

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

1-15-1975

Congressional Record S. 16 -Democratic Conference - January 14

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record S. 16 -Democratic Conference - January 14" (1975). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1235.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1235

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

BEFORE THE SENATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Tuesday, January 14, 1975, S-207, U. S. Capitol, 10:00 A. M.

As the first order of business, no task could be more pleasant for me than to greet my Senate democratic colleagues in the aftermath of the 1974 elections. Not a single incumbent of our party failed of reelection in the November elections. My congratulations go to those who having already served with distinction were returned to office. These Senators include Inouye of Hawaii, Cranston of California, Ribicoff of Connecticut, Allen of Alabama, Long of Louisiana, Church of Idaho, Stevenson of Illinois, Talmadge of Georgia, Gravel of Alaska, Magnuson of Washington, Hollings of South Carolina, McGovern of South Dakota, ^{Cojetan of Missouri} and Bayh of Indiana.

Of equal pleasure is the welcoming of newly elected Democrats. Before doing so, let me note that ~~many~~ their predecessors were Americans of exemplary dedication to the service of this country--Senators the likes of an Ervin, a Fulbright, a Bible and an Aiken. They will be missed but, in their place have come others who, I am confident, will serve with equal and perhaps even greater distinction. It gives me great pleasure to introduce them now--Senators-elect Leahy of Vermont, Morgan of North Carolina, Culver of Iowa, Stone of Florida, Glenn of Ohio, Ford of Kentucky, Hart of Colorado, Bumpers of Arkansas and, hopefully, subject to clarification under our Constitutional processes, Durkin of New Hampshire.

For the nation as a whole, 1974 was a year of frustration and tragedy. Energy and inflation, Watergate and recession--they tell much of the

story. The legacy left to us places new meaning on the expression "national challenge." The Senate of the 94th Congress meets today to accept that challenge.

We convene at a moment of great national stress. It is not the first period of crisis which the nation has known, nor is it likely to be the last. Nevertheless, we will do well to face the fact that the tragic war in Southeast Asia has strained our institutions as never before. Its cost and waste have done much to snuff out the illusion of omnipotent power. What we now know is that there are limits to what this nation or any nation can do with the sum of its collective will and strength. We now know that we must decide what is more and what is less beneficial to this nation. We must make the hard choices between what is more and what is less important. In this connection, we now have the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which set up the Budget Committees of the Senate and the House--a facility designed to provide effective guidance on these most difficult choices. Its first concurrent resolution providing a yardstick for the Congress to determine the economic model for the current year will be brought to the Senate by April 15, 1975.

As for the public's view of the federal government, it seems to me that there is more awareness, now, of the part Congress should and must play in the functioning of a Constitutional system of divided powers. The people have come to expect more from Congress in the way of discernment and leadership. It is up to us to see that they are forthcoming.

Insofar as the Majority Leadership is concerned, there are no panaceas for the nation's ill. A little fine tuning here or there of the intricate machinery of the American system is not enough. What has now become apparent is that a multitude of the components of this economy are out of whack. We are a complex nation with a vast complex of problems.

Viet Nam and Indochina set the stage for inflation. Wasteful usage of petroleum has placed unbearable demands on our own resources and required massive imports. The manipulated prices of these imports, in turn, have created international monetary imbalances and brought havoc into our domestic economy especially in terms of prices and employment.

As these problems become more pervasive, they intensify the urgency of maintaining in the Senate a broad perspective of our national requirements. I would hope, therefore, that this Conference and its Policy Committee could be used more fully for overall discussions of national issues. This practice, as you know, has been growing in the past two or three years. Its intensification, together with more frequent exchanges between the Majority Leadership of both Houses, can help us as Congressional Democrats to do our best to move the work of government.

As for the agenda of business for the first session of the 94th Congress, it will be dominated by energy and other problems of the economy. In the wake of last November's elections there are great responsibilities imposed upon the Congress, and especially on Democrats. Let me emphasize that there are also limits on what any Senate can do under the Constitution. We will not be able to work miracles. The Senate consists but one part of one branch of a government of divided powers. We cannot presume to discharge the functions of the House or of the Executive Branch or the Courts. Watergate should have taught all of us the tragedy and the folly of any such presumption on the part of any one branch.

Within these Constitutional limitations, however, Senate Democrats in cooperation with our Republican colleagues must do our share, our full share, in righting what has gone wrong in the nation.

For the benefit of new members, let me stress the equality of all Senators as an aspect of this undertaking. Each of us by virtue of the trust of our respective electorates has an equal obligation and right to participate fully in the work of the Senate. There are no first or second class Senators. That has been the policy of the leadership ever since the Senate Democratic Conference first elected me. That will be the policy of the Leadership as long as I remain Majority Leader. So to the recently elected members, let me say this: speak up and participate fully. Do not take a back seat. Give the Senate the benefit of your fresh insights.

During the past two years, the members of the House and Senate have constituted the only part of the Federal Government which owes its powers to election by the people. No member of the Executive Branch is in the same situation. In so noting, I do not wish to detract in any way from either the President or the Vice President nor the Constitutional process by which they were selected. I only wish to emphasize the burden of the responsibility which falls on the 94th Congress, collectively, to interpret the needs and wishes of the people of the nation.

