



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1971

No. 3

Senate

RELIEVING AFFLICTIONS OF CHILDREN

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, January 6, 1971, will long be remembered as a landmark in growth for children. On that date the Hormone Research Laboratory at the University of California, San Francisco, announced that Dr. Ch. H. Li had successfully synthesized for the first time the pituitary human growth hormone, or HGH.

The synthesis, one of the most complex achievements in protein chemistry, opens the way to a host of basic research in human growth and possibly improved treatment of cancer, heart disease, infections and other diseases. Among the first expected applications, will be in treatment of the 7,000 or more U.S. children born each year with deficient amounts of HGH, resulting in dwarfism.

Congressional efforts to maintain adequate levels of funding for health research are too often thought of merely in terms of interest group pressures, executive-legislative conflict, national priorities, and so forth. Such breakthroughs help remind us that our efforts in reviewing appropriations here can and do directly relieve the afflictions of children.

The adverse effect on that most valuable of human resources—our children—from inadequate funding of health research and post-graduate medical training was again brought home to me by these press reports and by recent testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Dr. Robert M. Blizzard, an eminent clinician, teacher, and researcher in growth problems of children spoke on the need for funds above those requested by the President for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases if we are to bring to fruition advances made recently in the fields of endocrine and metabolic disease.

Dr. Blizzard, Eudowood professor of pediatrics of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, represented Human Growth Foundation, an organization of parents and friends of children with growth disturbances; and the Endocrine Society of America. He estimated that some 100,000 children afflicted with problems of short stature could benefit from synthesis of human growth hormone and further study by trained investigators. Unfortunately, the synthetic hormone is suitable for only a very few of the many types of short stature. New research breakthroughs are still needed if we are to treat children afflicted by achondroplasia, dyastrophic dwarfism, and so forth.

In his testimony, Dr. Blizzard, a physician of international reputation in seeking solutions to growth problems of children, regretfully called the committee's attention to the "catastrophic situation"

in which these children—the constitutional slow growers, the dwarfs, the midgets, the obese and malnourished—will find themselves if we do not fully support these areas of research and training. I am very glad that the Congress added more than \$6 million to the President's recommendations for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases. I wish we could have done more.

Dr. Blizzard's testimony provides a clear and eloquent explanation of the problem of human growth, recent advances to assist dwarfed children, and what needs to be done. The January 7 Wall Street Journal carries an article describing the significance of the great breakthrough in pituitary research. I am certain that many of my colleagues will

be interested and I therefore ask unanimous consent that these statements be printed in the Record.

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

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT M. BLIZZARD

I appear before you as a professor of pediatrics, a teacher of specialists in growth problems, a researcher who has published over 80 scientific papers about normal and abnormal growth, and, most importantly, as a physician interested in relieving the afflictions of children.

The organizations or people which I represent, or from which I am representative, are (1) the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, (2) the Endocrine Society of the United States, (3) Human Growth, Inc., which is a foundation of parents and friends of children with growth disturbances, and (4) hundreds of thousands of the children and adults in this country who are afflicted with problems of growth; i.e., the dwarfs, the midgets, the constitutional slow growers, the obese, the diabetics, and the malnourished.

The assignment I have given myself today is to bring to your attention the catastrophic situation in which all of these people or organizations will soon find themselves, if the Bureau of the Budget, the House of Representatives, and the Senate do not continue to support certain areas of research and training to the extent previously supported.

My intent is to appeal to your good judgment and, consequently, to convince you of the essentiality of restoring funds in the budget that are needed for:

(1) Bringing to fruition the advances made recently to assist dwarfed individuals, such as those seated in the room;

(2) Bringing to fruition the advances made recently to solve the transplantation problem and closely related self-immunization and self-destruction (autoimmune) problems of thyroid deficiency, adrenal insufficiency, such as that suffered by former President J. F. Kennedy, pernicious anemia, gonadal failure, sexual impotence, and loss of body hair;

(3) Bringing to fruition the advances made recently in the fields of metabolic disease such as diabetes mellitus, cystic fibrosis, and hypoglycemia;

(4) Training the clinical investigators who can solve these and other basic problems. I feel particularly qualified to comment regarding these matters as I have spent the last 16 years of my life as an investigator and as a participant in pursuing these problems.

Simultaneously, I have been the teacher of over 20 clinical investigators who now are professors or assistant professors in many of your home States and who are spending 50 percent of their time as investigators helping to solve the medical problems alluded to, while spending the other 50 percent of their time teaching medical students, interns, or residents, while rendering superb clinical diagnostic, and therapeutic care to patients.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED TO BRING TO FRUITION THE ADVANCEMENTS MADE RECENTLY TO ASSIST DWARFED INDIVIDUALS, SUCH AS THOSE SITTING IN THIS ROOM

Funds from the National Institutes of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases have been used to isolate, chemically identify, and study the mechanism of action of human growth hormone. This hormone, which is necessary to promote normal growth in children is made by the pituitary gland which sits at the base of the brain.

Since native growth hormone made in animals was demonstrated in these studies not to be effective in humans, a program was established to collect donated human pituitaries at the time of death. From these pituitaries Dr. C. H. Li, professor of biochemistry at the University of California, Dr. A. Wilhelm, professor of biochemistry at Emory University of Atlanta, and Dr. Maurice Reben, professor of medicine at Tufts University in Boston, isolated the growth hormone.

This hormone has been given to several thousand children, such as Richard Battista, the 18-year-old man who sits before you, and who now is a 4½ feet tall. Just 6 years ago he was no taller than Mr. Wurt Butler, who is the 20-year-old less than 3-foot-tall man, who also sits before you. Mr. Battista and many other children receiving the hormone have been studied, and many of these are going

to reach an acceptable adult height when, before, this otherwise would not have been possible.

As a result of the investigation, therapy was possible and the total height of 2,000 children has increased by 1,800 feet or three times the height of the Washington Monument. However, there are too many children who require the hormone for even 10 percent or less of those who could benefit to receive it. We now believe there may be 100,000 children who could benefit if we had enough hormone to investigate its effect in other types of short stature.

We need to learn how to synthesize the hormone, or how to convert inactive animal growth hormone into active hormone for humans. This program requires further study by basic investigators and by clinical investigators who must evaluate the actions and toxicity of these preparations. Thousands of children are currently awaiting the results of these and similar studies so they can grow to an acceptable height. Gregory Smith, who is sitting before you, is one such child awaiting these advances. Gregory is 11½ years old but is the average height of an 8-year-old.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED TO BRING TO FRUITION THE ADVANCEMENTS MADE RECENTLY IN SOLVING THE TRANSPLANTATION AND RELATED PROBLEMS

The National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases has supervised the funds which you have allocated for study of these areas. A successful kidney transplant program and a successful dialysis (artificial kidney) program have been worked out. These programs are successful in maintaining life for a limited period of time for several thousand individuals. However, the successes are only partial. Recipients are susceptible to infection and to rejection of the transplants, and children do not grow in spite of transplant or the use of artificial kidneys.

Delineation of mechanisms of rejection will provide information regarding the etiology of self-immunization (autoimmunization) and self-destruction of the adrenal, thyroid, liver, or gonads in certain susceptible individuals. The mechanism of rejection of one's own "normal" organs in patients with hypothyroidism, Addison's disease, or pernicious anemia is apparently very similar to the rejection of a donor's kidney by a recipient. Basic studies in these areas must be pursued to restore normal life to millions of people who have, or will have, diseases that can be prevented.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE ACCOMPLISHED TO BRING TO FRUITION THE ADVANCEMENTS MADE RECENTLY IN THE FIELDS OF METABOLIC DISEASE SUCH AS DIABETES MELLITUS

Diabetes mellitus, or "sugar" diabetes, is now known to be at least of two types. Recent studies using funds appropriated by this committee have demonstrated that in one type there is apparent insulin resistance, and, in the other type, the body quite making insulin—possibly because the body destroys the insulin-producing cells in the pancreas. In this respect, this form of diabetes may be an autoimmune disease also.

Recent studies also have demonstrated and delineated various antagonists of insulin. Basic studies such as these will not only lead to information that will permit longer life for the millions of individuals who are, or will be afflicted with this disease but will lead to information that will prevent the blindness, the kidney failure, and the hardening of the arteries which incapacitates a majority of the diabetic patients after a few years.

Cystic fibrosis and hypoglycemia are two diseases where great strides have taken place in the past few years. In basic investigations the controlling factors of blood sugar have been delineated. Through understanding the mechanisms of sugar metabolism in the cell, various therapeutic agents directed specifically at the altered physiological sites can be developed. As a consequence of these studies, and current studies, one of the most significant causes of convulsions with resultant brain damage will be eliminated.

WHAT IS THE EVIDENCE THAT THESE GOALS ARE NOT GOING TO BE ATTAINED AT THE CURRENT LEVEL OF FUNDING FOR BASIC RESEARCH?

I have spoken today about the funds distributed by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases which is the institute that over the years has been charged

with supporting basic research in the endocrine and metabolic areas alluded to above. I have spoken about the responsibilities of this Institute because during the past 16 years I have been in a position to assist in achieving some of the goals outlined above and to know the investigators who have the capabilities to continue to solve the unsolved problems. I do not speak about this Institute because it and the investigators accountable to it are in the unique position of being discriminated against but because I do not know how the reduction in allocations has delayed and disrupted the attainment of the goals outlined above and other equally important goals.

In 1969 the actual appropriation was \$143,888 (in thousands) for all purposes. The 1970 estimate was \$137,588 and the 1971 estimate is \$132,152. For research grants the figures for these three periods are \$91,666, \$86,027, and \$85,874. These figures are at a time when inflation and salaries are increasing at the rate of 5 to 10 percent each per year. The consequence is that only 35 percent of approved grant applications can be funded in contrast to the 70 percent of approved grants funded a few years ago. In addition, and average of 15 percent is taken out of each grant that is funded to permit funding of 35 percent of the approved grants.

The catastrophe is that many of the investigators capable of solving the problems and bringing the work outlined above to fruition are not funded and are leaving the investigative field for administrative position. Those that remain are discouraged and are contemplating leaving the academic institutions where they work and teach. Since the majority of these investigators, such as myself, pursue research 50 percent of the time and teach medicine 50 percent of their time, and do so at a financial sacrifice, there will be little to keep them in the medical institutions as they no longer can do what they wish and that for which they are trained. This is catastrophic for the work which remains unfinished, for the medical schools who are left without their bright leaders and who will deny that such bright leaders are not essential to our medical schools if our prospective physicians are to be logical, scientific thinkers practicing medicine instead of tradesmen.

The catastrophe is also for those individuals who are dwarfed and will not grow, for those with diseases of autoimmunity or in need of transplants who will be helped, and for those with diabetes, hypoglycemia, or other metabolic disease who may succumb because the work has not progressed.

For these reasons, I and those whom I represent urge that the citizens proposed budget for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases be approved by this Senate subcommittee. It is urged that the citizens budget request for research grants of \$102,487 be approved. Other institutes may be comparably worthy, but this one I can speak about most authoritatively.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE AND WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO TRAIN RESEARCH SCIENTISTS AND CLINICAL INVESTIGATORS?

In the past few years there have been several separate training programs administered either through the National Institute of General Medical Sciences or through other institutes of the National Institutes of Health. This committee must be aware of the various types of training programs that have been in operation to evaluate the effect of proposals made by the Bureau of the Budget affecting these research training programs. There have been programs to train medical students, programs to train Ph. D. candidates, programs to train post-doctoral Ph. D.'s, and programs to train postdoctoral M.D.'s.

It is the latter about which I am best qualified to testify. The individuals entering these programs have been board qualified internists, surgeons, pediatricians, pathologists or specialists in some other field. These individuals accepted postdoctoral training fellowships in research at stipends of \$6,000 to \$10,000 per year because of their dedication to the science of medicine. They wished to pursue research and make their careers in the academic world where they could spend 30 to 70 percent of their time in basic or clinical investigation and the remainder of their time combining teaching and patient care.

Exemplary of the type of individuals trained are those trained in pediatric endocrinology in the department which Dr. Claude Migeon and I run. Each spends approximately 50 percent of his time pursuing the research problems outlined previously in the report and 50 percent of his time teaching medical students, interns or residents while rendering superb clinical diagnostic and therapeutic care to patients.

None of these individuals makes as much money in the academic field on a full-time salary as if he was in private practice as a pediatrician or internist. The internists and pediatricians who are our subspecialists in cardiology, neurology, endocrinology, et cetera, have all been through comparable programs.

It is paradoxical that our best trained researchers and teachers now should be expected to borrow money to take this specialized training for 2 to 4 years at the ages of 29 to 35 years. These individuals are willing to make the personal sacrifice of time—2 to 4 years—and money—a barely livable wage following 4 years of college,

4 years of medical school, a year of internship and 3 or 4 years of residency training. If these funds to train these postgraduate M.D.'s are exhausted or withdrawn, the effect will be catastrophic in several respects:

(1) The specialists in endocrinology, cardiology, and neurology will no longer be trained because they cannot afford to extend their indebtedness after college, medical school, internship, and residency;

(2) Medical schools will be without these teachers and scientists at a time when more comprehensive medical training is a necessity and when medical schools are expected to produce additional graduates;

(3) The clinical and basic investigators of the next academic generation who will be expected to solve the unsolved chemical, biological, and physiological health problems will not be available.

Our people cannot afford this catastrophe. Exemplary of the trend is the reduction of fellowships by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases from 459 in 1969 to 279 in 1971, and the reduction of training grants from 302 in 1969 to 252 in 1971. This committee is urged to increase the President's budget for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases by \$2.5 million for fellowship support and \$3.5 million for training grant support. This amount will permit continuation of training at the 1969 level.

In summary let me elaborate on a few salient points.

