

Education Appropriations

C.R. Dec 3, 1969

Testimony Labor-HEW

Subcom. of Com. on App.

Educational needs of nation

HEW Appropriations Bill

Funding for medical research

Need for adequate health services

Inequality of Educational, Social and Economic opportunity

Dropouts

Teachers poorly prepared.

Education Subcommittee of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Call for creation of National Advisory Commission on School Finance

Amendments to S.2218, bill to extend ESEA of 1965

Programs for the disadvantaged (Title I)

Library resources (Title II)

Innovative and exemplary programs (Title III)

Strengthening state departments of education (Title V)

Dropout prevention (Title VIII)

Vocational Education Act of 1963)

Senator Yarborough

Programs for the handicapped (Title VI)

Bilingual education (Title VII)

Mondale urges forward funding, full funding

John Davis, educator Minneapolis

Donald Bevis

Donald Bevis, educator, Minneapolis
y Waddic State Department of Education

Authorization-appropriations gap

Space program

Military Procurement

Rising cost of education

Impact Aid

Vocational Education

Work Opportunity Center Program of Mpls Public Schools (Vo. Ed.)

Public Law 815

Public law 874

Administration

National Advisory Council Report on Education of Disadvantaged Children

Cutback in funds for disadvantaged

President's Task Force on Education

Designated block grants

American Indians bilingual ed.

Mexican Americans

Limited funding of Dropout prevention program

Higher Education

Education Professions Development Act

Teacher Corps Program

Student Assistance programs

Conference Report on H.R. 13194, Insured Student Emergency Amendments
of 1969

C.R. Dec 3 (cont)

Office of Education

Educational Opportunity Grants

National Defense Student Loans

College Work Study Program

Talent Search

Upward Bound

Special Services in College Programs

Growing enrollment in colleges yet cutback in appropriations

College teacher supply

Higher Education Act

Developing Institutions (Title III)

Undergraduate Instructional Equipment and Resources (Title VIA)

Title X, Improvement of Graduate Schools

Opposition to Student Unrest Tied to HEW Appropriations Bill Sect. 407

Section 504 of Higher Education Amendments

Denounce repressive measures aimed at institutions of higher learning

Whitten Amendment Sections 408 and 409

School desegregation

Supreme Court decision prohibiting delay in desegregating schools

Polarization of America



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 115

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1969

No. 201

Senate

EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I had an opportunity to appear before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I testified before this subcommittee on the tremendous unmet educational needs facing our Nation, and urged them to recommend substantial increases in funding for education programs at all levels.

Funds for education programs are sound investments in the quality of American life. I believe that Congress has a responsibility to invest heavily in the children of this country, and I believe that fuller and more adequate funding for vital educational programs is the place to begin.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I presented to the Appropriations Subcommittee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am honored to have this opportunity to present my views on needed increases in appropriations for vital education programs. The H.E.W. Appropriations Bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, contains a vitally needed increase of \$1 billion over the Administration's budget request for education but still falls short of meeting the human needs of this nation. I recently made a statement on the Senate floor expressing my opposition to reductions in funds for medical research and related programs—a statement which reflected the deep distress felt by Minnesota's outstanding medical community concerning the drastic reductions in federal support of medical research and improved health delivery services. Therefore, I will focus today upon the need for appropriations increases for elementary, secondary and higher education.

I feel strongly that this nation is falling behind in its quest for quality education and adequate health services while frantically scrambling to escalate a questionable race toward higher and higher expenditures for military and space programs. The Senate must correct this imbalance, and the H.E.W. appropriations bill is the most appropriate vehicle for attacking this problem.

I would suggest that we may be asking the wrong question when considering appropriations for programs designed to meet human needs. We traditionally ask, "Can we afford to . . . ?" I would suggest that we should ask, "Can we afford not to . . . ?"

Or to state it another way, we look at human needs and do whatever we think we can afford at the time. In contrast, in our firm desire to reach the moon in the 1960's,

we established a national goal and resolved that we would, without question, provide the resources to achieve that goal.

I am fully aware of the fiscal constraints we are facing as a nation. My point is that we are reacting to these constraints in the wrong way—in a manner which does not reflect the over-riding human needs of a nation in turmoil. I would hope that we in the Senate, and particularly those who serve on the Appropriations Committee, could view appropriations not in the light of what we can afford in the traditional sense, but in answer to a more critical question: What will be the ultimate cost to the individual and to the society of the unrealized potential of millions of under-educated children and adults; of years of inequality of educational, social and economic opportunity; of neglected dropouts; of poorly prepared teachers; of alienated youth?

Quality education is truly an investment and not an expense. At a time when the nation's school systems are facing a severe financial crisis, the federal government must respond. In this regard, I have taken two major steps within the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in recent weeks. First, I have called for the creation of a prestigious National Advisory Commission on School Finance to study the school fiscal crisis. This Commission would be required to report to the President and the Congress within two years its recommendations concerning the proper federal role in financing education in partnership with state and local government. Secondly, I have introduced amendments to S. 2218, the bill to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which would increase annual authorizations for a number of selected ESEA programs. These include Title I (programs for the disadvantaged), Title II (library resources), Title III (innovative and exemplary programs), Title V (strengthening state departments of education), Title VIII (dropout prevention), and selected programs funded under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. I also supported enthusiastically amendments introduced by the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. Yarborough, which would increase annual authorizations for ESEA Title VI (programs for the handicapped) and ESEA Title VII (bilingual education).

Before commenting upon specific programs which I consider most deserving of appropriations beyond those provided in the House bill, I would like to stress three subjects of particular interest to educators in Minnesota. These include forward funding, full funding, and the illusion often created when we appropriate the same amount for a given program from one fiscal year to the next.

The uncertainty created by a lack of forward funding in most ESEA programs is undoubtedly one of the most frustrating aspects of federal aid programs. Little has to be said of the problem created for a local school district which does not know what federal funds it will have available until half of the school year has passed. The dilemma faced by the administrator attempting to attract staff to a federally funded project under these circumstances is self-evident. Minnesota educators for whom I have great respect, such as John Davis and Donald Bevis of Minneapolis and Gregory Waddick of the State Department of Education, have described the negative impact of our present uncertain funding pattern upon the recruitment and retention of personnel for federally-supported programs and upon sound long range planning. The ultimate losers are, of course, the children for whom federal funds are appropriated. On their behalf, and on behalf of the taxpayer seeking maximum return on his investment in education, I urge the Appropriations Committee to do everything within its power to place federal programs of aid to education on a forward funding basis. As you well know, this has been done to some extent with Title I with great success. The concept should be extended to as many programs as possible.

Another concern is the lack of full funding—the large gap between program authorizations and actual appropriations. This gap raises unrealistic expectations on the part of those who are looking to the Federal Government for assistance. Our failure to deliver what we promise creates widespread disillusionment and uncertainty concerning our will to implement the excellent authorizing legislation which now exists. I believe that the major shortcoming of the Congress in education has been our inability to fund programs at levels which even approach our own authorizations.

This problem is particularly severe, as you know, in education. Programs administered by the United States Office of Education have been funded at less than forty percent of authorization. In sharp contrast, our space program is funded at ninety-nine percent of authorization and military procurement at ninety-two percent. I ask that this Committee do all it can to close the appropriation-authorization gap in the fiscal 1970 budget.

My third concern is the false impression often created when programs are continued from one fiscal year to the next at the same appropriation level. In such instances, we are not maintaining the Federal commitment, as is often implied. In the face of rising costs and growing enrollment, programs funded at the previous year's level are, in fact, undergoing a marked reduction in operational capacity. In most programs, it takes an increment of from ten percent to fifteen percent to stand absolutely still. The appropriations bill passed by the House includes a number of examples of this reduction in our commitment to the schools of the nation.

Before turning to specific programs and

recommending increased appropriation levels, I would like to commend and support the action of the House of Representatives in adding nearly \$1.05 billion to a totally inadequate Administration request for education funds.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND IMPACT AID

I was particularly pleased to note the favorable House action which added \$209.5 million to the Administration request for the critically important area of vocational education. These funds will enable our dedicated vocational educators to develop imaginative, relevant programs suited to the demands of a rapidly changing society. The unique Work Opportunity Center Program of the Minneapolis Public Schools demonstrates what can be achieved by creative vocational educators.

I was also pleased to note that additional funds were appropriated under the impacted aid program. Public Laws 815 and 874 provide badly needed financial support to many Minnesota school districts.

However, despite the House increases, appropriations for many other key programs are inadequate. Programs which I consider particularly deserving of further appropriations increases include the following:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Title I, ESEA. I strongly endorse the action of the House in adding nearly \$171 million to the request of the Administration for fiscal 1970. The resultant appropriation of \$1,396,975,000, however, still stands in sharp contrast to the 1970 authorization of \$2,359,554,470.

The Fourth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children had this to say about the level of Title I funding:

"The Council is distressed at what appears to be a weakening federal commitment to the education of disadvantaged children. This is best evidenced by the \$68 million cutback in funding of Title I from \$1.191 billion last school year to \$1.123 billion this school year. *This cutback, combined with the continuing increase in the cost of education, results in an estimated \$400 million less for disadvantaged pupils in local schools this year than was available in the first year of the program.*

We are deluding ourselves if we think we can make an impact on education of the disadvantaged without providing the necessary resources . . . *The Council, therefore, recommends that the Executive and Legislative Branches move as quickly as possible to close the gap between the Title I appropriation and the authorization . . .*

I urge the Committee to fully fund Title I by adding \$962.6 million to the House appropriation.

Title II, ESEA. I applaud the action of the House in adding \$50 million to the Administration budget request, which included no funds at all for this program which has done so much to provide library and audio-visual resources for the schools of America. I urge the Committee to add \$5 million to the House figure (which is identical to the 1969 appropriation) in order to sustain our commitment at last year's level of actual purchasing power.

Title III, ESEA. This program, which has sparked major educational innovations in thousands of school districts, deserves far greater support than that requested by the Administration or that provided by the House. The appropriation now stands at \$164,876,000, identical to the 1969 figure. Again this appropriation stands in sharp contrast to a 1970 authorization of \$566.5 million. At a time when our educational system faces unprecedented demands for change and renewal, Title III is one of the few sources of financial support for the imaginative and innovative educator. I urge the Committee to add at least \$50 million to the

House appropriation for Title III, an action which would still leave this Title funded at less than one half of its authorization.

Title V, ESEA. This program of aid to state departments of education has been funded by the House, in agreement with the Administration budget request, at the 1969 level of \$29.75 million. The President's Task Force on Education stated:

"Along with any movement in the direction of 'designated block grants' should go the use of Federal resources to strengthen state departments of education. We therefore strongly recommend an increase in the funding of Title V of ESEA under which grants are made for this purpose."

If the Congress is seriously considering the possibility of shifting more administrative and program responsibility for elementary and secondary education programs to the states, it is incumbent upon us to help build a state capability to administer federally financed programs with maximum imagination and efficiency. I would therefore recommend that Title V be funded at \$40 million, fifty percent of its \$80 million authorization.

Title VII, ESEA. The House, in concert with the Administration budget request, has increased the 1970 appropriation for bilingual education programs to \$10 million from its 1969 level of \$7.5 million. I commend this action, but appeal for additional funds for expanding bilingual programs to serve American Indians and Mexican Americans and to develop programs of special language instruction for children living in deprived areas.

I urge the Committee to fund bilingual education programs at the full authorization level of \$30 million.

Title VIII, ESEA. The Administration requested that \$24 million of a \$30 million authorization be appropriated for dropout prevention programs for fiscal 1970. The House drastically reduced this request to the 1969 level of \$5 million. In view of the potential of this Title to deal with the frightening social implications of neglect of the school dropout, and in response to the many proposals which the Office of Education has been unable to fund, I urge the Committee to fund this program at the \$24 million level initially requested by the Administration.

Higher Education

Two related activities deserving of increased appropriations are the Education Professions Development Act programs and the Teacher Corps. Commenting on the E.P.D.A. programs, the President's Task Force on education stated, "The Education Professions Development Act of 1968, of which Teacher Corps is a part, is an excellent piece of legislation. We recommend that other titles of it also be funded at a higher level." The report went on to say, "We believe that the Teacher Corps has demonstrated its value and are strongly in favor of seeing it continued at a higher level of funding."

Education Professions Development Act programs (exclusive of Teacher Corps) are supported at the 1969 level of \$95 million by the House action in exact compliance with the Administration 1970 request. This program, designed to improve the quality of America's teachers and administrators, is authorized at a level of \$445 million for 1970. Again, we see a stark contrast between authorization and appropriation—between promise and delivery—between what must be done and what we are willing to do. I urge the Committee to approve a \$200 million appropriation for E.P.D.A. programs in 1970.

Teacher Corps, which has been an outstanding program—one which serves the disadvantaged while encouraging promising young persons to enter the teaching profession—will receive \$21.7 million under the House bill in contrast to the Administration's budget request of \$31.1 million and an authorization of \$56 million. I urge the Committee to approve full funding of this outstanding program for fiscal 1970.

STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Undergraduate Student Assistance Programs. As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been particularly interested in student assistance programs. Present programs, while very commendable in their intent, fail to meet the needs of thousands of young Americans who have the ability to attend our colleges and universities. Present appropriations fall far short of institutional requests and legitimate student need for assistance. Recent action taken by the Senate and House in approving the Conference Report on H.R. 13194, the Insured Student Loan Emergency Amendments of 1969, provided a federal subsidy to encourage the expansion of the guaranteed student loan program, and increased the authorization levels for several other important student aid programs. These new levels approximate very closely actual institutional requests and Office of Education estimates for 1970. I would, therefore, urge the Appropriations Committee to respond to this unquestioned need by appropriating funds in accordance with these new authorization levels.

Specifically, if each of these programs were fully funded, an additional \$60 million would provide 125,000 more Educational Opportunity Grants; an additional \$96 million would provide nearly 150,000 more National Defense Student Loans; and an additional \$121 million would enable nearly 250,000 students to participate in the College Work Study Program.

SPECIAL STUDENT AID PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS—TALENT SEARCH, UPWARD BOUND, AND SPECIAL SERVICES IN COLLEGE PROGRAMS

These programs, all designed to encourage and assist disadvantaged students to take advantage of the educational opportunities which this nation makes available to the more affluent, are of major importance to the future of this nation and should be funded at the highest possible level. The authorization for these programs is \$56.7 million. I believe these highly promising programs deserve full funding.

