

If we do that, I think the winner will be the American people and the free market system in our country that works only when there is healthy and robust competition.

So I know we are going to set this legislation aside and go to a Santorum amendment, after which we will come back to it. There are a number of Members who wish to come to the floor and speak on this issue—Senator SIMON, Senator LEAHY, and others. I hope at the end of the debate we will have succeeded in amending the telecommunications bill to include a Justice Department role. I think it is important for the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

Mr. KERREY. Reserving the right to object. As in morning business? I thought the Senator was going to offer an amendment.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am still waiting to hear if there is an agreement on my offering the amendment. We are waiting to hear from Members on your side of the aisle.

Mr. KERREY. Did the majority leader not earlier ask? Is that what we are proceeding under? I thought we were going to—

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Nebraska, what we are trying to do is get an agreement on when we are going to vote, if we can get a 10:30 agreement to vote. Does anybody object to voting at 10:30? Otherwise, we will have a Sergeant at Arms vote. There is going to be a vote. Either vote on the amendment or have a live quorum and we will have a vote. It is up to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. KERREY. I just got this amendment. I am not going to agree to a time of 10:30 or any other time at the moment until I review this amendment.

Mr. DOLE. We had an agreement last night, I understand, with the Senator for 10 o'clock. He had the amendment in his hand last night.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, 10 o'clock—my understanding last night was we were going to take it up at 10 o'clock. I did not understand.

Mr. DOLE. Take it up at 9:15, vote at 10. Now we are going to take it up at 9:45, vote in 45 minutes. I understand it is a very technical amendment.

Mr. KERREY. Let me just continue what I am doing, which is reviewing the amendment which I am looking at now for the first time.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair.

#### LACK OF PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. SANTORUM. I rise to continue my vigil in pointing out the lack of leadership of the President in coming forward and offering a balanced budget resolution. I have been in the Chamber noting the days that have passed since the Republicans in the Senate brought to the floor a balanced budget resolution which lay out a chart, a plan in specific detail, of how we would achieve a balanced budget over the next 7 years. Since that time, the President has played coyly with this issue and unfortunately has not come to the table. In fact, he has done a whole lot of things that lead many of us to believe we are not so sure he is ever going to come to the table.

Mr. KERREY. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I have not been in the Chamber before when the Senator brought this chart down. I am 51 years old, 51 years old. I spent 3 years in the world's largest, most powerful Navy. And I was taught, when I was in the Navy, the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, deserved respect, and I never called the President of the United States by his first name in public, let alone on the floor of the Senate.

I just ask my colleague, do you feel this is respectful? You can disagree with the President, say you have something you do not like about what he is doing, but, for God sakes, "Where is Bill?" I ask my colleague—

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, I would suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the reason this chart was put forward really is as a response to some of the comments made by the Senator from Massachusetts about the previous President. You remember the famous statement repeated over and over and over again in the 1992 election, "Where is George?" How many times?

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Excuse me. How many times did we hear that refrain throughout the course of the election? So I would just—

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a followup question on that?

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Pennsylvania saying essentially then if somebody else does something that he finds objectionable, because the other person has done it, therefore it establishes a precedent and he does not mind doing it as well? Is the Senator from Pennsylvania saying he is following the example of the Senator from Massachusetts, that whenever the Senator from Massachusetts does something, even though he may object to it, he is going to cite it as a precedent? The question that I asked

was, does he respect the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, enough to call him by a name that is worthy of that respect, regardless of whether he disagrees? If you want to bring up these opinions, bring up these policies, bring up whatever you want to the floor—

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to reclaim the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the time.

Mr. SANTORUM. I think you will find the dialog that has occurred in charting the number of days that the President has refused to offer a budget has been very respectful of the President in referring to him as the President.

The point of the chart is apparent.

I find it ironic that when this was going on by the Senator from Massachusetts, I do not remember anybody coming to the well, much less the Senator from Nebraska coming to the well, defending President Bush from those similar attacks. So I think it—

Mr. DORGAN. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SANTORUM. Depends on whose ox is being gored as to who is offended by the remarks. I can appreciate the constructive dialog, but I think it is a suitable poster and will continue with it.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator would yield for a moment.

