

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 2

JANUARY 25, 1967, TO FEBRUARY 7, 1967

(PAGES 1423 TO 2878)

Second, lending agencies want to see solid, mortgageable property before they will consider loans.

Finally, the unfinished shack is by definition much in conflict with the very idea of a leisure home. The second home customer, whether he is fully aware of it or not when he starts shopping, does not want to spend his vacation and leisure hours as a slave to his home at the lake.

The second home market, in fact, although it is still quite new on the American scene, has already undergone some significant changes.

Back in 1957 when the American Plywood Association—then the Douglas Fir Plywood Association—began pioneering the second home market, we directed our efforts toward the do-it-yourselfer because we felt that the average family would have to build it themselves if they were going to have a leisure home.

This approach changed radically, however, when market surveys showed beyond any reasonable doubt that few home craftsmen had any intention of building their own vacation homes from the ground up.

Even in recent years, some builders have found to their own surprise that they have overestimated the amount of work the second home builder intends to do by himself and underestimated the amount of money he has available.

One builder in the state of Washington who entered the second home market a few years back told us he first offered homes in the \$1,500 to \$2,500 range and found that the majority of his sales were for the \$2,500 unit. So the next year he upped his range to the \$2,500 to \$3,500 area and again found that the more expensive units were the best sellers.

Now, this same builder finds that his best seller is a unit that can be built anywhere for from \$7,500 to \$10,000.

"We made the mistake of underrating the market and the acceptable price," he told us. "Now we know that the average customer wants a second home, and he doesn't want very much less than he has in his primary home."

I would not want to leave the impression with you that we think the do-it-yourself market is dead.

In many areas of the country, builders tell us that they are getting requests from buyers who want nothing more than a plan and the materials. They intend to do all the work themselves right from the ground up. Others want the builder to put up the structure, but they plan to save some money by doing the interior paneling and the painting themselves.

The latest trend, however, and the one that seems to be the most successful way to sell second homes, is the planned community. It is not for the newcomer in the building industry, nor for the builder who does not have plenty of money to work with. It is a project requiring—in addition to money—lots of land, engineers, legal aides, promotion people, salesmen and top leadership.

The most successful leisure communities—and there are many of them in this country today—offer the buyer a piece of ground and a home along with an array of planned activities so numerous and so diverse that at least one of them has appeal for the potential buyer. When the buyer looks about him he finds such attractions as swimming pools, marinas, golf courses, lakes, riding stables, rifle ranges, tennis courts, theaters, shopping centers, day nurseries and organized programs that include picnicking, cookouts, dances and old-fashioned ice cream socials.

The man who buys this sort of an arrangement is at the other end of the personality spectrum from the guy who wants quiet privacy for himself and his family.

The planned leisure community fairly crackles with activity. There's something doing every minute. The resident doesn't have to think much about what he's going to do for entertainment from day to day. It's all decided for him. And he doesn't seem to mind togetherness with his fellow men.

Here again, some builders have underestimated how much home a buyer wants and how much he wants to spend. Some of the earliest planned communities, featuring small lots and small homes at prices everyone could afford, have not been as popular as those in which the buyer was offered larger lots, larger homes and more in the way of entertainment.

One successful concept in this business of selling second homes is built on the phrase "Vacation Now—Retire Later." This idea seems to have appeal to people of all ages. The young people like the thought of buying a home for the fun they will get out of it now, at the same time hoping that their investment will grow in value through the years. Then there is the added attraction of having at hand a place to spend their retirement years, hopefully all paid for.

In our research, we have uncovered situations in which one builder could not sell second homes he built and concluded that there was no market in his area for this type of thing. At the same time, however, other builders in the same area were making hay with homes that were about the same size and price as his.

The problem was that the first builder was not promoting his home properly after they were finished and ready for occupancy. He had failed to recognize that the second home market involves the sale of recreation, leisure, scenery and an intangible way of life. The building itself is only one small part of the package. When imagination is not put to use in selling the finished product, the project can fail.

I am pleased to say that the American Plywood Association recognized early in the game that the leisure home market was a sleeping giant in the American economy.

