

U.S. Congress, 1970
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 3

FEBRUARY 9, 1970, TO FEBRUARY 19, 1970
(PAGES 2777 TO 4246)

dosages of 2,4,5-T will produce fetal deformities in both mice and rats.

It was in response to the findings of the Bionetics study that Dr. Lee DuBridge, President Nixon's scientific adviser, announced last October that a series of coordinated measures would be undertaken by the Government to restrict use of 2,4,5-T. Mr. Whiteside's account of that statement includes an assurance that the Department of Agriculture would deregister the pesticide for food use, effective at the beginning of 1970, unless the Food and Drug Administration could find a basis for establishing safe residue tolerance levels in food.

Mr. President, despite the absence of any such determination by FDA, this pesticide continues to be sprayed at home and abroad on food crops which are ultimately used for human consumption.

So that we may seek an explanation for this disturbing state of affairs, Senator MAGNUSON, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, last week agreed to my request that a 1-day hearing on the matter be scheduled by the Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment Subcommittee on the 11th of March. The Senator from Washington and I last week also sent the following letter to Dr. Lee DuBridge, Director, Office of Science and Technology; Hon. Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; Hon. Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; Mr. Charles Meacham, Commission, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and Mr. James Nance, president, Bionetics Research Laboratories, Inc., people whom we would like either to appear as witnesses at the hearing or to submit a report to the Committee on matters relating to 2,4,5-T:

FEBRUARY 12, 1970.

DEAR ———: In the past weeks, questions have been raised by several sources concerning the dangers which may be posed by use of the herbicide known as 2,4,5-T. We at the Senate Commerce Committee were especially disturbed by Thomas Whiteside's discussion in this week's New Yorker of the possible effects of this compound on plant communities, on certain shell-fish and migratory fish, and on man himself.

In order to explore the questions raised by Whiteside and others, the Energy, Natural Resources and Environment Subcommittee of the Committee has scheduled a one-day hearing for March 11 at which we would like you to appear as a witness. Our purpose is essentially to attempt to acquire some understanding of the current state of knowledge concerning 2,4,5-T and to keep abreast of Administration decisions and other developments regarding the herbicide.

If you have any difficulty with our proposed date, please do not hesitate to let us or the staff man, Leonard Bickwit (225-6627), know. We look forward to seeing you and to hearing your views on matters which are of great concern to all of us.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. HART,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy,
Natural Resources and the Environment.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee.

Senator MAGNUSON's decision to schedule this hearing is another instance of the Commerce Committee's concern for the effects of pesticides on man and his

environment. In 1958, the committee reported the Pesticides Research Act, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the impact of pesticides on fish and wildlife resources. The committee has also been responsible for several amendments to that act, the latest of which extended authorization for research through fiscal 1971.

Last year the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment held two sets of hearings which explored the effects of pesticides on commercial and sports fisheries. Our hearing next month is an extension of that effort to find a governmental policy or procedure which will protect man and the environment from the use of harmful pesticides.

EDITORIALS SUPPORT NEED FOR IMPROVED SOCIAL POLICYMAKING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, during 1969 the Special Subcommittee on Social Program Planning and Evaluation, of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, devoted careful study to S. 5, the proposed Full Opportunity Act. Hearings on the bill and on the HEW study of knowledge about current social conditions, "Toward a Social Report," were held during July and again in December. The testimony received during those hearings underscored a point I have made repeatedly in this Chamber: Towering ignorance of real social conditions too often supplants data and fact when we attempt to legislate in the human programs area.

No testimony received by the subcommittee during 1969 documented that premise so pointedly as did that provided by former Presidential Assistant Joseph A. Califano, Jr. Mr. Califano's remarks provided a shocking indictment of our good-intentioned but hopelessly irrational approach to social policymaking. Recently, both Tom Wicker, of the New York Times, and Laurence Stern and Richard Harwood, of the Washington Post, judged Mr. Califano's remarks to be of sufficient importance to be discussed in their widely-read columns. I ask unanimous consent that these columns be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

In addition, the same testimony prompted the St. Paul Pioneer Press to editorialize in favor of the structural mechanisms for social monitoring and reporting which are proposed by the Full Opportunity Act. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Council of Social Advisers" also be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 25, 1969]

IN THE NATION: THE MISSING INGREDIENTS
(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, December 24.—Ringling through the rampant materialism of Christmas is one clear note of concern and generosity, sounded by a small group of servicemen stationed at Monterey, Calif. Appalled at the "social crisis" as well as the "feeling of hopelessness about America's ability to deal with its own problems," they have con-

tributed a tithe of their monthly earnings to the Urban Coalition.

With this small beginning, the group writes, "If one-tenth of the people in the country could be persuaded to tithe ten per cent of their income after taxes for a period of ten years, then \$50 billion could be raised." That may well be so, and no one should spurn either the efficacy of that much money or the spirit that would produce it; unfortunately, both are only a part of the social dilemma in America.

