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Mr. President:

On behalf of the United States Delegation, thank you for receiving us and for your generous words of welcome. Your expressions of friendship are most cordially reciprocated. It is my hope and expectation that this Ninth Interparliamentary Conference of Mexico and the United States will strengthen the understanding which already exists between the two Congresses.

Deputy Luis Farias, and his colleagues of the Mexican Delegation have prepared a challenging program. Without anticipating the discussions in Aguascalientes, I would note that the agenda puts heavy emphasis on matters pertaining to arms control and disarmament. That is most appropriate. Not only is the question critical, it is one in which Mexican leadership has already made significant contributions in the Hemisphere and in the United Nations. The Treaty of Tlatelolco, for example, which provides for a nuclear free zone in Latin America, is largely the result of Mexican initiative. Indeed, it is not too much to say that the Treaty would never have been signed had not it been for Mexican persistence over many month of difficult and exacting negotiations.

Mexican concern has gone beyond curbing the atom for use in war to releasing its potential for peaceful purposes, particularly in the desalinization of sea water. One such project as you know, Mr.
President, brings together the governments of the United States and Mexico in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency. I mention it, in particular, because it resulted from an Interparliamentary Conference in La Paz in 1965 and originated with a suggestion first made by two members of our delegations at that time--by Senator George Aiken who is the dean of the Senate Republicans and the distinguished Deputy Alfonso Martinez Dominguez.

The desalinization project is only one of many examples of Mexican-American cooperation which has grown steadily more fruitful. As a participant in the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary meetings since their inception, I have seen and felt the steady emergence of a new trust and a new confidence between Mexico and the United States. The mutuality deepens with the years and underwrites the rich promise of the future for both nations.

Many persons have contributed to this happy state of affairs. However, I wish to take this occasion, Mr. President, to stress what you have done--out of your personal dedication, your humanity, and your statesmanship, for the building of a responsible and respectable relationship between the Republic of Mexico and the republic of the United States, a relationship based on equality, dignity and friendship.

We thank you for your welcome. We are happy to be in Mexico where, already, we feel at home once again.
The men and women portrayed in stone in the Capitol are an inspiration to the countless Americans from all parts of our nation who visit this building each year. To this honored group, we now add the sculptured figures of the two remarkable men who have been chosen for inclusion by the people of Hawaii. They typify the greatness in diversity of the Fiftieth State. From their lives, generations of Americans will derive a sense of the character which makes Hawaii what it is today, a great contributor to the strength and progress of the Union.

It is fitting that the men who are honored, today, were a European and an indigenous Hawaiian. In their different national and racial origins they mirror the melting-pot as it has existed so uniquely in the Fiftieth State. In Hawaii, races not only live in harmony with races but more and more, and in a higher sense, they live without race.

The man responsible for the political integration of the Hawaiian Islands, King Kamehameha, and the man who exemplified the humanitarian spirit that characterizes Hawaii, the Belgian Father Damien, richly deserve the honor we pay them on this occasion. Kamehameha the Great was determined in war and just in peace. He brought the warring islands for the first time under one rule. He reigned with wisdom—understanding well the needs
and aspirations of his peoples. He led them to higher levels of economic
well-being and political stability by encouraging agriculture, industry,
and efficient administration, and by the active seeking of friendship with
foreigners to whom he extended Hawaii's traditional aloha, a heart-felt
warmth of welcome to the stranger. For his acts of enlightened leadership,
Kamehameha I is remembered with respect and admiration throughout the State.

The supreme Christian charity of Father Damien will remain a
profound inspiration to Hawaiians, to all Americans and to mankind. Dedi-
cated to the service of God and to all of God's children, Father Damien
devoted his life to the victims of leprosy on the Island of Molokai. There,
his compassion and tireless self-sacrifice brought physical comfort and
spiritual hope to the afflicted and the dying. For his reward, he accepted
with religious ecstasy his own death as a leper.

These were great men of a great State. I am honored to accept,
on behalf of the Capitol, therefore, the sculptured likenesses of King
Kamehameha the Great and Father Damien who will, henceforth, represent
the State of Hawaii in Statuary Hall.
A decade is drawing to a close. It began in a Republican Administration. It ends in a Republican Administration. In between, the Democratic Party has aimed at raising the nation's standard of living and at putting into practice, the Constitution's promise of equal treatment for all citizens.

In this decade, there has emerged from a Democratic Congress an expanded housing program and legislation to provide for the better education of the nation's young people.

A Democratic Congress has opened the door to adequate medical and hospital care for the long-neglected and made a commitment to end a persistent poverty and affluence in this nation.

A Democratic Congress brought to fruition the 100-year effort to strike down legal and other barriers to equal treatment of all Americans.

These and other legislative achievements carry the hallmark of President Kennedy and President Johnson. They are written into the 89th, Journals of the Democratic 87th, 88th, and 90th Congresses.

Yet, these beacons of progress—let us face it frankly—were overshadowed last November. A decade of social advance was buried in the avalanche of public bitterness, revulsion and frustration which is Viet Nam. Years of national achievement sank out of sight in the tide of violence, unrest and anxiety which engulfed the nation.

The grim war continues in Viet Nam. Fear still stalks the streets of the nation's towns and cities. The uncertainties over the future are undiminished.
To be sure, the primary responsibility in this situation no longer adheres to the Democratic Party. To be sure, national leadership has passed to the Republican Party. But there can be no comfort for us in this changeover. If Democrats mean to retain a significance for this nation, there is no refuge in the shift of responsibility along with the Presidency to the Republican Party. On the contrary, we will acknowledge our own responsibility for the past and we will accept our share of responsibility for the present.

We will face frankly the twin tragedies of these times--the tragic conflict abroad and the tragic clashes at home and we will look for the means of their resolution. As the party of opposition, we will question the priorities and policies, the attitudes and the approaches of the Republican Administration in dealing with these and other national issues. We will do so responsibly, offering with our criticisms, constructive alternatives.

