



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 20, 1971

No. 112

Senate

INCOME FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the House has recently passed legislation which could mark an historic turning point in Federal policy toward older Americans. H.R. 1 recognizes the need to establish a minimum income above the poverty level for retired citizens. Many Senators have worked in recent years for improvements in the quality of life for senior Americans, and as a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I applaud this section of the bill, which would provide a Federal guaranteed minimum income to replace welfare for the elderly. I look forward to early Senate action on this provision.

I point out that in March and April of this year, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging introduced older Americans minimum income legislation which I cosponsored. The Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) introduced Senate bills 1645 and 1384, respectively, with bipartisan support, to abolish old-age assistance through welfare, and to implement through social security the principle that no retired member of this affluent society should have to live in poverty. S. 1645 and S. 1384 contain important provisions which should be adopted, to broaden and improve the elderly minimum income provisions of H.R. 1.

I believe that the Nation is coming to recognize the horror of poverty in a wealthy country. The President has proposed a family assistance plan to provide an income floor for a majority of persons now below the poverty level.

There are serious problems in developing this legislation, but the principle is critically important.

But most assuredly, older Americans, who have contributed a lifetime of work to this society, who have endured the depression and World War II, most of whom contributed to social security for years in anticipation of a dignified retirement, should not be humiliated in their latter years by lack of a minimum

adequate income. It is clear that inflation, rising property taxes, and increasing medical costs can deprive millions of of senior Americans of a decent retirement life, if there is no compensating income protection.

Approximately 30 percent of older Americans live below the poverty line, almost 6 million Americans. Senator CHURCH points out that nearly 3 million eligible individuals do not apply for old age assistance, because of the demeaning features of the existing system. In Minnesota, the average monthly social security payment to retired workers was only \$114 monthly or \$1,368 annually, and we know that less than 20 percent of all social security recipients have any outside income. The poverty level for older persons is figured at around \$1,800 for individuals and \$2,400 for a couple, yet only 20 percent of Minnesotans over 65 sought welfare relief under old age assistance. The system is obviously not meeting the need.

Senate bills 1645 and 1384 would provide annual income floors for older Americans—\$1,800 for retired individuals and \$2,400 for retired couples. This legislation would provide supplementary social security payments for all older citizens below the poverty level, and would take more than 2 million older Americans off welfare rolls.

The legislation also provides revenue sharing in the best sense. It would free nearly \$700 million of State and local revenue now used for welfare payments in old-age assistance. These costs would be met out of Federal general revenues.

At the same time, administration would be simplified. Older citizens with low incomes would be provided an efficient, single-step service through the 700 local social security offices. The inconvenience and unfortunate connotations associated with additional applications to welfare offices would be ended.

Senator CHURCH's bill contains additional assistance for low-income seniors. It provides an increase of the minimum benefit to \$120 for beneficiaries with substantial service.

The Church bill also provides a general benefit increase, but with a new provision which gives a greater percentage increase to beneficiaries with low incomes. The usual across-the-board percentage increases provide less for those with lower benefits who need the most. The Church plan would weigh the increases to bring needed relief to those with lower incomes. Under S. 1645, or a 20-percent increase; individuals receiving \$185 monthly would be raised to \$210, or 14 percent.

I also urge favorable Senate action on my own social security amendments at this session, in the effort to improve the quality of retirement life. In S. 1268 I have proposed that social security benefits be based on a recipient's 10 highest earning years, in order to protect retirement earnings from reductions caused by years of unemployment or recession. For example, workers have no control over loss of income or layoffs due to the present recession, but it costs them retirement income.

I have also proposed, in Senate bill 1266, that the retirement test income be raised to \$2,400 annually. This would provide further income security by allowing those beneficiaries who wished to work to earn 50 percent more annually under the regulations, before losing any social security benefits.

The 92d Congress has the opportunity to end poverty among older Americans. The United States has not kept pace with other industrialized Western nations in recent years in efforts to assist the elderly. During the last decade, Sweden, West Germany, and France have outstripped us in average amounts spent per capita in support for the elderly. In addition, these and other Western countries have spent significantly larger percentages of gross national product to aid older citizens, in some cases doubling our effort. We cannot be content knowing that some 6 million older Americans live in poverty. I urge the Senate to act favorably on the pending minimum income legislation for older Americans.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 27, 1971

No. 118

Senate

Mr. MONDALE. I would like to address myself to the section of the Sugar Act which discusses the distribution of the additional sugar beet allotment. The House version authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to give preference to areas where a sugar beet factory has recently closed. The Finance Committee deleted this language and in its report said that such a preference may "discriminate against new areas and favor an area where the facility has already failed."

I think that both the Senate and the House versions have expressed valid concerns, but I do believe that there is a middle position which may be agreeable to both Houses. I agree with what I think is the Finance Committee's position and that is that they do not want to give any kind of preference to areas that do not have the desire, ability, soil conditions, financing or the local support to make a sugar beet plant a success.

The situation that I just described is not the case in southwestern Minnesota where the 60-year-old American Crystal Sugar Plant at Chaska, Minn., was closed. The urban growth from Minneapolis and St. Paul surrounded this plant and had made this an undesirable location for this type of activity. Furthermore this obsolete plant could not meet the pollution control standards that had been established by the State without a very large expenditure of money. These factors, along with the fact that the actual growing of the beets had steadily moved westward so that most of the growers were more than 50 miles from the plant, made this a very uneconomical plant.

The fact that the plant closed, however, is not an indication that these farmers do not want to grow sugar beets or that they cannot. The plant was closed this past January with no notice to the local growers that relied on this plant. Many of these growers had recently pur-

chased new equipment, bought fertilizer, prepared the soil, and did other things to make them ready for the 1971 campaign. These growers were ready, willing, and able to grow beets this spring but could not proceed because the plant at Chaska had been closed. I believe that there are grounds to treat these growers differently than we would treat an area where there were poor soil conditions or where the local farmers did not desire to grow sugar beets or only desired to do so when prices for other crops had fallen. I am convinced that the Senate Finance Committee did not mean to treat these two very different situations in the same way.

I think the House probably had the Chaska situation in mind when they agreed upon the preference language whereas the Finance Committee was probably thinking along the lines of the latter situation that I described when they decided to delete this language. I would hope that the Senate conferees would agree with these distinctions and during the conference with the House an agreement recognizing these equities could be reached.

Even though the Senate Finance Committee did not adopt the preference language of the House bill they did go along with the farm history provisions which will be very beneficial to the growers in southwestern Minnesota. This provision "protects for 3 years the farm history of a producer who lost his market for sugar beets because of the discontinuance of contracting by a processor."

I am confident that the Secretary of Agriculture will look with favor upon southwestern Minnesota because of this farm history provision and the undisputed ability of the growers in this area to produce the quantity and quality of beets that are needed to justify an allotment.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 1971

No. 125

Senate

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1971

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a few days ago, the Senate passed S. 1483, the Farm Credit Act of 1971. This legislation passed with no real opposition and little discussion on the floor of the Senate.

However, the short time devoted to consideration of this bill should not be allowed to obscure its enormous significance for our Nation's farmers.

My State of Minnesota is a major agricultural producer. The 950 farmer cooperatives in Minnesota make up over 12 percent of those in the country. Because agriculture is such a vital part of my State's economy, I was pleased to sponsor S. 1483. I have followed the progress of the hearings with interest and have given this bill my full support.

Farmers must be able to obtain adequate credit in the years ahead if they are to withstand the vicious cost-price squeeze that has overtaken our agricultural economy. Congress has a responsibility to see that farmers be able to provide and improve their output which has made America the best fed and best clothed Nation in history.

Technological improvements in agriculture require that farmers "retool" their operations in much the same way that manufacturers must modernize their plants and equipment. To do this,

farmers must have access to adequate credit. Cooperatives for marketing of farm products and for furnishing supplies to farmers efficiently at the local level are needed to maintain the continuity of farm operations. The Farm Credit Act of 1971 will give the Farm Credit System the statutory mechanism to effectively provide sound credit to our Nation's farmers.

I have confidence that the farmer-controlled boards of the 20 Federal land bank associations and 18 production credit associations in my State will carry out a sound lending program for farmers under the provisions of this act and the regulations which will be prepared to carry out the legislative intent. Likewise, I am sure that the district board directors elected by the members of the associations and the borrowing cooperatives will assure sound operations of the Federal Land Bank, the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, and the Bank for Cooperatives of Saint Paul.

The Farm Credit Act will benefit the farmers and will strengthen the lending activities of the Farm Credit Banks of my State. I am equally convinced that this legislation will benefit the entire country.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1971

No. 126

Senate

NEED FOR A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be one of the 22 Senators from both parties who have cosponsored the Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act, S. 5. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). I think enactment of the bill will contribute significantly to the ability of both the executive branch and the Congress to deal intelligently with pressing social issues.

Both the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration have endorsed the purposes of this bill but have objected to the establishment of a new structure, a Council of Social Advisers, as unnecessary. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, has just written an excellent article which points out how the efforts of both administrations in this area have fallen short of the mark. The summer 1970 issue of *Law and Contemporary Problems* has just been released. This issue on "The Institutionalized Presidency" contains the article I refer to under the title "Social Advisers, Social Accounting, and the Presidency."

Because I think all Senators should acquaint themselves with the need for early action in this area, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the *RECORD*.

SOCIAL ADVISERS, SOCIAL ACCOUNTING, AND THE PRESIDENCY

(By WALTER F. MONDALE)

On September 10, 1970, the United States Senate passed S. 5, the Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act. Among other things, the bill would have established a Council of Social Advisers in the Executive Office of the President.¹

The bill was not acted on by the House. However, Senate passage represents significant progress for this measure, which did not even emerge from committee when it was first proposed in 1967 as S. 843.² I have re-introduced the bill in the Ninety-second Congress, again as S. 5.

I. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

One might wonder why a United States Senator is so concerned about a structural innovation in the President's office, but I believe that a review of the case for such a Council and of the precedents regarding Executive Office structure will show that Congressional impetus for this is both well-founded and appropriate.

In the twenty-five years since the end of World War II, the Executive Office of the President has undergone radical structural change. This is not readily recognized, perhaps because of the staying power of the two best-known, general-purpose staff units, namely the White House Office and the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget). Yet these are the only two present units which were in the Executive Office in 1945.

It is also little realized that today's Executive Office contains sixteen separate units. In contrast with four at the end of 1945, and that eleven of the present constituent units have been established or significantly altered in the past ten years.³ So the structure of the Office is quite fluid and, increasingly, specialized. It is against this background that the proposal to establish yet another unit—a Council of Social Advisers—must be evaluated.

II. WHAT A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS WOULD DO

With the steady evolution of the Executive Office's composition, it seems clear that the question is not *whether* we should consider establishing new units in the Executive Office but rather, which ones, and when. Under my proposal, the Council of Social Advisers (CSA) would be composed of three of the nation's most gifted and respected social analysts (appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate) and staffed by a number of America's brightest young social scientists. The CSA would be responsible for monitoring, on an on-going basis, specific and actual conditions in the country which affect the "social opportunity" of our people. Developing a system of "social indicators"

would be a principal task of the Council.⁴

A chief objective of such an agency would be to enlarge the chances each of our citizens has to develop his potential to the fullest. That is why I have called the proposal the "Full Opportunity Act." Indeed, the bill stipulates, really for the first time in our history, "the opportunity to live in decency and dignity" as a national goal for all of our citizens.

