

UNITED STATES
Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 32

DECEMBER 17, 1975 TO DECEMBER 19, 1975

(PAGES 41103 TO 42450)

should be settled in more conventional ways are quite another. At LaGuardia on the day of the call, the visibility was 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 the shortage problems of a great 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 inconsistencies 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 for one 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 we select candidates for the Presidency.

I am pleased that the introduction of S. 2741 has had that effect. Since then a number of editorialists and commentators have focused on the many serious problems contained in our present nominating system and called for its drastic overhaul. My colleague from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) was kind enough to have several of these commentaries inserted in the RECORD of December 11, 1975. Since then more have appeared, and I would like to share them with my colleagues as well.

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

There being no objection, the commentaries were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Britain (Conn.) Herald, Dec. 8, 1975]

FEWER PRIMARIES

Instead of getting better, it's getting worse. That is, the situation in which a person who wants to become President of these United States has to come up with the job-stealing time, the small fortune, and the physical endurance required to conduct what amounts to 30 mini-presidential campaigns across the country, before he even gets to run the big one itself. That is, assuming he or she wants to compete in all of the state presidential primaries that are now scheduled next year, including the one in the state of Connecticut.

The problem of proliferating primaries has been the subject of scrutiny and reform for some time now. Even when there were fewer such contests nationwide, there was agitation for a national primary, or at least for a series of regional primaries.

Now a man who gave up the presidential race last year for the very reason that he was unwilling to undergo the rigors required by running in up to 30 primaries, Senator Walter Mondale (D-Minn.) has introduced a bill to create a regional primary system.

There have been other regional primary bills before, but Sen. Mondale's is apparently the first of its type to be introduced, one that would divide the country into six regions which are roughly comparable in their populations.

All of New England would be included in one of the six regions, along with New York State and New Jersey. Currently there are six primaries scheduled in this area, in New York, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

Certainly it appears to make electoral sense to be moving toward fewer primaries, even a regional system. Political parties in the United States may not yet be strong enough to justify a single, national presidential primary for each party and states' rights advocates may prevent this from ever happening. But we now have 30 separate state primaries. If this goes all the way to 50 state primaries, why not just hold them all the same day and call it a national presidential primary? Meanwhile a regional primary system might help get voters used to the idea of fewer primaries, and would serve as a half-way house on the road toward total consistency.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 13, 1975]

MONDALE'S REGIONAL PRIMARY BILL

The way presidential candidates are selected "is indisputably one of the most important processes in our entire political system," Sen. Walter Mondale told the U.S. Senate this month, "but it is also, unfortunately, one of the most irrational. It has evolved over nearly 200 years without design, structure or purpose into a complex maze of state laws, party regulations, and unwritten traditions. No other major nation chooses its leaders in such a chaotic manner, and the question is whether we should continue to do so."

Mondale's answer to that last question is no. And as part of a program for changing the selection process—only part, he emphasizes—the Minnesota Democrat has proposed a bill setting up a system of regional primaries. The bill would divide the nation into six regions, each of which would have a primary-election date assigned to it by lot, with the six dates two weeks apart. States within each region would be free to hold primaries or not, but those that did would have to conduct them on their region's election date.

The effect, Mondale says, would be to eliminate both "the disproportionate and unfair advantage" a few states have because their primaries are either very early or very late and "the unseemly race every four years"

to hold the nation's first primary. The plan would also shorten the primary campaign and give candidates a chance to present their views in each region. Moreover, it would bring order—and perhaps substantive discussion of issues—to what is now a media event conducted in a circus atmosphere and a game in which candidates vie for psychological advantages over one another.

A side effect of the bill, Mondale says, might be to reduce the number of primaries. "Since no single primary state would be allowed . . . to stand uniquely apart from the other states, but would be compelled instead to share with them the commercial, publicity and other benefits, they might have previously enjoyed, perhaps the idea of holding a primary will be less attractive." And that, the senator suggests, might help restore "a blend of states holding preferential primaries and states using the caucus-convention system of electing (national party) convention delegates"—a blend Mondale says "is now seriously out of balance."