In the Congress--in the Senate--we will join with the President in an effort to end the war in Viet Nam. As far as conscience permits, we will uphold the President's hand in that situation; he is the President of all Americans--Democrats no less than Republicans. But we cannot and we will not acquiesce in the indefinite absence of peace.

We will sustain the President in a foreign policy of discerning internationalism; that is what the realities of the world demand, as the 20th century moves into a final quarter. But we cannot and we will not endorse a costly and indiscriminate involvement abroad merely because it is put forth under the label of internationalism.
We will vote necessary expenditures for the military defense of the nation. But we will not sign blank checks for billions at the sound of the bugle of fear. Rather, we will seek a balance, to the end that the nation may meet the urgent needs for stability within, no less than the demands for security from without.

As a political party, we will face the fact that the great and automatic national majority which was enjoyed for many decades is no more. It is not only that we have made our share of mistakes and suffered the consequences. It is also because issues have changed and attitudes have changed. The great constituency upon which the Democratic Party rested for four decades is now less clearly defined for us. In my judgment, it is there nonetheless. It is waiting to respond to new perceptions and to a rededicated political leadership which addresses itself not only to those who are satisfied with things as they are but which reaches out to those who are not.

It is no longer enough to extoll our contribution to the building of the nation as it is. The Democratic Party must look to what it can contribute in the building of the greater nation which we can become. In short, it is for us to rekindle the people’s faith in the Democratic Party by searching out and pursuing the direction to a new unity at home and, in the world, to the building of a more durable peace. That is the quest on which we set forth tonight.
PRESS RELEASE OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

The Democratic Policy Committee and the Democratic members of the Finance Committee have agreed upon the following understanding:

1. Support an extension of the surtax until November 30, 1969. This will be accomplished by attaching this temporary extension to a separate House-passed bill. The House-passed surtax extension, the investment credit repeal, the extension of the excise taxes and the change of the standard deduction will remain on the Senate Calendar until the tax reform bill is reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

2. The Chairman of the Finance Committee and the members of that Committee have given their assurance that a tax reform package will be reported to the full Senate not later than October 31, 1969.

3. The Democratic Policy Committee has endorsed the position of the Finance Committee that the date of the investment tax credit repeal will be identical to that date in the House-passed bill (April 18, 1969). The endorsement was at the specific request of the Finance Committee members to assure all that the investment credit repeal is endorsed and the date is specified as contained in the bill on the Senate Calendar.
Pursuant to the understanding in the Senate is contingent

upon its acceptance by the Administration and the Republican leadership

which has been pressing in the Finance Committee and on the Senate floor

for the extension of the surtax. May I say that many of the members

present today went along with this understanding not withstanding grave

reservations about the usefulness of the continuance of the surtax as

an anti-inflationary measure. The approach is offered as an accommoda-

tion to the Administration. If it is acceptable, then the Majority

Policy Committee is compelled to stand on its previous resolution.
Let me first thank you for your invitation, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate having this opportunity to testify at the beginning of this series of hearings on firearms legislation and especially on my bill, S. 849.

The gun law thus far has asked a sacrifice on the part of the law-abiding gun owner in return for what hopefully will be a measure of control over the inordinate flow of weapons into the hands of the lawless and untrained, the addict, the incompetent and the criminal. Providing such legislation at the Federal level has provoked numerous questions and the debate still rages on.

What is clear so far is that the burden imposed by the present law on the law-abiding gun owner has not been distributed equally. We in Montana, for example, seldom experience the use of guns by the criminal and unfit. At the same time we Montanans pride ourselves in the responsible use of weapons for sport and even for self-defense. Unfortunately, that is not the case elsewhere in the land. Our large metropolitan centers have been wracked by crime and violence perpetrated by hoodlums having no notion of the responsible use of weapons. Yet we in Montana are asked to bear the full measure of the burden of gun legislation. What we stand to benefit from its hoped-for objective—a reduction in gun crime—is greatly disproportionate when viewed solely
within the geographical confines of Montana. Nevertheless, may I say that in Montana the sacrifice asked by this law has been made. It has been made by Montanans though to some the whole notion of gun legislation may be repugnant. It has been made simply because Congress recognized that the ease with which guns are made available to the lawless has become not only a state and local problem, but a national problem as well.

And just as Congress recognized that the ease of gun accessibility by the lawless has reached national proportions justifying Congressional action, so does the penalty for the criminal use of guns warrant equally close attention by the Congress. And that is just what my bill, S. 849, aims to do.

Gun crime is a national disgrace. And with this bill I offer another approach to curtailing the gun crime rate—an approach that says to the criminal in terms that are clear and simple that his resort to a gun will be met automatically with punishment that fits such an act of violence. In contrast to the present gun law, no burden is imposed on the law-abiding gun owner. No sacrifice is asked. The burden falls squarely where it belongs—on the criminal and the lawless; on those who roam the streets, gun in hand, ready and willing to perpetrate their acts of violence.

I am no expert in crime control. I am not even a lawyer. But I know there is something wrong when the FBI tells us that
while our gun crime rate continues to spiral upward, our prison population shrinks proportionately. I hope this trend is reversed. I would think an assured prison sentence for criminals who choose to resort to firearms would help establish such a reversal or at least stem the tide. That is the purpose of my bill.

Under its provisions, for a first offender the penalty would be 1 to 10 years in prison; for a subsequent offense—a mandatory 25 years. The proposal varies from present Federal law in two major respects. Under no circumstances can the sentence for using a firearm be suspended or assessed concurrently with the sentence for the commission of the crime itself. The criminal gun user will be sentenced solely for his choice to use a gun. Moreover, the subsequent offender will be compelled to serve 25 years for making such a choice. In this regard, it just seems to me that no leeway or discretion is necessary when it is found that a criminal has chosen a second time to use a firearm lawlessly.