The Talent Search program, funded at a \$4 million level in fiscal 1969, has been increased to \$5 million by the House for fiscal 1970, in accordance with the Administration request. I recommend that this program receive an appropriation of \$8.5 million for fiscal 1970—the Office of Education estimate to the Department and a figure which would represent a significant beginning in meeting our commitment to identifying the latent academic talent among our disadvantaged youth.

The Upward Bound program has been funded at \$30 million in the House bill, representing a slight increase over the 1969 appropriation of \$29.8 million. I urge the Committee to fund this program at a level of \$35–\$40 million.

The Special Services in College Program, which has never been funded, received an appropriation of \$10 million in the House bill. I urge the Committee to support that appropriation level for this promising program.

College Teacher Fellowship Program. Despite a growing undergraduate and graduate enrollment in our colleges and universities, the Administration and the House have seen fit to decrease appropriations for this program from the 1969 level. The \$70 million appropriated in 1969 has been reduced to \$56.1 million by the House in the 1970 bill and is not being appealed by the Administration.

The President's Task Force on Education expressed deep concern about the supply of college teachers, pointing out that new starts in predoctoral fellowships had decreased dramatically in recent years. New starts in predoctoral fellowships totaled 15,000 in

1966–67; 13,913 in 1967–68; 10,950 in 1968–69; and an estimated 9,675 in 1969–70. The report stated, "Unless this trend is reversed immediately, the supply of Ph. D.'s in all fields but particularly science, four to six years hence may decline seriously. We urge the Administration to give this problem early attention."

I share this concern and urge the Committee to increase the appropriation for the College Teacher Fellowship program to \$75 million, a figure which represents the departmental request to the Bureau of the Budget.

PROGRAM ASSISTANCE TO HIGHER EDUCATION

In a recent meeting with Minnesota college presidents and their representatives, I heard firsthand of the plight of the college and university as it attempts to absorb the impact of a burgeoning student enrollment.

Programs authorized by the Higher Education Act, which were singled out by Minnesota educators as particularly in need of increased appropriations were Title III (Strengthening Developing Institutions), Title VIA (Undergraduate Instructional Equipment and Resources), and Title X (Improvement of Graduate Schools). Each of these was identified as a program which required better funding if the institutions were to begin to meet ever-increasing demands.

The program for strengthening developing institutions, Title III, had an authorization of \$35 million in 1969 and received an appropriation of \$30 million. The House bill provides identical funding for 1970. But for 1970 the authorization for this program has doubled, and I urge the Committee to double the appropriations for this program as well—to a level of \$60 million.

The Administration and the House have provided for no appropriation at all for the purchase of undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources under Title VIA. I find it difficult to believe that a program authorized at the level of \$70 million by the Congress is deserving of absolutely no funding. Yet this is the situation as the appropriations bill now stands. This is particularly appalling in view of the growing importance of quality higher education. I urge the Committee to match the 1969 appropriation of \$14.5 million.

Title X programs designed to improve graduate schools received no appropriation in 1969 and are apparently going to receive the same in 1970 according to the request of the Administration and the House bill. Again, we have a program authorized by the Congress (at a level of \$5 million) which is not a reality because no funds have been appropriated. I urge the Committee to fully fund this program with an appropriation of \$5 million.

Before closing, I wish to register my strong opposition to Section 407, the Student Unrest Rider to the H.E.W. Appropriations bill. I believe that Section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments represents a more adequate approach to student unrest and strongly recommend that it be given a fair test. Adopting repressive measures is not the answer—measures which would punish our institutions of higher learning through the extreme measure of cutting off Federal financial assistance.

I also oppose Sections 408 and 409 of the appropriations bill, the so-called Whitten Amendment. I believe that this amendment would seriously jeopardize the progress being made in school desegregation across the nation. The potential implications of this amendment, particularly in view of the recent Supreme Court decision prohibiting further delay in desegregating the schools, are frightening. Any legislative action which will impede progress in this area or which would further polarize America as it attempts to resolve its racial conflict should be rejected.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 115

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1969

No. 201

Senate

A PROGRAM TO ABOLISH POVERTY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Dean Wilbur J. Cohen, University of Michigan School of Education, and former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has prepared an excellent article entitled "A 10-Point Program To Abolish Poverty by 1980," which will be published shortly in the Information Please Almanac of 1970.

I have had an opportunity to read this series of wide-ranging and provocative proposals. They constitute a well-thought-out blueprint for a coordinated attack on the persistent problem of poverty in the midst of plenty. The proposals, which range from ending racial discrimination, expanding educational opportunities, and improving social security to upgrading our health system, reforming the welfare program, and providing family planning and other social services reflect the breadth and depth of knowledge Dean Cohen has gained from a lifetime of commitment to programs designed to meet human needs.

I commend this thoughtful article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 10-POINT PROGRAM TO ABOLISH POVERTY BY 1980

(By Wilbur J. Cohen)

The United States is rich in material and human resources. In 1971, the annual gross national product will undoubtedly exceed \$1,000 billion; the average annual income of families will be approaching \$9,000. Moreover, abundance is growing.

Historically, poverty has been the result of inadequate production of goods and services. This situation still exists in most of Asia, Africa, and South America. By contrast, the abolition of poverty in the United States is no longer a problem of productive capacity.

The Nation has the material resources to eliminate poverty. In recent years, remarkable progress has been made toward the twin goals of the abolition of poverty and the provision of economic security for all. In addition, there are sufficient resources to assure the overwhelming majority of Americans whether at work or retired, whether widowed, orphaned, disabled, or temporarily unemployed) continuing incomes paid as a matter of right—incomes sufficient to assure a modest level of living, not just enough to meet the low standard that is used today to define poverty.

Although there are different standards of poverty, the Social Security Administration index is the most widely used. For an urban family of four persons, the poverty level was

\$3,412 for the year 1967 compared with \$2,974 for 1959. These figures are adjusted for family size and price changes on this basis. In 1959, there were about 39.4 million people living in poverty; in 1968 the number was down to 25.4 million—a decline of 14 million persons. In 1959, 22.4% of the U.S. population was below the poverty level; in 1968 this figure had declined to 12.8% (See tables.)

We have, however, not only the resources but also much of the institutional framework to build upon to make poverty a thing of the past and to better the economic security of all Americans. With a comprehensive and coordinated plan, the job of eliminating poverty can be accomplished.

During the 1960's improvements in the social security program have brought higher benefit payments to a great majority or retired older people, widows and orphans, and the long-term disabled. Twenty-five million people—1 out of every 8 Americans receive a social security check every month. Because of their social security benefits, about two-thirds of these beneficiaries are able to maintain a level of living somewhat above the poverty level. Nevertheless, about 8 million social security beneficiaries still live in poverty, even with their benefits.

Yet, substantial progress has been made in reducing the number of the poor, in improving the level of living for people whose incomes are just above the poverty level, and even in improving the position of those who are still below the poverty criterion.

The striking reduction of poverty during this decade is attributable to economic growth, to the various measures taken to make it possible for more people to participate in the economy through job training, rehabilitation, and improved educational programs and to the major improvements that have been made in the social security program.

Nearly 30% of the poor live in households with an aged or disabled person at the head. Most of these people could be moved out of poverty through further improvements in the social insurance and assistance programs. One of the greatest challenges comes in finding solutions for the rest of the poor—those who lived in households where the head worked all year but was still poor or could find work only part of the time or had no job at all. We can find solutions to this problem by a ten point coordinated program.

First: A successful national attack on poverty is dependent on continued economic growth and economic development:

We could reduce the poverty group from 25.4 million to about 15 to 20 million in the next 10 years with continued economic growth, and the expansion of employment in areas where underemployment now exists. This involves changes in tax policies, housing, and other programs.

Second: Opportunities for work—meaningful, productive, self-supporting work—must be expanded:

Economic security is perhaps best defined as a job when you can work and income when you can't. Most fundamental is the opportunity to work. Job opportunities must be made available for all who can work, and programs that improve the ability of the individual to earn must be expanded.

Well-planned and useful work, not made work, can be provided. There are over 5 million useful, public service jobs that could be developed—jobs in hospitals, and nursing homes, jobs that would contribute to improved roads, parks and recreation centers, jobs that would help relieve the pains and anxieties of children, the aged, and the disabled.

For those whose capacity to earn is low, and for those who have a potential capacity but are unable now to get a job, much can be done to improve programs that prepare them for full participation and full opportunity. Educational activities, job training, health and rehabilitation programs, manpower retraining and relocation, and special programs could enable the disadvantaged young to compete in the labor market.

Third: Racial discrimination—in jobs, in education, and in living—must be ended:

Justice and opportunity must become a reality for every American, regardless of race, creed, sex, or national origin. Every effort must be made to diligently carry out the constitutional obligations and statutory requirements of the Civil Rights Act so that equality for every boy and girl and every family in the Nation. In addition to its other insidious effects, discrimination is economically wasteful, costing the Nation about \$30 billion a year in terms of the gross national product.

People might be equipped for full participation in our economy and in all aspects of American life because this is the only worthy goal of a free and democratic society. We must not buy our way out of facing the tough problems of providing opportunity by the acceptance of a permanent class of the disinherited, condemned to live on a dole when they want to be a part of society and equipped to move ahead. Jobs are basic to economic security and the first task is to see to it that everyone is given the chance to learn and to earn.

Fourth: Family planning services must be available, on a voluntary basis, to those with lower incomes and less than a college education as they are to the higher-income, college-educated person in the suburb:

In the period from 1960 to 1965, low-in-

come women of child-bearing age had an annual fertility rate of 153 births per 1,000 women. The rate for the rest of the female population was 98 births per 1,000. This rate of 98 per 1,000 is consistent with an ultimate family size of about three children—considered to be the size that most Americans, regardless of race, economic status, or desire.

Thus it is considered likely that the poor would bear children at the same rate if they had access to the same family planning services available to the nonpoor. And, on that basis, it is estimated that in 1966, among 8.2 million low-income women of childbearing age, there were 450,000 births of what might be called unplanned-for children. Among these 8.2 million women, there were about 1 million receiving family planning services, and 4 million who were not but indicated they would if they were available. To provide family planning services to these 4 million women would cost about \$120 million a year. This is an investment we could afford.

Fifth: Opportunities for education at all levels must be expanded:

The vitality and economic growth of our society depends, to a major extent, upon the effectiveness of American education. We must assure equal access to high-quality education from preschool through graduate studies. The cost of educating every American must be recognized as an investment in a stronger, more vital Nation. To raise the necessary funds, the property tax must be eliminated as a source of revenue for education, and the Federal government must contribute at least one-third of the total cost.

Quality preschool opportunities, for instance, are essential for disadvantaged children if they are ever to have the hopes of succeeding in regular classroom studies. Less than one third of the Nation's 12.5 million children age 3-5 are enrolled in nursery schools or kindergartens. The proportion of children from low-income families enrolled is even less than the average.

The need for modern and effective technical and vocational education is also self-evident. We need a vastly expanded and a strengthened vocational education system, as well as imaginative new ties between school and the world of work in agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Unless children born into poor families have the opportunity to learn and develop skills, they will not only be poor children but will face the high probability that they will be poor adults they themselves will raise poor children.

Sixth: The social security program should be improved:

A job today not only provides current income but carries its own insurance against the loss of that income. This social insurance device is an institutional invention of first-rate importance. It is based on the idea that since a job underlies economic security, loss of income from the job is a basic cause of economic insecurity.

Under social insurance, while a worker earns he contributes a small part of his earnings to a fund, usually matched by the employer. And then, out of these funds, benefits are paid to partly make up for the income lost when the worker's earnings have stopped. Under this "income insurance," the payments made are usually related to the amount of the earnings lost and are thus designed to maintain in part the level of living obtained by the worker while he worked. Cash payments are made under social insurance programs to make up in part for earnings lost because of retirement in old age, disability, and the death of the family breadwinner.

In the United States, the largest and most important of the social insurance programs is the Federal system popularly called social security. This program insures against the

loss of earnings due to retirement, disability, or death and pays benefits to meet the great bulk of hospital and medical costs in old age.

This year 90 million people will contribute to social security. Ninety percent of our population aged 65 and over are eligible for monthly social security benefits. More than 95 out of 100 young children and their mothers are eligible for monthly benefits if the family breadwinner should die. And 4 out of 5 people of working age have income protection against loss of earnings because of the long-term severe disability of the breadwinner. When the Federal civil-service system, the railroad retirement program, and State and local government staff retirement systems are taken into account, nearly everyone now has protection under a government program against the risk of loss of earned income. In addition, many are earning further protection under systems that build on social security.

Social security provides a highly effective institution for income maintenance—one that is acceptable to the public, has a very low administrative cost, and is practically universal in application. But it needs improvement, particularly in the level of benefits.

Indicative of the need for higher benefit levels is the fact that the average social security benefit for retired workers is now about \$100 a month; for aged couples it is about \$170; for aged widows, \$86; and for disabled workers, \$112. Many people get lower amounts, and about 2.8 million beneficiaries get the minimum benefit. The minimum for a worker who goes on the benefit rolls at age 65 or later is only \$55 a month.

In September, 1969, President Nixon recommended important changes in Social Security benefit and contribution structure. His proposal included a 10 percent increase in benefits, and the establishment of an escalator provision which would automatically gear future increases to the cost of living. He asked Congress to make changes in the financial structure, the most important of which is to increase the maximum contribution and benefit base from \$7,800 to \$9,000 a year by 1972. In addition, he recommended a change in the retirement test by an increase in the amount a beneficiary could earn before a reduction in benefits would take place from \$1,680 to \$1,800 a year, he also recommended several other changes.

While President's proposal does represent a liberalization of the program, it is far from adequate. To bring benefits and contributions up to adequate standards, the following proposal should be adopted:

1. *An increase in benefit levels.* As a first step, Congress should increase all social security benefits by at least 15 percent this year, and another 15 percent two years later, with an increase in the minimum progressively to \$100 a month for the single retired worker or widow and to \$150 for the couple.

2. *A method of keeping the system in line with rising earnings.* Benefits should be paid based on average earnings over a worker's 5 or 10 consecutive years of highest earnings, rather than on his lifetime average, so that the benefits will be more closely related to the earnings actually lost at the time the worker becomes disabled, retires, or dies.

3. *A way to make the program more effective as the basic system of income security for those who earn somewhat above the average, as well as for average and below-average earners.* The present ceiling on the annual amount of earnings counted under the social security program should be increased from the present \$7,800, in stages, to \$15,000. Then automatic adjustment of the ceiling should be provided, to keep it in line with future increases in earnings levels.

