

University of Montana

## ScholarWorks at University of Montana

---

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

---

9-16-1971

### Congressional Record S. 14407 Conference Report Extension and Revision of Draft Act and Related Laws

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

#### Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record S. 14407 Conference Report Extension and Revision of Draft Act and Related Laws" (1971). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1002. [https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield\\_speeches/1002](https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1002)

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@mso.umt.edu](mailto:scholarworks@mso.umt.edu).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

EXTENSION AND REVISION OF THE  
DRAFT ACT AND RELATED LAWS—  
CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6531) to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to increase military pay; to authorize military active duty strengths for fiscal year 1972; and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of putting in a live quorum call was to lay before the Senate the ingredients of a discussion with the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), as to what the Senate wishes, if that can be determined, with regard to when the vote on tabling the conference report should take place.

The Senate is aware of the fact that while no absolute, definite commitment was made that there would be a motion to table today, the chances were 99 out of 100 that there would be such a motion. If one wants to be technical, he can say that there was no definite promise, but I think that is stretching a technicality a little bit too far.

The distinguished chairman of the committee indicated that he would like the tabling motion to take place on Tuesday. I demurred. He indicated he would settle for Monday; again I demurred.

I have asked the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) if he intends to make a motion to table—and incidentally, he postponed some most important engagements to be here this afternoon—and he stated that it was his intention to do so. It is well known that if the distinguished Senator from Colorado was not prepared to make a motion to table, the Senator from Montana now speaking was prepared to do so.

To me, there are three factors to be considered in the discussion of this conference report. One is the matter of pay, and the date thereof. Another—and in my opinion the most important matter; I may be wrong but in my personal opinion the most important matter—is the amendment passed by the Senate which calls for a withdrawal from Vietnam within 9 months following July 1, provided that during that period all prisoners of war would be released.

I emphasize the word "all," as far as the POW's and the MIA's are concerned who can be determined to be alive, and I emphasize the word "all" in relation to the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. That word "all" means just what it says—a withdrawal lock, stock, and barrel, provided, of course, that all the POW's and all the identifiable living, missing in action are included.

That is the second factor. May I say I am in favor of what the distinguished Senator from Colorado is seeking to achieve, and naturally I am in favor of the Senate amendment as passed to which I have just referred, having to do with the termination of hostilities in Southeast Asia by a date certain.

The third factor to be considered is that there is a group in the Senate which is unalterably opposed to the extension of the Draft Act, and I happen to be included in that group.

I feel somewhat embarrassed at this point, and because of my embarrassment, I am bringing the matter to the floor so that all Members will be aware of the situation which has developed. It is my personal preference that the vote be taken this afternoon, at a time certain, and with a limitation of time, equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the manager of the bill.

The Democrats today have seven Members missing. I do not know how many Republican Members are absent. There are Members on both sides of the aisle who gave up engagements of some import to them to be here this afternoon, and I feel personally indebted to them on the basis of the information disseminated. There are others who will not be here next week, because they will be attending important conferences at the request of the President of the United States, or they will be observing holidays in connection with their faith, and there may be other reasons as well.

In my opinion, very few votes will be changed from the way Senators are thinking now. I am aware of the fact, not being an amateur in this profession, that if a time extension is allowed, the lobbying efforts will increase in proportion. As far as I am concerned, I do not care how any Senator votes, but I do think a sentiment ought to be expressed in this body; and as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote at any time, under any circumstances, and regardless of what Senators are here or are away.

So I would like, if I might, to receive an expression from the Senate as to what Senators think ought to be done, because every Senator here has just as much responsibility as I have and just as much responsibility as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the manager of the bill. This is a body of equals, and every Senator's voice, as far as I am concerned, is just as loud, just as strong, and just as valid as any other Senator's voice.

There are, as I have indicated, Senators here today who are prepared to vote. There are Senators here today who will be absent next week because of overriding reasons. But may I say frankly to my associates in this Chamber, I can think of no more important question confronting this Nation today than the disposition, the termination, of the tragic, wasteful, unnecessary, and uncalled for war in Southeast Asia—the longest war in which this Nation has been engaged, still with no end in sight; a war in which far in excess of 2½ times the number of bombs dropped in World War II already

have been dropped; a war which has cost us 351,000 casualties; a war which has cost us \$130 billion and which has played, I think, a significant part in creating the economic difficulties which confront this Nation today; a war which has caused hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths, tens of thousands of maimings, millions of refugees, and the dislocation of a society and a culture, for which we are largely responsible.

I cannot reconcile myself to the fact that as of September 9, 1971—these are figures released by the Department of Defense—301,504 Americans have been wounded, 45,487 Americans have been killed in combat, 9,757 Americans have died from noncombat injuries. The total casualties as of September 9, less than a week ago, were 356,784 Americans. Too many, too much, too long.

We talk about other problems, such as the economic situation in which we find ourselves—and it is important, because it touches all our pocketbooks. But what is it that touches our hearts?

Well, I cannot put aside the deaths, the mutilations, the woundings in Vietnam or elsewhere; because, just as we are equals in this body, to me, one American life, regardless of race or creed or color or origin, is just as important as another American life.