I would add that for the most part I agree with gun legislation; especially in its stated objective: to assist Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies in their fight against crime and violence. At the same time I do object when a Federal agency—when any Federal agency—misinterprets or misconstrues the law in the name of enforcement. That is why I joined as a co-sponsor of the bill, S. 845, offered by the distinguished
Senator from Utah, Mr. Bennett, to strike down the ammunition regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to the Gun Control Act of 1968. In my opinion those regulations fall squarely beyond any authority granted by Congress under the law. Indeed, Congress voted down registration; and registration, in my opinion, is precisely what the Treasury regulations call for.

On February 4, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah (Mr. Bennett) introduced S. 845. It seems to me to indicate that registration by another name is being required by a regulation of the Internal Revenue Service. This regulation covers ammunition for pistols, rifles, shotguns and some components, including primers, propellant powders, cartridge cases, and bullets.

Under sections 992 (b) (5) and 923 (g) the dealer is required to record the name, age, and address of the buyer of firearms or ammunition, while section 923 (g) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations relative to record keeping by dealers. The regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for far more than sections 922 and 923 require and, in my judgement, go considerably beyond the intent of Congress in passing the Gun Control Act of 1968.

For example, the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury call for the following: Date; manufacturer; caliber, gage, or type of component; quantity; name; address; date of birth; and mode of identification, driver's license, and so forth.

It seems to me that this goes far beyond "the name, age, and address" of the law and covers a good deal more territory which, in effect, amounts to registration.
If there is to be registration, let it be in the open and on the table, and let everyone be aware of it. Congress, in my opinion, opposed registration under the Gun Control Act of 1968, and this regulation, in my judgment, would go far beyond what Congress intended.

This is back-door registration and should be corrected. In my judgment, it is necessary to correct an unnecessary burden and a deceptive form of registration and to bring the regulations in line with the intent of Congress at the time the bill was passed.

With that said, let me again reiterate that I think the objectives sought by the 1968 law are wholly correct. I hope they are met; though it is premature now to make a judgment on that score.

And it is only to complement the objectives of the existing law that I offer my proposal for mandatory jail sentences against perpetrators of violent gun crimes. The message it brings to the criminal gun user is clear. For ultimately the decision to resort to a firearm is up to him. If he finds the penalty so severe as to deter his use of this deadly weapon, only then can society be protected from the violence it produces. The State of Alaska I understand has already adopted such an approach. Other states are in the process of joining the effort. Mr. Chairman, I urge you and your subcommittee--already so distinguished for your leadership in this area--to steer this proposal through the full Judiciary Committee and on through the Senate.

By offering mandatory jail terms in return for gun violence at the Federal level, the Congress will provide, I believe, a splendid model for all fifty states to follow.
Mr. Chairman, another piece of proposed legislation which I would urge the Judiciary Committee to face up to relates to unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature being sent through the U. S. mails. I have received numerous protests from my constituents in Montana, and I believe the situation has reached such a magnitude that it demands action on the part of the Federal Government.

First of all, it is important to protect children against this kind of traffic in smut. Furthermore, I see no reason why the average citizen should have to put up with this kind of unsolicited material sent through the mail. The responsibility for keeping this material out of the mail should be placed on the sender, not the unsuspecting boxholder as is now the case.

It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, that very shortly hearings on S. 2073 and S. 2074, introduced by the minority leader (Mr. Dirksen) and other Senators, and S. 2057, introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Bayh) and other Senators, will be held, and the bills given the immediate and considerate judgment which they deserve.
STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANFIELD (D., MONTANA) AT THE SWEARING-IN OF MARJORIE HUNTER AS PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

House Caucus Room, Cannon Office Building
September 9, 1969, 7:00 p.m.

This is the first time that I have been called on to perform an induction. More accurately, what we are about is not so much an induction as it is a coronation or an investiture. I feel, tonight a kindred link with the Archbishops of Canterbury, the Popes of Rome or, in a pinch, the Chief Justices of the United States Supreme Court.

What is involved here is in direct descent from Medici Italy and the England of Henry the Eighth. Therefore, this ceremony may not be as far out for me as I had first thought. I say that because the Senate of the United States and Southeast Asia, where I have just been, are the last places in which the art of court intrigue and papal politics are still practiced with classic finesse.

At least, I thought they were the only places. /I asked Maggie Hunter on what vehicle of fealty she wished to enter upon her new office. One never knows what to expect from the ladies of the press anymore than the gentlemen. Even less. Had Maggie asked for the "Gutenberg Bible," I would not have been surprised.

But she did not ask for the Gutenberg or even the Constitution or the Rules of the Senate. She handed me, instead, a copy of Gay Talese's The Kingdom and the Power. After I read the book I knew that I had been brought into a situation of high intrigue. The book clearly delineates
the still unfinished revolt of the Washington office from the New York Times. I shall now proceed to lay bare the details of this heresy by reading above, below, and between the lines of the book.

Not unlike the Northern Irish, the inhabitants of the southern principality of the Washington office have never accepted from New York what is regarded—-to put it mildly—as an alien hegemony. A fearsome struggle for freedom has gone on incessantly—a struggle whose prototype can only be found in the Hundred Years War.

Since the days of King Arthur—Krock, the motto of the Washington office has been "Dieu et Mon Droit," or loosely translated, "If the mini-states vote in the U. N., why not us?" Or, even more loosely translated: "Who's running this newspaper anyway?"

King Arthur is said to have abdicated the throne of the Washington office only after he was assured that the southern principality would carry on the struggle under young Lord James. At first, Arthur's successor did not Reston his laurels. On the contrary, he haunted the halls of the Senate seeking the help of the astute Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Unfortunately, Bill Fulbright would only mutter that he was through with one-sided foreign aid.

