

U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 23

SEPTEMBER 7, 1972 TO SEPTEMBER 15, 1972

(PAGES 29651 TO 30948)

ices to be provided free to all handicapped individuals as evaluation of rehabilitation potential for up to 18 months duration, counseling, guidance, referral, placement and client advocacy services, vocational and other training services and family services where necessary to the adjustment or rehabilitation of a handicapped individual, physical and mental restoration services, and maintenance payments during the process of rehabilitation; and expands from existing law and the House bill the scope of vocational and comprehensive services to include as a discretionary service the provision of telecommunication sensory and other aids and devices; requires the vocational rehabilitation counselor or coordinator to develop for each individual and individualized rehabilitation written program which will be reviewed on an annual basis by the counselor and the client (or where appropriate, his parent or guardian), and will contain a statement of long-range rehabilitation goals and intermediate objectives for the individual. Primary emphasis in the development of this program must be the determination and achievement of a vocational rehabilitation goal. The decision that this goal is not possible can only be made in full consultation with the individual (or his parent or guardian) that such a goal is not then possible for the individual.

2. Increases the authorization for basic vocational and comprehensive rehabilitation services (see separate chart on authorization levels), and earmarks 15% of all appropriations as supplementary funds for the provision of vocational and comprehensive rehabilitation services for a severely handicapped individual which may be used for that individual only after the cost of purchase and provision of such services (including counseling) exceeds 200% of the average cost per individual of the purchase and provision of such services for all handicapped individuals rehabilitated in the State in the preceding fiscal year. In addition, a 10% limitation is placed on funding under the basic program from supplementary funds for the provision of services to individuals who do not have a vocational goal. This is a major change from the House bill which provides a separate title for services to the severely handicapped, and emphasized through report language a priority for the severely handicapped under the basic program.

3. Contains a new provision of law not contained in the House bill which would limit the amount of money under this Act spent for alcohol and drug abuse disabilities by ensuring that either reimbursement was available for such services, or that first-dollar funding was provided by programs which are designed specifically to provide for treatment and rehabilitation, prevention or control of alcoholism, drug addiction, or alcohol or drug abuse disability; the intent of this provision is not to exclude individuals suffering from such disabilities from services, but rather to tap resources from specific programs which are responsible for providing such services. The Senate bill also differs from the House bill by consolidating the provision of evaluation of rehabilitation potential for handicapped individuals contained in section 15 of existing law (title II of the House bill) as a mandatory basic service under title I, and eliminates the provision of such services for disadvantaged individuals who do not fit the basic definition of handicapped individuals as contained in the same section. Similar to the House bill, the Senate bill consolidates grants on a population/PCI formula basis to the States for innovation and expansion of services to classes of individuals with particularly difficult problems, 50% of such funding to be available for State purposes, and 50% to be used to carry out programs of Federal priority.

4. Established a new mandatory program of

client advocacy systems within each State which will provide ombudsman to seek to resolve complaints of clients and client applicants, and authorize the Secretary to carry out experimental client appeal and review systems. Neither provision is contained in existing law or in the House bill.

5. The Senate bill proposes to change the State allotment formula for the basic program (Part B) by distributing all funds up to the guaranteed FY 1972 level according to the existing Hill-Burton formula which magnifies the weight of per capita income and distributing the remainder of the appropriations on a new formula which weights more heavily population. This formula would provide a protection to States with a low per capita income by guaranteeing them at least the amount they received in FY 1972, but would more equitably distribute appropriations above the FY 1972 level in order to provide greatly needed funds to larger, more populous States for expansion of programs and services. This change is not contained in the House bill.

