

U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 21

OCTOBER 4, 1967, TO OCTOBER 17, 1967

(PAGES 27725 TO 29208)

of administration officials that American intervention in Vietnam saved Indonesia from communism. This allegation was most recently alluded to by the President in his San Antonio speech. Foreign Minister Malik, who was one of those who really did prevent a Communist coup in Indonesia, obviously feels that Indonesia's interests and those of Asia as a whole would be best served by a political accommodation in Vietnam and by an end to the bombing of North Vietnam rather than by continuation of this ugly war.

The peace plan put forward by the Canadian Foreign Minister, Paul Martin, is of extreme importance because of continued Canadian contract with the Hanoi government as a member of the International Control Commission created in Vietnam by the Geneva accords in 1954. Mr. Martin has described a halt in the bombing as the "first priority before further steps can be taken toward a ceasefire and an armistice."

Secretary General U Thant has expressed confidence that negotiations could begin within 3 or 4 weeks if the bombing ended unconditionally. There is every reason to believe that an opening of negotiations would follow an unconditional—or indefinite—cessation of the bombing within 3 or 4 weeks. If talks did not begin after several weeks of a bombing suspension, the United States would be in a strong position in world opinion to take whatever necessary action might be deemed desirable at that time.

Mr. President, the risks involved in taking the necessary first step of a bombing pause are much less than those that will result from continued escalation of the bombing and of the ground war. The greater danger of a global war lies in the steady expansion of the Vietnamese fighting.

The risks that are involved are very limited and are worth taking especially in view of the statements by Secretary of Defense McNamara concerning the limited effectiveness to date of the bombing of North Vietnam and in view of the alternative risks involved in the continued escalation of the war. Certainly, we as the most powerful nation on earth can afford to bend a little and venture this minimal risk which could possibly lead to an end to this war which now seriously threatens the peace of the entire world.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] on the proposal which he made in the Senate yesterday that we invite North Vietnam to peace talks by announcing a date on which we would halt all military action in the war including reinforcements of our forces. I am hopeful that President Johnson will heed the suggestion urged yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I also urge the President to announce that along with stopping all bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally, we will withdraw to Saigon and our coastal bases or enclaves under the protection of our air power and our 1st and 7th Fleets once negotiations begin, provided, of course, that the Vietcong cease offensive action during that period.

Mr. President, there are many paths toward peace in Vietnam available to us.

However, before we can begin any of them, it is obvious to all that an unconditional halt in the bombing is the essential prerequisite.

#### LONG-TERM PLANNING FOR GROWTH OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have long been concerned with the need for adequate long-term planning to provide sound plans and projects for the growth of our metropolitan areas. Skilled planning agencies at the local level are necessary to help the Federal Government plan and budget Federal grant-in-aid programs for urban improvement.

Recently, Mr. Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, discussed this subject in a speech delivered at Columbia University. Titled "Metropolitan Development and Budgeting: A Step Toward Creative Federalism," Mr. Haar stresses the importance of strong local involvement for adequate Federal planning.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Haar's remarks be reprinted in the RECORD.

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

#### METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND BUDGETING: A STEP TOWARD CREATIVE FEDERALISM

(Remarks of Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, at Columbia University, New York City, September 21, 1967)

"The heavens themselves, the planets, and this centre

Observe degree, priority, and place,  
Insisture, course, proportion, season, form,  
Office, and custom, in all line of Order"

—TROILUS AND CRESSIDA.

Substance of programs of an Administration is the first order of public concern. But, as Maitland pointed out, the substance of laws is often to be found in procedural interstices. So, too, may the general approach toward coping with substance mold the very nature of program solutions, and become the key to success or failure. Thinking clearly about goals, relating them to actions, and weaving these priorities together on the third dimension of a National-State-local framework is the assignment given to the present Federal establishment by President Johnson. The establishment of intellectual order is thus the essence of the President's approach to the operation and management of government. Consequently, the achievement of the Administration may be measured in terms of its search for efficiency, its awareness of relating action programs to objectives and of its attainments in meshing the different capabilities of the local and National levels—and how these increase human welfare.

It is these new concepts of scientific management in the Federal Government which have led the Department of Housing and Urban Development to look afresh at the way it implements national urban goals.

For, indeed, Congress has established national goals for housing and urban environments: it has also set forth a practical series of financial programs to help local communities work toward these goals. Thus far, the tendency nationally has been to state these goals in terms of broad national commitments, such as "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American fam-

ily" (Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949) rather than as programs for specific action. The grant-in-aid programs, on the other hand, can be little more than a functional way of paying for financing local needs. It is in identifying and measuring the link between the two wherein resides the major task of budgeting and programing.

