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SENATOR MANSFIELD'S INTERVIEW ON THE STATE OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech which I made on Friday evening, February 1, on the state of the Congress, along with the interrogation conducted by six reporters and the analyses and commentary by CBS at the end of the interview, be printed in the Record.

I would like to say that I also afforded, ABC, NBC, and PBS, all of which carried the statement, the opportunity to furnish the transcription of any analyses which they had made. Thus none of these networks have furnished a transcription of their summary or analysis. It is for this reason that only one summary or analysis is included.

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

STATE OF THE CONGRESS—1974

Wednesday evening President Nixon addressed a joint session of Congress, through the medium of radio and television, he also spoke directly to the nation. His State of the Union Address was welcomed by the Congress. It will receive full and cooperative consideration. Whatever the legal difficulties which confront the Administraton, the regular business of the nation must come first. This President put it first. Insofar as the Congress is concerned, it will be first.

Tonight, I offer an assessment of where the nation stands and what lies ahead as we see it in the Executive Branch. The President, alone, speaks for the Executive Branch. One Senator cannot speak for the 100 Members of the Senate. Nor will all 435 women and men in the House of Representatives agree with everything that I have to say. Nevertheless, my remarks are indicative of the prevailing views of the Democratic Majority as reflected in the Leadership of the Congress.

In some respects, of course, these views are on the same wave length as the President's, for example, when he spoke on Wednesday of his desire to protect the personal liberties of Americans. In others, they differ. It can be no other way. We are a government of separate branches. Our politics remain cast in two major parties.

Twelve months ago the 93d Congress convened after a sweeping victory for a Republican President in the 1972 election. From that same election, however, there also came an increase in the Democratic Majority in the Senate and a continuing Democratic Minority in the House. The Congress was still divided; it was those who chose to note the first event but to ignore the second. The facts of the election, nevertheless, were clear. There had been not one but two basic decisions. The people had continued the President in office. At the same time, they had rejected government by one party and government by one branch. And, may I add, subsequent events have underscored the wisdom of this duality of choice.

The Congressional Majority accepted the President's electoral mandate. At the same time, we concluded that there was also a mandate to the Legislative Branch. Therefore, we moved promptly to reinforce the nation's system of checks and balances against an accumulation of power in the Executive Branch. This accumulation did not begin in the 93d Congress. It had been going on, administration after administration, Democratic and Republican, for decades. Nevertheless, there were, at the outset of the 93d Congress, the following evidences of an ominous shift to one-branch government by delegation:

1. Excessive Executive curtailment of public information in the name of national security.
2. Arbitrary Executive impoundment of appropriated funds.
3. Unauthorized Executive attacks on the national press.
4. Executive pre-emption of sole authority over the Federal budgets.
5. Multiplying expressions of Executive contempt for Congress and, by extension, for the people who elect the Congress.
6. Executive usurpation of sole control over changes in the basic organizational structure of the government; and,
7. Illegal invasions of personal privacy by Executive order.

To the Congress, these were flashpoints of a danger to freedom and we were determined to judge, we are determined to legislate a greater Congressional impact began to be registered on all of the basic decisions of the Federal government.

A year ago, for example, this nation's principal concern was to get out of Viet Nam. That was a goal set in 1973 or 1972 by this Administration. It was set by its predecessor in the distant past. It was a goal reiterated year after year by this Administration. In 1973 that was done. An effective settlement was negotiated with the North Viet Namese by D. Henry Kissinger, the present Secretary of State. The final withdrawal of our military forces was achieved under what became an absolute legal existence by the Congress. Thereafter, the gate to re-involvement anywhere in Indochina was shut tight by legislation.

The bitter and tragic experience of Viet Nam led us, moreover, to act against a repetition elsewhere. Now, any military intrusion into another nation—and, hopefully, we have seen the last—is conditioned on the expressed consent of Congress as prescribed in the War Powers Act. Hereafter, what this nation may find necessary to do abroad is in the hands of the Congress. The Congress, as the gate to re-involvement anywhere in Indochina was shut tight by legislation.
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of a Vice-Presidential resignation is not one for the Congress. The President has stated his case, and in that regard I think the Congress is concerned, that closes the matter of resignation.

