

Mr. Mondale

Mr. President:

I am offering an amendment to the pending bill designed to provide the data and the analysis needed to deal more effectively with shortages.

My amendment would require that the President prepare each year a National Shortages Report and a National Food Policy Report. It would establish a National Shortages Board to collect, analyze and disseminate information about scarcities of minerals, food, raw materials, industrial products and vital services. The Board would also make recommendations regarding methods to prevent or minimize the effects of shortages, and it would cooperate with existing agencies in seeking to carry out these objectives.

In 1973 our economy has been plagued with shortages. While food and energy have been the most dramatic cases of scarcity, we have experienced shortages of a wide variety of other products. For example, scarcities have developed in products ranging from glass to paints, from anti-freeze to furniture. Industries such as steel, petrochemicals, rubber, paper and plastics cannot get raw materials from their suppliers, and they cannot supply their own customers. Vital materials such as copper, zinc and phosphates are in short supply worldwide.

Earlier this year we witnessed skyrocketing food prices. Farmers have responded to consumer demand with fence to fence planting. Yet, they are facing severe shortages of propane, natural gas, diesel fuel, gasoline, farm equipment, and fertilizer which restrict and endanger production goals.

In many instances, shortages have not yet been felt at the retail level. But the bottlenecks in manufacturing are spreading, and wholesale prices are rising rapidly. In November the wholesale price index stood at 17.5 percent above a year ago. Prices for basic materials in October were 23 percent higher than in 1972. As of June, the price for ferrous scrap had risen 34 percent above last year. By October refined petroleum products were up 40 percent, cotton up 25 percent, and fertilizer prices were up by 40-60 percent.

As shortages filter down to the consumer level in 1974, higher prices will continue to erode the incomes of working families.

Another result of shortages is rising unemployment. Small plants that are unable to obtain supplies of raw materials will lay off workers or close down altogether.

But the energy shortage makes all others look pale in comparison. Thousands of auto workers and airline employees have already been thrown out of work. A cutback of 15 percent in the petrochemical industry alone could mean a loss of as many as 1.6 million jobs.

The brutal impact of plant closings, worker lay-offs, and skyrocketing prices is usually measured in an economic sense. But there are heavy political costs as well. For people cannot see their jobs, pay checks and purchasing power disappear without also feeling a profound loss of confidence in government. And right now, as a result of the corruption

and abuse of power by the present Administration, confidence in government is lower than at any time in recent history.

Government so far has failed to anticipate shortages, and, once they were upon us, failed to do anything about them until we were in a crisis situation.

How was it that we could sell off a quarter of our wheat stocks to the Russians -- at ridiculously low prices -- and then find out that supplies for American consumers were dangerously low.

Why was it that only a year ago the major oil companies and the Administration were fighting to keep oil imports out -- when today we desperately need added supplies?

In reaction to shortages, the Administration has followed a pattern of looking the other way as long as possible while the nation lurches from food crisis to energy crisis to who knows what crisis comes next.

It is time we stopped waiting for problems to reach a crisis stage before doing something about them. It is time we acted before the consumers' dollar is worth 50 cents and workers have lost their jobs. It is time we acted with foresight and proper planning, rather than in emergency working groups and crisis committees.

Obviously, we need better forecasting. The Committee rightly pointed out in its report on the Export Control Amendments that it "expects the Executive to develop and maintain information systems and procedures which are adequate to anticipate developing



short supply situations so that appropriate action can be taken to forestall critical shortages before they materialize."

At the present time forecasting responsibilities are scattered throughout a wide variety of government agencies, including in Agriculture the Economic Research Service, the Export Marketing Service, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, the Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Forest Service.

In Commerce both the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Service and the Office of Business Research and Analysis have responsibility for forecasts. Both the Bureau of Mines and the U.S. Geological Service make projections for the Department of Interior. The Department of State also has a small staff devoted to forecasting.

With respect to forecasting ability, there are wide discrepancies in the number of trained personnel and their qualifications among these agencies. Agriculture, for example, has hundreds of Ph. D. economists involved in forecasting while in the Department of Commerce only a small staff has responsibility for the hundreds of commodities required by our industries.

Obviously, there are limitations on our ability to make accurate predictions about the future supply and demand of food, vital minerals and other raw materials.

But the limitations on forecasting techniques cannot be blamed for the lack of advanced planning we have seen.