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate it very much. The Senator refers to the Senator from Massachusetts. My recollection of the dialog "Where's George?" was that it occurred at a political convention. Is the Senator from Pennsylvania equating the floor of the Senate with a political convention?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am not equating the floor of the Senate with a political convention, no.

Mr. PRESSLER. If my friend will yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. PRESSLER. I think in American society we refer respectfully to our President. I have heard various Presidents referred to by their first name on the Senate floor. I do not want to start digging it out. We have a friendly society. We refer to our President by first name or last name. We have good, healthy debate. I think that this whole objection here is nonsense. And I urge—

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

Mr. PRESSLER. I urge the Senator from Pennsylvania to proceed.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the time.

Mr. KERREY. Parliamentary point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point.

Mr. KERREY. I just heard my comment referred to as nonsense. Is that correct?

Mr. PRESSLER. I did not refer to the Senator's comment as nonsense. I just said this whole debate I think—

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I believe you have to look long and hard to find a Member who comes here and refers to the President by his first name, whether it is President Clinton, President Bush, or President Reagan. You have to look long and hard to find it. I appreciate the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks it is humorous. I do not.

Mr. DORGAN. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time belongs to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Chair. He has done an effective job in moving this debate along to a vote at 10:30, and I appreciate the opportunity to have this discourse.

I think it may indicate that there is a sensitivity of the members of the President's party about the President's lack of leadership. And I understand that sensitivity. I understand that there may be justifiably some embarrassment about the lack of leadership by this President and jumping into his defense on something other than the substance of what we are discussing here.

We are not discussing substance in this little interplay. We sort of got off the track. Let us talk about the substance. The substance is that I have to put—I did not get a chance to get to the floor yesterday, but I have to put now "22"—22 days with no proposal to balance the budget from the President.

I will show you the chart I had the other day that was in the Washington Times. And again I understand the embarrassment of the other side on this issue. I understand they are a little sensitive about this because I am sure it is something I would not be proud of if it was my President on the Republican side.

But here is what Michael McCurry in a dialog with the reporter from the Washington Times said about the balanced budget amendment and the President on Larry King earlier this week suggesting that he may have a balanced budget resolution. The question was:

Where does President Clinton stand on writing his own budget now?

The answer from the press secretary:

As he indicated last night in his television interview, he's prepared to contribute his ideas to the budget at the appropriate time.

Washington Times question:

What does that mean?

Michael McCurry, White House Press Secretary:

It means we're ducking the question for now.

"We're ducking the question for now." The President of the United States, who has the responsibility to lead this Nation, is ducking the question for now.

I understand the embarrassment. I understand the sensitivity that many

Democrats in this Chamber have about a President who is ducking the question, who is ducking the issue, who is refusing to lead, who is taking a back seat to all domestic policy in this country as we work here in the Congress to get it done and work, as we see in this case, on a bipartisan basis to get it done, but again without the leadership of the White House. Here we are debating probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we are going to get a chance to debate that is going to affect our economy for a long, long time. We have very important fiscal matters to be concerned with here in getting our budget in order and tax policy and other Government program policies like welfare. But when it comes to regulating the private sector, this bill is probably as important as ever and the President has not been offering his own telecommunications bill, not putting forward leadership on that area, basically standing back and sniping, saying, well, I do not like this or I do not like that.

But where is the leadership? Where is the leadership on welfare reform as he goes around the country talking about how the Republican plan is mean spirited and terrible, and yet he has offered no plan this year. The plan he offered last year was cast aside by his own Congress, the Democratic Congress, as a joke, as irrelevant, as a nonstarter, as not even meeting the straight-faced test of incremental reform.

And so we have a President on that major issue domestically, who has just taken a walk and now this week he trots out the veto pen, on what? On reducing the deficit. On reducing the deficit, on a bill that was bipartisan, that was signed. This bill was signed on by the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic side as well as on the Republican side and passed with over 60 votes in the Senate, and he vetoed it.

I have to quote the Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, who came to the floor during the debate and said in his tenure on the Appropriations Committee, which spans six Presidents—six Presidents—he has never been in a conference committee where the President of the United States did not send a representative to negotiate the conference report. Every President has always sent a member of his staff to sit in the conference committee when they are drafting the report, to negotiate the final deal so we could settle it. The President did not send anybody. He said that is the first time in his history on the Appropriations Committee.

