

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews

Mike Mansfield Papers

1-23-1975

Congressional Record S. 675 - Mandatory Gasoline Rationing

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Congressional Record S. 675 - Mandatory Gasoline Rationing" (1975). *Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews*. 1238.

https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/1238

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches, Statements and Interviews by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

January 23, 1975

S 675

S. 328—MANDATORY GASOLINE
RATIONING

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. President, I am today introducing, along with Senators MANSFIELD, CASE, HOLLINGS, METCALF, and HASKELL, a bill that would mandate the President to establish within 60 days a program for the nationwide rationing of motor gasoline. I strongly believe that we must legislate now for a mandatory gas rationing program rather than pass the buck to the President through a grant of standby rationing authority.

In his state of the Union address the President presented a comprehensive program designed to conserve our scarce fuel and to encourage further research and development for alternate sources of energy. Though I do not agree with important elements of the President's program, I commend him for taking decisive action and would emphasize that it is incumbent upon this legislative body, if it is not in agreement with the President, to expeditiously develop its own energy program. Somewhere we must bite the bullet.

I strongly support the President's goal of reducing oil imports by at least a million barrels per day. However, I do not feel that a program of price increases through tariffs can achieve the type of reduction in the consumption of oil that is urgently needed. I am furthermore very concerned about the effects an across-the-board tariff on oil imports will have upon my home State of Connecticut and upon all of New England. New England's over 80 percent dependence upon outside sources of oil for its energy needs has already led to exceptionally high prices for all forms of energy use, in particular for home-heating and industrial purposes. I fear that the additional costs imposed by the unilateral imposition of an oil import fee of up to \$3 would create an intolerable burden for the people of New England and could directly affect the ability of many businesses and industries in the area to survive.

I believe that it has become quite evident that the most effective way to achieve an immediate and significant reduction in the consumption of oil in this country is to limit the use of motor gasoline at the gasoline pump. Gas rationing is designed to effect the necessary reductions by restricting the daily use of nearly 7 million barrels of motor gasoline for automobile travel. As the President has stated, measures for voluntary restraint have not produced the results that need be achieved. It also seems clear that high prices have not and will not sufficiently dampen demand for gasoline.

Particularly significant is the fact that while gasoline prices—untaxed—have increased across the country upwards of 50 percent since late 1973, demand has shown a corresponding decrease of less than 5 percent. I seriously question whether another price increase in the nature of 10 cents per gallon at the gas

pump—the estimated average price increase resulting from enactment of the Administration's program of import fees and excise taxes and decontrol of domestic oil prices—will lead to the type of reduction in the consumption of gasoline that is being called for.

The problem does not lie in the fact that the American people are not willing to sacrifice, but that vacillation in Government policy has failed to inspire the sacrifice that Americans are ready to make. An October Gallup Poll indicated that 75 percent of the persons interviewed would agree to reduce the use of their car(s) by 10 percent. Just recently a Newsweek poll revealed that 55 percent of the persons contacted preferred gas rationing over increased fuel prices as a means to reduce energy consumption. Clearly, the American people are ready to sacrifice, but only if the Government is willing to take the lead by promulgating a coherent national program of mandatory energy conservation.

"The Mandatory Gas Rationing Act of 1975" does not legislate for a specific form of gasoline rationing. In the past I

have suggested a plan of sucker rationing that would limit the number of days cars would be allowed on the road. However, I do not wish to legislate administrative decisions thereby reducing the flexibility necessary in the development of an effective rationing program by the executive branch.

The bill does provide for petition in hardship cases, especially for those who are not able to avail themselves of public transportation. In addition, the bill allows for appropriate adjustments in the overall allocation of fuel oil to carry out the purposes of a gasoline rationing program.