On November 17, 1966, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive agencies, stressing the use of Programing and Budgeting Systems to: identify our national goals with greater precision, determine priority among goals, develop and analyze alternate means of effectively reaching those goals, obtain accurate information about probable costs for programs, relate analysis to budget requests so that those requests follow and support comprehensive and sound agency planning.

Greater precision in the identification of national goals in the Federal system demands much more than sophisticated budgeting techniques on the Departmental level. The use of systems analysis requires inputs of information which must be both current and accurate, and, in the particular case of urban planning, based on local research and knowledge of local conditions. Comprehensive metropolitan planning must provide perspective on a range of urban problems based on such research and knowledge. The Office of Metropolitan Development seeks to help local governments develop and interpret statements of metropolitan policies in order to better formulate and quantify national goals. For national goals to be effective, they must reflect the plans of the urban areas affected, and be suitable for translation into action by local urban institutions. The problem faced by the administrator of a Federal grant-in-aid program is to establish the essential connections between local problem definition and aggregate national goals so that urban planning can lead to effective action.

Quantification is basic to the use of the systems analysis effort to link programs and goals more closely together. Although there are many factors which cannot now be easily quantified, more of the planning process is amenable to this treatment than was once thought possible. As usable data become available, further goals and more standards can be made explicit and operationally defined. As quantitative information increases, the possibilities of establishing effective cost/benefit ratios for qualitative evaluation also increase. The relationships among such goals as adequate water supply, waste disposal, and stream purification should be clarified by definite characteristics, and the evaluation of combined programs for meeting established goals should be made with objective criteria. On the basis of such analytical series, it is possible to develop priorities among these goals and plan for action to meet them.

The commitment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development toward meeting such goals will require a series of programs, working through the cycle of development and feedback, with specific results to be obtained during each stage. These will lead toward amelioration of the urban environment only by a high level of coordination among federally aided projects, and between these and other development activities. The emphasis on the concentrated and coordinated use of Federal aids which is the guiding principle of the new Model Cities program should also be applied to the planning of other urban development programs.

When the goals and schedules of a series of development programs have been prepared, they can serve as the base for advance programing and as an informed and definite rationale for yearly budget requests.

Use of systems analysis in planning and budgeting Federal Urban programs will institute important changes in present procedures, and, at the same time, make different demands on the planners. Recently, the Department of Housing and Urban De-

velopment prepared projections of national needs for the major facilities funded under metropolitan development programs: water supplies, sewer systems, waste treatment plants, open space and outdoor recreation areas, and mass transportation systems. These projections considered the current backlog of needs which have not been met, future needs arising from an expected population increase, and the continuing need for replacement as facilities wear out or become obsolete. The Department can use these projections to make rough estimates of future Federal program levels. Yet these projections are inadequate in the information they contain.

They do not tell us about the intentions of local communities to make use of Federal aid programs, or about the ability of local governments to contribute to the cost of any facility. Furthermore, these projections indicate only the demand side of the equation, but contain no information by which to measure and compare the benefits. Again, they do not describe the relations among facilities at the local level—such as the possibility of undertaking several projects jointly to meet common needs and achieve economies in accomplishment. Nor do they describe possible indirect impact of Federal investments, such as the extent to which water and sewer programs will contribute to anti-pollution goals, often benefiting other areas in the same watershed as the projects. Furthermore, the national projections do not take into account the special circumstances of individual urban areas—exceptional needs, or opportunities, or unusual problems in the provision of better facilities.

Such national projections, then, have their limitations in their inability to encompass the realities and complexities which are inherent in each individual urban area. Even though they may be based on the best information available at the national level, they may be out of touch with the realities and complexities that can be appreciated only by a closer look at individual urban areas.

Moreover, the structuring of these national overviews is not well matched to the way in which development decisions are made within the Federal system. Decisions to make use of Federal grants-in-aid (and appropriate matching funds where necessary) originate with state and local governments. Although Federal funds provide the impetus, Federal participation must blend with these local activities and with those of the private sector. The development of programs to advance national goals toward attainment requires liaison among all levels of government, and a system of data collection and communication which will adequately reflect the problems and events occurring at the local levels.

Clearly, adequate Federal programming requires very strong local involvement: participation in the full sense of the word. If the tool of systems analysis is to attain full usefulness, the Department of Housing and Urban Development should inaugurate new cooperative arrangements which will assign major responsibility to metropolitan planning agencies for gathering information on the needs and capacities of urban areas and for assisting in planning and budgeting Federal grants-in-aid programs.

The metropolitan planning agencies now operating in almost all urban areas are particularly well equipped to perform these functions. They are in close touch with local governments in the areas they serve, and in many cases their staffs are directly responsible to councils of locally elected officials. Their understanding of local problems gives them insight and perspective on areawide urban development. Their studies of population trends and economic growth supply a realistic context for evaluating the metropolitan impact of local development proposals. As planners of the future metropolis,

they are concerned with establishing goals for metropolitan development, and with programs to meet them.