The bill also provides for an annual report of the President on the nation's social status. Requiring the President to report annually on such areas as education, health, housing, alienation, political participation, personal security, and social mobility would do far more than assure the publication of CSA findings and recommendations: It would guarantee such societal knowledge visibility of the sort that only presidential involvement can generate.

It has been asked whether the state of the art in social accounting and the state of the art in the social sciences warrant the formalization in statute of social accounting and reporting requirements. Much of America's turmoil in the 1960's grew out of massive frustration at continuing social unfulfillment. That frustration mysteriously eluded the attention of decisionmakers, in both the public and private sectors, until the time for defusing the bomb had all but slipped away. Tragically, that should never have been the case. For in truth, the real conditions of explosive neighborhoods in Watts, Detroit, Newark, and elsewhere were known—and their implications understood—by a variety of social scientists who not only possessed such publicly-useful knowledge but published it as well.

To our collective sorrow, most of those studies remained buried in the forbidding pages of the scholarly journals of a dozen or more academic disciplines, ranging from anthropology to political science. One can only imagine how different the tumultuous decade just ended might have been had there existed then the sort of mechanism for monitoring and reporting social conditions I am proposing.

Thus it becomes clear that the social sciences do have something to contribute to the process of rationalizing public policymaking. The social sciences have demonstrated in recent years both a rediscovered interest in social problem-solving and a dedication to the development of research tools which serve this end.

During the three years that my proposal has been before the Congress, the objective of social reporting has been widely accepted. Both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations have based their opposition on the structural changes proposed by the bill, but they have pledged themselves to further the development of social accounting. In fact, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare produced in January 1969 a document entitled *Toward a Social Report*.⁵ As rudimentary as this pilot effort was, it illustrates that we can begin whenever we are ready.⁷

In the four years since I first introduced the "Full Opportunity Act," a number of individuals and study groups have determined that it is time to establish a Council of Social Advisers and to provide for an annual Social Report. For example, in October 1969 the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee of the National Academy of Sciences—Social Science Research Council recommended the preparation of an annual social report, initially outside of the government but with the aid of federal funds.⁸ The Committee also recommended the subsequent establishment of a Council of Social Advisers. In December 1969, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence also recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of such a council and to the preparation of a social report.⁹

III.—NEED FOR A SOCIAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

A second point which must be made was strongly underscored by the hearings held on the CSA proposal in both the Ninetieth and Ninety-first Congresses. Put succinctly, hunch, intuition, and good intentions have been the heavy artillery of social problem-solvers, to a far greater extent than anyone has recognized. This point was made most forcefully in the testimony of Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., principal domestic policy assistant in the Johnson White House (and now a supporter of S. 5) who observed, at a December 1969 hearing:

"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."¹⁰

He also related the experience he had when, in 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did not even know the composition of welfare rolls. There was—and still is—the myth that there are vast numbers of able-bodied men receiving welfare.

When the welfare data were finally obtained, almost two years later, we learned that of the 7.3 million then on welfare:

- 3.5 million were children
- 2.1 million were women over 65
- 700,000 were handicapped or blind
- 900,000 were mothers of the children
- 100,000 were males who were incapacitated beyond any ability to work or be trained
- and 50,000, less than one-tenth of one per cent, were males who could possibly be called "able-bodied."¹¹

Despite such experiences, the Johnson Administration believed that sufficient progress in social accounting could be made through the existing executive structures. It pointed particularly to the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It also thought the Program Planning and Budgeting System, which it had initiated in 1965, would greatly improve analysis of social programs by the operating agencies and the presidential staff.

It is true that efforts to predict and evaluate the effects of social programs have expanded greatly. But we are already suffering from the fact that such efforts are scattered and unconnected.

When the Nixon Administration first assumed office in 1969, it found an elaborate review of the cost-effectiveness of various Economic Opportunity Act programs, which the General Accounting Office had prepared on order of the Congress. Somewhere in the midst of the study were data which ultimately proved disastrous to the Job Corps. The GAO figures showed that the annual cost for training a Job Corps enrollee ranged between \$6000 and \$8000. They also showed that only sixty-five per cent of participants could be classified as successful.

The central difficulty, from a policy point of view, was one which unfortunately occupied little if any of the time or attention of those who ultimately decided the fate of the Job Corps. Questions there were that deserved to be asked and answered:

Is it really such an outrage to spend \$3000 to \$4000 for six months' training of an urban youngster with a wretchedly deprived background and no future but one most likely to be devoted to crime or waste?

What would it cost society to keep such a person in prison or on welfare?

Given the difficulty of the problem, is a sixty-five per cent success rate really poor, or is it possibly a great achievement?

Most importantly, what other programs were there to use which would offer a higher success rate, a lower cost, or both?

What future might have awaited the Job Corps had questions such as these been asked and answered can only be left to conjecture. For in due course some 17,000 youngsters who had found new hope in the Job Corps fell under the axe of an unusually cruel system of social accounting. Indeed, several months later, the Administration was unable even to locate almost one-half of these young people, though it had promised to transfer them all to other manpower programs.

The danger of piecemeal social accounting was underscored when a number of us in Congress asked for data which would permit a comparative analysis of the Job Corps with a variety of other manpower programs favored by the Administration. Several weeks later the GAO, following repeated congressional inquiries, produced a table which featured the number "2." This was a footnote which said that the data were "not available."

Subsequent experience with alternative manpower programs suggests that the Job Corps was, and is, relatively effective after all. For example, it turned out that there

were no placement data on the JOBS program, which was initially favored by the Administration. Later, we learned that this was one of the poorest manpower programs, with a success rate of only thirty to fifty per cent. So it would seem that a partial system of social accounting permits, or perhaps encourages, unwise decisions. Now that we have gone so far in measurement and evaluation, I think we dare not stop.

IV. NEED FOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Surely it was at least in partial recognition of this decision-making deficiency in the American political system that, less than six months after having assumed office, President Nixon created a National Goals Research Staff (NGRS) on July 12, 1969.¹³ Physically and organizationally located within the White House itself, the NGRS was from the outset over-shadowed by the larger political imperatives which confronted the Administration. Overseeing the work of the NGRS was but one of several responsibilities of a member of the White House staff, Mr. Leonard Garment.

The NGRS was commissioned originally to undertake a comprehensive review of the nation's objectives in the years immediately ahead and to prepare a report each year on the Fourth of July. Ultimately it produced a first, and final, compilation of potential problems which could come to plague the American people.¹⁴ So disturbingly wanting was the report that the *New York Times* observed editorially that it represented a "disappointing evasion of responsibility."¹⁵ Moreover, the *Times* editorial continued,

"The 169-page report, plus appendices, which was a year in the making, sets forth neither goals nor priorities. 'The Staff did not have a goal-setting function,' the report contends. If not, this White House task force was either misnamed or misdirected, or both."¹⁶

As is so frequently the case with organizational changes not based on statute, the NGRS effort aborted at some critical juncture. Those not privy to the pressures which played upon this small group may never know with certainty either the reason for the project's demise or the point at which it came. Still the experience of the NGRS may be instructive.

The point to be made is simply that the Nixon Administration's early efforts to achieve improved social policymaking have not succeeded. In disbanding the NGRS, the White House announced that its work would be carried on by the new Domestic Council. Thus we have seen two administrations rely, at one time or another, on the Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a new National Goals Research Staff, and a new Domestic Council to do a job which both agreed needs doing. So the relevant question is, when will such disparate and disconnected impulses be gotten together into some sort of comprehensive, systematic enterprise which has a decent chance for perseverance and productivity?

I am convinced that the day will not dawn when such irrational policy judgments as that involved in the Job Corps illustration are no longer made until America is provided with a new statutorily-mandated governmental structure. This structure must be capable of synthesizing our knowledge in the social area and proceeding directly to obliterate current gaps in that knowledge. Surely the unhappy experience of the NGRS underscores the need for a status which assures continuity. And no good can come from continuing to make decisions based on the chance availability of unconnected social measurements and evaluations.

So critical is the range of social problems confronting our country today that we can no longer afford the idle luxury of what John Gardner has so eloquently and tellingly termed "stumbling into the future." With a gunstock full of notches commemorating such disastrous undertakings as that of the NGRS, now is the time to target our hopes for improved social policymaking in one direction and one direction only. I believe that the creation of some sort of mechanism capable of comprehensively analyzing social conditions in this country, and reporting factually on those conditions to the President, the Congress, and the country, is the direction in which we now must move. We have already invested tremendous amounts of energy, talent, and money in cost-benefit analysis, experimentation with planning-programming-budgeting systems, and a wide variety of program evaluation techniques. Is it not now appropriate to move unhesitatingly toward a more sophisticated level of institutionalized structures competent to the task and responsible for performing it?

V.—THE COUNCIL, THE CONGRESS, AND THE PRESIDENT

Some observers, who agree that we need a system of social accounting and that a new statutory structure is the only way to bring it about, nevertheless harbor one further concern. What chance, they ask, is there that even a council created by statute could effectively do all of these things which need doing so urgently if it is unwanted by the President?

Surely no one would suggest that the conclusions and recommendations in the annual

social report prepared by a Council of Social Advisers for the President and the Congress would run counter to the thinking of the President or his Administration. Yet, such a report would necessarily contain data and analysis which might lead other commentators to different conclusions.

Mr. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget has said:

"The United States budget is not the document of an executive whose decisions are law, nor of a prime minister whose party must support him or bring down the government. It is, rather, a set of proposals to the Congress for action on appropriations and tax measures. Precisely because it must advocate the course recommended by the President, the budget cannot emphasize the difficulty of the choices made. It records the President's decisions, but it does not identify the close ones. Alternatives that were serious contenders for adoption but were finally rejected are seldom if ever mentioned. In some cases, programs generally recognized as ineffective or of low priority are debated but finally left unchanged because all participants in the debate realize how few are the lances a President can afford to break against politically impregnable targets. Thus, the budget is a document designed to persuade an independent Congress rather than to analyze policy alternatives."¹⁷

Even if we had reason to believe that a comprehensive system of social accounting would be promptly initiated by the executive branch, without a statutory requirement, there would be a sound basis for legislation. The Congress also must have access to such information. Prestigious members of a statutory council, subject to Senate confirmation and available to testify before congressional committees on their findings, would assure the Congress and the public of the required quality and visibility of their work. Further, the tension between the council members and the Congress should elevate the level of analysis in the same way that our understanding of economics has been enhanced through the hearings on the *Economic Report*.

There is ample precedent, since the Second World War, for the establishment of specialized councils which (a) were essentially foisted on given administrations and (b) have proved to be meritorious additions to the federal government's structure, notwithstanding initial executive opposition.

Certainly the Council of Economic Advisers, created by the Employment Act of 1946,¹⁸ supports this thesis. Similarly, the National Security Council, established in 1947,¹⁹ and the Council on Environmental Quality,²⁰ set up only a year ago, came to occupy respected positions even within administrations which initially opposed them. The Nixon Administration, for example, opposed incipient congressional efforts to highlight the ecological crisis by a statutory prescription for top-level presidential and congressional advice. Yet when signing into law the measure creating the new Council, the President heralded the action as one opening a new decade of the environment, and he has used it widely and effectively since then.