There is no easy solution to our "energy" problems and certainly nobody, least of all myself, wants gasoline rationing. However, as a matter of policy, I am convinced that our Government must adopt a program of mandatory fuel conservation. Unless in the very near future this Nation can effect a major cut-back in the consumption of oil, the flow of American money abroad will completely undermine financial stability in the Western world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my introductory statement and of the 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. 328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Mandatory Gasoline Rationing Act of 1975".

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) (1) The President shall, within sixty days following the date of the enactment of this subsection, promulgate a rule which shall be deemed a part of the regulation under subsection (a) and which shall provide, consistent with the objectives of subsection (b), for the establishment and carrying out of a program for the rationing and ordering of priorities among classes of end-

users of gasoline, and for the assignment to end-users of gasoline of rights, and evidences of such rights, entitling them to obtain gasoline in precedence to other classes of end-users not similarly entitled. In promulgating

such rule, the President shall take such action as may be necessary in order to meet the needs of individuals who, by reason of their handicapped condition, are unable to avail themselves of public transportation facilities.

"(2) The President shall, by order, in furtherance of the rule authorized pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection and consistent with the attainment of the objectives in subsection (b) of this section, cause such adjustments in the allocations made pursuant to the regulation under subsection (a) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

"(3) The President shall provide for procedures by which any gasoline user for whom rationing is established under paragraph (1) of this subsection may petition for a review or modification with respect to his ration. Such procedures may include the use of such State and local officers and boards as may be necessary to carry out the functions of this section.

"(4) No regulation or order under this subsection may impose any tax or user fee, or provide for a credit or deduction in computing any tax.

"(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the provisions of this subsection shall terminate upon the expiration of the twelve-month period following the date of the promulgation of such rule required under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

Mr. WEICKER. Does the Senator from Montana, due to his schedule, care to comment at this time? I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; if the Senator will allow me to make a few statements and raise a few questions.

Does the Senator think that the American people have been called on up to this time to make any real sacrifice so far as inflation, recession, or the energy issues are concerned?

Mr. WEICKER. In response to the distinguished Senator from Montana, I say to those who inquire as to why the situation has become worse during the past year that it is because we have done nothing. The Senator from Montana and I are standing in exactly the same position, talking about exactly the same issue 1 year later, and no action has been taken. It is good for members of his party and my party to talk about the good things in life, such as tax rebates, but I do not see how we can climb out of our present difficulties unless there is also a

little hard news and a little sacrifice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am not at all sure that tax rebates are the answer. It appears to me that is the easy way out, and everybody will vote for it. But it does not face up to the problem. It temporarily puts a little extra money in the hands of those who are the recipients of tax relief in that form.

I would hope that consideration would be given to the possibility of reducing taxes this year, rather than a rebate for last year. I think there is much more to it on that basis. Certainly, it calls for no sacrifice to vote for a tax rebate at a time such as this, or at any other time, for that matter.

Is it the Senators understanding, with respect to the Presidents proposal to eventually impose an import tax of \$3 on imported petroleum—February, March, April—that that tax will automatically increase the price of gasoline at the pump?

Mr. WEICKER. In response to the distinguished Senator from Montana, I say two things: First of all, I agree with and I am glad to hear him comment as the business of the tax rebates. I do not think tax rebaters are the answer, either and I think what he is focusing on is so important. It is that sacrifice has to be involved here. The traditional political responses are probably what has put us into our present predicament, and certainly our holding to them will not get us out of our predicament.

It is my understanding, and I cannot speak for the administration, that, yes, the additional tariff will raise the price of everything associated with oil—not just gasoline, but heating oils and all the products associated with oil. In fact, it will be an inflationary measure in and of itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the figures bruited about are anywhere from 10 cents to 20 cents increase in the price for a gallon of gasoline. Does the Senator recall any figures resembling them or approximately them?

Mr. WEICKER. Roughly in that area relative to gasoline, and probably even a greater impact in the area of heating oil.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President said

the other day quite emphatically that if we went to rationing, it would mean 9 gallons a week for individuals who use cars. I have a great respect and affection for the President, but I think that is a very, very, conservative figure because of the amount of petroleum supplies we have on hand and the amount of reserves which have been increased, not to any great extent.