Now, there is a complete abdication of leadership. And so after an honest bipartisan effort was put together in the conference report, voila, the President decides it is not good enough for him even though he had no input into the process. I think it just goes to show you that what we have is a President who has decided to start running for the 1996 election and forget about serv-

ing in the office of the President. The whole concept now is just simply to run for office, to run against the Congress, not to offer anything, because if you offer anything, then you can be held down to specifics and people can criticize you. If you just criticize the other side, well, then all you do is pander to the different groups that you have to get to get elected.

And that is what is going on here. There is no substance coming out of that White House whether it is telecommunications, whether it is welfare, whether it is rescissions, whether it is balancing the budget. It is a continuation of, as the majority leader so eloquently said, the a.w.o.l. strategy of the President, absence without leadership. I think we should demand better.

And so I have set myself on this mission of coming here. I try to get here every day, but sometimes because of the floor schedule and the business we have at hand, I have not had a chance to do it every day. But I get here just about every day and put up the chart and count. I have been informed by my staff that we have, I think it was, 135 days between the time—

Mr. DORGAN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is the morning business time requested 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ABRAHAM). There was no limit placed on the morning business.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, so I will probably have to have another little doohickey over here so we can put the "1" here, because it will be 135 days where the President is not going to offer a bill.

Again, he made comments on the Larry King show earlier this week that he was going to come up with a plan. He had talked about a plan that was going to balance the budget. This was, I think, day 6. He talked about a plan that was going to balance the budget over 10 years. That was his mission; that he was going to come up with that.

I did a little homework and found out that the last plan that was around here to balance the budget in 10 years that was offered never actually came to the floor of the House, but it was put together. It was by the chairman of the Budget Committee at the time. The chairman of the Budget Committee at that time was Leon Panetta, now Chief of Staff at the White House. But at the time of putting this budget together in 1991, he was chairman of the Budget Committee. This was after the Bush budget battle of 1990, and he thought it would be responsible.

I give him credit for this, because I was on the Budget Committee at the time and worked very closely with then Chairman Panetta. I had the utmost respect for him and his ardor in putting forward plans to put this country back on sound fiscal footing. I was not always in agreement with how he did it, but I know then Chairman Panetta really had a strong motivation to deal with these problems, face up and

to do it in a way that was honest, no gimmicks. This was a legitimate attempt by then Chairman Panetta to deal with these issues.

I found it ironic that when he actually put the document together—it was in late 1991—he not only did not even bring it up in the Budget Committee, but he was roundly criticized by those on his side of the aisle, so he pulled it down.

I must tell you, it was a budget to balance the budget over 10 years. There were some interesting points in it. What you find is that, very much like the Republican budget that was put forward and passed by the Senate and the House, it called for reductions in growth in entitlement spending. It called for reductions in growth in Medicare. It called for reductions in growth in Medicaid. It called for reductions in growth in Federal retirement programs. If you go on down the list on what the Republicans are now being roundly criticized for, the Panetta budget in 1991 was very similar in respect, maybe not to degree, but certainly similar in the programs that it went after, the recognition of where the problem was, and focused on entitlements as the biggest area for resolution of that problem.

The other interesting thing is that only two-thirds of the deficit reduction was achieved as a result of spending reductions. Two-thirds were achieved through spending reductions. The other one-third of deficit reduction was achieved through a tax increase. A little over \$400 billion in new taxes, not specified, but new taxes that were going to be placed on the American public.

Maybe it goes back to the reason why the President has been so shy about offering this or bringing to light this 10-year budget. I am of the opinion that maybe what the Chief of Staff of the White House did was rummage through some of his old budget files when he was Budget chairman or have someone dig up his 1991 proposed budget and offered that to the President: "See, Mr. President, we can do it."

I know again how concerned the Chief of Staff is about the budget deficit and how honest he was in dealing with that. I believe he has been a voice in the White House saying, "Let's be responsible. Let's go out and show how we are going to do it, and let's bite the bullet like the Republicans have in the Congress, and lead this country into the future. Mr. President, here was my plan to get there. You should look at it."

So what the President probably did was read it and probably voiced he has a plan he is looking at, a 10-year plan, to balance the budget. But it, unfortunately, contains another big tax increase. This tax increase would actually pale by comparison to what the President and the last Congress passed in 1993. This was, as I said before, close to \$½ trillion dollars in new taxes on

the American public to solve this problem.

