

February 11, 1981

LR 16
LB 167

Department of Roads hearing scheduled for tomorrow the time has been changed from 1:30 until 2:00.

Mr. President, Senator Beutler and Vickers would like to print amendments to LB 167 in the Journal. (See page 507 of the Legislative Journal.)

Finally, Mr. President, I have a resolution signed by several members, LR 16. (Read LR 16 as found on pages 508 and 509 of the Legislative Journal.) That will be laid over pursuant to our rules, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Is that it?

CLERK: Yes, sir.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle, do you want to adjourn us until tomorrow morning?

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker and members of the body, I move that we adjourn until 9:00 tomorrow morning, Thursday, February the 12th.

SPEAKER MARVEL: All those in favor of that motion say aye. Opposed no. The motion is carried. We are adjourned until 9:00 tomorrow morning.

Edited by:


Marg A. Turner

CLERK: Mr. President: (Read roll call vote as found on page 516 of the Legislative Journal.) 26 ayes, 17 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Motion fails. The next item of business, item #5, resolutions. The Call is raised.

CLERK: Mr. President, LR 16, first of all, Senators Wagner and Dworak ask unanimous consent to have their names added as coinroducer.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Hearing no objection, so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, LR 16 offered by several members, found on page 508 of the Journal. (Read LR 16.)

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit.

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, before I proceed I would like to ask that anyone of the other members who would like to add their name to this resolution would be allowed to do so and I apologize that I did not contact everyone yesterday and ask them if they cared to sign the resolution but time was rather short and I did not have that time. Those of us who have signed this resolution ask for its introduction because we recognize as we did more than one year ago the futility of an embargo upon grain. On January 14, 1980, this Legislature adopted a resolution which we asked that the existing embargo be terminated. We did so for a variety of reasons but first of all, because we said it would not be effective, that it could have a serious disruptive effect upon the economy, that although the first impact would be adverse to farmers, that it would only be a matter of time until that impact would also be felt by business and by labor. If you have read the local newspapers the past several weeks you have noticed that more than four thousand bankruptcies have occurred in Nebraska in the past recent months. You have noticed that there have been even in Nebraska, some layoff of individual workers. There are more than fifty thousand automobile workers that are laid off across the United States. There have been serious disruptions of the farm equipment business. These disruptions will be continuing until something is done to restore some kind of equity in our foreign trade. It has been proven that it has been totally impossible to stop the sale of grain to Russia. The imports of grain to Russia have increased from seventeen million tons last year to more than thirty-one million tons this year. The only difference is that the American businessmen, farmers, laboring people have not benefitted from those sales as they would have had the sales been made directly rather

than indirectly. Senator J. James Exon who a year ago indicated that the business and farmer, laboring people should be protected from the impacts of the embargo if it were to be allowed to continue, speaking in Columbus, Nebraska, last Saturday, called the embargo a dismal failure. There have been some indication that this administration may try to expand the embargo to cover more goods than just agricultural commodities. It has been evident that it has been impossible to stop the flow of agricultural commodities to Russia and I predict that we will find that if that embargo should be expanded that it will be just as impossible to stop the flow of other equipment. Certainly the embargo will not work. The free trade system of the world is such that someone will always find a method or mechanism whereby to provide those articles which some other country chooses to purchase. There is some concern and genuine concern that perhaps the Russians may not even choose to buy the eight million tons of grain which they are allowed to buy under the present agreement. There is some concern about a loss of face, if, for example, the Russians said to the United States, we do not choose to do business with you. For that purpose the resolution is worded in such a way that we are asking President Reagan and his administration to reinstitute the negotiations for trade with those countries which choose to do business with us. I think it is a reasonable method and a reasonable approach. We recognize that an embargo once instituted, has serious impacts upon the marketplace and to remove it also has serious impact but we feel there is a way in which it can be done and the sooner we do it the better it is for all concerned. There have been many reasons given by a variety of persons who would like to see the embargo terminated but perhaps the best reason I can think of is this, the continued adverse impact upon the market system is going to create a problem as it comes time to plant a crop this spring. Unless our agricultural sector of the United States has the incentive to produce commodities we are not going to see the production which we need and eventually the result will be a shortage of commodities, worldwide shortages of food, starvation throughout the world, skyrocketing prices and resulting adverse impact upon many people who have no way to protect themselves. There may be others who wish to endorse the proposal. I think the proposal is a reasonable one, a sound one that showed support. The midwestern members of Congress will meet with the President on February 17. I ask that this resolution be adopted, that it be advanced to the members of Congress from this state to show that the Unicameral Legislature still supports the lifting of the embargo. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be given your support.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion before the House is the adoption of the resolution and the Chair recognizes Senator Kremer and then Senator Burrows. Senator Kremer.