Furthermore, as far as rationing is concerned, it would not be on that kind of a basis of inequality, but on the basis of understanding the needs of the working man who probably has to drive 20, 30, 40, or 50 miles. It would be on the basis of correcting inequities, not on the basis of treating all people equally so that all people would get the same amount of gasoline each week.

Does the Senator know the percentage of self-sufficiency which this Nation, based on its own production, is capable of or is operating on, producing at the present time?

Mr. WEICKER. Yes; I believe the figure is around 75 percent, and this, I think is what really puts the entire picture into proper focus. With the exception of the oil-producing nations themselves, we are probably better off than any other nation in the world. Just with a minimal amount of sacrifice on our part we should be able to do the job here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. My recollection is that the figure was somewhere around 85 percent. What we have been doing is importing most of our needs, not from the Middle East—I want to emphasize that, not from the Middle East, because when the question of oil comes up, it is always the Middle East. We import about 28 percent from Venezuela, about 18 percent from Canada, and half of that is Venezuelan crude, while 9.5 percent comes from Nigeria, 10 percent from Iran, which, in the ordinary sense, is not a Middle East country, 4 or 5 percent from other countries outside the Middle East. The first Middle East country, Saudi Arabia, is responsible for 9.5 percent of the imports; in other words, about a third of our imports come from the area which we describe colloquially as the Middle East.

If we can supply, ourselves, up to 85 percent, which the Europeans cannot do and which Japan cannot do, why do we have to wait until the year 1985 to complete Project Independence? Why can we not become independent within 2 or 3 years? We are wasting, according to studies made by the Ford Foundation and Senator NELSON's subcommittee, between 35 and 40 percent of our energy—wasting it. So we are making no sacrifices. If we tighten our belts just a little, if we reduce gasoline consumption just a little, if we built up our reserves, say, for a period of 3 to 6 months, it would appear to me, contrary to all that is said in the newspapers and downtown, that we do not have to wait until 1985 to become self-sufficient in oil. We have the resources if we have the guts to face up to the realities of the situation and get away from this never-never wonderland in which too many of us have put ourselves.

It is our own fault, absolutely—nobody else's—that we waste this gasoline and that we fear to face up to the realities of the situation.

I commend the distinguished Senator, who, once again, is leading the fight to ask the American people to achieve some degree of stability in the area of petroleum and who is pointing out, quite correctly, that the President's proposal to place a \$3 import tax on petroleum is going to increase the price of gas. In other words, it is an indirect tax on gasoline, and the alternative the Senator is offering to the Senate and to Congress, to the people and to the administration, is far more equitable, far more feasible, and certainly is far more understandable.

I have been surprised in the last couple of days—I did not expect this—to get a number of letters and telegrams from my own State of Montana in which my constituents say that now they would prefer rationing rather than having the price of their gasoline at the pump increased, because of the \$3 impost on imported petroleum products.

The Senator from Connecticut has led the fight in this area. He is right. I think if we ask the people of America to do something little in the way of sacrifice, they will be more than willing to assume the burden. The primrose path

we are following now can lead only to economic disaster; 12.2 percent inflation is not the answer; 7.1 percent unemployment is not the answer. Talk of war in the Middle East is not the answer. Therefore, I hope that we will come back to reality, and do what has to be done.

I wish to assure the distinguished

Senator from Connecticut that as far as I am concerned, I will give him every bit of support that I can. He is doing a service.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana. I think he has responded to a fair question that the President of the United States asked, which was: Never mind Congress giving me standby authority; let Congress speak for itself. Let Congress go ahead and toe up to the mark and vote for the various solutions rather than giving me—the President—a variety of alternatives. The Senator from Montana has spoken very clearly as a Member of this body.