I think we also have a responsibility of the Congress. The question is now before the House of Representatives where it belongs at this point in our Constitution. It may be handled properly and deliberately. On the basis of available information, I anticipate that it will be dealt with fully in this session.

There has been much done by the Senate Watergate Committee, it is also within the Constitutional responsibility of the Congress. That work, too, I would anticipate that should be completed during this session in legislative recommendations.

The question of impeachment and the Watergate hearings create enormous responsibilities for the Congress. They are also irreducible responsibilities. They have had to be assumed in order to cleanse the political processes of the nation. The members of the Congressional Committees which are pursuing these matters—members of both parties—deserve every support in these endeavors.

As for the crimes of Watergate—and there were crimes—they cannot be put to rest by the Congress. Nor can any improprieties of Mr. Kissinger or Mr. Dean be destroyed or mitigate them. The disposition of crimes is a function of the Justice Department. We do not need to recount those crimes here. Mr. Leon Jaworski, the special prosecutor, is doing his job and so, too, are the courts. There may be new revelations of materiality. Whether it is months or years, there are no judicial shortcuts.

Looking ahead, in terms of the Senate and House and other representatives will face the people in an election. That event will test the record of the past two years more impressively and sooner than any amputation of freedom at a critical moment in our history. The transitory political lives of elected officials are in flux for months or even years. It is the political life of the nation that is involved most deeply.

To excite Watergate and what it implies before it becomes fatal to liberty is a fundamental responsibility of this government. The people have a right to an electoral system free of shenanigans, capable of yielding honest, responsible and responsive government, open to all, and shaped to meet the needs of all.

The people of this nation, in their overwhelming number, do not want government by any means to be one of the most helpless and influential. That is the rub of the problem. It is incumbent on us to foresee and not merely to recognize gravity of great importance to the future, whether corporate, labor, personal or whatever, into the electoral process. That is a sacred obligation.

We have taken steps in law in the direction of fulfilling that obligation. Citizens, for example, can now indicate on the front page of their income-tax returns whether or not they wish a dollar of their taxes to go to defray election costs at no additional cost to themselves. The funds would be directed toward the financing of free elections.

In my judgment, we shall not come finally to the Congress, except as a result of the public business of elections with public funds. We are moving in that direction, as I have already indicated, with the most deliberate mark. There are other measures under consideration in Congress which will accelerate the movement. It would hope and trust that the President will join with the Congressional leadership in supporting these efforts to clean up political payoffs and to assure that the public purpose which was in 1973 that Watergate arose, and in 1978 that it was investigated, may be that it was in line that the matter was finally ended in a new system of open elections openly paid for. I urge the support of the people of the nation in that resolve.

What Watergate did to public confidence with regard to the national politics, energy crisis has done in the realm of the nation's economy. Grave uncertainties have come about by the interruption of long lines of cars at the filling stations, and slower speeds on the highways. The implications of the shortage are far beyond the oil crisis. The potential energy tank gas into every aspect of our society. Today, the petroleum situation threatens the life, the business maintenance of the homes of millions of Americans.

We have become aware, suddenly, of an ability to compete. We now must provide for the energy needs of the United States, and the gas and oil fields of the world. That is the single most important element in preventing a national catastrophe. The recovery between Egypt and Israel will also be of significance in this connection. The President and Secretary of State Kissinger, in his notable astuteness on the interplay of the Middle East conflict and other aspects of the international situation and the energy question. While I am on this subject, I would like to commend the peripatetic Mr. Kissinger. His achievements extend far beyond the Middle East, as, for example, in the improvement of relationships with the Soviet Union.

In the year ahead, I hope that the President and Secretary of State will turn the pressure against the other countries, and the production of hoarder is a problem that is not new, even in the past. I have already said in my State of the Union address that we might accept a form of new cooperation with the other American republics.

