was reserving the right to object.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard. The Senator from Alabama objects.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I did not object to the Senator from Ohio having time; I objected to the request of the Senator from Louisiana.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that.
Mr. ALLEN. I would be delighted, if the Senator from Ohio would like some time, to yield to him, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.
Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from Alabama.
Mr. President, my purpose in reserving the right to object to the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana was to ask the following question. If the course he was suggesting were pursued, as apparently it will not be, would there be adequate time for debate and amendments from the floor, and if there were, did the Senator believe we could work the matter out in sufficient time for it not to be held in complete hostage to the debt limit situation?
Mr. LONG. I would certainly have hoped so, but evidently the Senate is not to be permitted to consider the thing. It was my thought that someone ought to make some gesture of good will, to try to bring this thing to a head. But I re­spect the right of anyone to object.
Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator for his reply.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana, to set the record straight, has offered to bring up a revenue bill the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Finance Committee. He asks unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of that veable bill—I would expect that it is an innocuous bill—but that while that bill is going over to the House of Representatives with the Senate amendments added, this debt ceiling bill will stay over here in a state of suspended animation, and if they fall on the one, then they would have the debt ceiling bill to come back to.
Another reason why that is not fair is that it is not fair to our House brethren over there to have this innocuous tax bill changed into something entirely different, when all they have an opportunity to do over there is to vote for a conference. They do not consider the bill ab initio; they do not consider it originally, make their changes in the Senate version, and then will on the one, they would have the debt ceiling bill to come back to.
I do not believe the House is going to reverse itself, having voted 347 to 54 last week not to take the Senate amendments and not to agree to a conference. Why the Senator is suggesting, and by the way, I never have seen that compromise, and I do not know whether any other Senator has. What is in that compromise, and who did sit on that compromise committee? No one has ever said.
Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I hope he was listening when he was reading the report there from the Treasury Department, I believe, on the dire effects that the failure to pass the debt limit places the country in, and the Treasury in.
I would like, for the Record, Mr. President, to call attention to the fact that on yesterday the Senator from Alabama—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.
Mr. ALLEN. That on yesterday, Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama had pending before the Senate and the Senate, the President, that the Senate recede from its amendment to H.R. 11104. That motion had been made the preceding day but then a motion to adjourn kept it from coming up. So that motion was made, and I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to agree that that motion be allowed to come up for a vote. I notice that there were two Senators who voted for cloture but also voted to recede.
There were 39 votes against cloture today and 33 votes against it yesterday, so that I am hopeful when the motion to recede is made again and Senators understand the full significance of that motion, and then the Senator from Louisiana understands the full significance of that motion, it will constitute final passage of the debt ceiling bill, because acceptance of this motion to recede is, in effect, final passage of the bill.
Mr. MONDALE. Would the Senator from Alabama advise us how many attended that meeting?
Mr. ALLEN. I do not know.
Mr. MONDALE. You were not there?
Mr. ALLEN. You did not invite me. Had you invited me I would have been. But you failed to invite me. But I would like to know who participated in that compromise. Apparently there were a bunch of folks all of the same mind. I did not hear of anyone against the campaign handout bill that was present there. They got together in a smoke-filled room.
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. ALLEN. I yield.
Mr. LONG. The Senator could have seen the amendment and had the opportunity to debate it if he had not objected. I think the Senator has set the record straight.
Mr. ALLEN. For a question, yes.
Mr. ALLEN. I did not state that I would not insist on holding the public campaign financing measure up, but then a motion to adjourn kept it from coming up. So that motion was made, and I appreciate the desire of the Senator from Louisiana to agree that that motion be allowed to come up for a vote. I notice that there were two Senators who voted for cloture but also voted to recede.
There were 39 votes against cloture today and 33 votes against it yesterday, so that I am hopeful when the motion to recede is made again and Senators understand the full significance of that motion, and then the Senator from Louisiana understands the full significance of that motion, it will constitute final passage of the debt ceiling bill, because acceptance of this motion to recede is, in effect, final passage of the bill.
Mr. MONDALE. Who voted for final passage yesterday?
Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question without losing my right to the floor.
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HON. JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Congratulations on your stand against rider on debt limit bill.