I do, too, because the problems of inflation and recession that we are now involved with are not a New England problem; it is not a middle America problem; it is not a black problem; it is an American problem and America must move together to solve our energy crisis.

This Nation's story is a story of the majority, rather than shifting the burden over to the minority, accepting that burden as their own.

There has been no solution to the problem of inflation that is caused by high-priced oil, and the solution, it seems to me, plainly lies in the reduction of consumption. One year of voluntarism has been 1 year wasted, and has represented many hundreds of thousands of jobs lost.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WEICKER. In just a minute. One year of taxing the poor and the elderly is equally no good. The time is now for all to share in the uncomfortable task—and I mean uncomfortable according to political traditions—of conservation. If we do, the price of gasoline will come down. Furthermore, it will hold the line on spiraling fuel prices, while we develop mass transit, while we develop

smaller cars, while we reconstruct our architecture so that we do not have air-conditioning all year long, and while we develop alternative sources of energy, such as solar energy. The alternative, as the Senator from Montana has stated, is the continued outflow of dollars to other nations and the economic ruin of this Nation.

I am glad to yield for additional comments or questions to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and I commend both the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) for taking the initiative.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question. That is, does the Senator know of any other way, short of rationing, to have an immediate impact to decrease the consumption of petroleum products?

Mr. WEICKER. Absolutely none. And I do not believe that the imposition of these additional taxes is going to reduce consumption one bit. It will breed inflation; it will not significantly reduce consumption.

Mr. HASKELL. I would concur with the distinguished Senator. I have another question: As the distinguished Senator has articulated, conservation and increased production are the two tools we have to meet the problem facing us. I assume that the distinguished Senator would concur with the Senator from Colorado that rationing has the most immediate impact, but conservation generally has a more effective impact in increasing the supply?

Mr. WEICKER. Absolutely. What we have to do right now is hold the line now. Just think: The distinguished Senator from Montana a year ago made comments identical to those he has made today. Where would we be had those comments been heeded? We would be way ahead of our present situation. Somewhere we have to start; for God's sake let us have a mandatory fuel conservation program right now, and not 10 years from now.

Mr. HASKELL. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Actually, in December of 1973 I attempted to get mandatory gasoline ra-

tioning on the emergency energy bill which President Nixon later vetoed. If we had had rationing in effect for 12 months, we would probably be \$30 billion or more ahead.

I have one further question: Would the Senator agree with me that from a national economic welfare and security viewpoint, we simply cannot afford the transfer of dollars overseas for oil in the amounts that we now have them?

Mr. WEICKER. In response to the question of the Senator from Colorado, every day that goes by without conservation measures is a further display of our weakness to those who are setting the artificially high price. It proves to them that they are right, that they can maintain their inflated price and they can jack it up still farther. Every day that goes by that this Nation does not act shows there is inherent weakness in the Nation.

What I think is unfair is that I do not think the American people are at all weak. But I must confess that the political leadership—both in the executive and the legislative branches—is speaking some very weak language right now. I want to see done what everyone feels in his heart should be done; I want the message to be heard that there is no way we are going to be able to stanch the outflow of dollars unless energy conservation becomes a national ethic.

Mr. HASKELL. Would the Senator concur that raising the price of imported oil by \$3, or to a level of \$14, and decontrolling of oil prices in the United States—which would inevitably mean that domestic oil would cost \$14—would the Senator agree that that would impose an intolerable burden on all of our citizens except the very rich?

Mr. WEICKER. The answer is yes. I would only depart somewhat; we have not discussed the aspect of deregulation, and it is of deep concern to me. But there is no question that the present policies that are being advocated will have a limited effect upon the more fortunate in this country. That is why we say that the fact that we keep on looking at each other in terms of poor, rich, and middle income is a matter that really annoys me, and bespeaks the need of leadership. It is the problem for all of us to solve; it is an American problem. A rationing

program will require all Americans to equally sacrifice in this national effort to reduce our energy consumption.