We must face up to this issue. Perhaps a delay on the tabling motion for 1, 2, or 3 days may not hurt. Personally, I have no feeling except a feeling of obligation, on the basis of the statements I have made to the Members of this body—all of them, Republicans and Democrats alike. But I have a very strong feeling about the war in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, including Cambodia and Laos. So far as I am concerned, that war is going to remain on the front burner until it is terminated, and terminated completely. I say that with full recognition of the other difficulties which confront us in this Nation and in the world today, and I say that in the strong belief that what we have done in Southeast Asia has helped to contribute to these problems and has helped to keep them from being solved.

So, with that statement, I will conclude.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am one of those who will not be here next week, for one of the reasons that has been decided by our distinguished majority leader; but that is not the chief point to be made.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me for a statement to him?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I would like to respond to the Senator from Montana now, if I may. I expected to have a chance to do that with respect to the point about the vote today. I was interrupted by someone who had a memorandum.

Mr. PASTORE. But the majority leader took occasion to say why some of us will not be here, and I rise only on that point. I shall not be very long. I will

cause the Senator from Mississippi no injury in presenting his own logic and his own case before the Senate.

All I rise to say is that we were told that there would be a vote today. If this were a new matter that came up yesterday or came up this morning, there would be no reason for time. But there is not a Member of this body who does not know what this is all about. The name of the game is withdrawing from Vietnam. Let us not fool ourselves about that. All of us here are ready to vote. I do not see what other persuasive arguments can be made that have not already been made, except for the reason that has already been stated. I have already heard from my State about what I should do, and there will be a great deal more over the weekend.

I hope this does not become a matter of maneuvering and a matter of strategy. I hope each one of us can stand up with unfettered conviction and express that conviction as duly elected Members of this body.

I would hope that the majority leader would insist upon this vote being taken this week.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this is no contest between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Mississippi. This is not a matter of maneuver or a matter of strategy.

I want to state some hard facts to the Members of the Senate about this very complicated and involved bill. Preparations for hearings on this bill started a year ago. Hearings actually started in January and were very complete and exhaustive. The committee spent approximately 3 weeks around the table, writing up this bill. The bill including a great deal of draft reform came here and was debated for 7 weeks, with approximately 20-to-25 rollcall votes.

The bill went to conference, and nearly all the conferees engaged in an active, vigorous conference for 5 consecutive weeks.

The matter was brought back to the floor of the Senate, and I believe it would have been passed in a very few days just before we recessed, had it not been for those who did not see fit—quite within their rights—to let the matter come to a vote. Then we had a 5-week recess.

I do not claim any credit whatsoever—not any. I am no busier than anyone else and do not work more than anyone else in this body. But through a sense of responsibility, of being back here and prepared, I came back from the recess on September 1, except for September 4, I have been here ever since, working on this bill and on the military procurement bill which also is pending. I am still here,

and am ready to proceed on this matter and on the military procurement bill, as are other members of the committee.

But this is a very far-reaching matter; and I wanted to be doubly sure that every effort possible was made with regard to the Mansfield amendment at this conference, over the strongest kind of opposition from the House conferees and, as everybody knows, from the Administration, and many other factors.

For myself, I told them that I was not going to yield totally on the Mansfield amendment, that I was not going to agree to its being watered down to a meaningless instrument. We brought back here a considerable part of the Mansfield amendment. It was not germane under House rules. I did not think it was—and the House Members did not think it was, but we brought an amendment back, and much more than we thought we would. Some Senators, including the Senator from Montana himself stated yesterday that our amendment was a step forward and that it did have meaning. It became not a Senate amendment, only, but a sense of the whole Congress. The New York Times and the Washington Post stated that it was the first legislative determination to close down this war and bring the troops home. It was tied to the POW question, and nothing else. So that it has some meaning.

The dealings I have had with the Senator from Montana have been exemplary so that I have no grievances, but I am going to appeal to all Senators now, in a few minutes, to give me just a little more time.

How much is a little more time?

Just 2 or 3 or 4 more calendar days, to try to help Senators get the newly developed facts on this matter before they pass on the conference report.

I warn that if the Senate turns down the conference report, it will again be opening up all the component questions. There is no doubt about that. At one time, the House waived their rules on germaneness through their Rules Committee. Otherwise, one Member there, as I understand it, could have knocked out what we had in the Mansfield amendment.

Let us not be too hasty. I want further to develop some facts which have occurred since we took the recess. Those facts have been partly developed.

We have gone now about 75 days without any draft law on the books; that is, a law that will give the President the power to induct. Even though, during the early days, there was a continued so-called volunteer enlistment, there has already developed in the last 75 days a marked downward turn, to the degree that we have the facts and figures, in enlistments in all the services, not only quantitywise but also qualitywise. That is a major point to consider.

Incidentally, my friends, so far as the chance to get this subject fully into the minds of all Senators is concerned, Senators have been busy with many other things, including committee meetings morning and afternoon, and the sad events incident to the passing of our late lamented friend from Vermont, Winston

L. Prouty, this week we all went to the funeral services on Tuesday afternoon and many went yesterday to the funeral itself.

So that the hard fact is, I have been standing here in this Chamber for 3 days talking to empty chairs. That is all. Three or four Senators were in the Chamber from time to time and some have joined in the discussion, but there has been no chance, within this brief span of time, to get the facts developed so that they could be passed on to the Senate as a whole.

As Senators know, I have been writing letters, placing them in the RECORD, and sending them around to everyone's offices trying to get the facts across.

