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The Senate met at 11:15 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. Ellender).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We commend to Thee, O Lord, all who are engaged in the Government of this Nation. Grant to them integrity of purpose and unfailing devotion to the cause of righteousness. May all their legislation be such as will promote the welfare of the people, succor the poor, relieve the oppressed, bring new opportunities to the underprivileged, correct bad policies and reduce social wrongs, to Thy glory and the good example of the people, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 2, 1971, be approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A CONVERSATION WITH THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on January 26, the TV networks very generously made available a substantial amount of time for congressional Democrats to set forth views on current issues.

I agreed to make this appearance, with the concurrence of the Senate Democratic conference and the distinguished Speaker of the House (Mr. Albert) whom I would have preferred to have seen speaking for the Democrats as he can so ably do, but who was unable because of a previous on-call commitment to undertake the telecast at the time.

I want to make clear that while the occasion was billed as a "Democratic state of the Union message," it was not so intended. There is only one person who can deliver a state of the Union message in this Nation and that is the President of the United States, whoever he may be.

It is both his constitutional prerogative and his responsibility as the sole political representative of the Nation as a whole. I would not presume to intrude on either that right or that responsibility. He speaks for the Nation on the state of the Union and, of course, answers to the Nation as a whole on the state of the Union.

My appearance was simply a Democratic point of view on the current situation as elicited from me in the course of "A Conversation With the Majority Leader"—animated but pleasant—by four distinguished American correspondents: Roger Mudd, CBS News; Bill Monroe, NBC News; Robert Clark, ABC News; and Frank Mankiewicz for Public Broadcasting.

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript be included at this point in the Record.

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

A CONVERSATION WITH THE MAJORITY LEADER

(As broadcast over the CBS television network Tuesday, January 26, 1971, 10:10-10:45 p.m., e.t.)

With: Roger Mudd for CBS News; Bill Monroe for NBC News; Robert Clark for ABC News; Frank Mankiewicz for Public Broadcasting.

ANNOUNCERS. From CBS in Washington, "The State of the Union—A Democratic View". As it was in recent years following the President’s State of the Union, the CBS Network has provided time for the opposition party to present its views on the state of the union. The invitation was sent to, and accepted by, the Democratic party leadership in the Congress, and the following was recorded in the course of the conversation.

In the office of Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana, the Senator has chosen to give his party’s view of the state of the union through an interview with representatives chosen by the four networks.

The conversation was unrehearsed, with no restrictions on topics discussed. Senator Mansfield has been Majority Leader since 1961.

With him tonight are Frank Mankiewicz of NBC for Public Broadcasting; Roger Mudd, Congressional Correspondent for CBS News; Robert Clark, Congressional Correspondent for ABC News; and Bill Monroe, Correspondent for NBC News, who starts the questioning.

BILL MONROE. Senator Mansfield, President Nixon advocates reversing the flow of power to Washington, decreasing federal power, increasing the power of the cities and states. Do you look on this as desirable?

ROBERT CLARK. The chief proposal made by the President, Mr. President, is his rather massive plan for federal revenue sharing. The most important and powerful Democrat in Congress on the subject of revenue sharing and taxes and revenue generally is Wilbur Mills, who has already announced that he will do his best to kill the President’s revenue sharing program. Is there going to be a Democratic position on revenue sharing, an alternative to the President’s program, or is Wilbur Mills going to stand as the chief Democratic spokesman on revenue sharing?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Wilbur Mills, of course, is the key to the whole proposal. He is Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, a very powerful man and a very good man. But there are some questions about the President’s suggestion, such as I think ought to be given some consideration before we arrive at a final determination.

The President is only asking for hearings, prompt hearings. He thinks he has a good proposal there, but some of the—we have no specifics, no details. We don’t know yet what it all entails and the only thing which stands out in my mind, and I assume in Wilbur’s mind as well, is the fact that 65 billion of the $16 billion would be given to the states without any quid pro quos and I think that’s a possibly dangerous procedure to follow. I can understand Wilbur’s feelings on this matter and sympathize with him.

But, despite that, I think we ought to go ahead and hold hearings and find out just what is entailed.