Approximately 50 percent of the grants that support the work that has benefited the children who have been helped have been cut out totally and completely. The other 50 percent of the grants have been cut back by as much as 20 and 25 percent.

These are the problems. I know the committee is aware of the problems. The Bureau of the Budget is critical and the House Appropriations Committee is critical, yet we feel that the Senate Appropriations Committee can bring to their attention and hopefully be the forerunner, the arrow, to keep abreast of the times and to keep in the budget those items which are so necessary to continue to have a standing stool. You were not here this morning but Dr. Isselbacher spoke about the three legs of the stool—medical education, research, and training—and if one cuts off one leg, the entire stool falls.

In relation to specific requests, because I am best acquainted with the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, I am coming with a specific request that the appropriation for the basic research for the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases be increased by \$17 million to the total figure of \$102 million which was supplied in the budget by Dr. Welt yesterday. This is the citizens' budget.

I come secondly to request that the training grant support which supports post graduate M.D.'s be increased from \$3.2 million to a total of \$18.5 million.

In the past 3 years the training grants from the NIAMD have been cut from 302 to 252. This is the portion of the appropriation which transposed graduate M.D.'s.

In the past 10 years I have trained 20 physicians, 20 teachers in the post graduate training program. These individuals now are professors around the country who spend 50 percent of their time doing research and 50 percent of their time doing medical education. These are the people who are going to drift out of the academic field unless such support is given. Unless support is maintained at the same level, we are not going to train similar teachers for the future.

The loan program is totally unrealistic for the position of graduate M.D.'s for the reasons that were reiterated this morning. These people could go out in practice and make \$30,000 or \$40,000 but they prefer to be associated with medical schools where they make \$20,000 or \$25,000 and they do this through sacrifice so they can do what they wish; that is, teach and do research. These individuals are not going to benefit by further training; that is to say, an additional 3 years training beyond the 12 years after high school. Therefore, they are not going to take loans. Therefore, our future teachers are not going to be supplied if we have to depend upon a loan type of program.

These are the requests. Thank you very much, sir.

I would like to thank the committee for their attention and their interest in these matters which must be of concern to all of us, whether we be scientist, lay person, Congressman, or Senator.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 7, 1971] HUMAN GROWTH HORMONE IS SYNTHESIZED FOR FIRST TIME BY CALIFORNIA SCIENTISTS

SAN FRANCISCO.—The Hormone Research Laboratory at the University of California, San Francisco, announced that two of its scientists have synthesized for the first time the pituitary human growth hormone, or HGH.

The synthesis, one of the most complex achievements in protein chemistry, opens the way to a host of basic studies of human growth and possibly improved treatment of cancer, heart disease, infections and other maladies, scientists here indicated.

The synthesis was made by C. H. Li, director of the laboratory, who first isolated and

purified HGH in 1956, and an assistant research biochemist, Donald H. Yamashiro.

Biochemist Li told a crowded news conference on the campus that the synthesized hormone currently amounts to only a few milligrams in his laboratory. But he added, "I believe once you show it can be done, it will be developed (through) large-scale production" in drug-industry laboratories.

Among the first applications, he indicated, would be in treatment of the 7,000 or more U.S. children born each year with deficient amounts of HGH, resulting in dwarfism. Some of them are treated successfully with a natural growth hormone obtained from cadavers, but this method has proven inadequate to supply the amounts needed, doctors indicated here. When asked whether pituitary dwarfism might soon disappear as a result of successful synthesis, Mr. Li said "yes."

CHANCELLOR HAILS "BREAKTHROUGH"

Philip R. Lee, chancellor of the San Francisco campus of the university, told newsmen that HGH synthesis was a "contribution of great significance" and "perhaps one of the most important breakthroughs" to come from the famed hormone laboratory here. Asked whether the research might bring a Nobel Prize to Mr. Li and his co-worker, he replied, "The Nobel Prize committee has to answer that question."

The pea-sized pituitary gland, located just below the brain, is called the body's master gland because its 10 known hormones control so many vital body functions, ranging from growth to reproduction and metabolism.

Mr. Li and others at the laboratory previously isolated and purified eight of the 10 hormones and determined the structure of seven, including HGH. But HGH synthesis required four more years after its structure was determined, "and we lost sleep very often," Mr. Li reported. The hormone is a protein containing 138 amino acids, each in a definite sequence like the words in a sentence. By contrast, previous breakthroughs in protein synthesis included that of ACTH, another pituitary hormone, which contains only 39 amino acid "words" and insulin, which contains 51.

The HGH synthesis marks a major advance in scientific efforts to make proteins from non-living chemicals. Proteins are the basic substance of all living matter and, chemically, are the most complex. They are the structural material for life, and for the enzymes and many of the hormones that carry out the thousands of chemical reactions that make life possible. Until now, the largest protein made in the laboratory has been an enzyme called ribonuclease, consisting of 124 amino acid building blocks. It was first synthesized two years ago by scientists at Rockefeller University, New York, and Merck & Co., Rahway, N.J.

The scientist said synthetic HGH hasn't been tested yet in humans but its chemical activity has been verified by other means. He added that the first sample is only about 10% as active in promoting growth as the natural hormone, indicating that some impurities crept into the material.

The university announcement said, "Using the new synthetic HGH, the answer may... be found as to why we grow to a certain height and then stop; what goes wrong with those who grew abnormally short or tall; why certain cells become runaway cancer cells; why some people maintain a normal weight and others are abnormally thin or fat; and many other heretofore unsolved questions."

It also noted that Mr. Li's research disclosed the HGH stimulates milk secretion by the mammary glands and promotes the activity of both male and female sex hormones.

HGH MAY AFFECT CHOLESTEROL

Mr. Li said animal studies indicate HGH may be far more important than previously suspected. He said it appears to play a role in lowering blood cholesterol, for example. Many studies have shown that the risk of heart attacks is far greater among men who have a high level of blood cholesterol, a fatty substance produced by the body and also linked to certain dietary fats such as butter. Thus, he suggested that synthetic HGH may help scientists understand the mechanisms by which cholesterol can be controlled.

The lab director also noted that, in animal studies, injection of HGH enhanced resistance to infection, promoted wound healing and helped repair bone fractures.

In animals with cancer, the growth hormone stimulates the spread of the disease, Mr. Li noted. The synthesizing of HGH opens the way to constructing a synthetic molecule that is "antagonistic" to growth and which "might be anticancer" in effect, he said.

Mr. Li was born in Canton, China, in 1913 and studied at the University of Nanking. In 1935 he came to Berkeley, where he obtained his Ph.D. He has remained on the University of California faculty since then. He still speaks in heavily accented English. In his spare time, he plays tennis, reads and catalogs stamps and coins.

In 1956, he and his co-workers made scientific history by isolating and purifying Adrenocorticotropin, known as ACTH, a key hormone that regulates salt and water retention in the body and helps produce 60 different hormones. The discovery led to successful synthesis and production of ACTH for treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and other diseases.



Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1971

No. 3

Senate

S. 5—INTRODUCTION OF THE FULL OPPORTUNITY AND NATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and for 21 other Senators from both parties a bill, entitled "The Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act."

Title I of the bill stems from S. 843 which I introduced almost 4 years ago and is identical to title I of S. 5 which was passed by the Senate on September 10, 1970. Title II was first offered as an amendment to the bill by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and was included as title II in the bill which the Senate passed last year.

Title I of the bill establishes full social opportunity as a national goal. The goal is more fully described in the bill as embracing such areas as educational and vocational opportunities, access to housing and health care, and provision of special assistance to the handicapped and other less fortunate members of society. It establishes institutions and procedures for advancing this broad social goal, including a new Council of Social Advisers in the Executive Office of the President, and a requirement for an annual social report to be submitted by the President to the Congress.

The bill is patterned generally after the Employment Act of 1946 which, for the first time, established as a national goal the achievement of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. To assist in achieving that goal, the Employment Act established the Council of Economic Advisers, provided for the annual Economic Report of the President, and established a Joint Economic Committee in the Congress.

It is my belief that this legislation will accomplish for the broad range of social policies what the Employment Act has done so well in the economic sector. By declaring a new national objective and increasing the quantity, quality, and visibility of information needed to pursue that objective, we should markedly advance our prospects for effective social action.

Mr. President, by now we have had a series of studies by prestigious commissions which have told us about the gap which remains in our society between the promise of full opportunity and the realities of deprivation, powerlessness, and poor fortune into which millions of our citizens are born.

The increasing affluence of great segments of our society has merely sharpened the division between them and those who have not yet benefited from the phenomenal growth in our economy, and in our technological and scientific base, and in our educational systems. As a result, the demands of the deprived for their fair share in the benefits of our society and the responsiveness of our political institutions have both increased dramatically. At the same time, however, we have also become acutely aware of the fundamental inadequacy of the information upon which social policies and programs are based.

Because of our information gaps, national problems go nearly unnoticed until they suddenly are forced upon us by some significant development. Thus, we learn of widespread hunger in America, of the rapid deterioration of our environment, of dangerous tensions and unrest in our great urban centers, of the shocking conditions under which migrant farmworkers live, and of the absence of decent medical care for tens of millions of our citizens. We desperately need ways to monitor our social health and to identify such problems before they destroy our society.

Another tremendously expensive consequence of our lack of adequate information is that we devise and operate programs based on myth and ignorance. The

Congress has been groping with the problem of welfare reform, but it is painfully evident that we lack some of the basic information which we need in order to design a system in which we could all have confidence. Similar problems are presented with respect to urban renewal, mass transportation, air and water pollution, and health delivery systems.

Finally, after years of experimenting with such techniques as program planning and evaluation systems, we are still quite ill equipped to measure what our existing programs do accomplish. And we have no adequate means to compare the costs and effectiveness of alternative programs. A council of social advisers, dedicated to developing indicators of our social problems and progress, could well be a source of enormous savings to the taxpayer as well as of more effective solutions to the problems we face. Such a council, taking full advantage of new developments in planning programming and budgeting systems, in computerized data collection and statistical methodology, in systems analysis and social accounting, could unlock the enormous potential of the social sciences to assist the Congress and the Executive in developing and administering public policy.

A council of social advisers would not, itself, be a new decisionmaking forum. Rather, as a social monitoring, data gathering, and program evaluation agency, it would provide the new domestic council with much of the information which that body will need to make its policy and program recommendations to the President. The domestic council will have available to it the broad range of economic information now furnished by the Council of Economic Advisers. The council of social advisers would fill a significant gap in the information system which is needed to buttress the policymaking apparatus established last year under the President's reorganization authority.

While title I of the bill, with its new council of social advisers and its new social report, should greatly augment the capacity of the Congress to make intelligent policy decisions, title II of the bill is even more significant with respect to strengthening the Congress.

I was delighted to cosponsor the amendment to the bill which was offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) last year to create a new congressional staff office of goals and priorities analysis.

This office would be an arm of the Congress serving it in its examination of budget proposals, program costs and effectiveness, appropriations, and national priorities.

The appropriations process is the mechanism through which the Congress seeks to reflect its views on budgetary priorities. But there remains a great need to equip Congress with the kind of manpower, data and technology that would furnish it with the information necessary if it is to fully examine and evaluate appropriations measures with regard to the relative needs of the Nation. The office would not supplant the efforts of the Appropriations Committees to determine the Nation's expenditures. Rather, it would further explain, coordinate and compare the various budgetary proposals so as to provide the overview so necessary to responsible fiscal planning. The program information it would collect and interpret would be made available to other committees and individual Members of Congress.

These services should, in concert with the other work of the office, serve to im-

prove the legislative process. Too often, congressional procedures result in each appropriation's being considered in a piecemeal fashion.

In committees, on the floor, and in conference—over a period of months—the Government's spending priorities take shape. Yet this is done in virtual ignorance of total alternative budgets by which other priorities might be expressed. Revisions and amendments are made, often on the floor of the Senate, each of which affects a vast range of alternatives.

Yet these alternatives are seldom really identified. An appropriation increase, for example, may be offered with excellent justification, but with no clear idea of what other equally worthwhile projects are precluded by this additional expenditure.

Currently, the Congress has only one complete, coherent budget with which to work—that submitted by the President. There is no reason, of course, why the Congress should accept this budget, item by item. The new Office would, in providing Congress with hard cost-benefits and sound, need-projection data, improve the chances that the inevitable deletions, additions, and other revisions of the budget would occur as a result of informed and considered analysis of the merits of each budget proposal, and of how all spending decisions influence, and are influenced by, the condition of the total economy.

The Congress needs its own office to provide this kind of ongoing analysis and to generate comprehensive budget alternatives which could be examined in a totality. The executive branch is quite well equipped to function in such matters. With the Domestic Council and the Office of Management and Budget, and with the extensive facilities of the National Security Council, the Council of Environmental Quality, the Council of Economic Advisers and with a new Council of Social Advisers, the White House is formidably equipped to present a given budget and make its case.

Meanwhile, the Congress—coequal in policymaking, and supposedly preeminent in the control over spending—has far too little resources, even in its Appropriations Committees, and has no established mechanism to help individual Senate or congressional staffs examine the policy and program evaluations reflected in the budget. The President said, when announcing his proposal to establish the Domestic Council and the Office of Management and Budget:

A President whose programs are carefully coordinated, whose information system keeps him adequately informed and whose organizational assignments are plainly set out, can delegate authority with security and confidence.

Certainly the Congress, the branch of Government which shares with the executive the responsibility to determine national priorities and delegate authority, should be so organized and informed. Such an office in the Congress could do much to restore the growing erosion of congressional power and give substance to the admittedly ill-defined contentions about national priorities, peace and growth dividends, and fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, I have now served in the Senate for over 6 years. Along with many of my colleagues, I spend most of my time dealing with the human problems with which the average American is confronted.