History compels the conclusion that Presidents use, in varying degree, all of the statutorily-created structures in the executive branch. Moreover, they tend to use most vigorously and trustingly those bodies which draw esteem and respect both to themselves and their President. Thus it may safely be concluded that a Council of Social Advisers which performed satisfactorily its mission of measuring and monitoring and reporting on social conditions in America would, far from meeting perpetual presidential resistance and rancor, come in time to enjoy a position of trust and respect. From such a position it could reasonably be anticipated that the Council could begin to elevate social policymaking in America to new levels of sophistication.

The principal concern of this essay has been the interrelationship between a proposed federal mechanism for improving social policymaking and the office of President of the United States. Is there some possibility that even a valuable new council would contribute to overburdening him with specialized advisory units?

I believe a Council of Social Advisers, charged with the responsibility for advancing and asserting existing knowledge of real social facts about this society, should serve to integrate, coordinate, and systematize the now dissident and discordant efforts of social planners and evaluators wherever they may be located within the federal government.

Moreover, the CSA should, in operation, synthesize advisory inputs which now compete for individual, isolated attention, thus reducing the cumulative advice-receiving burden of the President. Additionally, in synthesizing available information, the CSA would be speaking to the President—and to the Congress and the country—in a voice which, while a blend of many voices, would still be coherent.

Finally, I believe that we shall never begin to end our hopeless method of making social policy decisions of the most sensitive sort on the basis of hunch, intuition, and good intentions until we move in the direction pointed to by this legislative proposal. The enactment of legislation creating a comprehensive advisory role in the social policy

area will, I believe, radically alter not only the process by which decisionmakers choose, but ultimately the choices which are made.

When President Nixon established the National Goals Research Staff in July 1969, he stated that the report to be prepared by the unit should "serve as a focus for the kind of lively widespread public discussion that deserves to go into decisions affecting our common future."²¹ The document which ultimately emanated from the NGRS could not begin to serve the critical focusing function the President had envisioned for it. After a round of newspaper comments, it disappeared from view. No congressional committee held hearings on it. A Council of Social Advisers, speaking social facts to the American people in a clear and coherent voice, could provide the kind of focus the President asked for.

When, finally, such a Council is created—as I think is very likely—it will be a most fitting recognition of the firm resolve of our people to govern themselves rightly and intelligently and of the efforts of many, along the way, to make a start toward the objective so well stated by Abraham Lincoln: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."²²

FOOTNOTES

¹ S. 5, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. § 103 (1970). As originally introduced, the bill would also have established a Congressional Joint Committee on the Social Report, but this provision was deleted. See 116 Cong. Rec. S15,163 (daily ed. Sept. 10, 1970). Provision for a Congressional Office of Goals and Priorities Analysis was added in Committee. S. 5, § 202. These latter provisions are not discussed in this article, which is intended to focus on the more directly presidential issues.

² 843, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967). The hearings on this bill were published in three parts in 1968. See *Hearings on S. 843 Before the Subcomm. on Government Research of the Senate Comm. on Government Operations*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1968). Among those participating in these hearings were Dr. Bertram M. Gross, a Political Science Professor, and Joseph Kraft, a journalist, who were early advocates of a Council of Social Advisers.

³ The White House Office and the Office of Management and Budget, as Executive office units date back to 1939. Since then the following additions have been made: Council of Economic Advisers (1946); National Security Council (1949); National Aeronautics and Space Council (1961); Office of Emergency Preparedness (1961); Office of Science and Technology (1962); Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (1963); Office of Consumer Affairs (1964); Office of Economic Opportunity (1964); National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development (1966); Office of the Vice President (1969); Office of Intergovernmental Relations (1969); Council on Environmental Quality (1970); Office of Telecommunications Policy (1970); and Domestic Council (1970).

⁴ See especially SOCIAL INDICATORS (R. Bauer ed. 1966) for a comprehensive review of the concept of social indicators and social accounting.

⁵ S. 5, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 101 (1970).

⁶ U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT (1969).

⁷ The hearings on S. 5 contain testimony and an extensive bibliographic section documenting more fully the state of the art in social accounting. See *Hearings on S. 5 Before the Special Subcomm. on Evaluation of Social Programs of the Senate Comm. on Labor and Public Welfare*, 91st Cong., 1st & 2d Sess. (1970).

⁸ NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: OUTLOOK AND NEEDS (1970).

⁹ TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, TO INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY, FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE 272 (1969).

¹⁰ Statement of Joseph A. Califano, Jr., in *Hearings on S. 5 supra* note 7, at 204.

¹¹ *Id.* at 209-10.

¹² Only three days earlier, the Bureau of the Budget had opposed S. 5 on behalf of the Administration, principally on the grounds that a new structure was not needed and would only be duplicative. See Statement of Maurice Mann, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, in *id.* at 144-45.

¹³ TOWARD BALANCED GROWTH: QUANTITY WITH QUALITY, REPORT OF THE NATIONAL GOALS RESEARCH STAFF (1970).

¹⁴ *What Goals?*, N.Y. Times, July 21, 1970, at 34, col. 1.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ C. SCHULTZE ET AL., SETTING NATIONAL PRIORITIES 4 (1970).

¹⁷ Ch. 33, 60 Stat. 23.

¹⁸ National Security Act of 1947, ch. 343, 61 Stat. 495.

¹⁹ National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 83 Stat. 852.

²⁰ 5 WEEKLY COMP. PRES. DOC. 982, 984 (1969).

²¹ Address delivered by Abraham Lincoln Before the Republican State Convention, Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1858, in 3 COMPLETE WORKS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN I (J. Nicolay & J. Hay eds. 1905).



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1971

No. 126

Senate

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2448. A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax to low-income individuals who have attained age 65 for State and local property taxes paid by them on their residences, and for rent considered as taxes paid by them. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR THE ELDERLY FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill designed to bring property tax relief to low-income elderly people. My proposal would allow a credit against the Federal income tax for that portion of the property tax that is determined to be excessive.

As a member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have been impressed with the difficulties which older citizens face in maintaining homeownership. Every day I receive agonizing letters from older constituents who are being forced out of their homes by financial pressures.

For senior citizens, homeownership is a crucial part of remaining independent. With increased family mobility, and the decline in the traditions of the extended family sharing a large home, older persons must hold on to their own dwellings or face a disastrous choice: move into an institution or enter a rental housing market beset by rampant inflation.

About two-thirds of persons aged 62 to 64 own their own homes. But beyond age 65 homeownership drops markedly; at 72 years of age, it is 50 percent. Each year 425,000 older Americans are forced to give up their homes. As a result, pressures are increased for public housing for the elderly. Moreover, the loss of independence contributes to declining health and morale, and loss of dignity, and leads to greater pressure for other public assistance.

The fundamental reason that elderly people have trouble holding onto their home is poverty.

The median income for elderly heads of families in 1969 was \$4,800; for unrelated individuals, it was \$1,850.

Over the last decade, people over 65 have fallen further behind in their income relative to everyone else. In 1962, the median income of elderly heads of families was 50 percent of the median for those under 65. By 1969, it had fallen to 47 percent. For unrelated individuals the same ratio went from 47 percent in 1962 to 43 percent in 1969.

But it is at the lower end of the income scale that the problems of the elderly are most acute. In 1970, 27 percent of all elderly families were poor or near poor and 60 percent of unrelated elderly individuals were poor or near poor. These percentages are six times the comparable figures for the remainder of the population. Compared to those under 65, families that are poor or near poor are twice as numerous among the elderly; among unrelated individuals, poverty is seven times as likely among the elderly.

Property taxes seriously aggravate the desperate income situation of older citizens.

In Wisconsin, it is estimated that over 7,000 elderly householders with income under \$1,000 paid property taxes amounting to about 30 percent of their subsistence income in 1968. Nationwide, local property tax collectors are taking about \$3 billion from families with income below \$5,000—and probably half of this comes from households of the elderly.

Recent studies by the Minnesota Planning Agency and the Minnesota Commis-

sioner of Taxation illustrate the same problem. These studies confirm what letters to my office describe so poignantly every day—the desperation of older citizens forced to give up their family homes because their retirement income does not cover their property taxes.

These studies also show how unfair the property tax really is. For example, in Minnesota persons with an income of \$2,000 pay 6 percent of that income in property taxes; at \$10,000 of income, the tax is 2.4 percent, and at \$20,000 it is 1.5 percent. Persons over 65 at lower income levels are especially burdened. Households with incomes of \$1,500 pay 10 percent of their income in property taxes; with \$2,000 income, 8.4 percent is paid as property tax, and at \$3,000 income, 6.4 percent.

Minnesota has taken steps to relieve this burden on older citizens by providing a State property tax credit which somewhat reduces the oppressive effect. Over half the other States have taken similar action, but in my judgment, further relief is necessary.

Federal law now permits taxpayers to deduct property taxes from their incomes, but this only helps those who itemize their deductions. In 1969, of the 6.9 million tax returns filed by persons 65 and over, only 3.3 million itemized their deductions. Thus, even this small aid did not reach over half the elderly.

I propose a tax credit of up to \$360 against unusually high property taxes or rent paid on a personal residence. My proposal is closely modeled after the Wisconsin and Minnesota laws. Property taxes are considered unusually high if they exceed a certain percentage of household income. After determining the amount of the tax which is excessive, 75 percent of this excessive part is relieved.

According to my formula, the cutoff point is \$6,000—any elderly person earning over this amount would get no help.

To preserve equity between owners and renters, I propose to include the latter—it is assumed that 25 percent of the rent payment is in effect payment for property taxes.

A major portion of those eligible for this program do not have incomes high enough to pay income taxes. For these older citizens, the property tax relief would be in the form of a direct cash refund rather than a credit against income tax.

The following table gives the maximum property tax that is considered reasonable in the terms of this legislation. Relief is provided for 75 percent of the difference between one's property taxes and the figures in the table. Thus, for a household with \$2,500 in income and \$200 in property taxes, there would be a tax credit or refund of \$120.

Maximum justifiable property tax by household income level	
Household income:	Tax
\$1,000.....	--
\$1,500.....	--
\$2,000.....	\$20
\$2,500.....	40
\$3,000.....	60
\$4,000.....	140
\$5,000.....	240
\$6,000.....	360

The cost of my bill is relatively low. In 1970, the Wisconsin law provided tax relief of \$7.2 million to 74,000 low-income elderly families. This was less than 1 percent of total property tax collections in the State.

My bill will be somewhat more expensive, because relief is provided to households with up to \$6,000 of income. This ceiling is higher than that provided by the State plans presently in effect. A

large family with \$4,500 in income needs the relief almost as much as an individual or family further down on the income scale.

In addition to relieving the elderly of the burden of excessive property taxes, the law has an important side effect: It makes the overall tax system less regressive by transferring income from the general taxpaying population to elderly people who are poor.

In my judgment, this Nation has failed to adequately fulfill its obligations to its senior citizens. The beneficiaries of my bill have been paying taxes for over 40 years. I think we can afford to give them sufficient tax relief so that they are not forced to relinquish their homes. I think we owe them at least this much.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 2448

A bill to allow a credit against Federal income tax to low-income individuals who have attained age 65 for State and local property taxes paid by them on their residences, and for rent considered as taxes paid by them.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits allowable) is amended by renumbering section 40 as 41, and by inserting after section 39 the following new section:

"Sec. 40. Residential property taxes and rent paid by individuals who have attained age 65.