ROGER MUD. Senator, do you think Nixon’s State of the Union Message signified to you a sharp break with the policies of federal government, over the past three years? He said in his speech, "Let’s face it. Most Americans today are simply fed up with government at all levels." Do you believe that?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have a President who does, but it varies in different degrees when you refer to the Congress, the Executive Branch of the government and the State and even the Federal government. I do understand that, in his thinking, a decided change. I think something must be done and I feel that what we have to do is try and keep up with the times and get away from old outdated policies which have outlived their usefulness.

FRANK MANKIEWICZ. Senator, the Republican President now, if I can ask you as a spokesman here for the Democratic party, how do you think that his proposals are revolutionary? I do think they signify a change and, in his thinking, a decided change. I think something must be done and I feel that what we have to do is try and keep up with the times and get away from old outdated policies which have outlived their usefulness.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, it isn’t a case of "I told you so" or welcoming a recent convert. It’s a case of trying to do what is best for the country because it is the nation that comes first and as far as the parties are concerned and those of us who are in politics, the future of the party and the politician, I think comes second if not third.

ROGER MUD. Senator, you are a politician who has been through the birth, the development of the New Deal. Do you believe that the states and the local governments are better at administering these programs than the federal government?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. Quite the contrary,
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But I think the federal government could make its own administrative savings and programs much more effective, and that applies to all administrations, regardless of coloration. I think there's been too much waste spent in administration and not enough money spent as the intent of the Congress indicated. One of the reasons, I'm informed, for whom the money was in reality appropriated. But we'd have too much in the way of too many programs, and ineffectiveness in the way of good administration and lacking a great deal in effective efficiency.

Robert Clark. But do we, Senator, see a picture of Democrats, and especially those who are regarded as Presidential hopefuls, all government directors or directors of the federal government? But since that time has spent money more efficiently. Isn't there a conflict here? Aren't you saying that you can't trust local government? And I've yet to have the federal government and let them have the money without strings.

But Senator Mansfield, I don't mean to say that I thought the power should revert to Washington. What I meant to say, and I think it is difficult for many people to know, to understand, to recognize who really speaks for the Democrats these days, but I'm not the one. Two and a half, no matter how you put it out, the same guy is always shelling it up to the government.

But Mansfield, there's no plan that would increase the power of local and state governments?

Senator Mansfield. No. This is a little new, this message by the President less than a week ago. Again, I have to fall back on the fact that we have no details, no specifics. But Senator Mansfield, I would talk about one specific, and I think it is difficult for many people to know, to understand, to recognize who really speaks for the Democrats these days, but Senator Kennedy yesterday introduced in the Senate a very ambitious program for national health care that would take a long step towards socialized medicine, would cost something like $50 billion a year. You going to support that program?

Senator Mansfield. I think there are currently something like five massive medical care and health programs before Congress. Wouldn't it be better for the Democrats to get together behind one single program?

I'm going to support something out of the administration. But Senator Mansfield, I don't mean to say that the administration is going to offer a comprehensive health program as well. Some- thing as vast as the mounting medical costs, hospital beds, doctor's fees, drugs and so forth, and so on, and which is crying out for assistance legislatively and otherwise.

I'm going to support something out of the administration. But Senator Mansfield, I don't mean to say that the administration is going to offer a comprehensive health program as well. Some- thing as vast as the mounting medical costs, hospital beds, doctor's fees, drugs and so forth, and so on, and which is crying out for assistance legislatively and otherwise.

Robert Clark. Well, I think there are currently something like five massive medical care and health programs before Congress. Wouldn't it be better for the Democrats to get together behind one single program?

Senator Mansfield. I think that inflation was at a rate of around seven percent, the figures come out, the inflation is a little in excess of five percent so there seems to be some diminution there. With the reduction in interest rates, even though the interest rates on an inflationary environment, the rise in the stock market, maybe there are indications that a turn for the better is taking place. But we cannot say so with certainty at the present time. We have to wait and see what the figures will show in the months ahead.

Robert Clark. What happened to that temporary wage-price freeze that you and other Democratic leaders of Congress proposed a couple of months ago? Would you still like to see that put into effect?