Back in 1959 and 1960 the association ran what was probably the first national consumer advertising campaign ever directed at the second home market. Four color advertisements in Saturday Evening Post were headlined "Every Family Needs Two Homes," and we invited consumers to write for construction brochures and construction plans. The results were amazing.

These ads, plus publicity in a score of consumer magazines and trade publications, helped create national interest in leisure homes and brought the association orders for over one million second homes plans and brochures.

If there was any doubt in our minds about the depth of the second home market, it was completely dispelled by those startling results.

The association has continued its promotion of the leisure home market through the years and we have firm plans to continue it this year.

Some of you are familiar I am sure with the advertising program we conducted just this year in Sports Illustrated with the Western Wood Products Association. This series was based on a home we thought to be the ultimate in second home design, location and year-round liveability. We called it the Raging River cabin.

The home incorporated six major criteria set forth by the owner.

He wanted:

One—All weather liveability. The home had to be pleasant and inviting during all weather and all seasons.

Two—He wanted maximum living area with corresponding less attention to sleeping and utility areas.

Three—He wanted maximum compatibility of site and structure.

Four—He wanted plenty of storage area for such bulky items as outdoor furniture.

Five—He wanted low maintenance characteristics. He did not want to spend his leisure time taking care of the property.

Finally, because the homesite was in a remote area, he wanted a plan that would be adaptable for prefabrication and remote site assembly.

The finished job was a classical example of second home planning and design, right from the selection of the location to the interior design.

We also featured in this area a three-stage beach cabin that can be built progressively, beginning as a campsite and ending as a permanent second home ideal for retirement.

To give you an idea of consumer interest in projects such as these, I would like to pass along some of the results we got from these ads.

Our April ad in Sports Illustrated drew a total of 4,233 requests for literature. Of these 1,684 requested a copy of the second home plan featured in the ad at 35 cents and 2,549 asked for a Second Home Idea booklet we offered at 25 cents per copy.

The June ad brought 4,949 requests and in August, we re-ran one of the advertisements and over 1,800 coupons were returned.

By the end of the year, returns from the three advertisements totalled over 12,000 with pieces of literature distributed considerably more than that.

We think this is significant considering that these people had to go to the trouble of cutting the coupon out of the ad, mailing it, and sending money with it.

It can be safely assumed, I think, that these ads stimulated thousands of others into thinking about a second home and perhaps starting to make plans for their futures.

In this same series of ads, we made a pitch for the vacation dollar by reminding the consumer that he could take a trip around the world in 60 days and wind up with only memories for his money—or he could build his own wonderful world of leisure with a plywood second home that would be his for a lifetime.

Using the same theme in another ad, we told the consumer that a two week resort vacation costs a lot of money. But once it's over, it's over. We reminded that a plywood second home would be his for lifetime.

The promotion of second homes by the American Plywood Association will continue in 1967. We think the idea has caught on smartly with the consumer and we intend to use all of our resources to sharpen the new American demand for the good life.

THE FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators CLARK, HART, HARRIS, INOUE, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MUSKIE, NELSON, and PROXMIER, a bill entitled "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 10 days for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk as requested.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is designed to give us a clear and precise picture of how well we are doing in our efforts to provide a decent life and full opportunity for all Americans.

A decent life and opportunity to develop to the maximum of one's ability and ambition has been a cherished ideal

of American life since our Nation was born.

But we have found through many difficult days that these goals are not easily won. The great depression, for example, taught us that our noble ideals were hollow for those without economic security. And so government—Federal, State, and local—accepted responsibility for assuring a full employment economy and instituted special programs for the elderly and for those dependent on welfare support for survival.

We have since undertaken broad new Federal commitments for education, health, agriculture, housing and urban development, economically depressed areas, and other aspects of our national life, complementing and supporting broad programs of State and local government.

Even so, millions of Americans—the uneducated, the elderly, the handicapped, the jobless, the mentally ill, the poverty stricken, those denied access to the ballot—still live on the edge of despair, without hope or opportunity.