Mr. HASKELL. I would agree. And the rationing proposal is something every one of us in this country, regardless of how we are classified otherwise, will share in the burden equally, and I commend the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Montana for the introduction of this measure.

Mr. President, as I have stated, in December 1973, I offered an amendment to an emergency energy bill which would have required the FEO—now the FEA—to report back to the Congress within a specified period of time a plan for gasoline rationing. I got less than the 50 votes required. But I am convinced that if that amendment had carried, and if the energy emergency legislation had been signed instead of vetoed by former President Nixon, our Nation could have avoided a large part of the energy supply crisis that has plunged us into a recession.

This Nation, which was self-sufficient in energy through 1950, now imports 7.3 million barrels of the 17 million barrels of oil it consumes a day. And an increasing portion of that imported oil—nearly 30 percent—comes originally from Arab wells. The actions by the OPEC nations have nearly tripled the price of oil in the past 18 months. The price we pay for importing that oil is leading us to economic disaster.

The transfer of over \$30 billion a year of American money to the OPEC nations must be stopped. And it must be stopped now if we are to have any hope of climbing out of our recession.

So far we have clearly lacked the commitment to and the leadership for stiff energy conservation measures. But introduction of this legislation today is ample evidence that the awareness of the need to conserve is increasing rapidly. A recent poll indicates that the American people favor gasoline rationing over higher gas taxes 55 percent to 32 percent. Even though the President has indicated he would veto any legislation containing a mandate to implement gasoline rationing I believe we must persist. We can no longer afford to ignore the inevitable and must bear the responsibility of conveying this sad news to the American people.

In addition to gasoline rationing other stringent conservation measures are urgently needed. The recent final report of the Ford Foundation Energy Policy Project and the Federal Energy Administration's Project Independent Report tell us that if we get tough and do more than talk about energy conservation we can save anywhere from 3.49 million to 4.02 million barrels of oil per day in 1985. That is two-thirds of our total oil imports and it converts to a savings of between \$28 million and \$38 million now leaving the country daily to buy OPEC oil.

These conservation measures are not far-out ideas cooked up by crazy scientists. For example, a year ago the Treasury Department issued a shopping list of fairly simple energy conservation steps:

Set thermostats 3 degrees higher in summer, lower in winter; increase the efficiency of industrial energy use by a mere 2 percent; improve the energy efficiency of commercial buildings by 10 percent; begin mandatory auto tune-ups every 6 months; use cold water detergents to end hot-water laundering; increase the load factors on commercial aircraft from 50 percent to 70 percent; and encourage car-pooling to increase the average number of auto passengers from the present 1.3 to 2.3.

Those are simple steps. But they could have been saving us 2.6 million barrels of costly foreign oil per day—not in 1985 or even 2 years from now but immediately. They were never implemented.

The only other immediately available tool to save a significant amount of oil is gasoline rationing. Other measures will be necessary in the near to long term, such as establishing a mandatory 20-mile-per-gallon standard for autos and establishing programs to increase use of public transit and discourage generally the wasteful use of the private auto to eliminate the need for rationing. These two steps alone could save from 1.46 to 2.02 million barrels of oil a day by 1985—and more than half that could be saved in 3 years.

But we cannot afford to wait. And the American people cannot afford the President's program of conserving oil by dramatic increases in the price of imported oil. That program would add an inflationary \$30 million this year alone. Even

if the economy as a whole could stand it the consumers—those hit first and hardest—cannot. We must find an alternative. And in my view rationing is the most direct answer to the problem.

I do not discount the need to work on the supply side of the energy picture. But that has serious lead time problems. The environmental consequences of a go-for-broke supply increase are enormous and must be carefully weighed before we go ahead.