That balance is worth preserving. And Mondale is right in calling the caucus system, used in Minnesota, "one of the healthiest elements in our entire political process because it permits greater and more direct individual participation than any other system." The caucus system lets people take part in the political decision-making process from its beginning instead of making them wait to choose among alternatives others have selected for them.

But changing the primary system would not be enough, Mondale says, because it's only one of the four basic elements in the presidential nominating process. Others are party rules and procedures governing 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 some elements, Mondale contends, have often resulted in new problems in others, 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 comprehensive look and report back after 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 system 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 public service by suggesting the 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 reform, the Presidential primary. The nominating process has come a long distance since such progressive states as Oregon and Wisconsin offered the direct primary as the way to freedom from party bosses. That purpose was sometimes well served; but, as with so many cures, the side effects have proved harmful in their own right.

Senator Mondale, convinced that the system now "verges on anarchy," would drastically alter it with a bill to create six regional primaries instead. The idea is not new. Senator Packwood of Oregon and Representative Udall of Arizona have been nursing 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

candidates in the field, required a run-off, excluding the aspirants, not to mention the voters, to three nationwide elections, at a staggering expenditure of money and energy.

Yet even that drawback might be preferable to the present hodgepodge, in which 30 states offer 30 different sets of rules and opportunities, allowing a candidate to shop for political terrain that favors him while ignoring states where he might lose. Throughout the process as it stands now, the emphasis is on a trumped-up "psychology." The objective is to create a snowball effect by snatching early victories—or even making showings that can be blown up as victories—in a few unrepresentative states that catch all the attention of the media because they are the first to be heard from.

A regional system, with five or six primary election days for the entire process, might not eliminate this snowball effect entirely. But where it developed, it would at least be based on something more valid than a minority turnout of a minority party of a tiny state like New Hampshire—or a free-for-all among nine or ten candidates in Florida, with none of them getting a really significant proportion of the vote.

It is premature to regard the Presidential primary as expendable, but good sense demands at the very least a drastic move toward uniform rule and a curtailment of what Senator Packwood has rightly described as "a Barnum and Bailey traveling sideshow" that leaves the candidates "tired and broke, and the public bored or bewildered and—far too often—disgusted."

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1975—H.R. 4073

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the Regional Development Act Amendments of 1975 are something of a landmark for regional economic development in the United States today. Essentially, this act extends some of the same authorities of the Appalachian Regional Development Act to the other regions of the Nation.

The conference report continues the programs of Appalachia for another 4 years as the administration proposed. Congress in this act also recognizes the successes and the great benefits these programs have achieved in the Appalachian communities and agrees to such an extension, together with important amendments that will improve present programs.

Many Members of the Senate have been aware that the other seven regional commissions, established largely on the Appalachian model, have not enjoyed the same kind of approval from the administration. It has said: "OK, if we must have these commissions, let us keep them modest in program authority and modestly funded."

Through the efforts of many Senators—not least of whom are Senators McCLELLAN and MANSFIELD—we bring this conference report to the floor for final approval that at least provides greater authority in both programs and funding to these regional action planning commissions on a scale of some comparability with Appalachia.

The Senate bill—the Regional Development Act of 1975—provided a 2-year extension of the Appalachian programs. It provided also a 2-year extension of the title V regional commissions in order to put them on the same cycle as the Appalachian Act.

For the first time, the commissions are given authority like those in the Appalachian Act in areas 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 fiscal year 1977.

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—through the initiatives 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 House conferees were unwilling 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 conferees accepted all of the Senate version. But it was only a 2-year extension of the title V Commissions. The Senate conferees 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. Conferees 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 1977.

As 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 for Puerto Rico and 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 do in fact have regional economies 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 that process 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 amend-

ments 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 regions now 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 RANDOLPH, 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 agreed 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:

SEC. 5. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act, and the provisions of section 3, shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendment made by section 4 of this Act (and the amendment made by the first section of this Act to the extent that it changes the period within which hearings must be requested) shall apply with respect to any decision or