"(a) General Rule.—In the case of an individual who has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year and whose household income for the taxable year does not exceed \$6,000 (\$3,000, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return), there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter an amount, determined under subsection (b), of State and local property taxes paid by him during the taxable year for property used and used by him as his principal residence, and of rent considered as taxes paid by him during the taxable year for property used by him as his principal residence.

"(b) Amount of Credit.—

"(1) General rule.—Except in the case of a married individual who files a separate return, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year is an amount equal to 75 percent of so much as does not exceed \$360 of the State and local property taxes paid by him during the taxable year on property owned and used by him as his principal residence and rent considered as taxes paid by him during the taxable year for property used by him as his principal residence, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) 3 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$1,500, but does not exceed \$3,000,

"(B) 6 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$3,000, but does not exceed \$4,500, and

"(C) 9 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$4,500, but does not exceed \$6,000.

"(2) Married individuals filing separately.—In the case of a married individual who files a separate return, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year is an amount equal to 75 percent of so much as does not exceed \$180 of the State and local property taxes paid by him during the taxable year on property owned and used by him as his principal residence and rent considered as taxes paid by him during the taxable year for property used by him as his principal residence, reduced by the sum of—

"(A) 3 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$750, but does not exceed \$1,500,

"(B) 6 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$1,500, but does not

exceed \$2,250, and

"(C) 9 percent of so much of his household income as exceeds \$2,250, but does not exceed \$3,000.

"(c) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) State and local property taxes.—The term 'State and local property taxes' means taxes on property imposed by a State, a political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia which are allowable as a deduction under section 164.

"(2) Rent considered as taxes.—The term 'rent considered as taxes' means 25 percent of the rent paid solely for the right to occupy property used as a principal residence.

"(3) Household income.—The household income of an individual is the sum of—

"(A) the adjusted gross income, as determined for purposes of this chapter, of such individual and members of his household, and

"(B) all other items of income of such individual and members of his household which are excluded from gross income under any provision of the chapter (or regulations prescribed thereunder) or under any other law of the United States, or exempt from the tax imposed by this chapter under any such law, other than—

"(i) gifts, bequests, and inheritances received from any person, and

"(ii) donations of tangible personal property received from the United States or any State or political subdivision thereof.

"(4) Member of household.—The members of the household of an individual are all individuals whose principal place of abode is the principal residence of such individual.

"(d) Special Rules.—

"(1) Husband and wife.—In the case of a husband and wife who file a single return jointly under section 6013, the age requirement contained in subsection (a) shall, with respect to property jointly used by them as their principal residence, be treated as satisfied if either spouse has attained the age of sixty-five before the close of the taxable year.

"(2) PROPERTY USED IN PART AS PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—In the case property only a portion of which is used by the taxpayer as his principal residence, there shall be taken into account, for purposes of subsection (a), so much of the property taxes and rent considered as taxes paid by him with respect to such property as is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to be attributable to the portion of such property so used by him.

"(3) COOPERATIVE HOUSING.—For purposes of subsection (a), an individual who is a tenant-stockholder in a cooperative housing corporation (as defined in section 216(b))—

"(A) shall be treated as owning the house or apartment which he is entitled to occupy by reason of his ownership of stock in such corporation, and

"(B) shall be treated as having paid property taxes during the taxable year equal to the portion of the deduction allowable to him under section 216(a) which represents such taxes paid or accrued by such corporation.

"(4) CHANGE OF PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—If during a taxable year a taxpayer changes his principal residence, subsection (a) shall apply only to that portion of the property taxes and rent considered as taxes paid by him with respect to each such principal residence as is properly allocable to the period during which it is used by him as his principal residence.

"(5) SALE OR PURCHASE OF PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—If during a taxable year a taxpayer sells or purchases property used by him as his principal residence, subsection (a) shall apply only to the portion of the property taxes with respect to such property as is treated as imposed on him under section 164 (d) and, for purposes of subsection (a), the taxpayer shall be treated as having paid such taxes as are treated as paid by him under such section.

"(e) ADJUSTMENT FOR REFUNDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of property taxes and rent considered as taxes paid by an individual during any taxable year shall be reduced by the amount of any refund of such taxes or rent, whether or not received during the taxable year.

"(2) Interest.—In the case of an underpayment of the tax imposed by this chapter for a taxable year resulting from the application of paragraph (1), no interest shall be assessed or collected on such underpayment if the amount thereof is paid within 60 days after the taxpayer receives the refund of property taxes or rent which caused such underpayment.

"(f) Deduction Not Affected.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall not affect the deduction under section 164 for State and local property taxes.

"(g) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 40. Residential property taxes and rent paid by individuals who have attained age 65.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 6401 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to excessive credits) is amended—

(1) by inserting ", 40 (relating to residential property taxes and rent paid by individuals who have attained age 65)," after "lubricating oil)", and

(2) by striking out "31 and 39" and inserting in lieu thereof "31, 39, and 40".

(b) Section 72 (n) (3) of such Code relating to determination of taxable income for certain purposes) is amended by striking out "31 and 39" and inserting in lieu thereof "31, 39, and 40".

(c) Section 6201 (a) (4) of such Code (relating to assessment authority) is amended—

(1) by striking out "Section 39" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "Sections 39 and 40", and

(2) by inserting after "lubricating oil)" in the text "or section 40 (relating to residential property taxes and rent paid by individuals who have attained age 65)".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1971

No. 126

Senate

NEED FOR A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to be one of the 22 Senators from both parties who have cosponsored the Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act, S. 5. This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE). I think enactment of the bill will contribute significantly to the ability of both the executive branch and the Congress to deal intelligently with pressing social issues.

Both the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration have endorsed the purposes of this bill but have objected to the establishment of a new structure, a Council of Social Advisers, as unnecessary. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. MONDALE, has just written an excellent article which points out how the efforts of both administrations in this area have fallen short of the mark. The summer 1970 issue of *Law and Contemporary Problems* has just been released. This issue on "The Institutionalized Presidency" contains the article I refer to under the title "Social Advisers, Social Accounting, and the Presidency."

Because I think all Senators should acquaint themselves with the need for early action in this area, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the RECORD.

SOCIAL ADVISERS, SOCIAL ACCOUNTING, AND THE PRESIDENCY

(By WALTER F. MONDALE)

On September 10, 1970, the United States Senate passed S. 5, the Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act. Among other things, the bill would have established a Council of Social Advisers in the Executive Office of the President.¹

The bill was not acted on by the House. However, Senate passage represents significant progress for this measure, which did not even emerge from committee when it was first proposed in 1967 as S. 843.² I have reintroduced the bill in the Ninety-second Congress, again as S. 5.

I. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

One might wonder why a United States Senator is so concerned about a structural innovation in the President's office, but I believe that a review of the case for such a Council and of the precedents regarding Executive Office structure will show that Congressional impetus for this is both well-founded and appropriate.

In the twenty-five years since the end of World War II, the Executive Office of the President has undergone radical structural change. This is not readily recognized, perhaps because of the staying power of the two best-known, general-purpose staff units, namely the White House Office and the Bureau of the Budget (now the Office of Management and Budget). Yet these are the only two present units which were in the Executive Office in 1945.

It is also little realized that today's Executive Office contains sixteen separate units in contrast with four at the end of 1945, and that eleven of the present constituent units have been established or significantly altered in the past ten years.³ So the structure of the Office is quite fluid and, increasingly, specialized. It is against this background that the proposal to establish yet another unit—a Council of Social Advisers—must be evaluated.

II. WHAT A COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS WOULD DO

With the steady evolution of the Executive Office's composition, it seems clear that the question is not whether we should consider establishing new units in the Executive Office but rather, which ones, and when. Under my proposal, the Council of Social Advisers (CSA) would be composed of three of the nation's most gifted and respected social analysts (appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate) and staffed by a number of America's brightest young social scientists. The CSA would be responsible for monitoring, on an on-going basis, specific and actual conditions in the country which affect the "social opportunity" of our people. Developing a system of "social indicators"

would be a principal task of the Council.⁴

A chief objective of such an agency would be to enlarge the chances each of our citizens has to develop his potential to the fullest. That is why I have called the proposal the "Full Opportunity Act." Indeed, the bill stipulates, really for the first time in our history, "the opportunity to live in decency and dignity" as a national goal for all of our citizens.

The bill also provides for an annual report of the President on the nation's social status. Requiring the President to report annually on such areas as education, health, housing, alienation, political participation, personal security, and social mobility would do far more than assure the publication of CSA findings and recommendations: It would guarantee such societal knowledge visibility of the sort that only presidential involvement can generate.

It has been asked whether the state of the art in social accounting and the state of the art in the social sciences warrant the formalization in statute of social accounting and reporting requirements. Much of America's turmoil in the 1960's grew out of massive frustration at continuing social unfulfillment. That frustration mysteriously eluded the attention of decisionmakers, in both the public and private sectors, until the time for defusing the bomb had all but slipped away. Tragically, that should never have been the case. For in truth, the real conditions of explosive neighborhoods in Watts, Detroit, Newark, and elsewhere were known—and their implications understood—by a variety of social scientists who not only possessed such publicly-useful knowledge but published it as well.

To our collective sorrow, most of those studies remained buried in the forbidding pages of the scholarly journals of a dozen or more academic disciplines, ranging from anthropology to political science. One can only imagine how different the tumultuous decade just ended might have been had there existed then the sort of mechanism for monitoring and reporting social conditions I am proposing.

Thus it becomes clear that the social sciences do have something to contribute to the process of rationalizing public policymaking. The social sciences have demonstrated in recent years both a rediscovered interest in social problem-solving and a dedication to the development of research tools which serve this end.

During the three years that my proposal has been before the Congress, the objective of social reporting has been widely accepted. Both the Johnson and Nixon Administrations have based their opposition on the structural changes proposed by the bill, but they have pledged themselves to further the development of social accounting. In fact, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare produced in January 1969 a document entitled *Toward a Social Report*.⁵ As rudimentary as this pilot effort was, it illustrates that we can begin whenever we are ready.⁷

In the four years since I first introduced the "Full Opportunity Act," a number of individuals and study groups have determined that it is time to establish a Council of Social Advisers and to provide for an annual Social Report. For example, in October 1969 the Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey Committee of the National Academy of Sciences—Social Science Research Council recommended the preparation of an annual social report, initially outside of the government but with the aid of federal funds.⁸ The Committee also recommended the subsequent establishment of a Council of Social Advisers. In December 1969, the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence also recommended that consideration be given to the establishment of such a council and to the preparation of a social report.⁹

III.—NEED FOR A SOCIAL ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

A second point which must be made was strongly underscored by the hearings held on the CSA proposal in both the Ninetieth and Ninety-first Congresses. Put succinctly, hunch, intuition, and good intentions have been the heavy artillery of social problem-solvers, to a far greater extent than anyone has recognized. This point was made most forcefully in the testimony of Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., principal domestic policy assistant in the Johnson White House (and now a supporter of S. 5) who observed, at a December 1969 hearing:

"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."¹⁰

He also related the experience he had when, in 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare did not even know the composition of welfare rolls. There was—and still is—the myth that there are vast numbers of able-bodied men receiving welfare.