Most of these metropolitan planning agencies are aided through the Federal 701 Planning Assistance program. This permits the Department of Housing and Urban Development to give grants at all levels—city, county, and state—to establish comprehensive planning capabilities, including data collection. Now the Department intends to ask these agencies to assist the Federal government by supplying information needed for the advance budgeting of Federal urban development programs. This contribution from the metropolitan planning agencies will help the Department to perform its role of developing policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas, and assisting the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban and metropolitan development. At the same time, this new function will help to strengthen the metropolitan planning agencies in carrying out their basic responsibilities for planning the development of their own areas.

As a first step toward improved budgeting, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to look ahead two years and give us an estimate of the local applications which are likely to be submitted for Federal grants-in-aid for metropolitan development. We shall ask them to consider the connections between these proposals—that is, which proposals are interdependent, which are closely related to one another, and which are relatively independent. We shall ask them to tell us what they expect to be achieved if these proposals are all funded—how far these projects will advance the area toward its metropolitan goals; what contribution these projects will make in terms of improving standards of public service, reducing environmental pollution, reducing travel times, or expanding the supply of sound housing. By combining these results for a large number of metropolitan areas, the Department hopes to get a relatively adequate picture of the demand for Federal aid in urban development, and the extent to which this level of Federal spending would achieve local and national urban goals.

Concurrently, we shall ask the metropolitan planning agencies to begin converting their own metropolitan development goals into preliminary targets to be achieved by 1970, and into a staged program for meeting these targets. We will want to know what requests for Federal urban development aid will be generated by this program, and what progress can be made by 1970 as a result of this aid.

This new involvement of metropolitan planning agencies in advance budgeting for Federal-aid programs will benefit these agencies as well as the Federal government. It will help move metropolitan planning from a long-range vision to a realistic plan of action. And it will serve the metropolitan area in this descent from the clouds, improving communication among local communities on their development projects, so that these can be coordinated for maximum effect and economy. It can work toward acquiring basic sources of information—information which can be organized on a comparative and operational basis, and organized into coherent, demonstrable propositions.

The Federal government will also benefit by having more realistic information on future requests for Federal aid and a greater understanding of what might be achieved by means of this aid. Our hypothesis is that a higher proportion of metropolitan development decisions can be made on the basis of systematic quantifications than are now being made. Metropolitan planning needs more means of obtaining comparative cost/benefit ratios. The costs of achieving urban

goals will become clearer, and goals can be related to different program levels. Meaningful choices are possible. With the help of metropolitan planning agencies, the Federal and local governments will also be able to move beyond general goals for the future of our urban areas into staged programs for getting from here to there. We can have firmer underpinnings for proof and demonstration.

The benefits which this cooperative planning is designed to realize will be still-born, however, in the absence of adequate Federal funds to support the metropolitan planning agencies and the grant-in-aid investment programs. To insure that these urban programs can continue to go forward, President Johnson has requested Congress to increase Federal taxes through a 10 per cent surcharge. Passage of the additional taxes will be essential if metropolitan planning and the new budgeting system are to fulfill their goals.

Systems analysis and programs budgeting are not cure-alls for the sound and orderly development of metropolitan areas. They cannot, by computerized magic, accomplish the thinking and the work of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and of the many metropolitan planning agencies involved. They are highly serviceable tools, which, if used properly, will increase the effectiveness of both planning and action, at all levels of government—local and Federal. Used with full knowledge of their advantages and limitations, these methods can both improve and accelerate the Administration's efforts in bettering the quality of urban life. For the measure of this Administration's success is not in the number of dollars it spends, nor in the number of projects it manages, but in the positive benefits which its efforts bring to individuals and communities.

#### GEORGE MEANY COMMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, in his recent testimony before the Committee on Finance, called upon the Senate to make vitally necessary improvements in the Social Security Amendments of 1967 passed by the House.

Mr. Meany said he was shocked when the House of Representatives reduced the overall benefit increases asked by the President, especially as they affect the "most-poverty stricken beneficiaries." He called indefensible House "failure to include the disabled under medicare, its drastic cutback in coverage and services under medicaid, and its harsh and punitive restrictions aimed at destitute mothers and children receiving public assistance."

Mr. President, since Mr. Meany's testimony is worthy of our careful study in considering this important legislation, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967 (H.R. 12080)

(Summary of statement of George Meany, president, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, to the Senate Committee on Finance, September 19, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to present the views of the AFL-CIO on H.R. 12080, the amendments to the Social Security Act passed by the House of