I tell you, Mr. President, this is serious—the trend that has already developed whereby the services will be depleted of their manpower. Consequently, I want to make available further projections by the men who know more about it than anyone else, the Chiefs of Staff, and the service secretaries, and Mr. Laird, and bring those facts here to the floor of the Senate more completely than we have been able to do so far.

We cannot seem to find the time when everyone can be here conveniently. To be here, we have to make personal sacrifices and we cannot all be here all the time. Even with that, while some cannot be here, others who are away now can be here later, so that will all average out.

Of course, I do not know how they will vote, but at least I want to have the satisfaction of knowing, when this vote is taken, that I have done all I can do with regard to bringing the Senate all the facts.

I tell you, Mr. President, man to man, and looking every Senator in this Chamber in the face, that under these circumstances, we have not had an opportunity, nor the time, to do that.

This is not a personal matter. But what are we going to do with a bill that has been going around for 7 months now and carrying all the added load of the war? I greatly respect anyone who voted for the Mansfield amendment. But what are we going to do in the committee which has gone through all this long and tedious work, and getting back here after the recess, with the scant attention it has received in this Chamber and with all the new facts that have been intervening? What are we going to do with all the work the committee has done on the bill under circumstances like this?

Are we going to close our ears to this plea for a little time? I do not believe that the Senate will. I know that there was a time here when my request would not have been rejected. Thus, I lay this appeal before the Senate, now, and propose definitely that if the Senate will give us this time—I am not asking for any favors, this is not a personal matter, I repeat, but I do not hesitate to make this an official request—we will be ready.

As I say, the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) and I have had a briefing on this matter already, after the funeral services last Tuesday afternoon, and we put together what information we could. We called for more. So, we request that this matter

go over until Tuesday. I would hope that a matter of this importance would deserve a vote up or down.

Is that too much to ask for?

Is it too much to ask for a vote of yea or nay on the merits?

A motion to table would only postpone, put off, make it necessary to go into rearrangements of everything that is in the bill. We will, in addition, have to go through most of these things again on the procurement bill. I am not being critical of anyone about that. But at least give us the chance to complete the facts and then the Senate can make its judgment. I do not believe that the Senate will turn down this mild request.

Let me put it this way: I appeal to you on behalf of the committee that, if a motion to table is made, the Senate will vote against it, for the sole and only reason, if for no other, than to provide for a little delay which will give the committee the opportunity to bring the full, additional facts as they bear upon this subject, to all Senators.

For Senators not now in the Chamber, I want the opportunity to talk to every one of them on the telephone if they are in the city, so that they will know before they vote that regardless of everything there is a demand for a decision now that could be decisive on the whole bill with no chance to develop the facts—a demand that the whole thing be disposed of now. I do not believe the Senate will do it. I do not believe that any committee will want to be treated this way.

As far as I am concerned, they never will be treated this way. Senators do not owe me anything. Let me emphasize that again. I owe the Senate everything. So it does not make any difference to me which Member of the Senate may want to go forward at this time. I am telling Senators under my own responsibilities as a fellow Senator, and as one who is familiar with the facts, that these facts need to be developed further. We can come in here next Tuesday, I hope, or Monday, if we must. I hope there will not be a motion to table. However, if there needs to be some assurance of some kind in order to present the facts, I would submit that is all I would ask for. I believe that we will be saving time. We will be doing the sound thing regardless of whichever way the vote goes.

I do not buy these arguments that it is inconvenient. I would like to accommodate every Senator. However, when one accommodates one Senator on one day he inconveniences another Senator another time.

I want to assure the Senate that there has been no agreement that there will be a vote. I could not agree to a vote on a motion to table when I am trying to develop these facts.

I am trying to develop these facts. I am, in effect, stating that we can be ready this coming Tuesday or Monday.

In the whip's notice, it is stated:

I cannot be sure about votes on Thursday or Friday. The only thing I can be sure about is that the Senate should be alerted to a possible vote to table. There are indications that such a motion may be made tomorrow or Thursday.

That notice states exactly the way the situation has been. So no one is taken by surprise. I believe that there are additional facts that will be of interest to all Senators and of concern to most of us. They could well be determinative of the fate of the pending bill.

I repeat with emphasis that I want until Tuesday or Monday, whichever date will be selected in order to present those facts. I do appeal to every Member here to vote against a motion to table today, if for no other reason than just to give us a chance to develop the full facts upon these vital points that control the security of our Nation, our people, not because of some far away land.

I hope that my aide can note those Senators who could not be present to hear this statement. I want time to call every one of them.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senate will allow me, this is not, of course, a personal matter. I can appreciate the defense of the committee which the distinguished chairman has put up. I want to assure him that that committee and all committees have my respect. However, I think there is an overriding factor which goes beyond a committee of an institution like the Senate and certainly beyond individual Senators. And that concerns a feeling for the people of the country, the ones who put us where we are, the ones whom we are here to serve. It is not a committee, it is not the Senate which is paramount. It is the people of the United States of America.

The Senator has stretched the point, I believe, when he quoted from the whip's notice—and technically he was correct. But the reason that the majority leader did not say definitely that the vote on a tabling motion would be on Thursday—and the vote was to be on tabling—was because unless we get an agreement nailed down, we have to allow ourselves a little opening, a little flexibility, so to speak.

And as far as the arguments which the Senator wants the Senator to hear, he gave them on yesterday. They are in the RECORD, and I think we all read the RECORD. He gave them today in part. And he will never have a bigger audience than he has right now.