When the welfare data were finally obtained, almost two years later, we learned that of the 7.3 million then on welfare:

- 3.5 million were children
- 2.1 million were women over 65
- 700,000 were handicapped or blind
- 900,000 were mothers of the children
- 100,000 were males who were incapacitated beyond any ability to work or be trained
- and 50,000, less than one-tenth of one percent, were males who could possibly be called "able-bodied."¹¹

Despite such experiences, the Johnson Administration believed that sufficient progress in social accounting could be made through the existing executive structures. It pointed particularly to the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It also thought the Program Planning and Budgeting System, which it had initiated in 1965, would greatly improve analysis of social programs by the operating agencies and the presidential staff.

It is true that efforts to predict and evaluate the effects of social programs have expanded greatly. But we are already suffering from the fact that such efforts are scattered and unconnected.

When the Nixon Administration first assumed office in 1969, it found an elaborate review of the cost-effectiveness of various Economic Opportunity Act programs, which the General Accounting Office had prepared on order of the Congress. Somewhere in the midst of the study were data which ultimately proved disastrous to the Job Corps. The GAO figures showed that the annual cost for training a Job Corps enrollee ranged between \$6000 and \$8000. They also showed that only sixty-five per cent of participants could be classified as successful.

The central difficulty, from a policy point of view, was one which unfortunately occupied little if any of the time or attention of those who ultimately decided the fate of the Job Corps. Questions there were that deserved to be asked and answered:

Is it really such an outrage to spend \$3000 to \$4000 for six months' training of an urban youngster with a wretchedly deprived background and no future but one most likely to be devoted to crime or waste?

What would it cost society to keep such a person in prison or on welfare?

Given the difficulty of the problem, is a sixty-five per cent success rate really poor, or is it possibly a great achievement?

Most importantly, what other programs were there to use which would offer a higher success rate, a lower cost, or both?

What future might have awaited the Job Corps had questions such as these been asked and answered can only be left to conjecture. For in due course some 17,000 youngsters who had found new hope in the Job Corps fell under the axe of an unusually cruel system of social accounting. Indeed, several months later, the Administration was unable even to locate almost one-half of these young people, though it had promised to transfer them all to other manpower programs.

The danger of piecemeal social accounting was underscored when a number of us in Congress asked for data which would permit a comparative analysis of the Job Corps with a variety of other manpower programs favored by the Administration. Several weeks later the GAO, following repeated congressional inquiries, produced a table which featured the number "2." This was a footnote which said that the data were "not available."

Subsequent experience with alternative manpower programs suggests that the Job Corps was, and is, relatively effective after all. For example, it turned out that there

were no placement data on the JOBS program, which was initially favored by the Administration. Later, we learned that this was one of the poorest manpower programs, with a success rate of only thirty to fifty per cent. So it would seem that a partial system of social accounting permits, or perhaps encourages, unwise decisions. Now that we have gone so far in measurement and evaluation, I think we dare not stop.

IV. NEED FOR STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Surely it was at least in partial recognition of this decision-making deficiency in the American political system that, less than six months after having assumed office, President Nixon created a National Goals Research Staff (NGRS) on July 12, 1969.¹² Physically and organizationally located within the White House itself, the NGRS was from the outset over-shadowed by the larger political imperatives which confronted the Administration. Overseeing the work of the NGRS was but one of several responsibilities of a member of the White House staff, Mr. Leonard Garment.

The NGRS was commissioned originally to undertake a comprehensive review of the nation's objectives in the years immediately ahead and to prepare a report each year on the Fourth of July. Ultimately it produced a first, and final, compilation of potential problems which could come to plague the American people.¹³ So disturbingly wanting was the report that the *New York Times* observed editorially that it represented a "disappointing evasion of responsibility."¹⁴ Moreover, the *Times* editorial continued,

"The 169-page report, plus appendices, which was a year in the making, sets forth neither goals nor priorities. 'The Staff did not have a goal-setting function,' the report contends. If not, this White House task force was either misnamed or misdirected, or both."¹⁵

As is so frequently the case with organizational changes not based on statute, the NGRS effort aborted at some critical juncture. Those not privy to the pressures which played upon this small group may never know with certainty either the reason for the project's demise or the point at which it came. Still the experience of the NGRS may be instructive.

The point to be made is simply that the Nixon Administration's early efforts to achieve improved social policymaking have not succeeded. In disbarring the NGRS, the White House announced that its work would be carried on by the new Domestic Council. Thus we have seen two administrations rely, at one time or another, on the Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a new National Goals Research Staff, and a new Domestic Council to do a job which both agreed needs doing. So the relevant question is, when will such disparate and disconnected impulses be gotten together into some sort of comprehensive, systematic enterprise which has a decent chance for perseverance and productivity?

I am convinced that the day will not dawn when such irrational policy judgments as that involved in the Job Corps illustration are no longer made until America is provided with a new statutorily-mandated governmental structure. This structure must be capable of synthesizing our knowledge in the social area and proceeding directly to obliterate current gaps in that knowledge. Surely the unhappy experience of the NGRS underscores the need for a status which assures continuity. And no good can come from continuing to make decisions based on the chance availability of unconnected social measurements and evaluations.

So critical is the range of social problems confronting our country today that we can no longer afford the idle luxury of what John Gardner has so eloquently and tellingly termed "stumbling into the future." With a gunstock full of notches commemorating such disastrous undertakings as that of the NGRS, now is the time to target our hopes for improved social policymaking in one direction and one direction only. I believe that the creation of some sort of mechanism capable of comprehensively analyzing social conditions in this country, and reporting factually on those conditions to the President, the Congress, and the country, is the direction in which we now must move. We have already invested tremendous amounts of energy, talent, and money in cost-benefit analysis, experimentation with planning-programming-budgeting systems, and a wide variety of program evaluation techniques. Is it not now appropriate to move unhesitatingly toward a more sophisticated level of institutionalized structures competent to the task and responsible for performing it?

V.—THE COUNCIL, THE CONGRESS, AND THE PRESIDENT

Some observers, who agree that we need a system of social accounting and that a new statutory structure is the only way to bring it about, nevertheless harbor one further concern. What chance, they ask, is there that even a council created by statute could effectively do all of these things which need doing so urgently if it is unwanted by the President?

Surely no one would suggest that the conclusions and recommendations in the annual social report prepared by a Council of Social Advisers for the President and the Congress would run counter to the thinking of the President or his Administration. Yet, such a report would necessarily contain data and analysis which might lead other commentators to different conclusions.

Mr. Charles Schultze, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget has said:

"The United States budget is not the document of an executive whose decisions are law, nor of a prime minister whose party must support him or bring down the government. It is, rather, a set of proposals to the Congress for action on appropriations and tax measures. Precisely because it must advocate the course recommended by the President, the budget cannot emphasize the difficulty of the choices made. It records the President's decisions, but it does not identify the close ones. Alternatives that were serious contenders for adoption but were finally rejected are seldom if ever mentioned. In some cases, programs generally recognized as ineffective or of low priority are debated but finally left unchanged because all participants in the debate realize how few are the lances a President can afford to break against politically impregnable targets. Thus, the budget is a document designed to persuade an independent Congress rather than to analyze policy alternatives."¹⁶

Even if we had reason to believe that a comprehensive system of social accounting would be promptly initiated by the executive branch, without a statutory requirement, there would be a sound basis for legislation. The Congress also must have access to such information. Prestigious members of a statutory council, subject to Senate confirmation and available to testify before congressional committees on their findings, would assure the Congress and the public of the required quality and visibility of their work. Further, the tension between the council members and the Congress should elevate the level of analysis in the same way that our understanding of economics has been enhanced through the hearings on the *Economic Report*.

There is ample precedent, since the Second World War, for the establishment of specialized councils which (a) were essentially foisted on given administrations and (b) have proved to be meritorious additions to the federal government's structure, notwithstanding initial executive opposition.

Certainly the Council of Economic Advisers, created by the Employment Act of 1946,¹⁷ supports this thesis. Similarly, the National Security Council, established in 1947,¹⁸ and the Council on Environmental Quality,¹⁹ set up only a year ago, came to occupy respected positions even within administrations which initially opposed them. The Nixon Administration, for example, opposed incipient congressional efforts to highlight the ecological crisis by a statutory prescription for top-level presidential and congressional advice. Yet when signing into law the measure creating the new Council, the President heralded the action as one opening a new decade of the environment, and he has used it widely and effectively since then.

History compels the conclusion that Presidents use, in varying degree, all of the statutorily-created structures in the executive branch. Moreover, they tend to use most vigorously and trustingly those bodies which draw esteem and respect both to themselves and their President. Thus it may safely be concluded that a Council of Social Advisers which performed satisfactorily its mission of measuring and monitoring and reporting on social conditions in America would, far from meeting perpetual presidential resistance and rancor, come in time to enjoy a position of trust and respect. From such a position it could reasonably be anticipated that the Council could begin to elevate social policymaking in America to new levels of sophistication.

The principal concern of this essay has been the interrelationship between a proposed federal mechanism for improving social policymaking and the office of President of the United States. Is there some possibility that even a valuable new council would contribute to overburdening him with specialized advisory inputs?

I believe a Council of Social Advisers, charged with the responsibility for advancing and asserting existing knowledge of real social facts about this society, should serve to integrate, coordinate, and systematize the now dissident and discordant efforts of social planners and evaluators wherever they may be located within the federal government.

Moreover, the CSA should, in operation, synthesize advisory inputs which now compete for individual, isolated attention, thus reducing the cumulative advice-receiving burden of the President. Additionally, in synthesizing available information, the CSA would be speaking to the President—and to the Congress and the country—in a voice which, while a blend of many voices, would still be coherent.

Finally, I believe that we shall never begin to end our hopeless method of making social policy decisions of the most sensitive sort on the basis of hunch, intuition, and good intentions until we move in the direction pointed to by this legislative proposal. The enactment of legislation creating a comprehensive advisory role in the social policy

area will, I believe, radically alter not only the process by which decisionmakers choose, but ultimately the choices which are made.

When President Nixon established the National Goals Research Staff in July 1969, he stated that the report to be prepared by the unit should "serve as a focus for the kind of lively widespread public discussion that deserves to go into decisions affecting our common future."²⁰ The document which ultimately emanated from the NGRS could not begin to serve the critical focusing function the President had envisioned for it. After a round of newspaper comments, it disappeared from view. No congressional committee held hearings on it. A Council of Social Advisers, speaking social facts to the American people in a clear and coherent voice, could provide the kind of focus the President asked for.

When, finally, such a Council is created—as I think is very likely—it will be a most fitting recognition of the firm resolve of our people to govern themselves rightly and intelligently and of the efforts of many, along the way, to make a start toward the objective so well stated by Abraham Lincoln: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."²¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ S. 5, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. § 103 (1970). As originally introduced, the bill would also have established a Congressional Joint Committee on the Social Report, but this provision was deleted. See 116 CONG. REC. S15,163 (daily ed. Sept. 10, 1970). Provision for a Congressional Office of Goals and Priorities Analysis was added in Committee. S. 5, § 202. These latter provisions are not discussed in this article, which is intended to focus on the more directly presidential issues.

² 843, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967). The hearings on this bill were published in three parts in 1968. See *Hearings on S. 843 Before the Subcomm. on Government Research of the Senate Comm. on Government Operations*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1968). Among those participating in these hearings were Dr. Bertram M. Gross, a Political Science Professor, and Joseph Kraft, a journalist, who were early advocates of a Council of Social Advisers.