Senator Mansfield. Well, it's kind of late now to put it in. It was proposed at a time when we thought it would be most effective. Now, it's happening.

Robert Muus. Senator, the President last week, in effect put the burden on the Congress when he said that the 92nd Congress had recorded as the greatest Congress in the nation's history.

Senator Mansfield. So did the Republican majority.

Senator Mansfield. When the proposal was first made, it was m—suggestion that the Speaker, Carl Albert of Oklahoma, should propose a bill, a whole bill, because I had done my part, I thought, in answering the President's economic message some months ago. I didn't look forward to this with antipathy, but I'm enjoying it, but I'm doing what I think is a duty. But the Speaker, Carl Albert of Oklahoma, shouldn't have just called for something that he could not make it. I'd said on that I'd go on with him if he would just take the lead. But he seemed to think that I was informed that I was the pigeon, so here I am.
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Don't think they all will be enacted because it's so comprehensive that I think it isn't realistic to expect that all these proposals could be completed in two years.

Mansfield. Well, you do think that the six great goals are of such magnitude and are so revolutionary that there is nothing that the Congress is able to do to bring the Congress up, that the recommendations will fall of their own weight and we will have something to report in?

Senator Mansfield. Oh, no. I wouldn't make that charge say, that the Senate is just going to sit there and do nothing. I think basically they're all trying to do the best they can for the country.

Robert Clark. I think Roger has quoted the President on the 92nd Congress. To put that in perspective, Roger, if you'll pardon me, I think we need to quote him on the 91st Congress also; and he said in his summary of the last Congress in its last days, he called it a failure in many ways and said that in its closing days it gave the American people a spectacle that had lost the capacity, that Congress had lost the capacity to decide and the will to act. Would you agree that's an opinion that is at least shared by Senator Mansfield?

Senator Mansfield. No, I would not. I think as far as the Senate is concerned, we've voted very much as far as the House is concerned. I must say in all candor, they've acted better than we have.

Clark. You have any sense of failure, even partial failure, in terms of the end of the last Senate session and the logjam that happened in the Senate?

Senator Mansfield. No, not failure. Disappointment, but the Social Security Bill will continue to be debated. It has been passed before Senator Mansfield and I, in my opinion, and be made retroactive to the 1st of January. The trade bill and the welfare, the deficiency bill, and I think we need some consideration, so I think if you balance it up, it evens out.

Bill Monroe. Would you like to see the Senate perform better, more efficiently, in the 92nd Congress?

Senator Mansfield. Oh, yes. And I anticipate it will, despite the fact that a filibuster is in the making at the present time on the change of Rule 22.

Monroe. What are the circumstances that might let it perform more efficiently?

Senator Mansfield. We might have to reduce the Rule 22 from two-thirds of those present and voting to three-fifths of those present and voting that we might get caught in the logjam, as we did in part, in the closing days of the 91st.

Monroe. What's the filibuster?

Mankiewicz. Senator, one of the things the Senate certainly re-assessed and I think one of the things that the Senate may have been talking about in some of his less complimentary comments on the Senate was in the area of foreign policy and specifically in Southeast Asia. Do you see anything in the events of the last couple of weeks and even in the last couple of days in Cambodia to suggest to you that perhaps the Senate might want to move again in that area?

Mansfield. Yes, indeed. I think the Senate is to be commended for taking the time it did to consider the things that the administration has been saying in the consideration of the Cooper-Church proposal to make its presentation. But it is the Congress, the Congress is a co-equal branch of the government, and I think it's about time that the Senate and the House move in this area.

Clark. Senator, do you think that the President has violated or disregarded the intent of Congress in the expansion of the air war into Cambodia?

Mansfield. I think that the intent has been disturbed, distorted, but I think that he's doing it in the most difficult situation and trying to adhere to the strict interpretation of the law, but I think it's being interpreted a little bit out of proportion.

Muns. Senator, how would that follow? If there's doing it in the best interests of this country which can involves going beyond the pledges that the administration gave to the Congress about the air war in Cambodia?