As the issue is discussed further in the coming weeks I intend to pursue several issues which may need to be proposed in the form of amendments to this basic piece of legislation. I hope the sponsors will be amenable to these amendments. They would include:

Setting a specific goal, such as a saving of one million barrels per day, for the rationing program;

Insuring the rationing coupons will be negotiable instruments to guard against the growth of a black market;

Considering ending rationing when this Nation achieves 85 or 90 percent self-sufficiency in energy, instead of cutting the program off after twelve months;

Recognizing tourism as an industry and insuring the coupons will be cumulative so that those who desire to cut corners elsewhere to save for somewhat longer trips will be able to do so; and

Insuring the Congress will have an opportunity to review the administration's proposal before it is implemented. If rationing is forced on the President in spite of his avowed opposition, we will need to take a careful look at the program to insure that it is implemented in accord with our intent—not merely a program designed to fail.

I commend my distinguished colleagues for their willingness to face this most unpleasant issue squarely. Those of us who shy away from carrying the distasteful message to our constituents, to make them understand that we are on the brink of economic disaster, will be held accountable.

We must cut our dependence on foreign oil to avert that disaster. Mandatory rationing is urgently needed and I am pleased to cosponsor this legislation to require it.

• Mr. WEICKER. I thank the Senator

from Colorado and the Senator from Montana for their foresight. I hope we can have hearings in the Senate, to show that we can act, that the initiative sits here and that the Senate can act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of my time to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. WEICKER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To sum up, the American people have not, repeat, have not been made aware of the increasing deficit in the balance of payments, which has skyrocketed until it has now quadrupled what it was a little over a year ago.

Furthermore, we are aware that the OPEC countries in Africa, in Latin America, in and around the Middle East, and in Southwest Asia can, if they so desire, turn that spigot off and on. So we have no assurance of a continued oil supply except at extraordinary price levels, and we have not even got that assurance in case of a further breakout of war in the Middle East, as far as that region is concerned.

Of all the oil-producing countries in the Western World outside of OPEC, this Nation is the most fortunate, because it produces, for its own consumption, 85 percent of its needs, whereas Western Europe, even with the North Sea oilfield development, probably is 85 percent deficient, depending upon imports, and Japan is almost totally dependent upon imports, and because of that is now in the process of trying to make arrangements, and probably has, with oil-producing nations so that its economy can keep going.

We are also aware of the fact that there is a 35- to 40-percent wastage of energy in the United States, and certainly, if that is the case—and I think it is, based on reputable studies by the Ford Foundation and by Senator NELSON's committee—there is no reason why we cannot sacrifice just a little through rationing, through cutting down on the thermostats, through using less air-conditioning, through insulating our homes, and do so in a way which, in my opin-

ion—though I could be wrong—would within the next 2 to 3 years make this country self-sufficient in petroleum.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Connecticut has to yield.

Mr. WEICKER. I yield.

Mr. STONE. I wanted to ask a question of either of the two introducing Senators as to whether under their rationing plan wasteful uses of energy are curtailed as opposed to curtailing across the board, the object being, of course, for all of us to find an energy policy that will put people back to work.

How will this fit into the plan of not merely curtailing inflation, which obviously it will help to do, but of attacking recession in the sense that the use of gas and oil will be allowed and fostered for productive use which means job-producing, productive use? How does that fit in?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will allow me, to yield—time is running out—I would hope it would produce more car pools. You travel the highways here, one person to a car. You put four or five in a car, you not only save on your rationing so you can take a trip to Florida or some place else during the winter, but you also conserve energy, and you keep the price down.

As far as work is concerned, any system, as during the Second World War when we had an A, B, C, T system, made allowances for those who had to travel distances to work. Everybody was not treated alike, because if that was the case the people in the lower- and middle-income groups would once again get it in the neck, and they would be the ones who would make the greatest sacrifice and they are the ones who in reality should make the least.