³ The White House Office and the Office of Management and Budget, as Executive office units date back to 1939. Since then the following additions have been made: Council of Economic Advisers (1946); National Security Council (1949); National Aeronautics and Space Council (1961); Office of Emergency Preparedness (1961); Office of Science and Technology (1962); Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations (1963); Office of Consumer Affairs (1964); Office of Economic Opportunity (1964); National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development (1966); Office of the Vice President (1969); Office of Intergovernmental Relations (1969); Council on Environmental Quality (1970); Office of Telecommunications Policy (1970); and Domestic Council (1970).

⁴ See especially SOCIAL INDICATORS (R. Bauer ed. 1966) for a comprehensive review of the concept of social indicators and social accounting.

⁵ S. 5, 91st Cong., 2d Sess. 101 (1970).

⁶ U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT (1969).

⁷ The hearings on S. 5 contain testimony and an extensive bibliographic section documenting more fully the state of the art in social accounting. See *Hearings on S. 5 Before the Special Subcomm. on Evaluation of Social Programs of the Senate Comm. on Labor and Public Welfare*, 91st Cong., 1st & 2d Sess. (1970).

⁸ NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES: OUTLOOK AND NEEDS (1970).

⁹ TO ESTABLISH JUSTICE, TO INSURE DOMESTIC TRANQUILITY, FINAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE 272 (1969).

¹⁰ Statement of Joseph A. Califano, Jr., in *Hearings on S. 5 supra* note 7, at 204.

¹¹ *Id.* at 209-10.

¹² Only three days earlier, the Bureau of the Budget had opposed S. 5 on behalf of the Administration, principally on the grounds that a new structure was not needed and would only be duplicative. See Statement of Maurice Mann, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget, in *id.* at 144-45.

¹³ TOWARD BALANCED GROWTH: QUANTITY WITH QUALITY, REPORT OF THE NATIONAL GOALS RESEARCH STAFF (1970).

¹⁴ *What Goals?*, N.Y. Times, July 21, 1970, at 34, col. 1.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ C. SCHULTZE ET AL., SETTING NATIONAL PRIORITIES 4 (1970).

¹⁷ Ch. 33, 60 Stat. 23.

¹⁸ National Security Act of 1947, ch. 343, 61 Stat. 495.

¹⁹ National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 83 Stat. 852.

²⁰ 5 WEEKLY COMP. PRES. DOC. 982, 984 (1969).

²¹ Address delivered by Abraham Lincoln Before the Republican State Convention, Springfield, Ill., June 16, 1858, in 3 COMPLETE WORKS OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN 1 (J. Nicolay & J. Hay eds. 1905).



United States
of America

Congressional Record

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

Vol. 117

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 6, 1971

No. 127—Part II

Senate

THE PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, communities, large and small, are growing more and more concerned by a recent slowdown in activity by HUD's public housing program.

At this time 500,000 units have been applied for under the public housing program but no final action has been taken on any of these applications.

Long-standing delay in construction of badly needed units can be attributed primarily to the lack of funds which the administration has made available for this program.

But the recent slowdown appears to be related to a number of administrative factors such as the establishment of the HUD area offices, the freeze on available development funds, circular A-95 which requires clearance of all housing development to conform with comprehensive planning and a lack of personnel devoted to public housing production within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

While community officials—and the poor—have been remarkably patient through all the delays resulting from the lack of funds and staff, they certainly do not want needless redtape to take up the scarce resources which are available.

And undoubtedly the overburdened taxpayer does not want to see his money wasted on a needless shuffling of papers.

Unfortunately, a new decision by HUD would recall all current public housing applications where a site has not been approved in accordance with the housing site guidelines.

In many large metropolitan areas, housing site guidelines are necessary to ensure the economic and social well-being of the community.

But for many smaller communities

these guidelines do not apply at all. According to the newly announced HUD decisions, however, both small and large cities must resubmit their applications.

For local housing officials, this is an unnecessary waste of time and money. For HUD, it will mean more obstacles before any housing can be built.

In applications where the new site criteria is necessary I think there should be ways to include such without returning all applications to the local communities. The housing authorities could be asked to supply an addendum to the original application or else this could be taken care of when HUD reviews the site that has been selected.

Senator PROXMIER, Senator WILLIAMS, Senator CRANSTON, and I have written to HUD about all of these matters. We think it's important that public housing applications be moved along as quickly and efficiently as possible. Toward this end, we have asked that HUD consider the development of a separate, less complicated review process for small, non-metropolitan housing authorities.

I would like to share with my colleagues in the Senate, our letter to HUD which fully describes these problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., August 6, 1971.

HON. EUGENE A. GULLEDGE,
Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit,
FHA Commissioner, Department of Housing
and Urban Development, HUD Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GULLEDGE: Within the last few weeks we have become increasingly disturbed about what appears to be "slowing-down" in the production activity in the public housing program. Our constituents report

to us that badly-needed construction for low income families is just not moving as it should. This report comes from both large and small communities.

The causes for this "slowing-down" appear to be related to the establishment of the HUD area offices, the freeze on available development funds, the issuance of the A-95 circular requiring clearance of all housing development for conformance with comprehensive planning—and most recently, the recall by HUD of all public housing applications where a site has not been approved to review them for conformance with the new housing site guidelines. Also, we note in the testimony of Secretary Romney in the House of Representatives last week and before the Senate Hearing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee this week, the statement that a major reason for not moving faster on public housing production is the lack of sufficient HUD personnel in the public housing production area.

We would like to express to you our serious concern about any slow down in public housing production activity. In particular, we would like to have your appraisal relative to the new site reviews, as to how much time such reviews will take; and what a local housing authority can anticipate in terms of a time schedule. We would like your judgement as to whether a separate, and perhaps less complicated site review process might be instituted for small communities in non-metropolitan areas.

We would greatly appreciate a response to us:

First, your judgement as to an adequate level of HUD personnel in the public housing production area, and your general judgement as to how fast the Department can move to implement the backlog of public housing production demand.

Second, your judgement as to the time which will be required to complete a site review for a local housing authority; and whether it might be feasible to develop a separate, less complicated review process for small, nonmetropolitan housing authorities.

We will look forward to your early response on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER F. MONDALE,
ALAN CRANSTON,
WILLIAM PROXMIER,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senators.

"(b) While studying at the Institute and while traveling in connection with his study, including authorized field trips, each student or enrollee in the Institute shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons employed intermittently in the Government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code."

SEC. 502. The table of contents to "PART IV—CORRECTION OF YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS" of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after

"403. Juvenile delinquency..... 5031" the following new chapter reference:

"404. Federal Corrections Institute..... 5041".

SEC. 503. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

SUMMARY OF OMNIBUS CORRECTIONAL REFORM ACT OF 1971

This bill provides a new comprehensive approach to prison reform on the state and local level. It provides substantial federal support for a program of creating a new, modern correctional system built around smaller institutions, located in or near the urban communities they serve. At the same time, it takes account of the major effort needed to redirect the nation's penal effort by requiring the development of certain short range programs which will make present penitentiaries more effective.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Title I outlines the basic long range program which will result in a new penal strategy. It consists of several amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968:

(1) Require that after two years from passage no state plan for LEAA assistance will be approved as comprehensive (a necessary prerequisite to receiving Federal funds) unless it allocates at least 40% of the requested funds to the improvement of correctional practices and programs. (Part E of the LEAA Act presently requires a 20% allocation.) The actual allocation of LEAA funds is also changed accordingly. In terms of present Congressional authorization this would authorize \$700 million for this new program in fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

(2) Require that any such correctional plan contain a 20 year program developed in detail by five year segments for the gradual phasing out of large country prisons located a substantial distance from major urban areas whose community they serve (regardless of whether they be classified as low, medium, or high security) and their replacement with small, community-based corrections facilities designed to apply modern corrections theory.

TITLE II—REHABILITATION AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Title II is the first of several programs designed to provide immediate improvement while the states develop their long range programs. It authorizes the expenditure of \$400 million over the next four years to develop and fund projects providing programs for rehabilitation, job placement, on-the-job counseling and correctional education for criminal offenders, youth offenders, and juvenile delinquents. Heavy emphasis is placed on the rehabilitation of those who have committed no more than one serious offense on the theory that these are the most easily helped.

To be eligible to receive a grant under this title a state must appoint a planning and administration council which would develop a plan and submit it to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The plan would be required to allocate at least 40 percent of all Federal funds granted to local

government bodies and nonprofit organizations and 15 percent of all Federal funds to private, profit making individuals, businesses and organizations. This would result in the involvement of many segments of the community in the corrections process.

Grants to the states will be determined by the number of persons detained in correctional institutions and by the total population of the state. However, in no case will such grants amount to more than 75 percent of the total cost of such programs in any given year. The title also provides means for the Secretary to determine that funds are actually expended in accordance with the provisions of this title, and for a method of judicial review should a state not be satisfied with the Secretary's ruling.

TITLE III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

This title is intended to provide special funding for the development of specialized school curricula, for the training of educational personnel and, for research and demonstration projects. These programs and projects would be especially tailored to the needs of persons detained in state and local correctional institutions with the intention of improving their vocational and academic education so as to enhance the possibility of rehabilitation of such persons.

Section 301 of title III would amend section 511(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Presently the authorized funding is \$80 million per year, but in unrestricted form. Under the proposed amendment the authorized funding would be increased to \$100 million for each of the next five years. Additionally the amended bill would require that \$110 million, be spent on projects under Section 1103(a) (6) of title 20 of the United States Code which authorizes the development of special educational programs for criminal offenders.

Section 302 of title III would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to state and local governments, educational agencies, public and nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, and other public and nonprofit private education or research agencies. Such grants would fund research and demonstration projects to the academic and vocational education of anti-social, aggressive, or delinquent persons including juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders.

To advise on the creation of general policy with regard to the education of persons covered by this title, the Commissioner is authorized to appoint special technical advisory committees. Members of such committees who are not already full time employees of the United States are entitled to receive compensation as shall be determined by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare but not in excess of \$75 a day. \$13 million is authorized to be spent on this title over the next three fiscal years.

TITLE IV—SPECIAL PROBATION PROGRAMS

Title IV authorizes the expenditure of \$40 million during each of the next five fiscal years for the creation of special probation supervision programs. These programs will be designed to accommodate juvenile delinquents and young offenders under 25 who have not yet become repeated offenders and who have not been found guilty of capital crimes. Such programs must be structured so as to reduce the need for the commitment of such offenders to state correctional institutions.

Any state desiring assistance must submit a state plan to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The plan must establish suitable controls to insure that the appropriate state agency exercises proper supervision, qualified probations personnel are employed, and incentives for local participation in programs designed to reduce the need for commitment to correctional institutions are provided.

Funds will be provided for the states on the basis of a formula which takes into account the number of persons under the age of 25 within the states and the number of youthful offenders who have not been committed to state correctional institutions. Provision is also made to insure that the federal share of such programs will not exceed 75% and that the funds provided under this program will not be in lieu of funds coming from other sources and already being spent on such programs. Additionally, each state involved shall develop programs to monitor the effectiveness of the special probation programs developed. Provision will be made for the collection and utilization of such information by the Federal Corrections Institute.

TITLE V—FEDERAL CORRECTIONS INSTITUTE

Title V amends title 18 of the United States Code by adding at the end thereof a new chapter creating a Federal Corrections Institute. The Institute would serve several functions related to the short range improvement of present corrections systems and the long range development of a new corrections system as foreseen in title I. It would collect and disseminate useful data relating to efforts to improve the present corrections system and develop a new, community based system as provided in title I. It would also provide training for Federal, State and local personnel involved in the judicial system and corrections field so as to facilitate the acceptance and development of a new corrections system.