CALIFANO'S TESTIMONY

Another major problem is that we do not know enough about what we are doing, hence about what we ought to be doing, in the social services. This point was graphically made in recent testimony to a Senate Labor Subcommittee by Joseph A. Califano, who was former President Johnson's right-hand man in domestic affairs.

Mr. Califano said that it had taken the Johnson Administration almost two years merely to find out who were the seven million people then receiving about \$4 billion annually in welfare payments; it was not known until then, for instance, that there were only about 50,000 welfare recipients who were actually employable, despite all the loud political charges about bums and freeloaders. No real study of welfare recipients had ever been made.

DIGGING FOR DATA

Similarly, Mr. Califano said, it took almost two years to make the kind of study of housing needs in America that enabled Mr. Johnson to state in 1967 that 26 million new housing units would be needed in the next ten years—an estimate the Department of Housing and Urban Development recently confirmed on the basis of additional data.

When Watts blew up in 1965, Mr. Califano said, a Federal team of about twenty people had to go there just to find out who lived in Watts, and in what conditions. "We know how many children get a piece of paper that says they graduated from elementary school," he went on, "but we don't know what a first-grade education is. . . . In the transportation area, just the Northeast Corridor, while studies have been done of do you want trains, highways, planes. . . . I think you will find they are still relatively primitive. . . ."

Yet, he said, if a President asked the Defense Department "how fast and how efficiently can you transport so many troops from A to a variety of countries around the world," he would get an answer of extreme sophistication, with a wealth of detail on all contingencies, close cost estimates for every possible variation, and calculations of expected political effects.

FACTS ARE LACKING

That kind of information is sadly lacking for domestic problems, and the lack all too often paralyzes action, leads to the wrong action, or prevents the right course being found. The subcommittee chairman, Walter Mondale, of Minnesota, concluded that for all the "cold facts" at the Government's disposal, it still was not very good at answering "the strategic questions of how we improve American society."

Or, as Mr. Califano put it: "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."

SOCIAL ADVISERS

Senator Mondale is proposing the establishment in the White House of a Council of Social Advisers, and in Congress a Joint Committee on Social Affairs—both on the model of important existing bodies devoted to eco-

conomic matters. Their task would be to develop the social information needed, to speak for social needs in America, to provide for human problems the same background of detailed knowledge we already have on defense and economic questions.

It should be no discouragement to the Monterey servicemen to say that their spirit and dollars, however widely duplicated, will not prevail unless soundly directed. As will be discussed in another article, the sense of urgency they feel is the other ingredient generally missing from a mix that might lead to advancement.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 7, 1970]

FEDERAL AGENCIES LACK PROPER DATA ON WHICH TO BASE SOCIAL POLICIES

(By Richard Harwood and Laurence Stern)

Joseph A. Califano Jr., once described by someone with a fine metaphorical sense as the Assistant President for Domestic Affairs in the latter Johnson Era, related a minor irony of his White House days to a Senate subcommittee last month.

As the story went, one day at the White House former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare John Gardner was asked what kind of Americans were on the receiving end of the \$4 billion national welfare roll. Were they blind? Were they children? Were they alcoholics?

The nonplused Gardner confessed that neither he nor anyone else at HEW seemed to have any conception of what the breakdown looked like. Strange to say, it took two years to find out—from the summer of 1965 to 1967.

Of the 7.3 million people then on welfare, Califano told the Senators, "we found out to our amazement that we were dealing only with about 150,000 fathers, so to speak, adult males in the working level age, and of them about 100,000 were so incapacitated that they were beyond the ability to work or be trained."

This left a suspect population of 50,000 able-bodied males on the welfare lists—less than a tenth of one per cent of the total welfare population.

Of the remaining number 2.1 million were women over 65 (with a median age of 72); 700,000 were either blind or so severely handicapped that they couldn't work; 3.5 million were children not supported by their parents; 900,000 were mothers.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) reacted with what passes in the Senate for incredulity. Citing President Nixon's espousal of "workfare" as a *sine qua non* of his welfare program, Mondale observed: "... based on these statistics, conservatively 90 per cent of the people on welfare are not employable. They are senior citizens, disabled or they are mothers with large families."

"I assume," he continued, "this mythical, able but unwilling adult male free-loading on welfare is just that, a myth."

As with most friendly colloquies in Senate hearings, this was all aimed at proving a point: there is a towering ignorance in our national information centers of the facts upon which intelligent social policy can be based.

By illustrating, we know how many divorces there are each year. But what kind of marriages are there? We know how much we spend on elementary schools but what is a good second-grade program—and what kind of second grades, or 12th grades, do we have?

Why is it that hunger is suddenly discovered not as an aberration but as a widespread affliction in certain regions and classes of Americans? How can something as massive as an urban riot happen without depositing advance hints of the rising level of social combustion?

As Califano put it, "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..."