I never cease to be amazed by the abundance of evidence about how little we seem to know at the Federal level about what is really going on.

As one person observed, we have a natural strategy of suboptimization at the Federal level where we do better and better at little things and worse and worse

at big things

Thus, something as elementary as good nutrition, something as essential to a sound body and a sound mind—adequate and decent nutrition—was something about which the Federal Government was almost totally ignorant in 1967. We knew how many soybeans were grown. We knew how much money was being spent on the direct commodity distribution program, the food program, and so on. But no one had the slightest idea whether there was widespread hunger, and if there was, where it was to be found and why, what the cost of feeding the hungry was, what the cost of not feeding them was, or any of the other fundamental questions directly related to the issue of the most basic necessity of American life itself. The same thing was true with decent housing.

In 1967, even though we should have been warned earlier, the major American cities began to explode in our faces. Newark, Detroit, and one community after another literally blew up in an astonishing and cataclysmic explosion causing the widespread loss of human life, and human injury, and millions and millions of dollars in property damage, and an emotional and cultural shock to Americans which we are still in the throes of. None of this was anticipated by the Government.

When hearings were started, this Nation was thrashing around; Congress and the Senate were thrashing around; members of the Cabinet and leading members of the executive branch were thrashing around, all trying to find out what was causing such a fundamental occurrence as this outrageous, heart-breaking phenomenon in American life.

We could go on from this example to other examples. In the Federal system we lack an institution which takes not a tactical approach but a strategic approach to human problems which this society faces. We need to chart the social health of this country and seek to go forward; not, as John Gardner said, stumbling into the future, but trying to come up with the analysis, facts, and figures, and, as someone said, the "hot data" to help us understand our society and what we must do to make it more effective than it is in meeting this Nation's human problems.

One of our most impressive witnesses was Mr. Joseph Califano who formerly served as adviser on domestic programs to President Johnson. More than any other man he was in the Nation's "hot seat" trying to develop a program to advise the highest official in the land on domestic programs.

He recounted several instances of the phenomena to which I have made reference. For example, on one occasion, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was in conference with Mr. Califano. He was asked how many people were on welfare, who they were, and all the rest. Since we are spending several billions of dollars, one would have thought that information would be immediately at hand. The Secretary thought the information would be available to him as soon as he returned to his office and that he would send it right back. As a matter of fact, it took HEW a year and a half to find out who was on welfare. Mr. Califano said this was a common experience with basic and fundamental human problems, to find that not even the President would have available to him the basic data necessary to make the choices upon which our very civilization depends.

He commented in this way about the issue of hunger:

The even more shocking element to me is that no one in the federal government in 1965 knew how many people were hungry, where they were located geographically, and who they were. No one knew whether they were children, elderly Americans, pregnant mothers, black, white, or Indian.

Unless something of which I am unaware has been done recently, I believe we still do not know where hunger in America is with the kind of precision that is essential for an effective program to feed all the hungry among us.

Then Mr. Califano concluded with this statement:

The disturbing truth is that the basis of recommendations by an American Cabinet officer on whether to begin, eliminate, or expand vast social programs more nearly resembles the intuitive judgment of a benevolent tribal chief in remote Africa than the elaborate sophisticated data with which the

Secretary of Defense supports a major new weapons system. When one recognizes how many and how costly are the honest mistakes which have been made in the Defense Department, despite its sophisticated information systems, it becomes frightening to think of the mistakes which might be made on the domestic side of our Government because of lack of adequate data.

Since this bill was first proposed, it has attracted strong support from a broad spectrum of leading public figures in the Nation. Among them have been two former Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare—John Gardner and Wilbur Cohen. Significantly, two principal officials in the Johnson administration, who had opposed the bill in 1967 as premature, have now joined in its support. These are Charles Zwick, former Budget Director and Joseph A. Califano, Jr., former Special Assistant to President Johnson. Former Secretary of the Treasury, Joseph Barr, has also testified in favor of the bill.

Two prominent study groups have also made recommendations along the lines of the bill. In October 1969, the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee of the National Academy of Sciences and the Social Science Research Council recommended the investment of substantial Federal funds in developing social indicators. It also proposed the preparation of an annual social report, initially outside the Government, and the eventual establishment of a Council of Social Advisers, as a Government agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the summary and major recommendations of this committee report be printed in the Record.

In December 1969, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, issued its final report. I was pleased to note that among its recommendations were proposals for the development of social indicators and for the establishment of a counterpart to the Council of Economic Advisers to produce an annual social report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the Commission's report and the text of the proposed Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other matters will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 5) to promote the public welfare, introduced by Mr. MONDALE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 5

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act."

TITLE I—FULL OPPORTUNITY

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 101. In order to promote the general welfare, the Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government, consistent with the primary responsibilities of State and local governments and the private sector, to promote and encourage such conditions as will give every American the opportunity to live in decency and dignity, and to provide a clear and precise picture of whether such conditions are promoted and encouraged in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal, and by measuring progress in meeting such needs.

SOCIAL REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 102. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than February 15 of each year a report to be known as the social report, setting forth (1) the overall progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to carry out the policy declared in section 101 with particular emphasis upon the manner in which such efforts serve to meet national social needs in such areas as health, education and training, rehabilitation, housing, vocational opportunities, the arts and humanities, and special assistance for the mentally ill and retarded, the deprived, the abandoned, and the criminal; (2) a review of State, local, and private efforts designed to create the conditions specified in section 101; (3) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by such efforts and the progress

of development of plans to meet such needs; and (4) programs and policies for carrying out the policy declared in section 101, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress reports supplementary to the social report, each of which shall include such supplementary or revised recommendations as he may deem necessary or desirable to achieve the policy declared in section 101.

(c) The social report, and all supplementary reports transmitted under subsection (b) of this section, shall, when transmitted to Congress, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committees on Education and Labor and Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the consideration of the report by any other committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of any such committee.

COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT

SEC. 103. (a) There is created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Social Advisers (hereinafter called the Council). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 101, and to formulate and recommend programs to carry out such policy. Each member of the Council, other than the Chairman, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule by section 5315 of title 5 of the United States Code. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of such schedule.

(b) The Chairman of the Council is authorized to employ, and fix the compensation of, such specialists and other experts as may be necessary for the carrying out of its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, and is authorized subject to such provisions, to employ such other officers and employees as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of such chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53.

(c) It shall be the duty and function of the Council—

(1) to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the social report;

(2) to gather timely and authoritative information and statistical data concerning developments and programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 101, both current and prospective, and to develop a series of social indicators to analyze and interpret such information and data in the light of the policy declared in section 101 and to compile and submit to the President studies relating to such developments and programs;

(3) to appraise the various programs and activities of the Federal Government in the light of the policy declared in section 101 of this Act for the purpose of determining the extent to which such programs and activities contribute to the achievement of such policy, and to make recommendations to the President with respect thereto;

(4) to develop priorities for programs designed to carry out the policy declared in section 101 and recommend to the President the most efficient way to allocate Federal resources and the level of government—Federal, State, or local—best suited to carry out such programs;

(5) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to programs, activities, and legislation to carry out the policy declared in section 101 as the President may request.

(6) to make and furnish such studies, reports thereon, and recommendations with respect to programs, activities, and legislation as the President may request in appraising long-range aspects of social policy and programing consistent with the policy declared in section 101.

(d) Recognizing the predominance of State and local governments in the social area, the President shall, when appropriate, provide for the dissemination to such States and localities of information or data developed by the Council pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

(e) The Council shall make an annual report to the President in January of each year.

(f) In exercising its powers, functions, and duties under this Act—

(1) the Council may constitute such advisory committee and may consult with such representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumers, State and local governments, and other groups, organizations, and individuals as it deems advisable to insure the direct participation in the Council's planning of such interested parties;

(2) the Council shall, to the fullest extent possible, use the services, facilities, and information (including statistical information) of Federal, State, and local government agencies as well as of private research agencies, in order that duplication of effort and expense may be avoided;

(3) the Council, to the fullest extent possible, insure that the individual's right to privacy is not infringed by its activities; and

(4) (A) the Council may enter into essential contractual relationships with educational institutions, private research organizations, and other organizations as needed; and

(B) any reports, studies, or analyses resulting from such contractual relationships shall be made available to any person for purposes of study.

(g) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary. For the salaries of the members and salaries of officers and employees of the Council, there is authorized to be appropriated not exceeding \$900,000 in the aggregate for each fiscal year.

TITLE II—NATIONAL GOALS AND PRIORITIES

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. The Congress finds and declare that there is a need for a more explicit and rational formulation of national goals and priorities, and that the Congress needs more detailed and current budget data and economic analysis in order to make informed priority decisions among alternative programs and courses of action. In order to meet these needs and establish a framework of national priorities within which individual decisions can be made in a consistent and considered manner, and to stimulate an informed awareness and discussion of national priorities, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress to establish an office within the Congress which will conduct a continuing analysis of national goals and priorities and will provide the Congress with the information, data, and analysis necessary for enlightened priority decisions.

ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 202. (a) There is established an Office of Goals and Priorities Analysis (hereafter referred to as the "Office") which shall be within the Congress.

(b) There shall be in the Office a Director of Goals and Priorities Analysis (hereafter referred to as the "Director") and an Assistant Director of Goals and Priorities Analysis (hereafter referred to as the "Assistant Director"), each of whom shall be appointed jointly by the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and confirmed by a majority vote of each House. The Office shall be under the control and supervision of the Director, and shall have a seal adopted by him. The Assistant Director shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Director, and, during the absence or incapacity of the Director, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as the Director. The Director shall designate an employee of the Office to act as Director during the absence or incapacity of the Director and the Assistant Director, or during a vacancy in both of such offices.

(c) The annual compensation of the Director shall be equal to the annual compensation of the Comptroller General of the United States. The annual compensation of the Assistant Director shall be equal to that of the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

(d) The terms of office of the Director and the Assistant Director first appointed shall expire on January 31, 1973. The terms of office of Directors and Assistant Directors subsequently appointed shall expire on January 31 every four years thereafter. Except in the case of his removal under the provisions of subsection (e), a Director or Assistant Director may serve until his successor is appointed.

(e) The Director or Assistant Director may be removed at any time by a resolution of the Senate or the House of Representatives. A vacancy occurring during the term of the Director or Assistant Director shall be filled by appointment, as provided in this section.

(f) The professional staff members, including the Director and Assistant Director, shall be persons selected without regard to political affiliations who, as a result of training, experience, and attainments, are exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret public policies and programs.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 203. (a) The Office shall make such studies as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of section 201. Primary emphasis shall be given to supplying such analysis as will be most useful to the Congress in voting on the measures and appropriations which come before it, and on providing the framework and overview of priority considerations within which a meaningful consideration of individual measures can be undertaken.

(b) The Office shall submit to the Congress on March 1 of each year a national goals and priorities report and copies of such report shall be furnished to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Joint Economic

Committee, and other interested committees. The report shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) an analysis, in terms of national goals and priorities, of the programs in the annual budget submitted by the President, the Economic Report of the President, and the Social Report of the President;

(2) an examination of resources available to the Nation, the foreseeable costs and expected benefits of existing and proposed Federal programs, and the resource and cost implications of alternative sets of national priorities; and

(3) recommendations concerning spending priorities among Federal programs and courses of action, including the identification of those programs and courses of action which should be given greatest priority and those which could more properly be deferred.

(c) In addition to the national goals and priorities report and other reports and studies which the Office submits to the Congress, the Office shall provide upon request to any Member of the Congress further information, data, or analysis relevant to an informed determination of national goals and priorities.

POWERS OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 204. (a) In the performance of its functions under this title, the Office is authorized—

(1) to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations governing the manner of the operations of the Office;

(2) to employ and fix the compensation of such employees, and purchase or otherwise acquire such furniture, office equipment, books, stationery, and other supplies, as may be necessary for the proper performance of the duties of the Office and as may be appropriated for by the Congress;

(3) to obtain the services of experts and consultants, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; and

(4) to use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(b) (1) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish to the Office, upon request made by the Director, such information as the Director considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Office.

(2) The Comptroller General of the United States shall furnish to the Director copies of analyses of expenditures prepared by the General Accounting Office with respect to any department or agency in the executive branch.

(3) The Office of Management and Budget shall furnish to the Director copies of special analytic studies, program and financial plans, and such other reports of a similar nature as may be required under the planning-programming-budgeting system, or any other law.

(c) Section 2107 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the "and" at the end of paragraph (7);

(2) striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) the Director, Assistant Director, and employees of the Office of Goals and Priorities Analysis."

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 205. The Joint Economic Committee of the Congress shall hold hearings on the national goals and priorities report and on such other reports and duties of the Office as it deems advisable.

PAYMENT OF EXPENSES

SEC. 206. All expenses and salaries of the Office shall be paid by the Secretary of the Senate from funds appropriated for the Office upon vouchers signed by the Director, or in the event of a vacancy in that office, the Acting Director.

The material, presented by Mr. MONDALE, is as follows:

SUMMARY AND MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

We are living in social crisis. There have been riots in our cities and in our universities. An unwanted war defies efforts to end it. Population expansion threatens to overwhelm our social institutions. Our advanced technology can destroy natural beauty and pollute the environment if we do not control its development and thus its effects. Even while scientific progress in biology and medicine helps to relieve pain and prolong life, it raises new problems relating to organ transplants, drugs that alter behavior, and the voluntary control of genetic inheritance.

At the root of many of these crises are preplexing problems of human behavior and relationships. The behavioral and social sciences devoted to studying these problems, can help us survive current crises and avoid them in the future, provided that these sciences continue to make contributions of two kinds: first, in increased depth of understanding of human behavior and the institutions of society; and, second, in better ways to use this understanding in devising social policy and the management of our affairs. Recommendations for achieving such

growth are the central concern of this survey and this report.