In this regard it was a major achievement of the 93rd Congress that it prepared the way for the 94th to approach the dominant issues of concern to the American people. The 93rd, for example, enacted a broad public service employment program along with expanded workmen's compensation benefits which will help to offset the rising tide of unemployment. In the face of a national jobless rate edging towards 8%, however, these measures are only a beginning. As the recession deepens, additional actions of this nature will have to be considered.

Prior to the adjournment last year Senate Democrats also pledged to provide tax cuts as a way to curb the recession and stimulate the economy. As we move in this direction, it should be kept in mind that a budget severely out of balance will not by itself provide stimulus. That will be the case particularly if the imbalance is caused in major part by revenue short-falls due to lost taxes from failing businesses.

Therefore, the Democratic Conference, last year, also pledged a search for some way to reconstitute the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a way of dealing with the host of businesses and institutions that are expected to fall or collapse in the weeks and months ahead. I would urge the appropriate legislative Committees to look into this possibility without delay.

The Democratic Conference during 1974 agreed that credit should be allocated on a priority basis in the light of the Nation's most critical needs, notably in the areas of housing and energy. That question, too, needs prompt examination by the appropriate committees.

As the recession now dominates our national life, wage-price-rent and profit movements must be closely watched. To that end it was the position of the Conference, last year, that, as needed, the concept of controls should come into play. The time to examine this need very closely in terms of possible legislation, it seems to me, is also at hand.

Before the last adjournment, the Democratic Conference urged that a beginning be made in allocations, rationing or other effective means to reduce consumption of energy and other scarce materials. If we are going to cope effectively with exorbitant and arbitrary prices for petroleum, in my judgment, a reduction of consumption equal to at least two million barrels per day, and preferably more, must be achieved. Savings of that kind cannot be made without a stringent conservation system. It is time for enforcement of speed laws, encouragement of a more rapid phase-in of efficient automobiles and a reduction of the wastage of fossile fuels by public utilities and other industries as well as in the home.

I have just recently returned from China, a country of 800 million people where production of petroleum is a fraction of our domestic output. Yet, after meeting all of its domestic ^{needs}, that country is still able to export crude. I am not inferring by any means that the situations in the two countries are the same. What I am suggesting is that the energy crisis has two sides. Only one deals with availability of supply. The other is the wisdom of usage. A recent Ford Foundation study pointed to an energy wastage rate of about 40% in this nation. To me that strongly suggests that the root of our problem is not so much one of supply but rather of a great lack of wisdom in usage. Unless we put an end to the superfluous and extravagant, supplies, no matter how great, will never be sufficient.

One final word on energy. A spectre of confrontation and war in the Mideast was raised recently as a result of interpretations given to an

interview by the Secretary of State. In my judgment, self-sufficiency and negotiations, not confrontation, must form the basis of this nation's policies on energy. The less talk of war in the Middle East in order to bring out petroleum or whatever, the better for all concerned.

What is suggested by the proposals which were put forward last year by the Senate Democrats for dealing with recession and inflation and by the House Leadership in recent days is that the nation's economy runs badly without foresight and without direction. Orderly management of our economic affairs is far better than the endless instability which results from following a hands-off policy interspersed with stop and start crash economic remedies. That policy has already induced a drastic recession on top of spiraling inflation.

In this connection, I would once again point out that under P. L. 93-426 an Executive-Legislative-private Commission has been authorized to study ways of dealing in an integrated long-range fashion with the nation's shortages and supplies and with other fundamental economic questions. Congressional appointments have already been made to this Commission and additional recommendations have been made to the President. The Administration, however, has yet to act to bring this Commission into being.

Beyond economic questions, there will be other issues of pressing importance before the 94th Congress. The implications of Watergate, for example, are not yet behind us. Nor will they be put to rest until there has been translated into law an effective method to reveal and to prevent future abuses of that kind.

It will be recalled that when the 93rd Congress convened in January, 1973, there appeared to be a need to investigate the irregularities that occurred during the political campaign of 1972. It was clear that several regular Senate Committees shared a concern in the matter but that the Senate's responsibility was paramount. On the recommendation of this Conference, therefore, the Senate decided that a special Committee should be empaneled to investigate Watergate and related matters. The wisdom of that course, I believe, was underscored by subsequent developments. The Ervin Committee became the sole locus of the Watergate investigation. It operated in a non-partisan fashion and with telling effectiveness.

On a matter that bears close resemblance to Watergate, there is a similar need for investigation. Intelligence-gathering as it has been pursued at home and abroad by the C. I. A. has raised serious questions concerning possible dangers to Constitutional freedoms. Therefore, the practices which are being pursued under legislation enacted a quarter of a century ago need to be fully tested against the imperatives of today. The Senate can no longer evade its responsibility for being conversant with the mechanisms of intelligence-gathering which have been set up and which operate largely in secrecy. To confront that responsibility, an arm of the Senate must explore deeply. It

must be asked how the 1947 National Security Act works today to balance methods employed abroad against effects at home that may serve to weaken and erode the basic precepts of the Constitution. And if I may add another dimension to this question, it needs to ask too: What has been the effect of the operations under this law on the good name of the United States of America in the world--on the reputation which once was this nation's among all peoples, for decency, integrity, honest dealing and compassionate human concern?

