Senate agreed to accept the House provision with a clarifying amendment.

John Sparkman, WILLIAM PROXMIRE. HARRISON WILLIAMS, Jr., THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, Bob Packwood, Managers on the Part of the House. WRIGHT PATMAN, LEONOR K. SULLIVAN. HENRY S. REUSS, FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, FRANK ANNUNZIO, THOMAS M. REES, WILLIAM R. COTTER. PARREN J. MITCHELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be recommitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit the

conference report.
Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There appears to be a sufficient second and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll——
Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President. does the Senator from Wyoming still have the

Mr. McGEE, Yes

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader for the purpose of a request he is about to propound.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I

may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, would he consider a time limitation for the debate on the motion?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I will consider it, and probably will a little later. I would prefer to talk to one or two

Senators to see what they have in mind.
Mr. MANSFIELD. May I point out that
many Senators have left, and are leaving. This motion merely means it will go to conference, and something could be done on a 5- or 10-minute basis. The issues have been made clear in the course of the 10- or 15-minute discussion already.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if any other Senator on the floor wants to give an indication that he wants to talk and for how long. I will not speak until such a Senator does. I will agree to 10 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I see no sign of any Senator wishing to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after I have been given some recognition, there be a 20-minute time limitation on this motion, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Wisconsin and the proposer of the motion, the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, some of us are interested in rent controls. If the Senator wants 20 minutes on this issue, some Senators think this other issue should be raised, and I think another 5 minutes should be allowed for us to have anything to say about it that we think should be said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the request for an additional 5 minutes on that basis.

Mr PROXMIRE, Fifteen minutes on a

Mr. MANSFIELD. Fifteen and ten. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader, without losing my right to the floor.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 91-510, as amended, placing restrictions on the number of committees a Senator may serve on, that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Cannon) be permitted to serve on the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, created by Senate Resolution 338 of the 88th Congress, second session.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the majority leader is making an exception to the Legislative Reorganization Act, which provides that Senators may be permitted to serve only on a certain number of committees.

Our previous experience with the Legislative Reorganization Act has shown that continued exceptions act as an erosion of the act, so that finally the act was completely destroyed.

The ethics committee is a certain, special, unique committee. The ethics committee is composed of, and should be composed of, the most respected and honored Members of this body. The ethics committee should have on it members who have absolute integrity, and they are most likely to be some of the busiest Members of the Senate. So I think there is a unique situation in this category of naming a man to the ethics committee.

While normally I would object to any erosion of the Legislative Reorganization Act through the proliferation of Senators serving on more committees than allowed by that act, I think this is a unique situation—unique in the finest category of that word. I hope that no precedent is being established for putting a Senator on the Ethics Committee so he can serve as the majority leader would like him to serve. Therefore, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I say I agree completely with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Montana, who has just spoken, I would not make this proposal unless it was an unusual situation, and I want the Senator to know I appreciate his understanding, and to reiterate, as much as I can, that it is not to be considered a precedent for future action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Senate Resolution 338 of the 88th Congress, second session, appoints the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I feel I have the floor, subject to the will of the Senate, and I would like, before the time begins to run, to ask 5 minutes for

THE DETERIORATING SITUATION IN CAMBODIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on April 12, I addressed myself briefly to the deteriorating situation in Cambodia.
While I do not approve of the 42d consecutive day bombing runs over Cambodia I recognize and accept the fact, in my opinion, that the administration is en-deavoring to find a way out of what is to them, and this country, a difficult, embarrassing, and dangerous situation. There is also talk that the President is considering sending Dr. Kissinger to Paris, again, to meet with the North Vietnamese to try and build a firmer base for a cease-fire in Vietnam and Laos and, hopefully, to lay the base for a Cambodian cease-fire. I hope this is true. In my judgment, the problem of Cambodia is not military but diplomatic and the important factor is to find someone who can pull the country together again. I hope the resignation of the Cambodian Cabinet, just announced, is a prelude to serious negotiations between all the participants in the civil war now raging in that unhappy nation. But a continuing con-cern over the direction of events leads me to return to the subject again today. By putting our bombers, an airlift and a river convoy all at the service of the Phnom Penh government, we are already on a course of deepening involvement in the internal affairs of Cambodia and what may well be a collapsing government. Moreover, we may well be also inviting the breakdown of the fragile cease-fire in Vietnam and Laos.

The fact is, Mr. President, that we had no business of the American people in Cambodia 3 years ago. We have no business there now and we are still paying the price in dollars and may, again, begin to pay in lives. Nor can I see the remotest valid business of the American people there tomorrow. But then, what was the business of the American people in the military involvement in Vietnam and Laos?

Yet, here we are at this late date digging ourselves deeper into another tragic military involvement, inflicting one more vast compass of devastation on one more hapless land, in support of one more irrelevant government, in one more obscure region of Indochina. In my judgment, to continue to pursue this vein is to cast into doubt all that has been achieved by way of negotiation in Vietnam.

Is it not time to ask ourselves: Why? What for? For whom? And to ask the questions again and again? On what constitutional grounds do we risk a single American life in or over Cambodia? On what authority do we spend \$150,000 or thereabouts of the people's money for each of the hundreds of sorties which are being flown around the Cambodian capital of Phnom Penh? What far-out concept of national interest, obligation, or whatever compels us to wreak further