The Institute's overall policy and operations would be under the supervision of an Advisory Commission including personnel from the judicial, probations and corrections fields and including private, concerned citizens and persons who have actually served in prisons. Also included on the Advisory Commission will be the Director of the Institute, the Attorney General (or his designee), and the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (or his designee).

The Director of the Institute with the approval of the Advisory Commission shall acquire property and shall make the necessary arrangements for the Institute's construction and equipment. The Advisory Commission shall supervise the design of a training curriculum for enrollees from the judicial and corrections fields. Candidates for admission to the Institute shall be selected by the State planning agencies created under LEAA, subject to final selection by the Director of the Institute. While studying with the Institute each enrollee shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons intermittently employed in government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code. Such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title are authorized.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2536. A bill to enable lower-income families to achieve homeownership and to enable certain private housing to be available for families at all income levels in order to achieve an economic diversification of income groups, particularly to avoid the clustering of low-income families, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I join today in endorsing the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), one of the leading congressional experts on housing programs for lower-income families.

The Housing Reform Amendments Act of 1971, which I will cosponsor when it is drafted, is a product of our mutual

interest in legislation to expand existing housing programs; to amend these programs to achieve consolidation of essential assistance provisions; and to extend them to assist the full range of families who are not able to afford the expense of adequate housing in our Nation.

We worked together to prepare the section-by-section summary which Senator BROOKE has just introduced. It incorporates our original ideas, as well as other proposals which have been put forward over the past 2 years by various public interest groups. I believe that its adoption will correct most of the major problems associated with the present array of housing programs—problems which have impeded their use to assist all families in need of assistance to obtain safe, decent, and suitable housing. This rich Nation should be able to organize its housing programs to assure that all families can achieve a suitable standard of shelter.

The time has come to complete the recent congressional efforts toward decent housing by consolidating our assistance programs, by extending them to cover existing gaps in coverage, and by adopting provisions to assure a sound and healthy living environment. During 1967 and 1968, the Senate Housing Subcommittee spent an enormous amount of time in developing the section 235 homeownership and the section 236 rental assistance programs. This effort was worthwhile: these two programs are rapidly expanding to serve an enlarging number of families who require housing assistance. In 1969 and 1970, the public housing program was amended to achieve a greatly expanded capacity, largely through the amendments sponsored by Senator BROOKE, and by the chairman of the Senate committee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama, JOHN SPARKMAN. Despite these achievements, however, inadequacies in program structure still exist, some of which were forecast as early as 1967 by the housing subcommittee. The expansion of these housing programs over the last 2 years makes it essential that these inadequacies be corrected without delay.

The four major inadequacies among existing programs are: First, a lack of uniformity in such basic provisions as income limits, income definition, rent requirements, and quality of housing product; second, failure to include coverage for all families who need housing assistance; third, isolation of low-income families in "ghettoized" housing developments; and, fourth, concentration of low-income housing opportunities in central cities, to the exclusion of metropolitan and regional areas which are rapidly developing as the chief centers of employment for lower income families.

The Housing Reform Amendments Act of 1971, proposed by Senator BROOKE and myself, addresses itself to each of these major inadequacies. It proposes full consolidation of the basic elements of housing assistance under the FHA mortgage assistance programs and the public agency housing programs; it provides for assistance to all families who require housing assistance to the degree that they need it; it provides for a "cross section of

income" occupancy in all assisted housing; it provides incentives for expansion of assisted housing into metropolitan and regional areas through full tax payments and public service grants, as well as "emergency housing" powers to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to develop assisted housing in those areas where no sponsor is willing to undertake it. As Senator BROOKE has indicated, these provisions, coupled with the housing requirements in the Community Development Act of 1971, S. 2333, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, and the Government Facilities Location Act, S. 1282, introduced by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, should produce new and effective ways to achieve housing opportunities for lower income families in areas of urban growth outside central cities.

Mr. President, before I began discussions with Senator BROOKE on the Housing Reform Amendments Act of 1971, I had been working on a proposal designed to accomplish a greater cross section of income occupancy in Government assisted housing. This measure would provide a subsidy to those who need it and would also make available a percentage of units at reduced rentals or reduced mortgage interest rates to encourage occupancy by higher income families.

In the rental housing program, this would be done by calculating rentals as though the mortgage carried an interest rate 2 percent below the FHA rate. The FHA rate is now 7 percent which would mean that the rentals would be calculated at a 5-percent interest rate and this would result in a substantial rental reduction. The 2-percent interest rate differential would be paid by HUD to the lender.

It is proposed that up to 20 percent of the units may be occupied by families without regard to income limitations. There would be no certification as to income and the families would pay whatever rental is called for on the basis of the mortgage calculated at the rate 2 percent below the FHA rate. An additional 20 percent of the units would be occupied by families at varying income not in excess of the public housing limits and who will pay one-fourth of their income for rental, including utilities. The remaining 60 percent of the units will be occupied by families at varying income levels who also will pay one-fourth of their income for rental. Families obtaining subsidies would recertify their incomes every 2 years. This program would also permit cooperative ownership.

A similar proposal relates to the purchase of single family sales housing. In specified subdivisions or geographical areas designated by the Secretary, such as new communities, 20 percent of the buyers would get the benefit of a home purchase mortgage 2 percent below the FHA rate. The balance of the purchasers, 20 percent of whom would have incomes not in excess of public housing limits, would pay 20 percent of their income, and the subsidy would cover the balance due for principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and mortgage insurance premiums.

In many respects, my proposal is very similar to the housing reform amendments bill. For example, both bills would

provide a single subsidy program that would cover the complete range of low- and moderate-income housing; both bills provide that at least 20 percent of the units in an assisted project would have to go to the lowest income families; both bills provide a rental not to exceed 25 percent of a family's income; and both bills insure that under the homeownership program, the maximum mortgage payment—including taxes and insurance—would be 20 percent of a family's income.

I believe that it is important that each of these bills be submitted for full discussion. That is why I am cosponsoring, with Senator BROOKE, the Housing Reform Amendments Act of 1971, while at the same time introducing the Housing Opportunities Act of 1971.

In order to insure full consideration of both bills, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my proposal, the Housing Opportunities Act of 1971, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 2536

A bill to enable lower income families to achieve homeownership and to enable certain private housing to be available for families at all income levels in order to achieve an economic diversification of income groups, particularly to avoid the clustering of low income families, and for other purposes.

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 "Housing Opportunities Act of 1971".

SEC. 2. (a) The text of section 235 of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 235. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make, and to contract to make, periodic assistance payments on behalf of homeowners and cooperative members. The assistance shall be accomplished through payments to mortgagees holding mortgages meeting the special requirements specified in this section.

"(b) To qualify for assistance payments, the homeowner or cooperative member shall be of lower income, or otherwise meet the eligibility provisions prescribed by the Secretary under this section, except that if any cooperative member who has received assistance payments transfers his membership and occupancy rights to another person who satisfies the eligibility requirements prescribed by the Secretary and undertakes the obligation to pay occupancy charges, the new cooperative member may qualify for assistance payments upon the filing of an application with respect to the dwelling unit involved to be occupied by him. The amount of the mortgage attributable to the dwelling unit shall involve a principal obligation not in excess of \$20,000, except that the Secretary may, by regulation, increase the limitation by not to exceed 25 percent in any geographical area where he finds that cost limits so require and by an additional \$3,500 for any family with five or more persons.

"(c) The assistance payments to a mortgagee by the Secretary on behalf of a mortgagor shall be made during such time as the mortgagor shall continue to occupy the property which secures the mortgage, except that (1) assistance payments may be made on behalf of a homeowner who assumes a mortgage if the homeowner is approved by the Secretary as eligible for receiving such assistance, and (2) the Secretary is au-

thorized to continue making assistance payments where the mortgage has been assigned to the Secretary. The payments shall be in an amount not to exceed—

"(1) the balance of the monthly payment for principal, interest, taxes, insurance, and mortgage insurance premium due under the mortgage remaining unpaid after applying 20 per centum of the mortgagor's income, but in no event shall the amount of any payment by the Secretary under this clause be less than the amount of the payment computed under clause (2) of this sentence; or

"(2) in any subdivision (including a geographical area designated by the Secretary), condominium, or cooperative approved for sale under this section, not more than 20 per centum of the families shall be eligible without regard to income limitations to have assistance payments made on their behalf in an amount equal to the difference between the amount of the monthly payment for principal, interest, and mortgage insurance premium which the mortgagor is obligated to pay under the mortgage and the monthly payment which the mortgagor would be obligated to pay if the mortgage were to bear interest at a rate 2 per centum per annum below the maximum rate fixed by the Secretary for mortgages insured under section 203(b) of this title.

"(d) Assistance payments to a mortgagee by the Secretary on behalf of a family holding membership in a cooperative association operating a housing project shall be made only during such time as the family is an occupant of such project and shall be in amounts computed on the basis of the formula set forth in subsection (c) applying the cooperative member's proportionate share of the obligations under the project mortgage to the items specified in the formula.

"(e) The Secretary may include in the payment to the mortgagee such amount, in addition to the amount computed under subsection (c) or (d), as he deems appropriate to reimburse the mortgagee for its expenses in handling the mortgage.

"(f) Procedures shall be adopted by the Secretary for recertification of the mortgagor's (or cooperative member's) income at intervals of two years (or at shorter intervals where the Secretary deems it desirable) for the purpose of adjusting the amount of such assistance payments within the limits of the formula described in subsection (c), except that no recertification of income will be required of mortgagors receiving payments under subsection (c) (2) of this section.

"(g) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary to assure that the sales price of, or other consideration paid in connection with, the purchase by a homeowner of the property with respect to which assistance payments are to be made is not increased above the appraised value on which the maximum mortgage which the Secretary will insure is computed.

"(h) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including such sums as may be necessary to make the the assistance payments under contracts entered into under this section. The aggregate amount of contracts to make such payments shall not exceed amounts approved in appropriation Acts, and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed \$325,000,000 per annum prior to July 1, 1972, which maximum dollar amount shall be increased by \$400,000,000 on July 1, 1972, and by \$400,000,000 on July 1, 1973.

"(2) Not less than 20 per centum of the assistance payments authorized in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be contracted to be made on behalf of families whose incomes at the time of their initial occupancy are not in excess of the maximum income limits which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed in sections (2) and 15(7)(b)(ii) of the United States

Housing Act of 1937, for initial occupancy in public housing dwellings. Other payments may be made in behalf of families whose incomes exceed those limits but who would nevertheless be eligible for assistance payments under the formula specified in subsection (c) (1) of this section.

"(3) Not more than 15 per centum of the appropriation authorized under this section shall be contracted for in connection with existing dwellings, or dwelling units in existing projects, unless such units are approved by the Secretary for substantial rehabilitation.

"(i) The Secretary shall from time to time allocate and transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture, for use (in accordance with the terms and conditions of this section) in rural areas and small towns, a reasonable portion of the total authority to contract to make assistance payments as approved in Appropriation Acts under subsection (h) (1).