EMILY D. PEASLEE,
EMUND W. PEASLEE.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: We agree with your attempts preventing unrelated amendments being attached to major legislation. Carry on.

J. ELLIS MICKLER.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Favor your stand campaigning. Vote no on increasing national debt. Bring Federal Reserve Board under congressional control. Reduce executive emergency powers. LEVITCH FAMILY and PEACOCK FAMILY.

LOUDER, MISS.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Hang in there, Jim. This requires more time than they have given.

AL EUBANKS.

MOBILE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,

BUBBA and Pat Hayard.

DAYTON, OHIO,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Please stick by your guns in regards campaign contribution.

CHARLES PHILIPS.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Hang in there. The people are with you.

BILL and SUE KENNEDY.

MIAMI, FLA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Urge you continue your courageous stand against demagoguery.

JOHN STERNER.

MOBILE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Keep up your magnificent effort. Your one man stand could determine the republic's future.

W. ROBERTS WILSON.

MOBILE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Thanks for your Senate Sunday stand against financial spending.

M. E. HUNNERWELL.

SELMA, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Congratulations on your stand on the election bill.

BOBBY HINSON.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,

Mr. and Mrs. Don Wacker.

MERCER ISLAND, WASH.,

S SRVSTNER.

MOBILE, ALA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: I am with you 100 percent.

BOBBY HINSON.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,

FRANKS X. FURLONG.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,

BOB CLARK.

STRATFORD, CONN.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Congratulations and continued Senate filibuster against Gratification of greater Federal debt ceiling.

God bless you.

HUGH DOLAN.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,

Senator JAMES ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Please continue the filibuster your efforts are deeply appreciated.

C. L. KIRSCHNER.

MONROE, MICH.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Stick to your guns on public financing of Presidential campaign. We're all for you.

HERMAN SPERR.

DAVENPORT, IOWA,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Congratulations on your courageous filibuster against the national campaign funding. Keep up the good work.

T. R. MOTTO.

DEARBORN, MICH.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Thank you for your stand against public funding of campaigns. Millions of us support you.

GLADYS PURCELL.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,

Senator JAMES B. ALLEN,

CHARLES L. McBRIDE.

MECER ISLAND, WASH.,

Senator JAMES ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Good work. Vote against election financing rider.

Mr. and Mrs. DON WACKER.

MOUNT VERNON, WASH.,

Senator JAMES ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Good show. Thank you. Yours truly,

DON BEERMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

HON. JAMES B. ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: I fully support your filibuster to hold debt ceiling down.

KINDEST REGARD,

H. CECIL MILLER, JR.

HIRAM, OHIO,

Senator JAMES ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: Best congratulations on your stand on the election bill.

THOMAS W. BROWN.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,

Senator JAMES ALLEN,
Capitol Hill, D.C.: I support and commend your opposition to public fund election financing. Keep it up.

PERRY M. BOLING.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I am deeply troubled by the implications of the rash action taken by the Senate in approving the use of tax money for political campaigning.

This action has been referred to in the media as "revolutionary," and I certainly must agree. It is an overthow of many of the principles upon which our political system has operated for almost two centuries.

Most certainly I am not opposed to campaign reforms. Our political system needs constant monitoring and readjustments.

What has been undertaken here, however, is not a simple adjustment or correction of the system. What has been done is to throw out the system and impose a new one, at least insofar as it involves Presidential elections.

It is somewhat frightening to realize that an action of this magnitude would be undertaken on the floor of the Senate without the benefit of committee hearings or studies on the specific program which was adopted. It is at best extremely poor legislative procedure, and in my estimation, unbelievably irresponsible. As important as the debt limit bill is, I would hope that President Nixon will veto it if it reaches him with the campaign financing rider attached. Better that the Government suffer a brief financial crisis than this legislation be allowed to go into effect.

The use of a so-called veto-proof bill as a vehicle for the campaign financing provisions demonstrates a lack of faith in the merits of the proposal. If this were a sound program, proponents should have no qualms about putting it through regular channels to let it rise or fall on its own.