I do not know whether we are best advised to proceed in this matter precisely as we did in the Watergate affair. What I do know is that any investigation of the C. I. A. should be undertaken, as was the case in Watergate, by one Senate group and not by many. The investigation, moreover, should be pursued by a membership which provides a wider perspective than that afforded by any one Committee and one which reflects the general character of the Senate in the 94th Congress.

In that respect, I should report to you that I have been informed by Senator Stennis that it is his intention to hold hearings under the auspices of the Armed Services Committee, that he has been in touch with Senator McClellan and Senator Young of the Appropriations Committee and, at my suggestion that any investigating Committee should be broadened, he indicated that he would also get in touch with Senator Sparkman of the Foreign Relations Committee and Senator Muskie of the Government Operations Committee. He also informed me that the Majority and Minority Leaders would be included in any such inquiry by his Committee. Furthermore, he assured me that insofar as it would be possible, the hearings would be open.

I am sure that this will be a matter for discussion later in the Conference. It is my desire only that this issue be brought to your attention at this time. The advice and guidance of the Caucus on an appropriate course is welcomed. May I add, that the existence of a Presidential Commission of inquiry in no way abrogates or reduces the Senate's responsibility in this matter.

If the questions posed by the C. I. A. present us with troublesome issues, there are others which will also arise, involving national health insurance, protection for consumers, and revamping the criminal laws with special attention for victims. There is old business as well. Specifically, there is the question of surface mining protection, and I would expect that the Congress will move quickly to retest the veto of this vital legislation.

Let me conclude this brief introduction to the work of the 94th Congress by noting that nothing in my political preference for Democrats and particularly for the Democratic members of the Senate is meant to suggest that our party has cornered the market on ideas, talent, experience or dedication. I have a deep respect for the President, the Vice President and members of the Executive Branch ~~Branch~~. Neither the Senate Democratic Majority, the Democratic controlled Congress, nor the Republican-controlled Executive Branch will be able to do much to confront the questions which deeply concern the people of the nation unless all are prepared to work together. Insofar as the Senate Majority Leadership is concerned, we will address the agenda for action in the 94th Congress in a spirit of cooperation and unity with the Republican Congressional minority and the President. Together we can do and we must do a great, great deal to meet the needs of the people of the United States.

REMARKS OF SENATOR MANSFIELD
AT SENATE DEMOCRATIC CON-
FERENCE ON TUESDAY, JANUARY
14, 1975

Gentlemen, as the first order of business, no task could be more pleasant for me than to greet our Senate Democratic colleagues, in the aftermath of the 1974 elections. Not a single incumbent of our party failed of reelection in the November elections. My congratulations go to those who having already served with distinction were returned to office. These Senators include Inouye of Hawaii (applause), Cranston of California (applause), Ribicoff of Connecticut (applause), Allen of Alabama (applause), Long of Louisiana (applause), Church of Idaho (applause), Stevenson of Illinois (applause), Talmadge of Georgia (applause), and Gravel of Alaska (applause), Eagleton of Missouri (applause), Magnuson of Washington (applause), Hollings of South Carolina (applause), McGovern of South Dakota (applause), and Bayh of Indiana (applause).

Of equal pleasure is the welcoming of newly elected Democrats. Before doing so, let me note that their predecessors were Americans of exemplary dedication to the service of this country—Senators the likes of an Ervin, a Fulbright, a Bible, and an Aiken, as well as others. They will be missed, but, in their place have come others who, I am confident, will serve with equal and perhaps even greater distinction.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce them now: Senator Leahy of Vermont (applause), Senator Morgan of North Carolina (applause), Culver of Iowa (applause), Stone of Florida (applause)—he is going to have to attend some of our meetings—Glenn of Ohio (applause), Ford of Kentucky (applause), Hart of Colorado (applause), Bumpers of Arkansas (applause), and, hopefully, subject to clarification under our constitutional processes, Durkin of New Hampshire (applause).

For the Nation as a whole, 1974 was a year of frustration and tragedy. Energy and inflation, Watergate and recession—they tell much of the story. The legacy left to us places new meaning on the expression "national challenge." The Senate of the 94th Congress meets today to accept that challenge.

We convene at a moment of great national stress. It is not the first period of crisis which the Nation has known, nor will it be the last. Nevertheless, we will do well to

face the fact that the tragic war in Southeast Asia has strained our institutions as never before. Its cost and waste have done much to snuff out the illusion of omnipotent power. What we now know is that there are limits to what this Nation or any nation can do with the sum of its collective will and strength. We now know that we must decide what is more and what is less beneficial to this Nation. We must make the hard choices between what is more and what is less important. In this connection, we now have the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which set up the Budget Committees of the Senate and the House—a facility designed to provide effective guidance on these most difficult choices. Its first concurrent resolution providing a yardstick for the Congress to determine the economic model for the current year will be brought to the Senate by April 15, 1975.