4. *Provide protection against the loss of earnings that arises because of relatively short-term total disability.* Disability bene-

fits should be paid beginning with the fourth month of disability without regard to how long the disability is expected to last. Under present law, the benefits begin with those for the seventh month of disability and are payable only where the disability is expected to last for at least a year.

5. *Improve protection for older workers by liberalizing the definition of disability for workers aged 55 or over.* The revised definition should permit benefits to be paid to a worker aged 55 or over if, because of illness or injury, he can no longer perform work similar to what he has done in the past. Under present law, the definition of disability requires that the worker be unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity.

6. *Improve work incentives by liberalizing the retirement test provision under which a beneficiary's earnings reduces the benefits he receives.* At the present time an individual can receive his full benefits if his annual earnings are less than \$1,680. This amount should be increased to \$2,400. The reduction also should be limited to one-half the amount earned above the exempt amount, regardless of the total amount of earnings.

The increase in the earnings-base ceiling proposed would result in higher income for both the cash benefits and the Medicare parts of social security and would go a long way toward financing the proposed reforms.

If the cash benefit program were to remain entirely self-financed, the ultimate contribution rate paid by employees and the rate paid by employers for the total social security program would have to be increased somewhat to meet the cost of all the proposals outlined. General revenue financing could be used to meet part of the increased costs.

Ways to relieve low-wage earners from the burden of the higher rates should be explored. One way would be to amend the income-tax laws so that, for low-income people, a part of the social security contribution would be treated as a credit against their income tax or, if no tax were due, could be refunded.

These benefit increases and the other program improvements would help all workers and their families. Their most important effect would be to reduce the number of poor in the future and to provide a level of living somewhat above poverty for most beneficiaries. But the effect of these changes on today's poor would also be very significant.

Seventh: Our health services must be improved:

High-quality health care must be available to all—in the inner city as well as the suburb. We must reduce the high toll of infant mortality: a more effective method must be found for financing prenatal and postnatal care for mothers and children. We should also:

1. *Provide under Medicare for protection against the heavy cost of prescription drugs.*

2. *Cover disabled social security beneficiaries under Medicare.*

3. *Put the entire Medicare program on a social insurance prepayment basis so that medical and hospital insurance both would be financed from social security contributions and a matching contribution from the Federal Government.*

Eighth: We must improve other social insurance programs.

Other social insurance programs—unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation—although not administered by the Federal Government, require Federal standards. Coverage of both of these programs should be expanded, and benefit levels in many States should be substantially improved.

The introduction of Federal benefit standards into unemployment insurance, where there is already a Federal-State relationship, would not be structurally difficult. In workmen's compensation, which has been entirely a State matter, it would be necessary to

establish some new device, such as a Federal program providing a given level of protection, which employers would not have to join if they presented evidence of membership in a private or State insurance arrangement with an equivalent level of protection.

Ninth: Our welfare system must be radically overhauled.

Drastic changes must be made in the existing welfare system—in the scope of coverage, the adequacy of payments, and in the way in which payments are administered.

Although work opportunities and improvements in social insurance can bring economic security to the overwhelming majority of people, they cannot do the whole job.

The Federal-State welfare programs have been confined to certain categories of recipients—the aged, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and families with dependent children when a parent is either missing from the home, dead, disabled, or unemployed. In addition, the States have been allowed to define the level of assistance provided in these programs, and many have set the level below any reasonable minimum, and payments vary widely among the States. General assistance for those not eligible under the Federal-State categories is entirely supported by State and local money and with few exceptions is very restrictive.

There are about 10 million persons receiving assistance payments—about 9 million under the federally aided programs, and about one million persons receiving general assistance not financed with Federal aid. This figure would be approximately double if the States took full advantage of the Federal eligibility standards and removed from State plans and administrative procedures the restrictions that now bar needy people from getting assistance. Moreover, because of the low level of assistance standards in many States a high proportion of those receiving assistance are still below the poverty level.

But criticism of existing public assistance programs is not confined to inadequate coverage or inadequate amounts. The list of criticisms is long, going to the nature of the program itself and its administration. The determination of eligibility for one is an unnecessarily destructive process, involving the most detailed examination of one's needs and expenditures and frequently prying into the intimate details of one's life. Moving from detailed budgeting to broad categories of allowances and to simplified determinations of income and resources would help to protect the dignity and self respect of the assistance recipient.

One problem that has haunted assistance and relief programs for years is how to provide adequate assistance without destroying economic incentive for those who can work. Reasonably adequate welfare payments, particularly to a large family, will sometimes turn out to be more than can be earned by a full-time worker with low skills.

Under aid to families with dependent children the Federal Government assists states to make payments to families with the father unemployed. In the 29 States that do not take advantage of this Federal offer and continue to provide aid only if the father is dead, disabled or absent from the home, the assistance program is correctly criticized on the grounds that it sets up an incentive for the unemployed worker to leave home.

Support for an assistance program that applies to all in need and that pays an adequate amount has been faced with hard going because of the incredible longevity of myths about those whom the programs are supposed to aid: that the poor live high on welfare handouts and that the poor are lazy and don't want to work.

The myths persist despite the fact that over 3 million of those on welfare are aged or disabled and over 4 million are children, and despite the fact that 80% of working-age men who are poor but not on welfare have jobs, and about 75% of them are in fulltime jobs.

President Nixon, in August, 1969, proposed a dramatic reform in the welfare system which included:

1. A federally financed and administered assistance plan to replace the aid to dependent children program which would pay each working and non-working family in the United States a minimum income. For a family of four without any income the amount paid would be \$1,600 a year with \$300 additional for each child.

2. States would be required to supplement existing Federal payments to families with dependent children.

3. A work-incentive provision which allows the family on assistance to keep first \$60 a month earned and also 50 percent above \$60 up to a maximum level set according to the size of the family.

4. A work component which requires all family heads to register with the state employment office and accept suitable jobs.

5. An expanded day-care program for the children of working mothers and a job-training program to enable the parents to prepare for full-time employment.

6. Federal minimum payment standards for the 3 million aged, blind, and disabled receiving welfare.

As in the case of Social Security changes, the proposal includes several needed revisions, but does not go far enough. For example, by maintaining some form of Federal-State cooperation in financing payments, the plan retains the state by state inequities prevalent under the present system. It does not include over one million poor people who do not have families and who are not covered under existing welfare programs.

Tenth: the services that will help people move out of poverty must be brought to the people—where and when they need them:

Family planning services, visiting-nurse services, day-care services for the children of working mothers, community action programs and consumer and legal aid must be available where needed. City Hall—and Washington—must be closer to the people they govern. There must be an adequate program of consumer and legal protection for the poor. There must be an end to practices that short-change the poor in the grocery store, in the welfare office, or the landlord, at the neighborhood department store, and in the courts—in short, in all the waystations that add up to life in the ghetto.

It is important, too, that credit union facilities be available to the poor and that credit unions take even greater responsibility for the consumer education of their members.

A DEMANDING TASK

The problems of poverty and economic insecurity in the United States do not lend them-

selves to easy, magic solutions. They require a combination of deliberate, carefully designed, wide-ranging approaches, for the problems themselves are not simple. Being poor means more than not having enough money. It often means poor in spirit, hope, health, and intellectual resources.

The abolition of poverty will require money—about \$15 to \$20 billion a year initially. This is only about 1½ to 2% of our gross national product. We can afford the money. But money must be accompanied by far-reaching, penetrating approaches, by bold and coordinated public and private programs that provide opportunities for the poor. For those who are able to work, greater emphasis must be placed on jobs, education, and training. For those who cannot or should not be expected to work, improvements must be made in the social security program, which, combined with private benefit plans constitute the most effective institutions for income maintenance. They cannot, of course, do the whole job. The present welfare system must be drastically overhauled to adequately serve those whose needs are not met by other programs. Concomitant with improvements in existing programs, the search must continue for new and imaginative programs that will meet the demands of the decade ahead.

Setting the elimination of poverty as a national goal is a huge and complex undertaking. The nation has the economic capacity, the technological capability, and the intellectual resources to accomplish this goal before the end of the next decade. But the most difficult task will be sustaining the determined commitment of the nation to the American promise: Full and equal opportunity for all to share in the good life that can be offered by a dynamic, prosperous, democratic society.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF PERSONS IN U.S. BELOW POVERTY LEVEL, 1968

Characteristic	[In millions]		
	Total	White	Non-white
All persons.....	25.4	17.4	8.0
A. In families.....	20.7	13.6	7.1
B. Unrelated individuals.....	4.7	3.8	.9
C. Family members under 18.....	10.7	6.3	4.4
D. Adults.....	14.7	11.1	3.6

Source: Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 28, Aug. 12, 1969, U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF POPULATION IN U.S. BELOW POVERTY LEVEL, 1968

Characteristic	Total	White	Non-white
All persons.....	12.8	10.0	33.5
In farm families.....	18.8	15.9	58.9
In nonfarm families.....	9.5	7.5	27.1
Family members under 18.....	15.3	10.7	41.6
Unrelated individuals.....	34.0	32.2	45.7

Source: See Table 1.

TABLE 3.—POVERTY LEVELS FOR VARIOUS FAMILY SIZES, 1967

Size of family	Urban non-farm male head			Urban non-farm female head	Farm male head
	head	head	head		
1 member.....	\$1,750	\$1,632	\$1,476		
2 members.....	2,178	2,110	1,841		
3 members.....	2,674	2,573	2,264		
4 members.....	3,412	3,393	2,907		
5 members.....	4,022	3,984	3,431		
6 members.....	4,517	4,497	3,852		
7 or more members.....	5,562	5,433	4,720		

Source: See Table 1.

about eighty-five percent are opposed to it. And therefore, an additional march would not present additional evidence on the question, and I doubt that the statement meant anything more than that.

Mr. STROUT. Mr. Mitchell has sent up an omnibus anti-crime budget to Congress. He has appeared several times in favor of preventive detention, which means that you put the suspect in jail and keep him there before his trial. Did your Commission take a stand on that?

Doctor EISENHOWER. This was considered at great length, and as I have told you, we had nine lawyers and very eminent lawyers on the Commission, including two judges. And after the most serious consideration there is a brief statement in the report which upholds the position taken by the American Bar Association, namely, that pre-trial detention is, in effect, essentially determining the answer before the trial is held, and therefore we did not find it possible to favor the idea of detention.

Mr. STROUT. Putting that in positive terms, then, you're against it?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Yes, the report is.

Mr. HERMAN. Doctor Eisenhower, I would guess that in the next week or two we are likely to read more and more about a certain question of police violence. The police violence issue was dealt with in the Walker report and has been brought up from time to time, has kind of passed out of the news. Now the Black Panther problem has brought it back into the news. Does the question of police violence, in your view and that of the Commission play a major role in things of this sort?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I don't want to accept the word major. Let me first say that most of the police of the United States are doing a good job, and they have one of the toughest jobs in America. They are not only out there enforcing the law, but in a way they are the only representative of all Government that the average citizen ever sees. He is the Government to them. Now, occasionally there is misbehavior or over-reaction by the police, and this leads to an exacerbation of the difficulty that's under way, and leads to widespread criticism. But we should not magnify this beyond what it actually is. It is very unhappy when it occurs. Further, you know, the nihilists and the anarchists in our society are deliberately trying always to entice or to lure police into overreaction as a means of solidifying larger support back of what they are trying to do. So, to try to put it into perspective it is very unhappy whenever there is misbehavior by the police, but most of the police in this country are doing a great job for all of us.

Mr. STROUT. Doctor Eisenhower, I was very much impressed by one statistic in your report, and that is that ninety million firearms are available to the civilian public in this country. I think the United States, am I not correct, that it is the only industrial, the only large nation where you can buy a revolver at the hardware store?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I am so glad you asked the question, because sometime back when I was detailing the reasons what is different in this country, I should have mentioned that we are the only advanced country in the world with ninety million fire arms, nearly twenty-five million of which are the real offenders, the concealable handguns. These are not sporting weapons; their only purpose is to kill. Unfortunately, too many American families think that they possess them in their homes for self protection. But the number of incidents where a household used that gun for self protection is very small, but they are the very guns that are used in murders. And as you know, I'm sure, fifty percent of all the murders occur within the family, and eighty percent among the family and acquaintances. So, we have strongly recommended the system of restrictive licensing

on handguns as a means of rendering serious crime in this country.

Mr. WALKER. On another subject, Doctor Eisenhower, your report calls for the extension and vigorous enforcement of the 1965 voting rights act. Now, the House recently amended that act, and some say that they watered it down. Is this what you had in mind, or have you already seen one of your Commission's recommendations ignored by the Administration?

Doctor EISENHOWER. The real specialist on our Commission on this regard was Congressman McCulloch, and I noticed when the House passed the new bill, he expressed regret that there was not simply an extension of the 1965 act which he feels is more attuned to the need of this period. Now, it may be that in some time in the future, we need to think in terms of expanding that act to apply to all of the United States, but I take Congressman McCulloch's word for this. I think he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. HERMAN. Doctor Eisenhower, we don't have much time left, perhaps thirty seconds. Let me ask you this: A great deal of what you have advocated, both in your reports and here this afternoon, sounds a great deal like former Attorney General Ramsey Clark. Now, he was one of the political villains in the last election. A great deal of capital was made by the Republicans in attacking him. Do you think, as a political reality, that your program can be accepted by the American people in their current mood?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Oh, I would certainly hope so. I feel no greater affinity for Ramsey Clark, whom I know very well, than I do for the present Attorney General, and certainly I have great confidence in our present President, and it was the last President who brought us in. I think this whole thing is above partisan politics.

Mr. HERMAN. Thank you very much for being here today on Face the Nation. We'll have a word about next week's guest in a moment.

ANNOUNCER. Today, on Face the Nation, Doctor Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, was interviewed by CBS News Correspondent Hal Walker; Richard Strout of the Washington Bureau of Christian Science Monitor; and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the subject of the environment is upon us as the most crucial domestic issue of the 1970's. We recently read that our college and other school-age youth are likely to make this subject a larger issue than Vietnam—because they feel more able to make meaningful accomplishments in the area. In my office the environment is at the forefront with the mails daily continuing pleas for a wide range of action to protect our greatest natural heritage.

A recent Minnesota poll, which I shall place in the Record, indicates that 82 percent of Minnesotans interviewed are interested in conservation.

I personally am most concerned with the entire range of issues on how to improve and enhance the quality of our environment and was quite honored to be named chairman of a new task force on this issue by the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. President, one of the most candid, thorough, remarkably concise, and well-written series of articles to come to my attention on the environment has re-

cently been published in the Minneapolis Tribune. Written by Richard P. Kleeman of the Tribune's Washington Bureau, it deserves wide readership by those across the Nation who are concerned about our future world and whether it will be fit to live in.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EIGHTY-TWO PERCENT INTERESTED IN CONSERVATION

Interest in conservation runs high for many Minnesotans, a recent survey by The Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota Poll indicates. And most of the people in the survey have concrete ideas on what they can do to protect natural resources.

