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political Caucus, a year old, has established strength in each state delegation.

Writing a letter from Tennessee ("the Magnolia Mafia"), from North Carolina, from all the other states rounded up 420 votes for Farenthoud against Presidential candidate William Shute's choice, Thomas Eagleton, of Missouri. At this point Sisley withdrew, making the vote for Eagleton unanimous. But that roll call did three things: it proved that women could make their mark; it showed George McGovern, considered the most pro-feminist of the candidates, that even he was not immune to the challenge from the ladies; and Sisley Farenthoud a national role model for political women. In February, 1973, the National Women's Political Caucus elected her its first chairwoman at its national convention in Houston.

What does Sisley Farenthoud think about the President's popularity? "I don't think many of us know all that's involved," she says. "Right now I'm writing a book on the CIA and the whole intelligence area. I am appalled at what I am learning—how our intelligence operations are used as alternatives to diplomacy. Do we even know what a President knows of covert operations?" "We're through in a kind of charade in this country."

If she became President, what legacy would she want to write? "A new future rights program Lyndon Johnson started. To restore our natural environment, and with it the human spirit. To establish a Department of the Environment.

ANNE L. ARMSTRONG

Former Co-Chairman, Republican National Committee; 47 years old; Republican.

In "the kind of country where the rattlesnake could have a party," says honcho J. Powdred Doble once described it, along the Texas gulf coast, amid unrelieved miles of lacy, thorny mesquite trees, is the small oasis around the century-old ranch house where Anne Armstrong lives.

This is silent land. But inside the house the incessantly ringing telephone breaks the stillness. Here in this remote spot Anne Armstrong is busy. The former Co-Chairman of the Republican National Committee, the former Republican National Committee's cabinet rank, remains a bright star in the G.O.P. hierarchy. The White House, the Vice-President's office, Cabinet members, newspaper editors, even ex-President Nixon will track her down for speeches, for advice, for service on commissions. She sits on two corporate boards of directors, American Express and Union Carbide.

At 23 Anne Legendre, a pretty girl from New Orleans, arrived in Texas to visit friends. And wound up marrying John Armstrong, the best-looking man in the state. The Armstronds have five children in five years and kept busy running their 50,000-acre ranch.

What has influenced her life? "I became very interested in politics and world events when I was a little girl," says Anne. "I particularly admire the United Federalist Movement. Working in the summer for a New Orleans newspaper—I loved that! Then coming here to this ranch. Ranch life is a way of life." She could have got no other way—a real closeness with family.

"As far as politics, I have lived mine on a very private level. There are as many Republicans, maybe twenty, in this county, The Republicans in Texas needed every warm body they could get, so it was a good place to go to move ahead fast."

She did just that—as National Committee,teawoman from Texas and then up the ladder—high on a portion of the No on Nixie Club with Senator Robert Dole of Kansas. In 1973 her efficiency and wide popularity in the Republican party led President Nixon to appoint her to the White House, give her

Cabinet status and wide responsibilities for issues relating to women and minorities. When the Watergate story began to unfold, she forthrightly criticized the President for tape conversations but at the time saw no impeachable offense committed. Most observers, including G. Gordon Liddy, who was watching Watergate with clean shirts, but that must have been deeply disappointing to one who had worked so diligently for her party through the years.

She is fascinated by—and knowledgeable about—foreign policy. "There is just no way we can withdraw to Fortress America. There is an unfortunate but natural inclination now just to attend to our business here, but that wouldn't work out. I think we need to understand long-range consequences better. We plan for short-range problems but we need long-range answers."

If she were President, what legacy would she most like to leave? "We've been through a period when Americans felt ill at ease with themselves. We do not know quite where our moorings are. I would like to have restored a sense of confidence in ourselves."

SENER MONDALE ON REGIONAL PRIMARIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) introduced a bill to establish a system of regional presidential primaries to replace the present "chaotic" means of nominating Presidential candidates, Senator Mondale says that he was introducing his bill "in the interest of contributing to a national debate" on this important question.

I am pleased to report that, in response to his initiative, such a debate already has begun. A number of columnists and editorial writers have commented on Senator Mondale's proposal, and I would like to share them with my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following commentaries be printed in the Record.