As for the public's view of the Federal Government, it seems to me that there is more awareness, now, of the part Congress should and must play in the functioning of a constitutional system of divided powers. The people have come to expect more from Congress in the way of discernment and leadership. It is up to us, all of us, to see that they are forthcoming.

Insofar as the majority leadership is concerned, there are no panaceas for the Nation's ill. A little fine tuning here or there of the intricate machinery of the American system is not enough. What has now become apparent is that a multitude of the components of this economy are out of whack. We are a complex nation with a vast complex of problems.

Vietnam and Indochina set the stage for inflation. In addition, wasteful usage of petroleum has placed unbearable demands on our own resources, and required massive imports. The manipulated prices of these imports, in turn, have created international monetary imbalances and brought havoc into our domestic economy especially in terms of prices and employment.

As these problems become more pervasive, they intensify the urgency of maintaining in the Senate a broad perspective of our national requirements. I would hope, therefore, that this Conference and its Policy Committee—and the Policy Committee is the creature and the servant of this Conference—could be used more fully for overall discussions of national issues. This practice, as you know, has been growing in the past several years. Its intensification, together with more frequent exchanges between the ma-

jority leadership of both houses, can help us as Congressional Democrats to do our best to move the work of government.

As for the agenda of business for the first session of the 94th Congress, it will be dominated by energy and other problems of the economy. In the wake of last November's elections there are great responsibilities imposed upon the Congress, and especially on Democrats. Let me emphasize that there are also limits on what any Senate can do under the Constitution. We will not be able to work miracles. The Senate constitutes but one part of one branch of a government of divided powers. We cannot presume to discharge the functions of the House or of the Executive Branch or the courts. Watergate should have taught all of us the tragedy and the folly of any such presumption on the part of any one branch.

Within these Constitutional limitations, however, Senate Democrats in cooperation with our Republican colleagues must do our share, our full share, in righting what has gone wrong in the nation.

For the benefit of our new members, let me stress the equality of all Senators—of all new colleagues—as an aspect of this undertaking. Each of us by virtue of the trust of our respective electorates has an equal obligation and right to participate fully in the work of the Senate. There are no first or second class Senators. This is a body of equals. This is a body of peers. That has been the policy of the leadership ever since the Senate Democratic Conference first elected me. That will be the policy of the Leadership as long as I remain Majority Leader. So to the recently elected members, let me say this: speak up and participate fully. Do not take a back seat. Give the Senate the benefit of your fresh insights.

There are no barons as far as chairmen of committees are concerned in this body and there will not be any unless you allow it to happen.

During the past two years, the members of the House and Senate have constituted the only part of the Federal Government which owes its powers to election of the people. No member of the Executive Branch is in the same situation. In so noting, I do not wish to detract in any way from either the President or the Vice President nor the Constitutional process by which they were selected. I only wish to emphasize the burden of the responsibility which falls on the 94th Congress, collectively, to interpret the needs and wishes of the people of the nation.

In this regard it was a major achievement of the 93rd—a responsible and constructive Congress—that it prepared the way for the 94th to approach the dominant issues of concern to the American people. The 93rd, for example, enacted a broad public service em-

ployment program along with expanded workmen's compensation benefits which will help to offset the rising tide of unemployment. In the face of a national jobless rate edging towards 8%, however, these measures are only a beginning. As the recession deepens, additional actions of this nature will have to be considered.

Prior to the adjournment last year Senate Democrats also pledged to provide tax cuts as a way to curb the recession and stimulate the economy. As we move in this direction, it should be kept in mind that a budget severely out of balance will not by itself provide stimulus. That will be the case particularly if the imbalance is caused in major part by revenue short-falls due to lost taxes from failing businesses.

Therefore, the Democratic Conference, last year, also pledged a search for some way to reconstitute the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or something approximating it, as a way of dealing with the host of businesses and institutions that are expected to fall or collapse in the weeks and months ahead. I would urge the appropriate legislative Committee to look into this possibility without delay.

The Democratic Conference during 1974 agreed that credit should be allocated on a priority basis in the light of the Nation's most critical needs, notably in the areas of housing and energy. That question, too, needs prompt examination by the appropriate committees.

As the recession now dominates our national life, wage-price-rent and profit movements must be closely watched. To that end it was the position of the Conference, last year, that, as needed, the concept of controls should come into play. The time to examine this need very closely in terms of possible legislation, it seems to me, is close at hand.

Before the last adjournment, the Democratic Conference urged that a beginning be made in allocations, rationing or other effective means to reduce consumption of energy and other scarce materials. If we are going to cope effectively with exorbitant and arbitrary prices for petroleum, in my judgment, a reduction of consumption equal to at least two million barrels per day, and preferably more, must be achieved. Savings of that kind cannot be made without a stringent conservation system. It is time for enforcement of speed laws, encouragement of a more rapid phase-in of efficient automobiles and a reduction of the wastage of fossil fuels by public utilities and other industries as well as in the home.