The 592 adults, representing a balanced cross-section of the state's population, were asked:

"Conservation refers to conserving our natural resources. How much interest do you have in conservation—a great deal, some interest, very little, or none?"

Almost half (48 percent) described their interest in conserving natural resources as great and another 34 percent said they have some interest in the problem. Thirteen percent said they have very little interest and the remaining 5 percent reported having none at all.

The more education the person being interviewed had, the more likely he was to be greatly concerned about conservation: 64 percent of college-educated people in the survey said they had a great deal of interest in the subject. People in their 30's showed a high interest more often than other age groups (58 percent), but a majority of all adults except those 60 and over said their interest in conservation was a strong one.

What can the individual do to conserve the environment? Minnesota Poll field reporters asked this question:

"What do you think you, yourself, could do at this time to conserve our natural resources?"

About one in three (36 percent) of the respondents was at a loss to know what he personally could do, but the remaining 64 percent cited specific ways they could contribute to conservation. The more interest the person had in conserving natural resources, the more inclined he was to know what he could do about it.

Thirty percent of the people said they could do their part by personally practicing conservation—by taking care not to litter, pollute or otherwise damage the land, forests or water they used. "We can keep the lakes clean by not dumping in them and by using biodegradable products in the home," suggested a 59-year-old Minneapolis housewife.

A 42-year-old Wilkin County farmer said, "How I handle the land to prevent erosion can help."

Supporting anti-pollution groups or speaking out to educate others about conservation was mentioned by another 19 percent. "I talk vehemently about it every chance I get," said a 48-year-old Edina man. "I deplore draining the marshlands, and I don't like snowmobiles in remote areas and careless campers who leave the area in an unnatural state."

A St. Paul chemist felt his training could be useful: "Professionally, I could become income involved in control of industrial pollution. Politically, I could support groups such as MECCA."

Twelve percent recommended working through the political system. "I could encourage my senator or congressman to promote conservation," said a 42-year-old St. Paul man.

Finally, 8 percent said their chief concern

Doctor EISENHOWER. No, no. They coincide with periods of great social upheaval and great social change, but not necessarily with war. As a matter of fact, the rate of violent crime in the United States declined from 1900 right through World War I and through World War II, down to 1960. The great increase of a hundred percent has occurred in the 1960's.

Mr. HERMAN. Was there no little peak or anything after World War I or after World War II when the men came back?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Not of a measurable degree that I recall.

Mr. WALKER. Doctor Eisenhower, with your recommendations and understanding the need to bring inflation under control, the need to stop our expenditures in Vietnam before much can be done, what have you set as a goal, a time table for putting these recommendations into effect and seeing some results?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Well, I suppose I'm optimistic, but I would like to think that all the branches of the Government will soon begin to study our entire report, as well as the Kerner and the Crime Commission reports that preceded it, and develop a well integrated program now, even though it is not possible to implement that program, and to enter into a commitment after studying all the evidence. I would then hope that as soon as the war is over and inflation has been brought under control, that having made the commitment we will now begin to pass the legislation and do the other things necessary to put the program into motion.

Mr. HERMAN. Does some of this hope stem from your meeting with the President?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I think that would be going too far. What he authorized me to say as a result of our very helpful conversation was that he is gravely concerned about the problem, would not only study our report in great detail, but wanted me to mark some of the portions of the fifteen volumes of backup research material which he plans to read.

Mr. STROUT. Aren't you waiting a long time until the war is over or until inflation is curbed? Isn't this going to be just one more of the blue ribbon groups that have discussed this same subject? I was around, I recall, when the Wickersham Commission brought in its report on crimes. And your report is like the Wickersham Commission in 1930. It seems to me it's just layer after layer of crime reports, put one on top of the other.

Doctor EISENHOWER. Well, Mr. Strout, I realize that this subject has been studied before, and the things that we should have done have not been done. But I have considerable confidence in a few new developments. One, the television and the newspapers and the magazines of this country have carried the evidence that we've developed during the past eighteen months to all of the American people, and I'm very gratified by this. I have great confidence that if the American people really realize how serious this problem is, and they are stirred up, and they notify their Senators and Congressmen how they feel, that out of this welter of this great turmoil of discussion that we will get action.

Mr. STROUT. What happens if we don't get action?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Well, I suppose that some of us can keep on talking and hope that eventually something—one can't guarantee this. I said at our final press conference that if you'll just ask me back in five years, I would like to give you an accounting of what I think has happened in the meantime.

Mr. STROUT. Do you think the threat to the United States is greater from outside or within?

Doctor EISENHOWER. This is difficult to say, but I'll say this: In my judgment the threat to the future of the American society is as

great internally as it is from any possible combination of external forces. And may I remind you, I'm sure you know—

Mr. HERMAN. Are you referring to crime when you say the threat, the internal threat?

Doctor EISENHOWER. The internal threat is very serious in my judgment. And you know, Toynbee pointed out that of the twenty-one civilizations that failed, nineteen of them failed because of internal decay, and not due to external forces.

Mr. HERMAN. I interrupted you. I'd like you to pinpoint for us a little bit what you consider to be the nature of the internal threat. Were you referring simply to crime, were you referring to violence, the mass demonstration problem; what is the internal threat that concerns you most?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I am concerned about, for example, the growing intellectual polarization in our society. This is partly due to civil rights, it's partly due to the war in Vietnam. There is a growing and very serious generation gap. I dislike such trite phrases, but perhaps in short order it describes what has happened. This needs to be closed. We have to be concerned about air and water pollution. We most assuredly have to be concerned about air and water pollution. We most assuredly have to be concerned about minority groups in our country not getting true justice in our society. And then here we are the most affluent country in the world, and we haven't yet solved the problems of poverty and hunger. And this is leading to still deeper intellectual divisions. It's all of these and more that to me indicate a weakening of the whole American internal structure.

Mr. WALKER. In your estimation have the recent remarks of Vice President Agnew widened or narrowed those gaps you talk about?

Doctor EISENHOWER. You mean his discussion about the television and the like?

Mr. WALKER. The war.

Doctor EISENHOWER. Well, you know, this brings up a very interesting thing. As you well know, Mr. Walker, I have never liked to base my comments on what others have said, but try to make my own views known. It is very interesting, you know, the press loves to criticize everybody else, but is awfully tender whenever anyone criticizes it. And this is a very interesting thing, you know, because of all the freedoms guaranteed to us by the Constitution, the only one that the individual can't exercise for himself is the freedom of the press, which is really the freedom to know. And this places a very serious responsibility upon all of the mass media of this country. And I think that the mass media are big enough to stand a little criticism and might even benefit by that.

Mr. STROUT. Doctor Eisenhower, I think the press can stand a lot of criticism, but we have our problems, too. I cite one to you. We had this recent peace moratorium parade in Washington.

Doctor EISENHOWER. Yes.

Mr. STROUT. Attorney General Mitchell said that it was characterized by violence. His wife, Mrs. Mitchell, compared the anti-war demonstration to the Russian Revolution, and said her husband attributed it to liberal communists. Now, your report that just comes out that we in the press are supposed to write and do write, you say that that same moratorium parade, "in the largest single protest demonstration in American history, the overwhelming participants behaved peacefully." Now, which of those versions is correct? Was it the same parade we are talking about?

Doctor EISENHOWER. You know, so much depends on where you were and what perspective you had when you saw it. There were two hundred and fifty thousand to three hundred thousand in this moratorium parade, and the best evidence we have is that between one and two hundred participated in

two incidents of violence, one at the Department of Justice and one near the South Vietnamese embassy. Now, had I been an official of the Justice Department and had been sitting up there and had witnessed some windows broken and stones being thrown, I think maybe the next morning I would have said that this was a violent incident. But, if one just stands off from Baltimore as I did and looked at the whole thing, I absolutely marveled that you could bring so many hundreds of thousands of young people into a means of communication to the American people and to the Government, and have so little difficulty.

Mr. HERMAN. How about the impact of television films of things of this sort? This has been part of the field of study of your Commission, the impact of television news of violent demonstrations and how it should be handled.

Doctor EISENHOWER. Yes. Unfortunately, one of the three things that I hoped very much to complete we didn't complete, and this was a study of the effect of violence in the news media on the actual business of violence. We did complete the study in the entertainment media, and this showed in 1967 and 1968 a very serious picture. And I can't tell you how happy I am that the new program year in the entertainment aspects of television has greatly reduced the incidence of violence.

Mr. HERMAN. But on television news, you say you didn't complete the study. Can you share some of your thoughts with us on this serious problem of how television should bring into the living room a scene of violence in the streets, or should not?

Doctor EISENHOWER. Well, this would be purely personal, of course, because I can't speak—I realize that it's very difficult in a medium which is using both words and pictures to give a—quickly, a balanced picture. And there must be a temptation in using this medium to picture that which is most dramatic, and this therefore, if one has such as in the march we were discussing, I doubt that you would find it terribly attractive just to show two hundred and fifty thousand people peacefully marching down the street. But if you saw them throwing stones at the Justice Department, I think the cameras would be there.

Mr. HERMAN. Have you any personal deductions about the impact, the influence on violence generally in the country?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I cannot draw a conclusion. When we undertook our work, Mr. Herman, I made up my mind and all the Commissioners did, that we weren't going to give expression to our preconceptions. And so we hired two hundred of the finest criminologists and psychiatrists and sociologists and historians in this country, and we are willing and I am willing to speak up on those things where I think that all the evidence gives me a right to have a judgment, but I don't want to give expression just to an off-hand opinion.

Mr. WALKER. Doctor Eisenhower, one of the things you did come up with was a recommendation that we listen to the voices of youth. Yet when nearly a quarter of a million people came to Washington last month in the mobilization effort, President Nixon said that he watched a football game. Now, do you consider this the kind of response that you are looking for in your recommendations?

Doctor EISENHOWER. I think that these statements can sometimes be misconstrued. I've heard criticism of the President's statement. I think what he probably was saying is, we have at the White House, evidence on how the American people feel about the war in Vietnam. Everybody knows that—from the Gallup poll and everything else—that about fifty percent of the people wish the war would come quickly to a conclusion, and that of the young people of the country,

was the preservation of fish and wildlife. A 32-year-old Ottertail County farmer favored "stopping all hunting for five years or Minnesota will be a barren state as far as game goes."

Other specific Minnesota conservation projects mentioned by the respondents included stopping the pollution of Lake Superior and Lake Minnetonka and establishing Voyageurs National Park.

"How much interest do you have in conservation?"

(In percent)

	Great deal	Some	Very little	None
All respondents.....	48	34	13	5
Southern Minnesota.....	43	39	13	5
Twin Cities area.....	51	33	11	5
Northern Minnesota.....	47	33	15	5
Grade school education.....	29	37	23	11
High school.....	46	36	13	5
College.....	64	29	6	1

OUR WORLD FIT FOR LIFE? POLLUTION THREATENS MAN'S SURVIVAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What men do to their world affects everyone in it—farmer or city-dweller, ardent conservationist or casual consumer. Everyone has to breathe the air, drink the water, eat the food, throw away his trash and share his living room with his neighbors.)

(All this, and more, makes up the environment we live in.)

(Now, after two centuries of apathy and exploitation, Americans are beginning to worry about what is being done to that environment by a society that is increasingly rich but too often heedless.)

(The problems, and the things we are doing—or not doing—about them, will be described in this series of articles by a member of the Tribune's Washington Bureau.)

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: 'My wife and I would like to bring a child into this world. But first we think perhaps something should be done—and quickly about its physical environment.'"

This letter is one of dozens on the subject that come to the White House each week as evidence of mounting public concern—and impatience—over what man is doing to the only world he's got.

A California mother writes: "Can it really be true that man has less than a half-century left on this earth? When I watch my two young sons sleep at night, the fear of this for them is strong inside me."

And a Maryland sixth grader speaks for his class: "We are very concerned about environmental problems. . . . Let the world be beautiful like it was at first."

A young man in Illinois summed up the mood: "Stop air pollution. Stop noise pollution. Stop water pollution now now now now now (repeated 60 times)."

It is almost impossible to pick up a magazine, read a newspaper or look at television without finding new accounts of actual or threatened danger to our surroundings. Congress and the state legislatures are flooded with proposals for cleansing our water, purifying the air, controlling pesticides and cutting the level of noise, radiation, erosion and other unwanted assaults upon our living space.

So great is the clamor that one water pollution expert's first reaction to a reporter's question is a protest: "You're not going to write another 'ain't-it-awful' story! At least try to say something positive."

There has been plenty of "ain't-it-awful" writing—though there are positive things to be said.

TRUTH IS WORRISOME

But certainly the facts are frightening. Listen to Charles C. Johnson Jr., head of environmental health services for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW):

"Toxic matter is being released into the air over the U.S. at a rate of more than 142 million tons a year, or three-quarters of a ton for every American . . ."

"Not counting industrial and agricultural wastes, we discard more than 165 million tons of solid wastes very year . . ."

"Much of the drinking water available in our nation's communities is of unknown quality . . ."

"Radiation as an environmental hazard is a growing threat to ours and future generations which we have barely begun to understand. Radiation sources are now to be found throughout the environment . . ."

These facts—and more, from pesticide traces already found in many foods to the threat of sonic booms from supersonic planes yet to be built—have for the first time shoved the problems of environmental pollution onto the front burner of the political stove.

Now concern for the environment has become "good politics" on a national level. "It's about the only subject I speak on across the country, and I never find anyone who isn't interested," says Sen. Gaylord Nelson, the Wisconsin Democrat who has been campaigning on conservation issues since he first ran for his state's legislature in 1948.

Twenty years later, Nelson finds it hard to be optimistic but he sees the issue growing:

"This will be the biggest issue of the seventies—more important by far than Vietnam or hunger or equal opportunity, because those issues will be irrelevant unless we solve our environmental problems."

"CAN'T CONTINUE AS WE ARE"

Minnesota's Sen. Walter F. Mondale—just named chairman of a Democratic National Committee task force on the environment—agrees:

"We can't continue as we are. With our pollution of air and water, the use of the ocean as a garbage can, the destruction of remote areas of natural beauty and our tipping of the critical balances of nature, we are raising doubts as to man's very survivability."

