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CONGRESSIONAL LEADERSHIP: TODAY AND TOMORROW

Speech of Senator Mike Mansfield (D., Montana) at the 55th Annual Convention of Associated General Contractors of America
The Community Concourse Theater San Diego, California
Monday, March 11, 1974, 2:00 p.m.

It is not without some reticence that I choose to address you on the subject of Congressional leadership. As someone has recently pointed out, the trouble with being a political leader these days is that you cannot be sure whether people are following you or chasing you. Whether it is called a 'message' or a 'signal,' some sort of shock has definitely been sent by the people to Washington. At a minimum, it causes a painful ringing in the ears. It can, in more serious cases, portend sudden political death. It is even rumored to be the only known cure for Potomac fever.

However that may be, it is obvious that the public impression of the Federal government, at this time, is not a happy one. A recent public opinion poll shows the Presidency at its lowest ebb in history. Reluctantly, I must acknowledge that, according to the same poll, only the Congress has fallen lower in public esteem. It is small solace to note that that has long been the public attitude toward Congress.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of whether or not so much scorn is warranted, the fact remains that what is
being expressed is, in part, a deep sense of public dissatisfaction with the Federal government. Our people are caught between the jaws of a fierce inflation and increasingly irrelevant price and wage controls. The effects of this painful pressure are intensified by the oil crisis and a growing awareness of an inequitable tax structure. To cap the situation are the shocking blows against the nation's political institutions which have been delivered by the tragedies of Watergate.

Whatever the sense of frustration, I hasten to add that I do not think that the nation is at the end of the road. To the bumper sticker which commands: "America: Love it or leave it," the response is simple: whatever the current irritants who is leaving and who doesn't love it?

You can understand the reasons for that sentiment. Your industry at its best is a symbol of this country. It is energy and growth. It is fresh ideas, competition, progress, service, a faith in the future of the people of the nation. Qualities such as these go with the United States. They have enabled us to withstand the gravest adversity in the past. They provide the binders which hold the nation together, even at a time of government disarray.

Out of these qualities will come the source of tomorrow's renewal of the nation's spirit. It is in this context--in the context of renewal--that I would like to discuss the Congress of the United States, its role and the leadership it is trying to contribute to the nation in this time of trial.

Thirteen years ago I was elected the Majority Leader of the United States Senate. The mandate has been renewed by my colleagues at regular two year intervals. Many have taken issue
with the nature of that leadership over the years. It is a political fact of life that some individuals—even some at this meeting—I assume there are at least a few Republicans here—would have preferred me to be the leader of a minority.

Notwithstanding my party role in the Senate, I can assure you that there exists a close working relationship with the leadership of the other party. To be sure, Senator Scott of Pennsylvania and I have differences. Most of all, however, we share our problems in common. A Senate in continual partisan conflict is an ineffectual Senate. The Senates of the past few years have had their faults but measured by any responsible yardstick, they have been effective. They have been active, innovative, careful, cooperative, and they have been made up of Americans with a sense of decency, integrity, and fair play.

In the past year, in particular, the Legislative Branch has been the principle rock of the Republic and the guardian of Representative government. On the fundamental Constitutional questions, party labels have faded almost completely. On the many lesser issues, whether the energy crisis, taxes, appropriations or whatever, there are differences between the parties and even within the parties in the Congress. There are also differences between the branches and the Congress. It can be no other way. We are a government of separate branches; our politics remain lodged in two major parties. The juxtaposition of views from these various centers of political power are healthy and they are essential under our system of government.
I would note in this connection that the Democratic Majority in the Congress accepted without question the vast electoral mandate given a Republican President in 1972. We are not, however, overawed by it. We concluded that the retention of the Democratic Majority in the Congress also carried a message. We read it as a separate mandate from the voters for the assertion of the independent functions of the Legislative Branch. Therefore, we acted to reinforce the Nation's system of checks and balances against what seemed to us to be an excessive accumulation of power in the Executive Branch and, may I say, that in this process we had a great deal of help from the Republicans in Congress.

The accumulation of Executive power did not begin in the present administration. It has been going on, administration after administration, for decades and much of it had become lodged, as a practical matter, in the permanent bureaucracy. Nevertheless, there were, at the outset of the present Congress, many evidences of a decided shift toward one-branch government which most members of the Congress of both parties found deeply disturbing in a Constitutional sense.

In my judgement, the erosion of the system of checks and balances has been halted. It has not been easy. A President can make decisions as one person and, in a moment, if he chooses to do so. In Congress, a majority of the 100 Senators and of the 435 House Members not only have to agree on a goal but on what course to take to reach it. Then, if a Presidential veto stands in the way of that source, we have to begin again and reshape a new one which will gain the adherence of two-thirds of the Members.
If the country is not in the best of shape today, we might well ponder what the situation might have been if there had not been an independent Congress of dedicated Members—Republicans and Democrats. The fact is that there has been a more constructive Congressional input into National Leadership in the past year than at any other time in many years. While it may be too early for this change to be felt or even to be widely perceived, it is, nevertheless, a change of great significance. A few years ago, for example, this nation's principal concern was to get out of Vietnam. That was not a new concern. The goal of withdrawal was not adopted in 1973 or 1972, but in the distant past, scarcely a year after the beginning of the deep military commitment, and it was reiterated in just about every State of the Union message by two Presidents year-after-year for a half-dozen years. For even more years, individual Members of Congress had spoken out against a continuance of the involvement.

But at the beginning of the 93rd Congress, we were still in Vietnam. In 1973—last year—Americans were still dying in Indochina. The urgency remained: to translate words of peace into action. In 1973 that was done. A settlement was negotiated with the North Vietnamese by Dr. Henry Kissinger, the present Secretary of State under the direction of the President. It is not to ignore that achievement to note that the full and final withdrawal of our military forces was brought about only after a swelling chorus of public in opposition to the war was registered/the Congress; the Congress, in turn, then exacted an absolute legal insistence on the war's end. It was the Congress which thereafter also shut tight the legal gate to reinvolvement anywhere in Indochina, notwithstanding a last ditch resistance by the Executive Branch.
Hopefully, we have seen the last of these military intrusions into other lands. Insofar as Congress can restrain the Executive Branch by legislation, we have done so. Hereafter, the substantial use abroad of the military forces of this nation will be dependent on an open consideration of the question before the people of the nation. War, by whatever name it is called, is too fundamental a question to leave to one Branch alone. The legislation which Congress has passed asks that it be decided by the President together with the Congress. If previous Congresses allowed a withering of their responsibilities as assigned by the Constitution, I hope the present Congress will be remembered for having restored them. I hope we have seen the last of back-door entries into devastating "small wars."

We faced something new in Vietnam and Indochina. It was an ambiguous war, over-simplified as an anti-communist crusade. As we later discovered, it was part civil war, part tribal conflict, part international clash, and part "war of liberation." In retrospect, we plunged recklessly into that ambiguity and we remained immersed long after our presence had lost all relevance to this nation's interest, not to speak of the well-being of the Vietnamese people who turned refugees by the millions. Vietnam is over, now, for us, if not for the Vietnamese. The families of the bereaved Americans have not forgotten the war, nor have those who, like the tens of thousands of paraplegics, bear its permanent scars. Indeed, the war should not be forgotten, least of all, by the government if, for no other reason, than that its experiences are relevant elsewhere.
In foreign policy—in the aftermath of Vietnam—there is a need for continuing re-examination of our attitudes, policies and commitments. There is a need for a renewal of our thought with regard to the rest of the world. The recent agreement between Egypt and Israel is of significance in this connection. The President and the Secretary of State have acted so far with inventiveness and astuteness in regard to the interplay of developments in the Middle East, the general international situation and the world-wide economic consequences of the energy crisis. In that effort, they have had wide and non-partisan support from the Senate and Congress.

While I am on this subject, I would like to commend Secretary Kissinger. To date, he has brought great knowledge, a high intelligence and deep dedication to the whole range of our international policies. To that I can attest, personally, having joined him in an inter-American Conference in Mexico City two weeks ago. His erudition and candor won the kind of warm response from our neighbors to the South which has not been forthcoming in many years.

I would also point to his unflinching efforts, with the full support of the President, to improve relations with the Soviet Union and with China. In these policies, too, which have had substantial support from the Congress, lies a renewal of the nation's foreign policies. A sterile cold war shows signs of yielding to the positive efforts of the President and the Secretary of State to strengthen international peace. I would hope that they will be able to maintain the momentum which they have generated in this connection. I would hope, too, that they will move to reduce the
huge U.S. military garrisons in Europe and Asia and to bring about a reduction of nuclear and other armaments on a mutual basis. Certainly the Senate Leadership will support the Executive Branch in this connection. To the extent that reductions in these financial burdens and drains on our resources can be achieved, it will be possible to divert our efforts to the constructive inner needs of the nation. Our National security, may I say, is subject to danger not only from armed enemies abroad but from those inner discontents which feed on neglect at home.