SENATOR KREMER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I'm sure that those of us who signed the resolution really searched our hearts. I know I did. I have come to the conclusion that the net result of this embargo has not accomplished what those of us who are citizens of this great country of ours hoped it really would accomplish. We are certain that our feed grains and wheat is being sold to other countries that in turn process these grains and the product in turn of course is being sold to the country to which we are trying to address the problem. That is unfortunate. Not only does the commodity get there but it increases the cost and at the same time we are inheriting a problem here in our country that is going to be rather serious. Those of us whose vocation is agriculture are greatly concerned what is going to happen unless the prices for our commodities get a little bit better adjustment. All of our energy fuels are up in cost, fertilizer is up in cost, everything is up, up, up and right today corn is selling for much less than it did in the middle of summer. It is not following the trend of the time. Unless some readjustment can be made in this area, as Senator Schmit clearly pointed out, we are going to see some shortages. The bankruptcies and the farm sales that are taking place today are rather disturbing. So after giving this a lot of thought I signed the resolution and I will back it up. For the best interests of our country at this point, I believe it is better that we raise the embargo. We can't do it. The best we can do is to pass this resolution. I support the resolution.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Burrows.

SENATOR BURROWS: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, I fully support the resolution. I think that it was a sad mistake to embargo grain or food. History has not shown that you can starve other nations into submission and where, if it has been ineffective, it has simply reduced our balance of payments and left more dollars for the Russians to build military and has the really only effect of inciting the Russian people toward a more militaristic government and not working for a peaceful coexistence of the two countries. What it can do if it worked and it didn't work because they bought the grain elsewhere, they paid more and the dollar losses come back to the Nebraska farmer and agriculture in the U.S. What it did do, if it worked, was just change the diet of the Russian people to a little poorer diet, a little less meat and that is the issue and how you are going to get cooperation with a country by doing this, I simply cannot

understand. If the embargo was on military technology that would be very understandable but to short our own balance of payments and leave the Russians with more dollars for weapons is a highly illogical theory. I support the resolution. I think we made a bad mistake in this country when we embargoed the grain and a very costly one to the State of Nebraska. The cost is not one in millions but probably several billion dollars to the State of Nebraska had we maintained the grain sales to Russia. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I guess I am going to hazard presenting a dissenting voice on this resolution, knowing I am sure that it will, in fact, pass. Now I cannot claim at all to have the expertise that Senator Schmit does in grain marketing but in the area of foreign policy I wouldn't claim necessarily to be an expert but I did answer one out of the three questions posed to the nominee for Deputy Secretary of State. The Deputy Secretary didn't answer any of them so I am at least a little more knowledgeable maybe in that area than a current appointee. It seems to me that certain things in this resolution we may not want to certify to, at least I would hope not. I guess I would try and strike a look at, not just the situation in Afghanistan, the situation in Poland which may be a country that those of us can relate to a little better, it is a little closer culturally to us than Afghanistan, and to notice that in the resolution the statement that says, the lack of grain has not been known to produce a democratic society. I think the circumstances in Poland would seem to indicate contrary, that it is food shortages in that country that has generated dissent, that has led to the formation of independent unions, that has led to strikes and things that previously were not known in countries in the Soviet block. So I would say that the lack of grain or the lack of food can create pressure for a democratic society and that I think we are, in fact, seeing that in a country that borders the Soviet Union and that may be something to keep in mind. Also there is the statement that the continuing embargo has not, without curtailing the adventurism of the Soviet Union. Well I am not going to claim to know at all the intentions of the Soviet Union and I doubt anyone in this Legislature is qualified to really make a statement with regards to that but again looking at the circumstances with regards to the country of Poland, there has been widespread speculation for months that the Soviet Union would, in fact, invade that country and for whatever reasons they have chosen not to and I am sure there is