Mr. President, I am aware, of course, that this issue has been considered for years in Congress. In fact, I would point out that in June 1967, Russell D. Hemenway, national director of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, made these remarks at a hearing before the Senate Finance Committee:

The NCCE wishes to be on record as opposed to any proposal which provides direct Treasury financing of elections. We feel this would substitute the Treasury for the voluntary political contributor. To appropriate Federal funds to pay for campaigns is anti-
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Since taxpayers have failed to provide funds for campaigning through the "checkout" system on their tax returns, the proponents of this new plan would take the money from them unless they object. This is an insult to the American public.

Mr. President, the place for campaign reform to begin is through the enforcement of the laws which we do have. As Arlene Greenspan wrote in an article, "How Should We Finance Elections?" in the May 10, 1973, Wall Street Journal:

"There's not yet an obvious need to go to the extreme of taxing people to pay for the candidates' anti-trust suits or their expenses to the national debt. At least that step shouldn't be taken before trying sterner enforcement of existing law."

Mr. President, I believe that this goes right to the heart of the American political system. It paralyzes the individual, and undermines the vitality of the party system and the choice of candidates and over State and local party organizations. By reducing the financial dependence on the rank and file constituents, the party hierarchy is insulated against the public will. The inherent dangers of stifling conformity, rigid discipline, and a self-perpetuating power structure within the major parties are obvious.

It is in order here, I think, Mr. Chairman, to explain why the political financing of campaigns would operate. Suppose the two national parties were each allocated $10 million from the Treasury. Nomination would be optional for each party for certain specified costs of the presidential campaign. But would not the two national parties discover that their preferred whips were respected as orders by party officials, by everyone in the party from super­visor to coroner to candidates for the House and Senate?

Afove all, the basic principle of voluntarism is destroyed, since the individual may not determine where his money is going. Nor would the individual participate in many of the meaningful campaign activities which fundraising is merely a stimulus. Politically, for the candidate and public, it is far more important to receive a hundred $1 bills than one contribution for $100. In the interest to cleanse the present system of abuses, one does not want to handicap the political process. It will do no good to handicap an unresponsive, bureaucratic mechanism which renders the public will meaningless and impotent. The American people are now reacting against the overbureaucratized agencies of Government. At a time when our leaders are concerned about making it easy to humanize and personalize the Government, we do not want to build the same difficulties into politics. We see in some of the election financing schemes the same pattern which has characterized much recent Federal legislation: full of good intentions, financed by Federal largesse, but functionally incapable of reaching the goals it set. Legal aid of rigid and uniform directives are imposed in situations requiring adjustment and flexibility.

Mr. President, we have had hearings over the years and each time we have found that the financing of election campaigns is a much more complex problem than it appeared. That is exactly why proponents of these schemes bring them directly to the Senate floor where they can label them "campaign reform" and dare other Members of Congress to vote against the proposals.

If the idea of taking tax money to pay for political campaigning has any merit, it should be able to survive our commit­ment to our constitutional appeal that if sent to the Senator he would feel compelled to sign it as I say on its merits.

The campaign financing provisions of the bill are an appalling testimony as to the lack of faith in the American people. It is big brother legislation at its worst.
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Yet it was virtually ignored by the ladies and gentlemen in the press gallery. They could not have cared less. I dare say that not more than a fraction of one per cent of the American people are even aware that this Senate voted last week against an opportunity to commit to a balanced budget. When this amendment came up last week, Mr. President, I asked our friends in the press gallery stepped out for a smoke, or a visit to the rest room.

And, I suppose, Mr. President, it will be the same today and tomorrow—or just as it was yesterday when the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) called upon this Senate to be ashamed for its conduct. And I suppose that the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) will continue to be bailed up in the press gallery stepped out for a smoke, or a visit to the rest room.

This is the fix we are in, Mr. President. This is the fix this Senate, and the news media, are in. I do not wonder that polls show that garage collectors are regarded with far more respect than either the Congress or the major news media. The garage collectors deserve their ranking, Mr. President. And with all due respect to my colleagues and to the major news media. I am afraid we deserve ours.