Under the energy shortage and other economic difficulties, there is the danger of a crumbling of international cooperation, notably in the relations with Western Europe and Japan. That, indeed, would be the final straw. The consequences of devi-take-the-finest-economic policies among free nations would be disastrous to all concerned and might well initiate the general erosion of world peace. In that connection, I am convinced that the meeting this month to consider our common plight with the representatives of the United Nations in the General Assembly will do all in his State of the Union message.

There is also the need for a new look, with, at our relations with a Latin America that is changing rapidly. It may well be that the statesmen have maintained with Mexico—ties in which regular meetings of the Congresses of the two countries play an important role in the development of a prototype for a new cooperation with the other American republics.

Under the energy shortage and other economic difficulties, there is the danger of international cooperation, notably in the relations with Western Europe and Japan. That, indeed, would be the final straw. The consequences of devil-take-the-finest-economic policies among free nations would be disastrous to all concerned and might well initiate the general erosion of world peace. In that connection, I am convinced that the meeting this month to consider our common plight with the representatives of the United Nations in the General Assembly will do all in his State of the Union message.

As for the energy crisis at home, the immediate requirement is to make certain that the shortage does not devastate the economy and that the price of past neglect is paid by all Americans. If that means rationing, then let us not hesitate to use this device. Surely a price roll block will be imposed by the President at the Congress. Surely the tax benefits accorded the major oil companies, and the energy loss in the over-all requirements of the nation, to the considerable tax benefits to the United States, as well as excessive oil profits, will be scrutinized by the Congress.

Critical information on the production and distribution of energy must no longer be kept secret in the executive branch. The nation's corporations. It is essential that the facts be discovered and laid before the nation. Whether they may occur in this country or receive the promise of the extension beyond the government of the United States, of an obligation to answer, through the Congress, to that common aim.

Let me say that we do not need scapegoats in this situation. But we must have a foundation of fact on which to build a policy on energy. I do not know far more than we know now if we are to know how to deal with the nation's well-being. I speak of the threat of widespread business shutdowns and a run-away inflation, which can only culminate in a severe recession with extensive unemployment and appalling human hardship. That, the people of this nation will not tolerate. That, the Congress of the United States will do all in its power to prevent.

The energy crisis has shocked this nation. In so doing, it has also shown us in a sudden flash the precarious manner in which our national economic life has come to be organized. It is all well and good to be concerned as at this time with the exhaustibility of our natural resources. But what of the exhaustibility of pure air and water, steel, nickel, tin, iron and copper, and many other essential supplies? Where will the supplies of wheat are stimulated one year only to compel high-priced imports the next?

We must to our advantage our resources to put it mildly. We spend nearly $3 billion a year on air-conditioning and less than $150 million on air pollution control. We, therefore, single out the need for a national policy on energy. We have got to know where an action of this kind fits in our relations with day, and for the time being, should it be measured. Pollution is building dead seas on the coast of New York, New Jersey, the Great Lakes states and elsewhere. Yet, during the recent recession the President declined $3 billion that had been appropriated for the treatment of waste.

It would be my hope that the concern of the Government will not stop with the energy shortage. The need is to take a careful look at the only at the charging of the single danger signal but at the whole integrated switchboard of our national existence. It is not for the Government to spend tens of millions of dollars in a rescue operation to keep the barometer wall, but the Government neither.

We have, therefore, a debt of gratitude to the people that has been done by the Senate Watergate Committee, it is also within the Constitutional responsibility of the Congress. That work, too, I would anticipate that should be completed during this session in legislative recommendations.
the federal government can then be used more effectively and efficiently to promote the social and economic welfare of the country.

Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily, although we've done that in part, because it would be under the constraint of the President's budget—which has now broken the $30 billion barrier—can be reduced and passed.
program on Wednesday night, and yet people really don't have any faith that their government will find a solution, or that the question is even being asked, or how are you going to restore that confidence?