Social problems are most visible during crisis, but they persist even in relatively calm times, for the human needs that underlie them are continuous. Our concerns must include health and access to medical care, raising children to become effective and satisfied adults. We want a society that provides educational services in classrooms, museums, libraries, and the mass media, and that offers abundant opportunity for satisfying and productive work without fear of unemployment. People need pleasant, livable housing, efficient and economical means of transportation, and opportunities for esthetic outlets and the appreciation of nature. The social order must provide safety for citizens and freedom of movement without fear of attack or molestation. It must encourage individuality and cultural diversity, while reducing intergroup tensions; and it must progress toward international understanding and the elimination of war as an instrument of national policy.

These are large issues, involving values and goals as well as means. The job of the social scientist is clear. He can keep track of what is happening, work at understanding the sources of conflict and resistance to change, and try to determine both the intended and unintended consequences of problem-solving actions. Through the development of general scientific principles and the analysis of specific instances, social scientists seek to illuminate the ways in which the society is working.

This survey was undertaken to explain the behavioral and social sciences and to explore some of the ways these sciences could be developed and supported so that their potential usefulness to society can be realized. The survey is directed to two tasks: first, to assess the nature of the behavioral and social science enterprise in terms of its past growth, present size, and anticipated development; and second, to suggest ways in which these sciences might contribute both to basic understanding of human behavior and to effective social planning and policy-making.

THE SCOPE OF THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

This survey embraces nine behavioral and social science disciplines: anthropology, economics, geography, history, linguistics, political science, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology. It also takes into account the social science aspects of statistics, mathematics and computation. The survey recognizes the contributions to behavioral and social science by professionals in business, education, law, public health, medicine, and social work, although it does not cover these fields in detail. The importance of collaborative work in solving social problems emphasizes the links between these sciences and engineering, architecture, and the biological and physical sciences.

The behavioral and social sciences have shared in the rapid expansion of knowledge common to all fields of scholarship over the last decade and have attracted an increasing number of trained workers (Figure SR-1). Increasing proportions of bachelor's and master's degrees were granted in these fields between 1957 and 1967, and the trend will probably continue. The relative proportion of doctorates may decline slightly, not because of a slowing down in their production but because of very rapid increases in other fields, notably in engineering. Ironically, despite the increase in the number of degrees granted (Figure SR-2) [Not printed in the Record], the social sciences face manpower shortages because of the upsurge of interest in them.

FIGURE SR-1.—Degree production in the behavioral and social sciences as percentages of degree production in all fields

[In percent]

Bachelor's:	
1957	14
1967	21
1977 ¹	31
Master's:	
1957	9
1967	12
1977 ¹	15
Doctorates:	
1957	19
1967	19
1977 ¹	27

¹ Projected.

Source: Tables 9-1, 9-3, 9-5.

Behavioral and social scientists are more inclined to pursue academic careers than are many other scientists, although a trend toward greater nonacademic employment is apparent. Approximately half of all professional behavioral and social scientists work in universities or four-year colleges. Many others work in other educational settings, such as junior colleges and secondary schools, and in public-school administration. The rest are employed in government, hospitals, research centers, and industry; economists and psychologists find more employment outside universities than do others.

SCIENCES OF BEHAVIOR AND THE PROBLEMS OF SOCIETY

All sciences make some distinctions between basic research, applied research, and the development of products, processes, or services based on research. The history of science shows that the relationship between basic and applied science is complex, with basic research sometimes lagging behind and

sometimes leading applied research. But the scientific method can be applied to problems of a practical nature, whether or not the applications can be derived from the basic science of the time.

The third category of scientific activity—development—is more difficult to define for the behavioral and social sciences. The result of development in the physical sciences or in engineering is usually a tangible product, such as a color television set or a space capsule, and it is relatively simple to determine developmental costs. Although there are some tangible products of behavioral and social science, such as computerized instructional systems, many useful ones are services or processes in the public domain, such as a parole system, a new form of welfare payments, or a form of psychotherapy.

If the usefulness of social-problem-relevant research is to grow, the scale of social science research will have to expand, because many problems can be studied only on a national or international level. As this scale increases, the basic sciences of human behavior should benefit, much as the natural sciences have benefited from increases in the scale of their own research.

The Committee has considered several steps to strengthen the behavioral and social sciences, both as sciences and as contributors to public policy.

One step is to develop improved social indicators: measures that reflect the quality of life, particularly in its noneconomic aspects. Some data for constructing social indicators now exist. We have data on educational opportunities, adequacy of housing, infant mortality, and other statistics bearing on health, highway accidents and deaths, violent crimes, civil disorders, reflections of cultural interests (library use, museum and theater attendance), and recreational activities. We now need a major effort to find indicators that can accurately reflect trends for the nation as a whole as well as differences among regional, sex, age, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups. Most social changes are gradual. A sensitive social indicator should tell us whether, in the area to which it pertains, things are getting better or worse, and to what degree.

Social indicators should help us measure the effects of social innovations and changes in social policy as well as assess their unintended by-products. New methods of construction as well as changes in building codes could be reflected in changes in indicators of the quality of housing. Broad programs for increasing highway safety might affect accident indicators and also the consumption of alcohol under certain circumstances.

Indicators that measure our economic state are in use, but they are not precisely analogous to the social indicators we are proposing. Economic values can be expressed in dollars, and economic indicators can be aggregated to produce a single economic unit, such as the gross national product (GNP). There is no corresponding unit of value by which to measure the quality of life. This is not an obstacle to the development and use of separate quantitative indicators, each of which measures some aspect of the quality of life, even though it may not be possible to combine them into a single number.

The development of a useful system of social indicators is not simply a matter of measuring many aspects of society. The central problem is to decide which among many measurable attributes most truly represent the fundamental characteristics with which we are concerned. Thus, progress toward valid indicators will depend largely on the understanding we obtain from research into the basic structure and processes of our society. Conceptual and theoretical work at the highest level is necessary if we are to interpret the changes taking place.

To expedite the development and use of a system of social indicators, we offer the following recommendation:

Recommendation: Social Indicators—The Committee recommends that substantial support, both financial and intellectual, be given to efforts under way to develop a system of social indicators and that legislation to encourage and assist this development be enacted by Congress.

We believe that the resources of the federal government will have to be called upon to develop successful indicators. The estimated annual cost of running an organization to carry on developmental work is \$1.5 million. Access by such an organization to data routinely collected by federal agencies would facilitate its work. Because the effort would be in the national interest, we suggest that the task of developing social indicators be undertaken directly by the government; in Chapter 6 we discuss several alternatives for locating an indicator agency within the federal system.

If social indicators are to be useful to society, they will have to be interpreted and then considered in conjunction with the making of social policy. Just as the annual Economic Report of the President interprets economic indicators, an annual social report should eventually be produced that will call attention to the significance of changes in social indicators.

Because of the particular problems involved in developing sound, workable social indicators, we are hesitant to urge an official

social report now. We favor, instead, a privately sponsored report during the next few years, perhaps through the initiative of either the National Research Council or the Social Science Research Council, or through a joint effort of the two.

If such an annual social report proves substantial after reasonable experimentation, it might then become a government responsibility like the annual economic and manpower reports now made for the President. This approach is also discussed in Chapter 6, where we offer the following recommendation.

Recommendation: A privately developed annual social report—The Committee recommends that behavioral and social scientists outside the government begin to prepare the equivalent of an "Annual Social Report to the Nation," to identify and expedite work toward the solution of problems connected with the eventual preparation of such a report on an official basis. Support for this endeavor should come from private foundations as well as from federal sources.

A natural next step would be to establish a council of social advisers to consider the policy implications of the report. We do not recommend the establishment of such a council until the annual social report shows that social indicators do indeed signal meaningful changes in the quality of life.

For the present, we urge full participation of behavioral and social scientists in the Office of Science and Technology and in the President's Science Advisory Committee, as well as in the numerous advisory bodies attached to administrative agencies and the Office of the President (see Chapter 5).

Behind the development of social indicators and an annual report lie some basic steps: to gather better social data and to store it in usable form, with the necessary safeguards against invasion of privacy. Fortunately, we have the experience of the Decennial Census and the Current Population Survey, without which a great deal of social science, particularly demography could not have been developed. There are also many sample surveys that deal with employment and other economic factors and statistical reports on agriculture, health, and other aspects of life.

Even in a non-Census year, the federal government spends more than \$118 million on statistical programs. Data are scattered through government agencies in many forms, and suggestions for centralizing those data in some form of national data system have been made several times. We see many problems in such plans and therefore recommend that the President appoint a special commission with a full-time professional staff and a broad-based advisory committee to make a detailed study with recommendations. Suggestions should come from data-collection agencies of government, from representatives of the various behavioral and social sciences, from computer specialists, and from the public.

Further specification of the task of the proposed commission is given in Chapter 7. We summarize our position in a recommendation:

Recommendation: A national data system—The Committee recommends that a special commission be established to investigate in detail the procedural and technical problems involved in devising a national data system designed for social scientific purposes; that it recommend solutions for these problems and propose methods for managing a system that will make data maximally useful, while protecting the anonymity of individuals.

Protecting respondents' anonymity is very important and may prove to be among the most difficult problems to be dealt with. We propose, therefore, that it be faced in advance of the report that the special commission on a national data system may issue, and that some method be found for continuing to monitor the data systems as new methods of data storage and retrieval are created. The benefits of having policy guided by accurate information about the welfare and quality of life of the citizen can be very great, but it would be a sad consequence if, in the process of obtaining this information, the availability of data about individuals became a limitation on their freedom. To this end we offer the following recommendation.

Recommendation: Protection of anonymity—The Committee recommends the establishment within an appropriate agency of the federal government, or as an inter-agency commission, of a high-level continuing body, including nongovernmental members, to investigate the problems of protecting the anonymity of respondents, to prescribe actions to resolve the problems, and to review the dangers that may arise as new techniques of data-matching are developed.

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH IN UNIVERSITIES

In PhD-granting universities, research in the behavioral and social sciences is conducted in departments of colleges or arts and sciences, in professional schools, and in institutes and research centers that exist outside the departments. Research funds are almost equally divided among these three administrative units, although departments employ more behavioral scientists because they have teaching responsibilities as well as research assignments (see Figure SR-3).

FIGURE SR-3.—Distribution of behavioral and social science research funds and research personnel among departments, institutes, and professional schools, Ph. D.-granting universities, fiscal year 1967

[In percent]

ALLOCATION OF ORGANIZED RESEARCH FUNDS, FISCAL YEAR 1965, \$225,556,000

Departments	34
Institutes ¹	35
Professional schools	31

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS ON UNIVERSITY STAFFS, N=18,498

Departments	71
Institutes ²	10
Professional schools	19

¹ Multiple-discipline institutes account for 80% of the total institute research expenditures.

² Multiple-discipline institutes account for 75% of full-time research personnel within all institutes.

Source: Questionnaire survey.

Doctorate-granting departments are usually heavily committed to research, whereas professional schools are more variable in the extent to which they foster organized research in the behavioral and social sciences. Many schools of business, education, and medicine have fairly well established traditions of research relating to the behavioral and social sciences. Schools of law and schools of social work, however, give less attention to organized research in these sciences. Neither of these has anything like the behavioral and social science research expenditure per school that is found in schools of business, education, or medicine.

Law schools have not had sufficient access to research funds, their faculties have had little free time for research, and they have not developed a pattern of employing research technicians as schools of business, education, and medicine have. A growing number of law schools desire to change this state of affairs and to introduce more social science research; in Chapter 11 we offer a recommendation for inducements to aid them in doing so.

University institutes devoted wholly or in part to behavioral science research have proliferated for a number of reasons, including administrative convenience, exploration of interdisciplinary work, and concentration on research on social problems. Approximately a fourth of the scientists working in institutes and a fifth of the research money are in institutes representing only one discipline. The rest of the personnel and funds are in interdisciplinary institutes. Approximately one fifth of all institutes are oriented toward research contributing to the solution of social problems, as in the many urban institutes that have recently been formed in universities.

Despite the variety of administrative arrangements discussed above, universities are still often handicapped when trying to do fully satisfactory research into social problems.

Disciplinary departments in universities, which grant most of the PhD degrees, are often better suited to basic research than to applied research. Their faculties sometimes cooperate with other departments and institutes on research, but such work usually lacks the continuity and staffing necessary for applied research. Furthermore, disciplinary values tend to favor research oriented toward problems of particular disciplines. Departments try to achieve a balance between specializations in the disciplines, which, while admirable in itself, presents problems in organization of large task forces to study significant social problems.

Institutes usually have limited full-time staffs and rely heavily on part-time workers from the disciplines. Consequently, they have little control over the education of most of their workers. The result is that much of their research leads back to disciplinary interests because that is where professional advancement lies. Moreover, the availability of research funds for institutes is unstable by nature, and the level and character of research fluctuates according to the money available.

Professional schools are concerned with particular kinds of applied research related to their professional foci; thus many general social problems tend to lie outside the sphere of any single school.

Professional schools also have the mixed blessing of a close relationship with client systems (such as hospitals, businesses, courts, or legislatures). This linkage is helpful in directing research to significant problems, but it also tends to limit the research to the interests of its clients. Further, research goals must compete with the primary task of training a body of professional workers. Often research suffers.

In view of these limitations, we believe a new university organization should be created for training and research on social problems. To clarify the essential elements of this organization, we have proposed a new school, which we call a Graduate School of Applied Behavioral Science.

Recommendation: A graduate school of applied behavioral science—The Committee recommends that universities consider the

establishment of broadly based training and research programs in the form of a Graduate School of Applied Behavioral Science (or some local equivalent) under administrative arrangements that lie outside the established disciplines. Such training and research should be multi-disciplinary (going beyond the behavioral and social sciences as necessary), and the school should accept responsibility for contributing through its research both to a basic understanding of human relationships and behavior and to the solution of persistent social problems.