But, I do want to commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I admire him, as he knows, and I support him. I hope he will stand firm, and that he will again offer his motion to recede in this matter.

MOTION TO REcede

Mr. ALLEN. Now, Mr. President, I move—and I call attention to the fact that this motion is a motion for final passage of the debt ceiling bill, unencumbered by the campaign fund political handout—that the Senate do now recede from its amendments to H.R. 1104. I have a written motion at the desk, and I ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ALLEN. The amendment is to recede from its amendments to H.R. 1104. Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 560 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Aiken
Allen
Bartlett
Bell
Bennett
Biales
Brock
Buckley
Byrd
Harry F., Jr.
Cannon
Cook
Cotton
Curts
NAYS—43

Abourezk
Bayh
Bell
Bentsen
Bennett
Brooke
Byrd
Case
Church
Clark
Crandon
Gravel
Hart
Hartke
Harkey
Hathaway
Baker
Chiles
Eagleton
Eastland
Fulbright

NOT VOTING—15

Goldwater
Haskell
Hughes
Rumphrey
Inouye

Yea—42

Dole
Domenici
Dominick
Eskin
Gurney
Hansen
Helms
Hollings
Hruska
McClellan
McCurtis
Muskito
Jackson
Javits
Johnson
Kennedy
Korbel
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mccarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McGrady
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
McGee
McKee
Packwood
Pearson
Percy
Symington

So Mr. ALLEN's motion was rejected.

Mr. GRiffIN. Mr. President, the openness of this vote, it seems to me, underscores the appeal made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance earlier for some spirit of conciliation in this body. He detailed at great length the difficulties that the Government will face if it does not pass this debt ceiling bill passed and to the White House for signature.

The votes have been very interesting: 39 votes against invoking cloture; and there was a very close vote on the matter of whether or not the Senate should recede and send the House bill to the President for signature today. It seems to me that this vote, as well as the argument made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, speaks eloquently and persuasively for adhering to the orderly procedures of the legislative process, and the orderly procedures of the legislative process would be to consider such an important subject as public financing of campaigns by having it reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration and then brought on the floor, debated, and considered on its own merits.

I want to make a gesture in the direction of Mr. ALLEN in saying that I try to resolve this matter. I am only one member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am not enthusiastic about the concept of the public financing. I do think there are some steps we can take in the direction of public financing and I want to say that as one member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I will vote to report a public financing bill before this session of Congress adjourns, if that would be the will of the majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I would hope, and I would think, particularly since the subcommittee that has just reported has rejected a bill, and since the full committee has completed its work on the consideration of the Ford nomination and would be able to turn its attention to the bill, that the Rules Committee could now take a look at the possibility of reporting legislation. I can only speak for myself on that.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is a serious matter. We cannot hear back here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's point is well taken. Senators will be in order. Conversations will cease. The Senator is entitled to be heard, and other Senators are entitled to hear.

Will the Senator suspend until we have order?

Does the Senator from Michigan yield? Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the distinguished Republican.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, with the understanding that the Senator from Michigan does not lose his right to the floor.

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

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, our constant concern here, of course, is the state of the Treasury and the necessity for securing early action, if we can, on an act which has already expired. I still support the Campaign Reform Act in its full form and in its modified form. I think it is an idea whose time has come, and it ought to come now. I am convinced of it. I am not speaking as an incumbent of an office, but I am speaking for a view which is not embraced by a majority of my own party on this particular date.

I believe we will have and must have campaign reform, that we must do something about the present system of financing campaigns. I would like to take that incubus off the
backs of Presidential candidates and others. I would like to have some assurance that a campaign reform bill can be reported out at a date to which we can all look forward and make our plans accordingly. That would be up to the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and up to the majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee and the ranking members of the Finance Committee, but the fundamental undertaking would have to come from the Rules Committee, on which the Senator from Michigan and I now serve, and on which the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook) is the ranking Republican member.