I have just recently returned from China, a country of 800 million people where production of petroleum is a fraction of our domestic output. Yet, after meeting all of its domestic needs, that country is still able

to export crude. I am not inferring by any means that the situations in the two countries are the same. What I am suggesting is that the energy crisis has two sides. Only one deals with availability of supply. The other is the wisdom of usage. A recent Ford Foundation study—and one by Senator Gaylord Nelson and his committee, and by others—pointed to an energy wastage rate of about 40% in this nation. To me that strongly suggests that the root of our problem is not so much one of supply but rather of a great lack of wisdom in usage. Unless we put an end to the superfluous and extravagant, supplies, no matter how great, will never be sufficient.

One final word on energy. A spectre of confrontation and war in the Mideast was raised recently as a result of interpretations given to an interview by the Secretary of State. In my judgment, self-sufficiency and negotiations, not confrontation, must form the basis of this nation's policies on energy. The less talk of war in the Middle East in order to bring out petroleum or whatever, the better for all concerned.

May I say that I think insofar as petroleum is concerned, we place too much emphasis on the Middle East, because approximately 28 percent of our imports come from Venezuela; another 18 percent from Canada, though half of that is Venezuelan oil refined, about 9.5 percent from Nigeria; about 9.5 or 10 percent from Iran, which is not considered a Middle East country in the ordinary sense; and 4 or 5 percent from other parts of the world, Indonesia and elsewhere.

So what we have as far as the Middle East is concerned is approximately a third of our imports, and I think we ought to keep that in mind.

What is suggested by the proposals which were put forward last year by the Senate Democrats for dealing with recession and inflation and by the House Leadership in recent days is that the nation's economy runs badly without foresight and without direction. Orderly management of our economic affairs is far better than the endless instability which results from following a hands-off policy interspersed with stop and start crash economic remedies. That policy has already induced a drastic recession on top of spiraling inflation.

In this connection, I would once again point out that under P.L. 93-426 an Executive-Legislative-private Commission has been authorized to study ways of dealing in an integrated long-range fashion with the nation's shortages and supplies and with other fundamental economic questions. Congressional appointments have already been made to this Commission and additional recommendations have been made to the President. The Administration, however, has yet

to act to bring this Commission into being.

Beyond economic questions, there will be other issues of pressing importance before the 94th Congress. The implications of Watergate, for example, are not yet behind us. Nor will they be put to rest until there has been translated into law an effective method to reveal and to prevent future abuses of that kind.

It will be recalled that when the 93rd Congress convened in January, 1973, there appeared to be a need to investigate the irregularities that occurred during the political campaign of 1972. It was clear that several regular Senate Committees shared a concern in the matter but that the Senate's responsibility was paramount. On the recommendation of this Conference, therefore, the Senate decided that a special Committee should be empaneled to investigate Watergate and related matters. That was the beginning of Watergate. The wisdom of that course, I believe, was underscored by subsequent developments. The Ervin Committee became the sole locus of the Watergate investigation. It operated in a non-partisan fashion and with telling effectiveness.

On a matter that bears close resemblance to Watergate, there is a similar need for investigation. Intelligence-gathering as it has been pursued at home and abroad by the C.I.A. has raised serious questions concerning possible dangers to Constitutional freedoms. Therefore, the practices which are being pursued under legislation enacted a quarter of a century ago need to be fully tested against the imperatives of today. The Senate can no longer evade its responsibility for being conversant with the mechanisms of intelligence-gathering which have been set up and which operate largely in secrecy. To confront that responsibility, an arm of the Senate must explore deeply. It must be asked how the 1947 National Security Act works today to balance methods employed abroad against effects at home that may serve to weaken and erode the basic precepts of the Constitution. And if I may add another dimension to this question, it needs to ask too: What has been the effect of the operations under this law on the good name of the United States of America in the world—on the reputation which once was this nation's among all peoples, for decency, integrity, honest dealing and compassionate human concern.

I do not know whether we are best advised to proceed in this matter precisely as we did in the Watergate affair. What I do know is that any investigation of the C.I.A. should be undertaken, as was the case in Watergate, by one Senate group and not by many. The investigation, moreover, should be pursued by a membership which provides a wider per-

spective than that afforded by any one Committee and one which reflects the general character of the Senate in the 94th Congress.

In that respect, I should report to you that I have been informed by Senator Stennis that it is his intention to hold hearings under the auspices of the Armed Services Committee, that he has been in touch with Senator McClellan and Senator Young of the Appropriations Committee and, at my suggestion, that any investigating Committee should be broadened, he indicated that he would also get in touch with Senator Sparkman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and he has—and Senator Muskie of the Government Operations Committee. He also informed me that the Majority and Minority Leaders would be included in any such inquiry by his Committee. Furthermore, he assured me that insofar as it would be possible, the hearings would be open.

I am sure that this will be a matter for discussion late in the Conference. It is my desire only that this issue be brought to your attention at this time. The advice and guidance of the Caucus on an appropriate course is welcomed. May I add, that the existence of a Presidential Commission of inquiry in no way abrogates or reduces the Senate's responsibility in this matter.