While there is reason for optimism in regard to a renewal in foreign affairs, it will be of little avail unless there is also a restoration of confidence in government and in the nation's political institutions at home. It is not just a question of Watergate or forgetting it or pretending that it never happened. It is the whole cloth of government which has become tattered with doubt, distrust, and dissatisfaction. It would, indeed, be convenient were it possible to exorcise in a moment all the inertia, neglects, and abuses that have gone into creating this climate. That cannot be. What can be done is to use the chief instruments of government—the Courts, the Congress and to the degree that it is prepared to cooperate, the Executive Branch—to dissolve these abuses before they become fatal to liberty. That is a fundamental responsibility of public leadership—in the Congress, no less/in the Presidency.

Before all else, the people have a right to an electoral system free of shenanigans and capable of yielding honest, responsible and responsive government open to all and shaped to meet the needs of all. It is incumbent on us to foreclose an excessive
intrusion of great wealth, whether corporate, labor, personal or whatever, into the electoral process. That is a solemn and urgent obligation and, in my judgement, it will be met except as we are prepared, in the end, to pay for the public business of elections largely with public funds. We are moving in that direction. The Congress has taken the lead by enacting the Presidential Campaign Fund Law. I would urge now, as I have at every opportunity, that you check off a dollar on your income tax returns, if you have an income to report these days—for use in election campaigns. It will cost you no more and it will make a non-partisan contribution to cleaner politics.

After what has come to light in the last year, I would hope that the President will join with the Congressional Leadership in supporting efforts to scrub up the present system of campaign-financing. If it was in 1972 that Watergate arose, and in 1973 that it was investigated, may it be said that the matter was finally ended in 1974 in a new system of open elections openly paid for.

It is up to the Congress, too, to do something about other government abuses. Quite apart from Watergate, for example, there have been invasions into the most intimate workings of our lives, into the privacy of all Americans, by ill-coordinated, bureaucratic activity. There have been misinterpretations and maladministrations of laws, sometimes to the extent that they bear little or no resemblance to what Congress intended in the enactment. Representative government has yet to deal effectively with the problem of how to keep bureaucracies responsive to the public need, especially when they grow large, inert, cumbersome, and as in our times, more and more, automated and impersonal. In my judgement, Congress spends enough time writing laws—in some instances, too much. It may be that
it is time, now, for Congress to devote itself more to looking to the manner of execution of these laws.

What Watergate, election abuses and, often, a distant bureaucracy have done to public confidence with regard to the Federal government, the energy crisis has done in the realm of the nation's economy.

The immediate responsibility is to make certain that oil shortages do not devastate the economy and that the price of past neglect is borne equitably by all Americans. Congress has shown leadership here, and I deplore the recent Presidential veto of its efforts to devise immediate relief in the realm of prices and in equitable distribution of available supplies.

Beyond the immediate, what we must have is a foundation of facts on which to build a national policy on energy. We have to know far more than we know now if we are to meet what otherwise promises to be a recurrent threat to the nation's well-being. It is a threat of widespread business shutdowns, of transportation paralysis and of a permanent inflation which can only culminate in recession, unemployment and appalling human hardship. That, the people of this nation will not tolerate. That, the Congress of the United States no less than the Executive Branch must do all in its power to prevent. The need will not change even if the Arab Nations turn the valves wide-open. The need will not change even if mild weather permits a conversion of heating oil to gasoline and summer vacations as usual are in order. I hope that the ball of blame, therefore, will not be passed between the two branches for failure
to meet the problem; I hope we will be able to work together to resolve it.

The energy crisis has shocked this nation. In so doing, it has also shown us a sudden flash the precarious manner in which our entire national economic life has come to be organized. It is all well and good to be concerned at this time with the shortage of petroleum. But what of bauxite, nickel, tin, iron, and copper, and many other materials? What of wood and concrete? Where will the supplies of these and other essentials come from in the years ahead? Indeed, what of food, with the kind of disjointed policies in which exports of wheat are stimulated one year only to compel high-priced imports the next?

To say that we have been extravagant with our resources is to put it mildly. In the earliest years of this nation, the first President, George Washington, spoke of raising "a standard to which the wisest and honest can repair." Do we meet such a standard when one day we are obsessed with the threats to our environment and the next, in our concern over the drying up of petroleum supplies, we all but forget that pure air and water are also exhaustible resources? To meet the Washingtonian standard—that is, the President's, not the city's—will take courage, courage to change, courage to innovate, courage to learn, and courage to renew.

It is my hope that the concern of the President and the Congress will not stop with the end of the energy crisis. The need is to learn from a bad dream before it becomes a nightmare. The need is to begin, now, to take a careful look at not only the flashing of warning lights but at the whole integrated switchboard of our
It is not enough, for example, for the Federal government to dole out tens of millions of dollars in a rescue operation to keep a bankrupt Penn Central Railroad on the tracks. We need to know where an action of this kind fits into a national rail policy; where that policy, in turn fits into a total transportation pattern; where that pattern, in turn, fits into the overall transportation requirements and the availability of fuels and other essentials in meeting them, not only today, but for the next decade or more. In short, we need to think ahead and to think in an integrated fashion. We need to begin to make the hard choices between what is more important to the nation and what is less, between what is enduring and what is transitory. That is the full scale by which government intervention in the nation's economy, when it must take place, should be measured. Unless we begin soon to develop that scale, the right hand of government will tend more and more to undo what the left hand has done. Accordingly, a few days ago the Minority Leader who shares this view joined with me in addressing to President Nixon the following letter:

Dear Mr. President:

It occurs to us that there is a need to look beyond the current crisis to the way in which our economic life has come to be organized. The energy shortage is a part, not the whole of the difficulty which confronts the nation's economy. Danger signals are flashing elsewhere on the complex switchboard of our national existence.
It is our thought that there must be a better way to deal with the needs of our people than by Federal intervention and bail-outs to shore up faltering parts of the economy, on a crash basis. The practice of waiting for the storms to strike and then, hurriedly, erecting shelters is not only wasteful and inefficient of the resources of the nation but its cumulative effect may well be devastating.

There is a need, it seems to us, to anticipate and, as far as possible, to act in an orderly fashion before the difficulties have descended on us. Unless we have some synchronized and coordinated machinery for this purpose, the nation will be subject to a plague of crises, one after another, in the years ahead. It is our suggestion, therefore, that we consider bringing together representatives of the Legislative and Executive Branches of government on a regular basis with those of industry and labor and other areas of our national life for the purpose of thinking through our national needs, not only as they confront us, today, but as they are likely to be five, ten or more years hence and how they are best to be met. If the government is to intervene in these matters as it is doing, an effort ought to be made to put that intervention, as far as possible, on a rational and far-sighted basis.

We would appreciate your reaction to this suggestion and would be prepared to work with the Executive Branch in bringing about a concerted consideration of the proposal.

Sincerely,

Hugh Scott

Mike Mansfield
Let me close by saying that there is a great deal that is right in this nation. We are a generous country with a strong, decent, industrious and compassionate people. There is ample intelligence and inventiveness and an immense experience and vitality in our midst. If, working together, today, we will put these attributes to use for the benefit of all, there need be no fear for the nation's tomorrow.

This nation will withstand the adversity of today. This nation will find, again, in the months and years ahead, the essential political leadership in the Presidency and in the Congress. We will renew. We will endure.
It is my understanding that broadcasting is the prime news source of the nation. It could hardly be otherwise. With TV sets in 99.8% of the homes and radios in 99.9%, who can escape it?

More difficult to comprehend is the credibility of broadcasting. It is reported to be greater than the press. Newspapers are suffering, apparently, from the same contemporary lack of sex appeal as politicians. The Harris poll, I believe, showed a bare 20% approved of the Congressional performance. It is small solace to note that the rating of the Presidency was only slightly higher. To make matters worse for me,
personally, I find that during the entire thirty-odd years of my service in the Legislative Branch, Congress has consistently been held in low esteem. I do not have the temerity to inquire into the prior situation.

That the broadcasting profession has not yet joined the press and the Congress in popular ill-repute is particularly surprising since you are the messengers who usually are there, first, with the bad news. And history records the custom of beheading the bearer of bad tidings.

It is not that you have spared the nation the unpleasant details. When the Emperor has been without clothes you have not dressed him up with words. During the past year, in particular, yours has been a narration of unremitting gloom except for the streak of streaking. So faithful have you been in carrying the bad tidings on petroleum, Watergate, pollution and what not that one suspects a tendency in your profession to find a disaster of one kind or another to fill the vacuum between the
Commercial and movie reruns.

But enough of that. I have not come here to make light of your industry and its practices. I know better. Those who have been foolhardy enough to do so in the past have not escaped unscathed. In any event, I would prefer discussions of the fairness doctrine or public financing of political broadcasting and similar issues to take place on my home grounds. Before Committees of Congress, the Congressman and not the broadcaster gets the last word.

