

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 2

JANUARY 22, 1969, TO FEBRUARY 4, 1969

(PAGES 1381 TO 2774)

but a new player entered the game at this point.

Rep. Aspinall, alerted by the press, called the department. He got the details and promptly went through the ceiling. His committee was being bypassed, he wasn't being consulted, and a long-standing agreement was being dishonored. The chairman won't say he called Mr. Johnson, but the President got the word, probably through Assistant White House Counsel W. Devier Pierson. The President called Udall and insisted that all the interested Members of Congress be briefed or the plan was off.

Thursday night the Arizona delegation went downtown to hear about the plan to create Sonoran Desert and Marble Canyon Monuments. Marble Canyon was bad; Sonoran Desert, a planned 911,000 acre tract, was unacceptable. Some of the best hunting in the State was in the land along the Mexican Border, and oil and gas and other minerals were suspected there.

The Utah and Alaskan delegations were notified late Thursday of briefings to be held early Friday. Both groups were stunned by the plans, which could hardly be evaluated in a few minutes. They felt that some of the area probably belonged in parks. Indeed, Sen. Wallace F. Bennett, R-Utah, had introduced bills to make arches and Capitol Reef into parks, but on a smaller basis. Initial reactions were blank, but by the time they got back to the Capitol, anger had set in over the manner of making the withdrawals.

All had been sworn to secrecy, but bits and pieces leaked out. Sources at Interior by now were giving a general description of the area involved and members of the Utah delegation added enough to the puzzle that the outline could be seen in some detail. Friday morning Rep. Burton, Sen. Bennett, and Sen. Moss were all calling for hearings on the plan to give Utahans a chance to discuss it.

The story of the proposed withdrawals was broken by the Deseret News in its Friday afternoon editions.

Meanwhile, Mr. Udall took his proclamations to the President at a final Cabinet meeting Friday noon. His department prepared to put out its press release under an embargo for Sunday use, but at 2:00 p.m. Mr. Udall was back; the President had not acted. "The release is just wastebasket material until the President acts," Interior said. "Maybe we will get it by 10 a.m. Saturday."

Friday night Mr. Udall called the President again. The proclamations were not signed. Rep. Aspinall had threatened to block any development funds for the monuments if they were rammed through over his objections. Mr. Johnson was furious that he had been misled.

On Saturday, the 10 a.m. deadline passed. At 2:00 p.m. nothing had happened. The President knew that the C & O Canal National Monument had received no funds, that Rep. Aspinall did not bluff.

Late Saturday afternoon the Secretary, apparently thinking the proclamations had been signed, released the announcement. "President Johnson has signed proclamations adding more than 7.5 million acres. . . ." Also, in another release, Interior noted that Mr. Udall had named D.C. Stadium the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium. Mr. Johnson might have looked upon that idea with little enthusiasm, though his argument with Udall was based on far more than a name.

By 8 p.m. Saturday, Interior was calling back its release. Mr. Johnson had not signed the proclamations. Saturday night Mr. Udall and the President again quarreled on the phone. Mr. Udall offered his resignation. At one time, Mr. Udall simply made himself unavailable for the Johnson wrath. He went to the Justice Department to discuss the plan with Government lawyers there. Nothing was done.

Representative Aspinall was livid. People who saw him described his anger as "violent." Mr. Johnson was only slightly less angry.

All day Sunday the proclamations simmered, unsigned, on Mr. Johnson's desk. Mr. Udall waited, fretting, at his office, amid boxes of books and paintings awaiting the movers.

Monday morning the President was still undecided. He wanted to make his mark on the park system as had his predecessors for half a century. In 5 years he had used his executive authority to create only one monument: tiny 27.5 acre Ellis Island in New York Harbor was added to Liberty Island National Monument.

As Lyndon Johnson prepared to leave the White House for the last time as President, he signed withdrawals of 384,500 acres in Utah, Arizona, and Alaska, but rejected 7.2 million acres of Mr. Udall's proposal. Devier Pierson said at 10:30 that Mr. Johnson had acted. The Johnson administration expired 90 minutes later.

In a final press release the President said: "I am happy to be able to dedicate this portion of the public domain to the purposes of conservation. The areas I have chosen are not large—but they are superb landmarks of major historic and scientific interest, and action is needed now to insure that this land is put to its finest use.

"A number of additional national monument proposals were presented to me for consideration by the Secretary of Interior. They include the Sonoran Desert area in Arizona, an enlargement of the Mount McKinley National Park in Alaska, and the creation of a vast new park area above the Arctic Circle in Alaska. Each would be an exciting addition to our park system.

"After a careful review of these proposals, I have concluded that it would not be desirable to take executive action for the acquisition of this land in the last few days of my term. The proposals include over 7 million acres—an enormous increase in our total park holdings. I believe the taking of this land—without any opportunity for congressional study—would strain the antiquities act far beyond its intent and would be poor public policy. Understandably, such action, I am informed, would be opposed by leading Members of Congress having authority in this field who have not had the opportunity to review or pass judgment on the desirability of the taking.