I think if you looked at the debate during consideration of the budget resolution, there certainly was not a fervor to go out and raise taxes. I know there were a couple of Members who voiced that concern, but frankly, that sentiment was roundly dismissed by both sides of the aisle as something that was not only not in the public's interest but certainly not in the interest of the economy.

If we look now at what is going on with the economy and the effect of the 1993 tax increase on the economy and the fact that we had the largest ever payment of taxes in April, the largest amount of money ever written to the Internal Revenue Service at tax time was this last April where they sent an enormous amount of money—I think the number is around \$20 billion in tax payments paid over what the previous record was—some economists are suggesting that is one of the reasons we may be seeing the slowdown now, because that tax time and that tax increase drew so much money out of the economy that it had the dampening effect of reducing the rate of growth and possibly even spinning us into a recession.

So I think everyone realizes that tax increases are not the way to deal with the budget deficit. I think we saw from the debate just a few weeks ago—I do not remember an amendment that called for a tax increase—that in fact suggested we should solve the problem by instituting new taxes.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. EXON. My question of the Senator from Pennsylvania is simply that we have, as I understand it, very important business to transact. Can the Senator advise me as to how long he intends to hold the floor on the matter that we have heard from him on several occasions?

Mr. SANTORUM. I expect I will be talking for a few more minutes. I know the leader would like to get a vote and is seeking a unanimous consent agreement to get a vote on a—

Mr. EXON. If I might, I simply advise my colleague, as I understand it, the Republicans have a golf game this afternoon. I am sure that is a high-priority item. But this measure before us, which I would like to get to, is a very important piece of legislation for America.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I reclaim the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. I do not know anything about that. I have some very pressing business of my own which, hopefully, can wait. My wife is expecting our third child, and we are hoping that will come tomorrow. We are very anxious about that. Things are looking good. I would like to be home tomorrow.

But if Senate business calls, Senate business calls, and I will be here if I need be.

I know what we would like to do is proceed on some of these amendments. I have these notes passed to me saying no one wants to agree to vote on anything; we want to stall and delay.

Mr. PRESSLER. If my friend will yield, I think what is going on, Senator DOLE is trying to get an agreement for a vote at 10:30 and has been unable to do so. But I say respectfully to everybody, when I was a lieutenant in the Army—a mere second lieutenant—LBJ was referred to affectionately, at least by my superiors, as "LBJ."

Also on this floor I heard the term "Reaganomics" used a great deal back at the point when it was thought not to be popular. I am very respectful, as I am sure my friend is, of the President of the United States.

Let me say, whether it is Ike, FDR, LBJ, Reaganomics, Bush-whack—I have heard all these terms around the Senate over the years. I just want to point that out because I am very respectful, as I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania is.

Military service was mentioned. When I was a second lieutenant, we used to affectionately and supportively refer to LBJ as LBJ. Maybe we need a new form of rules because past Presidents have been referred to in a variety of ways on the Senate floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KERREY. Will the Senator yield for an explanation? I say to my colleague—

Mr. SANTORUM. I will not yield.

Mr. KERREY. The Senator brings an amendment to the floor and then stands up for a discussion. It should not be a surprise the amendment is being delayed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. SANTORUM. Thank you, Mr. President. I will quickly wrap up my remarks, and, hopefully, we can move to the vote soon.

In response to some of the comments, I know this amendment was made available last night, and it is really a minor, technical amendment. I hope that is something we can agree to down the road.

I think it is important. I understand telecommunications is important, and if we can get agreements, we can move forward on it. But this is also important. The role of the President in this country over the next 18 months, and whether he is going to be a leader of this country in moving forward on the domestic agenda, whether it is telecommunications or balanced budget or welfare reform, or a whole host of other areas, is important.

The Presidency—an office I respect—is important to this country. In fact, that is the reason I am here, because I think it is important. I think it is necessary for the President to step forward and offer suggestions, to lead the

country. If I did not think it was important, if I did not think the President had a role, if I did not think the President was in fact the leader of the free world, then I probably would not be here. He would be like any other American who did not have to participate in the process.