In the past, presidential campaigns have been almost devoid of environmental discussion, except for a few brief ritual gestures, and the last campaign was no exception. "We should never again have such an election campaign," says conservationist David Brower—and Nelson and Mondale predict that we won't.

"I wouldn't be surprised to see a president elected on this issue," Mondale says. "But it's going to turn into a great national debate that won't be easily won; there are enormous commercial and industrial and military issues involved."

The issue, indeed, goes beyond our borders. Rep. Albert Quile of Minnesota found European lawmakers at a recent NATO parliamentary meeting in Belgium "tremendously interested" in problems like London smog (which floats across the North Sea to Norway) and U.S. pollution (which floats all the way across the Atlantic in air and water currents). Since Quile's return, NATO, at President Nixon's suggestion, has set up a committee on preserving the environment.

And the Duke of Edinburgh, when he wasn't telling how broke the British royal family is, predicted during his recent American tour that "hideous problems" of pollution, if unsolved, could mean "the world is heading for wreck."

INCIPIENT DISASTER?

A U.N. conference on human environment will be held in 1972.

Does all this mean the moment of environmental crisis is here?

"It's approaching the disaster stage," Nelson argues. "Our resources are actually quite limited and our air and water especially are being rapidly degraded."

"Knowledgeable scientists agree with Paul Ehrlich when he says the oceans will be sterile in 10 years—with man dying out soon afterward—because pollution and pesticides are destroying their productivity."

President Nixon's science adviser, on the other hand, won't go that far.

"There is a serious situation that needs very prompt attention," says Dr. Lee Dubridge. "But 'crisis' implies that unless something is done tomorrow, the world blows up—and these are long-term problems."

Dubridge concedes that there are "individual crisis areas" where present trends must be reversed quickly. Among these he lists the contamination—what some call the "death"—of Lake Erie and the fouling of the air over the nation's big cities by automobile engine exhaust.

But Dubridge notes that, even if we could pass laws forbidding air and water pollution, it wouldn't work: "Our whole economy would be brought to a halt."

There, in fact, is the problem at its simplest: The end result of an ever-growing society of ever-increasing wealth producing ever more goods and services with too little regard for preserving the world and its atmosphere.

Now, however, there seems to be a growing conviction that something's got to give. As one expert said to a congressional conference on the environment last month: "We can't afford the luxury of assuming that the extinction of man will not happen—and in our children's generation, it likely will happen. We may be the last people on earth who can alter this process."

OUR WORLD FIT FOR LIFE? POPULATION OUTSTRIPS PLANNING—GROWTH ENDANGERS ENVIRONMENT

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Were you one of the many who drove into a national park campground last summer—and found the "full" sign already posted?

Have you tried to get a dial tone from a New York City pay telephone?

Were you in one of the tourist autos tied up for nearly two hours on Washington's Constitution Av. last July—by a minor rush-hour fender-bender collision?

Perhaps you flew to New York, Chicago or Washington on a tight schedule—only to find yourself circling for an hour or more waiting for landing clearance at these "saturated" airports.

Or maybe your errand was something as simple as picking up a quart of milk at the corner grocery some Sunday evening—and you had to wait in a checkout line behind 25 other improvidents.

If these situations sound painfully familiar you may find more truth than humor in those bumper stickers that proclaim: "Trouble parking? Support planned parenthood."

The fact is that the onrushing growth of population, and its unplanned distribution, are creating tremendous environmental problems—both here and around the world.

If present growth rates continue, the United States will have 300 million inhabitants by the end of the century. It took the nation 300 years to grow our first hundred million people, 50 years to produce the next hundred million—but the third will arrive in just 30 more years.

It's the same the world over. By the year 2000, there will be nearly seven billion human beings—twice today's total—and from then on, we'll add another billion every five years, at present rates.

Such population growth puts heavy strains on supplies of pure air and water, recreation space, mineral resources, and food stocks.

"A growing population will increase the demand for such resources," President Nixon said last summer, "but in many cases, their supply will not be increased and may even be endangered."

A biologist told a recent national conference on conservation and voluntary sterilization: "Competent scientists believe the world cannot indefinitely support the 3.5 billion people we have on earth today—let alone the horrendous numbers anticipated in the relatively near future."

Former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall is even more blunt: "If we're really going to double our population, our environmental problems become insoluble."

Most population studies focus on the specter of hunger and world poverty. But for the United States, most of the problems—like those listed at the start of this article—are not those of poor and underdeveloped people and nations, but of the affluent society.

The United States has 6 percent of the world's population—but it consumes 60 or 70 percent of its resources.

"Rich people occupy more space, consume more of each natural resource, disturb the ecology more—and create more land, air, water, chemical, thermal and radioactive pollution than poor people," says Dr. Jean Mayer, the Harvard nutritionist who is managing this week's White House conference on hunger.

"So it can be argued that, from many viewpoints, it is even more urgent to control the numbers of the rich than it is to control the numbers of the poor."

The same theme—tying living standards to population growth—was struck by a citizens advisory committee on environmental quality. Reporting to Mr. Nixon, the committee—headed by a very rich man, Laurence S. Rockefeller—declared:

"We believe there should be a national goal of at least reducing the increase of our population growth, and, upon further study, perhaps seeking to stabilize it as a key factor in restoring and maintaining environmental quality."

BIRTH CONTROL NOT SIMPLE SOLUTION

Although this philosophy would seem to unite two sizeable constituencies—conservationists and birth controllers—it's not that easy. And although President Nixon has called for expansion of federal birth control services, action has been hesitant.

The Office of Economic Opportunity, one of the federal agencies involved, is seeking congressional approval to spend \$22 million this year to offer birth control services to 700,000 needy women. But although this would double the number of women reached, even the expanded program would fall short of serving the more than 5 million women who want and would qualify for subsidized birth control services—and who now bear an estimated 450,000 unwanted children every year, according to a federally sponsored survey.

Government birth control programs are not only small and strictly voluntary, they are also highly controversial. Typical of the source and tone of the opposition is the position of Cardinal Patrick O'Boyle, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington, D.C., who condemns expanding government birth control efforts as "anti-life" and based on "a false sense of values, which compares the

cost of preventing people with the cost of serving them."

If the Roman Catholic hierarchy finds voluntary programs distasteful, it would probably react even more strongly to some of the more drastic proposals being aired for slowing U.S. and world population growth.

SOME CALL FOR STRICTER MARRIAGE LAWS

Some propose asking American parents to adopt the principle of the two-child family as "a social and family ideal."

Others would go much further. Kingsley Davis, a University of California population expert, suggests such steps as state laws raising the minimum age for marriage or federal laws ending income tax breaks for married couples and tax exemptions for children.

"This country would be better off with half the population," Davis argues. "With our present technology and the population of the 1930s, the country would be a paradise. As it is, it's getting to be like hell."

More practical, but no less an advocate of population "recession," is Udall. "The most hopeful thing in this area are our kids," he says.

"Our national policy has been growth and more growth . . . but our youth, with their new life style, seem to be adopting a new national policy—marrying later, having fewer children and having them later in life."

This trend has led to a nine-year drop in the birth rate which Udall believes may point to a leveling off of the nation's population in a decade or so at 230 to 240 million people.

Even if there should be a slowdown in growth, there will be a population problem as long as 70 percent of the nation's people are jammed into less than two percent of its land—the cities and suburbs.

FARM ECONOMY SHOULD BE STIMULATED

"A national population policy," says conservationist Raymond Dasman, "should seek to encourage people to live in areas within which environmental problems could be minimized—to discourage both unhealthy and unwieldy concentrations of people at one extreme and uniform land-destroying dispersal of people at the other."

Two men with Minnesota roots but of opposing politics—Republican Rep. Odin Langen and DFL former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman—have long argued for slowing down farm-to-city migration by new efforts to stimulate the economy of the countryside.

President Nixon appeared to be heeding such advice when, last month, he established a cabinet-level Rural Affairs Council as a counterpart to his Council on Urban Affairs.

A national commission on urban growth recently proposed creating 100 new cities of 100,000 people each, plus ten of at least 1 million each. But even this proposal, as Mr. Nixon pointed out, would house only one out of five of the people expected to join the U.S. population in the next 30 years.

OUR WORLD FIT FOR LIFE?: MUST DOUBLE SUPPLY OF ELECTRICITY IN 10 YEARS—POWER NEEDS AFFECT ENVIRONMENT

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One suburban Minneapolis man found out how much electric power means to modern life on a bleak October morning this year when a freak snowstorm knocked out the current in his home. He didn't mind being without lights.

He wasn't disturbed when he found he couldn't shave.

He didn't even get upset when he realized he couldn't brew either regular or instant coffee because both his coffemaker and his stove were dead.

But it was just too much when, after resigning himself to shaving and breakfasting

downtown, he couldn't even leave home—because the electrically operated garage door wouldn't open and he didn't know how to disconnect it.

Such momentary inconvenience for one suburbanite translates into a major long-term problem for the nation. Four years and 37 major power failures after the great northeast blackout of 1965 experts say we must in the next 10 years double the output of a power industry which already has an \$80-billion plant investment.

And in 30 years, if present forecasts of a U.S. population of 300 million come true, we'll need almost five times our current 325-million kilowatt power capacity.

Adding that much generating capacity could have a heavy impact on the environment.

And how that much power is to be produced—whether by more coal-, oil- or gas-fired plants or through a vast expansion of nuclear-powered generators—is producing intense, sometimes angry, debate.

Those who favor nuclear power lean heavily on environmental as well as economic arguments.

"Anyone who has ever visited a nuclear power station is bound to be impressed with its quiet and clean operation," says Glenn Seaborg, chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). "The growth of nuclear power will help abate air pollution, help reduce traffic and noise in the area surrounding the power plant and generally should make that area a much more attractive and healthier place to be."

Seaborg goes on to contrast this picture with the situation if we try to meet end-of-century power needs with coal, saying we would need to burn 10 million tons of coal per day, moved by some 100,000 railroad cars, producing "a disastrous environmental hazard" in the form of air pollution.

The AEC, playing its controversial dual role as both promoter and regulator of nuclear energy, predicts that half of U.S. power needs will be filled by nuclear-generated power within 30 years, although today only about 1 percent is thus produced.

But there are many who disagree with Seaborg's cheerful view of the environmental benefits of nuclear power stations, and the smooth road to vastly increased nuclear generating capacity is filling up with chuckholes—as Minnesotans well know from the current controversy over Northern States Power Company's (NSP) plans to operate nuclear plants at Monticello and Prairie Island.

In rising numbers, scientists, politicians and plain citizens have become concerned—sometimes alarmed—over possible effects of radioactive or heated wastes from the "nukes."

CHANCE OF ACCIDENT CAUSES WORRY

They worry not only about known effects of pollution discharged into the air and water by normal operation (and the AEC stresses the outstanding safety record of existing nuclear plants). They worry also about unknown, long-term dangers of genetic harm—and about the chance, however slim, of a radiological accident that could release even small amounts of radioactive waste to the environment.

To Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, who wants a careful restudy of the seven nuclear power stations being built or planned around Lake Michigan, "It's the same old story in our dealings with the environment." He explains:

"Most of what we know about nuclear plant pollution is what we *don't* know . . . we put technology to work the minute it comes off the production line, without waiting to learn whether it can improve quality as well as quantity in American life."

"Then, when it brings environmental dis-

aster a few years later, it's too late to do anything."

AEC claims radioactive discharge from nuclear plant is minimal. AEC member James T. Ramey contended that Minnesota was "making a mountain out of a molehill" when it insisted that NSP's Monticello plant have radioactive discharge limits 50 times lower than AEC and international standards.

As for thermal (heat) pollution, about the only agreement currently is that it needs more study—and that raising the temperature of river and lake water can have both good and bad effects on different forms of aquatic life. The AEC has given its blessing to pending legislation that would let states regulate heat pollution under a federal licensing system: The Interior Department, bidding for jurisdiction in the field, so far has taken a tough, protect-our-waters stance.

The dispute is getting rough. Recently, an electrical industry publication took a two-page newspaper advertisement to claim that "a handful of people are pulling the plug on America."

MINNESOTA CASE TO PROVIDE TEST

The AEC's Seaborg doesn't go that far. But he calls for "less hysteria, less searching for scapegoats, less polarizing of conservationists and technologists." What is needed instead, he says, is "adjustment and compromise . . . and a better working relationship between reasonable and rational environmentalists and technologists who will see they are not as far apart as they believe."

In a conciliatory move, AEC broke precedent recently and agreed to have its top officials appear at several open conferences on nuclear power—the first of them held in Vermont and Minnesota.

But others are less placatory. NSP is suing the state of Minnesota over the Monticello plant permit in both state and federal courts; a half-dozen other states and several federal agencies are watching, with most quietly rooting for Minnesota's tougher-than-AEC position.

Some congressional boosters of nuclear power plants have charged the coal industry with trying to block atomic power. Others, like Chairman Chet Hollifield, D-Calif., of the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee, argue that opponents are courting disaster.

"Unless the demands for clean water and air are kept in perspective," a Hollifield committee report said this year, "the anti-technologists and single-minded environmentalists may find themselves conducting their work by the light of a flickering candle."

Seaborg warns that future power shortages could mean blackouts of days instead of minutes or hours:

"The environment of a city whose life's energy has been cut—whose transportation and communications are dead, in which medical and police help cannot be had, and where food spoils and people stifle or shiver while imprisoned in stalled subways or darkened skyscrapers—all this also represents a dangerous environment that we must anticipate and work to avoid."

SEES NEW ROLE FOR STATES

Which way to turn, then, in this bitter controversy?

One man who should have a balanced view is Dr. Joseph Lieberman—an AEC veteran who helped run its nuclear reactor safety program, then moved over to help run the environmental health service in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

"In general," he said in an interview, "with the kind of care AEC requires to go into the location, design and operation of nuclear plants, and the regulation and compliance control exercised, I think they're safe."

"But, having said that, it does not mean you build a plant and go away and forget it: Here is an area where states can play a role of surveillance and monitoring, because states

have a responsibility to their citizens to check the utility out, and to keep track of what is happening to these plants . . ."

Lieberman's agency and AEC are currently discussing a possible program of nuclear plant surveillance, and AEC has offered Minnesota a watchdog, monitoring role as a possible compromise of the current controversy.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 3, 1969]

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?: VIEWS ON CONTROL OF POLLUTION VARY

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—If the federal government's water pollution control chief ever needs a reminder of how tough his job is, all he has to do is look out the window of his spacious, 11th-floor office.

Below him the Potomac River, brown and sluggish, carries its load of pollution slowly toward the sea—evidence of the failure of past clean-up efforts and warning of disappointments that still seem likely in the future.