Thus in the past few years, dramatic new programs have been enacted to alleviate these social ills. But even as these new programs were being enacted and implemented, debate has continued over their need and their effectiveness. And today this debate has reached a critical focus: Should we cut back on our domestic efforts because of the costly war in Vietnam, or are our national social needs so severe as to require that we continue, and perhaps expand, these domestic undertakings despite the burden of Vietnam?

The continuing controversy envelops and impedes our efforts to afford all Americans a decent life and full opportunity. And it also reflects a serious need—a need for more refined and sophisticated knowledge about the condition of our Nation's social health and the effectiveness of our efforts to improve it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given such time as I may need to finish my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be given 7 additional minutes, because we are in the morning hour. Otherwise it would go till 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. The need to assess the effectiveness of our new domestic programs has already been stressed by many, including the President and our distinguished majority leader.

In his state of the Union address, President Johnson recognized that new programs require trial and error, and have produced both. He therefore placed top priority on assuring that these new programs work effectively.

And Senator MANSFIELD, both last year and again this year, has urged that Congress dedicate itself to the task of legislative oversight, to take a close look at

the programs we have enacted and correct their rough edges, overextensions, overlaps, and even significant gaps.

In addition, rudimentary efforts in charting progress, evaluating effectiveness and impact, and determining priorities are already underway in the Government. But for the most part, these are fragmentary efforts, scattered and buried in the various executive offices and Federal agencies, and frequently the findings are unavailable to Congress and the public.

The fact is that neither the President nor the Congress nor the public has the kind of broad-scale information and analysis needed to adequately assess our progress toward achievement of our national social aspirations.

For example, after nearly two decades of urban renewal, men are still debating whether it has helped the poor or merely moved them en masse to new slums. We debate the poverty program not on the basis of overall impact, but by citing isolated examples—good or bad, depending on the point to be made—of a Job Corps camp here, a community action program there, and head counts of the number of poor people who have some contact with program officials.

In area after area proponents using one set of facts say we are not doing enough while opponents using another set of facts say our effort is misdirected and we are doing too much or that our efforts are misdirected and that our money is being wasted.

I think it is clear, Mr. President, that we need new tools to assess our efforts and progress in the area of social reform, and for better understanding of these efforts and the state of our social health as a nation.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to meet this need.

First, it would establish a Council of Social Advisers, which would compile and analyze social statistics, devise a system of social indicators, help develop program priorities, evaluate the effectiveness and impact of our efforts at all levels of government, and advise the President in the establishment of national social policies.

Second, it would require the President to transmit to Congress an annual report on the state of the Nation's social health, specifying progress made, listing goals for the future and specifying policies for achieving these objectives.

Third, it provides for a joint committee of Congress to review the President's annual report on the state of our social health, just as the Joint Economic Committee exercises oversight responsibility in economic matters.

I would hope, Mr. President, that this act might accomplish in the area of national social policy what the Employment Act of 1946 has accomplished in the field of economic policy.

For just as we thrash around in the area of social policy today, so too did we thrash around in the area of economic policy before 1946—making decisions on the basis of untested theories and inadequate information, and assuming that cyclical waves of boom and bust were inevitable.

But 20 years ago Congress enacted the Employment Act of 1946, establishing the

Council of Economic Advisers and requiring the President to deliver to Congress an annual report on the progress of the economy during the year past and prospects for the year ahead.

In the two decades since enactment of that law, we have developed the sophisticated capability to register every quiver in the U.S. economy. Our current boom, unprecedented in duration and vitality, is a result of decisions and policies made possible by the superb economic analysis and planning and sophisticated statistical data of the Council of Economic Advisers.

And through the annual Economic Report, the President's policies and programs have been given broad public exposure, while the report's statistics accurately measure the performance of the economy in comparison with past years.

We still debate economic policy, of course, but our decisions are now shaped on the basis of hard, factual information, and our economy is doing far better than it has ever done before.