If the questions posed by the C.I.A. present us with troublesome issues, there are others which will also arise, involving national health insurance, protection for consumers, and revamping the criminal laws with special attention for victims. There is old business as well. Specifically, there is the question of surface mining protection, and I would expect that the Congress will move quickly to retest the veto of this vital legislation.

Let me conclude this brief introduction to the work of the 94th Congress by noting that nothing in my political preference for Democrats and particularly for the Democratic members of the Senate is meant to suggest that our party has cornered the market on ideas, talent, experience or dedication. I have a deep respect and affection for the President, the Vice President and members of the Executive Branch. Neither the Senate Democratic Majority, the Democratic controlled Congress, nor the Republican-controlled Executive Branch will be able to do much to confront the questions which deeply concern the people of the nation unless all are prepared to work together.

Insofar as the Senate majority leadership is concerned, we will address the agenda for action in the 94th Congress in a spirit of cooperation and unity with the Congressional minority under the leadership of Senator Scott, who has been an excellent working partner, a man of understanding and toler-

ance, and the President. Together we can do, and we must do, a great deal to meet the needs of the people of the United States. That is our collective responsibility, and we cannot and must not evade it. To shirk our responsibilities would be demeaning. The welfare of the Republic must always come first. As far as we as Democrats are concerned, it will.

REMARKS OF SENATOR MANSFIELD
AT SENATE DEMOCRATIC CON-
FERENCE ON TUESDAY, JANUARY
14, 1975

Gentlemen, as the first order of business, no task could be more pleasant for me than to greet our Senate Democratic colleagues, in the aftermath of the 1974 elections. Not a single incumbent of our party failed of reelection in the November elections. My congratulations go to those who having already served with distinction were returned to office. These Senators include Inouye of Hawaii (applause), Cranston of California (applause), Ribicoff of Connecticut (applause), Allen of Alabama (applause), Long of Louisiana (applause), Church of Idaho (applause), Stevenson of Illinois (applause), Talmadge of Georgia (applause), and Gravel of Alaska (applause), Eagleton of Missouri (applause), Magnuson of Washington (applause), Hollings of South Carolina (applause), McGovern of South Dakota (applause), and Bayh of Indiana (applause).

Of equal pleasure is the welcoming of newly elected Democrats. Before doing so, let me note that their predecessors were Americans of exemplary dedication to the service of this country—Senators the likes of an Ervin, a Fulbright, a Bible, and an Aiken, as well as others. They will be missed, but, in their place have come others who, I am confident, will serve with equal and perhaps even greater distinction.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce them now: Senator Leahy of Vermont (applause), Senator Morgan of North Carolina (applause), Culver of Iowa (applause), Stone of Florida (applause)—he is going to have to attend some of our meetings—Glenn of Ohio (applause), Ford of Kentucky (applause), Hart of Colorado (applause), Bumpers of Arkansas (applause), and, hopefully, subject to clarification under our constitutional processes, Durkin of New Hampshire (applause).

For the Nation as a whole, 1974 was a year of frustration and tragedy. Energy and inflation, Watergate and recession—they tell much of the story. The legacy left to us places new meaning on the expression "national challenge." The Senate of the 94th Congress meets today to accept that challenge.

We convene at a moment of great national stress. It is not the first period of crisis which the Nation has known, nor will it be the last. Nevertheless, we will do well to face the fact that the tragic war in Southeast Asia has strained our institutions as never before. Its cost and waste have done much to snuff out the illusion of omnipotent power. What we now know is that there are limits to what this Nation or any nation can do with the sum of its collective will and strength. We now know that we must decide what is more and what is less beneficial to this Nation. We must make the hard choices between what is more and what is less important. In this connection, we now have the Budget Control and Impoundment Act which set up the Budget Committees of the Senate and the House—a facility designed to provide effective guidance on these most difficult choices. Its first concurrent resolution providing a yardstick for the Congress to determine the economic model for the current year will be brought to the Senate by April 15, 1975.

As for the public's view of the Federal Government, it seems to me that there is more awareness, now, of the part Congress should and must play in the functioning of a constitutional system of divided powers. The people have come to expect more from Congress in the way of discernment and

leadership. It is up to us, all of us, to see that they are forthcoming.

Insofar as the majority leadership is concerned, there are no panaceas for the Nation's ills. A little fine tuning here or there of the intricate machinery of the American system is not enough. What has now become apparent is that a multitude of the components of this economy are out of whack. We are a complex nation with a vast complex of problems.

Vietnam and Indochina set the stage for inflation. In addition, wasteful usage of petroleum has placed unbearable demands on our own resources, and required massive imports. The manipulated prices of these imports, in turn, have created international monetary imbalances and brought havoc into our domestic economy especially in terms of prices and employment.

As these problems become more pervasive, they intensify the urgency of maintaining in the Senate a broad perspective of our national requirements. I would hope, therefore, that this Conference and its Policy Committee—and the Policy Committee is the creature and the servant of this Conference—could be used more fully for overall discussions of national issues. This practice, as you know, has been growing in the past several years. Its intensification, together with more frequent exchanges between the majority leadership of both houses, can help us as Congressional Democrats to do our best to move the work of government.