Title II—Special Federal responsibilities

Establishes new authority, similar to the House bill, for annual interest grants for rehabilitation facilities, for Rehabilitation Centers for severely handicapped deaf individuals, funds for the establishment and operation of centers for Spinal Cord Injury, and grants for services for individuals suffering from end-stage renal disease; for services to older blind individuals; and provides for the establishment of State Advisory Councils on Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, a provision not contained in the House bill; provides for an expanded program of grants for special projects and demonstrations including an expansion of the special grant program for rehabilitation services for handicapped migratory or agricultural workers and their families, a provision similar to the House provision; continues authority from existing law for grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities, construction and operation of the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, grants for vocational training for handicapped individuals (including weekly allowances for maintenance); expands the size and broadens the authority of the National Advisory Council on Rehabilitation of the Handicapped.

Title III—Research and training

1. Consolidates all research and training authority (to be exercised by the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services Administration through a Division of Research and Training) in present law in one title similar to the House bill; follows the intent of the House bill to provide greater emphasis on research and training relating directly to the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals by providing that all such activities shall be carried out and administered by the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services Administration; and further identifies priorities for research by providing for the establishment and support of new Rehabilitation Research and Training Centers, the establishment and support of Rehabilitation Engineering Research Centers, grants for spinal cord injury research, and grants for international rehabilitation research and exchange of personnel and technical assistance.

Title IV—Program and project evaluation

Expands upon similar provisions in the House bill to provide a Federal program of program and project evaluation of the impact and effectiveness of all programs authorized under the Act, and to determine priorities for research, demonstration and related activities; and upon the House provision under which the Secretary would undertake a comprehensive study of the role of sheltered

workshops, including a study of wage payments.

Title V—Office for the handicapped

Establishes an Office for the Handicapped in the Office of the Secretary to develop a Federal five-year plan for delivery of services to handicapped individuals and to coordinate, evaluate and review existing Federal programs for handicapped individuals; and incorporates in this Office the function of the National Information and Resource Center for the Handicapped contained in the House bill to evaluate existing data and information systems and to develop a coordinated system of information and data retrieval and dissemination relating to services, programs and information for handicapped individuals.

Title VI—Miscellaneous

Provides for agency-wide programs, not contained in the House bill, of action and focus on problems of the handicapped, including the establishment of an Interagency Committee on Handicapped Employees to ensure the adequacy of hiring, placement and advance practices in the Federal government in relation to handicapped employees and applicants, including the requirement of an affirmative action program to employ qualified handicapped employees by all Federal contractors and of non-discrimination by all Federal grantees.

Title VII—Amendments to Randolph Sheppard Act

Contains amendments to the Randolph Sheppard Act for the Blind, which were ordered reported to the full Committee by the Subcommittee on the Handicapped in S. 3507 earlier this year (not part of the Rehabilitation Act).

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 3988. A bill to establish a temporary commission to conduct a comprehensive study of certain matters relating to the national security of the United States. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

A COMMISSION ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to establish a Commission on National Security. This Commission would be charged, over a period of 2 years, with studying all matters it deems relevant to the present and future national defense of the United States; examining the long-term implications of all decisions related to the national defense; and advising both the President and the Congress on these matters.

The American people want a strong national defense. But they do not want—and they should not have to pay for—waste and needless escalation in the military budget.

Beyond this basic consensus, disagreements inevitably arise both over the nature of the national security and over the best means of insuring it. Recent congressional debates on such basic questions as appropriate U.S. troop levels in Europe and on a variety of weapons systems—ranging from the ABM to the Trident program—have dramatized these differences. Regardless of one's views on the merits of each of these issues, I think most of us can agree that the assumptions and objectives underlying the defense budget and defense planning have often been obscured.

I think we can also agree with former

Budget Director Charles Shultz, who once observed that:

The benefits and costs of proposed military programs cannot be viewed in isolation. They must be related to and measured against those other national priorities which, in the context of limited resources, their adoption must necessarily sacrifice.

As Mr. Shultz suggests, the national defense is a major aspect of our national welfare, and military programs must be evaluated in that perspective. It has been observed that our national security interests are best served by efficiency in the forces we buy; inefficiency will require us to spend more than is necessary and will inevitably detract from our commitments to our children, our cities and towns, our farms and our natural environment.