Unfortunately, this is not always the case in the area of social policy. For when we come to debate the dimensions of our social ills and the effectiveness of efforts to alleviate them, promote individual opportunity, or enhance the quality of American life, we often lack the kind of hard data and analysis provided by the Council of Economic Advisers and the various economic indicators that have been developed.

And the same situation prevails in the area of planning and embarking on new social programs.

For example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has discovered that it costs \$88,000 per life saved to educate motorists to drive safely, but an advertising campaign asking motorists to use their seat belts save a life for each \$88 spent.

Escalate this to a bigger problem—crime, for example.

What is the cost of juvenile programs—counseling, summer camps, sports activities—in terms of juveniles saved from crime? How does this cost compare with the amount spent on police and prisons? Would a dollar spent on prevention save five spent on prisons? And will we save something more precious—a human life?

This is the kind of analysis that is needed, and is lacking.

Another problem is the measurement of accomplishment. The administration believes it is making progress in eliminating inadequate housing, educating children, curing poverty.

But in many instances, officials are not certain they are gaining ground. Neither is Congress nor the public, whose support is essential for long-term success.

We now have too few social indicators to which we can refer—in contrast to the abundant economic indicators—and the few that we now have are in many instances insufficient.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver told the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization that the last complete statistics on the number of families in the Nation living in inadequate housing are those of the 1960 census, thus 7 years out of date.

Consumer Counsel Esther Peterson says that we do not know how much it costs the elderly to live, a basic fact that must be known before the Government can ease the plight of those on fixed incomes, or demonstrate that it is doing so.

Another example is the lack of sound statistical data on the number of mentally ill in the Nation.

Obviously we cannot expect to measure social values with the same precision and exactness which we measure economic trends. But this is not to say that we cannot improve upon present statistical data dealing with our social problems.

More and better indicators must be devised, and social scientists believe it is entirely possible to do so.

Another major obstacle in trying to develop programs to encompass problems of great scope—crime, urban development, education—is the complexity of interagency coordination. Bureaucracy is burgeoning. The Washington Post recently counted 300 Federal programs dealing with education, poverty, physical environment, and community development. The responsibility for administering these programs is scattered through 150 major bureaus and offices in Washington and 400 regional and sub-regional offices in the field.

In education alone, 10 departments and 15 agencies, ranging from the Department of Justice to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, have operational responsibility.

And to carry this a step further, Federal involvement is small when compared with the numerous State, regional, county, and municipal efforts in education, recreation, welfare, conservation, crime, and urban planning and development.

Although the proposed Council of Social Advisers would not itself be a coordinating agency, I believe this legislation would encourage coordination. The overall evaluation of the social state of the Nation will fill a major gap in our knowledge of social progress. It will provide the information and policy recommendations that will help the administration coordinate its attack on massive social problems.

It would also function as a research collection agency and information repository whose resources could be available to any State, county, and local government to help those first-level and most important governmental units do a more effective job.

Federal efforts, while increasing, remain limited and supplement local programs. The local agencies must be given every opportunity to solve problems within their capabilities.

In form, the Council of Social Advisers would parallel the Council of Economic Advisers. It would be composed of three members eminently qualified to analyze and evaluate governmental activity in social reform.

The Council would have a staff of experts capable of analyzing the interrelationships of programs in such fields as medical care, social welfare, education, urban planning, and penology. In other words, to determine the total impact on people.

Specifically, the Council would serve

as a social statistical agency, compiling data needed to measure the social health of the Nation. Much of the raw statistics are available now in the multitude of governmental offices and the files of private research agencies. It is hoped that it will be possible to devise a system of social indicators that may be watched constantly for danger signs indicating failure or miscalculation. It would develop priorities and recommend the most efficient way of allocating national resources, determining which programs should be emphasized, and what level of government should be responsible for the task. It would conduct special impact studies into the social consequences of various programs and Government policies.

For example, what are the social consequences of Government policies which tend to concentrate defense and space technology contracts in certain areas of the country, draining people and talent from one area and contributing to the jam of population in another? Another example might be an inquiry into the indirect impact of our vast freeway construction programs, which stimulate the economy and speed auto travel, but which can also isolate the poor and accelerate deterioration of neighborhoods and communities. In Watts, the inability of residents to easily reach the State employment office due to cutbacks in public transportation, is said to be a major factor in the terrible 1965 riots there.