As for the agenda of business for the first session of the 94th Congress, it will be dominated by energy and other problems of the economy. In the wake of last November's elections there are great responsibilities imposed upon the Congress, and especially on Democrats. Let me emphasize that there are also limits on what any Senate can do under the Constitution. We will not be able to work miracles. The Senate constitutes but one part of one branch of a government of divided powers. We cannot presume to discharge the functions of the House or of the Executive Branch or the courts. Watergate should have taught all of us the tragedy and the folly of any such presumption on the part of any one branch.

Within these Constitutional limitations, however, Senate Democrats in cooperation with our Republican colleagues must do our share, our full share, in righting what has gone wrong in the nation.

For the benefit of our new members, let me stress the equality of all Senators—of all new colleagues—as an aspect of this undertaking. Each of us by virtue of the trust of our respective electorates has an equal obligation and right to participate fully in the work of the Senate. There are no first or second class Senators. This is a body of equals. This is a body of peers. That has been the policy of the leadership ever since the Senate Democratic Conference first elected me. That will be the policy of the Leadership as long as I remain Majority Leader. So to the recently elected members, let me say this: speak up and participate fully. Do not take a back seat. Give the Senate the benefit of your fresh insights.

There are no parsons as far as chairmen of committees are concerned in this body and there will not be any unless you allow it to happen.

During the past two years, the members of the House and Senate have constituted the only part of the Federal Government which owes its powers to election of the people. No member of the Executive Branch is in the same situation. In so noting, I do not wish to detract in any way from either the President or the Vice President nor the Constitutional process by which they were selected. I only wish to emphasize the burden of the responsibility which falls on the 94th Congress, collectively, to interpret the needs and wishes of the people of the nation.

In this regard it was a major achievement of the 93rd—a responsible and constructive Congress—that it prepared the way for the 94th to approach the dominant issues of concern to the American people. The 93rd, for example, enacted a broad public service employment program along with expanded workmen's compensation benefits which will help to offset the rising tide of unemployment. In the face of a national jobless rate edging towards 8%, however, these measures are only a beginning. As the recession deepens, additional actions of this nature will have to be considered.

Prior to the adjournment last year Senate Democrats also pledged to provide tax cuts as a way to curb the recession and stimulate the economy. As we move in this direction, it should be kept in mind that a budget severely out of balance will not by itself provide stimulus. That will be the case particularly if the imbalance is caused in major part by revenue short-falls due to lost taxes from failing businesses.

Therefore, the Democratic Conference, last year, also pledged a search for some way to reconstitute the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or something approximating it, as a way of dealing with the host of businesses and institutions that are expected to fall or collapse in the weeks and months ahead. I would urge the appropriate legislative Committee to look into this possibility without delay.

The Democratic Conference during 1974 agreed that credit should be allocated on a priority basis in the light of the Nation's most critical needs, notably in the areas of housing and energy. That question, too, needs prompt examination by the appropriate committees.

As the recession now dominates our national life, wage-price-rent and profit movements must be closely watched. To that end it was the position of the Conference, last year, that, as needed, the concept of controls should come into play. The time to examine this need very closely in terms of possible legislation, it seems to me, is close at hand.

Before the last adjournment, the Democratic Conference urged that a beginning be made in allocations, rationing or other effective means to reduce consumption of energy and other scarce materials. If we are going to cope effectively with exorbitant and arbitrary prices for petroleum, in my judgment, a reduction of consumption equal to at least two million barrels per day, and preferably more, must be achieved. Savings of that kind cannot be made without a stringent conservation system. It is time for enforcement of speed laws, encouragement of a more rapid phase-in of efficient automobiles and a reduction of the wastage of fossil fuels by public utilities and other industries as well as in the home.

I have just recently returned from China, a country of 800 million people where production of petroleum is a fraction of our domestic output. Yet, after meeting all of its domestic needs, that country is still able to export crude. I am not inferring by any means that the situations in the two countries are the same. What I am suggesting is that the energy crisis has two sides. Only one deals with availability of supply. The other is the wisdom of usage. A recent Ford Foundation study—and one by Senator Gaylord Nelson and his committee, and by others—pointed to an energy wastage rate of about 40% in this nation. To me that strongly suggests that the root of our problem is not so much one of supply but rather of a great lack of wisdom in usage. Unless we put an end to the superfluous and extravagant, supplies, no matter how great, will never be sufficient.

One final word on energy. A spectre of confrontation and war in the Mideast was raised recently as a result of interpretations given to an interview by the Secretary of

State. In my judgment, self-sufficiency and negotiations, not confrontation, must form the basis of this nation's policies on energy. The less talk of war in the Middle East in order to bring out petroleum or whatever, the better for all concerned.

May I say that I think insofar as petroleum is concerned, we place too much emphasis on the Middle East, because approximately 28 percent of our imports come from Venezuela; another 18 percent from Canada, though half of that is Venezuelan oil refined, about 9.5 percent from Nigeria; about 9.5 or 10 percent from Iran, which is not considered a Middle East country in the ordinary sense; and 4 or 5 percent from other parts of the world, Indonesia and elsewhere.