I am aware of the pressures put on every Senator. I received a letter signed by the three service Secretaries. I am sure that every other Senator also did.

I read in the public press of the visit by Secretary Laird and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the chairman of this committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee. That is fine. They are pushing their cause. They are probably trying to get a little more elbow room so that they can work a little longer, a little more assiduously, and a little more personally.

I have gotten communications from home. Oh, yes, I have gotten communications from the commander of the national American Legion. I will get more communications as the pressure mounts. However, these things bother me not at all, because it is the way the system works. However, the thing I believe in is not these telegrams or phone calls. I be-

lieve in the individual honesty and responsibility of every Senator here. And we are sent here to exercise our own best judgment and to make a determination on the basis of the facts and on the basis of our consciences.

As far as the pressures are concerned, they can pressure me from now until doom's day, and I would not change my opinion on this one whit, because this is an important matter. There have been attempts to shove it to one side as if it did not exist. And a lot of people were willing to do it. This matter of Vietnam and Southeast Asia is too important to be shoved aside, and it will not be shoved aside.

I happened to read in the Washington Post of August 15, 1971, in the Outlook section, an article by Arthur Hadley. Arthur Hadley was a lieutenant platoon leader in Europe during the Second World War. He covered the Korean war as a Pentagon correspondent for Newsweek and later worked as an editor for the New York Herald Tribune. He recently spent 60 days in Vietnam.

I want to read, if I may, just the last three or four paragraphs of this rather lengthy article.

These paragraphs read:

In Saigon the senior general paces back and forth. "Vietnam is a poison in our blood. It runs through our national life and infects us all. Those at home as well as those of us here. Will we learn from it? Will it have been worth it morally? That question has to be left to history."

As my home bird jets me toward "Back in the world"—

That is what they call the United States in Vietnam—

I have one overriding thought: I have been in hell and found most of the inhabitants there, contrary to popular belief, fine people. And this includes specifically the South Vietnamese, now in their 30th year of war. But all are trapped by a complexity too vast for them to understand, trapped in a ritual of boundless destruction. We and the enemy, partners together, dance, entombed by our opposing simplicities. So far, we are both unable to find the strength within ourselves to stop the music.

I keep remembering the words of Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address: "Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. . . . Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding."

There is no way out of the Vietnam tragedy without pain; and we are all part of the action. Those most intimately involved deserve our anger only occasionally, our tears almost always.

When a motion is made to table, if agreement can be reached to vote it up or down, it is my intention, if the tabling motion is agreed to, to offer to the Senate for its consideration instructions to the conferees to reconsider the termination of the war amendment which passed in this body in June by an overwhelming majority. The only difference will be this: In view of the fact that 2½ months will have elapsed since the 1st of July, the beginning of the new fiscal year, it would be my intention to reduce the period from 9 months to 6½ months, approximately. I want to serve notice on the Senate that in my opinion this is the amendment.

It is my belief that what the distinguished Senator from Colorado wants to achieve may well be achieved in conference without specific instructions, though that is a matter for the Senator to decide. I make that statement on the basis of the speech which he made on Monday last.

So I would hope it would be possible to come to a vote this afternoon, but I am not unreasonable and I would be glad, if need be, and if the Senate approves, to consider another time—certainly not as long away as Tuesday, but a time certain. Like the Senator from Mississippi, I, too, recognize the fact that Senators will be absent for various reasons every day. I accept that regardless of how it would affect the outcome of the motion to table or the motion to approve or disapprove the conference report.

I will have more to say later, but I think the distinguished Senator from Colorado now should have his say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. We have perhaps one of the most unusual situations before the Senate today that we have ever had because we have a conference bill before us for adoption which contains three elements, all of them very diverse in their relationship and in their nature.

The first element is the draft bill itself. This is the bill which was the basic vehicle for this legislation reaching this point. I have tried to make it clear repeatedly that I favored and I do favor an extension of the draft for 2 years, because of my own work on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee for 10 years, and also because I believe, contrary to some people, that instead of entering a period of complete detente we are entering a period which can be most critical to the United States; at least it can be very critical if we enter this period dependent wholly upon a situation where we are dependent upon volunteers under the present pay schedule.

The second element that is a part of this legislation having become so by virtue of the rules in the Senate, is the Mansfield amendment. I did not vote for the Mansfield amendment and I do not believe in this type of amendment because I have full faith that the President, in the keeping of his promises as he has since he took office, will fulfill the basic requirements of that amendment anyway.

But more than that, I cannot see tying the hands of any Chief Executive when he is moving as fast and as rapidly toward the aims of that amendment as I believe any President, or any of those running today, or our present President, or even past Presidents could have moved.

Then there is the third element in this bill, and this is the one which has attracted my chief attention in this matter. I refer to the pay provision. I will not detain the Senate by repeating over and over the speech I made Monday.

Senators are acquainted with it, and Senators know that the Allott amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 51 to 27 after the previous pay provisions of the House had been rejected by about the same amount. Then, when the conference report came back from the conference committee, we found that the people I wanted to help most by my provision, which adopted nothing of my own ideas, but adopted mainly the provisions of the Gates Commission on pay for officers and enlisted men, had been sort of scuttled. In fact, it had been scuttled. When I discovered, as it came back, that the enlisted men in the first four grades and first two officer grades would actually receive less compensation, even taking into consideration the tax provisions and the tax effects than they would have received under either the Senate bill or the House bill I made it known then that I would not vote for the conference report under those provisions.