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

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Dec 10, 1975]

THE MONDALE PLAN

Sen. Walter Mondale has proposed a plan to bring some order out of the chaotic process of selecting candidates for the American presidency. His proposal for a nationwide regional presidential primary system is unquestionably a first-rate contribution to political science in an area heretofore lamentably neglected.

It is a plan which may have little chance of adoption. It is by no means a perfect plan, and Mondale is the first to admit that. It's not fair. But what he proposes is far and away better than the formless, slipshod and basically unfair process by which we now select the delegates to the presidential nominating conventions.

Indeed, to call the way in which these delegates are now chosen a "process" is to dignify anarchy. No other free nation goes about for its highest office in so haphazard a manner or puts such restraints upon free selection. Every one of the states and the District of Columbia goes its own way in the free-for-all scramble.

As Mondale said in his Senate speech, "It's often a mindless process from the candidates' perspective, too often a self-defeating one for the parties, and frequently an ineffective one for the nation."

Mondale tells us what we ought to have known all along but has barely conceded to us, that choosing presidential candidates is a "national process that deserves a national debate." On this we can all agree.

Some of those who have given thought to the problem have suggested a national primary, an all-on-the-same-day nationwide primary, to replace them. This at least seems if it does not destroy the function of the national nominating conventions, which he sees as instruments necessary to reconcile the needs and views of the various political factions. A national primary would, in addition, offer a built-in advantage to those candidates already well-known or well-connected, to the least extensive organizational and financial backing.

Mondale's answer, embodied in a bill he introduced last week, is that maybe something that may be regional primaries. It would divide the country into six regions. In each region those states choosing to hold primaries would all hold them the same day. Each of the six regions would be assigned an election day to be determined by lot. The six election dates would be staggered by state legislative councils.

The plan, Mondale says, would meet his six criteria for a national delegate selection process: It would retain the national conventions; it would have a high degree of candidates, including those not blessed with wealth or name recognition; encourage broad party participation but limit the participation of those administratively burdened; permit candidates to conduct coherent campaigns in each region; provide a measure of the candidates' appeal to all sections, and be of national design, giving undivided weight to no one state or area.

In introducing his regional primary plan, Mondale also said he "would like to see" President Ford, "first occupant of the White House whose presidency has not been the product of the existing nominating process," appoint a special commission to analyze that process and evaluate alternatives.

Perhaps Mondale would be satisfied if such a study is all that comes of his proposals. In any case, by placing his regional primary plan before the Congress and the country, he has made an invaluable contribution. He forces us to take a serious look at a situation which badly needs, at the very least, clarification.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 5, 1975]
the only cop on the block, he didn’t hesitate to plunge into the Congo or Lebanon, but he is not intervening now in Angola or Lebanon, though the situation in both places is a little scary.

So there is a chance that we will make similar progress in other fields. We are gradually getting some fiscal reform, welfare reform, and so on, but not political or constitutional reform; but election reform will be the slowest and the toughest because it is in the hands of the pigs who get where they are under the old system.

Nevertheless, Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota has come forward with a bill to improve the presidential system, which he presents as another step in present mindless irrational and chaotic Presidential primary system.

He rejects the notions of a single national presidential primary; he thinks it would undermine the national conventions, give the well-known and well-heeled candidates an unfair advantage, and risk too much on a single roll of the dice.

He proposes instead that the states and territories be divided into six regions, each of which would hold its Presidential primaries in one of the six regions. Each region has a regional primary system.

The six primary election dates, two weeks apart, would be assigned by lot to the six regions by the Federal Elections Commission five months before the first primary, and Mr. Mondale hopes that they will be:

"States," he says, "could retain the right to determine the particular type of primary [they wish] to have, so theirREASONS FOR A REFORM

In other fields, they will force the long overdue reforms. The six primary election dates, two weeks apart, would be assigned by lot to the six regions by the Federal Elections Commission five months before the first primary, and Mr. Mondale hopes that they will be:

"States," he says, "could retain the right to determine the particular type of primary [they wish] to have, so their

The problems of scheduling simultaneous primaries, the short-winded, the list: June 1 for Mississippi, Montana, Rhode Island, and South Dakota, and June 8, for Arkansas, California, New Jersey, and Ohio. (Arkansas may change its date to something earlier.)

The nation’s 48 presidential primaries would give way in large part to six regional primaries with similar purpose but presumably much more significant results if a similar reform before the United States senate could be enacted.