Such a recommendation should, of course, be adapted to local situations. However, such a school should be of scientific stature commensurate with that of the best medical and engineering schools. It should have a core faculty with tenure, like any professional school, and it should not be organized along disciplinary lines. Disciplinary departments would, of course, continue outside the new school. If the school develops topical subdivisions (such as urban research centers, or centers studying the development of new nations), these subdivisions should be terminated when they are no longer pertinent.

The new school should have its own PhD program, and it should attempt to educate its students for inventive development relevant to social problems. In other words, the school should do empirical research on significant social problems and train professionals to carry on this kind of research.

Such a school will require considerable planning, and it will face many obstacles. Among these is the problem of developing professional identity for its graduates. Many of them will probably be employed in non-academic settings, and the university-professorship model of career aspirations will not serve. It may be necessary, therefore, to create a new professional society and new journals devoted to applied behavioral science in order to define a new professional identity.

The word "applied" in the title promises that the school will cover that end of the spectrum, but, of course, it must also be concerned with basic research. A high-level applied school will inevitably work on basic problems of data-collection and analysis, model-building, and simulation. Work on social indicators, even on a local scale, could improve the statistical basis of the indicators and investigate how to combine them or substitute one for another. Beyond such methodological problems, each Graduate School of Applied Behavioral Science should have some specialized areas of research, for the whole of applied behavioral science is too broad to tackle all at once. The problems of the cities, of poverty, of crime, of nation-building, of conservation, of regional governments, of individual growth and development, of early education—any one of a range of problems—could serve among the specialties in one school.

Instructive precedents in a number of universities exhibit many qualities of the proposed new type of school; Chapter 12 discusses these and the proposed school at greater length.

BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES OUTSIDE THE UNIVERSITY

Substantial numbers of social scientists work in nonacademic settings for federal, state, and local governments, for business and industry, and for nonprofit research organizations. Their functions, however, are not too different from those of their university colleagues.

The federal government estimates an 18.4 percent growth in federal social science employment from 1967 to 1971, and a similar growth is reported by state governments and nonprofit organizations. The percentage growth in federal social science employment is greater than the growth in overall federal employment and total federal scientific employment for the same period. Chapter 13 reports the limited data we have collected.

One indication of the amount of nonacademic research in the behavioral and social sciences is the amount of federal funds for nonacademic research performers, both to private research organizations and to the government. Roughly half of the federal funds go to nonuniversity research, and it is divided about equally between the government, on the one hand, and industrial firms and nonprofit institutions on the other (Table SR-1).

TABLE SR-1.—FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH IN BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, FISCAL YEAR 1967, BY PERFORMER

(Dollar amounts in millions)			
Federal obligations for basic and applied research			Behavioral and social sciences as percent of total obligations
All fields of science	Behavioral and social sciences		
Intramural (within Government departments and agencies).....	\$1,574	\$77	5
Extramural, nonuniversity:			
Industrial firms.....	1,437		
Nonprofit institutions.....	269	177	3
Others.....	646		
Total nonuniversity.....	3,925	154	4
Universities.....	1,348	143	11
Grand total.....	5,273	297	6

* Estimated from residual funds after removing amounts to universities.
* Estimated from the Survey.

Source: Federal Funds for Research, Development, and Other Scientific Activities: Fiscal Years 1967, 1968, 1969, NSF 68-27 (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1968), vol. 17, pp. 124, 130.

THE FINANCING OF RESEARCH

In 1966-1967, some 3.4 percent of the nation's total research and development expenditure was spent on the behavioral and social sciences—about \$803 million. This was more than double the amount spent for social science research and development in 1961-1962 (Table SR-2).

TABLE SR-2.—SUPPORT OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 1962, 1967, BY SOURCE

(Dollar amounts in millions)		
Sources of funds	1961-62	1966-67
Federal Government:		
Basic research.....	\$46	\$132
Applied research.....	74	159
Development.....	68	97
Subtotal.....	188	388
State governments.....	5	15
Industry.....	130	289
Colleges and universities.....	24	48
Foundations.....	23	24
Nonprofit institutions.....	14	39
Total, behavioral and social sciences.....	384	803
Total, all fields of science.....	15,604	23,686
Behavioral and social sciences as percent of total science.....	2.5	3.4

Source: Table 1-2 and table A-8, appendix.

Between 1959 and 1968, federal support of behavioral and social science research increased at an average rate of approximately 20 percent a year. Since today's social problems are so urgent, it is important to maintain growth at least close to this level. We distinguish between normal projected growth (no increase in the scale of research operations) and projected new programs (the addition of new large-scale research). In Chapter 14 we discuss the matter more fully and offer the following recommendation concerning normal research support.

Recommendation: Rate of Federal funding for normal research support.—The Committee recommends an annual increase in funds available from the federal government

for support of basic and applied research in the behavioral and social sciences of between 12 and 18 percent to sustain the normal growth of the research enterprise over the next decade.

To sustain normal growth in the behavioral and social sciences, the indicated increase in research funds will be needed, and a corresponding increase will also be needed for instructional funds, student aid, space, and equipment. Our recommendation also applies to funding for behavioral and social science research outside the universities.

The costs of projected new programs are not included in the normal-growth projections, for they are of a different character from the steady and gradual increase required by the increases in the number of social scientists and the growing sophistication of research techniques. However, the new programs require abrupt increases in funding, with each program having minimum start-up costs. The operating costs of the various new programs, when they are in full swing, are likely to total an additional \$100 million annually, as explained in Chapter 14.

The agencies supporting the behavioral and social sciences are chiefly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (primarily through the Office of Education, the National Institutes of Health, and the National Institute of Mental Health), the Department of Defense, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation. We welcome their continued support and believe that other agencies should expand their use of behavioral and social science research, through both intramural and extramural support. In short, we endorse the principle of pluralistic support for the social sciences.

Proposals to establish a national social science foundation pose some problems concerning the role of the National Science Foundation. The implication that social science is important enough to warrant a special foundation is gratifying, but the issues are complex, and the members of the Committee are somewhat divided in their views. Because the charter of the National Science Foundation has recently been enlarged to permit support of applied research, and explicitly to support the social sciences, we favor giving it the opportunity to exercise its new functions. However, we also suggest that, if the National Science Foundation is unable to exercise its new obligations in social sciences, then a new foundation may be needed. Recommendations bearing on the National Science Foundation appear in Chapter 14.

Private foundations have been a significant source of support to the behavioral and social sciences through the years, frequently playing innovative roles and contributing in a variety of ways to the development of these sciences. The role of the foundations is discussed in Chapter 15.

WORLDWIDE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

Worldwide interest in the social sciences is growing, partly in response to the processes of development and modernization in new nations. Social scientists in other countries seek to strengthen their professional capabilities, and there is considerable American interest in study and research overseas.

Collaboration across national boundaries is especially important in the social sciences. Generalizations based on work in only one country may be too parochial and circumscribed, and some kinds of situations important to an understanding of human behavior cannot be studied satisfactorily in any one nation. In Chapter 16 we offer some suggestions about the relationships among social scientists on an international basis, and we discuss the strengthening of organizations devoted to furthering international social science.

OUTLOOK FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

As the sciences advance and research at their growing edges becomes more demanding of special knowledge and skills, the tendency toward specialization increases. This trend is important for the advancement of the frontiers of science, but it also runs counter to the demand for science to deal with problems of great complexity in an integrated way. While we recognize the legitimacy of specialization within disciplines, we recommend more attention to large-scale research concerning our rising social problems.

Our society cannot delay dealing with its major social problems. We cannot consume our resources and pollute our environment and then hope to replenish and restore them. We cannot permit international relations to deteriorate to the point of resorting to nuclear weapons. Social unrest, a result of rising expectations and frustrated hopes, will eventually reach a point of no return.

The social sciences will provide no easy solutions in the near future, but they are our best hope, in the long run, for understanding our problems in depth and for providing new means of lessening tensions and improving our common life.

(Excerpts From the Final Report of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence)

TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, TO INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY

INTRODUCTION

xxvii

Our Commission is not competent to recommend a specific level of national defense expenditures. We recognize that without the deterrent capability essential for security against external attack, internal freedom and security would not be possible. It is to be expected that our military leaders will, like other government officials, stress the extreme urgency of the programs under their charge. But we believe the time has come to question whether expenditures for the general welfare should continue to be subordinated to those for national defense.

Defense expenditures, stated in 1968 prices, fell from about 78 billion dollars in 1953 (at the end of the Korean War) to about 60 billion dollars in 1954 and remained at that level for the decade 1955 to 1964. But by 1968 they had risen again to the present 81 billion dollar annual level as the result of our major commitment of troops to Vietnam.⁵

Federal expenditures for the general welfare, while they have increased substantially over the past several years, are now approximately 60 billion dollars of which \$25 billion represents social security payments.

As a first step, we should try to reverse this relationship. When our participation in the Vietnam War is concluded, we recommend increasing annual general welfare expenditures by about 20 billion dollars (stated in 1968 dollars), partly by reducing military expenditures and partly by use of increased tax revenues resulting from the growth of the Gross National Product. We suggest this only as an initial goal; as the Gross National Product and tax revenues continue to rise, we should strive to keep military expenditures level (in constant dollars), while general welfare expenditures should continue to increase until essential social goals are achieved.⁶

⁵ For fiscal 1970, the budgeted figure is \$77 billion.

⁶ Some experts believe that since military expenditures were successfully held to an annual level of 60 billion dollars (in 1968 prices) for the decade from 1955 to 1964, a comparable plateau can and should be maintained for the decade of the seventies. In-

xxviii

Based on estimates of the Council of Economic Advisers,⁷ the funds needed to achieve this goal without inflationary consequences could be obtained from two sources:

(1) The end of the Vietnam war should reduce defense expenditures by 19 billion dollars annually. The Council anticipates that this reduction will be offset in part by war-end program adjustments and deferred weapons programs. Hence, defense expenditures should go down to about 65 billion dollars (at 1968 prices).⁸

(2) The Gross National Product is expected to increase over the next decade (in constant dollars) at the rate of about four percent a year. The same should be true of federal tax revenues, which should grow in real terms at an annual increment of approximately 15 billion dollars.⁹ Of this amount, approximately half will be required to meet expected annual increases for "baseline" federal non-defense expenditures other than general welfare programs. Hence, about seven or eight billion dollars more each year than the preceding year should be available for new and expanded programs in the general welfare field.

xxix

Whether somewhat more or less than the amounts we have indicated should be provided to overcome social ills is not the important point.¹⁰ What is important is that the people of this nation recognize both the possibilities and the need for choice. For an entire generation, we have necessarily been more aware of and responsive to the external dangers to our society than to the internal dangers. In this Commission's opinion, the internal dangers now demand a greater awareness and a more substantial response—one that can only be made if we face the need to reorder our priorities. It is time to

deed, it has been urged that, assuming the success of strategic arms limitation talks and a reevaluation of our foreign commitments, it would be feasible to hold the military budget for the early 1970s to 50 billion dollars (at 1969 prices). See Kaysen, "Military Strategy, Military Forces and Arms Control," in *Agenda for the Nation* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1969), p. 549.

⁹ Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, January, 1969, pp. 199-200.

¹⁰ At estimated 1972 prices, for example, actual outlays would be 73 billion. At this point, defense expenditures would be at seven percent of forecast GNP, as compared to perhaps eight percent at present. In other industrially advanced democratic countries, according to the Institute for Strategic Studies, defense expenditures (in 1966) were 6.4 percent of GNP for the United Kingdom, 4.4 percent in France, 3.6 percent in West Germany, 3.3 percent in Italy, 2.2 percent in Canada and 1.1 percent in Japan. For Soviet Russia, the estimated figure is 8.9 percent, but this represents a total 1966 defense outlay of less than 30 billion dollars as compared to about 68 billion dollars for the United States.

¹¹ This estimate assumes that the present 10 percent surcharge will have been repealed, but that other tax reform measures will be neutral in their effect on aggregate revenues. Any substantial reduction in federal tax revenues incidental to tax reform will make it more difficult to reorder our priorities as we have proposed.

¹² We further note that the same point can be strongly made for other non-military categories of expenditure that have been built into the federal budget, including agricultural and maritime subsidies, the postal service as presently structured, and space exploration. See Schultze, "Budget Alternatives After Vietnam" in *Agenda for the Nation* (Brookings, 1969), p. 44

balance the risks and precautions we take abroad against those we take here at home.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made a suggestion which merits careful consideration as a potentially valuable supplemental step toward reordering national priorities, namely, the preparation of an "Annual Social Report."¹³ The Annual Social Report, comparable to the present Annual Economic Report, would provide us with a set of measurements—of "social indicators"—and how well we have done in providing housing, education, health care, public safety, and opportunities for the upward advancement of all sectors of our population. It would tell us whether the disadvantaged

groups among us have been advancing at a rate sufficient to foster hope and to quiet the desperation that drives men to violence. It would significantly aid the nation and its leaders in establishing national priorities.

The Social Report would be prepared by social scientists recruited for stated periods of public service from among the nation's best scholars, just as the members and staff of the Council of Economic Advisers are today. They could be organized as a Council of Social Advisers, as are the Economic Advisers, or in some other visible and independent form. A major function of the social science staff would be to develop tools for measuring the comparative effectiveness of social programs. While we have learned a good deal about social stresses and the gross causative factors that require correction, we still know very little about whether particular remedial programs work at all, which ones work better than others, and why. We lack practicable means for measuring cost-benefit ratios, for establishing and observing parallel programs with significant variables, and for putting an end to programs which have failed to justify their continuance.¹⁴ A central staff charged with this responsibility could do much to improve the accuracy of our social planning and the efficacy of on-going programs.