Every expert agrees that cleaning up the nation's rivers and lakes is essential to meet growing demands of a growing population that finds a growing number of ways to use water. By the year 2000, the only way to meet those demands will be to reuse our water—not two or three times, but many times over. And to be reusable for most purposes water must be decontaminated.

David D. Dominick, the 32-year-old former U.S. Marine officer who is commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is an optimist, despite the view from his office:

"I think we're going to see significant improvement in the quality of our waters in the next three to five years," he said.

But the man who used to sit in Dominick's chair looks ahead and sees disappointment, while the government's chief auditor looks back and concludes that \$5.4 billion in public and private outlays over the past dozen years have produced little or no progress in cleaning up the nation's waters.

The complexity of the problem is reflected in the differing prescriptions of these men for curing it.

EXPERTS DIFFER ON TIME REQUIRED

Dominick bases his optimism on the fact that "we have time schedules for both industries and municipalities, many of which call for completing waste treatment works by 1972. Our real mission is to see that those schedules are met—if we can get everybody to come in with treatment facilities, we'll have clean water."

But James Quigley, one of Dominick's predecessors, foresees a longer wait for the kind of results Dominick predicts—and says the treatment works won't do it all anyway.

"In 10 or 15 years, I think we'll see a generally good job of 'point-source' pollution control," Quigley said. "But when that happens—and billions of dollars will have been spent to do it—the public may look at our waters and say, 'But they're still dirty.'"

By that Quigley said he means waters "will still be muddy and brown and contain pesticides and herbicides and bird and animal wastes. We'll still have a lot of 'non-point' pollution—runoff from farms, streets, parking lots, building projects—and I don't think anybody knows or even gives enough thought to how to control that."

Elmer Staats, comptroller general of the United States and Congress' chief auditor, reported recently that little progress has been made despite a 12-year effort by federal, state and local governments and private industry.

He blamed a "shotgun approach" that has allowed federal grants for sewage treatment plants to be made to lower-echelon governments on a first-come, first-served basis.

Staats recommended spending vastly more than the federal government's \$1.2-billion

share of the 12-year program, but under a new system that would give priority to grants for local treatment plants where they are most needed.

There's a congressional drive on—with Minnesota's Rep. John Blatnik among its leaders—to provide more federal money for such projects, but like other domestic programs in a war-weighted budget, it's an uphill fight.

\$800 MILLION APPROVED FOR GRANTS

Despite prior congressional authorization of \$1 billion for sewage plant construction grants this year, both the old and new administrations asked for only \$214 million. Late yesterday a Senate-House conference committee agreed to provide \$800 million, a compromise between the \$1 billion favored by the Senate and the House-approved appropriation of \$600 million—which is all the administration says it could use in the next 18 months.

Both houses now are likely to approve the \$800-million spending level, and a bipartisan congressional group will call on the President to urge him to spend that much.

In addition to the spending hold-down, local officials also were worried about a proposal which the Nixon administration seemed ready to adopt from its predecessors: To replace direct federal cash grants with "pay-later" pledges to help finance sewage treatment works.

This would force local governments to fund construction initially—and entirely—by local bond issues in an increasingly tight market for local bonds, while federal reimbursement would be spread over a 30-year period. The Interior Department is reported reconsidering this scheme.

Who is responsible for today's widespread water pollution? Spokesmen for industry made clear—at a recent conference where Interior Secretary Walter Hickel proclaimed a "war against polluters"—that they are tired of being branded the nation's worst polluters.

They much prefer the approach of Hickel's assistant secretary for water quality, Carl Klein, who rates municipalities, agriculture and industry—in that order—as the leading offenders.

Klein, however, quickly adds that because smaller industries add heavily to municipal wastes, industry is responsible for two-thirds of the combined non-farm pollution.

Agriculture's role as a water polluter was acknowledged by former Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, who said in his final report that "sediments from eroding land are the main burden of pollutants in surface water"—contributing 700 times as much contamination as sewage discharge.

Freeman also has pointed up a startling statistic: The fact that a large feedlot housing 10,000 cattle "has about the same sewage disposal problem as a city of 164,000 people." And this, experts agree, is a part of the water-pollution problem that has yet to be tackled.

TOUGHER LEGISLATION SOUGHT

Despite present and prospective problems, Dominick believes "the political climate currently is such that we can get tougher legislation."

Hickel and Dominick have said they plan to ask Congress for beefed-up authority to move rapidly against polluters. Generally, present water-pollution statutes emphasize state and local enforcement roles.

Even as it is now, the federal government has shown it can get tough: It threatened to sue the city of Toledo, Ohio, and four industries for not moving fast enough to end their pollution of Lake Erie, and it acted to force the state of Iowa to set higher water quality standards for the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers and lesser streams than the state was willing to impose.

Iowa's expected challenge to that federal order may create a state's-rights controversy as significant as Minnesota's assertion of its right to set stricter-than-federal standards for radioactive waste from nuclear power plants.

Dominick and Quigley deny that political pressure has been brought to bear on them to back down from strong water-clean-up stands.

But Quigley believes such pressures are probably concentrated at the state level, where most of the pollution control responsibility rests.

"The big polluter in any state," he said, "is also likely to be the big industry, the big taxpayer—and the big political supporter."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 4, 1969]

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?: DDT: DILEMMA FOR PRESENT, FUTURE

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—"We're very much concerned about the environmental effects," the secretary of health, education and welfare said, "but at the same time we have to feed a nation."

Thus, as he announced first steps toward a near-ban on the use of DDT, Secretary Robert Finch spotlighted an agonizing dilemma: How to balance enormous past benefits of pesticides against their harmful effects—some proven, some potential—on man and his surroundings?

A Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) commission of distinguished experts cited "abundant evidence" of widespread DDT residues "in man, birds, fish and other aquatic organisms, wildlife, soil, water, sewage, rivers, lakes, oceans and air."

Aware that massive doses of DDT had caused cancer in laboratory mice, the commission, reporting to Finch, also pointed to evidence that the pesticide is "highly injurious" not only to its insect-targets but to many other forms of life.

In recommending the virtual ban on DDT within two years, the commission said: "Our nation cannot afford to wait until the last piece of evidence has been submitted on the many issues related to pesticide usage. We must consider our present course in terms of future generations of Americans and the environment that they will live in."

And yet to condemn any food containing DDT—to act, for example, as he did against cyclamate sweeteners—could be disastrous, Finch said.

Strictly enforcing against DDT the law used to ban cyclamates "would convert us to a nation of vegetarians," he observed, because small traces of pesticides are found in "much of our red meat, many dairy products, some eggs, fowl and fish—all parts of basic food groups deemed necessary to a balanced diet." And such foods have been found safe, despite those pesticide traces, the commission reported.

RACHEL CARSON'S WARNING RECALLED

Agreement to work toward a DDT ban was reached by Finch and the secretaries of agriculture and interior seven full years after this warning by the late Rachel Carson in her controversial—but finally vindicated—book, "Silent Spring":

"Can anyone believe it is possible to lay down such a barrage of poisons on the surface of the earth without making it unfit for all life?"

Sen. Gaylord Nelson, the Wisconsin Democrat whose bill to ban interstate commerce in DDT has been pigeon-holed by three congresses, also deplores using some 800 million pounds of pesticides on U.S. crops every year with incomplete knowledge of their effects:

"The Great Lakes coho salmon are loaded with DDT, and it seems to affect their nervous and reproductive systems . . . the bald eagle is dying out because hens can't produce suf-

ficient calcium to form hard eggshells . . . persistent chemicals evaporate and become airborne—so DDT drops on Sweden, where it's banned . . ."

Nelson couples his dismal indictment with charges that agricultural and chemical interests have heedlessly promoted use of pesticides, while federal agencies—notably the Agriculture Department—and congressional committees have dodged the problem.

Nelson and 30 cosponsors earlier this year won Senate approval of a far-reaching proposal to require the Department of the Interior to include pesticides among pollutants when states set their water quality standards.

There are those, however, who counsel caution, perhaps because of DDT's incalculable World War II contribution in curbing malaria and other insect-borne diseases, and its 25-year record of protecting food crops.

"It's true that, improperly used, pesticides contaminate rivers and lakes and the life in them," Dr. Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's science adviser, said in a recent interview.

"But if we suddenly did away with them, there would be huge crop losses and possibly a huge incursion of disease-carrying insects that might cause losses greater than the loss of fish."

"That doesn't mean we do nothing. But we must use insecticides under controlled conditions and choose them for their qualities and the needed degree of persistency."

Pesticide played a part—albeit still a small one—in a federal health official's recent warning that "we can no longer afford to take the purity and safety of public drinking water supplies for granted."

Charles C. Johnson Jr., administrator of the government's environmental health service, made the statement in reporting early results of a survey of community water supply systems serving some 20 million residents in nine areas across the nation.

Preliminary results indicate that one water system in 11 contains some contamination and about 6 percent of the people served get drinking water that falls short of Public Health Service standards. Projected nationally, Johnson said, this would indicate that perhaps 8 million of the 150 million Americans served by community distribution systems may be drinking water of potentially unsafe bacterial content.

"While none of the samples exceeded recommended permissible limits," he said, "the high frequency of occurrence and our lack of knowledge of the long-term effects of this class of compounds dictate the need for increased surveillance and research, as well as for increased recognition of the potential of this problem by state and local health departments."

TENDENCY TO RELAX GETS BLAME

Individual wells and cisterns—from which some 50 million Americans get their water—also showed the presence of pesticides. This, Johnson said, "verified what many have long suspected: That pesticides are finding their way into ground water."

James McDermott, director of the federal bureau of water hygiene, speculates that communities have allowed their drinking water supplies to backslide.

And he says it's a drift that cannot long continue:

"Chances for accidental spills into water supplies have increased, towns are growing much closer together—so one man's intake is getting closer to the other's discharge."

"Within 50 years water is going to be so scarce in some sections of the country, and the cost of treating it will have risen so high, that direct reuse of water will make sense."

By then, McDermott suggests, technology, operation and surveillance of community water systems must be vastly improved: "If we're not able to maintain forward motion

in these areas," he warned, "we shall not be able to maintain this affluent society—where people take water for granted."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 5, 1969]
OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?: ATTACK ON CROWDED, NOISY, POLLUTED U.S. AIR IS SLOW

(By Richard Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The businessmen had come to talk about pollution, but the secretary of the Interior jolted them into thinking about the air as well.

"How many of you know that the jets that flew you here dump 35 tons of solid wastes in just one day as they land and take off at Washington airports?" Walter Hickel asked.

Had he chosen to add more insult to airborne injury, Hickel could also have reminded the industrial leaders that:

The airport where most of them landed, Washington National, is one of five in the nation already operating at "saturation."

Airplane noise in the Washington area is so bad that, especially on summer evenings, plays and concerts must pause or be drowned out and living-room conversation in a sizable segment of the metropolitan area is periodically obliterated by jet arrivals and departures.

What is true in the capital is true across the nation: our air is getting dirtier, noisier and more crowded every day. But this triple problem is also under continuing—though slow-moving—attack.

Every year more than 142 million tons of pollutants are released into the air over the United States. That's three-quarters of a ton for every man, woman and child. It adds up to more than the nation's total annual production of raw steel.

And, despite clean-air laws that date back to 1955, experts say the air-cleaning problem remains far more complex than depollution of water—because water can more easily be contained, traced and tested.

NEW YORK'S AIR IS DIRTIEST IN UNITED STATES

A 1967 study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) found that New York, N.Y., had the dirtiest air of 65 major metropolitan areas. The Twin Cities ranked 32nd, or just about halfway down the list.

"It doesn't look like you've got much of a problem at all," a spokesman for the government's National Air Pollution Control Administration said recently after checking a report on Minneapolis-St. Paul area air quality.

The five most common pollutants are: carbon monoxide, which comes primarily from automobile exhaust and accounts for more than half the nation's air contamination; sulfur oxides, largely from industrial and power plants, which together account for nearly one-third of the total pollution; hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxide, which combine under strong sunlight to cause "smog"; and particles—liquid or solid—of various kinds and sizes.

Almost all air pollution results from some kind of combustion, or burning—gasoline in auto engines; coal, oil or other fuels in industrial plants, generators and heating plants; or incineration of garbage and other refuse.

Auto exhaust was an early, but elusive, target. After preliminary efforts by a few states to set their own exhaust-control standards—which raised the specter of cars having to be built to meet different regulations in every state—Congress in 1965 gave the Department of Health, Education and Welfare control over exhaust emissions from all new cars.

But even though 1970-model cars must carry effective antipollution devices, the problem remains—because of the 100 million older cars remaining in use and because most

states don't require annual inspections to make sure the devices keep working.

WANTED: SUBSTITUTE AUTO ENGINE

Many experts, indeed, believe the only answer is elimination of the internal-combustion engine. And the Nixon administration recently announced plans to spur research on low-pollution steam and electric engines as possible substitutes—although recent reports question the practicality of steam for automotive power.

Dr. Lee DuBridge, Mr. Nixon's science adviser and a man who both lived in and analyzed Los Angeles, Calif., smog for 22 years, told *The Minneapolis Tribune* that the government "will find ways of greatly increasing its research funds in this area."

Although most federal research spending is being cut, this effort "is going to take priority," DuBridge said, with a boost from \$2 billion to \$10 or \$15 million per year planned to fund "very significant and promising projects."

Rep. Joseph Karth, D-Minn., has urged the government to use its leverage in another way—by buying low-emission vehicles for federal agencies. The government's purchasing agency, the General Services Administration, has plans to test a mechanism that would allow an auto to switch at will from gasoline to compressed natural gas as fuel.

The auto industry's record is mixed. The federal government brought—and later dropped—a conspiracy suit in California against automakers who allegedly withheld emission-control devices. Now New York has started a similar suit.

On the other hand, General Motors last May exhibited 26 experimental vehicles that either had new pollution-control systems or were powered by turbine, steam, electric or other power systems.

If progress in dealing with auto exhaust has been slow, the effort to choke off other forms of air pollution has sometimes seemed completely stalled. President Lyndon B. Johnson asked Congress to give the federal government full control of such polluters as industrial and power plants—but was turned down.

COMBINED APPROACH TO REGIONAL PROBLEM

Instead, Congress adopted a scheme devised by Sen. Edmund Muskie, D-Maine, for a combined federal-state-local approach to what is recognized as a regional problem not neatly confined by political boundaries.

This plan—slow-working and thus more to industry's liking—has resulted in designation of 57 "air quality control regions," including one for Minneapolis-St. Paul and others for Fargo, N.D.-Moorhead, Minn., and Sioux Falls, S.D.