Whereupon, Lord James offered the venerable Chairman a formula for freeing the United States from Viet Nam in return for his help in liberating the Washington office from the New York Times. The conspiracy was discovered just in time and Reston was carried off to New York by the crafty and time-honored technique of kicking him upstairs into a vice-presidency.
Sir Tom of Wicker came next. A brilliant and bold Lochinvar, he rode in from the South, watered his horse and worried the New York editors. He, too, was quickly enticed by the same Machiavellianism to an associate editorship in the Northern Capital.

Still, the Washington bureau was without a head who could be counted on not to give New York a headache. New York wanted undisturbed weekends beginning at Friday noon and they wanted untroubled sleep. In short, they wanted the peace and order which only a pliant-client state in Washington could bring. So New York turned to a man whose loyalty had withstood the ordeal by fire and water. Had he not risked his head in the White House towers? Had he not spurned the blandishments of the rival King of the United States in order to preserve the supremacy of the New York Times? In short, Max Frankel was the man.

Even so, New York was taking no chances. They sensed that the spirit of revolt still seethed in the breasts of Ned of Kenworthy, John O'Finney and other knights in the southern principality. Moreover, what of King Arthur Krock? Had he really withdrawn or had he feigned a withdrawal? Most significant, what of the woman who had infiltrated the Washington office? The purported new power behind the throne?

Which brings me back to the significance of this ceremony tonight. New York expects to breathe easier after Maggie Hunter is crowned as the Defender of the Rights of all women journalists. New York knows this Joan of Arc of the newspaper world. They have her catalogued for her deep sincerity, her high intelligence and her great integrity—all admirable traits, to be sure, but, let's face it, also two-edged swords in any big organization.
Because she is the way she is, however, New York expects Maggie to treat her new responsibilities as President of the Women's National Press Club with a seriousness bordering on compulsive preoccupation. Between that and her regular writing assignments, it is reasoned, there will be no time for hanky-panky in the Washington office. For as it was put the other day at the Round Table in New York, "We can handle the threat of an independent Kingdom in the Washington office but who—who—will save us from the threat of an independent Queendom?"
ADDRESS BY SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

Before the

Dinner in Honor of Senator Lister Hill

Jefferson Davis Hotel

Montgomery, Alabama

Friday, November 14, 1969

LISTER HILL - AN APPRECIATION

I am most appreciative of this invitation to come to Montgomery. It would be a pleasure to visit here in any circumstances. It is a privilege to join with the friends and admirers of Lister Hill in the place of his birth. You have accurately counted me as one of you in doing honor to him tonight.

Whatever I might say this evening could not begin to measure the depth or the breadth of this distinguished citizen of Alabama and of the United States. His achievements are outstanding. His attributes of character and intelligence are sterling. I will not list them. I could not. They are too many. Yet I must touch upon them because they are part of the story of this man who has brought us, from many places, to Montgomery out of a shared respect and affection for him.
It is said that we enter this world with nothing and can take nothing out of it when we leave. What counts is a man's accomplishments in his lifetime and that which he leaves behind in inspiration. The record of Senator Hill is still far from complete but it is already heavy with constructive achievements.

We need to look to the beginnings of Lister Hill to sense why he has become what he is—an adornment of this state and the nation and a living legend of the Senate. He is named, as you know, after one of the founders of modern surgery. That is not surprising since his father was a doctor and an enthusiastic one.

Nor is it surprising that a member of the Hill family entered the profession of medicine. Equally, it is not surprising that Lister Hill did not.

It is understandable that he had an avid interest in matters of health from an early age. Nevertheless, he chose then as he has been doing ever since—he chose his own way, in his own way. He did not latch on to the medical branch of the family tree. He chose instead to hang his shingle on a legal branch. To put it with the clarity of the contemporary idiom—he was determined to do his own thing.

In due course, he became a national legislator, joining first the House of Representatives and then the Senate, even as his family-inspired interest in medicine and health remained steadfast.
In due course, Lister the lawyer found himself, not with a legal practice and much less with a medical practice. Rather, he had a political practice extending from one end of Alabama to the other—a long way to go on a night call. And before he ended his legislative service, Lister’s problem on that score was multiplied a thousand-fold. His constituency was being drawn from all over the nation, and, from the entire world.

Who were these multitudes from everywhere who turned to Lister Hill in admiration and hope and for the inspiration of his leadership. They were those who suffered ills of body and mind and those who believed there exists a human responsibility and a social responsibility—to help in alleviating that suffering.

Lister Hill is a man who saw and understood at an early age the plight of those born with ills or who, sooner or later, became victims of devastating diseases. He never fought it. He saw human suffering and sensed from his family background how the ever-widening horizons of science, good sense and a human concern might be brought to bear upon it. In short, by the time he was in a position to act, two comprehensions—the anguish of illness and what to do about it—merged within him in what amounted to a magnificent obsession with the well-being of humanity.
Over the years, there has come within the scope of Lister Hill's vision, the nation's need for comprehensive health research, for additional hospital facilities and services and for more and better trained medical personnel. This man of compassion and insight has devoted a major portion of his lifetime to the practical legislative work essential to meeting the expanding health needs of the nation.

If you are familiar with hospitals, you know the term "Hill-Burton." It is a reference to a law which was co-sponsored by Senator Hill, almost a quarter of a century ago. This law has had an immense impact on the availability of hospitals and health centers throughout the nation. Its effect continues to be felt today. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine the extent of the chaos which would surely exist in the medical world without the great contribution of the Hill-Burton Act.

The stimulus afforded by this legislation has been a major factor in keeping hospital facilities at least within hailing distance of the nation's needs.

Nor did Lister Hill think it was enough just to build hospitals and health centers. He was determined that what was done in them would reflect the best of our scientific understanding and capability. So, during the years of his Senate service he made great efforts to increase research into the causes and cures of such devastating menaces as cancer and heart disease.
His sponsorship and consistent support of the National Institutes of Health is renowned. Out of these great centers have come a continuing flow of encouragement to health and medical research throughout the nation, advances in the understanding of health problems and in the capacity to deal with them.