In my speech Monday I made it very clear that I still was of that mind. I am concerned about the Senate, and I am concerned about this bill. We debated this bill from May 5 to June 24, which is at least 6 weeks, and maybe 7 weeks. On August 4 the conference report came back to the Senate.

I am concerned about our inability on the Senate floor to reach positions and reach decisions; to debate matters for a reasonable amount of time and then to show our will; to say: 'We have debated this, we have discussed it, we have studied it, and it is now time to stand up and resolve these questions.'

My own personal wishes at the moment are that we could vote up and down on the conference report. We obviously will not be able to vote up and down on the conference report at least for the present, and I do not know for how much time in the future.

In my speech Monday I stated that, in order to bring this matter to a resolution, I was prepared to offer a motion to table the present conference report.

Mr. President, there are other matters for consideration. The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has asked for time until Monday or Tuesday. I think it is very obvious that no one here, given the religious beliefs of some of our Members, would ask for a vote on Monday. I know I would not. That means, then, of certainty, either tomorrow or Tuesday.

On Monday morning I talked with the distinguished majority leader twice, I talked with the distinguished minority leader, and I talked with the chairman, the manager of the bill, in an attempt to arrive at some understanding of a reasonable time when we could vote. That is the reason why I said I did not preclude the matter of making a motion even on Tuesday.

Of course, we are now, from a practical reason, by reason of the various services attendant upon the loss of our dear friend in the Senate, Winston Prouty, on what is really the next legislative day. I did not offer the motion on Tuesday because of two things: One, the Senate was adjourned. It did not come back in session. That was not the main

reason. The main reason was that I did feel that, after a month's absence, there should be a reasonable opportunity to discuss this matter.

This morning, time and again, mention has been made by my colleagues of pressures—they have been made to me and they have been made to others—that the executive branch has brought on us. In my opinion, the executive branch would be very remiss, and certainly not worthy of the confidence of the people, if they were as convinced as they seem to be about the draft, in not talking to Senators. So I take no stock in the fact that the executive branch has been talking to Senators at all. They did this in the case of former Presidents. They did it with this administration. I see nothing wrong with that. I am reminded of a former President—I believe it was President Truman—who said, "If you can't stand the heat, you had better get out of the kitchen."

So all these factors tend to bring to us the real issues that we have in mind.

Lastly I say this: My desire, first of all, would be to bring this matter to a vote up and down. In that event, as it now stands, I would have to vote against the conference report.

I must say that this morning I tried to explore other means, which have not been consummated, of separating the pay provisions of the conference report out of the conference report, so that we could then, in effect, vote on a motion to table or up and down on the conference report upon the two other remaining main items, which would be the draft extension and the Mansfield amendment.

I had some encouragement, I might say, from the chairman, just before we started this session here, with respect to that. However, it will take more time than we have at the present moment to do that.

I might say, with respect to the absences of Senators, I have had commitments in my own State for months, literally—and I do say literally—for these 4 days of Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. It was for that reason that I urged both the majority leader—who was kindly and understanding, as he always is—and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to try to resolve this matter on Tuesday. I could not get assurances, and so I waited today.

I must say that unless I can receive some assurances which will assure me that we will have a reasonable opportunity to place the pay provisions in this bill into legislation this year, it is still my intention to offer a motion to table today, and I shall offer that, if these provisions or understandings and plans cannot be worked out, not later than 3 o'clock.

I cannot prevent any other Senator, I know—and I see some on the floor now conferring; we understand each other fully—from making such a motion. I would hope they would not make such a motion until the hour of 3, until time, I hope, when we will have been able to see if there is some way whereby we can eliminate the troublesome pay provisions from this particular bill. I am sorry that

they ever got in there, but they are in there, and we are realists and we are faced with the fact.

As far as I am personally concerned, although it has greatly discommoded me, I think that every Senator is prepared to vote today; and I doubt if any votes will be changed by Monday. I have tried to make my position clear here.

I want to make one other thing extremely clear, and that is that during the pendency of this legislation between May 5 and June 24, I believe I spoke once or twice, and both times relatively briefly—in fact, very briefly. I cannot and I will not participate in a filibuster upon this conference report. I believe the Senate has reached the place where we have got to stand up and face our constituencies and face them eye to eye—if you want to use Dean Rusk's words, eyeball to eyeball—and say we are now prepared to resolve this situation.

I am concerned, as I said, about the draft extension. I am concerned about the pay provisions, and I am perfectly willing to talk, in the meantime, with my various colleagues here about methods and means of trying to effectively separate the pay provision issue, because we find ourselves in a very strange situation where Senators would support a motion to table without any really common cause with respect to the bill. There are three different elements, and that is the reason I talk about them, of this bill; and Senators would support a motion to table for three different reasons.

I hope I have explained my purpose. I do wish to ask the majority leader for some little extended time. The Senators who are here can vote, and whether or not I make the motion to table by 3 o'clock will depend upon whether or not it is possible to separate the pay provisions out, with assurances that we will get the pay reform which I think is so vitally necessary, and which is the reason why I have stated that I will not support the conference report in its present form.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I understand the Senator to say that if he does not reach a reasonable agreement on his pay proposal, it is his intention to make a motion to lay on the table at 3 o'clock?