As Senator Jackson pointed out in a Forward to the December 4th Interior Committee Staff Analysis of the Energy Emergency:

"Since before the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, this Committee has made persistent efforts to obtain from the several departments and agencies of the executive branch an accurate estimate of both the nature and extent of impending shortages and analysis of their potential impact on the social and economic future of our nation.

Responses to the Committee's inquiries were typified by varying, uneven and sometimes conflicting estimates of the shortages. Virtually no analysis was provided of existing data."

The Chairman of the Interior Committee further found:

"From the study of the material contained in this document, there are three inescapable conclusions: First, the information required to determine and assess the extent of impending energy shortages in most cases has been available in the public domain, but no agency of the Federal government has compiled or made any competent analysis of such data. Second, there has been no adequate analysis of the anticipated social and economic impacts of projected fuel shortages. Third, the extent of shortages and the threat they pose to the economy and to national security exceed by far any savings resulting from measures taken to date by the executive branch."

The Interior Committee's findings with respect to energy accurately portray the lack of analysis of shortages among a wide range of other products as well.

While shortages tend to cut across the jurisdictional responsibilities of several agencies, too often relevant data is not collected and analyzed in a coherent fashion by the Executive Branch.

The amendment I offer today is not an instant solution to the problem of shortages. I recognize that there are

limitations on our ability to predict future economic trends. And even with better information we cannot guarantee that better policies would result.

My amendment would simply bring together information about shortages that is now scattered throughout the complex of federal agencies, make a start toward more comprehensive planning, and ensure that data and analysis are made available to the Congress and the public on a regular basis.

My amendment would first require the President to prepare an Annual Shortages Report including:

- a list of raw materials, minerals, services and manufactured items known or expected to be in scarce supply;
- projections of the actual and projected supply and demand for such goods and services;
- an analysis of the impact of shortages on the economic, social and other requirements of our nation;
- a review of the impact of public and private programs and activities on shortages;
- recommendations on methods to improve existing programs and activities to deal with shortages.

Second, it would require the President to submit an Annual Food Policy Report, including:

- a list of agricultural products known or expected to be in short supply;



- the estimated supply and demand of such products, both domestic and international;
- an estimate of domestic and world food reserves;
- a review of the impact of public and private programs on shortages of food and on the long term ability of our nation to produce food;
- an estimate of what consumers might reasonably be expected to pay for scarce food products;
- recommendations on methods to improve existing programs and activities related to shortages.

Third, my amendment would create a National Shortages Board to serve as a central office for the collection, evaluation and dissemination of information about shortages.

The Board would be composed of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, State, Transportation, Treasury, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Health, Education and Welfare -- with a Director appointed by the President, subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

The Board would advise the President in the preparation of the Annual Shortages and Food Policy Reports, would make projections regarding present and future supply and demand of scarce goods and services, and would review and evaluate the activities of public and private programs designed to deal with shortages.

On a day to day basis the Board would also cooperate with and assist existing agencies in attempting to anticipate, prevent and/or minimize the effects of shortages.

The Board would have specific responsibilities in seeking to help eliminate obstacles to the orderly production, processing, and marketing of food, including shortages of fuel, fertilizer, feed, equipment, transportation and credit.

The pending bill recognizes the need to react quickly and effectively when shortages threaten our domestic economy. Export controls are one means to curb demand for scarce materials; and in the face of rapid inflation and worker lay-offs, they may be essential to our domestic economy.

However, the United States is dependent upon other countries for a large and growing list of vital raw materials.

If we were to cut off exports of oil, coal, or other energy sources, would the Canadians, one of our biggest petroleum suppliers, be encouraged to cut off their exports to us?

When we impose export controls, we must be sure that they do not end up reducing our vital imports, aggravating shortages, pushing consumer prices higher, and causing even greater job losses to workers.

Therefore, in weighing government actions designed to alleviate shortages, the Board would also be responsible for analyzing the impacts of export controls on: domestic supplies and prices of scarce commodities, on anticipated imports of products needed by the U.S., on our nation's trade goals, and on our relationships with our trading partners.



Mr. President, although I recognize that my amendment is by no means a cure-all for the informational and structural problems of government in dealing with shortages, I believe it is an urgently needed step in the right direction, and I am hopeful that the Senate will adopt this proposal.