Under the leadership of Lister Hill, the Senate was also able to focus on the nation's long neglected and now most significant health problems—that of the needs of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. He has championed the cause of Americans who had suffered a long night of neglect because of ignorance, prejudice, indifference and fear. He provided us, in the Hill-Harris Act of 1963, with a legislative vehicle to move actively and constructively on this costly and difficult frontier of the nation's health problems.

Lister Hill was among the first to recognize a serious gap between the need and the supply of competent medical personnel—doctors, nurses, technicians, public health officials, and other essential medical workers. Besides sponsoring legislation to expand and improve training, he was a prime mover in providing scholarships and loans for those seeking to enter the health professions.

Lister Hill has been a strong supporter of the concepts of preventive medicine. He has been a leader in developing means of helping the disabled and the handicapped to lead productive lives.
In sum, Lister Hill's efforts for the improvement of medical and related services have served to benefit the people of Alabama and the other 49 states, and people throughout the world. Modern hospitals and medical schools are among his monuments in stone. Countless illnesses prevented, cures achieved through scientific research, and human suffering alleviated—all these and more are among the etchings of his spirit on our times. His work in Congress is the work of a man of decency, feeling and wisdom. It is just as surely a part of the extraordinary achievements of modern medicine as is the complex hospital in which it is administered or the hand of the skilled practitioner. By any measure, it is accurate to refer to Lister Hill as a medical marvel of our century.

Senator Hill has been most widely proclaimed for his outstanding legislative and other leadership in the field of health. Nevertheless, his efforts in other aspects of human welfare have also been of great significance. Many of the nation's most impressive educational measures, for example, clearly bear his imprint—his own inimitable touch. Far more often than not, the Hill hallmark on a bill was sufficient in itself to command a measure to the Senate as just and thoughtful.

In a personal vein, I should like to make reference to the relationship which I was fortunate enough to have with Lister Hill during the years in which we served together in the Senate of the United States.
Senator Hill is a warm friend, a man of decency, integrity, and diligence and he was, in the Senate, a colleague with a deep and selfless devotion to the nation. From the people of Alabama, I know, Lister Hill gained much strength. I know, too, that he constantly had their concerns and needs in mind and responded faithfully to them. He saw those needs of his state, not in narrow isolation but in the mirror of the larger unity of which Alabama is a part—the United States of America. His actions in the Senate were invariably designed to bring the needs of the one into harmony with the essential realities of the other, ultimately, to the common advantage of both.

After I was elected Senate Majority Leader, a decade ago, I depended heavily on Senator Hill's constant and unfailing cooperation. He was a source of immense strength to me. His advice and assistance were invaluable. His inspiration and strength permeated the entire Democratic leadership, of which, as a Committee chairman and as a participant in the deliberations of the Majority Policy Committee, he was a highly respected member. Outstanding—from the viewpoint of any Democratic Majority Leader—was his highly competent legislative skill in guiding major bills through the Senate.
This distinguished Senator endeared himself to me and to all of his colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—with his personal attributes of modesty, good humor, and kindliness. He made the day of many a tourist visiting the Capitol in Washington, or a staff aide, or a colleague, with his smile, his hello, and his effusion of human warmth.

I am going to add one final comment which, I believe, is the highest tribute that I can pay to Lister Hill and to this state of Alabama which sent him to Washington so many years ago. In the Nation's Capitol when some Members of Congress depart from its halls, they are found to have contracted a case of Potomac fever. The only known cure is by remaining in one capacity or another in Washington, D. C. Notwithstanding his exposure of over 45 years to the environment in which Potomac fever is endemic, there is no trace of the ailment in Lister Hill. He returned undefeated and in the best of health to his beloved Alabama where his roots were and will always be, where his heart is and will ever remain.
In honor of
Senator Albert Gore
At the Democratic Rally at the Fairgrounds Coliseum
Nashville, Tennessee
Saturday, November 15, 1969
6:30

I am delighted to join in this gathering, tonight, in honor of the leadership of the Democratic Party of Tennessee. Because of our long association, I am especially happy to be here with Senator Albert Gore.

He has been my colleague in the Senate for more than 17 years. I have called him friend for many years more. To me, Albert Gore is the personification of Tennessee. He is the embodiment of the best in public service.

Albert Gore and I served together in the House of Representatives. We entered the Senate together in 1953. Throughout all these years, we have worked side by side, on behalf of our respective states and the United States. We were drawn together from the outset because we speak for places where rivers are a common language of economic survival and we both happen to believe that they should be used for the good of all and not for the profit of the few.
Above all, we speak for people who believe in a decent peace and who want it sought by their government without "ifs," "ands," or "buts." We speak for an end to this tragic war which has divided the nation and its people. We are Democrats but, whatever their party affiliation or absence of it, we try to act on behalf of all of the people of our states.

The character of Albert Gore is written into his outstanding record in the House and Senate. His is a fierce integrity of mind and an unbridled independence of spirit. His is a vision of a splendid tomorrow for this nation and for its diverse peoples.

Albert Gore is one of the Senate's leading authorities on the nation's economy. Time and again he has warned of the dangers of high interest rates, inflation and inequitable taxation. Time and again, he has stood almost alone in beating back one or more of these assaults on the well-being of people of moderate income.

His warnings have gone unheeded for too long. Now the squeeze is on. Inflation is taking its toll out of the standard of living of tens of millions of Americans. Consumer prices have gone up 6 per cent this year. Inflation rides the market-basket of every shopper. Food prices are 5.7 per cent above the level of a year ago. Beef is up 13 per cent. Eggs are up 15 per cent.
The cost of mortgages, real estate, taxes, insurance, repairs and related expenses are up 11 per cent over 1968.