I would hope that we could evolve here some sort of understanding that we can get some action on this legislation. At the moment we are in a Mexican standoff. We are at a stalemate, and we are not hurting each other as much as we are hurting the country. Therefore, I think it is time for me to speak up.

I have tried to maintain my position as an advocate of legislation, and I still believe in it. I believe it is even more important, however, for us to find the means by which the Government can function, and I do not want to be one who stands in the way of that. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader would have any comment?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has yielded me the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to use the words of the distinguished Republican leader, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has yielded me the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to the distinguished Senator from Michigan yield to the distinguished majority leader.

I would point out to my colleagues in this body that the Senate has voted on the Presidential campaigns many, many times, and that the overwhelming majority of this body is in favor of something being done. I would point out also that, on the basis of the information laid out before the select committee, we have seen what some meaningful changes in the field of financing within 30 days after the Senate convenes next year.

I point out to my colleagues, however, that such a bill may or may not be reported with a recommendation of approval because the distinguished Senator from Alabama is a member of the committee, and he is certainly entitled to have his views stated and considered. He feels very strongly in this field of public financing of Federal elections.

Again, however, I give my assurance to my colleagues that I will make every effort as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration to try to report out a bill, either favorably or unfavorably, and to get the bill that has been referred to the full committee and is now pending as a proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. TAHAN), being amendment No. 704 to H.R. 11094.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the assurances of the distinguished chairman of the committee are enough for me.

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

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the amendment is exactly the same as the bill reported by the subcommittee. That bill is now before the Senate.

The reason I did not offer it as an amendment is because I fully support the effort of the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and others to pass a comprehensive act. Because of the pressures of the present political situation, I think it would have been an excellent measure to pass at this time.

I would comment that this particular bill has had 4 days of hearings. There were 40 witnesses. It goes quite far. I
hope that my colleagues will approve of it.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I may say that these assurances are reassuring to me. A great deal of work has been done by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration and particularly by the chairman of the subcommittees, Senator from Alabama (Mr. FOLL), who came up with some very thoughtful legislation.

The sentiment will exist to do substantively what we have been trying to do here. We have this as a basis for action. I support the subcommittee recommendations.

The Senate has indicated how it feels about this legislation. My main concern is that I want to see the Senate go ahead, and I do not want to make any incorrect assumptions that the Senator from Alabama would not want to be heard and heard fully in the committee. However, I would not assume that he would want to take the position that the committee would support or pursue this legislation. If I am wrong in that assumption, I will wait on the Senator from Alabama to correct me. However, I feel that we could get consideration of this measure if Senator Foll may not be for it, but they are willing for the Senate to consider the measure.

We are in the position then that if there is not too much objection, I have a motion that I would be prepared to make, a motion to reconsider the motion of the Senator from Alabama to recede. I do not want to do that unless that motion satisfies those Senators who are with me on this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would join the distinguished Republican leader in that responsibility and in that motion. However, I would like to ask for the response of the distinguished ranking Republican member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. May I say that, as I am sure Senators recall, when we took up the issue of the Federal financing of campaigns during the course of the debate on the legislation, we had before the Senate, the Senate did not move to table the proposal. And we felt that we should go in this direction.

I could say to the distinguished majority leader and to the distinguished minority leader and to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I would frankly, as far as I know, have a meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration before we leave on the 15th, so that we can consider the motion. I hope this activity immediately upon our return so that the entire Senate can know the terms that we will commit ourselves to, whether we report the bill favorably or unfavorably. However, I would certainly feel that the bill should be brought to a ground vote on its own merit. The committee has a responsibility to get the bill to the Senate. We will not impede or delay that bill from coming to the floor for debate within 30 days after our return from adjournment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, and I appreciate what he has had to say.

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

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Massachusetts as well as to the Senators from Pennsylvania, Virginia and the Senator from Minnesota, "Welcome to the club."

I am one Senator who knows what it is to lose as well as to win rounds in this struggle. And insofar as the Finance Committee is concerned, at least when a revenue bill might be available to implement financing of the type of approach that some of us feel the Congress might want to take, the Senators can be assured of my cooperation when this matter comes before the Senate on future occasions.