"Under these circumstances, I have directed the Secretary of Interior to submit these additional proposals to the Interior Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives for their consideration as new national parks. I hope the committees will see fit to give the proposed areas careful study at the earliest possible time."

RESTRICTIONS PROPOSED ON TAX-LOSS FARMING

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, last week I was pleased to join the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) and 22 other Senators in sponsoring legislation to limit the use of financial losses from farming to offset taxes on nonfarm income.

Our present farm tax system is being greatly abused by corporations and wealthy persons who are farming at a loss in order to reduce the taxes they pay on income from their other nonfarm enterprises.

If these tax loopholes are allowed to continue, the future of family farming in America will be jeopardized. Tax-loss farming disrupts normal market prices and creates ruthless and unfair price competition for legitimate family farm-

ers who are simply trying to earn a living.

In 1966, 108 individuals with annual incomes of more than a million dollars were involved in some phase of farming and 93 of them reported losses for income tax purposes.

This legislation will restrict the amount of excess farm losses that a corporation or individual can use to offset taxes against their nonfarm income. It also includes safeguards to exempt bona fide family farmers who find it necessary to supplement their regular farm incomes by other means.

Under our proposal, nonfarm income up to \$15,000 could be completely offset by farming losses in paying income taxes. This provision is aimed at protecting the person who is primarily a farmer but has a part-time job or other additional income.

Each \$1 of nonfarm income between \$15,001 and \$30,000 would reduce the original tax deductions allowed by \$1. Therefore, individuals with more than \$30,000 nonfarm income could not deduct losses from farming.

This legislation will not stop city people from owning farms. But it will prevent any corporation or individual from misusing tax provisions that have been developed primarily to help the bona fide farmer.

URBAN LEAGUE'S ENDORSEMENT OF COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on January 20 the National Urban League presented President Nixon with its recommendations for action to be taken by the new administration in order to "solve our most pervasive and corrosive problems."

I was pleased to find that the League has endorsed my own call for the creation of a Council of Social Advisers in the Office of the President. The Full Opportunity Act, S. 5, which I introduced on January 15, declares full social opportunity a new national goal and establishes a Council of Social Advisers to monitor our success in achieving that objective. It would also require the preparation of an annual social report and creates a joint congressional committee to review the report.

Mr. President, I hope the League's recommendations, and its support for the creation of a Council of Social Advisers in particular, will receive President Nixon's personal attention as well as that of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times article discussing the League's recommendations be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

URBAN LEAGUE URGES GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME TO REPLACE WELFARE SYSTEM
(By John Leo)

The National Urban League has urged that the welfare system be abolished and replaced with a program guaranteeing a minimum income for all American families.

This was the major recommendation in a 51-page memorandum presented by the league to President Nixon on Monday and released yesterday.

The document also urged a \$2-minimum

wage, with automatic increases tied to the Consumer Price Index; a White House conference to deal with friction between the police and Negro communities, and an immediate investigation of reports of "a rapidly deteriorating racial climate in the armed services."

Attacking the welfare system as "obsolete, punitive, ineffective and bankrupt," the league said it would give the details of a plan to replace it sometime after its mid-February board meeting.

Whitney M. Young Jr., the league's executive director, said the plan would look "something like" proposals for a negative income tax recommended by various Government and business committees. A minimum income proposal was studied by President Johnson and his advisers but was never espoused as Administration policy.

"THIS IS AN INVESTMENT"

Mr. Young called on President Nixon to "convince the American people that this is an investment, like the G. I. Bill, that will ultimately bring in far more money in taxes than it costs."

Current estimates are that a workable minimum income program could cost as much as \$30-billion a year, as against the present welfare bill to Federal, state and city governments of \$5.5-billion a year.

"The one prompt, effective solution to the problem of poverty in an affluent society," the memorandum said, "is to provide everyone with a minimum income."

The report contained no dramatic new proposals, arguing that action must be taken along the lines sketched out by the Johnson Administration, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the President's Committee on Urban Housing and the President's Commission on Automation, Technology and Economic Progress.

"The National Urban League believes," said the report, "that the new Administration has entered office at a time when the foundations for a massive crusade to solve our most pervasive and corrosive problems have been well established."

The report called for a sweeping eight-year program to eradicate slums and solve the urban crisis by the nation's 200th anniversary in 1976.

Mr. Young said he believed that the President was "anxious to deny, through his actions, the suspicions many Negroes have of him."

Urging Mr. Nixon to act immediately, he said:

"The President is now going through a honeymoon period. Before his detractors and the conservatives start acting, he should put these programs into action."

The memorandum called for a comprehensive plan for Government and industry, working in partnership, to develop the slums. It rejected proposals to curb inflation by permitting an increase in unemployment.

"Such a policy would wreak havoc in black communities where the unemployment rate runs as high as 40 per cent," the memo said.

The league asked for the establishment of a Council of Social Advisers, along the lines of the Council of Economic Advisers, to warn of danger signals on the racial front, and requested a special program to integrate the 100,000 Negroes in the armed services who are to return to civilian society this year.

President Nixon asked the league to put its proposals into a memorandum when he talked with Mr. Young last Nov. 15.