The regions were set up so as to involve all the states; for each region, states will propose five-year air-quality improvement plans—subject to federal approval and consistent with federally-set guidelines.

Even this more gradual approach has met resistance: the American Mining Congress, for example, has demanded withdrawal of the federal guidelines, arguing that they interfere with states' rights and tend toward imposing a national air-quality standard.

The job ahead is a big one. Robert Finch, secretary of health, education and welfare, says combined federal-state-local government spending for cleaning the air should reach \$454 million annually within five years—nearly four times the present level—and he says that industry should by then be chipping in some \$750 to \$950 million.

Noise is a relatively recent addition to the recognized list of air pollutants. The first federal control law was passed in 1968; it was not until last month that the government, acting under that law, issued its first regulations to limit the amount of noise new commercial jet airliners can make. And noise regulation applying to existing jets and those

in the development pipeline won't be along until later.

Airplanes aren't the only noise problem. Former Interior Secretary Stewart Udall combines the expert's view with that of the ordinary citizen when he says that "the noise level in this country has been doubling every 10 years," then adds: "New York just drives me crazy."

BUSES, SIRENS, HORNS AND JACKHAMMERS

And while considerable work is being done to cut jet noise and study the threat of sonic-boom damage, little has been done to silence the buses, sirens, auto horns, jackhammers and other noisemakers on earth.

A citizens advisory committee on environmental quality reported recently to President Nixon that "all these and scores of other noise sources can be silenced with present technology—what we do not have is a means of enforcing them."

The problem of pollution by crowding—air traffic congestion—is being attacked on several fronts. New air traffic control regulations have been proposed for major airports by the Federal Aviation Administration; Mr. Nixon has asked funds for 4,400 more air traffic controllers, and a 10-year, multibillion-dollar airport development program—which the administration wants financed by higher taxes on air passengers and freight—is before Congress.

For some conservationists, however, all this is offset by the prospect of the SST—the 300-passenger, 1,800-miles-per-hour supersonic transport jetliner for which Mr. Nixon recently requested a federal financing go-ahead. The SST, according to some critics, poses a sort of triple-threat to the air around us.

A presidential study committee warned—before Mr. Nixon approved the SST—that the aircraft's sonic booms could cause "significant further deterioration in the environment for people on the ground."

Earlier, an official of the Conservation Foundation here spelled out some of the reasons why many people worry about the SST:

"Few of us resent the time actually spent in the air on the present modern jets.

"All of us resent the delays and confusion involved in our inefficient airports and in travel to and from airports.

"All of us resent the crowding and discomfort we experience in airplanes that carry too many passengers in too small a space.

"But, rather than spend money to solve these very real problems, we spend it to develop an unneeded, environmental harmful, airborne monstrosity... It seems to be a question of putting technology first and forcing people to fit into it, rather than using technology to benefit people."

[From the *Minneapolis Tribune*, Dec. 8, 1969]

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?: "SOLID WASTE" ON MOON REFLECTS EARTHLY PROBLEM

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—When his 1957 car gave out not long ago, Richard Vaughan found it neither cheap nor easy to give it a decent burial.

A shredding plant finally agreed to pay him \$10 for the old clunker—but the neighborhood filling-station operator wanted \$20 to tow it there.

Most of us might have taken the \$10 beating and just grumbled, but Vaughan started thinking: Why not issue a certificate with every new car that would remain with the vehicle and entitle its final owner to recover \$10 or \$20 from a scrap dealer? The dealer in turn would be reimbursed by the auto maker—who thus would bear some of the cost of the waste pollution his product created.

Vaughan, it should be noted, is director of the Bureau of Solid Waste Management in

the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Thus his personal dilemma also was his professional concern.

But the incident illustrates a pollution problem that threatens literally to engulf the nation unless we handle it better—and soon.

The problem of "solid waste"—which is what the experts call anything that isn't air or water pollution—took on cosmic dimensions when the Apollo 11 and 12 astronauts left costly debris on the moon. But it has been an earthly problem of mounting proportions for a long time, as ever-present as the discarded can-opener rings that seem to have become America's new national symbol.

Every day, U.S. municipal and private collection services pick up the equivalent of more than five pounds of trash and garbage for each American.

And because we are using more no-return bottles, more cans and more plastic containers every year, our individual waste output has been going up by more than 4 percent each year. This means that by 1980, the collectors will have to pick up eight pounds of discard per person every day.

SOLID WASTES MUST BE MOVED

Even that is just what's actually collected. The experts figure that now another 10 pounds per person is jettisoned daily outside of collection channels by homes and businesses. And even these figures don't include the billions of tons of farming and mining wastes that pile up every year.

Solid waste differs from air and water pollution, which move on their own, often across political boundaries. Unless solid waste is picked up and carried away, it just piles up where it was dumped, creating ugliness, pollution and injury.

For the most part, even if we do pick it up, what we do with it isn't very different from what we did half a century ago: Though a number of major cities are experimenting with hauling garbage to remote dumping grounds by train, for example, that "merely substitutes an engine for the mule that used to haul the trash wagon," as one New York City sanitation official puts it.

Though the smoky, smelly open city dump has long been recognized as both an eyesore and a health hazard, more than 90 percent of this nation's solid wastes are disposed of on land. A recent survey of 6,000 such sites found that only one in 16 qualified as a sanitary landfill—a scientifically run area where refuse is spread, compacted and covered daily with earth, without burning or otherwise polluting air or water.

SOME LANDFILLS PUT TO GOOD USE

Space for such sanitary landfills is limited, but where they have been used, as in Los Angeles, Calif., for instance, they have been turned into community assets—parks, botanical gardens, even golf courses—when filled and covered over.

And for refuse that must be burned, there are now high-pressure, cleaner-burning incinerators—even one experimental model that would produce usable heat and power as byproducts. But the same survey found three-fourths of the nation's public and private incinerators lacking adequate air pollution control devices.

Past history of our concern for the solid waste problem is summed up by a recent National Academy of Engineering report with these words: "Minimum attention, minimum funding and minimum application of technology."

In 1965, after long disregarding the problem, Congress passed a law to provide \$92.5 million over four years, to pay for research on new ideas in solid waste management, with payments to state and local agencies that tested them. With this encouragement, the number of state solid-waste agencies has risen from a handful to 42.

This year a bipartisan group of senators, led by Edmund Muskie of Maine, introduced a broader bill to provide \$733 million in the next five years, mostly for grants to help build regional or local disposal plants. This "Resource Recovery Act of 1969" also would set up a national materials policy commission to develop better methods of solid waste planning and handling.

The picture is not all bleak. The National Academy of Engineering report found that sufficient technological know-how exists to permit progress toward solving "many" current waste problems—not through any single, dramatic breakthrough but on a step-by-step basis that would deal with one problem at a time.

And Vaughan's agency figures that increasing present total annual spending of \$4.5 billion a year by less than \$1 billion could raise the nation's solid waste collection and disposal services to satisfactory levels.

NEW APPROACHES TO BIG PROBLEM

Those figures assume that we would do things about as they're being done now—but engineers, scientists and politicians are beginning also to look at new approaches to the problem. Among them:

Improved equipment: An "ideal incinerator" is being developed under a federal research contract in California, while safer, quieter and cleaner garbage-collection trucks are being produced for what is not only an unpleasant job but one of the nation's most dangerous occupations.

Improved disposal: Besides experiments with garbage—hauling trains, cities are using or considering use of remote, unwanted areas for dumping—deserts, abandoned coal mines and land in need of reclamation. One device being tested would suck garbage from cities to disposal sites through underground pneumatic tubes.

Reuse: The recent Interior Department announcement that government scientists have extracted a barrel of crude oil from a tone of pressurized garbage is the latest of many attempts to reclaim and reuse what normally is discarded as waste. The idea of reusing scrap materials, familiar to anyone who saved paper or tinfoil or cans during the shortages of World War II, is being revived.

A can manufacturer has declared a bounty of a half-cent apiece for aluminum cans in certain areas of the country, and distributing 35,000 magnets to Boys Scout troops to help them identify nonmagnetic aluminum.

"We've got lots of thing around here made with garbage," says Vaughan. On his desk are several glass vials—one with a ground-garbage compound that can be used to purify water, another with a mixture usable in road building and a third containing a slow-release fertilizer—expensive but effective.

JUNK METALS, PAPER PROVE VALUABLE

"Reclaiming materials from solid wastes is still a financially marginal operation," the Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality reported to the President recently, "but there is considerable value in the reclaimed residue of our junk."

"The U.S. Bureau of Mines estimates that if all solid waste were properly incinerated, it would yield salvageable metals worth more than \$1 billion each year. A ton of recycled waste paper can provide an amount of wood pulp equivalent to 17 pulped trees."

There is talk—and research—about "self-destructible" containers that dissolve or disintegrate after use, but so far few have been marketed.

Secretary Robert Finch of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, recently proposed making manufacturers whose products constitute potential waste share in the cost of disposing of them.

This has set off talk of a "pollution tax" which the federal government might impose on manufacturers, with revenues to be shared with states and cities that confront actual disposal problems.

In two sections of Boston, Mass., the Ford Foundation is financing experiments that combine new technical disposal and collection devices with advice on how to use them from social scientists, design experts and black community leaders.

"We want to find out what lies at the heart of the problem," a project spokesman said. "Is it people or technology, or both? The only way we can find out is to get the technology there and then get the people directly involved in it."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 9, 1969]

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE? POLLUTION: WORRY, BUT LITTLE FUNDS

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—How much do we care about halting pollution and cleaning up the world we live in? Answer: Quite a bit.

How much are we willing to pay for it? Answer: Not much.

These contradictory conclusions can be drawn from two recent public-opinion surveys—one national, the other taken in Minnesota.

The contradiction points up a little-discussed but critical part of the struggle to preserve our environment—the fact that it's going to cost money, and most people would like to have someone else pay for it.

In the long run, of course, the cost inevitably will be borne by individual citizens—whether the money is spent by governments, which will get it back in tax collections or fees, or by industry, which will seek reimbursement by passing the cost along to its customers.

A nationwide survey taken by a major polling firm for the National Wildlife Federation found that almost all of the nearly 1,500 persons questioned were willing to have the federal government spend more on natural resource preservation than it does now—but only if the money is raised by cutting other outlays, not by increasing taxes or costs to consumers.

More than half of those questioned favored diverting some federal spending from national defense, and nearly half would also spend less on space and such international programs as foreign aid.

FEW WILLING TO PAY

But when it came to specifics, two-thirds of those interviewed said they would not be willing to have their family expenses boosted by \$200 a year—in taxes and higher product prices—to reduce pollution. Even an annual expense rise of \$20 a year won approval of only 55 percent.

Another question asked, How much would you be willing to have added to your electric bill to help the power company eliminate air and water pollution from its plants? Only one out of five was willing to pay an extra \$2 a month; only two out of five would pay an extra \$1 and only three out of five would be willing to pay as little as \$25 cents a month.

(One intriguing sidelight of the poll was the fact that residents of the Midwest seemed more willing than those who lived elsewhere to pay for antipollution efforts. Where only 55 percent of the national sample, for example, was willing to pay \$20 a year more for clean-up programs, the figure was 65 percent for Midwesterners.)

The Minnesota survey—conducted by a professional polling firm for one of the state's politicians—asked a cross-section of voters to identify the state's major problems.

Statewide, and in every region of Minnesota, high taxes were rated the No. 1 problem, being cited by 31 per cent of those questioned. But in most areas, the problems of pollution and conservation ranked second—though generally well behind taxes.

There was special evidence of environmental concern in Hennepin County suburban communities and in St. Paul, with 30 percent and 24 percent, respectively, of respondents in those areas ranking conservation issues second.

In Minneapolis, 17 percent ranked environmental problems in third place, well behind welfare and social problems and, of course, high taxes.

INDUSTRY EXPECTS TO BE REPAID

The public reluctance to dig into the pocketbook suggested by the Wildlife Federation's national survey found an industry echo during a recent water pollution conference here.

Several industrial leaders at the meeting made clear that not only is industry unhappy with its "polluter" image, but it also expects to be repaid for cleaning up the pollution it does cause.

"Only a profitable enterprise can afford the cost of what must be done," Brooks McCormick, president of International Harvester Co., told the conference. He added:

"Bankrupt businesses don't pollute streams. But they don't meet payrolls either."

The president of the U.S. Steel Corp., Edgar B. Speer, said his company opposes "water treatment for treatment's sake." He explained:

"Unless some user receives value as the result of the treatment given the waste, the money spent for pollution control is removed forever from productive use."

Speer made clear that he does not expect industry to absorb antipollution costs, either. "It should be realized," he said, "that the individual citizen, in the final analysis, foots all of the treatment bills—either in taxes or in the price of goods and services."

Another industry complaint has to do with federal tax policies. A spokesman for the paper industry—acknowledged to be a major source of pollution—professes "deep concern" over moves to repeal the 7-percent credit for business investments. Both the tax reform bill passed by the House and the measure pending in the Senate would do this.

SOME PROGRESS IS NOTED

"Our industry has been counting on that credit to ease the financial burden of acquiring antipollution facilities," said Edwin A. Locke Jr., president of the American Paper Institute.

"If the credit is now removed, it will be much harder to make the huge outlays required."

Despite all these indications of citizen and industry reluctance to cough up money for a pollution clean-up, there was evidence to the contrary in some of last month's elections.

Maine voters approved a \$50-million bond issue for sewage treatment plants—though they turned down less than half as much for roadbuilding.

In New Jersey, a \$271-million bond issue to fight water pollution passed easily. New York voters approved a sweeping amendment, called a "conservation bill of rights," calling on the state Legislature to give more attention to environmental protection.

At the local level, several mayoral elections apparently were influenced by pollution issues. A California district turned down a coal-burning power plant—despite its tax-paying potential—because it threatened to dirty the air, and citizens of a Seattle, Wash., suburb voted to preserve a park rather than bulldoze it into a golf course.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Dec. 10, 1969]

OUR WORLD—FIT FOR LIFE?: POLLUTION FIGHT NEEDS MONEY, LEADERS, EDUCATION AND IDEAS

(By Richard P. Kleeman)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Garbage trucks clatter as they haul our refuse to smoky, smelly dumps.

Noisy factories pollute both air and water. Huge jets whine overhead, spewing smoke into the air as they fly in and out of overcrowded airports whose inadequate access roads are clogged with traffic.

The automobile fouls the atmosphere in its lifetime, demands land-gobbling highways and ends up in an ugly junkheap.