With the New Hampshire primary starting that season in February 1976, it is too late for Senator Mondale’s bill. By now the states have made up their minds to be of much help before 1980, but few better bicentennial projects have been proposed than laying the groundwork for replacing the hodgepodge in which states vie for position and influence, and thereby
The cost of health care services has increased at a rate virtually unparalleled among other goods and services. Within just the past 4 years public and private health care expenditures increased by 50 percent and Federal expenditures increased by 86 percent. In 1965, in response to soaring medical costs we enacted medicare, yet today the elderly are found to be paying more for medical care than they did before medicare became law.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this spiraling increase has not meant a comparable rise in the quality or quantity of health care available to most Americans. Indeed, the problems of medical care, waste, and duplication in medical programs, and inadequate care for many have grown even more critical.

There are many national groups, Mr. President, that have provided useful leadership on the health care problem, helping those of us in the Congress identify the magnitude of the problem and seek constructive solutions. Not surprisingly, among those groups have been many who understood the importance of this issue, not only to their members but to all Americans. The Committee for National Health Insurance, under the chairmanship of Senator R. L. Collins of Missouri, has looked carefully at the health security problem. Recently, Mr. Woodcock provided valuable testimony on this issue to a House of Representatives subcommittee. His testimony and other sources point to the following failures of national health policy:

Over the last year, millions of American families failed to obtain proper preventive care for their children. Approximately 3.3 million preschool children did not receive immunization against such killing and infectious diseases as polio, measles, rubella, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus, despite the ready availability of easy and inexpensive preventive services.

It has been estimated that last year one-third of all pregnant women failed to receive proper prenatal care, thus endangering not only their own lives, but their babies' health.

We have seen doctor strikes, public hospital overcrowding, private hospital and nursing home price fixing. A May 1975 study by the Public Citizen Health Research Group cited $8 billion in waste from excessive bed capacity alone.

Last year doctors' fees escalated at a rate 40 percent faster than other items in the Consumer Price Index. Hospital charges ran an incredible 105 percent faster, or more than double the overall inflation rate.

These problems are not ones that can be solved by a patchwork response. By now, most students of American health care agree that the time has come for a national health insurance program. While no one has any doubt that health care should not be dependent on the ability to pay doctors' fees and hospital costs. It encompasses the broader concept of providing quality health care for all Americans without regard to income or to where an individual lives. In studying this goal and the health care proposals now before the Congress, I have determined that there must be three essentials in any national health insurance program. These essentials include: Universal coverage, comprehensive benefits, and very important, a strong national program that would emphasize the latter point, Mr. President, because it is essential that national health insurance include strong provisions to check the unnecessary and excessive rise in medical costs, while guaranteeing access to doctors and other providers of medical services. The bill I am today cosponsoring does that.

I firmly believe that any national health insurance program must provide coverage to all Americans—not just the poor. Quality medical care should not be dependent upon an individual's income or where he or she lives. The right to receive quality health care should be a birth given right for every American—just as every American has a right to a quality public education.

One only of the major health proposals before this Congress provides universal coverage for all Americans—that proposal is S. 3, the Kennedy-Corman bill. Under the other health insurance proposals, the coverage afforded is either on a voluntary basis or is offered only after an individual has already incurred up to $2,000 in medical bills or has been hospitalized for 60 days.

Universal coverage goes hand in hand with another essential part of health care—comprehensive benefits. Under present health insurance systems, the emphasis has been placed on curative rather than preventive care. Routine office visits and most outpatient services usually are not covered. There are economic incentives for expensive hospital visits and treatment, thus exacerbating the inflationary trend of medical costs, while there are economic disincentives for the safest and most cost-effective care—early diagnosis and treatment.

In the early 1930's and 1940's when health insurance plans covered hospital visits almost exclusively, the use of hospital services increased. When the coverage was expanded to include surgery, the number of operations increased. The recent expansion of the coverage has diverted health manpower resources into high cost specialized care. Yet today few insurance plans cover immunizations, laboratory and X-ray fees, infant care for healthy babies or general physical examinations, the very preventive care that permits early detection of serious ailments and often avoids costly health care expenditures for more serious cases.

Of all the major health insurance legislation before the Congress, once again only S. 3, the Health Security Act provides comprehensive benefits. Under the Kennedy-Corman bill, comprehensive benefits include hospitalization, inpatient and outpatient services, physicians services, dental services for children up to 15 years of age with eventual coverage...