a wide range of things and that the grain embargo is not maybe high on the list but may be a factor there. I think that this Legislature would rise up in great indignation if there was an invasion of Poland. I would hope that there is a certain feeling of same indignation when a country such as Afghanistan, even though perhaps the people are different culturally, different racial background than ourselves. I just bring those points to the attention of the Legislature. I think if you wish to discuss and include in the resolutions, comments on the impact of the grain embargo, on the grain markets of the United States, that is probably appropriate and most of us in this Legislature, certainly there are people with the qualifications here to discuss that but for us to be speculating about foreign policy, for us to be speculating about the intentions of the Soviet Union, for us to be suggesting that lack of food does not create pressure for democracy when, in fact, we see just the opposite in Poland, I think is overreaching our bounds and I am sure that again, most of us probably could have answered questions better than the nominee for Deputy Secretary of State. That still does not really qualify us as foreign policy experts and I would be much more comfortable with this resolution if we just addressed the economic circumstances of the grain embargo and left foreign policy to those who have probably more information and a broader perspective.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker and members, I signed the resolution and was also a part of the group that went to Washington a year ago to try to convince the Secretary of Agriculture at that time that this was a worthless endeavor. Senator Fowler says that we do control people with food and I guess I would have to agree with him to an extent. We also control the world today with many, many other things that are needed, especially for war, the precious metals and all the different things that are traded worldwide. Our country has made no effort to shut these things off from the Soviet Union to my knowledge at least. They are trying to do it all with food which hurts only one segment of our population and that is the segment that I represent. I just cannot see how you can control a war or control a nation by just shutting off one of their necessities and that might be food. Then on top of that it doesn't work because we just heard from... I read in the paper this morning I believe it was where a person from the common market of Europe was in Omaha making a speech and was telling what a great thing this embargo was. The common market itself is supplying the Soviet Union with the goods

that we can't supply, so I don't know what he is talking about. There is many ways that we could hurt the Soviet Union just as bad as we can by withholding the food from them and I resent it that our government has not taken those incentives and countries around the world have not taken those incentives if they really want to stop the Soviet Union. I don't know why they should pick on the American farmer to do the dirty work and that is what it amounts to so I hope you will support the resolution. I think it is a mistake. If you are going to shut off the supply of goods to Russia, let's do it across the board, not just with the things that we produce. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator DeCamp, do you wish to be recognized and then we will recognize Senator Schmit to close?

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I think the resolution is going to pass also, exactly as Senator Fowler said and I believe it should pass but I don't think some of the things that Senator Fowler said should be allowed to pass without comment. If you listened to the theme of Senator Fowler's talk, it went something like this. Starving people react, get violent, get angry, we as a country have the ability to starve people. Let's use starvation as our new foreign policy tool. That is about what it amounted to. Starvation should be our new foreign policy tool. If we are going to adopt starvation as our new foreign policy tool, Senator Fowler, then we are saying in essence in the most clear cut way, food is a weapon of war and we are just using this method of war right now rather than the guns. I don't think the history of this country is such that we want to adopt food as our first and basic weapon of war and use starvation as our method of foreign policy and I would urge you to adopt the resolution and with respect to the economic argument that Senator Fowler gave, I would point out that every embargo imposed thus far has resulted in the country embargoed being able to obtain the same amount or larger amounts of commodity embargoed by running it through black markets, third countries, unknown destinations, so on and so forth. It has created into depressed price in the country here, the United States, an artificially high price in the third country or the country through which the grain is then routed, a disruption of information about world market supplies and demands and everything else and it has had almost the opposite effect of that intended every time. So from an economic sound standpoint it is unsound and as a foreign policy tool I would submit to you, starvation should not be the first weapon in the United States arsenal.

SENATOR NICHOL PRESIDING

SENATOR NICHOL: Senator Schmit, did you want to close, please?

SENATOR SCHMIT: Mr. President and members of the Legislature, I'm not going to take a lot of time. I think there have been some good arguments. I respect Senator Fowler's concern. I recognize that he believes deeply in the things he has referred to. I still believe very strongly that if starvation is going to be a weapon, we can find all sorts of places we can apply that same principle, not only overseas but in our own country. I do not believe it has proven to be a humanitarian way of addressing foreign policy nor should we use it as a method of addressing domestic policy. I think that far better for us to attempt to satisfy the food and needs, not only of this nation, but of the world, to prove that our system is superior, that we can produce food in abundance, that we can merchandise that food and that we can become a principal granary of the world, that we can do so at an economic profit to ourselves, help to correct some of the deficit balance of trade which is today robbing this country of billions of dollars, increasing the cost of inflation to all of our people and causing serious concerns worldwide. The plain facts are the embargo has not worked. This Legislature said it would not work when we started out. Our Governor said it would not work. Senator Ed Zorinsky said it would not work. Congresswoman Virginia Smith said it would not work. All of these people have been proven to be right but the Nebraska Legislature to my knowledge is the only elected body that took official action as a group in opposition to the embargo at an early date. We did so January 14, 1980. We were right then. I believe we are correct today to reaffirm our opposition to the embargo and ask the present administration to do what it can to restore free trade in agricultural commodities because it is impossible to shut them off. I hope you would endorse the resolution and they would support it and vote for it.