For a significant change in public attitudes toward our national priorities has occurred over the past decade. This phenomenon is described and discussed in detail in the excellent report recently published by the Brookings Institution, "Setting National Priorities." Into the early sixties, according to this study, government programs were relatively uncomplicated activities; and it is only over the past 10 years that Americans have reached a widespread consensus, transcending party lines, that certain goals—improving the quality of public services, increasing equality of opportunity, rescuing the environment, for example—are properly the concern of the Federal Government.

This revolution in attitude toward the role of government has had a major impact on the Federal budget. Indeed, if we survey the pattern of Federal expenditures over the past 10 years, we find a shift in emphasis away from defense and toward domestic needs. Overall, the budget has increased approximately 130 percent in the 1963-73 period. This figure obscures the fact, however, that defense spending increased approximately 50 percent, while spending on domestic programs more than tripled.

The rise in Federal expenditures, and the heavy emphasis on spending for purely domestic purposes, are both trends unlikely to be reversed. They occur in conjunction with a third trend—a relatively slower rate of increase in Federal revenues, the consequence of the tax policies of the past decade.

Taken together, the tendency of Federal expenditures to outpace revenues and the growing emphasis on spending for domestic purposes, have profound implications for our defense and national security policies.

For now, more than ever before, we must be efficient in the forces we buy. Spending for national defense—as well as spending to meet urgent domestic needs—must be carefully scrutinized and justified.

In addition to this increasing demand on limited Federal resources, issues involving national defense are today more complex and difficult as a result of recent developments of major significance—such as the successful negotiations of a first round of arms limitations and the reassessments of our policies

toward both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Yet despite the urgent necessity of avoiding costly errors of judgment, and despite the increasing complexity of the problems facing us, the debate on national security issues is regrettably clouded with confusion and uncertainty. In particular, Congress is too often in the position of making crucial decisions on the basis of inadequate information—without careful examination of the implications of the decision for future defense and budgetary policies, without adequate investigation of alternative proposals, and in isolation from relevant diplomatic considerations.

It may be tempting in such circumstances for the Congress automatically to approve or oppose whatever a particular administration is seeking in the name of national security. In doing so, however, we abdicate our constitutional responsibility to provide for the common defense.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I urge the creation of a Commission on National Security. I am not the first to make this proposal; it was put forth by James Killian, the former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, at a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1969, and again last year by Francis O. Wilcox, dean of the Johns Hopkins SAIS, in his book entitled "Congress, the Executive and Foreign Policy." I believe the recent SALT agreements have given new strength to the arguments for the commission.

The bill I am introducing establishes a commission with 15 members—five appointed by the President, five by the majority leader of the Senate, and five by the Speaker of the House.

The bill requires that all those appointed to the commission must be qualified on the basis of their experience in matters relating to military planning, budget management and analysis, foreign affairs, and arms control and disarmament. It is anticipated that this commission will consist of seasoned and experienced individuals from a variety of backgrounds in the private and public sectors—persons who, in the course of their careers, have dealt with problems involving our national security.

Such individuals, of course, will come to this commission with divergent views on the critical issues of national defense. But, hopefully, those appointed to the commission will be persons with a recognized reputation for fairness, integrity, balance, and openmindedness—qualities which will enable them to make their final judgments and recommendations on the basis of all the evidence before the commission. I believe that the reports submitted by a commission composed of such individuals will help make the debate over national security more reasoned and more dispassionate.

This Commission would have full access to classified documents, with the authority necessary to carry out its responsibilities, including the power of subpoena. The Commission's existence is limited to 2 years, and it would be re-

quired to submit an official report within that time. An interim report is required within the first year of the Commission's existence.

The Commission's mandate is a broad one. The bill states that the Commission's duty shall be:

To conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters it deems relevant to the present and future national defense of the United States.

