

SENATE, 49 TO 46, BACKS FUND PLAN FOR '72 CAMPAIGN

Democrats Turn Back Bid
to Kill \$1 Tax Checkoff—

Final Vote Postponed
NYTimes NOV 19 1971

By WARREN WEAVER Jr.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18—Democratic Senators beat back today a united Republican attempt to scuttle their new plan for financing the 1972 Presidential campaign with Federal funds.

Winning the key vote 49 to 46, the Democrats appeared assured of enough support for final passage of the campaign financing plan, but the Republican minority successfully postponed a vote for more than seven hours by offering a series of amendments, all of them debated at length and then defeated.

Finally the Republicans refused to agree to a final vote tonight or as late as 5 P.M. tomorrow, and Senator Mike Mansfield moved to adjourn. The Republicans insisted on a roll-call vote, almost unheard of on adjournment, but Senator Mansfield was upheld, 55 to 40, and the Senate departed.

Future of Plan Unresolved

Unresolved in the confusion was not only the future of the campaign financing plan but also of the Administration's tax bill to which the Democrats are determined to attach the campaign measure.

If the campaign measure is attached to the tax bill, it will have to be approved by a Senate-House conference and then on the House floor. The House has passed a tax bill without the campaign financing provision. In the past sessions the House has rejected such a provision.

The campaign plan, attacked by the Republicans as a "slush fund" and a "raid on the Treasury," would offer the major party Presidential candidates \$20.4-million each in Federal funds to finance their general election campaigns.

The candidate who took the public money would have to limit his entire expenditures—from the convention to Election Day—to that amount. All taxpayers would have an opportunity to earmark \$1 of their income tax payments for a non-partisan political fund, from which the campaign money would be drawn.

Senator Mansfield charged that the Republicans were engaged in a filibuster against the campaign proposal and

Continued on Page 27, Column 4

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1971

Democrats Defeat G.O.P. Effort To Kill Federal Campaign Fund

Continued From Page 1, Col. 4

warned that it might lead to setting aside the entire tax bill, which the White House is anxious to receive as soon as possible.

"If this means delay or defeat of the President's program," Mr. Mansfield declared just before adjournment, "the finger will have to be pointed at the party or parties responsible for the delay."

Senator Hugh Scott, the Republican leader, denied that his colleagues were staging a filibuster.

"We have as much right to offer amendments as you have," Senator Scott declared. "When you're outnumbered, you need amendments. When you're outnumbered, you need an opportunity to fall back and regroup."

Meanwhile, the House postponed action on a package of bills designed to limit campaign spending, until after a Thanksgiving recess that runs until Nov. 29. Supporters of the legislation were fearful the delay could cost them votes.

In a day that featured strong political charges and countercharges and party-line voting, Senator Scott had some of the most unkind words for the Democratic campaign plan.

"In my 20 years in Congress, I have never seen a worse political grab than this," he said. "It's outrageous, it's scandalous, it's indefensible, and I will vote against it."

The key vote on the campaign amendment, sponsored by Senator John O. Pastore,

Democrat of Rhode Island, was as close to strict party lines as the Senate ever gets. Every one of the 46 Republican Senators present voted to kill the amendment, even Senator James B. Pearson of Kansas, who had co-sponsored it.

Of the 52 Democrats present, only three voted with the Republicans, Harry F. Byrd Jr. of Virginia, Sam J. Ervin Jr. of North Carolina and John L. McClellan of Arkansas. Later, they voted against most of the Republican amendments.

The Republican themes throughout the debate were that the Democrats were afraid they could not raise enough money to compete in 1972 and that the Pastore plan would not really reduce the role of wealthy contributors because it would not affect the primaries.

Republican Senators also argued that taxpayers agreeing to the checkoff would not understand that a share of their contribution was going to both major and minor party candidates whom they had no desire to support.

The Democrats countered that this was an opportunity to free the Presidential candidates from reliance on private contributors who expected favors in return.

Senator Mansfield said its approval would "put an end to a candidate being labor's man or industry's man or whatever's man."

"Under this amendment, he would be the people's man," he said.

Senate Roll-Call Vote On Campaign Funding

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18 (AP)—Following is the 49-46 roll-call vote by which the Senate today defeated a motion to strike from a tax bill a provision for financing Presidential campaigns from public funds:

FOR THE MOTION—46

Democrats—3
Byrd (Va.)
Ervin (N.C.)

McClellan (Ark.)

Republicans—43

Aiken (Vt.)
Allott (Colo.)
Baker (Tenn.)
Beall (Md.)
Bellmon (Okla.)
Bennett (Utah)
Boggs (Del.)
Brock (Tenn.)
Brooke (Mass.)
Buckley (N.Y.)
Case (N.J.)
Cook (Ky.)
Cooper (Ky.)
Cotton (N.H.)
Curtis (Neb.)
Dole (Kan.)
Dominick (Colo.)
Fannin (Ariz.)
Fong (Hawaii)
Goldwater (Ariz.)
Griffin (Mich.)
Gurney (Fla.)

Hansen (Wyo.)
Hatfield (Ore.)
Hruska (Neb.)
Javits (N.Y.)
Jordan (Idaho)
Mansfield (Neb.)
Miller (Iowa)
Packwood (Ore.)
Pearson (Kan.)
Percy (Ill.)
Roth (Del.)
Schweiker (Pa.)
Scott (Pa.)
Smith (Me.)
Stafford (Vt.)
Stevens (Alaska)
Taft (Ohio)
Thurmond (S.C.)
Tower (Tex.)
Weicker (Conn.)
Young (N.D.)

AGAINST THE MOTION—49

Democrats—49

Allen (Ala.)
Anderson (N.M.)
Bayh (Ind.)
Bentsen (Tex.)
Bible (Nev.)
Burdick (N.D.)
Byrd (W. Va.)
Cannon (Nev.)
Chiles (Fla.)
Church (Idaho)
Cranston (Calif.)
Eagleton (Mo.)
Eastland (Miss.)
Ellender (La.)
Fulbright (Ark.)
Gambrell (Ga.)
Gravel (Alaska)
Harris (Okla.)
Hart (Mich.)
Hollings (S.C.)
Humphrey (Minn.)
Inouye (Hawaii)
Jackson (Wash.)
Jordan (N.C.)
Kennedy (Mass.)

Long (La.)
Magnuson (Wash.)
Mansfield (Mont.)
McCree (Wyo.)
McGovern (S.D.)
McIntyre (N.H.)
Metcalfe (Mont.)
Mondale (Minn.)
Montoya (N.M.)
Moss (Utah)
Muskie (Me.)
Nelson (Wis.)
Pastore (R.I.)
Pell (R.I.)
Proxmire (Wis.)
Randolph (W. Va.)
Ribicoff (Conn.)
Sparkman (Ala.)
Stennis (Miss.)
Stevenson (Ill.)
Symington (Mo.)
Talmadge (Ga.)
Talmadge (Ga.)
Turney (Calif.)
Williams (N.J.)

Republicans against—0