I believe we will make progress in this Congress, and the Senate has the assurance of my complete support in helping to achieve a very proper conclusion in the Congress.

I say that, Mr. President, without having decided how I will vote on the measure. But I say to those Senators that if they do what the angels do on the side of the angels in this matter, I know that they will prevail. I hope they will prevail in this Congress, and if not, I think they will prevail during the next several years, between now and the next Presidential election.

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

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I address my question to the distinguished floor manager of the bill, the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long). As the Senator knows, some portion of any public financing bill that passes the Finance Committee to carry on where apparently we might leave off today.

Would the record show that I saw a nod of the head in the right direction? Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, before we have an opportunity to vote on this matter, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. FOLL), the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MANSFIELD), the ranking Republican member of the committee; the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROSSER C. BYRD), a member of the committee; the distinguished Assistant Minority leader, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), a member of the committee; and the distinguished Assistant Majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROSSER C. BYRD) whether, when the matter comes to the floor, we are prepared to have some kind of time limitation, so that at least those who can support the proposal, particularly the minority leader and other Members of the Senate who have been on the successful side on each vote during the period of this debate and discussion for the past week, have some reasonable assurance that there is good faith on the part of those who are here on the floor this afternoon. Otherwise, I must say that the suggestion, worthwhile as it might be, does not really have all the appeal it might otherwise have.

I wonder if the joint leadership would be prepared to include that in its time limitation request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would be loath to do that at this time, though I recognize the validity of the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. However, we do operate in this body on a certain amount of faith, and I am not entirely happy with the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the chairman of the Rules Committee; the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. FOLL), the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MANSFIELD), the ranking Republican member on the committee; the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROSSER C. BYRD), a member of the committee; the distinguished Assistant Minority leader, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), a member of the committee; and the distinguished Assistant Majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROSSER C. BYRD) it appears to me that that comprises--

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who else?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to hear from the distinguished Senator from Alabama on that as well.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I was going to say that that comprises a majority of the committee and I would not like to have any member in public, because I think they ought to have a right to their own independent judgment during the period intervening and at the time when the legislation is brought to the floor. But I think we have made progress in getting commitments, in effect, from the members of the committee who have spoken today, and I will assure the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts that as far as the Republican leader and I are concerned, we would make an effort at that time to achieve time limitation agreement if it were possible, and it would be my guess that we would be lucky in doing it in that fashion, and perhaps more successful, not posing that question at this time in this phase.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to point out to the distinguished Senator that we committed ourselves to report a bill, not necessarily a perfected bill, and I would be very reluctant, personally, to
agree to a time limitation without know-
ing what the provisions of the bill were. We may report a bill, favorably or unfavor-
ably, but we have made a commit-
ment to report a bill on this subject within 30 days after the Congress re-
sumes in the month of January. I think it would be extremely difficult to get an
agreement on something on which we are very uncertain.

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

Mr. CANNON. I do not have the floor. Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield to the Sen-
ator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Subcommittee of the Rules Committee has already
reported a bill to the full committee, so we are not really talking in a vacuum. At
least this measure has had the consid-
eration of the members of the sub-
committee. It had a 3 to 0 vote in the sub-
committee, and is therefore now before
the full committee. So this is something
that is not in a vacuum as far as the
Rules Committee is concerned. The sub-
committee reported a bill. They had
hearings on it, considered it in a markup session, and reported it to the full committee. Although I know it is difficult for the Chairman of the Rules Committee at this time, perhaps, to com-
mit the other members of the subcom-
mittee, we at least believe what has been re-
ported to the full committee from the
subcommittee represents the best judg-
ment of those members.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is exactly
right; I consider the best judgment of the particular members of the subcom-
mittee, but the full committee has not consid-
ered that report, has not consid-
ered the bill, and has not taken action;
and I would not at this time undertake
to commit the other committee members
to a particular bill simply because it has
been reported from a subcommittee. We
may make many changes in that bill before
the full committee.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the Senator will yield further, what we are trying to
bring out at this time is that we are not considering an entirely new concept or
a new bill. Your committee, through its sub-
committee, has already considered this proposal, and might be willing to
agree to a time limitation. I can under-
stand that the Senator from Nevada
could not commit the other members of
the committee, who have not had an op-
portunity to consider it, but at least it
would be some assurance for the major-
ity of the Members of this body who
have voted to support such a proposi-
tion that at least we can get final con-
sideration when it is reported out.