Two decades ago, the Council of Economic Advisers was created by the Full Employment Act of 1946, amid much skepticism about the "science" of economics and particularly about the wisdom and effect of governmental efforts to stimulate or restrain economic activity. Today we recognize the importance of the government's economic role and of national economic measurements, imprecise and imperfect as the economist's tools still are. The other social sciences may now have as much potential for informing wise government policy as economics had twenty years ago.

In a democratic society, the citizens possess the basic social power, and national priorities reflect the value judgments of the majority. Skeptics may thus take a pessimistic view of this Commission's recommendation that our national priorities be reordered. They will point, for example, to the reluctance of the public, despite the penetrating reports and the excellent recommendations of previous presidential commissions, to take the comprehensive actions needed to curb crime, eliminate racial discrimination, and alleviate the problems of the ghetto poor. They will point especially to middle-class America—to the "forgotten American"—and his concern over some consequences of racial integration, his rebellion against rising taxes, his distrust of dissent on the campus and protest movements in the capital. How realistic is it, they will ask, to think that the majority of Americans will support a reallocation of our national resources to deal with social problems?

¹³ *Toward a Social Report*, Government Printing Office, 1969.

¹⁴ Daniel P. Moynihan, *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding* (New York: MacMillan 1968), pp. 190-203.

xxxii

Skepticism is understandable. But the majority of Americans have always responded constructively to national crises when they have been fully informed and responsibly led. The "silent majority," like most other Americans, do not wish to surrender any of the most important freedoms of our open society—freedom of movement, freedom from harm, freedom from fear. They stand to benefit from the programs necessary to retain these freedoms just as much as any disadvantaged minority. All Americans—like majority and our various minorities—must come to grips with the basic causes of violence in our society and do what must be done to achieve liberty and justice for all.

Some, with little faith in our nation, predict that majority indifference will result in

a violent revolution of some kind. Indeed, nihilists and anarchists openly espouse this course. We see signs, however, that a peaceful revolution is already under way: a spirit of needed reform is rising steadily among the people and in the ranks of local and national leaders. We see a growing readiness to formulate new values, to set new priorities, and to make firm commitments now, to be honored as soon as resources are available.

Some ordinary citizens feel they can do nothing to influence the direction and the destiny of their nation. But more and more Americans are proving this to be a myth. A growing number of our citizens have found they need not stand idle while our cities rot, people live in fear, householders build individual fortresses, and human and financial resources flow to less urgent endeavors. A new generation of Americans is emerging, with the energy and the talent and the determination to fulfill the promise of the nation. As it ever was, the young—idealistic but earnest, inexperienced but dedicated—are the spearheads of the drive toward change, and increasing numbers of adult Americans are joining their ranks.

xxxiii

When in man's long history other great civilizations fell, it was less often from external assault than from internal decay. Our own civilization has shown a remarkable capacity for responding to crises and for emerging to higher pinnacles of power and achievement. But our most serious challenges to date have been external—the kind this strong and resourceful country could unite against. While serious external dangers remain, the graver threats today are internal: haphazard urbanization, racial discrimination, disfiguring of the environment, unprecedented interdependence, the dislocation of human identity and motivation created by an affluent society—all resulting in a rising tide of individual and group violence.

The greatness and durability of most civilizations has been finally determined by how they have responded to these challenges from within. Ours will be no exception.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

THE COMMISSION RECOMMENDS—

1. that "the time is upon us for a reordering of national priorities and for a greater investment of resources in the fulfillment of two basic purposes of our Constitution—to establish justice and to insure domestic tranquility."

2. that "when our participation in the Vietnam War is concluded, we recommend increasing annual general welfare expenditures by about 20 billion dollars (stated in 1968 dollars), partly by reducing military expenditures and partly by use of increased tax revenues resulting from the growth of the Gross National Product."

3. that "as the Gross National Product and tax revenues continue to rise, we should

strive to keep military expenditures level (in constant dollars), while general welfare expenditures should continue to increase until essential social goals are achieved."

4. that, to aid in the reordering of national priorities, consideration should be given to establishing a counterpart of the Council of Economic Advisers to develop tools for measuring the comparative effectiveness of social programs, and to produce an "Annual Social Report," comparable to the present Annual Economic Report.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1971

No. 5

S. 376—VIETNAM DISENGAGEMENT ACT OF 1971

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the 91st Congress ended at a moment of deceptive apathy about the war in Indochina.

Many of us in the Senate felt this sense of indifference. In some ways, we even welcomed it. We were numbed by the frustrating debates.

And, in fact, there seemed to be a breathing space.

The Church-Cooper amendment was supposed to put clear limits, by law, on more U.S. involvement in Indochina. The Secretary of State assured us there was no real difference on that score between the Senate and the administration. Of course, we were told, there would be no wider war.

But as this new Congress begins, our "advisers" are seen again in Cambodia, and our bombers and helicopters are all over Indochina. As I wrote the President recently, there are reports that our CIA and military are instigating and supplying a new invasion of southern Laos by Thai battalions. These reports have since been substantiated by sources in Laos.

I also came back to the new session to find on my desk this letter from Minnesota. The signature is withheld to protect the privacy of the family:

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I write to you my plea, not only because as the years have gone by more people believe, admire, and appreciate the stand Senator McCarthy took against the war, but because I feel you too would have the great courage to step forth.

We have just buried my son, who never had the chance to hold his baby daughter in his arms. He was killed in combat December 23, 1970 in Vietnam—Mike went not believing in the cause but only because he felt he was no better than anyone else who was forced to go.

I know now that we, their very own family and friends, not some government, are forcing them to go. From the outpouring of sympathy from our relatives, friends, and total strangers, I realize the people want an immediate withdrawal so no more will die in vain. I'm sure the outcry of the people coupled with giving the boys an opportunity to serve their country only in a truly peaceful effort here in these United States so all its people will gain the principles for which our Flag stands. If ever our dear Flag is being desecrated it is in Vietnam.

Therefore my plea—please lead the people in this truly great country in a cry for

immediate withdrawal so no more sons, brothers, and fathers will die in vain.

The columnists and pollsters tell us the war is no longer a major issue.

It is an issue for this mother, and the thousands like her all over America.

It is going to be a major issue for this Congress until every American soldier is out of Indochina.

I am not talking about Nixon's war or Johnson's war. This war belongs at the doorstep of every public official—including myself—who stood by and let it happen.

We quibbled. We gave the benefit of the doubt. We were never more wrong.

We are in danger of doing it all over.

The North Vietnamese, the Vietcong, the Pathet Lao, the Thai, the Cambodians—everybody knows what we are doing in Indochina except the American people, who are paying for it all with their men and their money.

That is why I asked the President about reports of U.S.-supported Thai troops in Laos. That is why the administration must be pressed at every turn to define the vague formulas, to say what they mean on these life-and-death issues.

When the President stood before the Congress and the country to tell us the state of the Union, he had an obligation to tell us the truth about the state of this war.

We paid nearly 50,000 lives and billions of dollars for that kind of straight talk from our President.

But whatever the evasion, the false optimism, or the sophistry, the Congress has an obligation to draw the line once and for all on the killing and dying.

Then, and only then, can any public official really answer the plea of these mothers—"so no more sons, brothers, and fathers will die in vain."

I am proud, Mr. President, to join in cosponsoring the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971, which would bring the orderly withdrawal of our forces by the end of this year.

The need for this act is as overwhelming today as it was last year when it was known as the end-the-war amendment. Of the many questions that test this Congress, none will weigh more heavily on our place in history.

We saw our Nation sink into the Vietnam tragedy before, and failed to stop it.

We cannot let that happen again.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

Walter F. Mondale
U.S.S.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 28, 1971

No. 6

S. 400—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO BE KNOWN AS THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM ACT

Mr. MONDALE Mr. President, I am joining my colleagues, Senator SAXBE, Senator BROOKE, and Senator EAGLETON, in introducing the Model Criminal Justice Reform Act.

Each of us served as the attorney general of our State. Based on our experience in law enforcement, we know that the best deterrence to crime is an excellent criminal justice system—well-trained and well-paid police, fair and efficient courts, and a modern and flexible corrections program.

Our bipartisan legislation is designed to establish a model criminal justice system in several States voluntarily choosing to participate under this program. Those States would agree to undertake comprehensive reform of their entire criminal justice system, and the Federal Government would pay most of the costs of such reform.

The principle here is simple: Criminal justice must remain primarily the responsibility of State and local governments; but the Federal Government can play a vital role in encouraging and financing reform.

The need for a new attack on crime is clear.

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice made this gloomy assessment of crime in America:

There is much crime in America, more than ever is reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the Nation. Every American knows that. Every American is, in a sense, a victim of crime. Violence and theft have not only injured often irreparably, hundreds of thousands of citizens, but have directly affected everyone. Some people have been impelled to uproot themselves and find new homes. Some have been made afraid to use public streets and parks. Some have come to doubt the worth of a society in which so many people behave so badly. Some have become distrustful of the Government's ability, or even desire, to protect them.

The situation is no better today. Sundown often brings fear to the streets of our cities. Once peaceful rural areas are now beginning to know this fear.

Each year, crime in America takes its toll in lives, injury, and tension. It has been estimated that crime costs our country between \$50 and \$100 billion every year.

We have been aware of these frightening facts and statistics for some time. But despite our knowledge, the crime rate continues to spiral.

There are no quick and easy solutions. The causes of crime are complex, and no single proposal will eliminate crime.

Most authorities do agree, however, that crime could be substantially reduced with more well trained and better paid police, speedy and efficient disposition of criminal cases, and corrections programs which rehabilitate offenders. In short, fundamental improvements in the entire criminal justice system of our States and localities would have a direct and dramatic impact on the crime rate in this country.

But the failures and inadequacies of the criminal justice system in most States has been well documented.

The report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice noted this failure:

The increasing volume of crime in America establishes conclusively that many of the old ways are not good enough. Innovation and experimentation in all parts of the criminal justice system are clearly imperative. They are imperative with respect both to entire agencies and to specific procedures. Court systems need reorganization and case-docketing methods need improvement; police-community relations programs are needed and so are ways of relieving detectives from the duty of typing their own re-

ports; community-based correctional programs must be organized and the pay of prison guards must be raised. Recruitment and training, organization and management, research and development all require re-examination and reform.

A 1969 staff report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence contains the following critical—but I believe accurate—portrayal of the criminal justice process in many States:

A system implies some unity of purpose and organized interrelationship among component parts. In the typical American city and state, and under federal jurisdiction as well, no such relationship exists. There is, instead, a reasonably well-defined criminal process, a continuum through which each accused offender may pass: from the hands of the police, to the jurisdiction of the courts, behind the walls of a prison, then back into the street. The inefficiency, fallout, and failure of purpose during this process is notorious. . . .

If any one part of the criminal justice system functions badly the entire system will be adversely affected. An excellent police force is hampered in preventing crime if there are long delays in bringing a defendant to trial; speedy disposition of criminal cases will not prove effective if a convicted defendant is sent to a prison which is only a breeding place for more crime.

As former State law enforcement officials, we realize that most of the crime plaguing this country falls within the jurisdiction of State and local governments—and that the responsibility for law enforcement and the maintenance of an effective criminal justice system begins and ends with those State and local governments. We are firmly committed to the principle that law enforcement must remain a State and local responsibility.

It is difficult to carry out this responsibility without adequate funds, and it is clear that most States and cities simply do not have the resources for meeting the increasingly complex demands being placed on them—from preventing crime to eliminating pollution. Consequently, Federal financial assistance to States and their cities is essential in combating crime. This principle was recognized with the passage of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

Unfortunately, title I of the Safe Streets Act was not designed to remedy the basic defects of the criminal justice system as it exists in most States. This legislation—with its triumvirate leadership in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and its use of the block grant funding mechanism with virtually no strings attached—provides little Federal leadership for reform.

Under the Safe Streets Act, grants often have been distributed on a piecemeal basis, and the problems inherent in the overall system generally remain. The Safe Street Act's major omission is its failure to encourage comprehensive reform of a State's criminal justice system with broad Federal assistance.

Without this type of incentive, basic reforms which most experts agree are essential may not be implemented in most States.

As the President's Crime Commission observed:

Many of the criminal justice system's difficulties stem from its reluctance to change old ways, or to put the same proposition in reverse, its reluctance to try new ones.

It is our belief that with a sufficient financial incentive for undertaking these reforms, some States and their localities would be willing and eager to overhaul their criminal justice system. That is why we have introduced this legislation.

Senate

The aim of our legislation is to establish model and experimental programs—hopefully in three or four States—to determine the effect of full-scale and comprehensive reform of the criminal justice system on the crime rate in those states. The program is of course completely voluntary, and no State will be affected by this legislation if it does not choose to enter the program.

There are three essential parts of this bill designed to accomplish meaningful reform. The first is the establishment of broad and flexible standards for reform of each aspect of a State's criminal justice system. The second is the requirement that no State can qualify for this model program unless its plan meets all the standards contained in the bill. And finally, there are the provisions of the bill which specify that the Federal Government will pay most of the total costs incurred in making these reforms.

Title I of this legislation outlines a comprehensive program for reform, with emphasis on law enforcement, the criminal courts, and corrections. States desiring to participate in the program will, with Federal financial assistance, develop and submit a State agenda for the specific implementation of these reforms within their States. Safeguards are built into the legislation to assure that the Federal money is used for the purposes agreed upon by the States and the Federal Government.

Reforms which a State can implement without new legislation or ordinances are classified as "phase I" and those requiring new legislation are classified as "phase II." The State will be given more time to implement phase II reforms, but in no event will a State be given more than 4 years to implement its total plan. The Federal Government will pay 75 percent of the costs of implementing phase I and 90 percent of the cost of implementing phase II.