And looking ahead, it is a sign of both our present condition and our future hopes that a California aerospace firm predicted the social explosion there on the basis of computer analysis of Los Angeles crime and welfare patterns.

Yet, the Nation as a whole was unaware of this potential danger until it was hard upon us.

Finally, the Council would also advise the President in the preparation of the annual social report, presenting to the Nation a detailed accounting of our social progress.

At a time when there is much emphasis on the quality of life, the annual social report would measure it with facts and figures, putting flesh on what are now usually only abstract suppositions.

How many Americans suffer in the squalor of inadequate housing? How many children do not receive educations commensurate with their abilities? To how many citizens is equality of justice denied? How many convicts in our penal institutions are barred from rehabilitation that would allow them the opportunity to reenter the mainstream of life? How many physically handicapped and mentally retarded are unable to get training to achieve their potential? How many individual Americans are denied adequate health care? How many are breathing polluted air? These are some of the possible indicators that might be considered in the social accounting.

In the social report, the President should delve deeply into aspects of American life that are only briefly touched upon in his state of the Union message, which has to deal heavily with economic policy and international affairs.

The social report would report and analyze trends of the past year, as measured by the social indicators, and would set forth goals for the future and a policy for achieving them.

A system of social accounting has been the subject of discussion by social scientists for the past several years, and has won wide support.

One of the foremost advocates is Bertram Gross, former Executive Secretary of the Council of Economic Advisers, now professor of administration at the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University.

He has argued that the Nation should be provided with a detailed annual report on the current status of the quality of life—a social state of the Union message.

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences sponsored a landmark study of social indicators, measuring the impact of the Nation's space program.

There has also been Government-sponsored research in this area.

Last year the National Commission of Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, which was established by act of the Congress, reported that our ability to measure social progress was far behind our capability to measure economic change. In improving the quality of life, the Commission found that "we have too few yardsticks to tell us how we are doing."

The President has directed the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to begin working on the necessary social statistics and indicators to supplement those prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Council of Economic Advisers. A panel of social scientists is now working with the Department. But while they are enthusiastic and hard-working, their effort is necessarily part time. They are unable to give the subject the concentrated attention it demands.

The Bureau of the Budget is organizing the planning-programming-budgeting-system, a step toward giving officials information necessary to enable more effective distribution of available funds among competing programs. It is not the purpose of this legislation to duplicate or shift this function. But I do think it necessary that there be a public accounting open to analysis by the Congress and the public. Evaluation of our social progress should equal the present evaluation of our economy. Congress can do this by institutionalizing the Council of Social Advisers and making the annual social report mandatory.

In social reform, there should be no retreat from our commitment. But perhaps our effort to defeat human despair has wavered not because of lack of dedication or energy, but because the inability to determine social priorities, and the absence of clear evidence of what progress has been made, hobble our efforts to plan and coordinate.

Mr. President, the legislation I introduce today is broad, but it is necessarily so.

I feel that our discussion should encompass the entire range of programs aimed at alleviating social ills and improving individual opportunity.

During the hearings we will be able to

consider the opinions of such experts in the field as Mr. Gross, Mr. Raymond Bauer, of Harvard University, and Mr. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination at HEW, who is fostering the effort at social evaluation there, and many others.

In the past, our Nation's progress has been measured only in economic and material terms. Now there is a new emphasis on social advance.

The President acknowledged this in his Economic Report by frequent reference to human issues.

Significantly, he pointed out that:

The sacrifices required of most of today's generation are not of income or security; rather we are called upon to renounce prejudice, impatience, apathy, weakness and weariness.

And he added:

In purely material terms, most Americans are better off than ever before. That fact expands our responsibilities, as it enlarges our resources to meet them.

The objective of this legislation is to discover routes to fulfill our responsibilities, and meet our basic social needs.