In the words of the distinguished economist, Walter Heller:

"Once again, in today's energy crisis, the U.S. is learning the costly lesson that we can't manage economic policy as if there were no tomorrow."

Mr. Mondale

Mr. President:

I regret that I must oppose the conference report on H.R. 9142, the Northeast Rail Services Act.

This legislation is designed to preserve essential railroad transportation in the Northeast, and that is a commendable objective. But while we are spending billions to overhaul the Penn Central and other bankrupt carriers in the Northeast, we must not neglect the pressing rail service needs of rural communities throughout America.

Last week the Senate considered a similar bill, but it made two major additions. The first amendment, which I was privileged to sponsor with Senator Humphrey, provided for a two year moratorium on any railroad abandonments. Our second amendment authorized federal assistance to restore service along abandoned tracks wherever those lines may be located. This amendment also called for a nationwide study of America's rail transportation needs and of the costs and benefits of abandonments.

Unfortunately, these amendments were not accepted by the House of Representatives. Without these changes, the conference report in my judgment fails to recognize and adequately deal with the critical rail transportation needs of our nation.

The steady decline in rail services to rural communities in the Midwest is not as dramatic as the threatened shut-down

of the Penn Central in the Northeast. It is, nevertheless, a serious nationwide problem and one that demands the urgent attention of the Congress.

Since 1970, more than 7,800 miles of track have been lost to rural America. Federal agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, are now making plans to speed the abandonment of rural branch lines. Under the so-called 34-car rule, hundreds of farm communities throughout rural America may be stripped of their rail service over the next 12 to 18 months.

Agricultural communities have for many years had to struggle with a terribly inadequate transportation system. Their highways have received almost no attention from the federal government. Railroad companies have allowed rural branch lines to deteriorate to the point where trains must creep along at the speed of a horse and wagon.

During 1973, the United States and other nations became painfully aware of the consequences of food shortages. At the government's urging, farmers responded with fence to fence planting. But without adequate means of transportation, country elevators all over the Midwest are still jammed.

In my opinion, the Administration failed to anticipate the needs of the farm community for increased transportation, fuel and other inputs needed to produce and move their products



to market. Worse still, it is still pursuing policies, such as the 34-car rule, which will only hasten the demise of our agricultural transportation network.

Now, the energy crisis has greatly increased the need to preserve and modernize rail services to rural America. With shortages of gasoline and diesel fuel, it makes no sense to abandon rail lines when trains can move each ton of freight for one-fourth to one-sixth the energy required by trucks.

Accelerated abandonments in the absence of any systematic analysis of America's transportation needs, capabilities, and the costs and benefits of alternative modes of transportation would be a tragic and costly mistake.

I regret that the pending conference report does not address this problem. We must not permit America's entire transportation system to reach the crisis stage before we take action to preserve essential rail services. It is my hope that the Senate Commerce Committee will begin consideration of the problem of rail abandonments soon after the Congress reconvenes next year.

As evidence of the need for action to preserve our nation's rail transportation system, I ask unanimous consent that a recent editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in the Record.

Mr. Mondale

Mr. President:

I am offering an amendment of the Export Control Act designed to provide the data and the analysis needed to deal more effectively with shortages.

My amendment would require that the President prepare each year a National Shortages Report and a National Food Policy Report. It would establish a National Shortages Board to collect, analyze and disseminate information about scarcities of minerals, food, raw materials, industrial products and vital services. The Board would also make recommendations regarding methods to prevent or minimize the effects of shortages, and it would cooperate with existing agencies in seeking to carry out these objectives.

Today a number of experts are arguing that we have entered a new era, one that will be dominated by the economics of scarcity. The United States has in the past 32 years consumed more minerals than all of the human race in all previous history. As other countries seek the benefits of industrialization and as the world's population continues to grow, these experts argue that shortages will spread.

Whether or not this view is correct, it is clear that for the immediate future shortages will continue to plague our economy.

Professor Otto Eckstein, who heads the Data Resources, Inc., recently said, "The energy crisis, combined with the shortage of primary processing industry capacity, will give

the entire economy a condition of shortage in 1974. Even in many of the finished goods industries, where physical capacity will be ample, the lack of sufficient input materials and energy will depress production and maintain a sellers' market."

In 1973, in addition to the obvious cases of food and energy, we have experienced shortages of a wide variety of other products, ranging from glass to paints, from anti-freeze to furniture. Industries such as steel, petrochemicals, rubber, paper and plastics cannot get raw materials from their suppliers; and they cannot supply their own customers.