Bread and butter issues of your industry are important but they do not begin to compare in significance with the influence which, over the last twenty years, broadcasters have had on the thinking of the people of the nation. Speaking of your influence, I should like to interject a public-service plea at this point. I urge you to use a little of that influence on a matter which I believe to be of the highest importance. In 1972, as you know, Congress enacted a law which permits voters to earmark a dollar
of their income tax for financing future Presidential elections.

The check-off feature for the Presidential Campaign Fund appears on the front page of the tax forms in 1973.

The Internal Revenue Service and the League of Women Voters both have prepared non-partisan shorts which explain the operation of this new law to the public. You will perform a distinguished public service if you will cooperate in the dissemination of these TV films during the next couple of weeks.

In looking at broadcasting in the mid-twentieth century, even with its trivia and its wastelands, historians of the 21st century may find that it, nevertheless, played the major role in forging a great intellectual revolution. They will see that during this period increasing numbers of people throughout the world were reached via the airways. The facts, theories, ideas and discussions which were once limited to the salons of the few were made available to all. In this fashion, countless men and women began to
to examine broad aspects of human life on this planet which otherwise could not have come to their attention. In short, broadcasting will be seen to have had, in our times, the effect of democratizing intellectualism.

That is not said to flatter your industry. I must confess that broadcasting has seemed to me to be a kind of massive farm machine, such as can be found in Montana or any other wheat state during harvest. In the distance, a harvester in operation appears to be only a massive cloud of dust; at closer range, it is seen as a machine which spews out vast amounts of relatively useless chaff. With all the turmoil, chaff and dust, however, the harvester yields the grain which nurtures us all.

So it is with broadcasting. The product may be part entertainment, part palliative, part stimulant, and part depressant. Be that as it may, broadcasting also exposes vast numbers of people to conditions of life throughout the world and to separate
and common problems of nations. It puts information and ideas
into millions of human minds, much as data is fed into computers.
The consequence of this immense activity is beyond specific
comprehension. There is not the slightest doubt, however, that
a profound influence is at work.

My principal concern, today, is with the nature of that
influence on public affairs in this nation. From World War II
through the Indochina withdrawal, it seems to me that the primary
emphasis in broadcasting was on happenings beyond our borders. A
survey now, I believe, would reveal a trend away from concentration
on events involving foreign policy unless they also relate directly
to current domestic concerns. To be sure, the peripatetic
Secretary of State still makes the airways and his achievements
are the subject of a great deal of broadcasting commentary. The
cutting edge of reportage, however, appears to be shifting towards
a greater concern with events at home or, at least, of events with
more immediate relevance to the needs of the people of the nation. Mr. Kissinger is...
the United States than is commonly realized. What has happened abroad and how we have responded, in my judgement, has done much to delineate the situation which now confronts us at home.

I do not propose to try to answer the question of whether this is as it should be. What I should like to do in these brief remarks is to examine some recent examples of ways in which certain foreign policies have affected our life here in the United States.

There is, first of all, the tremendous impact of two decades of U.S. activity in Southeast Asia which culminated in one of the most tragic wars in modern history. The circumstances and the attitudes which led us into the deep involvement in that remote part of the world have already receded into the past. What ought to remain fresh in our minds is the price we have paid and will continue to pay for that involvement. Beyond the obvious cost in human lives and suffering, beyond the tons of thousands of
paraplegics, our policies in Southeast Asia have been responsible in major part for:

- Stoking the fires of inflation;
- a loss in international value of the dollar;
- the appearance of a nationwide drug cult;
- a decline of public credibility in the basic institutions of free representative government,
- lawlessness at home;
- the alienation of a substantial part of a generation of young people; and
- an eventual increase in the total cost of government in the United States by several hundred billion dollars without constructive return to the people who will continue to pay these added costs well into the 21st century.

Some may still believe this many-faceted price was justified. I think you know that, not just for this year, but for many years I have not held that belief. Insofar as I am concerned,
it saddens me to realize that we might have chosen to stay out of Vietnam or to withdraw from the conflict at points along the way during the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon administrations with just as much honor as accrued to us in the end. We would have done so, moreover, with far less damage to ourselves and to the Vietnamese people.

That, however, is hindsight. What is relevant now is that the war has had a lasting and deleterious impact on life inside the United States. In my judgement, moreover, continued involvement in Indochina for purposes other than reconstruction of war damage, involvement in terms of the supply of petroleum, munitions, food, advice and what not to South Vietnam, to Cambodia and to Laos is reinforcing that impact.

In much the same fashion, a general line of foreign policy which has consisted of providing military equipment and supplies to just about any nation willing to take it has also
distorted the domestic situation of the nation. In fiscal year 1974, even after Congressionally imposed retrenchment had been legislated, we still managed to sell, give or otherwise make available equipment and supplies to seventy-eight countries. Last year, $5.4 billion of military equipment was sold abroad--most of it through the Department of Defense. An additional $4 billion worth was given to nations without capacity to pay for it.

That this great outflow of devastation has had a profound effect on some recipient nations is obvious; even a few artillery pieces can sometimes make a difference in the precipitation of coups and in the outcome of power struggles in new or unstable nations. What is not nearly so obvious, however, is that an export of $10 billion worth of military equipment is also not without deep effect on this nation's inner affairs. In the first place, a massive outpouring of military equipment, year in and year out, feeds
domestic inflation. It draws down stockpiles of strategic materials. It depletes supplies of finite raw materials such as iron, coal, and oil. It diverts large amounts of inventive genius and engineering skill to the production of military equipment which lives a short and not very useful life and then goes into obsolescence. It directs a flow of Federal resources from areas of urgent domestic need into a vast and largely useless overseas drain.

Moreover, as I detect the pride in personnel of the United States government who, in the manner of modern day Sir Basil Zaharoffs, peddle this material abroad, when they refer to rising levels of military sales as positive contributions to the balance of payments;

As I contemplate that while we are turning out ever more refined military equipment, other nations are doing better at producing electronic equipment, pollution-free automobiles,
and are buying U.S. resources such as timber for manufacture and re-sale to the United States.

As I contemplate, in short, the equanimity with which the federal government has been engaged in a world-wide arms business, I find it difficult to discern by what yardsticks we are measuring the contemporary performance of that government.

A third aspect of our foreign relations which inter-relates with our domestic situation is the maintaining of large U.S. military garrisons in bases abroad. This practice has been going on ever since World War II. Its effect is not unlike the give-away of billions of dollars of military equipment and supplies. Even now, we have 300 major overseas military bases and a thousand minor bases. There are over 300,000 American servicemen, plus dependents, in Western Europe. Another 45,000 are stationed in South Korea; U.S. outposts in Southeast Asia contain still another 40,000.
The financial drain of these deployments is readily apparent. What is only beginning to become clear, however, is that we can no longer afford to use federal funds and exchange resources for extravagances of this kind. There has been a severe shrinkage in the large margin for error which this nation possessed a quarter of a century ago. Years of attrition have weakened the value of the dollar abroad. Years of deficits are doing the same thing at home.

The U. S. military presence overseas has been too much for too long. Nevertheless, the federal government seems to be incapable of a significant reduction of a military presence anywhere abroad, not to speak of a close-out, unless we are invited to leave, politely and otherwise, by erstwhile host-nations or unless the people of this nation rise up in revulsion at policies of unwarranted involvement, as occurred in the case of Vietnam.
and Cambodia. When reductions are finally compelled in these circumstances, they may very well come too late to salvage what might have been worth preserving at an earlier time.

In all candor, that seems to me to be the likelihood with regard to NATO. For too long, the Executive Branch has fought tooth and nail to forestall any reduction of the U. S. commitment of forces on the European continent. Successive administrations have moved from argument to argument and from stall to stall in order to resist the rising pressures for redeployment. Successive Congresses, nevertheless, have come closer and closer to a legal insistence on reductions. We may now be about to witness not orderly reductions but withdrawals in haste and anger with consequent damage to the vital cooperative relationship of the North Atlantic region. In this connection, I must say that the recent exchanges between this nation and the European nations seem to me to be most ominous.
Overseas deployments and military exports constitute only a part of the sum of the current military enterprises of federal government. Total expenditures for the Defense Department have become so astronomical that they are now a key element in the general economic condition of the nation. This year's military budget request of $35.8 billion is the largest in our history, surpassing even the $81.6 billion we spent in 1945, the last year of World War II. At the height of the Indochinese war the military budget was $20 billion less than the amount requested for the coming fiscal year.

Secretary of Defense Schlesinger has stated that this request is "necessary to assure the foreign policy objectives of the United States." Without disputing the assertion at this time, I would call your attention to the impact of such an expenditure on the nature of our economy and our society.

Of the greatest concern in this connection, is a contention of the Secretary that the economic health of the United States can be enhanced by defense expenditures. In answer to Representative George H. Mahon, Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations,
Secretary Schlesinger on February 25 acknowledged that there was "an element of economic stimulus" in the Defense budget. Mr. Mahon, who is probably the most knowledgeable man in the government on military expenditures, stated that he had it on good authority that the Federal budget had been increased by about $5 billion during the last stages of preparation in the Executive Branch, "for the reason of stimulating the economy." It was in the framework of that exchange that there was acknowledgement by the Secretary of Defense of the use of the Defense budget as a tool in reviving a lagging domestic economy.

