employees who are now uncovered—and number about 15 or 20 million. Indeed these employees cannot, in the greatest stretch of imagination, be called rich people.

I love the majority leader. I respect his objectivity. I think he is fair, and I admire his patience and diplomacy. But I completely disagree with him on the statement that H.R. 10 does not provide for the poor stiff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The poor working stiff. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. The poor working man. Actually, the farmer—the individual, self-employment farmer, the barber, the small grocery operator, and others—for the first time, will be able to provide for himself and herself a pension, something he was never before able to obtain. He contributes all the money himself—no one adds anything to his pension. But we allow him to lay this money aside for his old age—tax free.

This was the whole argument. This is why a majority of the Senate and the House voted for it, and all the conferees.

But the matter has been debated up and down and back and forth. The Senator from Rhode Island put his finger on it earlier when he stated that these matters have all been discussed and voted on. Nobody has sought to bring anything in here on a dark night, under cover, and not been willing to discuss it. All these matters have been debated in public for all to see.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, they have.

Mr. SMATHERS. They have been discussed and argued back and forth in our committee, on the floor of the Senate, in the House, in the House committee, and in conference; and the majority of Congress has apparently had its say. There are a few people who apparently disagree with that position. They have the right to disagree, but now they want to follow every stratagem and tactic available—as they have the right to do—in an attempt to defeat it. But I think the majority will ultimately prevail, if we will stay here and do our duty and vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will. But let me say that the Senator from Montana, notwithstanding his position on any measure, accepts the will of the majority, whether he likes it or not. As far as I am concerned, it is in and will stay in, and be a part of this bill.

Now I should like to end my personal filibuster but first I shall yield once more to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, earlier I put the question, why can we not take up the supplemental appropriation bill, upon which there is general agreement, and after that has been decided, take up this foreign investment bill?

The answer to that question was that if we dispose of the supplemental appropriation bill, no one will pay any attention to the foreign investment bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. The Senator is incorrect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was implied in the answer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio now and again, as we all do, makes statements which call for correction, and this is one. That statement was not made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, the statement implied that there would not be a quorum present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Exactly. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I submit that in principle there is not much difference between the two. That means, Mr. President, that there is no faith nor desire to pass this foreign investment bill.

It was not the Senator from Montana who yesterday motioned up the foreign investment bill before the supplemental appropriations; it was the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And he withdrew it at my request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But insist that it be brought back prior to the bringing up of the supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator aware of the fact that had the Senator from Louisiana desired to do so, he could have held up four other bills, because his matter was privileged at 10:30 yesterday morning?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, I understand that. But the point I am trying to make, Mr. President, is that I cannot subscribe to a procedure which contemplates taking up, in advance, what seems to be an unacceptable bill, and holding in abeyance a bill that is important to the Nation, and upon which there is no disagreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say, before I ask that the Journal be considered read——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I finish my remarks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, I thought the Senator had concluded. Surely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Louisiana, in discussing the merits, urged that Senators should vote for it because it contained provisions to take care of the aged.

That was the argument that was made, and that was the argument that was intended to overpower the thinking of the Members of the Senate. That provision is now out. All that is left are these very controversial provisions.

I desire to make one remark before I close. Tomorrow the Nation will be honoring in final words the great services rendered by the late Harry Byrd as a Member of the Senate. He was chairman of the Committee on Finance. Respect will be shown to him because of his