The State plans will be administered by the chief executive of each State, or by a public agency designated or created for that purpose. At the discretion of participating States, State advisory councils may be appointed to advise the chief executive on the preparation and administration of the State plans, and to evaluate programs assisted under this legislation.

Title II of the bill establishes a new Federal independent agency within the executive branch—the Criminal Justice Reform Administration—to be headed by a single administrator, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. This agency will provide technical assistance as needed to the States and localities regarding all aspects of the program. It will also provide for the widest possible dissemination of information obtained under the program—including an annual report to the President on the activities of the Criminal Justice Reform Act.

It should be emphasized that we are not necessarily wedded to all the provisions of this bill in its present form. Rather, it is our hope that the bill will be the subject of extensive hearings; where appropriate, we expect that changes will be made.

We are committed to the basic premises underlying this legislation: That the crime rate will not be significantly reduced unless there is comprehensive reform of every aspect of a State's criminal justice system and that such reform must be planned and implemented by State and local governments with substantial Federal financial and technical assistance.

The standards in our bill are derived from the recommendations of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, various State crime commissions, and studies by those experienced in law enforcement.

We believe that they embody broad goals of reform with which most of those involved in law enforcement and the administration of criminal justice can agree.

In introducing this legislation, we do not assume that these standards are cast in bronze. They are, of course, subject to change after hearings and comments by interested individuals and organizations.

Since the standards are crucial to this bill, it might be helpful to summarize some of the more important ones and the problems they were designed to overcome.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

The bill requires uniform standards for recruitment throughout each State seeking to participate in the program. The need for such uniform standards was endorsed by the task force on the police of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice:

Many [police] departments provide little or no training, use ineffectual selection and screening techniques, and have no organized recruiting programs. This results in substantial variation in the quality of police service, not only in different areas of the country, but within the same State.

In Minnesota, the Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control encouraged the use of uniform standards in hiring peace officers.

The bill also calls for appropriate educational requirements for advancement which are uniform throughout each State. Linking education with promotion will simultaneously encourage police officers to pursue advanced education, and improve the quality of the upper ranks of the police service. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recommended this approach to improving the quality of law enforcement personnel.

Another important standard would require beginning compensation and increases in compensation which are appropriate for a professional—considering the size of the community for law enforcement personnel and the cost of living in the community in which such individuals serve.

In 1967, the President's Crime Commission produced statistics which showed that the median annual salary for a patrolman in a large city was \$5,300; typically, the maximum salary was less than \$1,000 more than the starting salary. This was contrasted with the starting salary for nonsupervisory FBI agents of \$8,421, with a high of \$16,905.

While salaries of the Nation's police have increased since 1967, they are still inadequate. As former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark recently noted:

Police salaries are woefully low. The average salary of the full-time officer is roughly three-fourths what is required to maintain a family of four at an acceptable standard of living.

The national situation is reflected in Minnesota. According to the task force on law enforcement of the Governor's Commission on Crime Prevention and Control:

Problems of police compensation hinge to a large extent on the public's attitude toward the police as a profession. Generally speaking, policemen are underpaid in this State. The underpayment, however, is not always reflected in the starting salary, but frequently relates to the top level of salary to which an aspiring policeman can advance.

This is especially true in the large metropolitan area police departments. In the rural areas both the starting salaries and the top salaries tend to be extremely low which, in turn, reflects on the capabilities of officers in small jurisdictions.

Because of their present inadequate level of pay, many policemen in Minnesota and throughout the country are forced to moonlight with other jobs in order to support their families. If we want full-time policemen who can concentrate on their law enforcement duties, we must pay a decent wage for such demanding work.

The bill also requires general State standards in a number of other areas relating to police service. For example, several standards are intended to improve existing retirement systems and pension plans.

Finally, the bill calls for a central facility in each State offering short-term

preservice and inservice training for all police personnel within the State.

The President's Crime Commission observed that—

Small rural departments often provide recruits with no training at all. By and large this is a question of money. Training programs are expensive, and they cannot be provided on a local basis for two or three officers at a time.

In Minnesota, the task force on law enforcement of the Governors' commission stressed the need for better training facilities. They placed highest priority on the need for quality training—

Quality training—basic, in-service, and advanced—is in our opinion, the keystone for professional law enforcement.

While the task force lauded the Minnesota Legislature's passage of a bill in 1967 making mandatory the training of new officers who will police a jurisdiction of over 1,000 population, they also noted the lack of both general training funds and facilities:

Training is now carried on to a limited extent in a few of the larger individual departments or by the training division of the State Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. Needless to say, facilities are inadequate, agencies are woefully understaffed, and there is a gross lack of funds to carry out training programs.

DISPOSITION OF CRIMINAL CASES

The bill contains one basic standard designed to accomplish the expeditious disposition of criminal cases in those States participating in the program. This standard requires that a State—and its localities—implement whatever reforms necessary to insure that the trial of all criminal cases will be commenced no later than 60 days from the date of a defendant's arrest or the initiation of prosecution—whichever occurs first. Failure to meet this standard will result in dismissal with prejudice of the charges against the defendant.

The administrator of this program will specify those periods of delay to be excluded in computing the time for commencement of a trial. For example, delays due to the absence or unavailability of a defendant or hearings on defense motions would probably be excluded from this 60-day limitation.

Underlying this basic standard is the need for States and localities to reform their judicial system in whatever way they deem appropriate to meet the 60-day deadline. Some States might have to increase the number of judges and clerks, and build more courthouses; other States might be able to reach this goal by streamlining their judicial system through the use of professional court administrators and more efficient court procedures. Increasing personal engaged in prosecuting criminal cases and defending indigents may be another means of reaching this goal.

In any event, the administrator of this act would simply determine whether a State's reform proposals were adequate to insure a speedy trial; the Federal Government would not be dictating a particular scheme for reform.

The speedy disposition of criminal cases is one of the most vital reforms in this bill.

A speedy trial eliminates the unfairness inherent in the lengthy pretrial detention of a defendant—presumed innocent under our system—who cannot raise bail or who is denied bail. Pretrial detention often hampers a defendant in adequately preparing his defense, and while awaiting trial he will usually be confined in an overcrowded institution.

A recent survey by the U.S. Census Bureau revealed the shocking fact that more than one-half of 160,000 inmates in city and county jails throughout the country were being held for reasons other than conviction of a crime. Almost all of the inmates in this category were awaiting trial. These individuals are the proof of inadequate and overburdened judicial systems.

But far more than unfairness to individual defendants results from long delays in disposing of criminal cases. It is clear that such delays are a major cause of our increasing crime rate.

Long delays in bringing a defendant to trial often make it more difficult for the Government to obtain a conviction. Witnesses tend to be less reliable after such delays, and some witnesses are no

longer available. And it is the repeat criminal offender who is usually aware of the advantages of a long delay between arrest and trial.

Studies have shown that the longer it takes to bring to trial a defendant out on bail, the more likely it is he will commit a crime while awaiting trial. The pressure for some form of preventive detention would be reduced by more speedy trials.

Finally, it is a truism of criminology that the surest deterrent to crime is the knowledge that its commission will be followed by swift and appropriate punishment. The delays in most judicial systems have obviously negated the impact of this important type of deterrence.

Chief Justice Burger, recognizing the link between increasing crime and court delays, has also recommended a 60-day limit for the commencement of all criminal trials. In a recent interview, the Chief Justice was asked whether delay has been a major factor underlying the rise of crime over the last decade; he responded as follows:

I cannot think of any judicial factor more important than delay and uncertainty. It's always difficult to assign priorities in this sort of thing, but I know of none I can think of more important than the absence of the sure knowledge that a criminal act will be followed by a speedy trial and punishment.

And that's why I have said that if we could have every criminal trial ready to be presented within 60 days after the arrest or the charge, I think you'd see a very, very sharp drop in the crime rate. It would surely put an end to the large number of crimes committed by men out on bail waiting six months to 18 months to be brought to trial.

As the Chief Justice pointed out, "we cannot blindly cling to methods and forms designed for the 17th and 18th centuries."

CORRECTIONS

In recent congressional testimony, Ramsey Clark described the relationship between our corrections system and crime:

Of all the activities within the process of criminal justice, corrections has by far the greatest potential to reduce crime, if that is what we want.

The reason is clear. Probably four-fifths of all serious crime is committed by repeaters, persons convicted before of crime, persons identified by the system as having a potential for further crime. At least half of these people, from studies that have now been made, we know could have been rehabilitated, and most of the others could have been kept out of harm's way, if we had cared. But we failed even to try.

Ninety-five cents of every dollar in this Nation that has been spent in penology has been spent for pure custody, iron bars and stone walls, and they don't do the job. We spent 5 cents out of every dollar for rehabilitation, which is crime reduction, and we have manufactured crime in the prisons and jails throughout the Nation. Little wonder we suffer so much crime.

Most authorities would agree with this assessment. As the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice observed:

For a great many offenders . . . corrections does not correct. Indeed, experts are increasingly coming to feel that the conditions under which many offenders are handled, particularly in institutions, are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation.

But in corrections, just as in other aspects of the criminal justice system, the recognition of major defects does not automatically lead to meaningful reform.

The President's Crime Commission and other experts have called for the development of a far broader range of alternatives for dealing with offenders. As the Commission pointed out:

While there are some who must be completely segregated from society, there are many instances in which segregation does more harm than good.

For the incorrigible offender who poses a clear danger to society, maximum security prisons are necessary. But it makes no sense to build an entire prison system designed to serve only the most hardened criminals—thereby forcing all other classes of inmates to adapt to such an institution.

The importance of properly classifying offenders was underlined by the disturbing finding of the President's Crime Commission "that approximately one-fourth of the 400,000 children detained in 1965—for a variety of causes but including truancy, smoking, and running away

from home—were held in adult jails and lockups, often with hardened criminals.”

As the President's Commission and others have emphasized, a variety of penal institutions and programs are required to meet the special needs of various types of offenders. In particular, the development of community-based correctional facilities—designed to avoid the use of far-removed and isolated institutions—is considered an extremely valuable rehabilitation tool.

But regardless of how an inmate is classified, it is important that institutions be adequately equipped and staffed to treat the inmates assigned there. Too many of our prisons and jails are overcrowded and understaffed. A recent study of over 3,000 jails by the U.S. Census Bureau found that about 85 percent had no recreational or educational facilities of any kind; about 50 percent had no medical facilities; and about 25 percent had no visiting facilities.

One of the most critical problems in many institutions is the lack of adequate education and vocational training programs. As the President's Crime Commission observed, ex-offenders often cannot secure the jobs for which they were trained in prisons and juvenile institutions. And while more than half of adult inmates in all prisons have not completed elementary school, education programs in our prisons are inadequate.

The President's Crime Commission noted that there are about 6,000 academic and vocational teachers now employed in the Nation's correctional institutions. It was estimated in 1967 that an additional 10,700 were needed immediately to develop effective academic and vocational programs.

Meaningful alternatives to incarceration must be available for various offenders—particularly juveniles and misdemeanants. But parole and probation services in many States do not provide suitable alternatives to incarceration.

In 1967, the President's Crime Commission found that to meet the requirements of both correctional agencies and the courts, there was an immediate need to double the Nation's pool of juvenile probation officers, triple the number of probation officers working with adult felons, and increase sevenfold the number of officers working with misdemeanants.

And as the Commission pointed out:

These inadequacies can have serious consequences. Lack of community treatment facilities for misdemeanants and juveniles means the neglect of one of the most important lines of defense against serious crimes, since many persons with juvenile or misdemeanor records graduate to graver offenses. Lack of probation facilities also may mean that many minor and first-time offenders, who would be more suitably and economically dealt within the community, are instead institutionalized. And lack of supervision, particularly through parole, means that the community is being exposed to unnecessary risks and that offenders are going without assistance in reestablishing themselves in jobs and schools.

Another important aspect of corrections reform concerns the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics and drug addicts.

In 1965, according to the President's Crime Commission, public drunkenness accounted for one out of every three arrests in America. Since these arrests burden the police, clog the lower courts, and crowd penal institutions, the Commission recommended that communities develop civil detoxification units and comprehensive aftercare programs.

In regard to drug addiction, the President's Crime Commission found that—

Drug addicts, to support their habits, were

stealing millions of dollars worth of property every year and contributing to the public's fear of robbery and burglary. The police, the courts, the jails and prisons and social-service agencies of all kinds were devoting great amounts of time, money and manpower to attempts to control drug abuse. Worst of all, thousands of human lives were being wasted.

It is obvious that many of the old methods for dealing with narcotics addicts simply do not work. Whether an addict is assigned to a prison or to a special treatment facility, he will more often than not return to addiction—and crime to support it—after release.

Some programs—such as methadone maintenance—have proved successful in treating drug addicts. However, a great deal of research must be done before we will know the best methods of eliminating this terrible problem.

It is clear that States and local governments—with Federal assistance—must put more emphasis on programs for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts and alcoholics. Such programs should be available both to inmates in institutions and as alternatives to incarceration.

With these problems in mind, our bill provides some broad standards for corrections reform. A State seeking to enter this program must show that it has:

Established a system for classifying persons charged with, or convicted of, criminal offenses so as to permit individualized treatment and security standards appropriate to the individual;

Established a range of correctional facilities that are adequately equipped and staffed to treat the particular classifications of inmates assigned there, including small-unit, community-based correctional institutions;

Provided comprehensive vocational and educational programs designed for the special needs of rehabilitating each class of criminal offenders;

Provided separate detention facilities for juveniles including shelter facilities outside the correctional system for abandoned, neglected, or runaway children;

Established standards applicable throughout the State for local jails and misdemeanor institutions to be enforced by the appropriate State corrections agency;

Provided parole and probation services for felons, for juveniles, for adult misdemeanants who need or can profit from community treatment, and for offenders who are released from correctional institutions without parole;

Established caseload standards for parole and probation officers that vary in size and in type and intensity of treatment according to the needs and problems of the offender;

Established statewide job qualifications and compensation schedules for correctional officers, including probation and parole officers, along with a mandatory system of in-service training;

Developed and operated programs of treatment and rehabilitation for persons suffering from alcoholism and drug abuse, available both to inmates and as an alternative to incarceration.