May I say that the Defense budget is, at best, a dubious tool for any purpose other than providing military security. When used for purposes of economic stimulation, it is an ominous tool. This nation will have reached a sorry point when it inflates military budgets to help a national economy which has already been damaged by excessive and wasteful expenditures for military purposes. In the end, economic difficulties cannot be cloaked in inflated military budgets. History is filled with the wreckage of great nations which found it expedient to meander along that course.
The use of the nation's manpower, materials and other resources for military purposes must be held by the Executive Branch and the Congress within dimensions which are commensurate with what is necessary to meet reasonably defined threats to the nation's security. If we fail to do so, we will not need anyone else to bury us; we will bury ourselves.

A fourth area of foreign policy which will have a continuing impact on our domestic situation is the nature of our relations with nations controlling significant sources of the and industrial raw materials. We have come to a shocking realization of the precariousness of our situation in this connection in the past six months. I do not profess to know whether any U. S. policy towards the states of the Middle East might have avoided the Arab cut-off of oil exports. I do know that we have done little until recently to pursue a policy which might lead to an acceptable stability in that region. Faithfully, we have paid our annual $20 million share of the costs of the United Nations Palestine Refugee Organization. Faithfully, we have re-pledged support for the people of Israel
and backed it with substantial force. All the while, we have hoped, somehow, that sparks would not light the tinder.

Without reflecting on the men and women who have struggled with the problems of the Middle East for many years, the fact is that the Middle East has scarcely been a pre-occupation of our principal policy makers except when the blood of war begins to flow. Fortunately, Dr. Kissinger with his background, intelligence, ability, and capacity for hard work, has been available to the nation at this time. His efforts under the President have been outstanding and there are now the glimmerings of hope for a durable settlement.

A byproduct of his efforts has been the resumption of oil shipments to this nation from the principal Middle Eastern fields. However that may be, it should be apparent to us, as we ride out the crisis of oil, that other domestic disruptions are likely as the result of an increasing U. S. dependence on raw materials from abroad. If oil is in short supply now, how long will it be before it is joined in that category by copper, bauxite, iron and other materials?
Nor are we alone in this time. If our problems are complex, contemplate the situation which confronts Japan and Western Europe. The resources to meet contemporary needs are finite—not infinite—and their distribution over the planet is indifferent to the political barriers which have evolved over the centuries. Barbara Ward speculated recently "that interdependence of our planetary life will enormously strengthen our sense of the seriousness of the economic and technological challenge before us. . ."

Foreign Relations and how they are conducted in these years will have much to do with proving or disproving the accuracy of her observation. May I say that, in my judgment, the President and the Secretary of State have been exercising leadership in bringing this nation to perceive that the quality no less than the security of life in the United States depends on more than a balance of terror, on more than our relations with individual nations or even with groups of nations. In the not too distant future we may have to speak not of foreign policy, but of planetary policy.
I should like, in conclusion, to revert to my opening comments. At the outset I said that broadcasting is a source of enlightenment which is doing much to create a universal intellectualism. In the United States the rays of this enlightenment are in a new focus on domestic problems. Nevertheless, it seems to me that, seen in perspective, some of our domestic difficulties might have been avoided or mitigated by a more restrained view of our international purposes and responsibilities in Indochina and elsewhere. To avoid the intensification of these difficulties, moreover, we must now face up to the fact that the U. S. military influence is spread abroad in a haphazard fashion. Much of our current activity abroad is archaic and wasteful. The whole structure is in urgent need of reformulation and contraction.

At the same time, we must also face the fact that a decent future for the people of the United States cannot be found by shutting a non-existent door. We need the rest of the world even as it needs us. In short, the challenge is to look outward with new perceptions, even as we turn inward to build anew at home.
In this context, the role of the broadcaster takes on immense importance. Your perceptions of a world in transition will be communicated to countless millions. You hold in your hands an instrument by which all of the inhabitants of this planet can become aware of the evolving nature of their Earth-home, comprehend a common destiny, and move forward together to its realization. May you use this instrument even more wisely for the benefit of the living generations and those yet to come.
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We are convened at the joint suggestion of the President and the Congressional Leadership on an issue of surpassing significance. Of sorts, this is an unprecedented gathering. I would hope that it foreshadows future contacts of a similar nature at the emergent stages of other issues which go to the core of our national well-being.

As to the immediate concern, this meeting represents a step in a process which began last February. Let me begin by defining the question before us, at least as I perceive it. Later in my remarks, I will suggest how the necessary legislative framework might be created to begin to come to grips with it.

Scarcity, diminishing sources, expanding usage, cartels, production restrictions, steep price rises and crash-based planning—for many of us these words help to describe the issue. In a more fundamental sense, the question we confront involves the manner in which vital elements of our national economic life have come to be organized. In particular, we need to ask ourselves: how are we equipped—or ill-equipped—to address the next crisis in resources or materials or commodities that may engulf the nation.
What we are here to explore is the possibility of creating an instrumentality which would, first, perceive what the fundamental needs of the nation will be now and in the years ahead and then sort out the information that relates thereto and, finally, provide alternative policy recommendations that might help us—in the Congress and in the Executive branch—to take the action deemed essential to avert catastrophes and to minimize hardships in the future.

On this very point let me quote briefly from the report of a highly distinguished Commission on a major aspect of the problem before us:

For all its wide diversities the materials problem is indivisible. There must be, somewhere, a mechanism for looking at the problem as a whole, for keeping track of changing situations and the inter-relation of policies and programs. This task must be performed by an agency near the top of the administrative structure.

Such an agency—should review all areas of the materials field and determine how they can best be related to each other. It should maintain on a continuing basis, a forward audit; collect and collate the facts and analyses of various agencies; and recommend appropriate action for the guidance of the President, the Congress and the Executive agencies.
The quotation is from the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission—the so-called Paley Commission. The date: June 2, 1952, 22 years ago. Many of the same conclusions were drawn by the National Commission on Materials Policy whose findings were reported a year ago. Yesterday, the General Accounting Office reported similar conclusions.

In short, for at least a quarter century experts have warned about coming crises with regard to vital basic materials. What manifested itself so clearly last year when long lines of cars began stacking up for short rations of gasoline, was not so much a lack of data and information, but more importantly that we simply had no systematized method of assessing information in order to determine our needs early enough and to move quickly enough to provide a reasoned answer, or even to make the attempt.

What if Government at any time in the past two decades had established a central information unit—a data bank so to speak—charged with compiling statistics on energy resources, analyzing on a continuing basis the status of supply and sources, projecting consumption rates, reporting refining capacity, evaluating current technology and future application and equipped to report anticipated deficiencies directly to Congress and to the President with specific recommendations. There is little doubt, I think, that had such an agency existed, there would have been no fuel crisis, and, certainly, no reason to have addressed the matter on a crash basis merely to meet immediate requirements for heat, light and transportation.

And if it is energy today, of what will we as a nation be in dire need tomorrow? Three or four years ago, the Interior Department told us that
there were at least thirteen basic minerals for most of which we depend upon sources outside the United States. The figure has grown to forty or more. They range from aluminum and chromium, to tin, lead, nickel and so on. For at least thirty of these materials, the nation has already become over 60% dependent upon other countries. In part, the dependence may be answered at some unknown future date by new technologies such as the recapture and recycling efforts that are just now barely more than an idea. For now, however, that dependence is with us and it is complicated by what happens when supplier nations gang together.

I realize full well that the President and Secretary Kissinger are trying to improve the bargaining strength of the consumer nations insofar as petroleum is concerned. But what happened with oil is very likely to happen with bauxite, or copper or nickel or zinc or tin or whatever, when the basic needs of heavy consumer societies must be met by sources beyond their national boundaries. At the White House last Wednesday morning, Secretary Kissinger stressed to the Leadership that the interdependence of developed and developing nations with regard to key resources was essential to global stability. But the international instrumentalities he envisioned to accommodate cooperation between producer and consumer nations can be established, it seems to me, only after there is constructed within our nation a mechanism able to grasp what is needed for our own people not only today but five or ten years hence.
The problem goes well beyond metals or minerals and does not relate only to those in which we are in a dependent status. In 1973, the nation experienced the biggest boost in the cost of groceries in over twenty-five years. Prices for fibers have risen 93 percent. The story of how inflation continues to wrack our people on every front was written graphically in the double digit figures released just a couple of weeks ago--10½% from March of 1973 to March of 1974; 14½% for the first three months of this year.

And while Americans are made to pay more let us not forget that in some areas of the world, the basic commodities are not even available. The problem is worse in Europe, Asia and Latin America. A whole corridor spanning the African continent is now caught in a struggle for survival under the twin burdens of drought and famine.