Mr. ALLOTT. I will say to the Senator that I am perfectly prepared to do that at 3 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That takes it out of my hands.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I did not understand the last statement the Senator made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The question I raised was to the effect that, if I listened to the Senator correctly, he had said that if a reasonable agreement was not worked out on the matter of his main interest, a pay raise which would be more equitable to the lower ranking officers and enlisted men, whether it was his intention, if no agreement was worked out, to make a motion to table at 3 o'clock. His answer, I believe, was in the affirmative.

Mr. ALLOTT. The answer was that I was prepared to do so. But I see two Senators in the Chamber with whom I would like to discuss this matter, and both of them are prepared to offer a motion to table. I would like to have an opportunity to talk with them prior to that time, concerning the outcome of other arrangements.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say, first of all, that I am in agreement with what the Senator from Colorado has said with regard to the desirability of voting the whole conference report up or down, and doing that, perhaps, on Tuesday, if we could be permitted to get to a vote. I would also hope that some means could be found to separate the pay raise controversy and some assurance given to the Senator from Colorado that a compromise pay raise proposal satisfactory to him could be disposed of on some other bill, with the support of the committee and of the Senate.

I think that would help greatly, and I would not expect that the administration would be adverse to seeing some compromise on the pay raise worked out with the Senator from Colorado. It seems to me that that might be the way to avoid the embarrassment to the committee and to the Senate of having worked so long for so little purpose as would be the result if we were now to lay on the table this conference report.

I hope the conference report will not be tabled. I shall vote against tabling it. I would like to see us dispose of the matter in time, however, and I repeat that by far the best vote, the vote which truly express the will of individual Senators, would be a vote up or down on the conference report.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Mississippi, I want to make my statement clear that I was prepared to do it.

I do wish to confer with certain Senators now in the Chamber with whom I have had previous conversations. I want to explain my position to them, and tell them what I have in mind. This is not in derogation of any understandings or definitive understandings the Senator and I may have made.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I gather from the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the comment by the distinguished minority leader that the possibilities of a reasonable agreement are pretty good.

Mr. ALLOTT. I could not say that at this point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What I want to say is this: If the Senator from Colorado does not make a motion to table, then I think, barring the possibility of a straight up or down vote on the conference report, that I will; and I would like at this time to make a unanimous-consent request, if the two Senators will agree.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Does the Senator from Colorado yield for that purpose?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield for that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the conference report occur at 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. GRAVEL. Yes, there is objection, Mr. President. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with all due respect, the Senator does not have the floor. I have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado has the floor. The Senator yielded for the purpose of a unanimous-consent request by the majority leader, to which objection was heard.

Mr. ALLOTT. Well, a man has to be recognized to object. I did not want to foreclose the Senator from Alaska; he has every right to object. But I just simply wanted to call to the attention of the majority leader that, due to the fact that Monday is a high holy day for some of our people, I would not think it would be an appropriate time to set a vote by unanimous-consent agreement, in any event.

Mr. GRAVEL. That was not the reason for my objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say that Monday is also a working day for the Senate, and it will be my intention to have the Senate in session on Monday. I am sure our brethren fully understand the situation, and we understand theirs.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think what we have seen in the objection raised to the request is only an indication of what would occur if we tried to achieve an up or down vote on the conference report at this time. I think the Senate is pretty well aware of the fact that there will be a filibuster against the conference report. By how many, I do not know. For how long I have no idea.

But if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Mississippi, and the Senate, I should like to propose that a motion to lay on the table occur at the hour of 12 o'clock noon on Saturday next. I make such a unanimous-consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving

the right to object, is this on the basis of a unanimous-consent request, or did the Senator make a motion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ALLOTT. If it is a unanimous-consent request, I shall have to object, for reasons I have stated before. I have canceled 4 days of appointments. I have not canceled them all entirely, but I have canceled, today, longstanding engagements and, if that is the only choice I have, I shall make the motion to table myself at an earlier time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in an attempt to go a little farther along the road of cooperation, we have found that a straight up or down vote is an impossibility in the immediate future. We have found, rather than a tabling motion this afternoon—stretched out to Saturday—that there was objection. I will make one more unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on tabling—I think, perhaps, to be offered by the Senator from Montana if the Senator from Colorado is satisfied in the meantime—occur at 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRANSTON. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I do not know what more the leadership can do. We will have to play it by ear. If we cannot even get an agreement to vote on a tabling motion on Monday, then I think we are in a state of disarray. I do not want to go beyond Monday.

I am not at all averse to the administration or anyone else lobbying over the weekend. That is part of the way things operate in this country; and, if they did not do that, they could be faulted.

But the Senate is on notice that at any time from now on, a motion to table will be in order, and it is the right and privilege of every Senator, or any Senator, to offer such a motion at any time he or she sees fit.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. May I suggest to the Senator from Montana that possibly a little later he may be successful in a unanimous-consent request for Tuesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. STENNIS. I just want to call attention to that now, for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I told the Senator from Mississippi this morning that Tuesday was too far away. I have been under obligations and pressures for today. I do not intend to retreat any further. As a matter of fact, I think I have retreated too far already. But now we are back where we were at the beginning, and I have no complaints and no further offers to make.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my opinion, the request by the majority leader or the willingness of the majority leader to have a vote on this matter at 11 a.m. on Monday is an eminently fair compromise between the positions stated with respect to this conference report.