The Employment Act of 1946 did this for economic progress; the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967 will help us chart the most direct, efficient, and economical paths to full opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] for this most perceptive legislative proposal of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, and the comments he has just made in introducing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until the Senate is in order? The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Oklahoma may proceed.

Mr. HARRIS. I, too, am concerned, as are a number of other Senators, with the general state of support for the social sciences in this country. Few steps we can take will more importantly contribute to social science development than recognition of social scientists as social advisers to our Government, to collect and analyze social statistics, to aid in developing national social priorities and to assist in devising a system of social indicators.

The enactment of such a proposal along with the establishment of a National Foundation for the Social Sciences would, in my judgment, go a long way in giving us the national capability we so desperately need to understand ourselves, our fellow man, and the society within which we live. No national problems so greatly resist solution than do social ones—poverty, crime, juvenile delinquency, education, urban planning, and change—yet in few areas of concern are we more unprepared by way of insights and understanding.

I support the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] in his efforts in this direction.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am delighted and flattered by the support of

the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. His proposal for a social science foundation is a farsighted proposal in this general area, and I am pleased to join as a cosponsor in that measure, which I hope will be adopted.

It seems to me that one of the great success stories in American government has been that of the Council of Economic Advisers. That was a unique and creative structure, which resulted in impressive improvement in the sophistication with which this Nation deals with its economic problems. It has resulted in more employment and more prosperity for our Nation, and has elevated the consideration of economic problems to its proper level in government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. It has been, as I say, a true success story in American government. I think we must realize that the time has come now for a similar agency to deal with the social needs of our people. This need has been recognized by many of the top social scientists in our country, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which are indicative of this present need—an article entitled "Insight and Outlook—A Social Accounting," written by Joseph Kraft and published in the Washington Post of January 4, 1967, and an article entitled "Crime and Our Loss of Trust in Human Beings," written by Max Lerner and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 16, 1967.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1967]

A SOCIAL ACCOUNTING

(By Joseph Kraft)

With one notable exception, practically everything Americans do gets officially measured at this time of year. The exception, the thing that is not measured, is the social effect or impact on daily life of all the other things that are measured.

But probably nowhere else is there a more pressing need to take regular readings. And, accordingly, some of the most perceptive men inside and outside the Government have begun to work for a social counterpart to the annual economic report made to the President and the Congress by the Council of Economic Advisers.

The economic report is a good example of the staggering number of things Americans do that are regularly reported and tabulated. Among other things it sets forth every year: gross national product; sources of personal income; volume of industrial production; wholesale and consumer price indices; corporate profits and farm income.

No one can assert with confidence the consequence of having all this information readily and regularly available. Certainly it does not make men agree anymore than they used to about such things as taxes, wages and profits.

But at a minimum the statistics act as warning signals. When things are not going well, when growth slows or unemployment rises, people know about it. Indeed, because

of the insistent message of the numbers, they cannot fail to know about it.

In that situation, the groups of men called institutions lean against the wind; make corrections; slow down what is going too fast; right balances that are off center. The economic numbers, in other words, have helped this country avoid economic disaster. They have worked to keep options open, to assure that the great opportunities if they are missed, get reopened or retrieved.

An almost exactly opposite condition prevails in the social field. Information of all sorts lies about profusely in bits and pieces. But it is rarely put together in a regular and comprehensive fashion.

Lack of regular information fosters an innocence and irresponsibility that is positively terrifying. City after city launches urban renewal drives only to discover—belatedly and with surprise—that poor people are being driven from their homes. County after county launches drives for new industry only to learn—also belatedly and with surprise—that it is polluting the atmosphere. State after state pushes highway projects, only to realize—with astonishment—that the result is impossible congestion in city streets.

On the federal level, the Executive Branch, not forced to pay attention by a steady flow of organized data, virtually ignores consumer protection. As studies by Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal of New York indicate, what little progress has been made in auto safety, fair packaging and lending, is the result almost exclusively of congressional efforts—some of them against the Executive Branch.

This terrible innocence, this unappreciation of social consequences has already brought about one awful, and now irrevocable, error in the post-war period. Almost without knowing it, this country has allowed the whole post-war generation of urban poor Negroes to grow up hostile to American society.