Unemployment was 3.5 per cent in August; it was 4.0 per cent in September— the highest level in two years, and the highest monthly increase since 1960. It may be a matter of coincidence, but 1960 also happens to be when the last Republican Administration was in charge in Washington. I repeat, it may be a matter of coincidence; then, again, it may also be a matter of stubborn Republicanism. Note that with a 5 per cent unemployment rate predicted in 1970, the Administration still declines to say whether this level would be "unacceptable."

Albert Gore does not decline to say. I know he does not find a 5 per cent rate of unemployment acceptable, just as he did not find an 8 per cent prime interest rate acceptable. Albert Gore is not the kind of Senator who will embrace a recession or depression in the guise of curbing an inflation.

Nor is Albert Gore willing to settle for the neglect of the health of Americans because they are unable to pay the sky-high cost of hospital and medical care. He was a leader in bringing Medicare programs to bear on the problem. Yet even this vital national program is now exposed to danger of insolvency because of runaway costs and a rampant inflation. Hospital charges alone have soared an astronomical 55 per cent, almost five times the rise in consumer prices.
This Administration has not delivered on its promise to curb inflation. It has opposed the Senate’s efforts to bring about reductions in wasteful and superfluous expenditures in the Defense Department. It does not appear to recognize the relationship of the tens of billions which we are spending annually for military purposes abroad and the rising inflationary pressures at home. Senator Gore understands that relationship. He also knows that the continuance of the surtax without relief from inflation and from the inequities in the income tax structure adds insult to the injury which millions of American wage-earners and salaries employees are already suffering. In full consultation with Senator Gore, therefore, the Democratic leadership in the Senate has resisted Administration demands for a continuance of the surtax unless there is also tax relief and tax reform. That is and has been a matter of Democratic policy in the Senate since the beginning of this session.

The fact is that the present income tax system is a gerrymandered house of special privileges for some at the expense of many. In the Senate we are now trying to restore a degree of order and fairness to this structure.

May I say that I look to Senator Gore for guidance in this matter because I know where his heart is and I know that he has the head to get us there.
To give you an example, on July 17, Senator Gore said on the Senate floor, "I know of no more unrealistic provision in the tax law than the $600 exemption for a taxpayer and for a taxpayer's dependent. Where is there a parent," he asked, "who can decently feed, clothe and provide shelter for a child for $600, or for himself or for his wife?"

If the views of the Democratic leadership in the Senate prevail, wage-earners and other persons on moderate incomes are going to get a measure of tax relief. As a senior member of the Senate Finance Committee, Albert Gore will be a moving force in this effort to bring about greater equity.

His work on the Foreign Relations Committee is also of the greatest significance. It bears directly on questions of fundamental importance to the entire nation—the war in Viet Nam and nuclear armsaments and disarmament. In sending Albert Gore to the Senate, Tennessee has kept alive the international tradition of this state which was personified by Cordell Hull over a quarter of a century ago. Senator Gore knows the world and the nation's international problems as do few men in the Congress or in the Administration. His views come into focus as a deep abhorrence of the tragedy of the war in Viet Nam and a deep hostility to the excesses and the waste which are sometimes concealed in the name of defense. There is a difference between patriotism and profiteering and Albert Gore is determined that it shall be reasserted and maintained.
Insofar as Viet Nam is concerned, his views have long since been straightforward and outspoken. He is not for "peace, but..." or "peace, if..." or "peace, perhaps..." He is, as he has long been, for "peace, period." I appreciate the President's difficulties in that situation as does Albert Gore. To be sure, President Nixon did not make the problem of Viet Nam. But, then, neither did President Johnson. Nor President Kennedy. Nor President Eisenhower. Its roots are deep and all of us, in a sense, have had a part in the planting.

Nevertheless, the war remains. The responsibility is now. It is the President's problem and, to the extent that we are Constitutionally empowered in the Senate and the Congress, it is our problem.

I am sure the President is seeking a way to peace according to his own lights. That he has a plan I do not doubt but he has yet to illuminate it.

A rational peace remains to be achieved and I do not yet see how it can be achieved except by the disengagement of this nation--not in stops and starts--but in an orderly manner from this involvement which is not now, never has and never can be our war.
This nation must not be the dog that is wagged by the tail of the Saigon
government. It must not be a rudderless ship waiting for the winds to shift in
Hanoi. We must make our own decisions in the light of the nation’s highest in-
terests. And so far as I am concerned, those interests call for the termination
of our involvement in Viet Nam at the soonest possible time.

The decisions must not be made for us by the Vietnamese of any faction.
Viet Nam is their country, not ours. After we are gone from it, whether they be
Nationalists, Viet Congs, Hoa Haos, Buddhists or Cao Daists—the Vietnamese will
still live in it and with one another.

Senator Gore said it another way on the Senate floor last November 4.
He said then that "this Nation should utilize its overwhelming presence in Viet
Nam to persuade the establishment of a broadly-based government that would include
the diverse factors, sects and faction, to serve as a means of concluding a peace-
ful settlement, and to provide some hope for the ultimate survival of democratic
processes and freedom in South Viet Nam."

On the issue of Viet Nam, as on all other major issues of our times,
the voice of Senator Gore has not been silent and must not be silenced. It is
a constructive voice in the Senate, for the State of Tennessee and for the nation.
There are other voices and they are raised, now, on all sides of the 
question of Viet Nam. As the war's frustrations persist, the divisions in the 
nation are deepening. The antagonisms are spreading. The decibals of violence 
and hate mongering are growing.

In the circumstances, it would be well to bear in mind that the First 
Amendment to the Constitution protects every citizen's rights to speak his mind 
freely, to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of 
grievances. That is the bedrock of the nation's freedom. The safeguarding of 
that right by Constituted authorities is not only a responsibility, it is a 
sacred duty.

