

scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, March 22, 1995, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to review the findings of a report prepared for the Committee on the cleanup of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

Those wishing to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call David Garman at (202) 224-7933 or Judy Brown at (202) 224-7556.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS
MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG, Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management to receive testimony on S. 506, the Mining Law Reform Act of 1995.

The hearing will take place Thursday, March 30, 1995, at 9:30 am in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written testimony statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Michael Flannigan at (202) 224-6170.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREST AND PUBLIC LANDS
MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG, Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Lands Management to receive testimony for a general oversight on the Forest Service land management planning process.

The hearing will take place Wednesday, April 5, 1995, at 9:30 am in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written testimony statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey at (202) 224-2878.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO
MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet on Monday, March 13, 1995, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in room 215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing on the Consumer Product Index.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE SENATOR

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the members of the Presbyterian clergy with whom I have had the chance to work on historical projects and other things is the Reverend Robert Tabscott.

He sent me some observations he made 21 years ago about our former colleague, Senator Bill Fulbright. Bill Fulbright was a remarkable public servant.

I had the chance to work with him on exchange programs and other matters in the area of foreign policy.

To get a little more perspective on the impact of Senator Fulbright on people, it is good to read what Robert Tabscott wrote almost 21 years ago.

I ask that the tribute be printed in the RECORD.

The tribute follows:

[November 1974]

THE SENATOR

(By Robert Tabscott)

Reaching back in my memories I was first appreciative of William Fulbright in the early fall of 1961 when he eulogized the fallen Dag Hammarskjöld. Six years later in Mississippi I read his book, "The Arrogance of Power." It was a watershed for me: a provocative word in a hard and sterile time. The book challenged the American dream of opulence and power and called for a rediscovery of the values of Jefferson and the American revolution. But more, it was a fervent appeal for a new tolerance among us for people of differing philosophies and cultures. The book shook my patriotic myths and aroused a circumspection for which I shall always be grateful.

So when it became possible to interview the Senator on one of my recent visits to Washington, I was beside myself. Meeting him in the privacy of his large comfortable office, it was hard to imagine him as an international figure. He was surrounded by half-packed cartons of books (a prelude to his departure from the Senate), a cumbersome stack of magazines and papers, several bottles of mineral water and at least a week's supply of health foods and vitamins. Entering the office, I stood motionless. "Sit down," he said in a sonorous voice. I was extremely nervous and he waited for me to gain my composure. "You will have to excuse me," I said, "but this is quite an occasion for me." Graciously, he coaxed me on. "Well I am glad I could give you this time." I described my work and the Rockefeller grant and asked if I could take notes. He smiled and said, "I don't know if I will say anything important, but you may." And so I did.

J. William Fulbright was born in Missouri sixty-nine years ago. But he grew up in Arkansas, enjoying the benefits of a well-known and prosperous family. He won honors at the University in Fayetteville and was awarded a coveted Rhodes scholarship. His three years at Oxford were indelible. He read Tennyson, Lord Byron, Dryden, inspected Norman Churches, sought out Canterbury and Stradford and buried himself in English history and political thought. In 1928 he settled for a time in Vienna. From there he ventured with a friend to Salonika, Athens, and the Balkans. But his mind probed even further into Chinese history, Russian literature, and Creek philosophy.

At 34 he became the president of the University of Arkansas. Two years later during a political controversy he was asked to resign by the governor. He refused and was promptly fired. It was 1942. That spring, young Fulbright decided to run for Congress. Contrary to almost everyone's expectations, he was elected. By 1945 he had become the junior senator from Arkansas and had launched a career that would span thirty years and bring him international prominence.

We probably know William Fulbright best as chairman of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee and for his untiring efforts to achieve détente with Russia and a better understanding of world Communism. For that he has been labeled a liberal and Communist sympathizer.

His greatest and most difficult years were between 1950 and 1973. At times he stood alone as he did against the maniacal red crusade of Joseph McCarthy, or as a persistent critic of two Administrations' Vietnam policies. On other occasions he has been painfully silent as he was during the Little Rock crisis and throughout most of the Civil Rights movement. The Senator is far from the hero his supporters have wanted him to be. But what is significant is that he has remained a man of conscience and integrity who has not sought to cover his inconsistencies but has acknowledged the painful struggle of public service and the burden of political compromise.

Two events illustrate that tension. On August 6, 1964, President Johnson requested Fulbright to introduce the famous Tonkin Resolution which gave the chief executive authority, " * * * to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." That action put us into a land war in Asia. Only two Senators, Morse of Oregon and Gruening of Alaska, voted against the resolution. But by February, 1965, Fulbright had become disillusioned. He was alarmed, " * * * by the tyranny of Puritan virtues, of the dogmatic ideology of false patriotism and a resurgence of manifest destiny in American life." The Senator would later confess that the Tonkin Resolution was one of the most regrettable mistakes of his public life.

In 1957, 19 senators and 77 representatives from the eleven states of the old Confederacy, drafted a manifesto attacking the Supreme Court's historic decision on segregation. "The court," they said, "had substituted naked power for established law." The signers pledged themselves " * * * to resist integration through all lawful means and by any lawful means." J. William Fulbright signed the Manifesto.

But there were reasons, he contended. It was an election year and there was great pressure in the south. He could leave his southern colleagues and go his own way or stay with them and be assured of remaining in the Senate. Better to compromise and to fight again. He was convinced that he could not survive if he stood alone. He chose to remain silent. Many were shocked and disappointed because of his actions.

But when you consider the events of the last decade there were few men and women in public life who stood apart to face the crisis of Little Rock, Vietnam, Selma, Kent State or Attica. At a time when the South needed the wisdom of its statesmen, not one major figure dared to challenge the old myths. It was left to a heroic company of black men and women and an unlikely army of students, teachers, ministers, editors, lawyers, judges, and businessmen to stir the nation's conscience and to open a way for politicians to follow.