Mr. CANNON. May I say to my col-
league that this is the first time I have
ever heard the suggestion that a time
limitation be agreed to on a bill that has not even been considered by the full
committee? I do not consider this a reason to report the bill to the Senate. I think that would be a dan-
gerous concept in any circumstance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the
Senator that we will make every effort
to obtain a time limitation at an appro-
priate point?

Mr. KENNEDY. I have every con-


ship, and I pledge myself, as one Mem-
ber, to give every opportunity to the
members of the Rules Committee to con-
sider this legislation, and when it comes
to the Senate, I hope we shall not have a
repetition of this effort to frustrate the
strong will of the majority.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I
yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I echo the remarks of the distinguished chairman of
the Rules Committee. This bill has now
passed the subcommittee and is now
in the full committee. We will pro-
ceed to mark it up in the full commit-
tee. But I think it is rather odd that we
should be asked to say to the Members
of the Senate, before marking up a bill in
the full committee, that we are going to
consider a bill as to which we have al-
ready agreed to a time limitation when
it comes to the Senate, or that there will be a limitation on amendments or
amendments to amendments. I would
suggest that that is a prerogative that
ought to be left to the Senate as a whole
when a report has been written on the
bill. It goes on the calendar. The Sen-
ator's suggestion seems rather odd to
me.

With such a precedent, we might con-

celvably, in the future, bring up subject
matter on the floor that is going to the
Finance Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or some other committee, and say, as a matter
of course, during the debate on the sub-
ject matter in the committee, "We want
you to know that when we bring this
bill to the Senate, we are going to sub-
ject it to a 2-hour time limitation, with
30 minutes on amendments and 30 minutes on amendments to amendments."

I can only say to the Senator that we
diligently work out that bill, and at
the time it reported on the floor and is
put on the calendar, obviously it will
be up to the Senate to work out a
time limitation.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the Sen-
ator.

Mr. President, in our party conferences we have often discussed how many times we vote when it is not necessary to vote. I would hope we could do this without
a record vote. I now move:

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. Presi-
dent, will the Senator yield before he
does that?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I yield to the Sen-
ator from Virginia.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I do not want to take an ambiguous position, hav-
ing sat here through the colloquy, but I want the record to show that I do not
vote any of my options 2 months from
now when some particular bill might
be brought in, if I do not agree to the
Committee recommendation, but not today—and I want the record to show that.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I thank the dis-
gusted Senator.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I think
that we should have a yea-and-nay vote on this. I am asking for a yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Mc-
CULLE. We have not yet had the
motion.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, I
now move that the Senate recede from
its amendments to H.R. 11104, now
pending, I make the motion on behalf of
the distinguished majority leader and
myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the
Chair correctly understand that the
motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania
is to recede from the Senate amendments to the Finance bill?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. ALLEN. Then to reconsider the
vote?

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I do not want to
move to reconsider if there is no objec-
tion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-
tion is on agreeing to the motion to recede—

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. From the Senate
amendments to the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now does
the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Dom-
nick) wish to demand the yeas and nays?

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, a parlia-
mentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
tator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the question, Mr.
President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-
tion is on receding from the Senate
amendments.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will
call the roll.

Mr. President, the assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Idaho (Mr.
Church), the Senator from Missouri (Mr.
Packer), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr.
Penzar), the Senator from Colorado (Mr.
 Haskell), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Hughes), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. Inouye), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MccFee), the Senator from Florida (Mr. Culson), the Senator from Mississipp (Mr. Eastland), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGov-
er) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Smarrcon) is absent be-
cause of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr.
Church) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the
Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Bax-
er), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pax-
on), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Per-
cy) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. Gold-
water) is absent by leave of the Senate of the United States.