I believe In the United States, however, it is largely the question of basic shortages and related matters which will mandate the crises. And the crises, one after another, will pounce on us most assuredly unless and until as a nation we are prepared to adjust our government apparatus to meet the fundamental problem. That problem is not really so much one of the absence of information. At last report, more than fifty federal agencies and administrations were collecting and compiling relevant data and that was before any apparatus was set up to address environmental concerns or to monitor product safety or to perform a host of other recently legislated activities.
Take a specific example. In the Commerce Department there are some 160 professionals in the Office of Business Research and Analysis and 20 or 30 of them alone are dealing with information on industrial commodities. Look at it in broader terms. We find that for data on imports and exports, we can turn to the Agriculture, Treasury and Commerce Departments, the Council on Economic Policy, FEO, the Special Trade Representative and more; for production, there are the Interior and Agriculture Departments, HUD, FEO and more; for basic regulatory decisions, there are DOT, ICC, FTC, EPA, the Federal Reserve and more; and so it goes. While the mint wants to watch silver for one reason, DOD has a different objective in mind. In some instances, two or three different agencies with overlapping responsibilities arrive at contradicting appraisals of the present state and future prospects of the same industry.

The situation is not very different here in the Congress, except in magnitude. When it comes to our diverse and seemingly insatiable appetites for economic information, our Committees reflect the same fractured state as the Executive: In the Senate, it is Agriculture and Forestry for agriculture, minerals, pesticides, fertilizers, timber and wood materials; Armed Services for strategic materials, stockpile; Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs for materials export policy, foreign trade, silver and gold production; Commerce for materials recycling, resource development, materials allocation, materials commodity controls; Foreign Relations for the importation of Rhodesian chrome; Interior and Insular Affairs for mining and minerals policy; Public Works for national materials policy, materials recycling; Select Committee on Small Business for materials production; Finance for the gamut of trade; Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for fissionable materials; Joint Economic Committee for materials recycling; Joint Committee on Defense Production for strategic materials, stockpile; Government Operations on any or all of the above, and so on.
In the House, it is much the same story.

So, I repeat, it is not necessarily the lack of knowledge that confronts us. Nor is it that we are seeking governmental intervention, controls or what-have-you. It is, rather, the question of how to coordinate and apply available knowledge in a manner which permits wise and rational policy choices to surface in a timely fashion and at a sufficiently high level of government to make them useful.

In 1952, the Paley Commission called for an organization to discharge this over-all function which would be neither an operating agency nor a supervisory agency but rather one with the function of "forward audit" concerned with:

the total pattern of activities in the materials and energy field; the relationships of individual programs to each other; the scope and dimensions of foreign production materials programs and their relationship to domestic programs; the probable effects of current production programs on the long-term materials position, the selection and development of current programs in the light of long-term requirements; programs for both scientific and technological research on materials, and their interrelations; and the relationship of materials policies to manpower, and to fiscal and foreign policies which may in various measure bear on materials.

Needless to say, little was heard of these suggestions subsequently. At best, pieces of these over-all functions were scattered through the government in the usual pattern of fragmentation. So we are here, today, to try once more. What we are seeking to do is to explore whether or not there can be created a meaningful instrumentality, to coordinate and to interpret and to forecast, which will enable the nation to expand its field of vision in this fundamental area of our national life.
The Senate Minority Leader (Mr. Scott) and I put it in these words in our letter to the President proposing this meeting:

It is our suggestion that we consider bringing together representatives of the Legislative and Executive Branches of the government on a regular basis with those of industry and labor and other areas of our national life for the purpose of thinking through our national needs, not only as they confront us, today, but as they are likely to be five, ten or more years hence and how they are best to be met. If the government is to intervene in these matters, as it is now doing, an effort ought to be made to put that intervention, as far as possible, on a rational and far­sighted basis.

To sort out information, to look at the whole and to identify potential areas of crises and to provide alternative policy recommendations in that perspective, that is how I think the mandate of a new instrumentality, if it were to be established, ought to be envisioned. To this instrumentality would fall the responsibility of perceiving the relationship of an adversity in one narrow economic segment to other segments; of how, for example, a fertilizer shortage, might affect food supplies on down the line, and what might be done to remedy that, since fertilizer depends on such essentials as natural gas, phosphates and nitrogen. Do we not also need the capacity to perceive the whole of federal intervention in the economy if it must occur and how the individual parts of that intervention relate to one another? That such a capacity did not exist when we sold off our wheat reserves is obvious. Did it not exist, too, when we sold abroad in the last six or eight months half of our national tin reserves—a material the source of which we classify as 100% foreign dependent?
Does it exist when we overseed our fields with soybeans today knowing that price instability lies even now on the horizon as evidence accumulates of a replenished protein feed source off the coast of South America?

I think all of us here sense that there exists some kind of requirement to deal with questions of this kind or, I daresay, we would not be meeting at all. At the end of this meeting, therefore, it would be my hope that we might at least be able to state that much affirmatively. It would be my hope, too, that we might go on from there and begin to clarify our thinking on some additional questions. In order to focus the discussion, I would like to set forth these questions at this time. The first is:

What kind of instrumentality, if any, might meet this requirement?

As proposed in the Leadership letter to the President, it was our thought that it should be one that is representative of the nation if it is to be effective; one, therefore, that would embrace representatives not only of the Legislative and Executive Branches but elements of industry, labor, agriculture and other significant segments of our national life. It should be a continuing instrumentality equipped, first, to draw on information from all sources on the status of resources, materials and commodities and other aspects of our economy—tasks performed now by dozens of agencies and organizations across the spectrum of national life, both public and private. Secondly, it must have the means to forecast the problems by drawing information out of the present massive but fragmented system. Thirdly, it must have the capacity to convert its projections into recommended policy options that might embrace such measures as conservation, research, stockpiling, allocation, modernization, manpower, export controls and whatever else may be necessary to keep vital, the nation’s economy. Finally, it must be in a position to report its findings authoritatively to the President.
and the Congress the ultimate arbiters of policy and the sources of action for the federal government. That is only one possible approach to this question. Others might see the requirement in different terms.

I think it was last December at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association that Dr. Stein said, "Maybe we need an economic planning agency." The statement reflects for me and for many others a deep frustration with the disjointed way government has tended for decades not so much to act but instead to re-act when a component of this gigantic, intricate machine of the U. S. economy gets out of whack. It is not only, for example, that a decision to build or not to build a new steel mill or chemical plant, or to start a mining operation can have major repercussions throughout a community, the nation, and even abroad, it is also that a shortage of raw materials derived from petroleum can shut down auto plants in Detroit and manufacturers of recording tapes in Los Angeles. As one noted economist characterized our present approach not long ago, it is like the old circus act with five clowns in a car, one pressing the gas, another pulling the brake, the third spinning and steering the wheel, the fourth blowing the horn and one sitting on top holding on for dear life. That one on the top, I suppose, is the American public.

As a second focal point of this preliminary discussion, I would note that a number of Congressional Committees are interested in aspects of this problem and are advancing concepts and proposals which are designed to deal with, at least, parts of it. There comes to mind, for example, the work in the Senate Commerce Committee and the Senate Government Operations Committee. There are probably other explorations underway in House committees and undoubtedly in other Senate Committees. Others, I would assume, are working on the problem in Executive agencies, not to speak of the activity of the United Nations, of private foundations, and the universities. In any event, it would be my hope that we would
consider in this group whether or not we wish to recommend to the President and the Congress the establishment of a temporary Commission of Executive and Legislative representatives and private citizens to examine all of these proposals and any others having to do with this question. Such a Commission might propose the design of a continuing instrumentality which would be capable of giving the President and the Congress the kind of integrated perception of our national requirements now and in the future which has heretofore been lacking. Senator Scott and I have had draft legislation prepared along these lines. In the event that this route of establishing a temporary Commission on the question meets with the general approval, I would hope that this draft, a copy of which is before you, would be studied and that the group would be prepared to move ahead, to the end that legislation to create a special study commission along these general lines might be introduced within the next couple of weeks.

I should like to conclude these remarks on this note. As we have had this draft resolution prepared, it is designed to minimize political factors and to place the consideration of this fundamental national problem on a basis of equality as between the branches and as between government and the private sector. In my judgment, the system under which this nation survives and grows depends as much on cooperation as it does on competition among the cores of power and responsibility within the government and within the nation. If there is any area in which the element of cooperation is imperative, it is in safeguarding the livelihood and well-being of the nation, not only in terms of needs, today, but in terms of the needs of tomorrow and tomorrow. Whatever we do, therefore, let us try to do it in that context, in the context of cooperation.
between the two parties, cooperation between the two branches and cooperation between the basic segments of our national life. When it comes to the nation's basic economic needs, there is no advantage to be gained for any particular segment in government or private life. If we do not work together, today, in this sphere, there will be no need to ask for whom the bell tolls; it will toll for all of us tomorrow.
It is not without some reticence that I choose to address you on the subject of Congressional leadership. As someone has recently pointed out, the trouble with being a political leader these days is that you cannot be sure whether people are following you or chasing you. Whether it is called a "message" or a "signal," some sort of shock has definitely been sent by the people to Washington. At a minimum, it causes a painful feeling in the ears. It can, in more serious cases, pretend... It is even rumored to be the only... 