I stress the word "peaceable" assembly as it is involved in the exercise 
of these Constitutional rights because these are difficult days and threats of 
disruption hang heavily over the nation. I do not believe in license or violence. 
Those who resort to it make a mockery of the Constitution. License and violence 
are contrary to law and those who violate the law must bear the consequences.
Albert Gore, I know, holds these sentiments. He knows the profound
significance of the First Amendment to the survival of the nation as well as the
necessity for maintaining public order. He has defended both throughout his years
in public life. He has stood not only for the peaceful exercise of Constitutional
rights by those with whom he may agree but by those with whom he may disagree.
That is as it should be, that is as it can only be if the Republic is to remain free.

In concluding, let me ask all of you to join in working to hold the confidence
of the people where we Democrats now possess it and to regain that confidence where
it has been withdrawn. I am persuaded that the democratic perception of the nation's
horizons is in accord with the needs of the people of the nation. We stand for a
determination to bring the war in Viet Nam to a rational end as soon as possible.
We stand for a redirection of the nation's resources from wasteful excesses in the
name of defense and from other spending of irrelevance to meeting the urgent inner
deficits of the nation---to strengthening education and health care, to safeguarding
the air, water, land and recreational resources of the nation, to improving the
livelihood of all of the American people (whether on the farms or in the cities),
to advancing the welfare of the elderly and to the reinforcement of public safety
throughout the nation.
There is a pressing need in the entire range of these basic requirements for a stable, progressive and satisfactory society. Democrats, out of power, must probe into these matters, not just with words but with hard work and deep commitment. Democrats in power must act on these matters within the limits of their capabilities.

I know Democrats. I know what they can do. Montana's delegation in Washington is 100 per cent Democratic—in both the House and the Senate. The Governor of Montana is a Democrat. A year from now it would be my hope that the people of Tennessee will make the same affirmation with the re-election of Albert Gore as Senator, with the election of Democrats to the Congress and to your state and local offices.
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I am delighted to be here tonight. I am delighted that I have been invited to join this gathering to honor the Democratic Party and to pay tribute to a man whom I have the privilege of calling a friend and colleague in the United States Senate. Robert Byrd and I have worked side by side for nearly 11 years on behalf of our respective States and the United States.

This audience is acquainted with much of the distinguished record of accomplishments which have highlighted Senator Byrd's career in the United States Senate. No member of that body has pursued his state's interest and the public good with more diligence or more effectively.
Coming from Montana, I know the difference between a show horse and a work horse. I also know that in Congress being the former may get your picture and name in the papers. Being the latter will inevitably gain you the respect and admiration of your constituents and colleagues.

Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia is not a show horse. He is a hard worker and the goals he seeks are those that perhaps drew us together early. Both of us speak for places where the land and water are a common language of economic survival; where a concern for nature and for nature's resources demands that they be used for the good of all and not for the profit of a few. Above all, we speak for people who believe in a decent peace and who want it sought by their government without "ifs," "ands," or "buts."

We speak as Democrats, but whatever their party affiliation or absence of it, we try to act on behalf of all of the people of our states.

The character of Robert Byrd is written into his outstanding record in your state and in the House and Senate. His is a fierce integrity of mind and an unbridled independence of spirit. His is a vision of a splendid tomorrow for this Nation and for its diverse peoples. And the people of West Virginia have long
recognized these outstanding qualities.

It was at the early age of 28 that Bob was elected to the West Virginia State House of Delegates. Since then he has held more legislative elective offices than any other person in the history of West Virginia, moving from the State House to the United States House of Representatives and on to the Senate. He has succeeded because he has spoken out and he has spoken out forcefully and effectively on the most important issues of the times. Time and again, for instance, Senator Byrd has warned of the dangers of high interest rates, inflation and inequitable taxation. Time and again, he has stood almost alone in beating back one or more of these assaults on the well-being of people of moderate income.

His warnings have gone unheeded for too long. Now the squeeze is on. Inflation is taking its toll out of the standard of living of tens of millions of Americans. Consumer prices have gone up 6 percent this year. Inflation rides the market-basket of every shopper. Food prices are 5.7 percent above the level of a year ago. Beef is up 13 percent. Eggs are up 15 percent. The cost of mortgages, real estate, taxes, insurance, repairs and related expenses are up 11 percent over 1968.
Unemployment was 3.5 percent in August; it was 4.0 percent in September—the highest level in two years, and the highest monthly increase since 1960. It may be a matter of coincidence, but 1960 also happens to be when the last Republican Administration was in charge in Washington. I repeat, it may be a matter of coincidence; then, again, it may also be a matter of stubborn Republicanism. Note that with a 5 percent unemployment rate predicted in 1970, the Administration still declines to say whether this level would be "unacceptable."

Robert Byrd does not decline to say. I know he does not find a 5 percent rate of unemployment acceptable, just as he did not find an 8 percent prime interest rate acceptable. Bob Byrd is not the kind of Senator who will embrace a recession or depression in the guise of curbing an inflation.

Nor is Bob willing to settle for the neglect of older Americans, of those who are unable to pay today's sky-high living costs out of a meager social security pension. Bob advocates a broad overhaul of our social security program. He knows that the elderly simply cannot survive adequately on present pension benefits. He says that eligibility should begin earlier and that widows should obtain a pension when they reach 50. What Bob says
is true and not only does he say it with words. He is there, pressing for it with hard work and with a deep commitment as well.

Like Bob also, I have a close affinity for mines and miners, and for the problems that have beset this age-old industry and those who have devoted a lifetime laboring beneath the ground, risking their lives so that others may enjoy the benefits yielded from the earth. Senator Byrd understands these problems. He is working to solve them. During the consideration of the Coal Mine Safety Act two months ago, Senator Byrd took the floor of the Senate to urge the approval of a provision that compensates those who have been disabled by a lifetime devoted to the mines. In pressing this special benefit Bob said—and I quote—"I feel that today we have proposed a measure which will bridge an important gap, and which will bring new hope to the mining population. I feel that it is necessary that we provide a way for old, disabled miners and their families to live without being dependent upon welfare. In so many instances, they long ago exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, and have been forced to go to the welfare offices, or to their children and stand up with their hats in their hands and hope for assistance. Here today we not only provide for some measure of assistance to the old, disabled, retired miner, but also lend some assistance to his children, who otherwise would have to provide help for their parents."