I am opposed to this legislation. Because of my respect for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, if the request of the majority leader is approved I will not vote to table today, but would vote to table on Monday at 11 a.m. I would hope that those who are interested in the draft bill, and do not believe in it, would give that consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate that.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I would like to say to the Senator from Montana and to the Senate that it seems evident from the discussion we have heard thus far today that there will not be a unanimous-consent agreement on time and that there may be a filibuster at some point on the conference report. I hope the filibuster will not occur, for in my view it is necessary that the draft extension bill be passed soon.

I hope the motion to table will be made either by the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), or by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). The country understands their interest. They know Senator ALLOTT's interest in the pay provisions; and the country knows that Senator MANSFIELD's amendment is to express the sense of the Congress that our involvement in the war in Vietnam be brought to a close.

Any Senator may offer a motion to table. I hope the Senator from Montana will ask other Members of this body not to offer a motion to table and that only the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Colorado will offer the motion. Then our reasons for voting to table will be understood, and I intend to vote to table. The country will know our reasons, and they are justifiable reasons. I am not in favor of a filibuster, and I think it will be unfortunate if someone offers the motion in support of a filibuster.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senate will be in order. The Senator will not proceed until the Senate is in order.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask this question of the majority leader: Is there any other busi-

ness to come before the Senate this fall, at this session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A good deal.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is, I think we ought to settle the pending question without any further delay.

I join the Senator from Kentucky in expressing the hope that either the Senator from Montana or the Senator from Colorado will make the motion to table. If that motion is agreed to, as I understand, the conferees will meet again; and it appears to me that there is a much better opportunity to work out something with Members of the Senate in conference than there is by continuous wrangling on the floor of the Senate considering the vast program of lobbying which the administration seems to be putting on. A few days ago, I would have voted against tabling. Now, partly as a result of their crash program on Congress, I expect to vote to table since we are not getting anywhere here on the floor.

I realize that the conferees may not make progress either but at least this Senate could proceed with other work.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am a little distressed about the magic of the hour of 11 o'clock. A subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce is just back from holding 2 full days of hearings in northern New England; and we find—it is an established fact—that there is absolutely no reliable air service north of Boston in the States of Vermont and New Hampshire. I believe the Senator from Vermont will substantiate that.

The Senator from New Hampshire is prepared to be here every day of the week; but, with serious illness in his family, it seems unfortunate to have to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning, which would be necessary, to drive my automobile to Boston in order to get here at the hour of 11. If it were the hour of 2 or 2:30 p.m., there would be no difficulty. I think other Senators might be involved.

I just want to call that to the attention of the majority leader, not as a personal favor to one Senator, but as a favor to a section of the country that I am going to proclaim at every point I can, whether germane or otherwise, is entitled to have a little reliable air service so that we can get to Washington to perform our duties and be here at 11 o'clock. It would be very difficult now.

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

Mrs. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned the unreliable air service to northern New England, and I wish to join him in echoing his expression. We do have a small feeder line which is doing the best it can under the circumstances and on a day-to-day basis, because it cannot be assured of being in business the day after tomorrow, if my understanding is correct. They are giving as good service as they can with small DeHaviland planes, which I understand are of Brit-

ish manufacture—a British plane because, as I understand further, the airplane manufacturers in this country simply are not interested in producing the kind of planes which would best serve our economy and which we are desperately in need of.

I do not doubt that we might have a use for a few 500-passenger planes but certainly not in Keene, Lebanon, Montpelier, Burlington, or even Bangor, Maine. So I think that this matter of an adequate air service is one which we should be concerned with. I understand that the Chairman of the CAB himself is concerned with it, but as long as we have got to put everything in the hands of Boeing, Lockheed, and other manufacturers who think in terms of 500-passenger planes, and in the hands of airlines who think in terms of getting a monopoly, I do not think the economy of this country will improve a great deal. I would like to get the pending business out of the way so that we can do something else. Possibly we might even find a way to improve the transportation systems of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is, as always, a great deal of merit to what the distinguished Senator from Vermont says. I was wondering whether it would not be possible to vote on the tabling motion at 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock this afternoon, with the time to be equally divided, let us say, from now until 4 o'clock, which would be 3 hours, or until 5 o'clock, which would be 4 hours.

If I make the motion to table, I would be willing to ask for only 5 minutes for the Senate amendment on the termination of the war, and give the rest of the time to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

There is other business to take care of. We have the very important military procurement bill which has piled up behind the conference report. I do not think it would take more than 3 hours for the Senator from Mississippi to give us the benefit of the information which he has acquired since September 1. With such good attendance of Senators in the Chamber now, perhaps this would be the best time to bring this matter to a head, to determine what the sentiment of the Senate is.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, my point this morning was about the information. It is a followup effort to get more definite information and some projections as to how this thing will look 6 months from now without a draft bill. That is something we cannot toss up in the air. I would spend the weekend, along with other members of the committee, contacting knowledgeable people and getting statements from them in writing for the benefit of the Senate. That is my point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the distinguished Senator from Mississippi will allow me to inquire, on my own time: What has the Defense Department been doing since the 1st of July when the present extension of the Selective Service Act expired? What has the Selective Service Administration been doing since the 1st of July when the extension of the Selective Service Act expired?



How come they need a weekend to bring the information up to date which they should have been accumulating over the past few months?