SPEAKER MARVEL PRESIDING

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Schmit, before we take a vote on the resolution, it is my privilege to introduce a distinguished guest who has consented to make a few remarks and Senator Marsh, Senator Marsh, if you will lead the escort group to the podium, Senator Marsh, Senator Beutler, Senator Goll and we will wait just...and the guest is the Honorable Andrew Young, former U.S. Ambassador. (applause) Mr. Ambassador, we are privileged to have you with us.

AMBASSADOR YOUNG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and it is a pleasure for me to be with you. I had the privilege of being the neighbor of your Governor when I served in the Congress as the Representative of Georgia and it is a pleasure to come to this beautiful building and to.

February 12, 1981

meet with old and new friends and to have an opportunity to see the legislative process grinding slowly but working the will of the people of this state and hopefully, having an impact on the people of this nation. Now fortunately I think I am very much in sympathy with some of the things you are presently discussing but I had better mind my own business and go on about my work. I have enjoyed meeting with students at the University of Nebraska and am on my way over to Creighton and it is good to have such a warm welcome because down where I come from, this is pretty cold. Only I called home to find out that it is seventeen degrees in Georgia too, so I just as well be here enjoying my time with you. Thank you very much and keep on keeping on.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Thank you, sir. Will the committee please escort the Ambassador from the Chamber. (gavel.) The motion before the House is the adoption of the Schmit resolution. All those in favor of the adoption of the resolution vote aye, opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Have you all voted? Clerk, record the vote.

CLERK: 33 ayes, 4 nays, Mr. President.

SPEAKER MARVEL: The motion is carried and the resolution is adopted. We now revert to General File, item #6. The first order of business is LR (sic) 143.

CLERK: Mr. President, LB 143 was offered by Senator Chambers. (Read title.) The bill was read on January 14 of this year. The bill was referred to the Public Works Committee for a hearing. It was advanced to General File with committee amendments pending. The bill was considered by the body on February 6 of this year. At that time Senator Chambers offered an amendment to the committee amendments which was adopted. Senator Hoagland, Koch and Labedz had amendments that were adopted to the committee amendments. Subsequent to that action the committee amendments were adopted by the body. I now have a series of amendments pending, Mr. President. The first is by Senator Beutler. The amendment is offered by Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, you may recall that when we ended this debate last time around we had an amendment which was in two parts and we had extended discussion on the division of the question. That amendment was subsequently withdrawn but now you will have presented to you, two separate amendments. This is the first of the two. The second will be offered by Senator Goodrich. My amendment does simply ask you to do simply one thing and that is reduce the speed limit

February 17, 1981

LR 16
LB 24, 109, 110, 114, 143, 188,
188A, 207, 207A, 234, 234A, 246,
325, 388.

PRESIDENT LUEDTKE PRESIDING

PRESIDENT: Prayer by Paster Rodney Hinrichs from the Rejoice Lutheran Church here at Lincoln.

PASTOR RODNEY HINRICHS: Prayer offered.

PRESIDENT: Roll call.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Higgins would like to be excused. Senator Labeledz and Chronister until....

PRESIDENT: Record the presence.

CLERK: Quorum present, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: Quorum being present, are there any corrections to the Journal?

CLERK: I have no corrections, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT: The Journal will stand correct as published. Any messages, reports or announcements.

CLERK: Mr. President, your Enrollment and Review Committee respectfully reports they have carefully examined and reviewed LB 207 and recommend that same be placed on Select File; 207A; 188; 188A; 234; 234A; 110; 143 and 109 all placed on Select File. (See pages 525 and 526 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, your committee on Enrollment and Review respectfully reports they have carefully examined and engrossed LB 24 and find the same correctly engrossed.

Mr. President, your committee on Public Works whose Chairman is Senator Kremer to whom was referred LB 114 instructs me to report the same back to the Legislature with the recommendation it be advanced to General File with amendments; 246 General File with amendments; 325 General File with amendments; 388 General File with amendments. (Signed) Senator Kremer, Chair. (See pages 526 and 527 of the Legislative Journal.)

Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request to have Senator Clark add his name to LR 16.

PRESIDENT: Any objections? If not, so ordered.

CLERK: Mr. President, LR 16 is ready for your signature.