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INTERVIEW OF SENATOR MANSFIELD ON ABC'S "ISSUES AND ANSWERS" TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the transcript of a television interview which I had on ABC's "Issues and Answers." On Sunday, February 1, 1970.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Transcript of interview]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I would point out that it was estimated that the Sentinel system itself would cost somewhere in the vicinity, if not more, and if we are getting a combination, it appears to me that with the cost increase, we would have to add to it that it would come at least to that figure if you put in the whole system because, remember, it is not just Washington state, southern New England, Texas, the Southeastern part of the United States, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, a part of the Dakotas, D.C. and perhaps eventually sites in Alaska and Hawaii. Those last two have not been mentioned.

I may say that the present estimates for the hard point missile systems in Montana and North Dakota have already far exceeded the original estimates.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, do you think if you look at this year's budget, that the ABM system was needed for defense of American cities rather than for the very limited defensive purposes to which it had been submitted to Congress for our own antimissile sites, that he would have won that big Senate battle which, of course, he won by only one vote?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, that margin was essentially one vote.

Mr. CLARK. Senator MANSFIELD. The margin was essentially one vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I don't know. I would imagine that if the results would have been the same whether it was a Sentinel system or a Safeguard system.

Mr. CLARK. There were two or three Senators at least among those who had indicated some reservations about the system but then swung the other direction when the President proposed only the very limited system. You don't think some people who voted with the President last year might not be now pulled back the other way?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That I couldn't say because this matter was in effect just springing on us. I had only read speculative reports that there would be an expansion of the present system. Those reports were denied and then the President, of course, made it official in his press conference the other night.

Mr. CLARK. Do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the Administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have no access to such information. Although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know, as has been reported, that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are, whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.

Mr. CLARK. In giving one of his reasons for turning down the Sentinel system when the President made his announcement, he would have won by only one vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, we have the option to say do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the Administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. CLARK. In the administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, I have no access to such information although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know as has been reported that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are or whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, I have no access to such information although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know as has been reported that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are or whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, I have no access to such information although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know as has been reported that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are or whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, I have no access to such information although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know as has been reported that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are or whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, do you see anything that has happened in the past year in the conduct of Red China that would justify the shift in the administration's position to point that anti-missile system on China rather than just protecting our own missile sites?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Senator, I have no access to such information although I am quite certain the President undoubtedly has there certainly can't be any question but that the Chinese are going ahead with their missile system. How good it is, how effective it is, whether it is an ICBM or an ICBM system, I am not sure at the present time. I do know as has been reported that they at least have the IRBMs, whether they are or whether they have developed an ICBM system capacity. I am not sure of that at this point.
February 3, 1970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 1047

Mr. SCALI. Senator, you called the President of the Senate of the Union Address the other day about the President's position with regard to Vietnam. I don't know what is going to happen if we keep on this way because if we keep on building weapons, some day we may use them and someday the people of the world are going to suffer.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, we have heard a great deal of talk from the Democrats on foreign policy and some of them have been talking for months about reordering national priorities. Now what happens to national priorities and how you spend your revenues is or health or education, if you get into an extremely costly program of anti-missile defense, you might have to cut back on the problems of pollution, the needs of the cities, the needs of people who are here at home. Both of them must go together.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the President is all that too high a priority to defense, then, Senator?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think so, but I must admit I don't have personal information as to how it is going to happen. I have been going better skelter in the spending of defense funds and only in the past year or so has the Congress and especially the Senate been raising questions and trying to draw back on some of that, some of those ill-conceived contracts and some of these weapons which have proved useless but on which billions have been spent.

Mr. CLARK. There is, Senator, a mounting impression in Washington that Democrats are interested in the President to prevent the field in the critical areas of priorities, in thinking of pollution and health and welfare programs, even draft reform where the President mentioned it at the last minute in the last Congress.

Are Democrats being outmaneuvered by a President who is interested in domestic problems rather than they expected in the White House?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I don't think so, and I do not believe that is the case in the nation. The welfare of the people which must always come first. It isn't a matter of being politically wise to take political advantage. It is a matter of doing what you can for the country as a whole and if it affects your welfare and you lose it, it is immaterial. The country must come first always.

Mr. CLARK. Scooty Reston, writing this last week in the New York Times, referred to you as a saint and he said a cooperative saint.

Senator MANSFIELD. He doesn't know me very well.

Mr. CLARK. But his point seemed to be that you were sometimes a little too gentle with the administration. Do you find your sainthood in the sort of rough partisan politics that some Democratic leaders find that they are not interested in. Senator MANSFIELD. Well, let me say I do not think that this is the case. I believe in cooperation and accommodating and then let the chips fall where they may.

The thing that always counts with me is the way you go about your business and not in a position to achieve much in the way of results.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, you called the President's State of the Union Address the other day about the elections. I don't know what is going to happen if we keep on this way because if we keep on building weapons, some day we may use them and someday the people of the world are going to suffer.