Mansfield. That's right, but what I mean is the interpretations that are being given by Secretary Muskie in the first place, and what is being done in Cambodia is in accord with Cooper-Church, which I think is contrary to the fact. Furthermore, you may recall that last week the President, on the removal of the last U.S. troops from Cambodia, made the statement that there would be no air support or logistic support for South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia and that the only air activity would be to interdict the infusion of men from North Vietnam down into South Vietnam.

Clark. Senator, you think you would agree that the only real power the Congress has, the only real power the Congress has, is to act retroactive to the present time on the legislation that the President is doing the best he can and it's a failure?

Mansfield. No. It's a failure. But at least the President has called that that he's doing the best he can with the laws that he has to work with. But a law is limited.

Clark. Can you conceive of this Congress taking that drastic step?

Mansfield. That is correct.

Mankiewicz. Now, take it what you're saying is that if the intent and spirit of the Cooper-Church Amendment were carried out, we would not be giving that support. Would you be willing to see, to see that government, in effect, overrule?

Mansfield. Well, let me put it this way. I'm more interested in the release of our prisoners of war, the safety of the U.S. troops, and the continued, if it's not accelerated with-withdrawal. There has been in excess of one million men and they've been trained, paid, armed, fed, everything by this government and if Congress cannot defend their country at this time and participate on their own behalf in Cambodia, then I don't think I'm interested in other countries except on a sympathetic arm’s-length basis. I am interested in P.O.W.'s. I'm my own P.O.W.

Monroe. Senator, is there a basic difference in our approach to Vietnam and ending that war between the Democratic Party and the Nixon Administration?

Mansfield. No. Only on the hope of some of us that it could be accelerated. But at least the President has reversed the invar, is moving in the right direction—out and we want him to continue to do so.

Monroe. There's no consensus yet among Democrats that we should set a deadline for getting all the way out.

Mansfield. Well, the question of a deadline is so much ought to be settled in private. But if it comes to the point, the President will, I think that there will be some of us who will vote for a public deadline to have him uphold withdrawal. But basically it should be something which the President himself and his advisors can take to some of the agreements on.

Mansfield. Senator, and you personally more favorable to the idea of setting a deadline under which you were now voting?

Mansfield. Oh, I voted for the McCovern-Hatchfeld Amendment.

Clark. Senator, could you be convinced that the sort of air support we're giving in Cambodia, and it seems to be very complete tactical air support, heavy bombing raids and so on, that this sort of air support is justified if it's only the way we can guarantee that we can proceed with the timetable for pulling American troops out of Vietnam?

Mansfield. I don't see the connection between the two because again I threw in the air war in Cambodia and the area of South Vietnam.

Clark. Well, if I can quote your old friend, George Aiken, who said on the 2nd day that he has been among those who has voted strongly concern over what's going on in Cambodia at the Senate hearing said, "That action has to be judged against the problem of withdrawing American troops from Vietnam." Would you disagree with that?

Mansfield. Well, I would take George Aiken's word on anything and if George Aiken says that, it's all right with me. I still have my own conviction.

Mansfield. Senator, you have yourself said that Democratic criticism against the President's foreign policy has been muted, that you were running out of time to go through with his withdrawal. Has the time now come when that criticism must increase in pitch and intensity?

Mansfield. Not necessarily, but the time has come, I think, to work harder in an attempt to get the President to continue the policy which he has now undertaken and to speed up the withdrawal of U.S. troops from all of Southeast Asia, Indochina and Thailand to withdraw lock, stock and barrel.

Muns. Precisely how do you do that?

Mansfield. By every means possible, that's happening in Cambodia, by showing the people downtown that these things are not unnoticed, that they want to hold hearings and to lay the story out.

Muns. But hearings don't really bring the Administration to bear?

Mansfield. Well, hearings bring the people to the—bring the situation to the attention of the people and the people are still the dominant factor in this country, as I think was indicated at the time of Cambodia last spring.

Clark. Senator, if the war is still going on in 1972, will the Democratic candidate for President have to be an anti-war candidate with a definite cut-off date for getting out of Vietnam?

Mansfield. You're asking me something I know nothing about.