Often and increasingly, shortages in one area of our economy are creating or aggravating shortages in other areas. Earlier this year, for example, consumers were alarmed by skyrocketing food prices. At the government's urging, farmers responded with fence to fence planting. Yet, shortages of propane, gasoline, fertilizer and machinery are now endangering farm production goals.

Government so far has failed to anticipate shortages and, once they were upon us, has failed to act until we were in a crisis situation.

How was it that we could sell off a quarter of our wheat stocks to the Russians -- at ridiculously low prices -- and then find out that supplies for American consumers were dangerously low?

Why was it that only a year ago the major oil companies and the Administration were fighting to keep oil imports



-3-

out -- when today we desperately need added supplies?

The Administration's economic policies in response to shortages have been a disaster. And in large part this failure can be attributed to the lack of any systematic planning. The Administration's failures cannot be excused because the facts were not available. The facts are available; the government has hundreds of economists working on projections of supply and demand for food products, raw materials and energy. But the Administration has failed to bring the facts together and has failed to establish any systematic analysis. The Administration's inability to carry out this analysis is an example of Executive mismanagement on a massive scale.

As Senator Jackson pointed out in a Forward to the December 4th Interior Committee Staff Analysis of the Energy Emergency:

"Since before the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East, this Committee has made persistent efforts to obtain from the several departments and agencies of the executive branch an accurate estimate of both the nature and extent of impending shortages and analysis of their potential impact on the social and economic future of our nation.

Responses to the Committee's inquiries were typified by varying, uneven and sometimes conflicting estimates of the shortages. Virtually no analysis was provided of existing data."

The Chairman of the Interior Committee further found:

"From the study of the material contained in this document, there are three inescapable conclusions: First, the information required to determine and assess the extent of impending energy shortages in most cases has been available in the public domain, but no agency of the Federal government has compiled or made any competent analysis of such data. Second, there has been no adequate analysis of the anticipated social and economic impacts of projected fuel shortages. Third, the extent of shortages and the threat they pose to the economy and to national security exceed by far any savings resulting from measures taken to date by the executive branch."

The Interior Committee's findings with respect to energy accurately portray the lack of analysis of shortages among a wide range of other products as well.

Obviously, we need better forecasting, as the Banking Committee rightly pointed out in its report on the Export Control Amendments.

The amendment I offer today is not an instant solution to the problem of shortages. I recognize that there are limitations on our ability to predict future economic trends. And even with better analysis we cannot guarantee that better policies will result.

But my amendment would provide for a centralized information system that could make use of advanced forecasting techniques. It would establish the kind of systematic analysis we need.

And my amendment would force the President, the Executive Agencies, and the Congress to weigh evidence of impending shortages before they get out of control. It would bring together information that is now scattered throughout the complex of federal agencies, provide for more comprehensive planning, and make sure that the data and analyses are made available to the Congress and the public on a regular basis.

My amendment would first require the President to prepare an Annual Shortages Report, including:

- a list of raw materials, minerals, services and manufactured items known or expected to be in scarce supply;
- projections of the actual and projected supply and demand for such goods and services;
- an analysis of the impact of shortages on the economic, social and other requirements of our nation;
- a review of the impact of public and private programs and activities on shortages;
- recommendations on methods to improve existing programs and activities to deal with shortages.

Second, it would require the President to submit an Annual Food Policy Report, including:

- a list of agricultural products known or expected to be in short supply;
- the estimated supply and demand of such products, both domestic and international;
- an estimate of domestic and world food reserves;
- a review of the impact of public and private programs on shortages of food and on the long term ability of our nation to produce food;
- an estimate of what consumers might reasonably be expected to pay for scarce food products;
- recommendations on methods to improve existing programs and activities related to shortages.

Third, my amendment would create a National Shortages Board to serve as a central office for the collection, evaluation and dissemination of information about shortages.

The Board would be composed of the principal Cabinet officers who now have planning responsibilities, including the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, State, Transportation and Treasury. But, in place of the present piecemeal planning efforts, the Board would have its own director and staff capable of coordinated analysis and planning.

The Board would advise the President in the preparation of the Annual Shortages and Food Policy Reports, would make projections regarding present and future supply and demand of scarce goods and services, and would review and evaluate the activities of public and private programs designed to deal with shortages.