Mr. WEICKER. What we have attempted to do in this legislation is to purposely be flexible, not pin a plan on the President. We said it has to be mandatory, it has to apply across the board and then, it seems to me, it is up to the President and Congress to work out the details of the plan. But obviously there are areas such as commercial use, agricultural use, and so forth, where the emphasis has to continue in order that, so productivity can be maintained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's additional 5 minutes have expired.

Mr. WEICKER. One minute.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The distinguished Republican whip yielded 5 minutes, and I ask him to yield 1 minute.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. WEICKER. I would hope this would be something to be looked at, by both the President and the Congress.

What it boils down to in common parlance is that the United States is the world's greatest oil junkie, and the time comes now when we have to kick the habit, and it is as simple as that. And if there is going to be any economic strangulation, which I think is the term I have heard used, then, as the Senator from Montana has said, we will have done it to ourselves, because—I am my own executioner because—we have the capability to resolve this problem.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I know that the legislation introduced today has been offered in good faith, with good intention and the best of motives. But, frankly, I am somewhat amazed and mystified by this move on the part of my colleagues.

President Ford has already made it abundantly clear, as recently as his press conference the other day, that after carefully examining the various options available, to deal with the very serious energy problem confronting this Nation, he is convinced that rationing is not the answer.

Now, despite that strong indication by President Ford, my colleagues have introduced a bill that, as I have read it, would require the President within 60 days to impose a rationing program. In effect, the bill would merely call upon the President to devise and implement a "fair and equitable" rationing program.

Now, in light of all the talk in recent months and years about Congress recapturing its powers under the Constitution, this proposal seems very strange—strange in that it would hand to a President outright all the tough decisions about such a rationing program.

On the other hand, President Ford, in effect, said the other day that—

If the Congress really believes rationing is the answer, then Congress ought to devise its own rationing program.

How should the scarcity of oil to be shared? How can a rationing program be made equitable? How large and what kind of an army of bureaucrats would be necessary to implement and enforce a rationing program?

None of the answers to these tough questions is addressed by the legislation introduced today. It merely directs the President within 60 days to put a rationing program into effect.

Now, the unfortunate fact is that rationing will not provide the answer to our serious energy problem. To propose it only delays the time when we can actually make the difficult decisions as to approach that really need to be made.

I wonder if anyone really thinks the American people would stand still for the regimentation required to enforce rationing—in peacetime—over a period of 5 to 10 years—the period required to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

Keep in mind that other industrialized countries in the free world—with more serious energy problems than we face—have already experimented with rationing and have found it lacking. It is interesting that other major free world countries have tried rationing, but have come to the conclusion that, like price and wage controls, it just does not work.

In the countries such as Japan and the European countries they have found it necessary, in order to dampen and restrain consumption to turn to price constraints.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there

Mr. GRIFFIN. If I might just make this additional point: Not only will rationing not work, but it does leave room for the incentives that we absolutely

need to develop and produce energy from alternative sources.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. All I wanted to say was that in certain European countries, France especially, they have increased the price of gasoline per gallon on the basis of the amount which you use and, if my memory serves me correctly, it is somewhere up about \$1.75 or \$2 a gallon at the present time.

France has practically nothing in the way of petroleum to develop, and it is dependent upon North Africa and the Middle East, North Africa especially, the Algerian fields, to supply its needs. It has no interest in the North Sea, because it does not come down along the French coast and so far, at least, there are no development prospects along the French and the Spanish coasts.

So I would think that what we ought to do—incidentally, I commend the President for coming out with a program even though some of us disagree with it in part. I commend him for stepping out and assuming the cloak of the Presidency, and stating on two occasions what he thought should be done for the American people.

He has also said, if I remember correctly, that if the Congress did not agree with what he was suggesting, then the Congress itself should come up with its own proposals.

This is what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and I and others are doing. It is nothing new, we tried to do it last year, we got nowhere. But it appears to me that if this country wants to become self-sufficient, it can, on the basis of various reasons given so far, and what we ought to do is fit our needs to our production and not be dependent on imports from the outside.