In conducting this study and investigation, the Commission will be required to consider, among other questions—

The nature and magnitude of external threats to the national security of the United States and the adequacy of present and projected military forces to meet such threats;

The alternative uses of manpower, including the respective uses of military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, the relationship of combat to support forces, and the role of reserves in national security planning;

The nature and mission of the strategic and tactical weapon systems employed, and of those planned to be employed, by the United States;

The relationship of defense expenditures and programs to arms limitation agreements;

The relationship of the military capabilities of U.S. allies to the structure of U.S. forces;

The relationship of foreign military assistance, including sales, to the national security of the United States;

The reform of the national security and defense planning process to provide a longer-range perspective than that imposed by the annual authorization and appropriations processes; and

Such other relevant questions of policy and practice related to the defense posture of the United States and the national security as the Commission deems appropriate.

Given this mandate, the Commission will certainly evaluate those weapons systems presently the subject of intense controversy, such as the Trident, the attack carrier, and the B-1 bomber. Behind each of these systems, however, lies a complex network of assumptions concerning basic security and defense requirements, which would also require careful study. In the case of strategic offensive planning, for example, the Commission inquiry would not be limited to the Trident or the B-1, or even to possible alternatives to these two systems; the Commission should deal with all aspects of the tripartite deterrent, including the future of and potential alternatives to the triad.

The Commission, of course, will have to do more than simply examine the merits of particular weapons systems. It is now clear that major proposals for new defense expenditures must also be evaluated in light of existing and future arms limitation agreements.

Decisions on specific military expenditures may well have a decisive impact on the success or failure of future arms limitations talks. Therefore, it will be extremely important for this Commission to evaluate such expenditures not just in

terms of their military utility—but also in terms of their potential diplomatic impact.

I believe, as President Nixon believes, that meaningful arms limitations agreements are a crucial aspect of national security. I also believe that there is always the danger of producing and developing weapons at the expense of future arms limitation agreements—a course which in the long run will mean less rather than more security.

Another important area for the Commission's consideration will involve manpower questions. Manpower costs today are the single most important factor in the defense budget, having increased sharply over the past 5 years. In this period, average military pay has doubled and average civilian employees' pay has increased approximately 50 percent. Payroll and other personnel costs have thus risen by \$10 billion, while total military and civilian manpower has declined by almost 1.5 million.

We are now committed to replacing the draft with an all-volunteer army, and this fact has cost and other implications which are not yet clear. Comparability legislation insures that Government salaries will keep pace with pay in the private sector, which will rise at a modest rate even in the absence of inflation. As yet, we have no assurance that even today's better military pay scales will enable us to meet the projected 2.3 million force level; we may therefore find that incentive pay increases are unavoidable.

This Commission should therefore monitor the initial experience with an all-volunteer army and report on its implications. In addition, it should investigate the critical problems of achieving force levels and structure that will offer maximum efficiency in the use of manpower and that will lead to the most advantageous balance of manpower and weapons systems.

The Commission should also study ways to provide a longer-range perspective on defense planning than that imposed by the annual authorization and appropriations process. Both the executive branch and the congressional committees with jurisdiction over national security issues must operate under the constraints of determining annual budgets and disposing of a crowded legislative calendar. It is particularly difficult for the Congress to undertake the broader and longer-range studies that lie outside the scope of pressing legislative responsibilities. The recent Brookings study, *Setting National Priorities*, observed:

While every new budget affords at least some room for the administration and the Congress to indicate their changing priorities, only a perspective that covers a number of years can illuminate the really large changes taking place in the scope and emphasis of federal activities.

This is certainly true of defense planning, where the perspective of the annual budget may obscure or distort long term, fundamental trends. Hopefully, this Commission will recommend ways to broaden that perspective.

At the same time, it should be emphasized that the Commission would in no sense determine national security and defense policies. Its recommendations would not be binding, nor would a commission report end the debate over a variety of national security and defense questions. Differences of opinion will certainly persist, but I believe the Commission can perform the invaluable service of helping to sharpen the focus of the debate. Its work would thus provide a framework for making defense policies.

No set of issues that we face is more important to our constituents, yet more obscured than the questions of how to defend our country.