So what we have as far as the Middle East is concerned is approximately a third of our imports, and I think we ought to keep that in mind.

What is suggested by the proposals which were put forward last year by the Senate Democrats for dealing with recession and inflation and by the House Leadership in recent days is that the nation's economy runs badly without foresight and without direction. Orderly management of our economic affairs is far better than the endless instability which results from following a hands-off policy interspersed with stop and start crash economic remedies. That policy has already induced a drastic recession on top of spiraling inflation.

In this connection, I would once again point out that under P.L. 93-426 an Executive-Legislative-private Commission has been authorized to study ways of dealing in an integrated long-range fashion with the nation's shortages and supplies and with other fundamental economic questions. Congressional appointments have already been made to this Commission and additional recommendations have been made to the President. The Administration, however, has yet to act to bring this Commission into being.

Beyond economic questions, there will be other issues of pressing importance before the 94th Congress. The implications of Watergate, for example, are not yet behind us. Nor will they be put to rest until there has been translated into law an effective method to reveal and to prevent future abuses of that kind.

It will be recalled that when the 93rd Congress convened in January, 1973, there appeared to be a need to investigate the irregularities that occurred during the political campaign of 1972. It was clear that several regular Senate Committees shared a concern in the matter but that the Senate's responsibility was paramount. On the recommendation of this Conference, therefore, the Senate decided that a special Committee should be empaneled to investigate Watergate and related matters. That was the beginning of Watergate. The wisdom of that course, I believe, was underscored by subsequent developments. The Ervin Committee became the sole locus of the Watergate investigation. It operated in a non-partisan fashion and with telling effectiveness.

On a matter that bears close resemblance to Watergate, there is a similar need for investigation. Intelligence-gathering as it has been pursued at home and abroad by the C.I.A. has raised serious questions concerning possible dangers to Constitutional freedoms. Therefore, the practices which are being pursued under legislation enacted a quarter of a century ago need to be fully tested against the imperatives of today. The Senate can no longer evade its responsibility for being conversant with the mechanisms of intelligence-gathering which have been set up and which operate largely in secrecy. To confront that responsibility, an arm of the Senate must explore deeply. It must be asked how the 1947 National Security Act works today to balance methods employed abroad against effects at home that may

serve to weaken and erode the basic precepts of the Constitution. And if I may add another dimension to this question, it needs to ask too: What has been the effect of the operations under this law on the good name of the United States of America in the world—on the reputation which once was this nation's among all peoples, for decency, integrity, honest dealing and compassionate human concern.

I do not know whether we are best advised to proceed in this matter precisely as we did in the Watergate affair. What I do know is that any investigation of the C.I.A. should be undertaken, as was the case in Watergate, by one Senate group and not by many. The investigation, moreover, should be pursued by a membership which provides a wider perspective than that afforded by any one Committee and one which reflects the general character of the Senate in the 94th Congress.

In that respect, I should report to you that I have been informed by Senator Stennis that it is his intention to hold hearings under the auspices of the Armed Services Committee, that he has been in touch with Senator McClellan and Senator Young of the Appropriations Committee and, at my suggestion, that any investigating Committee should be broadened, he indicated that he would also get in touch with Senator Sparkman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and he has—and Senator Muskie of the Government Operations Committee. He also informed me that the Majority and Minority Leaders would be included in any such inquiry by his Committee. Furthermore, he assured me that insofar as it would be possible, the hearings would be open.

I am sure that this will be a matter for discussion late in the Conference. It is my desire only that this issue be brought to your attention at this time. The advice and guidance of the Caucus on an appropriate course is welcomed. May I add, that the existence of a Presidential Commission of inquiry in no way abrogates or reduces the Senate's responsibility in this matter.

If the questions posed by the C.I.A. present us with troublesome issues, there are others which will also arise, involving national health insurance, protection for consumers, and revamping the criminal laws with special attention for victims. There is old business as well. Specifically, there is the question of surface mining protection, and I would expect that the Congress will move quickly to retest the veto of this vital legislation.

Let me conclude this brief introduction to the work of the 94th Congress by noting that nothing in my political preference for Democrats and particularly for the Democratic members of the Senate is meant to suggest that our party has cornered the market on ideas, talent, experience or dedication. I have a deep respect and affection for the President, the Vice President and members of the Executive Branch. Neither the Senate Democratic Majority, the Democratic controlled Congress, nor the Republican-controlled Executive Branch will be able to do much to confront the questions which deeply concern the people of the nation unless all are prepared to work together.

Insofar as the Senate majority leadership is concerned, we will address the agenda for action in the 94th Congress in a spirit of cooperation and unity with the Congressional minority under the leadership of Senator Scott, who has been an excellent working partner, a man of understanding and tolerance, and the President. Together we can do, and we must do, a great deal to meet the needs of the people of the United States. That is our collective responsibility, and we cannot and must not evade it. To shirk our responsibilities would be demeaning. The welfare of the Republic must always come first. As far as we as Democrats are concerned, it will.