Mansfield. Senator, if we could get to something that you were very active in relating to the foreign field, the annual debate, Senator Fulbright's contest over the system specifically. The President picked up a few votes last summer on that question, according to him. On the other hand, the Russians were rushing ahead with the development of their new supermissile, the AND, and that we were way behind, and if we at the ABM, we could use it as a bargaining chip in the SALT Talks. Since it now appears that the SS-9 production has slowed, if not
stopped and that we apparently are not going to live in a world with NATO at all. What, if any, feelings that you may prevail this year? Are you going to make another fight on the ABM in the Senate? I think it's a waste of money. And when we consider that we are far better off in submarines, missile-equipped, than the Soviet Union is, far better off in bomber fleet, too far behind in the field of emplaced missiles, I think that the answer would be to try and achieve a stand-off because we're both aware of the fact that if they're ever loosened, these weapons, that it will be the end of the world.

Monroe. Do you believe that the Administration is going after disarmament as vigorously as you or I believe?

Mansfield. Yes, I do, not fast enough by any means, but I have a great deal of confidence in the people of our country, whom I know fairly well and whom I think is doing his damndest to try and reach an agreement with the Soviet Union.

Clark. Senator Muskie came back from his trip to Europe this past week with some, what I thought were staggering thoughts in your plan for pulling American troops out of Europe. Does that disturb you? You've on repeated occasions said that you regarded Senator Muskie as a front-runner for the Democratic nomination. Is the question of reducing the European commitments enough to be involved as an issue in the Democratic contest for the Presidential nomination?

Mansfield. Well, I never question any Senator's motives. I'm sure that Ed Muskie had reasons to make that statement which indicated that he wasn't against acceptance of the idea but that he was reconsidering his position. But when you have 526,000 American military personnel and dependents in Western Europe a quarter of a century after the end of the Second War, when you figure that ten percent of the annual defense budget, over the dollar drain, the balance of payments, which are adverse to us, you'd better stop and think. Basically, it is cutting funds which concern me, it is a matter of principle. And politicians do have principle. As long as I have a half a day, I'll vote against anything that I think would reduce the strength of the gold dollar.

Mansfield. Eisenhower indicated that two and one-half billion dollars for the armed forces of NATO in Europe and he was quite a military man.

Monroe. Is there talk of the defense budget going up? Are you likely to offer considerable opposition to that?

Mansfield. Yes. The understanding is, according to the newspapers, raised $7 billion to $7.5 billion this year. We just can't keep on spending money like that when we have all these problems at home. I think we are spending too much money on exotic weapons. I think that there are weapons being produced that we can't use and they are supplied to us by anyone who is any nearer necessary, and to use that new familiar word "reorientation," I think we only need to bring about a realignment of our priorities.

Mansfield. Is there just one more question. When the President came up here last week, he did omit any mention of foreign policy. Do you think that was a bad precedent?

Mansfield. He did say he was going to give us his feelings, his message on the State of the World. Next month he'll be very far away. No, I don't fault him for that. I would have liked to have heard something, especially about Cambodia, but it's understandable.

Clark. Senator, if we can turn to some problems which are closer to home and on the front here in Congress, the seniority system which many people regard as the greatest problem of Congress is single-rater. The block to progress legislation, has come under the heaviest attack ever, probably, in the recent history of Congress. There are four Committee Chairmen in Congress, I believe, who are eighty or over. There are eight or ten who are in their seventies. Isn't the seniority system going to have to topple if Congress is to repair its image and give people the idea that it is ready to tackle the great problems facing the country?

Mansfield. Well, isn't it remarkable how well the so-called seniority system has operated? I think you might well ask the President or the Congress. If you were to look a few billion, that would be spent, would have been spent anyway, a good part of it even if they weren't there. I think that the core of the gold dollar, the dollar drain, the balance of payments, which are adverse to us, you'd better stop and think. Basically, it is cutting funds which concern me, it is a matter of principle. And politicians do have principle. As long as I have a half a day, I'll vote against anything that I think would reduce the strength of the gold dollar.

Mansfield. Yes.

Clark. Would you set a cut-off, an age limit for Committee Chairmen?

Mansfield. Senator, I think we ought to set an age cut-off for Senators.

Clark. Are you thinking along the lines of the proposal that Senator John Williams just before he left the Senate?