These problems of environment, all different, all complex, all add up to one big mess. As one industrialist told a water-pollution meeting here: "Pollution is indivisible, and it should be attacked as one big problem."

But can this work? Other experts warn against trying to do too much on an over-all basis. As a recent study by the American Chemical Society said, "It is vital to recognize that the environmental system is made up of a bewildering number of sub-systems that often are only distantly interdependent. Environmental problems are rarely amenable to sweeping solutions."

What, then, of the future? Many are quick to forecast impending disaster for a human race overwhelmed by its own technology—but that view is not unanimous.

"We have to start by recognizing that by the nature of civilization and of people, we can't avoid some impingement on the environment," says Dr. Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's science adviser. "A perfect environment can only be obtained at infinite cost—such as everybody dying."

A former Minnesota conservation official who now helps run the Federal Environmental Health Agency is not willing to give up hope.

SEES HOPE IN MAN'S ADAPTABILITY

"I'm not either with the gloom-and-doom people who say we've had it, or with those who say we've never had it so good," says Dr. James Lee. "Man has been able to adapt to past environmental and biological insults, and he gives every indication of being able to continue this adaptability."

"So, while I don't hold with the idea that man is going to succumb to the inroads on his environment in the near future, I also don't minimize the fact that, left uncontrolled, many of these environmental insults some day may result in his termination."

"We'll just have to await the verdict of time."

It is, of course, not just a matter of waiting. There are signs that we recognize the "insults" and are doing something about them—with air and water pollution control programs; the forthcoming near-ban on DDT; new government steps to prevent future oil spills, jet aircraft noise, and auto exhaust fumes; and the slow spread both here and abroad of birth control programs.

What more is needed? In addition to the already-impressive evidence of public concern—a necessity by everyone's assessment—it seems to boil down to four main ingredients: more money, education, stronger leadership and new ways of thinking about the problems.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin told a recent congressional conference on environment that it will take up to \$150 billion in spending by all levels of government, plus another \$150 billion from private industry, to clean up pollution in the next 15 to 20 years.

GAINS FROM EXPENDITURES SUGGESTED

By contrast, the same conference was told that current federal spending on all "natural resource" programs amounts to only \$3.7

billion, or 1.8 percent of this year's federal budget—the lowest percentage in a decade of steady decline.

What can we gain by spending more money on the environment?

The chemical society report begins by answering "better health," then adds: "Money spent to manage the environment buys cleaner laundry in the back yard, longer life for the paint on houses, less corrosion and breakdown of electrical and other equipment."

"It buys cleaner lakes and rivers for recreation. It buys relief from annoyance: a speck of ash in one's eye, unpleasant odors, yellowed foliage in the springtime."

"It buys nature as it ought to be, although it must be recognized that a modern, industrial society and a pristine environment cannot coexist."

"Nothing less than a revolution in our educational system is required," said Russell Train, president of the Conservation Foundation, before he became undersecretary of the interior in the Nixon administration.

The student must learn to see himself, Train said, as "part of an interdependent, inter-relating world—not simply as its manipulator."

Echoing this recently, a presidential advisory committee on environmental quality said, "Our formal education system has done little to produce an informed citizenry, sensitive to environmental problems and prepared and motivated to work toward their solution."

And a White House staff report urged \$20 million in federal spending to support formation of schools of human environment at U.S. universities.

Already convinced that college-age young people consider the environment as "relevant" an issue as Vietnam or race relations, Sen. Nelson has been organizing a nationwide "teach-in" on the subject.

As planned by a mushrooming organization led by Nelson and Rep. Paul N. McCloskey Jr., a California Republican, the teach-in calls for setting aside one day—next April 22—on campuses across the nation to hear speakers, hold discussions and stage rallies on environmental problems of particular local concern.

LEADERSHIP BY PRESIDENT NEEDED

If national policies on the environment are to be strengthened and continuously monitored, presidential leadership will be needed.

Last spring, President Nixon set up an eight-member, cabinet-level "Environmental Quality Council," with DuBridge as its executive secretary.

But to some critics, the cabinet group—which has met just three times since it was formed—is not enough. Nelson calls it "a poor second cousin" because Cabinet members' prime interests lie elsewhere. Rep. Joseph Karth of Minnesota says the council "has a built-in conflict of interest."

Though DuBridge disagrees, congressional critics want a presidential board of environmental advisers, assisted by an independent office of environmental quality. After a lot of pulling and hauling, Congress seems about to approve such an arrangement.

Many see a need—beyond these other steps—for a basic change in national philosophy.

"What needs to be developed at the earliest opportunity is a habit of thinking ecologically—of being thoroughly familiar with the balance of nature," says Adm. Hyman Rickover, the iconoclastic Navy expert on nuclear propulsion.

"It troubles me," he adds, "that we have always acted as if technology were an irrepressible force of nature to which we must meekly submit: if we reflected, we might discover that not everything hailed as progress contributes to happiness, that the new is not always better, nor the old always outdated."

Stewart Udall, for eight years secretary of the interior, sees a need to harness technology. In a recent interview, he noted that conservationists have always been "at war with technology," and called for a change:

"The question we now need to ask is whether we can make technology solve problems—and use it creatively, so that major public proposals, instead of diminishing the environment, will enhance it."

"Industry must solve environmental problems instead of doing things the cheapest way—because we have the capacity to do anything we want to do."

To one expert addressing the congressional conference on environment, engineer-conservationist Aaron Teller, the key lies in "looping the system"—learning to reuse scarce resources. "This must be legally imposed by a new value system," he said.

For example, he suggests that an auto—which wastes over 300 gallons of gasoline over its lifetime—be taxed for this when first sold. Teller predicts this would lead automakers to develop more efficient engines—which could eventually save the nation nine billion gallons of gasoline now wasted each year.

Nelson offers an even more drastic problem: "If we had any sense, we'd establish a national land use policy—and tell people what they could do with their land."

Some proposals would go even beyond this—such as that of the California researcher that all technological research and innovation—except that aimed directly at reducing present dangers to the general welfare—be halted for two years so man could "perfect" existing technology before pursuing more.

Adm. Rickover, reviewing more than a century of science-based technological development, asks gloomily:

"What use have we made of it? We have multiplied inordinately, wasted irreplaceable fuels and minerals and perpetrated incalculable and irreversible ecological harm."

"I have thought much about this," the outspoken Navy officer adds, "and I can find no evidence that man contributes anything to the balance of nature—anything at all."

A final, simple—yet perhaps futile—warning comes from conservationist Raymond Dasmann: "There is one basic rule we cannot really afford to ignore:

"Do not destroy what you cannot recreate."

THE RISK OF RECESSION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the cover article of Time magazine this week is entitled "The Rising Risk of Recession." Featured on the cover and in the story in the business section is Milton Friedman, economics professor at the University of Chicago. The article points out that even Professor Friedman, who it is said, "believes in a monetarist view of economics" and feels the chief instrument in controlling movement of the economy is the seven-man Federal Reserve Board, "thinks that the present tight money policy of this administration and the Federal Reserve Board must be loosened."

The article also states that two members of the Federal Reserve Board, Sherman Maisel, and George W. Mitchell, both economists agree.

Mr. President, the policies of this administration have not done the job of restoring health to this economy, and as the Time article points out:

The American people are angered and frustrated by inflation and the polls show

that an overwhelming majority criticize Nixon's handling of the persistent problem.

In a special box on page 69 of the same December 19, 1969, issue of *Time* is a dramatic set of illustrations of what rising inflation has done to the average American during this administration.

Pointing out that inflation is no laughing matter, this box begins in a whimsical way by saying that some old phrases have to be up-dated now, such as "two birds in the hand are worth three in the bush."

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "The Consumer: Behind the Nine Ball," be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE CONSUMER: BEHIND THE NINE BALL

Inflation is no laughing matter, but the prices of so many products have risen in 1969 that some Pittsburgh newspapermen have concocted a new game based on inflationary psychology. According to them, it now takes three to tango, four's a crowd, and that favorite song of a few years back has become *Four Coins in a Fountain*. Similarly, the number 14 is bad luck, and so is four on a match. A stitch in time saves ten, cats have ten lives, two birds in the hand are worth three in the bush, a bluffer is a fiveflusher, and that soft drink should really be called Eight-Up. Life, these days, begins at 41, girls are Sweet 17 and never been kissed, and inescapably, the American consumer is behind the nine ball.

The pastime is a wry reaction to a far more serious numbers game. As fast as incomes rose, the price of necessities seemed to rise even more steeply in 1969, and few wage-earners felt that they were better off than when the year began. An inflation sampler:

Food. The Department of Labor food-price index jumped 5% from January to October. In Pittsburgh, the price of eggs almost doubled overnight from 43¢ to 83¢ per dozen. The price of pork chops in Boston increased from 99¢ to \$1.39. One shopper in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, Mrs. Richard Davis, protested: "This can of soup had four prices on it when I bought it." The final price was 11¢ more than the first. The nickel Hershey bar vanished, and practically nobody could find a 10¢ cup of coffee.

Housing: The average cost of a home reached \$25,900 compared with \$24,200 a year ago. In San Francisco, for example, the price of a home climbed 12% in twelve months. One survey of the Bay area disclosed that there was enough low-cost housing to provide shelter for all the area's poor—but the comparatively well-off occupants refused to move out. Taxes took an ever deeper bite. In San Francisco, for example, property taxes jumped from \$102.30 per \$1,000 valuation to \$122.90.

Manufactured goods: Appliances cost more across the U.S. The price of a new car rose by an average \$107. Clothes were more expensive almost everywhere, and rose an average 10% in Boston. Men's neckties commonly went up by 50¢ or \$1—or more.

Medical care and pharmaceuticals: In the year's first ten months, the price of medical care—doctor's bills, hospital services and drugs—rose by 5%. In Boston, a hospital bed could cost \$85 a day, \$10 more than last year, and the price of dental care advanced from \$6 or \$7 per filling a year ago to \$9 to \$10 today. Even aspirins were up, from 89¢ to 94¢ per 100 tablets. A mouthwash named Binaca cost 29¢ when it was introduced by a Swiss company five years ago; it has since been taken over by a U.S. firm—and now sells for 79¢ in some places.

Entertainment: Movies were more expensive, up 25¢ per ticket in Manhattan's Radio City Music Hall. The cost of watching a Pittsburgh Steelers home game rose from \$6 to \$7—plus a 15¢ surcharge to help pay for a new building stadium, whose estimated price increased from \$32 million last spring to \$35 million at present. In the taverns of the steel city, the 15¢ beer could be found no more; it now costs 20¢.

THE EMERGENCY DETENTION PROVISIONS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am most pleased that the Committee on the Judiciary has ordered favorably reported S. 1872, a bill I introduced with 25 other Senators to repeal the emergency detention provision of the Internal Security Act of 1950. I am hopeful that floor consideration on this measure will take place in the near future.

I invite attention to an excellent letter I received from the American Civil Liberties Union in support of my fight to repeal the emergency detention provision. Their letter, I believe, clearly and concisely sets forth the need for the repeal of this law and I welcome their support. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this letter appear in the *Record* following my remarks.

As I have stated before, I believe that it is the responsibility of Congress to repeal this statute, and I believe that we should do so immediately. The repeal of the emergency detention provision will remove this threat to our liberty and freedoms.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, Washington, D.C.

HON. DANIEL INOUE,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR INOUE: The American Civil Liberties Union applauds your effort in leading the fight to repeal the Emergency Detention Act—Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. We thoroughly support you in this worthwhile effort and request that this organization be listed along with the many others in backing the various bills which have been introduced by you and many other Senators and Congressmen which would repeal this clearly unconstitutional and thoroughly abhorrent measure. Indeed, the opposition of the American Civil Liberties Union to the Internal Security Act and the Emergency Detention Act is an old one. We vigorously fought against their enactment in 1950, and have participated in challenges to the constitutionality of various parts of the Internal Security Act ever since. Our policy guide sets forth our position on the Emergency Detention Act as follows:

"The ACLU opposes, on basic civil liberties grounds of equality, free speech and association, and due process of law, the emergency detention provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. This law allows detention, during times of invasion or insurrection, of aliens whom the government feels to be politically 'suspect'."

If there is any way in which we can be of help in your valiant efforts towards eliminating the Emergency Detention Act from the statute books, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE SPEISER,
Director, Washington Office.

THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Washington Post of Sunday, December 14, contains an article by A. D. Horne on the Inter-American Development Bank. Mr. Horne has done a thorough job of highlighting the major problems which face the bank, including internal administrative troubles, the potential dangers in the U.S. veto power over bank loans, and the complexities of utilizing bank resources throughout the hemisphere in a balanced program of loan aid.

As long-time advocate of channeling our foreign aid through multilateral agencies such as the Inter-American Bank, I think Al Horne has done a singular job of showing us both the advantages and the potential problems we face as we move—as I think we must—toward greater utilization of such agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Horne's article be printed in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE INTER-AMERICAN BANK A CONTROVERSIAL SUCCESS

"The Inter-American Development Bank stands as an outstanding example of multilateral financial cooperation among the nations of the Americas." (President Nixon, message to bank's 1969 annual meeting.)

"The Inter-American Development Bank has made a major contribution, but technical rather than political consideration should be stressed in future loans." (The Rockefeller Report.)

"It's the peculiar nature of the animal: we provide the money and they control the bank." Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho), interview.)

(By A. D. Horne)

Even the initials are different: IDB in English; BID (for Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo) in Spanish.

The original impulse came from Latin Americans, in the early 1950s, and the Eisenhower administration resisted it until 1958, when Vice President returned from his fourth crisis in Lima and Caracas and told the President that something had to be done to mend U.S. relations with Latin America. One of the results was the Inter-American Development Bank.

Now, a decade and more than \$3 billion of loans later, it has outgrown its plush headquarters on 17th Street, a success in many ways, a focus of controversy in others. It has pioneered in funding types of projects the older World Bank thought too risky, but its loan procedures have been criticized as slipshod even by an independent consultant it hired. It has balanced carefully the needs of its small and large members, but it has been accused of both discrimination and logrolling.

It has provided the United States with a channel for development aid insulated at least in theory from direct political pressures, but Washington's role as chief stockholder and potential vetoer of low-interest loans has led to constant backstage maneuvering and occasional open confrontations with Latin members.

There are 22 members. Although the United States based on its subscription to the bank's ordinary capital, is allotted 42.25 per cent of the votes on the board of directors, a recent bank document put the actual U.S. contributions to all its resources at almost \$2.2 billion out of \$2.8 billion, or 76.9 per cent.



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