Senator MANSFIELD. But general.

Mr. SCALI. A spokesman for the Democratic National Committee has labeled it fuzzy, misleading and partly inaccurate.

Now, who are the voters supposed to believe? What is the unified voice for the Democrats?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, the Democrats have said if they win the election you can expect that all of that, you are expecting the impossible. But we survive and as far as whom the people of the country want to choose, the next Congress will be in the spring. Senator CLARK. Vice President Agnew said today on another program that the Democrats don't seem to be a cohesive force in this election year.

Senator MANSFIELD. Neither do the Republicans, so it works both ways.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, a federal judge has just given the nation a ten-day reprieve from a now COAST-to-COAST to Chicago plan to act to avert another crisis in just ten days from today?

Senator MANSFIELD. I don't think, at this moment, but any proposals the President wishes to send to us, we will be glad to receive and consider.

Mr. SCALI. Do you believe the President should do more than he has done to avert a new crisis?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, that is up to him. He seems to be loath to become involved in these labor disputes, which I think is a mistake. When is the conference, but have you got to lose by trying to talk these people into an agreement? And I think if this thing goes into effect, as it well might—it almost did yesterday—that the President will have to involve himself some way, and should.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, you then that a little jawboning by the President might be helpful in this critical period?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think so. It wouldn't hurt.

Mr. SCALI. There is still considerable vocal opposition to Judge Carswell's nomination among some Senate Democrats. Have you any knowledge of the decision which the President might make and do you think Mr. Nixon will win this time?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I haven't decided because I think any nominee of any President is entitled to the courtesy of having the hearings read and those hearings are continuing. I will read the hearings with great interest, then I will make up my mind.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, you said after the Senate's rejection last year of Judge Haynsworth that from now on all judicial nominations and other important nominations should be subject to very intensive scrutiny by the Senate.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Do you think that process has been completed by the Senate in this case, in the case of Judge Carswell?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, no, because the hearings are still going on, and I would assume they will not be completed for at least a week more, maybe longer, and then the votes will have to give due consideration to the findings of the Senate's committee when the nomination is reported out.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding another round of public hearings this week on Vietnam, even though the Nixon Administration has expressed doubt that they can serve a useful purpose.

What useful purpose do you think they can serve at this time?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, first, let me say that the hearings are not necessarily on Vietnam. There are a number of resolutions which have been introduced by the Senate in the first session of the 91st Congress. They have been held over. The Foreign Relations Committee has to look into the matter of courtesy to the President, and the position in which he finds himself, but these Senators have introduced a number of resolutions that are entitled to be heard and they will be heard.

Mr. CLARK. I believe, Senator MANSFIELD, the committee that has been signers is one generally supporting the President's Vietnam policy. You have to support any of the other resolutions that they will be examining.

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes, I am a sponsor of the Mathias resolution which calls for a reassessment and a reevaluation of this Tonkin Gulf, the Formosa resolution, the Mid-East resolution and any other extraordinary powers which have been given to the President since the end of the Korean War.

Mr. CLARK. Right. I meant the other specific plans for Vietnam withdrawal, and a number of those that are going to be examined.

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I think the President is marching to the height of the circumstances which confront him. I wish he could move faster. I am sure he wishes the same, but at least he is getting us out. That is the main word, out, and we aren't going in and up, as was the case—Senator CLARK. And you are happy with the present.

Senator MANSFIELD. Not happy, but it is a step in the right direction. I wish it could be faster.

Mr. SCALI. What do you think of the suggestion the President is going to make to the Congress to build up any single stand-out candidate who can take on Mr. Nixon in 1972?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I think as of now Mr. Muskie is the leading contender and he is a man of great integrity, dignity and intelligence.

Mr. CLARK. How wide do you feel that lead is?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would say of the moment the President would be in the lead, but you asked about a candidate and I think we have one.

Mr. CLARK. I meant how wide do you think Senator Muskie's lead would be over other Democratic candidates?

Senator MANSFIELD. At the moment quite wide.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, Ambassador Sargent Shriver has been in Maryland in the past few days checking on prospects that he would run as a Governor of Maryland. Would you like to see him run for Governor of Maryland?

Senator MANSFIELD. I never interfere in state politics.

Mr. SCALI. Do you see Sargent Shriver as a potential national leader?

Senator MANSFIELD. In a sense, yes.

Mr. CLARK. If we can get by for just a moment to that wide lead of Senator Muskie, this do to people like Hubert Humphrey who is making motions like he might be interested in having another go?
platform and the University of Minnesota and state justifying enough
to give him the national publicity which he
should receive.

Ed Muskie has the platform. He is using it
judiciously. He isn’t pushing himself too far.
When Hubert comes back to the Senate, as
I am sure he will, there will have that
platform. The picture then might change.