Mr. STENNIS. Reserving the right to object, I have not made myself clear. They have had an intensified recruiting program during that period, although they expected the bill to pass, which it did not. Now the point I am trying to get to, is: what has been the trend with reference to numbers, and what has been the trend with reference to quality, without the inducement of a draft law being on the books and, if that situation continues, what will be the likely situation 6 months from now, after the draft law has been off the books? Those are crucial and critical questions. It takes some time to get the pertinent facts in presentable form, which is what I am trying to do here, on Monday or Tuesday, whichever would be decided on. We just have to have time, that is all. We have to have a little time. I have already given some of this information to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I have got it. But, may I point out, the issue is the termination of the war in Indochina, not so much the extension of the draft per se, but the release of all POW's and, wherever identifiable, those missing in action on the one hand and the termination of the war on the other, which after all, is the administration's objective, so I understand. The third factor, I think, has gone out the window. That additional factor was to give the Government of Vietnam, and I quote, a reasonable chance to survive, unquote. That is down the drain now. They have got a one-man democracy there now—[laughter]—in Mr. Thieu. I would be glad if we operated on that basis here. [Laughter.]

The administration has tied the release of prisoners of war to the termination of the war. The Senate amendment says the same thing. We want to work in cooperation with the administration but, unfortunately, there are too many times when someone offers a suggestion here in good faith and we are looked upon as adversaries when we are trying to cooperate and to be helpful. Here is an amendment which passed the Senate by a vote of 61 to 38, an overwhelming vote of support by this body in backing of a cooperative and helpful amendment.

The big question is not the draft. The big question is the Senate amendment, seeking to bring about the release of prisoners of war, and a termination of the war, both at the same time. That is what we have heard time and time again in this country. We either mean it or we do not mean it. To use an outworn phrase, "It is time to fish or cut bait."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I made no request—

Mr. STENNIS. I thought the Senator had.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. No.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Let me say that the Senator speaks well on this point, which

is a part of the bill, but also in the bill is the fundamental question of the draft. It is a draft bill. That is the primary part of it. The Senate has voted on the Senator's amendment. I have said many times that I respect that. There are other ways, too, to secure vote on that, which will doubtless happen. But now, in getting to the facts that pertain to a major part of this draft bill, I am saying that we need this additional time. That is my request. That is the basis for it. That is the only thing. Then we can vote on all of them together. As to the development mentioned by the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), I want a chance to look into that a little here. These are important questions. So I am asking, the Senator has not requested this vote at 3 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Five. Five.

Mr. STENNIS. I am just not able to get the facts here. We are not able to do so. I think, also, that the membership is entitled to some kind of additional notice. This is too short a time. I hope that the Senator from Montana will pursue his efforts with reference to a vote on Monday, and I will have nothing more to say about the time of the voting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator consider voting at 5 o'clock with a 4-hour limitation, with 3 hours and 45 minutes given to the Senator from Mississippi and 15 minutes to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. STENNIS. Reserving the right to object, it is not a matter of time for debate now. That is not the bind that I am in. The bind is that we have not had a chance to develop the facts that I believe will be fully revealing.

That is not the request I make. I am asking for next Monday. I hope that the Senator will not pursue his request for today.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have already prefaced my remarks as to what I would do with respect to the position taken by the able majority leader. Now that has changed. Would the able majority leader consider voting tomorrow at 11 o'clock, Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I personally would be delighted to vote today or tomorrow, but there are—

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would have to say that I would have to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, we know that it really does not take unanimous consent. That is understood. A motion to table can be made by any Senator at any time. The idea is to try to be as reasonable as possible. It places the Senator from Montana in a most difficult position. Frankly, I do not care how much lobbying any organization or any administration does. I do not care how any Member of the Senate votes, because that is his responsibility. However, I do care how I vote. And all I want is a chance to test the sentiment of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, all I want is a chance to test the sentiment of the Senate so that we can then determine where we go and how. This bill is not going to be disposed of quickly under any circumstances, whether it is tabled or not. However, the possibility of an up and down vote is pretty remote at the present time.

I was wondering—if I could have the attention of the distinguished manager of the bill—if the manager of the bill could get most of his explanation out of the way this afternoon and some of it on tomorrow. And if no one makes a motion to table this afternoon, tomorrow we could go back to the Military Procurement bill and dispose of some of the amendments attached thereto and do the same on Saturday as well.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I would very readily agree to that. I would be glad to do that. I think I should agree to it. That would give us a chance to get into these matters further with respect to the draft bill. I would be ready.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, under the circumstances, I would have to object to a motion and a vote today, tomorrow, or the next day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On what?

Mr. ALLOTT. On agreement to a motion to table to be presented at a given time. The Senator is fully aware of the situation I am in.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suppose that would give the administration time enough to mend its fences if we go to the procurement bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator said he has been under pressure and that Mr. Laird had been to see me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I have been referring to communications I have been receiving.

Mr. STENNIS. It has been stated that the Secretary had visited with us. I have not seen Mr. Laird since we returned here.

I asked that these Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff come over and talk to me and to the Senator from Maine about these facts. That is what happened. And that is where I go to find the facts and the information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I find no fault with that. It was recorded in the public press.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, speaking of the point the Senator made, he referred to the fact that the Secretary had been to see the chairman of the committee, and so forth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. President, after this moment of silence. I think I will yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.