However that may be, it is obvious that the public impression of the Federal government, at this time, is not a
happy one. A recent public opinion poll shows the Presidency at one of its lowest ebbs in history. I must acknowledge that, according to the same poll, only the Congress had fallen lower in public esteem. However, I am glad to note that the most recent Gallup poll—for April—showed that the Congress had risen in the public esteem from 21 percent to 30 percent. To me, this is most encouraging because it could indicate a recognition of the fact that the Senate has not been diverted by Watergate or related matters, but has attended to its duties under the Constitution as it should, and has performed its job with dedication, dignity and responsibility.

Nevertheless, one must admit that there is a deep sense of public dissatisfaction with the Federal government. Our people are caught between the jaws of a fierce inflation. The effects of this painful pressure were intensified by the oil crisis, increased food prices, and a growing awareness of an inequitable tax structure. To cap the situation are the shocking blows against the nation’s political institutions which have been delivered by the tragedies of Watergate and related matters.

Whatever the sense of frustration, I hasten to add that I do not think that the nation is at the end of the road. To the bumper sticker which commands: "America: Love it or leave it," the response is simple: whatever the current irritants, who is leaving and who doesn't love it?
You can understand the reasons for that sentiment. Your business, at its best, is a symbol of this country. It is economic energy and financial growth to keep the economy rolling. It is fresh ideas, competition, progress, service, a faith in the future of the people of the nation. Qualities such as these go with the United States. They have enabled us to withstand the gravest adversity in the past. They provide the binders which hold the nation together, even at a time of government disarray.

Out of these qualities will come the source of tomorrow's renewal of the nation's spirit. It is in this context—in the context of renewal—that I would like to discuss the Congress of the United States, its role and the leadership it is trying to contribute to the nation in this time of trial.

Thirteen years ago, I was elected the Majority Leader of the United States Senate. The mandate has been renewed by my colleagues at regular two year intervals. Many have taken issue with the nature of that leadership over the years. It is a political fact of life that some individuals—even some at this meeting—I assume there are at least a few Republicans here—would have preferred me to be the leader of a minority.
During that thirteen-year period, the functioning organs of the Democratic Majority have been strengthened considerably in the Policy Committee, the Steering Committee and in the Democratic Caucus. There is greater freedom in the selection of members to various committees, the criteria for it being based primarily on geography and philosophy, and the selections are made by secret ballot by the members of the Steering Committee. The selections must then be approved by the Democratic Caucus and any selection made is subject to approval or disapproval, as the Caucus decides. The final decision then is up to the Senate as a whole. This, I think, is the best way to operate in a body composed of one-hundred Senators—all equal.
Notwithstanding my party role in the Senate, I can assure you that there exists a close working relationship with the leadership of the other party. To be sure, Senator Scott of Pennsylvania and I have differences. Most of all, however, we share our problems in common. A Senate in continual partisan conflict is an ineffectual Senate. The Senates of the past few years have had their faults but measured by any responsible yardstick, they have been effective. They have been active, innovative, careful, cooperative, and they have been made up of Americans with a sense of decency, integrity, and fair play.

In the past year, in particular, the Legislative Branch has been the principle rock of the Republic and the guardian of Representative government. On the fundamental Constitutional questions, party labels have faded almost completely. On the many lesser issues, whether the energy crisis, taxes, appropriations or whatever, there are differences between the parties and even within the parties in the Congress. There are also differences between the branches and the Congress. It can be no other way.
We are a government of separate branches; our politics remain lodged in two major parties. The juxtaposition of views from these various centers of political power are healthy and they are essential under our system of government.

I would note in this connection that the Democratic Majority in the Congress accepted without question the vast electoral mandate given a Republican President in 1972. We are not, however, overawed by it. We concluded that the retention of the Democratic Majority in the Congress also carried a message. We read it as a separate mandate from the voters for the assertion of the independent functions of the Legislative Branch. Therefore, we acted to reinforce the Nation's system of checks and balances against what seemed to us to be an excessive accumulation of power in the Executive Branch and, may I say, that in this process we had a great deal of help from the Republicans in Congress.

The accumulation of Executive power did not begin in the present administration. It has been going on, administration after administration, for decades and much of it had become lodged, as a
practical matter, in the permanent bureaucracy. Nevertheless, there were, at the outset of the present Congress, many evidences of a decided shift toward one-branch government which most members of the Congress of both parties found deeply disturbing in a Constitutional sense.

In my judgment, the erosion of the system of checks and balances has been halted. It has not been easy. A President can make decisions as one person and, in a moment, if he chooses to do so. In Congress, a majority of the 100 Senators and of the 435 House Members not only have to agree on a goal but on what course to take to reach it. Then, if a Presidential veto stands in the way of that source, we have to begin again and reshape a new one which will gain the adherence of two-thirds of the Members.

If the country is not in the best of shape today, we might well ponder what the situation might have been if there had not been an independent Congress of dedicated Members--Republicans and Democrats. The fact is that there has been a more constructive Congressional imput into National Leadership in the past year than
at any other time in many years. While it may be too early for this change to be felt or even to be widely perceived, it is, nevertheless, a change of great significance. A few years ago, for example, this nation's principal concern was to get out of Viet Nam. That was not a new concern. The goal of withdrawal was not adopted in 1973 or 1972, but in the distant past, scarcely a year after the beginning of the deep military commitment, and it was reiterated in just about every State of the Union message by two Presidents year-after-year for a half-dozen years. For even more years, individual Members of Congress had spoken out against a continuance of the involvement.

But at the beginning of the 93rd Congress, we were still in Viet Nam. In 1973--last year--Americans were still dying in Indochina. The urgency remained: to translate words of peace into action. In 1973 that was done. A settlement was negotiated with the North Vietnamese by Dr. Henry Kissinger, the present Secretary of State under the direction of the President. It is not to ignore that achievement to note that the full and final
withdrawal of our military forces was brought about only after a swelling chorus of public opposition to the war was registered in the Congress; the Congress, in turn, then enacted an absolute legal insistence on the war's end. It was the Congress which thereafter also shut tight the legal gate to reinvolvement anywhere in Indochina, notwithstanding a last ditch resistance by the Executive Branch.

Hopefully, we have seen the last of these military intrusions into other lands. Insofar as Congress can restrain the Executive Branch by legislation, we have done so. Hereafter, the substantial use abroad of the military forces of this nation will be dependent on an open consideration of the question before the people of the nation. War, by whatever name it is called, is too fundamental a question to leave to one Branch alone. The legislation which Congress has passed asks that it be decided by the President together with the Congress. If previous Congresses allowed a withering of their responsibilities as assigned by the Constitution, and they did, I hope the present Congress will be
remembered for having restored them. I hope we have seen the last of back-door entries into devastating "small wars."

We faced something new in Viet Nam and Indochina. It was an ambiguous war, over-simplified as an anti-communist crusade. As we later discovered, it was part civil war, part tribal conflict, part international clash, and part "war of liberation." In retrospect, we plunged recklessly into that ambiguity and we remained immersed long after our presence had lost all relevance to this nation's interest, not to speak of the well-being of the Vietnamese people who were turned into refugees by the millions. Viet Nam is over now, for us, if not for the Vietnamese. The families of the bereaved Americans--55,000 of them--have not forgotten the war, nor have those who, like the 303,000 wounded, including the 25,000 to 30,000 paraplegics, bear its permanent scars. Nor can we forget the cost in treasure, a cost which will amount to $352 billion by the middle of the next century. That figure, incidentally, is an estimate based on the assumption that the war would end by June 30, 1970. The source for these figures is contained in the Statistical Abstract of the United States, issued by the U. S. Department of Commerce under date of 1973. Indeed, the war should not be forgotten, least of all, by the government if, for no other reason, than that its experiences are relevant elsewhere.
In foreign policy—in the aftermath of Viet Nam—there is a need for continuing re-examination of our attitudes, policies and commitments. There is a need for a renewal of the thought with regard to the rest of the world. The recent agreement between Egypt and Israel is of significance in this connection. The President and the Secretary of State have acted so far with inventiveness and astuteness in regard to the interplay of developments in the Middle East, the general international situation and the world-wide economic consequences of the energy crisis. In that effort, they have had wide and non-partisan support from the Senate and the Congress.