Well, he was elected to participate in the process; he was elected to lead this country; he was elected to change this country. What he has done is elected not to participate. I think we need to point that out. We need to continue to point that out until he elects to participate.

So I will be back and I will talk about the number of days with no proposal to balance the budget from President Clinton.

#### QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue calling the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Abraham	Kerrey	Santorum
Hollings	Pressler	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to instruct the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LOTT. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], the Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], the

Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] is absent because of a funeral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 246 Leg.]

#### YEAS—80

Abraham	Feingold	Lieberman
Akaka	Feinstein	Lott
Baucus	Ford	Lugar
Bingaman	Frist	McConnell
Bond	Glenn	Mikulski
Bradley	Gorton	Moseley-Braun
Brown	Graham	Moynihan
Bryan	Grassley	Murkowski
Bumpers	Gregg	Murray
Burns	Harkin	Packwood
Byrd	Hatch	Pell
Campbell	Hatfield	Pressler
Chafee	Heflin	Pryor
Coats	Hollings	Reid
Cochran	Hutchison	Robb
Cohen	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Conrad	Inouye	Roth
Craig	Jeffords	Santorum
D'Amato	Johnston	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kassebaum	Simon
DeWine	Kerrey	Snowe
Dodd	Kerry	Thomas
Dole	Kohl	Thompson
Domenici	Kyl	Thurmond
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Warner
Exon	Leahy	Wellstone
Faircloth	Levin	

#### NAYS—8

Bennett	Kempthorne	Nickles
Breaux	Mack	Smith
Grams	McCain	

#### NOT VOTING—12

Ashcroft	Gramm	Shelby
Biden	Helms	Simpson
Boxer	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Nunn	Stevens

So the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the addition of Senators voting who did not answer the quorum call, a quorum is now present.

The Senate will come to order.

The majority leader.

#### THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me indicate this is the first time we have had a vote like this all year. I do not like these kinds of votes because it punishes people who are not here for no good reason, but we could not get an agreement to vote on an amendment and, as I understand it, we are not going to get any time agreement on any amendment.

The managers have been doing an excellent job, I want to indicate, both to Senator PRESSLER and Senator HOLLINGS. I would like to complete action on this bill. It is a very important bill. No one is trying to rush it, but if we cannot get an agreement on a technical vote, I do not know what other recourse there is but sometime today to file cloture, have a pro forma session

tomorrow, and then have a cloture vote on Monday around 5 o'clock to see if we cannot speed up movement of this bill.

If there is a willingness to agree to vote on the very important amendment offered by Senator DORGAN and Senator THURMOND from South Carolina, even at 5 o'clock on Monday, if we could agree to vote at 5 o'clock on Monday, agree to vote on the Santorum amendment here in the next 30 minutes? Failing that, we will have no recourse. Under the order, as I understand it, the Senator from Pennsylvania will be recognized to offer his amendment. We can have a vote, move to table the amendment, vote against tabling, and we can have another vote and another vote. But we do not make any progress.

But if the Senator from Nebraska is determined, as I believe he is, that we will not have any agreements or any votes, then we will just have to have some procedural votes between now and 2 o'clock.

If there is any inclination on anybody's part to make any kind of agreement, certainly I am prepared as the leader to try to accommodate all of my colleagues, many of whom are not here today, and many of whom would like not to be here today.

But, having said that, I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, if I may respond, what transpired here this morning was we were debating the second-degree amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to the underlying amendment offered last night by the Senator from North Dakota. We had a short period of debate last night. We came in here early this morning. We had just begun the debate and the Senator from Pennsylvania came to the floor, I understood with an amendment, and asked for unanimous consent to go into morning session.

I did not, in good conscience, in good faith to a colleague, ask for any time limitation.

Then the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania came—and not for the purpose of talking for a short period of time and then going to his amendment—with a very provocative, very effective, but very provocative political appeal against the President of the United States, to which I responded; to which I was quite willing to respond at an even longer time and had no opportunity. I had a very short exchange with the Senator from Pennsylvania on that issue.

I laid his amendment aside, which I think is appropriate for me to do. He has provoked an argument not on his amendment but on another issue. I did not choose to do that. He chose to come to the floor and, instead of addressing his amendment, provoked a debate on another subject. I laid that amendment aside and began to prepare my remarks to address the subject that he chose.