To be sure, an annual social report is not going to end congested streets, air pollution, and the shortchanging of the consumer interest. But it can create a climate of continuous self-correction; a barrier against irrevocable mistakes, not to say disasters, such as the loss of a Negro generation. And that it seems to me is perhaps the most important domestic business now before the Nation.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1967]

CRIME AND OUR LOSS OF TRUST IN HUMAN BEINGS

(By Max Lerner)

In the grand anticlimax of the 1960's the man who—by his own account and his lawyer's—strangled 13 women in Boston, has been put on trial for a number of minor breaking-into-apartment episodes because there is no way of trying him for the monstrous strangling crimes. His lawyer, Lee Bailey, told a gathering of Bostonians at a civic dinner that with Albert DeSalvo safely tucked away in a mental hospital "citizens will no longer have to open their chain-locks in terror."

How curious a reassurance this is, turning on the fact of one man in custody. The chain-locks are still tightly locked in Cincinnati where stranglings have not been solved, and there will be other cities through which fear and suspicion will stalk together.

Note that President Johnson's message on the State of the Union devotes more space to terror in the streets and terror in the home than to any other single national problem except the Vietnam war. His proposal for a "Safe Streets and Crime Control Act," to give Federal aid to State and local policing programs, will take care of the problem of funds. But what will take care of the recesses of the human heart and the twisted places in the human brain where these enormities happen?

My family had a wry reminder of this a few

days ago when a couple of hold-up men talked their way into our home while I was out of the city, herded my wife and our small son and our maid together in a room. While one of them ransacked the house for valuables, the other held the little huddle of three at gunpoint; then they tied them up and got away.

What hurts unforgivably and unforgettably, is not what they carried off, but the terror they left in the minds of two women and a child.

In this kind of minor episode, as in the major crimes which bedevil the suburbs and small towns as well as the big cities, the abiding residue is the loss of trust in fellow human beings.

This is why we ought to welcome a current project of sociologists and government people—headed by Daniel Bill of Columbia and William Gorham, an Assistant Secretary at HEW—to find some way of measuring the social health of the nation as well as its economic and political health.

Every year the American President gives Congress and the people a message on the State of the Union as a polity, an economy, and as a power among the powers of the earth. Fine, but how about an annual message on the state of the society, on the state of the happiness of the people, and on the changes taking place in both?

Kenneth Boulding, who is an economist but also much more, has recently suggested that what may be most worth studying in a society is its "integrative structure," by which he means the whole complex of loyalties, beliefs and commitments that holds it together.

In a book I once wrote on American civilization I called this the "cement" of a society, holding it together in a far deeper sense than the various forms of lip-service that we pay to democracy, morality, and virtue.

President Johnson quoted from Abraham Lincoln: "Let reverence for the laws become the political religion of the nation." But with all respect to Lincoln, there must be more in the integrative structure of a society than reverence for the laws. There must also be reverence for man himself, and trust in him, and a sense of the human nexus.

This is what has been broken by the terror in the streets and the terror that has attacked the home. The chain-lock, pulled back only with a wary and hostile eye, will not cure it: For it is itself a symptom as well as consequence of the disease. Putting the DeSalvos into mental hospitals will not cure it, nor rounding up the criminal junkies periodically, nor giving them free shots as the British do.

The cure must be radical, as the disease is. We could do far worse than to devote to their study a considerable part of the Federal taxes which we are about to increase.

Mr. MONDALE. Both articles help support the reasons why this type of measure should be enacted, and why such an institution should be developed. It will provide our Government and the President with the basis for an intelligent and wise allocation of resources in support of programs which offer the best possibilities of affording every American full opportunity for a decent life.

Mr. MONDALE subsequently said: Mr. President, I earlier introduced the Social Accounting Act of 1967, S. 843. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred first to the Committee on Government Operations and next to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It there objection? There being no objection, it is so ordered.

CONTROL OF POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a package of three bills aimed at controlling the pollution of the Great Lakes and the Nation's rivers and streams by cities and industries and by ships.