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. Pack-
wood) is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 48,
nays 36, as follows:

[No. 551 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Aiken
Bell
Bennett
Bentsen
Benn	
Beall
Brock
Belton
Buckley
Byrd
Byrd, F. H., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Cook

[December 3, 1973]
The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2702) to provide that daylight saving time shall be observed on a year-round basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated that we will reach this bill at 11:30 a.m. tomorrow. There will be no further votes today.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I would like 15 minutes tomorrow to deal with a pension and welfare fund situation. We have spoken about that to the deputy majority leader, but he is not in the Chamber. I would be happy to speak at 9:45 A.M. in the Senate. Mr. MANSFIELD. 9:45?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senate is to come in at 10. Normally, the majority leader schedules these matters a little in advance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will either be 9:45 or 10.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, may I ask this of the Senator from Colorado: I understand it to be his intention to propose, as an amendment to the daylight saving bill, the minimum wage bill introduced by him and Senator TARR. It would be my intention, utilizing such procedures as are available in the Senate, to contest that particular amendment. I rise to inquire whether it would be the intention of the Senator from Colorado to allow the daylight saving part of that bill to be debated first, without in any way losing his rights, because I have other things which I need to do until 1 o'clock, or whether he would intend to move right in and act on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is a very good question. I can say to the Senator from New York that I also have other things to do, including a meeting of the executive committee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. I suspect we will go forward, subject to the comments of my distinguished colleague from Ohio; that we will allow the daylight saving bill to go forward first before we move on the minimum wage bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. Mr. TAFT. That would be agreeable to me.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

REMOVAL OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 512 FROM "BILLS IN CONFERENCE"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on the calendar, under "Bills in Conference," the second measure is House Joint Resolution 512, the HUD loan insurance bill.

That conference was never fully consummated. However, the House later passed House Joint Resolution 719, which accomplished the loan insurance part, and left off some things; but House Joint Resolution 719 settled the matters covered in House Joint Resolution 512.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the entry of that particular measure under "Bills in Conference" be removed from the calendar.

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

DAVID BEN-GURION: HIS LEGACY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns I wish to say a word about the death and funeral today of David Ben-Gurion, the Premier of Israel who announced to the world the establishment of the birth of Israel on May 14, 1948, and who now has passed away in his 87th year.

His death has great symbolism for the people of Israel and the world. It is also a loss which touches me very deeply because I considered David Ben-Gurion a personal friend of my family. I visited him both in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem, and also in the settlement of Kibbutz, as it is called in Israel, where he lived.

In his life Ben-Gurion personified many of the highest values which are associated with the State of Israel. Leaving the czarist Russia, he arrived in Palestine in 1905 as one of the early Zionist settlers. The dream of Israel seemed remote in those days, but Ben-Gurion and a small band of colleagues set to work with indomitable energy. They brought Israel into reality, with the cooperation of the world through the United Nations, and with the approval of the United States, which under President Truman was the first nation to recognize the state.

He was chairman of the Jewish Agency, the executive body of the World Zionist Organization, through the critical years of nazism, World War II, rising Arab nationalism, and the postwar diplomatic struggle between Britain and the Jews of Palestine.

His efforts, joined with those of other great leaders, including Mrs. Meir, who is still Prime Minister, and others active in the Government of Israel, were crowned with success when he announced the establishment, to an expectant and electrified world, of the State of Israel on May 14, 1948.

In some respects, the struggle can be said to have just begun, for Israel was immediately besieged by invasion from the neighboring Arab States, putting Ben-Gurion to his greatest test as prime minister and defense minister during those early years. I saw him then and his style of leadership was imperious and contraversial but it had the dimension of greatness.

Throughout his life Ben-Gurion was a man of inexhaustible energy. He was the master politician, but he was also deeply devoted to scholarship and found the time to author 19 books and countless articles and essays. He liked best to be compared to the prophets of ancient Israel and the comparison was apt.