While I am on this subject, I would like to commend Secretary Kissinger. He has been superb. To date, he has brought great knowledge, a high intelligence and deep dedication to the whole range of our international policies. To that I can attest, personally, having joined him in an inter-American Conference in Mexico City several weeks ago. His erudition and candor won the kind of warm response from our neighbors to the South which has not been forthcoming in many years.
I would also point to his unflinching efforts, with the full support of the President, to improve relations with the Soviet Union and with the People's Republic of China. In these policies, too, which have had substantial support from the Congress, lies a renewal of the nation's foreign policies. A sterile cold war shows signs of yielding to the positive efforts of the President and the Secretary of State to strengthen international peace. I would hope that they will be able to maintain the momentum which they have generated in this connection. I would hope, too, that they will move to reduce the huge U. S. military garrisons in Europe and Asia, the almost 2,000 bases we have overseas, and to bring about a reduction of nuclear and other armaments on a mutual basis.

Certainly the Senate Leadership will support the Executive Branch in this connection. To the extent that reductions in these financial burdens and drains on our resources can be achieved, it will be possible to divert our efforts to the constructive inner needs of the nation. Our National security, may I say, is subject to danger not only from armed enemies abroad but from those inner discontents which feed on neglect at home.
While there is reason for optimism in regard to a renewal in foreign affairs, it will be of little avail unless there is also a restoration of confidence in government and in the nation's political institutions at home. It is not just a question of Watergate or forgetting it or pretending that it never happened. It is the whole cloth of government which has become tattered with doubt, distrust, and dissatisfaction. It would, indeed, be convenient were it possible to exorcise in a moment all the inertia, neglects, and abuses that have gone into creating this climate. That cannot be. What can be done is to use the chief instruments of government--the Courts, the Congress and to the degree that it is prepared to cooperate, the Executive Branch--to dissolve these abuses before they become fatal to liberty. That is a fundamental responsibility of public leadership--in the Congress, no less than in the Presidency.

Before all else, the people have a right to an electoral system free of doubts and capable of yielding honest, responsible and responsive government open to all and shaped to meet the needs
of all. It is incumbent on us to foreclose an excessive intrusion of great wealth, whether corporate, labor, personal or whatever, into the electoral process. That is a solemn and urgent obligation and, in my judgment, it will not be met except as we are prepared, in the end, to pay for the public business of elections largely with public funds. We are moving in that direction. The Senate has taken the lead by passing, in 1973, the Presidential Campaign Fund Law. The Senate on April 11 passed a campaign finance act covering Congressional races. Both are now in the House.

After what has come to light in the last year, I would hope that the President will join with the Congressional Leadership in supporting efforts to scrub up the present system of campaign financing. If it was in 1972 that Watergate arose, and in 1973 that it was investigated, may it be said that the matter was finally ended in 1974 in a new system of open elections openly paid for.

It is up to the Congress, too, to do something about other government abuses. Quite apart from Watergate, for example, there have been invasions into the most intimate workings of our
lives, into the privacy of all Americans, by ill-coordinated, bureaucratic activity. There have been misinterpretations and maladministrations of laws, sometimes to the extent that they bear little or no resemblance to what Congress intended in the enactment. Representative government has yet to deal effectively with the problem of how to keep bureaucracies responsive to the public need, especially when they grow large, inert, cumbersome, and as in our times, more and more, automated and impersonal. In my judgment, Congress spends enough time writing laws—in some instances, too much. It may be that it is time, now, for Congress to devote itself more to looking to the manner of execution of these laws.

What Watergate, election abuses and, often, a distant bureaucracy have done to public confidence with regard to the Federal government, the energy crisis has done in the realm of the nation's economy.

The immediate responsibility is to make certain that oil shortages do not again devastate the economy and that the price of past neglect is borne equitably by all Americans.
Beyond the immediate, what we must have is a foundation of facts on which to build a national policy on energy. We have to know far more than we know now if we are to meet what otherwise could promise to be a recurrent threat to the nation's well-being. It would be a threat of widespread business shutdowns, of transportation paralysis and of a permanent inflation which can only culminate in recession, unemployment and appalling human hardship. That, the people of this nation will not tolerate. That, the Congress of the United States no less than the Executive Branch must do all in its power to prevent. I hope that the ball of blame, therefore, will not be passed between the two branches for failure to meet the problem; I hope we will be able to work together to resolve it.

The energy crisis shocked this nation. In so doing, it has also shown us in a sudden flash the precarious manner in which our entire national economic life has come to be organized. It is all well and good to be concerned at this time with the shortage of petroleum. But what of bauxite, nickel, tin, iron, and copper,
and many other materials? What of wood and concrete? Where will the supplies of these and other essentials come from in the years ahead? Indeed, what of food, with the kind of disjointed policies in which exports of wheat are stimulated one year only to compel high-priced imports the next?

To say that we have been extravagant with our resources is to put it mildly. In the earliest years of this nation, the first President, George Washington, spoke of raising "a standard to which the wisest and honest can repair." Do we meet such a standard when one day we are obsessed with the threats to our environment and the next, in our concern over the drying up of petroleum supplies, we all but forget that pure air and water are also exhaustible resources? To meet the Washingtonian standard—that is, the President's, not the city's—will take courage, courage to change, courage to innovate, courage to learn, and courage to renew.

It is my hope that the concern of the President and the Congress will not stop with the end of the energy crisis. The need
is to learn from a bad dream before it becomes a nightmare. The need is to begin, now, to take a careful look at not only the flashing of isolated warning lights but at the whole integrated switchboard of our national economic existence.

It is not enough, for example, for the Federal government to dole out tens of millions of dollars in a rescue operation to keep a bankrupt Penn Central Railroad on the tracks. We need to know where an action of this kind fits into a national rail policy; where that policy, in turn, fits into a total transportation pattern; where that pattern, in turn, fits into the overall transportation requirements and the availability of fuels and other essentials in meeting them, not only today, but for the next decade or more.

In short, we need to think ahead and to think in an integrated fashion. We need to begin to make the hard choices between what is more important to the nation and what is less, between is enduring and what is transitory. That is the full scale by which government intervention in the nation's economy, when it must take place, should be measured. Unless we begin soon to develop that
scale, the right hand of government will tend more and more to undo what the left hand has done. Accordingly, on February 19, the Minority Leader, who shares this view, joined with me in addressing to President Nixon the following letter:

Dear Mr. President:

It occurs to us that there is a need to look beyond the current crisis to the way in which our economic life has come to be organized. The energy shortage is a part, not the whole of the difficulty which confronts the nation's economy. Danger signals are flashing elsewhere on the complex switchboard of our national existence.

It is our thought that there must be a better way to deal with the needs of our people than by Federal intervention and bail-outs to shore up faltering parts of the economy, on a crash basis. The practice of waiting for the storms to strike and then, hurriedly, erecting shelters is not only wasteful and inefficient
of the resources of the nation but its cumulative
effect may well be devastating.

There is a need, it seems to us, to anticipate
and, as far as possible, to act in an orderly fashion
before the difficulties have descended on us. Unless
we have some synchronized and coordinated machinery for
this purpose, the nation will be subject to a plague of
crises, one after another, in the years ahead. It is
our suggestion, therefore, that we consider bringing
together representatives of the Legislative and Executive
Branches of government on a regular basis with those of
industry and labor and other areas of our national life
for the purpose of thinking through our national needs,
not only as they confront us, today, but as they are
likely to be five, ten or more years hence and how they
are best to be met. If the government is to intervene
in these matters as it is doing, an effort ought to be
made to put that intervention, as far as possible, on
a rational and far-sighted basis.
We would appreciate your reaction to this suggestion and would be prepared to work with the Executive Branch in bringing about a concerted consideration of the proposal.

Sincerely,

Hugh Scott

Mike Mansfield

The President, on March 25, 1974, agreed to our suggestion and the first meeting of the joint leadership of both Houses and representatives of the Executive branch occurred on April 30. It was a good beginning and it marks Legislative-Executive cooperation and partnership at its best.

Let me close by saying that there is a great deal that is right in this nation. We are a generous country with a strong, decent, industrious and compassionate people. There is ample intelligence and inventiveness and an immense experience and vitality in our midst. If, working together, today, we will put these attributes to use for the benefit of all, there need be no fear for the nation's tomorrow.
This nation will withstand the adversity of today. This nation will find, again, in the months and years ahead, the essential political leadership in the Presidency and in the Congress. We must, and we will, renew and endure.
REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

AT THE

CLOSING PLENARY SESSION

OF THE

FOURTEENTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

MAY 15, 1974

Senator Olivares, Congressman Rodriguez, Congressman Wright, fellow parliamentarians from Mexico and the United States, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

The statutory authority for participation by Members of the United States Congress in these Interparliamentary Meetings contains a simple, straightforward mandate:

"... Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and at least annually with Representatives of the Chamber of Deputies and Chamber of Senators of the Mexican Congress for discussion of common problems in the interests of relations between the United States and Mexico."

In an atmosphere of marked cordiality, we have fulfilled our legislative mandate—and then some.