National defense is not a partisan issue. No one in the Congress or the Executive Branch would willfully weaken this country or wantonly underestimate the dangers abroad in a harsh world. Most of us are from generations that have seen the awful price of unpreparedness, from Pearl Harbor to the bloody retreat to Pusan.

However, too often, in the name of national defense, bureaucratic infighting causes waste and a misallocation of limited resources, weakening rather than strengthening the vitality of our Nation's security. It is because I believe in a strong and unassailable national defense that I—along with many of my colleagues—have criticized certain aspects of the military budget in the past.

Defending this country is not the issue. The issue is the foresight and efficiency that a government of imperfect men bring to a task where the cost of imperfection is so high.

We can do nothing less than apply to the national security—our Nation's most important business—the same standards of good planning and effective management that stock holders demand of any corporation.

We can demand no less care and honesty and objectivity in the making of our military budget than each of us applies to our family budgets.

In national defense, unlike so many issues that face us, there is no one special interest, no one region or group to be served. Our constituency is all America, and at stake is the future of our children and the peace of the world.

That is why I think Senators and Congressmen of both parties should be able to agree that we need a dispassionate and fresh look at where we are going in national defense. And that is why I think the next administration, whatever its composition, should welcome an independent and fair analysis of the fateful choices before it.

Mr. President, I am asking that we put aside partisanship where the stakes are too high for anything but the freest judgment that free men can make.

I therefore propose the creation of this Commission on National Security as one means of helping us make decisions on defense policy issues which will best serve the needs of this Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3988

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a temporary commission to be known as the Commission on National Security (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMISSION

SECTION 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed as follows—

- (1) five to be appointed by the President;
- (2) five to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, not more than two of whom may be from the House of Representatives and not more than three of whom may be members of the same political party; and
- (3) five to be appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate, not more than two of whom may be from the Senate and not more than three of whom may be members of the same political party.

Persons shall be appointed to the Commission who are qualified for appointment by reason of their experience in matters relating to military planning, budget management and analysis, foreign affairs, and arms control and disarmament.

(b) The Commission shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(c) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters it deems relevant to the present and future national defense of the United States. In conducting such study and investigation the Commission shall consider—

- (1) the nature and magnitude of external threats to the national security of the United States and the adequacy of present and projected military forces to meet such threats;
- (2) the alternative uses of manpower, including the respective uses of military and civilian personnel in the Department of Defense, the relationship of combat to support forces, and the role of reserves in national security planning;

(3) the nature and mission of the strategic and tactical weapon systems employed, and of those planned to be employed, by the United States;

(4) the relationship of defense expenditures and programs to arms limitation agreements;

(5) the relationship of the military capabilities of U.S. allies to the structure of U.S. forces;

(6) the relationship of foreign military assistance, including sales, to the national security of the United States;

(7) the reform of the national security and defense planning process to provide a longer-range perspective than that imposed by the annual authorization and appropriations processes; and

(8) such other relevant questions of policy and practice related to the defense posture of the United States and the national security as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress a detailed report of the results of the study and investigation conducted by it under this Act not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. The Commis-

sion shall submit an interim report to the President and the Congress on the results of its study and investigation not more than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the Commission, of any such subcommittee, or any designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act. Each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

(c) The Commission shall establish appropriate measures to insure the safeguarding of all classified information submitted to or inspected by it in carrying out its duties under this Act.

COMPENSATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 5. Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise employed by the United States Government shall receive an amount equal to the daily rate paid a GS-18 under the General Schedule contained in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, (including travel time) during which he is engaged in the actual performance of his duties as a member of the Commission. A member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States Government shall serve without additional compensation. All members of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates.

(b) The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at GS-18.

EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 7. Ninety days after the submission of its final report to the President and the Congress the Commission shall cease to exist.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

By Mr. BENTSEN (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S.J. Res. 267. A joint resolution providing for a special deficiency payment to certain wheat farmers. Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, today the distinguished Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) and I introduce a joint resolution to provide special deficiency payments to wheat producers who will receive less than parity on the domestic production of their wheat as a result of the recent large wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

Congressman GRAHAM PURCELL, chairman of the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Livestock and Grains is introducing an identical resolution in the House to make this a joint effort. The House subcommittee began hearings today on the impact of these recent sales on farmers and others; however, some injury is already apparent.

