

ing to cost more than \$1 billion, and it is an open secret that a committee will come forward with a recommendation to plug that loophole.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was medicaid.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator may call it medicaid, but it was one of the titles of the medicare bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was in the bill. The bill was known as the Social Security Amendments of 1965.

Mr. COTTON. I think I am justified in referring to any other bill by the name by which it is known, the medicare bill. If the Senator from Louisiana wants to split hairs, that is all right. There was one title in it called medicaid. If the Senator wants to treat us as if we were children, go ahead.

If \$100 million of this loss is to benefit the old people in 1968, why wait a year? If the Senator is going to propose this as an aid to old people, why not make it effective in 1967? Let us help the old people. If they need help, let us start upon it immediately. Otherwise, what is the reason for all the hurry about ramming this bill through?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The year 1968 is a presidential election year. Could that be a reason?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is estimated that it will take a little time to set up the administrative part of it.

Mr. COTTON. That means it is only window dressing because there will be a presidential election in November of that year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator—

Mr. COTTON. The Senator says he was getting it worked up simply enough to satisfy the intelligence of the Senator from New Hampshire. He assumes that the Senator understands.

Will the Senator from Louisiana accept an amendment to give the \$100 million to buy drugs for old people, for which they are to pay on a 50-50 basis, and make it effective January 1, 1967, instead of 1968, or does the Senator's solicitation for the Treasury go that far?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Whatever the Senate wants to do is all right with me.

Mr. COTTON. But the Senator said we had to take his explanation—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No.

Mr. COTTON. We were supposed to listen to his exposition—

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, who has the floor?

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

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

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I try not to impugn the motives or ability of any Senator. If I have, I make a contrite apology. I simply said that if the Senator does not understand my

explanation, I will try to find someone who can explain it. Some of these amendments have been proposed many times. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has been working on one for a lifetime.

If the Senator wants to offer his amendment, I will take it. We may have some administrative difficulties.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for agreeing to do what I thought was my privilege as a Member of the Senate.

I asked the Senator a direct question. If my references were unduly vehement, I, too, regret it, but it did seem to me that the Senator seemed to be a little complacent about the remarks of the Senator from Vermont.

I do not think the Senator from Vermont was out of order in suggesting it is a very poor method of trying to push through a 231-page bill at this time of the session, when we have had no time to consider it. Of course, we depend on committees. No one in the Senate has a greater respect for the Finance Committee than I. I served on it for one session of Congress. I respect the Senator from Louisiana. I consider him one of the most hard-working and diligent Members of the Senate. In my own estimation, there is no committee which works harder than that committee.

However, we have our obligations, even though we do not serve on the committee and, though we must rely on it in great measure. I still have a duty to know what we are doing, if I wish to live up to my oath of office.

[P. 25354]

If I made an insinuation that sounded political, I will take full responsibility for that, because that implication is justified. I rarely take the floor to talk about partisan politics—certainly when we are outnumbered 2 to 1. But in this particular case, we have all these additions. Now we are told those additions are for the old people. Up in New Hampshire and Vermont we have auctions, and we are familiar with the way they work. The auctioneer says, "Do I have a bid? Do I have a bid?" If he does not have a bid, he adds something attractive to the trash, and then he tries to get a bid. If he does not succeed in getting a bid, he adds something else that is attractive.

We have the same thing here. There is trash until someone says it is for the old folks. If there is something for the old people, the elderly—and God knows we want to help them—let us have it take effect, not in 1968, but January 1, 1967. Let us go the whole way, if that is to be the lump of sugar that will lead us down the pathway to pass the bill with its accessories.

I merely asked the Senator if he would accept such an amendment. I judge he will not.