On a day to day basis the Board would also cooperate with and assist existing agencies in attempting to anticipate, prevent and/or minimize the effects of shortages.

The Board would have specific responsibilities in seeking to help eliminate obstacles to the orderly production, processing, and marketing of food, including shortages of fuel, fertilizer, feed, equipment, transportation and credit.

The pending bill recognizes the need to react quickly and effectively when shortages threaten our domestic economy. Export controls are one means to curb demand for scarce materials; and in the face of rapid inflation and worker lay-offs, they may be essential to our domestic economy.

However, the United States is dependent upon other countries for a large and growing list of vital raw materials.

If we were to cut off exports of oil, coal, or other energy sources, would the Canadians, one of our biggest petroleum suppliers, be encouraged to cut off their exports to us?

When we impose export controls, we must be sure that they do not end up reducing our vital imports, aggravating shortages, pushing consumer prices higher, and causing even greater job losses to workers.

Therefore, in weighing government actions designed to alleviate shortages, the Board would also be responsible for analyzing the impacts of export controls on: domestic supplies and prices of scarce commodities, on anticipated imports of products needed by the U.S., on our nation's trade goals, and on our relationships with our trading partners.

Shortages create far greater problems for our economy than just inconvenience. Many of the shortages that have occurred in 1973 have not yet been felt at the retail level, but they will be. And as shortages spread through our economy, they carry with them the perils of unemployment coupled with inflation -- the greatest threat to our standard of living in forty years.

Bottlenecks in manufacturing are spreading, and wholesale prices are rising rapidly. In November the wholesale price index stood at 17.5 percent above a year ago. Prices for basic materials in October were 23 percent higher than in 1972. As shortages filter down to the consumer level in 1974, higher prices will continue to erode the incomes of working families.

Thousands of auto workers and airline employees have already been thrown out of work. A cutback of 15 percent in the petrochemical industry alone could mean a loss of as many as 1.6 million jobs.

The brutal impact of plant closings, worker lay-offs, and skyrocketing prices is usually measured in economic terms. But the human costs to the elderly living on fixed incomes and to unemployed parents with children to support are even greater. And at a time when trust in government is at an historic low, our political system cannot stand further loss of public confidence because of continued economic mismanagement.

Mr. President, this is a painful time in our country's history. My amendment is by no means a cure-all for the problem of shortages. There are no easy answers to the short term crisis over energy production, and there are no easy answers to long term questions of resource availability and use. My amendment promises no easy answers. But it would assure that the Administration, the Congress and the American people will have the kind of information we need to make the difficult choices with our eyes wide open. It would end decision making in panic and ignorance. I believe it is an urgently needed step in the right direction, and I am hopeful that the Senate will adopt this proposal.

In the words of the distinguished economist, Walter Heller:

"Once again, in today's energy crisis, the U.S. is learning the costly lesson that we can't manage economic policy as if there were not tomorrow."



Mr. President:

I am pleased to support H.R. 8449, the pending bill before the Senate. This legislation would expand the flood insurance program by raising the limits on coverage and by increasing the Federal commitment in support of the insurance fund.

Last year, Hurricane Agnes and the Rapid City floods caused billions in damages to property owners in the Northeast and Midwest. Each year flood disasters strike, and they are accompanied by enormous property losses and untold personal suffering.

The Federal Government through the Disaster Relief Act and similar legislation has attempted to provide emergency assistance to flood victims through loans and grants. However, assistance has often been uneven and in many cases inadequate to compensate for the personal losses involved. Increasing commercial and residential development in flood hazard areas has resulted in steadily mounting costs, both public and private, as a result of natural disasters.

The pending bill seeks to address this problem by ensuring that homeowners are covered by flood insurance and that new development in flood prone areas will be in accordance with appropriate land use and flood proofing requirements.

This measure would require the purchase of flood insurance in communities where Federal insurance is available in

connection with Federal aid for construction or acquisition of property located in flood prone areas. It would prohibit Federal supervised banks and savings and loan associations from making a loan in connection with properties in identified flood hazard areas unless such properties were covered by flood insurance. An appeals mechanism would be established for both individuals and communities to contest the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development's proposed land use controls.