There are those who may argue that merely establishing standards for criminal justice reform in congressional legislation will inevitably lead to Federal control over all law enforcement. There are several reasons why this fear is unjustified.

To begin with, the purpose of this legislation is only to establish model criminal justice systems in those few States voluntarily choosing to participate. The legislation is not designed to impose a single type of criminal justice system on the entire country; rather, its aim is to deter-

mine the impact of truly comprehensive reform on a statewide basis.

Furthermore, we have insured that the standards contained in this legislation are as flexible and as noncontroversial as possible. There may be some people, for instance, who still believe—in the face of abundant and indisputable evidence to the contrary—that the best way to rehabilitate criminals is to incarcerate them in dungeonlike prisons built in the 19th century and put them to work breaking rocks and digging holes. These people, it is true, will be offended by our recommendations for reform of our dismally unsuccessful corrections programs. But I believe that most will agree that the bill's standards for corrections—like the other standards in the bill—represent the consensus of the best thinking in the field, and that they point to much-needed and long-overdue reforms.

These standards are very broadly drawn—in such a way that the specifics of implementation must be left to the States. And different States can qualify under the bill's standards by implementing entirely different reforms—suited to the particular problems in those States.

For example, the standard for speedy disposition of criminal cases simply establishes a 60-day limit in which a trial must be commenced. To meet this standard, some States may hire court administrators to make their court system more efficient; others might find it necessary in its plan to call for additional judges and court personnel. But whatever the actual are more distant from the mayor's office and they will be uniquely designed to solve that State's problems.

Finally, if we are to avoid anything approaching a national responsibility for all law enforcement—which I believe would be disastrous—it is imperative that State and local governments begin the job of reforming their outmoded criminal justice systems. Many Americans are increasingly looking to Congress and the Federal Government for a solution to the problem of crime. And if the crime rate of the 1970's repeats the pattern of the 1960's, there will be greater public pressure to enact Federal criminal laws with an increasingly broad reach, as well as to expand the powers of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The only way to check this tendency is to strengthen State and local law enforcement.

Our bill, then, is not an effort to make the Federal Government responsible for all law enforcement. Instead, it is based on the assumption that the States and localities—with substantial Federal assistance—can sharply reduce their crime rate by comprehensive criminal justice reforms.

Justice Felix Frankfurter reminded us some years ago that—

There is no inevitability in history except as men make it.

And yet, for too long, Government has acted as if an increasing rate of crime was inevitable and beyond its reach. We have been overwhelmed by the apparent complexity of the problem, ignoring the obvious relationship between rising crime, on the one hand, and low police salaries, long court delays, and disgraceful prisons, on the other.

Many of the reforms which this bill seeks to encourage are relatively easy to implement; others will take time and require the investment of money and other resources.

But we clearly have the means to carry through all of these reforms and to make them work.

Rising crime need not be a fact of life during the next decade. Only our inaction and inertia will make it so.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1971

No. 8

Senate

S. 509—INTRODUCTION OF THE "INTERNATIONAL OPIUM CONTROL ACT"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this country is in a deadly struggle with international drug traffic.

And we are losing.

Drug addiction is killing thousands of our people, ruining a half million lives, stripping as much as \$8 billion every year from our economy, and right now destroying our great cities in a holocaust of crime and degradation.

It is dreadful enough that all this is happening to us. The unbelievable, disgusting irony is that we are letting it happen.

Opium is grown and made into heroin in a chain of corruption that links countries which are friends and allies.

For example, an estimated 80 percent of the heroin entering America comes from opium grown in Turkey, a NATO ally and recipient of \$5½ billion in U.S. aid since 1946.

Tons of this powdered death are processed each year in laboratories in France, another NATO ally and beneficiary of massive help from this country after World War II.

We have guarded the security of these nations. They are pledged to guard ours. Yet the heroin traffic—a threat within our common ability to control—continues to endanger the United States as much as any military invasion.

We cannot tolerate this horrible absurdity.

I am introducing here comprehensive legislation which would build an international quarantine to stamp out heroin traffic. The bill provides means to do this through fair cooperation with other countries. It offers assistance in diversifying crops and a major U.S. contribution to an international police campaign to break the drug network of processing and distribution.

But if this cooperation is not forthcoming, if others show evasion or indifference in our emergency, then my bill would call for strict penalties—the suspension of all U.S. military, economic, and other assistance, and ultimately an action to impose United Nations sanctions.

I know these are harsh measures. They are made necessary by the harsh realities of what the heroin traffic is doing to our Nation.

Though we have spent a half billion dollars on much-needed treatment over the past 3 years, the mounting heroin traffic mocks our effort. John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, told the U.N. in September that it was "a situation which is impossible for us to handle alone. Every time one heroin addict is cured, more take his place because of the ever-increasing amount of heroin available."

The number of new drug addicts nationwide doubled between 1968 and 1969. The total number now may be as high as a half million, and it grows by thousands every year.

Addiction is rising astronomically in many regions. For example, in the last decade the increase in new addicts was 668 percent in Connecticut, 1,600 percent

in Florida, 982 percent in Louisiana, 425 percent in Michigan, and 559 percent in Virginia.

On the basis of a half million addicts and data gathered in New York and Washington on drug-inspired crime, all this addiction may cost us \$8 billion a year in theft, criminal justice proceedings and related expenses. And studies show that over 90 percent of criminal addicts are users of heroin.

Even if that \$8 billion is reduced by half, the heroin traffic would still cost us each year 7 times what we now spend to fight air and water pollution, nearly 4 times our budget for health research, almost twice our investment in elementary and secondary education.

From 1965 to 1969, there were 3,000 drug deaths in the United States, a 10-fold increase over the 1960-65 period.

Every day in New York three people die because of drug addiction. In the last decade, 3,565 men from New York State died in Vietnam. Over the same period, 4,254 died from narcotics in New York City alone. Heroin is now the greatest single cause of death for 18- to 35-year-olds in New York.

What have the administration and other governments done to stop this carnage of Americans?

As usual, too much of what we have done here is hidden from public and congressional view. There are claims of success. At the outset of the administration, a high official told the Washington Post that stopping drug traffic would be a prime foreign policy objective. If heroin smuggling persisted, he reportedly said:

You can mark it down a failure of this Administration.

Now, 2 years later, the real measure of our diplomatic efforts—the rising rates of addiction, deaths, and crime—is plain. Our failure to overcome diplomatic inertia and take serious action to stop the drug traffic amounts to a national scandal.

Though the Attorney General testified to the Congress last July that he would welcome legislation authorizing sanctions against opium-growing countries, the State Department promptly repudiated his words the next day in response to a protest from the Turkist Government.

Despite recurring press speculation that the United States would undertake a serious \$10 million program to diversify Turkish crops, I have authoritative information that any steps on this scale have been stifled within the administration for "diplomatic reasons."

Though the United States gave Turkey \$3 million loan last March to encourage a change from opium, and though Turkey claims progress on the basis that opium-growing provinces have been reduced from 21 to 4 over the last decade, the actual acreage under opium cultivation in Turkey will have increased by 5,000 acres between 1969 and 1971.

According to the New York Times, the real effect of this celebrated reduction in provinces has been to double the amount of opium actually produced in Turkey because of more intensive cultivation and illegal planting.

Yet in spite of this deception, the United States quietly approved this past summer a \$40 million aid loan to Turkey with no conditions regarding the eradication of opium production.

Though France is the site of most of the processing of heroin, and though the administration claims that we have moved the French to step up their anti-drug efforts many-fold, the New York Times reports that France still has only 30 policemen to combat the enormous international drug network, only one-tenth the number of officers they assign to domestic drug abuse.

Though the French claim large numbers of arrests and heroin seizures over the last year, the Associated Press reports that these arrests are in reality small drug addicts, that France will not pressure Turkey on the drug traffic, and that enforcement efforts have yielded no specific results in eliminating the big laboratories where most of the heroin is made for shipment to the United States.

Though the administration promised to make the heroin traffic a prime objective, it has continued to treat the effort as a bureaucratic stepchild. The Secretary of State's Special Assistant for Narcotics has had no staff, and important dealings with foreign governments have remained, as in the past, largely an adjunct job of the Department's legal adviser. Incredibly, our Government's liaison with Interpol, a key agency in fighting the world drug traffic, has been a low ranking official in the Treasury Department, hardly a sign of high priority to foreign governments or our own bureaucracy.

Interpol, the only international police organization with any chance of fighting drug traffic, continues as a skeleton communications organization with a total budget of less than \$850,000, staff of only 44 people, and no specific narcotics personnel. The United States is now 1 year behind in our contribution to Interpol.

Not only does all this have murderous results today in this country, but actually adds to the international problem. Because Turkey and others continue the heroin traffic unabated, Iran recently lifted its 13-year ban on opium production. This deplorable setback will mean probably 500 more tons of opium to poison America and other societies.

What can and must be done?

The answer, Mr. President, is broad, firm legislation from the Congress that will at last fulfill the unmet promise of this administration in fighting drug traffic.

We must act as we would combat any foreign invasion or the infection of a fatal bacillus. We must attack the heroin traffic at its source in opium cultivation. We must break the chain of drug traffic which processes and transships heroin. And we must find the means to stop the spiral of drug addiction and crime in this country.

I will shortly introduce a bill to deal with this latter problem of drugs and crime. Today, I am introducing legislative measures to quarantine the international heroin traffic.

In summary, the principal elements of my bill would amend foreign assistance legislation to:

First, help assist any country to make the economic adjustment in eliminating all but minimal medicinal production of opium, through aid to growers in diversifying crops and to governments for enforcement.

I want to be very clear on this provision of my amendment. This is not a proposal to buy up an opium crop, which would only encourage production. This is not a subsidy to foreign farmers to forego opium cultivation, which would be a waste of money.

My amendment calls for the immediate eradication of illegal opium crops. The legislation then provides for assistance to the opium-growing country—over a 5-year period—to help the affected farmers find a new livelihood and to help cushion the overall economic adjustment in the country.

The total cost of Turkish conversion from opium, for example, has been estimated at \$10 million. We now give Turkey \$200 million yearly in military and economic aid while their opium crop flourishes.

Second, for any country which continues to allow the cultivation or processing of illegal opium—except a strictly limited and controlled crop for medicinal export—the President shall prohibit all military economic and other forms of U.S. assistance forthwith.

Third, if these penalties do not induce compliance, the President should institute action in the United Nations looking toward the imposition of international economic sanctions against the opium-growing or processing state, on the grounds that narcotics traffic is a threat to the peace and security of a member nation of the United Nations.

Fourth, make compliance, penalties, compensation, a policy matter to be recommended to the President by an Executive Committee on International Narcotics composed of the Secretaries of State and Treasury, the Attorney General, a member of each party from both the House and Senate, and two public members to be appointed by the President—to be chaired by the Secretary of State; the Committee to report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress, at least annually, at such time as to allow prompt application of their recommendations in legislation, executive action, and so forth.

Fifth, urge the President to propose and help institute a special narcotics staff in Interpol. The United States should provide initial funding over a 5-year period. Funding should be adequate to mount a concerted attack on the international narcotics organizational apparatus.

The U.S. role in Interpol, would be coordinated by committee at the Under Secretary level, which would endeavor to establish liaison with other members at the same level of government.

Also, the President should seek an international treaty to arrive at uniform standards of enforcement and punishment for narcotics offenders.

Sixth, urge the President to negotiate an international treaty providing uniform world standards for enforcement and punishment of opium producers, processors, and dealers. This would replace the present jumble of laws which inhibits effective legal cooperation among nations in fighting drug traffic.

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, I realize very clearly that this legislation carries harsh measures. It is directed at no single country, yet the fact is inescapable that it could affect our relations with Turkey, France, Mexico and other long-time friends.

As a strong supporter of aid to developing countries and of a close Atlantic Alliance, I took the decision to introduce this bill only with long and difficult reflection.

But there is just no doubt of the fundamental international equities in this terrible problem.

We are talking about 110,000 Turkish opium farmers, and as many as 500,000 American drug addicts.

We are talking about opium adding \$5 to \$10 million each year to Turkey's economy, and as much as \$8 billion yearly as the total social costs of hard drug addiction to the United States.

We are talking about a criminal empire in France which is literally murdering hundreds of our young people before our eyes.

Other governments often tell us that drug addiction is an "American problem."

I ask the Turkish Government: would the export from the United States of a poison which killed 3,000 Turks in the past 5 years be only a Turkish problem?

I ask the French Government: would the destruction of Paris by a poison processed in America—as New York is being destroyed today by heroin processed in France—be only a French problem?

And I ask the President and Secretary of State to show the American people that any imaginable defense contribution by Turkey to our security could outweigh the damage done the United States each year by the Turkish opium crop.

We can stop international drug traffic through friendly, fairly compensated cooperation among countries. But it must be stopped, one way or another. Director Ingersoll has said it plainly:

As long as illicit narcotic drugs are available, our problem will continue despite the energy and determination with which we attack the demand for the illicit traffic.

The Congress must act now with all the urgency and determination the drug crisis requires—before it is too late for our children.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 509) to provide for increased international control of the production of, and traffic in, opium, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

Walter F. Mondale
U.S.S.



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