Senator Mansfield. By acting and moving. That's the basic answer. And it's a logical one, yet questioning, and we just can't help it. I certainly don't blame the people for feeling that way. But if, in this period, we're going to continue to act constructively and responsibly to carry out the duties which are our responsibility in construction, and hopefully by what we do up here, at least, will restore some degree of that confidence which has been destroyed.

Question. Senator, I think we might also ask, how are you going to get any of these things done if you have so many legislative crises going off in so many different ways? I think in many eyes, the greatest failure of this Democratic-controlled Congress has been its failure to get together on constructive alternative programs.

Senator Mansfield. No. I would disagree with you completely, because our strengths lie in our diversity, and it's remarkable how the budget, in spite of all their differences, can come up and put through and pass sound, constructive legislation.

Question. Senator, you also want to solve the energy problem.

Senator Mansfield. That's right. But I don't think it's better to be divisive than to have a Democratic-backed program on the energy crisis or inflation or unemployment or other programs.

Senator Mansfield. Oh, we don't want a bunch of yea men in the Democratic Party. Well, I have to be, in opinion, because out of that, I think, comes our strength.

Question. Senator, you say you have a panel on the policy council—

Senator Mansfield. That's right. But we'll get some way to bring people from these committees together so that there won't be this constant overlapping.

Question. How long is it going to take, though, Senator?

Senator Mansfield. Not too long.

Question. Will the crisis be over?

Senator Mansfield. No. This crisis won't be over unless both sides come together and I think it's a good procedure to follow.

Question. Senator, President Nixon says the United States will be self-sufficient by 1980. Do you agree that we can be independent in six years?

Senator Mansfield. It's possible, but it will be nip and tuck. If you take into consideration the undeveloped reserves in the Asian area, consider the oil problems, and you will recognize the possibility that some of our companies, instead of going ahead where the easy oil is, might spend more of their time and energies in this country developing what we have. It would be nip and tuck.

Question. Senator, in the State of the Union the other night, the President made a statement about the United States becoming a self-sufficient energy by 1980. Do you agree that we can be independent in six years?
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Now, to the substance of the speech tonight, I'd like to turn to two CBS reporters in the bureau, Dan Rather and Bruce Morton. I want to quote them as their view, and just report on what you think the administration people think of what they saw and heard tonight.

RATHER: Well, I haven't talked with any of them, obviously. But you know them well enough to make a stab at it. I don't think they think very much of them. If Mike Mansfield that you expressed a few moments ago, which I think is a fair reflection of how he's been regarded in both Republican and Democratic circles, has never been shared at the White House by Mr. Nixon or his top aides. In the last aides once said--it's been 18 months--two years ago, when I said, well, Mike Mansfield tries to be fair to you. If you don't take in Mike Mansfield's appearances. Now, certainly tonight, in the speech portion of what he performed here, it was a thoughtful speech, delivered, but in the question and answer session, it was, I think, probably he would strike most people as refreshing as a drink of spring water to see a man at least ask the question of straight questions and give the appearance of straight answers. No, the White House won't particularly like that, because I think they will be pointing out two things. First of all, that this wasn't in the smooth, President Nixon's State of the Union Message. For one thing, Mike Mansfield had nothing to lose here, he could afford to be, and President Nixon was in many ways stepping into a bully pit the other evening. The second point is that President, although he handles news conferences well, as seen through his eyes and the eyes of his aides, did not offer any answers other than Mike Mansfield, and particularly for television, the short answer frequently comes across on television much better than a long answer.

MUNO. But do you think the White House would regard this as a plus or a minus?

RATHER. A minus--that they will suffer by comparison.

MUNO. A minus. Because of the low-keyed appearance of straight answers.

RATHER. Now, they will argue hard that it was only appearance of straight answers, and not the real strength of his program. But I suppose that the real strength of the economic program was disposed of.

REPORTERS. Thank you, Senator. Thank you very much.

