should be settled in more conventional ways are quite another. At LaGuardia on the day of the accident it seemed like an incredibly clear 20 miles, and except for the actions of the controllers, traffic would have proceeded under the most favorable conditions imaginable.

I think my constituent's displeasure over this incident was intensified by his recollection of the difficulty farmers had in getting fuel just for normal plowing, planting, and harvesting operations during our "crisis" periods of 1973 and 1974. Certainly, I can appreciate that feeling myself, having personally assisted in resolving some of the many problems faced by a number of Kansans who have had vital requirements in recent years for diesel fuel—which as many Senators know is very similar to jet fuel in the refining process.

Mr. President, if we are ever going to succeed in our energy conservation goals, we are going to have to have the cooperation of everyone—including labor organizations which can surely rely on basic, acceptable means of pursuing their work grievances. For as long as we have inconsistent goals of this type in our important national policies, I doubt that we can ever attain the energy independence which we so desperately need.

The actions of the PATCO controllers on this and related occasions are a matter of some concern in my opinion, and should be questioned by those of us in Congress who are serious about our Nation's energy future. It is inappropriate, of course, for us to actively discourage these types of "bargaining" pressures, but I certainly think it would be in order, for both the FEA and the GAO to determine just how much fuel was senselessly consumed during this episode—and to seek an understanding from those who are responsible.

REGIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I introduced S. 2741, a bill which would establish a series of regional Presidential primaries. I indicated at that time that one of my primary purposes in doing so was to help encourage a national debate on whether and how we might restructure the entire means by which the selection of national convention delegates—"Is Indisputably one of the most irrational.

In the political decision-making process from the selection of national convention delegates, the financing of presidential campaigns and the relationship between candidates and the news media. Efforts to solve problems in this area have often resulted in new problems, and the nominating process now "desperately needs a comprehensive approach." Mondale suggests a presidential commission, comprising "scholars, political figures and ordinary citizens" to take such a commission under the 1976 election. "I can think of no more worthy or appropriate undertaking in our nation's 200th year as we celebrate the blessings of our democratic society than to begin a serious effort to improve one of the most important elements of that system," he told the Senate. Nor can we. Mondale has performed an important service by bringing this effort and by providing, in his primary bill, a focus for part of the needed discussion.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 1975]

THE PRIMARY PROBLEM

Senator Mondale of Minnesota has joined the ranks of thoughtful politicians who are bent on modifying that once highly touted "primaries system. . . ." The nominating process has come a long distance since such progressive states as Oregon and Wisconsin adopted the direct primary as the way to choose their presidential candidates. That purpose was sometimes well served; but with the many cures, the side effects have proved harmful in their own right. Case in point. It seemed that the system now "verges on anarchy," would drastically alter it with a bill to create six regional primaries. The idea is not new. Senator Udall of Arizona has been pursuing similar legislation, while Senator Mansfield of Montana and others favor a nationwide primary held on a single day.

Like the original concept itself, these variations pose difficulties. In particular, a national primary might, if a party had many
For the first time, the commissions are given authority like those in the Appalachian model of health and vocational education. New authorities are also provided in energy and transportation. The authorization for the present fiscal year is raised from $150 million to $200 million, with $50 million for the transitional quarter, and then to $250 million for each of the following years.

Most people know that the gap between authorization and appropriations—close to 4 to 1—for the title V Commissions has been one of the best jokes in Washington. This year we were able to close the gap because of the effective help of Senators McCLELLAN, PASTORE and others—to raise that ratio to about 5 to 2.

Those of us who have championed the upgrading of these Commissions can take some pride in this bill. But we did not get everything we sought. We wanted the seven Commissions on the same authority cycle as the Appalachian Regional Commission. In the Senate bill, all Commissions were on the same cycle. The earlier passed House bill was simply an extension of the Appalachian programs for 4 years. The conference committee was at first to accept our title V amendments to the Appalachian extension bill. Finally and reluctantly, after much effort by many in both Houses, the House conference agreed and the Senate version. It was only a 2-year extension of the title V Commissions. The Senate conference agreed to a 4-year extension of Appalachia.

I wish to emphasize that we have not yet achieved our goal of having all the regional development programs on the same cycle. Conferences from the House Public Works Committee agreed that they would support a further 2-year extension of the Commission when legislation to extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act comes before us early in 1979.

Chairman of the Economic Development Subcommittee, I wish to assure my colleagues that I will work energetically to extend the title V Commissions to 1979, the same as the Appalachian Commission programs.

The title V Commissions are not yet comparable institutions to the Appalachian Regional Commission. But we have made a start. At the same time, there is interest in extending the regional economic development programs to other parts of the Nation, including a Commission in the Virgin Islands, and possible single State Commissions for Texas and California.

One thing is certain in my mind. The idea of regional development and regional planning is more viable than ever. We started in this country. As we debate and discuss the need to set national priorities and goals, we will begin to appreciate the regional building blocks that make up this huge country. These Regional Commissions are going to be the precursors of which I suspect we will grudgingly accept as a national necessity one of these years.

Let me say a word directly to the Federal and State officials of these title V Commissions. In offering these amendments to your programs, we are mindful that a change in emphasis is being given for development planning and programming. When we passed the Public Works and Economic Development Act in 1965, we in the Congress responded to conditions of economic lag that characterized most of the regions. Today, those conditions are considerably different. Many of the problems confront the dual problems of managing and facilitating growth in some parts, while trying to stimulate and enhance it in others. Also, the urban areas of the regions, as well as the previously emphasized rural ones, in many cases now present equally compelling development problems in their own right.

The amendments offered by this legislation broaden the program capacity of the Commissions, particularly in the areas of energy and transportation. They improve the capability of each Commission to deal with the many aspects of development. But they do not, nor were they intended to, move the Commissions from their basic economic development missions.

Mr. President, this legislation passed the Senate last summer by an overwhelming vote of 92 to 1. I hope we can repeat that message to the administration in accepting this conference report.

Finally, I wish to express my thanks to the chairman of the committee, Senator RANZOLLI, and the ranking member on the other side, Senator BAKER. They are two Senators who are in great measure responsible for the successes of the Appalachian programs. But I wish also to acknowledge their openmindedness and statesmanship in accepting and supporting the title V amendments to the Appalachian legislation. They did this at the risk of considerable disfavor from their own constituencies and the other Appalachian States.

SOCIAL SECURITY UNIFORM REVIEW PROCEDURES

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider H.R. 10727.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 10727, which the clerk will state by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 10727) to amend the Social Security Act to expedite the holding of hearings under titles II, XVI, and XVIII by establishing uniform review procedures under such titles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was urged to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 4, beginning with line 6, strike out;