After he sat down, the Senate approved the Miner Health
disability provision by a vote of 91 to nothing. That is what I call a successful Senator.

It has been said that the measure of a man’s success may be determined by comparing what he is with what he might have been, what he has done with what he might have done. In other words, a man with ten aptitudes who has developed only five of them is not as great a success as a man who strives to develop himself to the fullest.

Using that yardstick for success, Bob Byrd has achieved more than his fair share. A leading member of the all-important Senate Appropriations Committee, he has worked tirelessly to pare down Government costs where there is fat in the budget and to shore up worthwhile programs that have suffered from neglect. He has worked just as effectively on the Senate Judiciary Committee, a Committee long reserved for the Senate's most able and analytical legal minds. In that respect, let me say that it was while serving in the Congress that Bob somehow found time to obtain his law degree.

But above all, perhaps, Senator Byrd has distinguished himself most in the Senate as a member of the Leadership. It has been as the Secretary to the Senate's Majority Conference, a post he was elected to unanimously by the Senate Democrats, that he has demonstrated his outstanding capacity to bring together the varying viewpoints that represent the Democratic Party in the Senate.
His great success in this endeavor is due in large measure because he himself has shunned the tags and labels that have come to characterize most politicians. If there is a label that fits, it is that of responsibility. For Senator Byrd has exhibited the deepest concern for all of the problems we face as this Nation enters another decade; a concern for the problems at home and the problems abroad and especially for the most difficult problem of all today—the problem of Vietnam.

Insofar as Vietnam is concerned, let me say that I appreciate the President's difficulties in that situation as does Senator Byrd. To be sure, President Nixon did not make the problem of Vietnam. But, then, neither did President Johnson. Nor President Kennedy. Nor President Eisenhower. Its roots are deep and all of us, in a sense, have had a part in the planting.

Nevertheless, the war remains. The responsibility is now. It is the President's problem and, to the extent that we are Constitutionally empowered in the Senate and the Congress, it is our problem.

I am sure the President is seeking a way to peace according to his own lights. That he has a plan I do not doubt but he has yet to illuminate it. A rational peace remains to be achieved and I do not yet see how it can be achieved except by the disengagement of this Nation—not in stops and starts—but in an
orderly manner from this involvement which is not now, never was
and never can be our war.

This Nation must not be the dog that is wagged by the tail of
the Saigon government. It must not be a rudderless ship waiting
for the winds to shift in Hanoi. We must make our own decisions
in the light of the Nation's highest interests. And so far as
I am concerned, those interests call for the termination of our
involvement in Vietnam at the soonest possible time.

The decisions must not be made for us by the Vietnamese of
any faction. Vietnam is their country, not ours. After we are
gone from it, whether they be Nationalists, Viet Congs, Hoa Haos,
Buddhists or Cao Daists--the Vietnamese will still live in it and
with one another.

On the issue of Vietnam, as on all other major issues of our
times, the voice of Senator Byrd has not been silent and must not
be silenced. It is a constructive voice in the Senate, for the
State of West Virginia and for the Nation.

There are other voices and they are raised, now, on all
sides of the question of Vietnam. As the war's frustrations
persist, the divisions in the Nation are deepening. The antago-
nisms are spreading. The decibels of violence and hatemongering
are growing.

In the circumstances, it would be well to bear in mind that
the First Amendment to the Constitution protects every citizen's
rights to speak his mind freely, to assemble peaceably and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. That is the bedrock of the Nation's freedom. The safeguarding of that right by Constituted authorities is not only a responsibility, it is a sacred duty.

I stress the word "peaceable" assembly as it is involved in the exercise of these Constitutional rights because these are difficult days and threats of disruption hang heavily over the Nation. I do not believe in license or violence. Those who resort to it make a mockery of the Constitution. License and violence are contrary to law and those who violate the law must bear the consequences.

Robert Byrd, I know, holds these sentiments. He knows the profound significance of the First Amendment to the survival of the Nation as well as the necessity for maintaining public order. He has defended both throughout his years in public life. He has stood not only for the peaceful exercise of Constitutional rights by those with whom he may agree but by those with whom he may disagree. That is as it should be, that is as it can only be if the Republic is to remain free.

In concluding, let me ask all of you to join in working to hold the confidence of the people where we Democrats now possess it and to regain that confidence where it has been withdrawn. I am persuaded that the Democratic perception of the Nation's
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horizons is in accord with the needs of the people of the Nation. We stand for a determination to bring the war in Vietnam to a rational end as soon as possible. We stand for a redirection of the Nation's resources from wasteful excesses in the name of defense and from other spending of irrelevance to meeting the urgent inner deficits of the Nation—to strengthening education and health care, to safeguarding the air, water, land and recreational resources of the Nation, to improving the livelihood of all of the American people (whether on the farms or in the cities), to advancing the welfare of the elderly and to the reinforcement of public safety throughout the Nation.

There is a pressing need in the entire range of these basic requirements for a stable, progressive and satisfactory society. Democrats, out of power, must probe into these matters, not just with words but with hard work and deep commitment. Democrats in power must act on these matters within the limits of their capabilities.

I know Democrats. I know what they can do. Montana's delegation in Washington is 100 percent Democratic—in both the House and the Senate. The Governor of Montana is a Democrat. Democratic success in Montana was achieved through hard work and a unified effort. Bob Byrd knows the meaning of these terms. He has been practicing both for years in the Senate. With your help he will continue to do so in the years ahead.