Mr. CLARK. You haven’t mentioned any
names other than Senator Muskie. Are there
any others that you think are in the run-
ing?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes. There is Sena-
tor McGovern, who has indicated an interest.

Mr. CLARK. Senator Harris, who has indicated
likewise, and there will be others from time
to time. There always are.

Mr. SCALI. Doesn’t President Nixon look
unwasteful right now?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, he looks like he
is in the middle.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, if we can move back
into the foreign policy area for a while, the
French Government has announced the
sale of 110 or so Mirage fighters to the Libyan
Government and the State Department has
expressed concern on this. Are you at all
upset?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I think we have
to just roll along with these things as they
happen and do the best we can to try and
maintain some degree of equilibrium in the
Middle East to do what we can to bring the
Israelis and the Arabs together, if that is
possible, but in the meantime to work to-
gether with the other powers to see if we
can’t find some ways and means of pre-
venting a holocaust in that area.

Mr. SCALI. Some of your colleagues believe
that Mr. Nixon’s effort to establish a more
even-handed policy in the Middle East winds
up helping the Arabs more than the Israelis.
Do I take it that you disagree with that?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would think that the
President is trying to work his way right
through the middle of the difficulty which
exists in that area, to move with an even
hand. He has indicated that he intends to
give some additional help to Israel based, I
believe, on the visit of Golda Meir some
weeks ago, plus previous commitments made
by the previous administration. But it is a
difficult area and I understand the posi-
tion in which the President finds him-
selv’. He is trying to find a way out, I would
hopes would be possible for the Arabs and
the Israelis to get together, so that the
Israel know-how could be used to help
the Middle East and this matter could be
done away with as far as the continuing
unneatness is concerned. Together the Arabs
and Israelis could do great things; apart,
there is nothing but trouble.

Mr. CLARK. In the eyes of the Israelis, Sena-
tor Mansfield, an even-handed policy is an
effort by the big powers to impose a solu-
tion for peace in the Middle East.

Senator MANSFIELD. No. I don’t think we
can impose a peace. All we can do is use
our good offices and hope that out of that
will come some sort of a settlement which
will be as satisfactory as possible to both.
You can’t achieve a settlement, a complete
settlement which will be satisfactory to one
or the other.

Mr. CLARK. Some Democrats, including for-
ter Vice President Humphrey, have been
very critical of the Administration’s plans
for the Middle East. Again, with this line
that it is taking an anti-Israeli turn
you disagree, I take it, with Mr. Humphrey?

Senator MANSFIELD. I don’t think that is the
Administration’s viewpoint at all. If any-
thing, I would say it is quite sympathetic to-
wars Israel and as a matter of fact Israel is
getting definite military assistance from this
country in the form of planes and the like.

Mr. SCALI. Senator Mansfield, were you dis-
urbed at all that Under Secretary of State
Richardson has shot down your suggestion
that we begin to withdraw some of the
10,000 American troops that we still have in
Europe?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not at all. As a matter
of fact, I welcomed what he had to say in
Chicago. It marks the beginning of a dia-
logue. There are two sides to the question. I
would point out that in reality as far as a
“Sense of the Senate” resolution is con-
cerned, we already have the votes because
there are 51 cosponsors of the resolution
which seeks to bring about a substantial
withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe, who
number at the present time, counting de-
pending something of the order of 600,000,
and who comprise a balance of payments
drain, a gold drain which extends into the
billions of dollars.

Mr. SCALI. Mr. Richardson pointed out that
studies have indicated that flying American
troops to Western Europe in time of emer-
gency instead of keeping them there would
not be very efficient, that by the time the
men were flown there, too much time might
have elapsed and they might not be very
effective.

Senator MANSFIELD. He has a point there,
but he is thinking in terms of conventional
warfare. In my opinion if a showdown ever
comes in Europe, it won’t be settled by means
of conventional Armies, it will be settled
on a nuclear basis.

Mr. CLARK. We don’t want to end this
program on too ponderous a note. Senator
Mansfield, but we do want to solicit your
feelings on the question that perhaps pro-
voked more comment than any other in the
Capitol this past week. What do you think
about those new formal uniforms for the
White House police?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not much.

Mr. CLARK. Do you think that the Senate
might follow suit and have a Congressional
Guard of Honor?

Senator MANSFIELD. Heaven forbid.

Mr. SCALI. Do you see this, even in a light
way, as a little tactical mistake by the White
House?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, well, these things
happen.

Mr. CLARK. You are not disturbed enough
about it to propose that some new uniform
be designed?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, no, not at all. I
think there have been too many changes of
uniforms in the White House already under
this Administration.

Mr. CLARK. Senator, I am sorry, our time
is running out. We have covered a lot of
territory today and it has been a great
pleasure having you with us on ISSUES AND
ANSWERS.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you very much.