Mansfield. Yes, indeed.

Clark. And that would mean roughly that Senators couldn't run for election after they were 65 years old. Is that it?

Mansfield. Yes, this is correct. If they ran before they were 65 and got to 70 or 71 in the process, that would be understandable.

Clark. Do you plan to do anything to pursue this idea?

Mansfield. No.

Mansfield. Senator, we've talked about a number of these other issues that is, the ABM in particular. How do you think the Congress will act on this issue?

Clark. Senator. We have talked about a number of these other issues. I think specifically of the ABM, Cambodia, and I'm sure all of us here can think of others, that a lesser time has come and gone. I think the talk of Senator Byrd of West Virginia is who is now your Assistant Majority Leader, the importance of a major issue in the Senate in the last few years on which you have not had a chance to vote on a matter of principle.

Mansfield. Yes, the American people as the even numbered year approaches, we ought to be able to present the viewpoint of the party to the American people as the even numbered year approaches, we ought to have a vote on a major issue in the Senate. I think that the American people as the even numbered year approaches, we ought to be able to present the viewpoint of the party to the American people as the even numbered year approaches, we ought to have a vote on a major issue in the Senate.
MANSFIELD. I wouldn't go back to teach it except on a seminar basis because these youngsters know a lot more than I do, or did, and I'd be a little fearful of going up against them, they're smart; I'm glad they got the 18-year-olds.

CLARK. You've been in Washington, in the Senate since 1953, believe, and in Washington. Have you thought that it might be more fun to try to come to grips with all these problems, try to solve them from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue in the White House?

MANSFIELD. Never.

MANKIEWICZ. One quotation from the President's State of the Union was that America has been going through a long twilight of war and division, crime and inflation. We have gone through the long dark night of the American spirit, but now that night is ending. Do you think it is ending?

MANSFIELD. I hope so. But, again, time will tell. There are indications that it may be ending, the situation on the college campuses, for example. But there are other disturbing factors which you have to weigh against them, I hope sincerely that the President's right, but I don't know.

MANKIEWICZ. Senator, do you have any problem, Senator Mansfield, in differentiating in your own mind whether you're talking as a partisan or as a statesman? Do you sometimes wish that you hadn't said a particular thing because in retrospect it sounded a little partisan and you wished you might have been a little more statesmanlike about it?

MANSFIELD. Well, I'm not much of a partisan, and frankly I don't know why I'm in this job, to tell you the truth.

MANKIEWICZ. Is there a suggestion that perhaps you have some of your colleagues suggested that you're in it perhaps because you're not that much of a partisan?

MANSFIELD. Well, maybe it's because somebody has to keep the party together.

CLARK. Senator, you were one of the chief sponsors of the bill, the amendment that gave the vote to 18-year-olds?

MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

CLARK. Currently, do you think the Democrats are—reaistically, do you think the Democrats are doing anything more to attract the youthful voter in the country than the Republicans are?

MANSFIELD. Well, I don't think we should set out to attract them. We ought to prove by what we do, especially in the Congress, as to whether or not we are worth their support. These youngsters are smart. They know what's going on. I'm delighted to see them come in because they'll bring in new blood, new vitality, new ideas. I think we could use some of their naive and they could replace many of us who are looking to the past, to things which were good two or three decades ago and which we think are still good today. These youngsters are coming into a new role. I'm delighted they're coming into a new role. I want them in the system and only in that way will the necessary reforms be made.

CLARK. But, Senator, you talk about you can prove by what you do in Congress, and yet the younger Democratic leaders in the leadership battles in the House and Senate were shut out altogether this year. You ended up with Carl Albert and Hale Boggs and Bob Byrd in the Senate. Is that the way to appeal to youthful voters?

MANSFIELD. Well, those things are internal matters in both houses of the Congress. I think it's the overall record of the Congress which is going to determine how effective we are as Democrats in relation to the young people coming in.

MUNK. But how can you say that that's an internal matter, Senator? This is a national party appealing to the country.

MANSFIELD. That's right. But, when you bring in new officers or displace older ones, that is something which is done internally for a variety of reasons, the origin of which I know not.