

[No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Allott	Griffin	Montoya
Bayh	Harris	Moss
Bible	Hart	Murphy
Brewster	Hartke	Muskie
Brooke	Holland	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Prouty
Cannon	Jackson	Randolph
Church	Javits	Ribicoff
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Curtis	Kennedy, Mass.	Spong
Dominick	Kennedy, N.Y.	Talmadge
Eastland	Lausche	Thurmond
Ellender	Long, La.	Tower
Ervin	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Gore	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—45

Aiken	Hansen	Morse
Anderson	Hatfield	Morton
Baker	Hayden	Mundt
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Nelson
Bennett	Hill	Pearson
Boggs	Kuchel	Percy
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Proxmire
Carlson	Mansfield	Scott
Case	McCarthy	Smith
Clark	McClellan	Sparkman
Cooper	McGee	Stennis
Dirksen	McGovern	Symington
Fannin	Metcalf	Tydings
Fulbright	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—4

Dodd	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
Inouye		

So Mr. ELLENDER's motion to strike was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] are absent because of illness.

Also I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent by leave of the Senate.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Aiken	Fong	McGee
Allott	Fulbright	McGovern
Anderson	Gore	McIntyre
Baker	Griffin	Metcalf
Bartlett	Gruening	Miller
Bayh	Hansen	Mondale
Bennett	Harris	Monroney
Bible	Hart	Montoya
Boggs	Hartke	Morse
Brewster	Hatfield	Morton
Brooke	Hayden	Moss
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Murphy
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Muskie
Cannon	Hollings	Nelson
Carlson	Hruska	Pastore
Case	Jackson	Pearson
Church	Javits	Pell
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Percy
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Cotton	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Curtis	Kuchel	Randolph
Dirksen	Lausche	Scott
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Magnuson	Smith
Ellender	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ervin	McCarthy	Spong
Fannin	McClellan	Stennis

Symington	Williams, N.J.	Young, N. Dak.
Talmadge	Williams, Del.	Young, Ohio
Tydings	Yarborough	

NAYS—5

Dodd	Ribicoff	Tower
Long, La.	Thurmond	

NOT VOTING—3

Inouye	Jordan, N.C.	Russell
--------	--------------	---------

→ So the resolution (S. Res. 112), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, yesterday as shown on page 16988 of the RECORD, I obtained unanimous consent to have inserted into the RECORD at this point a sampling of the news articles which caused TOM DODD's case to be tried in the press and which made impartial deliberation here impossible. I now submit a copy of those articles:

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967]

THE GRACEFUL WAY OUT

The additional charges against Senator Dodd by four of his former employees are well known to the Senate Ethics Committee. In its long probe into the conduct of the controversial Connecticut Senator, the Committee has taken note of many documents and of much evidence that did not get into its public hearings. It is reasonable to suppose that the Committee's recommendations, which are expected within the next two weeks, will be based on the whole gamut of Mr. Dodd's misconduct.

It is also clear that the evidence leaves Senator Dodd without a leg to stand on. Mr. Dodd himself admitted that he had collected \$170,000 from testimonial dinners from 1961 to 1965, to be used as he saw fit. His office sent bills for the same travel expenses to the Senate and various private groups in seven instances. The picture presented in the current letter is one of repeated acceptance of money from people for whom the Senator was in a position to do official favors. It is charged, for example, that nine men whom he recommended for Federal appointments gave or lent him nearly \$90,000.

Numerous aspects of the case point to the assumption that the findings of the Committee will be sent to the Department of Justice for possible presentation to a grand jury. But the public is more interested in what the response of the Senate itself will be. In our view, that body cannot possibly ignore practices which cut so deeply into its own integrity.

As for Senator Dodd, his best course would be to resign. Even without the latest charges, his usefulness was at an end. The least the Ethics Committee can do is to censure him, and the best service that a censured Senator can render to his state is to make his office available to someone who can function without so grave a handicap.

Drastic action will also be expected of the Senate to correct the impression that the legislative process is a swapping of rewards for donations. The best course which the Senate can take is that which was recommended the other day by Senator Morton. Hard-headed political leader though he is, the Kentucky Republican came out for annual disclosure of senatorial income, assets and liabilities. That is the logical answer to the Dodd case in the Senate and the Powell case in the House. It is inconceivable that Senator Dodd would have done what he did if he had had to report in detail his lavish gifts from people eager to draw upon his official influence.

It is time for the Senate to end the flow of tainted money into senatorial pockets.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1967]

RESIGN

Senator Thomas J. Dodd has so diminished his power and influence by his private acts

and public explanations of them that there is not much he can do for his country. There is one thing he can do, and he should not delay doing it until even that is beyond his reach.

His selfish exploitation of his friends to enhance his personal wealth, maintain his political place and enrich his private life, as revealed by his own admissions entitles him to universal contempt. He is a disgrace to the Senate. He is a liability to his State. He is an embarrassment to his colleagues. He is an encumbrance to anything he embraces.

If he stays in the Senate, his endorsement will be the worst misfortune that can befall any legislative measure. Whenever he rises to speak, his reputation will stand beside him, like Banquo's ghost. The sponsor of every good legislative proposal will live in the constant terror that it will be overtaken by the fatal indictment of his endorsement.

What the Senate does with him or to him is now almost irrelevant. To every practical intent the seat he occupies is empty. Nothing the Senate does can put life back into a ghost as irrevocably lost to the political living as though he had been overtaken by corporate calamity. His daily presence in the Senate is a pain-inflicting spectacle. He stands a veritable monument to many of the frauds, frailties and flaws in our public life. The very sight of him must wound every man of sensibility and patriotism who has the capacity to reflect upon the curious follies of our elective system.

The Senator alone can end this daily anguish which the citizenry must endure as long as he remains in public life. Let him have mercy upon himself, who is indeed in need of mercy. Let him have mercy upon his countrymen, who by this final public act might be awakened to some mercy. Let him quietly take himself off the national stage and end a spectacle that is becoming an obscenity.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 28, 1967]

THE DODD JUDGMENT

It is impossible to read the report of the Senate Ethics Committee without coming to the conclusion that Senator Dodd richly deserves the censure which his peers have unanimously recommended. The committee also acted properly in referring "possible violations of law" by Dodd to the Department of Justice and the Internal Revenue Service.

No one can enjoy watching the ruin of a man's career. This is especially true when, as in Dodd's case, his fall from grace resulted in part from the secret rifling of his files by former employees—conduct which the committee described as "reprehensible," and which also was referred to the Attorney General as a possible violation of law. When all is said, however, the fact remains that the Senator from Connecticut brought his ruin down on his own head.

His handling of funds and certain of his other activities as the report correctly says, was "contrary to accepted morals, derogates from the public trust expected of a Senator, and tends to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute."

We do not doubt for a moment that the Senate, already stung by the Bobby Baker episode, should and will approve the resolution of censure proposed by the committee.

In the face of this, Dodd, still says that his "conscience is clear," that he has done nothing wrong, that he will remain in the Senate and that he will leave the final verdict to the voters of Connecticut in 1970.

This is a statement that is utterly devoid of sensitivity. Whatever the decision of the Connecticut voters may be, Thomas J. Dodd will stand condemned in the public mind as a man who betrayed the high trust reposed in him.