Mondale has been conducting a personal crusade for a Council of Social Advisers which would have the ear of the President, like the Council of Economic Advisers and like the National Security Council. His bill would set up a national system of social accounts that would calculate, among other things, the effects of such vast federal programs as the Interstate Highway Act on metropolitan areas; the impact of federal mortgage policies favoring the segregated suburbs on the inner city; the degree of achievement in the classrooms.

Califano speaks admiringly of the Pentagon and its sophisticated information systems, its rational decision-making processes. Yet even these systems have brought us such things as the F-111, which loses wings in flight; the C-5A, which does its most spectacular soaring on the cost ledgers, and the war in Vietnam, which refuses persistently to end in victory.

There certainly can be little arguing with the case made by Mondale and Califano for a federal social accounting system—a way of measuring the quality of our institutions and lives.

But there is something a bit scary about the notion, too, a trifle Orwellian. Implicit in the measurement of quality is someone's determination of what is good. Each time the government learns something about our social condition it subtracts from our personal privacy.

The preservation of the village idiot is as much a mark of our freedom as the eradication of the empty belly.

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press, Jan. 8, 1970]

COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

When the President and members of his Cabinet discuss fiscal and monetary matters, they have the advice of a prestigious group of experts who make up the Council of Economic Advisers.

There is no comparable body to advise on social problems. Senator Walter Mondale of Minnesota, and others in Congress, believe there should be. A Mondale bill calls for a National Council of Social Advisers to keep up a constant study of the total impact on society of various government programs, established to serve a real or imagined need, but often having unforeseen side effects.

Such a council might delve into the social effects of federal highway programs which disrupt urban neighborhoods and shake up development patterns in whole metropolitan areas. It might study the relation of federal mortgage insurance to inner city decay. It might help separate myth from fact in planning reforms of the welfare system. It could try to get an overall view of what is wrong with school systems in the racial ghettos.

There is a towering ignorance in government information centers of the facts upon which intelligent social policy can be based, says Mondale. Joseph Califano, an adviser to President Lyndon Johnson on many domestic matters, put it this way: "The disturbing truth is that the basis of recommendations by the Cabinet officer on whether to begin, eliminate or expand vast social programs resembles the intuitive judgment of a benevolent tribal chief in remote parts of Africa."

This situation exists partly because of an exaggerated national fear of "government planning," not entirely unjustified, of course. States rights philosophy also has retarded better national approaches to social problems such as welfare and the base migration of minority groups into big city concentrations in the past quarter century.

Not many years ago the Mondale proposal would have drawn only skepticism and sarcasm from the public and Congress. But in today's conditions it is at least getting sober consideration, although still considered by some as unnecessary or unrealistic.

Establishment of a Council of Social Advisers of course would not guarantee solutions of complex social problems, any more than the Council of Economic Advisers has completely solved fiscal and monetary problems. But in the latter case, Presidents, Cabinet members and Congress have had the benefit of intelligent, competent advice based on the most authoritative and reliable fact sources. No one would propose abolishing the Economic Council. It has proved its usefulness.

This experience suggests that the Mondale proposal is worth trying. Social problems are infinitely complex and still only vaguely understood. But on their solution or amelioration depends the future stability of America's democratic system of government. The very difficulties of the challenge call for new and special efforts to guide public policies intelligently. A National Council of Social Advisers would be a worthwhile experiment.

THE CASE AGAINST JUDGE CARSWELL

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it important for the average interested American citizen to know some of the reasons why a number of Senators, including myself, are opposing Carswell.

My opposition is not based on any speech or political views he may have had 22 years ago. Most men in public life change in 22 years. My opposition is based on Mr. Carswell's record as a trial judge—and a number of critical questions raised in the hearings which he has left unanswered. This record shows clearly that Mr. Carswell cannot separate his personal views and political prejudices from his conduct and decisions in court where civil rights and minority rights issues are concerned. Time after time where minority rights were concerned, he refused to uphold the laws of Congress, the rulings of his circuit, or the Supreme Court of the United States when the governing principles collided with his own basic prejudices.

He stalled school desegregation cases for years in his court.

He did not believe that black sharecroppers should be registered to vote so he aided and abetted local officials in their harassment of voting rights workers.

He was reversed by the court of appeals on minority rights cases time and again.

He deliberately set \$15 filing fees in civil rights removal cases to his court ignoring a decision on the fifth circuit forbidding these filing fees.

He advised local officials of how to avoid and circumvent a decision of the fifth circuit, thus preventing nine ministers from having a hearing and guaranteeing them permanent criminal records.

He stalled and delayed hearings to release students improperly jailed in voting rights drive. And when he finally signed a writ of habeas corpus he cleverly signed a second order remanding the case so the local sheriff could rearrest them the moment they stepped out of jail.

There are many great southern judges and lawyers who are just as "strict a constructionist" as Mr. Carswell but whose records are clear and who are eminent constitutional lawyers and who have demonstrated that they are judi-