These bills are similar to ones I introduced in the last session of the Congress. Changes have been to accommodate laws passed by that Congress and to take into consideration recent technological changes. These bills are the first part of a comprehensive pollution package that I intend to introduce in this session of Congress.

Great strides have been taken by all levels of government and the private sector in recent years toward meeting the problems of water pollution. We have some battles, but we are still losing the war against pollution.

Every major river system in America is now polluted and the tide of pollution is moving rapidly through our Great Lakes, the greatest fresh water resource on the face of the earth.

The ever-increasing pollution of the Great Lakes must surely shock every thoughtful American. Some experts have said that Lake Erie has become irreversibly polluted. The southern tip of Lake Michigan is becoming an industrial cesspool. Chicago's source of drinking water is threatened.

The causes of this pollution are many in number and varied in form. Many communities do not have adequate sewage treatment plants and discharge raw sewage into public waters during times of heavy rainfall because their storm and sanitary sewers are interconnected. Many industries do not have adequate sewage treatment plants and dump industrial acids and other chemicals into lakes and streams. Vessels and ships, as well as the shore installations and terminal facilities which service them, have inadequate sewage treatment facilities and are dumping wastes directly into harbors and into our navigable waters.

The navigable waters pollution control bill would help to control pollution of the Great Lakes and other navigable waters by prohibiting the dumping of oil, sewage, and refuse into those waters from vessels and boats as well as from terminal facilities and shore installations.

The Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966 prohibited the dumping of oil from vessels and ships into navigable waters; this bill would broaden the coverage of vessel pollution control from oil to include all pollutants; namely, oil, sewage and refuse. Under this bill coverage is also extended to include all sources; namely, shore installations and terminal facilities.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to consult with other Federal officials and governmental agencies which are presently involved in matters relating to navigable waters. It also directs the Secretary to appoint a technical committee of Government representatives, owners and operators of Great Lakes vessels, and such other persons as the Secre-

tary determines. In this way, the Secretary will develop regulations which are workable and, at the same time, adequate to protect the public interest.

Under this bill, vessels operating on navigable waters would be required to have approved sewage and refuse disposal facilities by January 1, 1971.

The industrial pollution abatement and prevention bill would provide a program of economic incentives to assist and encourage industry to assume its responsibility for preventing water pollution by properly treating its wastes.

Every day, industries are dumping great quantities of exotic and highly toxic waste into the Great Lakes and many of our rivers and streams.

There are certain industries which are making a major effort to remove dangerous pollutants from the wastes they discharge into public waters. These people are to be commended for their efforts.

Because facilities to treat industrial wastes are often very expensive and because some industries contend that they cannot afford to install these facilities, this bill would make direct grants and loans available to certain qualified industries to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of waste treatment facilities.

The bill also increases grants to municipalities for joint municipal-industrial waste treatment facilities and establishes and strengthens research in joint waste disposal facilities and advanced waste treatment methods.

The clean waters bill would increase Federal assistance to State, local, and other governmental units for the establishment of drainage basin agencies for comprehensive pollution control planning.

The key to effective water quality control is the drainage basin approach. If one city is treating its sewage properly before it discharges it into a river but another city on the same river is not, the net effects is still the same—the water becomes polluted.

The system of Federal grants to municipalities for treatment plant construction would be increased under this bill to a maximum of 90 percent Federal money if the State pays the remaining 10 percent and if the project is part of a drainage basin-water pollution control plan.

Under this bill, the amount of Federal funds available for treatment plant grants would be increased from \$3.5 to \$8.7 billion over a 5-year period.

Many communities do not even apply for Federal grants today because they cannot raise the necessary money from their overburdened property tax systems. The Federal Government can no longer sit back and insist that other units of government must solve the problem. The fact is, the job is not now being done and never will be unless we make this an urgent responsibility of the Federal Government.

The bill would also allow the Secretary of the Interior to make low-cost loans to States and municipalities and other agencies if they cannot secure money under reasonable terms from any other sources.

The time is near when our rivers and