Since the late 1960's Minnesota and other States including Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, Wisconsin, and Michigan have adopted laws to regulate the use of their floodplains. The National Flood Insurance program has complemented and strengthened these State programs by having comparable land use requirements and by providing much of the technical data needed to administer State programs.

In Minnesota, for example, legislation was enacted in 1969 requiring local governments to adopt flood plain regulations once the appropriate information was available to define these areas. This year a new bill was passed, requiring all flood prone communities to participate in the National Flood Insurance program, enabling citizens to buy flood insurance, requiring implementation of local land use controls and accelerating the identification of flood hazard areas throughout the State.

Is it called upon to provide assistance to communities in another State which has refused to participate in the program?

In view of the substantial efforts on the part of the State of Minnesota and other States, I believe that the Congress should approve legislation that would not weaken existing land use controls required of local communities for participation in the National Flood Insurance program.

For example, the Department of Housing and Urban Development now requires that land use controls apply to areas that could be inundated by the "100-year flood." A lowering of this standard would undermine the effectiveness of State programs as well as of the Federal flood insurance program.

Some argue that communities or entire states should have the option of not participating in the National Flood Insurance Program. While this concept sounds reasonable in theory, in practice it would greatly weaken the program. Existing properties would be affected because they would be ineligible for coverage under the flood insurance program. There would also be little or no control over improper future development within flood hazard areas. If a major disaster were to strike in a community or State which had withdrawn from the flood insurance program, the Congress would surely be called upon to enact special legislation to provide disaster relief assistance that might have been unnecessary had the area participated in the flood insurance program.



Yet, how can the citizens of one State, which had complied fully with the requirements of the flood insurance program, be called upon to provide assistance to communities in another State which has refused to participate in the program?

The pending bill would provide an equitable and urgently needed mechanism to protect property owners from the consequences of disastrous floods. I am hopeful that it will be approved by the Senate without any weakening amendments, and I would like to express my full support for its prompt adoption.

Mr. Mondale

Mr. President:

An excellent article, entitled "Needed: A National Food Policy," appeared in today's edition of the New York Times. Written by Tny DeChant, President of the National Farmers Union, this article points out the perilous scarcity of food in the United States and the disastrous policies of the Administration which have placed us on the brink of a national food shortage.

As Mr. Dechant warns, "A short grain crop anywhere on earth -- or a natural disaster anywhere on earth -- or a military crisis anywhere on earth -- would catch America short of one of its most valuable resources."

How did the world's leading agricultural producer come to find itself in the midst of a food crisis? N..F. U.'s President Dechant explains ~~that~~ the Administration set out to destroy two longstanding and indispensable tools of an adequate farm program. According to Dechant, "it wrecked the 'ever normal granary' machinery for building and managing reserves of basic farm commodities, by forcing commodity-loan rates far below the level of viable returns to producers, and by 'dumping' the last remaining Commodity Credit Corporation-owned stocks onto the market in a ruthless effort to break farm prices."

Thus, the Administration destroyed the federal government's reserve of storable commodities, a reserve that has

through the years enabled us to stabilize costs at levels which are both reasonable and acceptable.

Next, during the 1972 election year the Administration set about to withhold record amounts of land from production, a step which can be helpful in winning the farm vote. Secretary of Agriculture, Earl Butz, freely boasted of being able to spend money like a drunken sailor.

The disastrous world grain crop of 1972 and the resulting upsurge in demand for American farm products greatly reduced stocks of food available to meet the needs of American consumers. Continuing heavy demand now threatens to wipe out by summer the small margin of carry-over stocks that still exist.

The potential for new and even more dramatic increases for in the price of food illustrates the pressing need for a national food policy. Such a policy would be designed to ensure adequate supplies of food at prices that are stable and reasonable for both the consumer and the farmer. A primary tool in helping to carry out our food policy would be a national consumer and marketing reserve along the lines proposed by Senator Humphrey and myself in S.2005.

Our proposal would provide for a reserve of 600 million bushels of wheat, 150 million bushels of soybeans and 40 million tons of feed grains to be purchased at a time when supplies are ample and to be used in time of shortages. The bill is formulated in such a way as to avoid the price depressing effect and the increased storage costs of past reserve programs;



and it would benefit America's farmers, consumers and taxpayers.

Mr. President, as evidence of the need for a realistic national food policy, coupled with a reserve program, I ask unanimous consent that today's article by Tony Dechant be printed in full at this point in the Record.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)