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to contracts for assistance payments entered into on and after the date of enactment of this Act. The provisions of section 235 of the National Housing Act, as it existed immediately prior to such date, shall be applicable to contracts for assistance payments entered into prior to such date.

SEC. 3. (a) The text of section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 101. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make, and contract to make, periodic payments to a 'housing owner' on behalf of 'qualified tenants', as those terms are defined in subsection (c) of this section, in such amounts and under such circumstances as are prescribed in or under this section. A contract providing for such payments shall be for such period, not in excess of 40 years, as the Secretary determines. The aggregate amount of the contracts to make such payments shall not exceed amounts approved in Appropriation Acts, and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed \$250,000,000 per annum prior to July 1, 1972, which maximum dollar amount shall be increased by \$300,000,000 on July 1, 1972, and by \$300,000,000 on July 1, 1973.

"(b) (1) For the purpose of reducing rentals of dwelling units approved hereunder, the Secretary is authorized to make, and to contract to make, periodic interest reduction payments on behalf of the owner of a rental housing project designed for occupancy by families eligible under subsection (d), which shall be accomplished through payments to mortgagees holding mortgages meeting the special requirements specified in this section.

"(2) Contracts for interest reduction payments shall be made for the same period and under the same conditions as for the periodic payments on behalf of 'qualified tenants' as provided in section 101(a).

"(3) The interest reduction payments to a mortgagee by the Secretary on behalf of a project owner shall be in an amount not exceeding the difference between the monthly payment for principal, interest, and mortgage insurance premium which the project owner as a mortgagor is obligated to pay under the mortgage and the monthly payment for principal and interest such project owner would be obligated to pay if the mortgage were to bear interest at a rate of 2 per centum less than that fixed by the Secretary for mortgages insured under section 207 of the National Housing Act.

"(4) The Secretary may include in the payment to the mortgagee such amount, in addition to the amount computed under subsection (b) (3), as he deems appropriate to reimburse the mortgagee for its expenses in handling the mortgage.

"(5) The aggregate amount of contracts to

make such interest reduction payments shall not exceed amounts approved in appropriation Acts and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed \$75,000,000 per annum prior to July 1, 1972, which maximum dollar amount shall be increased by \$100,000,000 on July 1, 1972, and by \$100,000,000 on July 1, 1973.

"(c) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) the term 'housing owner' means a private nonprofit corporation or other private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which is a mortgagor under section 221(d) (3) of the National Housing Act and which, after the enactment of this section, has been approved for mortgage insurance thereunder and has been approved for receiving the benefits of this section, and includes a private nonprofit legal entity, a limited dividend corporation or other limited dividend legal entity, or a cooperative housing corporation, which is the owner of a rental or cooperative housing project financed under a State or local program providing assistance through loans, loan insurance, tax abatement, or other assistance, and which prior to completion of construction or rehabilitation is approved for receiving the benefits of this section;

"(2) the term 'qualified tenant' means any individual or family who can satisfy the following requirements pursuant to criteria and procedures established by the Secretary:

"(A) Not less than 20 per centum of the units shall be occupied by such tenants having incomes at the time of initial occupancy not in excess of the maximum amount which can be established in the area, pursuant to the limitations prescribed in sections 2(2) and 15(7)(b)(ii) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for occupancy in public housing dwellings; and

"(B) Not more than 20 per centum of the units may be occupied by tenants without regard to income limitations, provided that such tenants shall pay the full rental as fixed pursuant to subsection (b) and no payment shall be made under subsection (a) on their behalf; and

"(C) Other qualified tenants shall include those whose incomes exceed the limitations specified in paragraph (A) above but would nevertheless be eligible to have periodic payments made on their behalf pursuant to subsection (d) of this section; and

"(3) the terms 'qualified tenant' and 'tenant' include a member of a cooperative who satisfies the foregoing requirements and who, upon resale of his membership to the cooperative will not be reimbursed for any equity increment accumulated through payments under this section; and

"(4) the terms 'rental' and 'rental charges' mean, with respect to members of a cooperative, the charges under the occupancy agreements between such members and the cooperative.

"(d) The amount of the annual payment with respect to any dwelling unit shall not exceed the amount by which the rental for such unit exceeds 25 per centum of the tenant's income as determined by the Secretary pursuant to regulations and procedures established by him. In determining the income of any tenant for the purposes of this section, there shall be deducted an amount equal to \$300 for each minor person who is a member of the immediate family of such tenant, or for any person in excess of 65 years of age, living with such tenant, and the earnings of any such minor person shall not be included in the income of such tenant. The Secretary may authorize other standard deductions to compensate for deductions for social security, unusual and long-term medical expenses, care of children, and other such recurring expenses.

"(e) (1) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall establish criteria and procedures for

determining the eligibility of occupants and rental charges, including criteria and procedures with respect to periodic review of tenant incomes and periodic adjustment of rental charges.

"(2) Procedures adopted by the Secretary hereunder shall provide for recertifications of the incomes of the occupants, except the elderly and those eligible under subsection (c) (2) (B) hereof, at intervals of 2 years (or at shorter intervals in cases where the Secretary may deem it desirable) for the purpose of adjusting rental charges and annual payments on the basis of occupants' incomes, but in no event shall rental charges under this section for any dwelling exceed the full rental as fixed pursuant to subsection (b) hereof.

"(3) The Secretary may enter into agreements, or authorize housing owners to enter into agreements, with public or private agencies for services required in the selection of qualified tenants including those who may be approved on the basis of the probability of future increases in their incomes, as lessees under an option to purchase (which will give such approved qualified tenants an exclusive right to purchase at a price established or determined as provided in the option) dwellings, and in the establishment of rentals.

"(4) No payments under this section may be made with respect to any property for which the costs of operation (including wages and salaries) are determined by the Secretary to be greater than similar costs of operation of similar housing in the community where the property is situated.

"(f) The Secretary is authorized to make such rules and regulations, to enter into such agreements, and to adopt such procedures as he may deem necessary or desirable to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(g) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section, including but not limited to, such sums may be necessary to make annual or other periodic payments as prescribed in this section, pay for services provided under (or pursuant to) agreements entered into under) subsection (e), and provide administrative expenses.

"(h) In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary shall give due consideration to section 4 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, regarding improved architectural design in housing being provided for low and moderate income families."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be applicable to contracts for assistance payments entered into after the date of enactment of this Act. The provisions of section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, as it existed immediately prior to such date, shall be applicable to contracts for assistance payments entered into prior to such date.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2537. A bill to authorize treatment for certain narcotic addicts. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

NARCOTICS ABUSE TREATMENT ACT OF 1971

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk which I have entitled the Narcotics Abuse Treatment Act of 1971. And I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, all of us are generally familiar with the growing problem of drug abuse within our country. There are varying estimates as to the number of drug addicts in the United States. They range from 150,000 to 400,000, but the usually quoted figure is 250,000, up to one-half of whom reside in New York

State. Indication of the growth of the problem in recent years is the fact that between 1962 and 1970 there was a 1,000-percent increase in felony prosecutions for the possession or sale of dangerous drugs in Kings County, N.Y.—from 168 in 1962 to 1,861 in 1970. In Philadelphia arrests for narcotic violations increased 678 percent in the 5 years between 1965 and 1970. Estimates for Detroit are a 169-percent increase in the last 2 years for drug related arrests. Officials in Boston have estimated that the addiction rate is increasing perhaps as much as 50 percent per year. And in Virginia it is estimated by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs that there was an increase of 556 percent during the decade of the 1960's. Yet it has been estimated that each addict commits 120 crimes for each crime that he is arrested.

Besides the cost in human lives and personal tragedy, crime that is caused by drug addiction is also very costly. President Nixon in his June 17, 1971, special message to the Congress pointed to this cost, asserting that it takes between \$30 and \$100 per day per addict to sustain a habit. It has been estimated that each addict in the District of Columbia gets \$50,000 of illegal goods to sustain his habit each year. If Washington, D.C., and New York data are at all representative of the Nation in general, this means that the cost of sustaining drug addiction through illegal means in the United States is in the neighborhood of \$12.5 billion each year. And this does not include government and private expenditures to deal with the problem of addiction, nor does it include courts, police, probation, penal, and other costs.

The Congress has become increasingly aware of the growing magnitude of the addiction problem and has taken steps which in its judgment would help alleviate it. During the 91st Congress, for instance, no less than 20 major bills were introduced to deal with the various aspects of drug abuse. During this, the 92d Congress, further important legislation, focusing on rehabilitative efforts, has been introduced. There remain, however, two key problems: first, there are not at present any claimed rehabilitation techniques that have won a consensus of support; second, if there were such techniques, there would still remain the problem of changing the abuser's motivation so that he or she would want to be rehabilitated. These are not insurmountable obstacles, but it must be realized that it will take a long time before both of these problems can be successfully remedied. In the meantime we will continue to have the soaring drug-caused crime and drug addiction rate unless something is done.

The bill I am introducing today, Mr. President, I believe would overcome the issues I have raised. Specifically, the bill would establish a program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare whereby the Secretary can authorize a physician to administer drugs to an addict. The physician would be required to submit an itemized statement to the Secretary containing the costs of the services provided and would also

provide such verifying data as the Secretary requests in order for the addict to benefit from the program. The information regarding the addict would be confidential and not divulged to any person or government entity and not be admissible for any criminal action against the abuser. The cost of the program would be fully borne by the Federal Government. This proposal would not in any way alter present prohibitions against the illegal possession or sale of drugs.

It would, in my opinion, virtually eliminate drug-related crime from our society. And it would save the taxpayer billions of dollars as well. Studies in the cost of methadone maintenance programs, for instance, estimate that an addict can be maintained for \$3,800 annually, which is less than one-third the cost of keeping an addict in prison. Projecting these figures into a national program the cost would be roughly \$950 million per year. Looked at from another perspective heroin tablets sold in bottles of 100 tablets each cost \$2.16 for each bottle in England, where they have a program roughly the same as I am proposing. Computing this cost into a comparable one in the United States would mean an expenditure of approximately \$10.8 million per year to maintain heroin addicts on a Government program. Yet this expenditure would incur savings of over \$2 billion in potential prison costs and \$12.5 billion in drug-related crime. Consequently, while the budgetary expenditure for the program I am advocating would be in the neighborhood of \$942.5 million, assuming a \$3,800 expenditure per addict, there would be a real savings of approximately \$13.6 billion, let alone the savings in despair and heartache on which no dollar value could be put. But perhaps most importantly, we would virtually eliminate the crime caused by illegal drug trafficking and take a significant step toward completely eradicating the trafficking itself.

The concept I am advocating is not a new one. Between 1919 and 1923 a similar program was instituted in our country but it was halted not because it failed, but because it ran against "the philosophy of a punitive approach," according to the New York Academy of Medicine. Great Britain has also had good success with a similar program. In spite of increases in the rate of addiction during the 1960's, a trend which has definitely reversed, there are, according to one source, just under 3,000 narcotics addicts in England. This is for a total population of 55 million people or a ratio of approximately one addict for every 19,000 people. In the United States the picture is quite different, because it is estimated that there is one addict for every 800 persons; almost 24 times the rate in England. Admittedly, the problem of estimating the number of drug addicts within our country is difficult due to the obvious obstacles encountered under prevailing conditions. Yet, if the data presented here is anywhere near the truth our system of dealing with addiction is in great need of change.

It is my firm belief that the proposal I am offering today would reduce the crime rate in some areas of our Nation by



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