THE SAFE STREETS ACT—HOW IT WORKS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Safe Streets Act: How It Works," written by W.

Carey Parker, and published in the December 1968 issue of Public Management.

In his well-reasoned article, Mr. Parker lucidly explains the workings of title I of the Safe Streets Act of 1968, an act which inaugurates a major new program of Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement in the United States.

Mr. Parker brings no little expertise to his topic. During the 15-month journey of the Safe Streets Act through Congress, Carey Parker, as special assistant to the head of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, played a key role in passage of the act.

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

SAFE STREETS ACT: HOW IT WORKS

(By W. Carey Parker)

(NOTE.—The opinions expressed in this article are the author's, and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Justice.)

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, signed into law by President Johnson last June, inaugurates a major new program of federal assistance to state and local law enforcement in the United States. The Safe Streets program is designed to provide massive federal aid to help our states and cities improve and strengthen all aspects of their law enforcement systems. It promises to become the most important contribution ever made by the federal government in the war against crime.

The new Act is a direct outgrowth of the comprehensive studies carried out by the President's National Crime Commission. The Commission's report, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, emphasized that crime in America is primarily a state and local responsibility. The Commission found, however, that there were many urgent problems that state and local governments could not solve on their own. To help these governments carry out their law enforcement responsibility, the Commission recommended a program of sustained and substantial federal financial assistance in all areas related to law enforcement.

Acting on the Commission's recommendation, President Johnson proposed the Safe Streets bill to Congress in February, 1967. In the course of its 15-month journey through the Senate, the bill took on its "omnibus" quality with the addition of a series of titles dealing with controversial law enforcement problems such as police interrogation, wire-tapping, and gun control. The essence of the law enforcement assistance program remained unchanged, however, and became Title I of the Act.

The phrase "law enforcement" in Title I is a comprehensive term covering all aspects of the law enforcement and criminal justice system. It encompasses each of the basic elements of the system—police, courts, and corrections—as well as general programs for crime prevention and public safety. More specifically, the phrase covers detection and investigation of crime and apprehension of offenders; pretrial procedures; prosecution and defense of criminal cases; conviction and sentencing of offenders; post-conviction procedures; and imprisonment, probation, parole, and rehabilitation of offenders.

No part of the system is beyond the scope of the Act. In every area of law enforcement, federal funds will be available to support a variety of programs to develop new approaches, equipment, and techniques for better law enforcement.

To carry out the provisions of Title I, the Act creates a Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, located within the Department of Justice under the general authority

of the Attorney General. The Administration will be headed by three high-level officers, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Together, they will have the responsibility for administering four principal categories of federal grants under Title I:

Planning grants, to enable state and local governments to prepare and develop comprehensive plans covering their entire law enforcement systems. Federal funds may be used to pay up to 90 per cent of the cost of such planning programs.

Action grants, to enable state and local governments to carry out programs and projects to implement their law enforcement plans. In most cases, federal action funds may be used to pay up to 60 per cent of the total cost of a program. Grants for riot control or control of organized crime may be used to pay up to 75 per cent of the cost of a program, and grants for salaries or construction may be used to pay up to 50 per cent of the cost of a program.

Research, development, and special project grants, to encourage the application of modern science and technology to law enforcement. Grants in this category may be used to pay up to 100 per cent of the cost of a project, and may be made not only to state and local governments, but also to other public agencies, and to private organizations as well.

Education grants, consisting of student loans up to \$1,800 per year and tuition aid up to \$200 per quarter or \$300 per semester for law enforcement personnel and students planning careers in law enforcement.

In addition to these grants, the Act contains a significant provision authorizing the Federal Bureau of Investigation to expand its training programs for state and local law enforcement personnel, both in the field and at the FBI National Academy at Quantico, Va.

For the current fiscal year, Congress has appropriated a total of \$63 million for the Safe Streets Act. Of this amount \$19 million will be available for planning grants and \$29 million for action grants. Under the terms of the Act, both planning and action funds must be allocated among the states according to population. In addition, for the current fiscal year, \$3 million will be available for research grants, \$6.5 million for education grants, \$3 million for FBI training programs, and \$2.5 million for organization and operation of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. In future years, appropriations under the Act are expected to increase substantially with expenditures eventually reaching approximately \$1 billion a year.

The Safe Streets Act draws no distinction between state and local governments with respect to eligibility for research grants, education grants, and FBI training. Under the education grant program, for example, student loans will be available to local law enforcement officers enrolled on a full-time basis in college degree programs related to law enforcement. Similarly, local officers enrolled full-time or part-time in college-level courses will be eligible for assistance under the tuition aid aspect of the grant program.

The Act requires that special consideration must be given to student loans for police or correctional personnel on academic leave to earn degrees. Repayment of the loans will be cancelled at the rate of 25 per cent per year for each subsequent year of service in law enforcement.

With respect to eligibility for planning grants and action grants, the Act does draw a distinction between state and local governments, since essentially all such grants must be made in the first instance to state governments. At the same time, however, the Act places strict controls on state governments to insure full and adequate participation by local governments in the planning and action programs, including specific requirements as to the amount of federal funds that must be