Rogers Mudd. This is Roger Mudd in the Washington bureau of CBS. You've been listening to Democratic Senator Mansfield, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, giving the opposition's view of the State of the Union Address. I suppose that the relatively honest appraisal of what the Congress had done in the first session, simply because it was done in the Senate, that the accomplishments of that first session were not earth-shaking.

Senator credits both the Republicans and the Democrats, and he gives the blame to both the Democrats and the Republicans. The Senator is bitter in credibility on Capitol Hill is high, and probably he is the best spokesman that the Democrats could have in this period of contempt for politicians. Obviously, the Senator is looking forward to the elections in November, and his message tonight seemed to be that the Congress, particularly a Democratic one is, the country's best hope. He was critical, but he was not carping, and his message was that the people are entitled to an electoral system free of shenanigans, capable, perhaps, of yielding an honest, responsive government, and he said we owe, he said, the people of the country, not just a decent present, but a decent future.

Incidentally, we got texts of the Senator's speech about 3:00 o'clock this afternoon, unlike Mr. Nixon's speech on Wednesday, we were furnished an advanced look at the text, and it is, I must report, very similar to the one Mansfield made in his Senate caucus, eight days ago, behind closed doors; many of the phrases are the same, so this is not breaking much new ground.

And then, if you get into areas like tax reform, one of the other things that really worries me, is how it will be presented. As what I a legislative shambles that kind of bill can be when it gets to the Senate floor, people are going to wonder everybody can try to do favors for his own particular constituency. If you add that to the feeling that this is an attempt to end a Watergate year, it seems to me that it's going to be very hard to get final passage on very much. Mudd. Well, Dan Rather, just looking at the President's view of the State of the Union, would you think that it would suffer by comparison with the Mansfield view? Now, Mansfield tonight said he was on the same track on several things, for instance, on invasion of privacy. How much cooperation can there be, do you think between the White House and a Democratic Congress?

RATHER. Well, I think there can be a great deal, and part of what we've seen this week, Republican and Democratic, the President's State of the Union speech and Mike Mansfield's address here tonight, and again, a very refreshing thing is a reaffirmation of the country and a reaffirmation of the system. You've had the President lay out a detailed legislative program; you've had Mike Mansfield's talk tonight to be the differences. Now, in direct answer to Senator Mudd, I think there are wide areas of cooperation here that we can see some cooperation. I think we may see in some cases of the President not getting backwards to cooperate with Congress. Speaking of campaign finance reform might be one of these. I think we'll see more where the Congress will bend over backwards to help the President, but on the Watergate thing, to how to handle the energy crisis, on these two very important matters, I don't see much bending over backwards in terms of cooperation either way, but in effect, what I think Mike Mansfield was saying tonight was that if the President is telling the truth and has nothing to hide, then we have in such a hurry to have the whole Watergate thing put behind us.

MUNO, Bruce, did you think that Mansfield brought up Watergate reluctantly? He spent about four pages of talking about it.

MUNO. Now, rather reluctantly, really. Very gently, one jab at the White House, almost concealed in the speech--you know, he didn't come out and try to hit him over the head with it, but he could have talked about it. He's not a rabid partisan, but he's a partisan, and it's an election year. Do you think the President's prediction will come to pass, that the Congress will conclude one way or the other with important votes in this session?

RATHER. Frankly, I doubt that. But Mike Mansfield's—he has a great deal more experience than I do. It's very difficult for me to see how that can and will happen, but you, who know, who know? As you know, Roger, overnight's a long time in politics, and a week is forever, and here we are talking about what, another two or three months. What do you think?

MUNO. Well, I think that given the schedule that the House has, which is I suppose by late spring, that you will have some form of Watergate by the end of the year, certainly by election time. That's all the time we've got. Thank you, Bruce and Dan. This completes our final—our final—instant analysis—not in this case, because we got your notice. It concludes our analysis of the President's speech and the State of the Union, and if everything goes to plan, there will be now a Republican demand for an answer to Mansfield's answer to President Nixon. This is Roger Mudd, CBS News, Washington.