Producers who sold their wheat prior to any knowledge of the sale to the Soviet Union were handicapped in making marketing decisions. Since the first wheat in the Nation is harvested beginning as early as May and continuing into July, a great deal of production was harvested before the sale to the Soviet Union was announced on July 8. Traditionally, most of this early wheat crop is sold at time of harvest.

The Agricultural Act of 1970, at the urging of the Nixon administration, provided that the wheat certificate paid to farmers on their share of domestic consumption would be calculated to reflect the difference between the average market price for the first 5 months of the marketing year, July 1-November 30, and the parity price as of July 1—\$3.02 per bushel.

The sale of wheat to the Soviet Union has resulted in increases in the market price. Everything being equal, such an increase is good for wheat producers. However, since the increase in wheat market prices will reduce the amount of the certificate paid to farmers on the domestic portion of their wheat, only those farmers who sold at or above the 5 months' average market price will receive the parity price of \$3.02 per bushel. Those farmers who sold below the 5 months' average market price will receive less than the parity price by whatever amount their sale price was below the 5 months' average market price. Farmers in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and other States in the early wheat harvest area sold wheat at prices below the anticipated 5 months' average market price and they will not be able to get parity price for their production.

The evidence is clear that there was heavy early selling in these and other wheat-producing areas. As of July 31, only 59.4 million bushels of wheat were under loan for support price purposes as against 77.1 million bushels on July 31, 1971. In Kansas, for example, where the harvest was completed by July 31, 36.8 million bushels were under loans as compared to 51.9 million on the same date in 1971.

Let me cite an example of how farm-

ers who sold wheat before the market prices advanced in response to Soviet Union wheat sales will lose unless the current provision of law is changed, as provided in the resolution I introduced today. The average market price in July was \$1.32; in August \$1.51. It is anticipated that there will be further market price increases in September, October, and November which could result in an average market price during those months of \$1.75. Averaging the prices for the 5-months brings the market average for wheat to \$1.62 per bushel.

This \$1.62 per bushel price under the 1970 Agricultural Act is the point at which the USDA begins to calculate the amount of wheat certificate. Since the parity price was \$3.02 on July 1, the wheat certificate paid to producers on their domestic production will amount to \$1.42 per bushel.

But, it can be clearly seen that these farmers who sold below the estimated 5 months' average market price of \$1.62 per bushel, would lose the difference between their sales price and the 5 months' average market price. Let us take the specific case of a Texas farmer who sold his wheat at \$1.32 per bushel. Since this sales price is below the average market price of \$1.62, he would lose 30 cents per bushel. Instead of receiving the parity price of \$3.02 per bushel, he would receive only \$2.72 per bushel.

Mr. President, the inequity in this situation is apparent. My position simply is to bring equity in the payment by the Government to producers who are eligible for wheat certificates. No farmer in this Nation should be penalized in the amount of the wheat certificate he receives by his geographic location in the Nation.

In summary, the resolution, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make special deficiency payments to wheat producers who sold all or any portion of his 1972 crop of wheat for less than the average price for the first 5 months of the marketing year—July 1-November 30, 1972. The deficiency payment would be calculated as I have indicated above—the difference between the average 5 months' market price and the price the producer received in the sale of his 1972 crop of wheat.

The effect of the bill would be to assure that no producer receives less than the parity price of \$3.02 because he was not unaware of the pending Soviet wheat agreement which would increase the market price.

When major U.S. exporters were caught in a somewhat similar bind in August of this year a special export subsidy payment was administratively approved. If administrative action can be taken to avoid undue loss by the exporting companies in a surging market surely America's wheat growers should receive similar relief.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A BILL

S. 3827

At the request of Mr. GURNEY, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3827, a bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965