We have had our discussions—on no less than twelve major agenda topics. We have exchanged views candidly and honestly. And, yes, we have been reminded of our differences on some issues. We have not negotiated, but we have listened and learned. And we have resolved anew that rather than divide us—our differences shall serve to bring us closer together in understanding as we continue to explore ways and means of solving them.
This, I submit, is the hallmark of our Interparliamentary Meetings, namely, that relations between Mexico and the United States have reached the level of maturity where common problems are treated more as opportunities rather than impediments to further cooperation and understanding.

This is indeed an inspiring approach to the conduct of international relations and because of our Interparliamentary Sessions, it is there for all the world to see. We can be justifiably proud of it, and we can leave here today knowing that the Fourteenth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference has made a substantial contribution to it.

In terms of specifics, I want to focus attention on the Colorado River Desalinization Agreement signed August 30, 1973. It is--to say the least--an historic agreement. It provides a permanent, definitive and just solution of the problem of the salinity of the Colorado River.

As those familiar with the salinity issue are aware, no other issue in recent times has so troubled our relations; no other problem has so taxed our determination to seek mutually satisfactory solutions to common problems; no other problem has so tested the sincerity and ingenuity of our diplomats; and no other problem has so challenged the mutual respect and goodwill that our two countries have for each other.

In the end, our deeds have matched our words. Looking back, I am convinced that it could not have been otherwise--given the solemn determination of President Nixon and President Echeverria to resolve this issue. Their enlightened leadership on it deserves the highest praise. Likewise, a very special tribute is owed to former Attorney General Brownell, who worked closely with the U. S. delegation, and Foreign Secretary Rabasa, whose tireless efforts contributed so much to making the August 30 agreement a reality.
Legislation to implement the salinity agreement reached Capitol Hill in February. The appropriate committees of Congress have started the ball rolling on it, and because of the interest in this legislation, I fully anticipate that it will have priority status. Most certainly, we are indebted to Congressman Morris Udall for successfully bringing the necessary legislation out of the House Interior Committee on yesterday. While I cannot give our colleagues from Mexico an exact date on final passage, the sooner the better. In fact, speaking on behalf of the entire United States Delegation, I pledge our sincere efforts to do all that we can to expedite consideration of this historic legislation.

I express such confidence and make this pledge largely because of our deliberations on the salinity issue during this and previous conference sessions. These deliberations have helped immeasurably to lay the groundwork for early legislative action. They have given us a sober appreciation of the facts and helped produce a political climate that is very encouraging and follows in the pattern of the Chamizal settlement.

As a final note and with respect to the Colorado River issue, I want the record to show that for its demonstrated patience and the justness of its cause, we salute you and the great Republic which you represent so ably and with such distinction. May we live forever in peace and understanding and on the basis of equality, dignity and mutual respect.
REMARKS OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD (D., MONTANA)

BEFORE THE

SENATE DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

Thursday, July 18, 1974, Room S-207, U. S. Capitol, 9:30 A.M.

On Friday, July 12, the President signed into law a measure which opens the way for Congress to exercise effectively one of its fundamental responsibilities. I refer to the new Budget Act which provides for the coordination of Congressional procedures and clarifies the roles of the Branches with regard to control of federal finances. The Act mandates that Congress face and decide the following four basic questions each year:

1. How much money is needed, and how much can be provided to finance all federal programs?

2. How will available federal resources be divided among those programs?

3. How much revenue will be derived from existing taxes and should this amount be increased or decreased?

4. What size federal surplus or deficit is consistent with sound economic policy?

Congress has recognized the need to address these fundamental questions for decades. Our past inadequacies in dealing with them, however, have been all too apparent. With the fragmentation within the Committee structure and our sometimes leisurely and haphazard practices and with our varied viewpoints, we have not been able in the past to focus and act coordinately on these questions. As a consequence, the Executive Branch has acquired almost the whole of the
initiative in matters involving coordination of federal financial policy. That is not as it should be under the Constitution but, perhaps inevitably, that is how it has been in practice.

The Budget Act will not be a panacea for this situation. But, at least, it is designed to equip Congress in ways which will help us to face up to our own responsibilities and respond more effectively to some of the most critical choices which must be made by the federal government.

To begin with, the law creates here in the Senate a Committee on the Budget. A similar committee comes into existence in the House. In addition, there is established a Congressional Office of the Budget which is expected to be staffed with the kind of personnel that can provide the two committees with the research and technical analysis of overall budgetary matters that is so vitally needed for making valid judgments. A great deal will ride on these three instrumentalities--that is, the two budget committees and the Congressional Office of the Budget. Largely on the basis of their work, the Congress is expected by the law to lay down the national budget--issuing it early each session, then reviewing and revising it as the year progresses. The law affirms that it is up to the two Houses, in the final analysis, to determine the nation's priorities--where federal spending is to be increased and where it is to be cut. To that end, the start of the fiscal year is reset to October 1, and a timetable is established for Congress to make its decisions regarding spending and revenue throughout each year.

Having convened this meeting for the purpose of highlighting the significance of the new law, I would note that it is largely the task of this Conference of the Democratic Majority--in consultation with the Republican Minority--to assure that the undertaking gets off on the right foot. The initial responsibility which confronts us involves setting up the new Committee--the
Senate Budget Committee. Bear in mind that this Committee is established not under the Senate's rules but has been mandated by law so there is less flexibility than might otherwise be the case.

The law provides for a fifteen-member Committee and under the current ratio, that would allow nine seats for Democrats and six for Republicans. To fulfill our responsibilities under the Act, it seems to me that this Committee needs to be so equipped and balanced that it can address the national fiscal situation in a national perspective. We cannot be responsible for the Republican assignments, but we are responsible for our own. As in all cases of Democratic committee assignments, the prerogatives rest in this Conference. This Conference will say, in the end, who among the Majority members is to serve on this new Committee and who is to take the Chair, subject only to ultimate approval by the Senate as a whole.

Inasmuch as the Budget law presents for us and for the Senate a matter of new and surpassing importance, it is my judgment that we should not proceed as though we were dealing with a routine matter of committee assignments in which the policies of the Conference are already established, and with which we are fully familiar. If that were the case, in the Steering Committee, great weight would be given to years of continuous service. Other Committee memberships of an applying member would be considered. Attempts would also be made to accommodate younger members, as possible, with an interest in the Committee, on the basis of granting such members at least one stated preference. Members would be assigned more or less permanently to the Committee, with the most senior probably designated as Chairman, and once assigned, they would continue to accumulate seniority until such time as their seats were vacated. On the basis of past experience, moreover, the work of the Steering Committee in making these assignments might be expected to be upheld by a unanimous or near-unanimous Conference.
It is not yet clear, however, that routine consideration is necessarily the best way of approaching this new situation. To the Budget Committee, Congress has assigned, by law, responsibilities that are different and of enormous significance. We have authorized its support by what amounts to its own independent Congressional agency. We have bound ourselves to a timetable of legislation which is keyed to the Committee's recommendations. All of this, we have seen fit to embed in the law, subject to change only by law.

I reiterate that the decisions which are made, initially, in regard to the new Congressional budgetary structure are of the greatest importance. Their effect on the nation as a whole can be very profound. So, too, will be the effect in the Senate and the Congress. A whole new sense of timing in the way we conduct our business will be brought into play by this Act. A whole new set of inter-committee relationships may well emerge. As yet, unforeseen problems may well confront this Conference and the Leadership in the future. With this law, we have probably reached a watershed not only in terms of the responsibilities of Congress to serve as the arbiter of the nation's finances, but in terms of the Senate's internal organization and procedures.

In the circumstances, therefore, it seems to me that the shaping of the Democratic part of this new Committee is hardly a matter for routine handling. In the first instance, at least, it would appear to be a matter for consideration by the Conference itself, rather than by the Steering Committee, as an arm of the Conference. If the Conference shares that judgment--and I shall put the question shortly--then the question of how to proceed will be open for discussion.

I want to emphasize my belief, if I may, that there is an imperative need for balance as among geographic areas and ideological nuances in the Democratic membership of the Budget Committee. The Democrats who sit on the Budget Committee should be so selected, in my judgment, that they will reflect
an accurate cross-section of the Democratic members of the Senate. May I say that criteria of this kind, by specific direction of the Democratic Conference, have governed the selection of membership on both the Policy and Steering Committees for all the years that I have been your Majority Leader. In consequence, both have operated in a highly responsive and responsible manner regarding the general inclinations of this Conference.

I would also state my view that I do not believe that members should be designated to the new Committee unless they are prepared to give up now—not two years hence, but now—an existing membership on other major Committees. At the very least, this readiness should be considered in making assignments. I know that there is a grandfather clause in this law which permits sitting members to add membership on this Committee on top of others which they already hold. That is permissive, not binding, and I think that we would be well-advised to look for a quid pro quo from any member desiring this assignment.

The challenges of the new Budget Committee are too great to be treated as a mere add-on to the responsibilities already carried by individual members. Those who serve on it must give it preponderant attention if it is to function effectively; and if I may underscore the point, I would stress that it requires the direct contributions of Senators not the mere presence of staff aides. As it is now, excessive Committee assignments of individual members already leave Committees and subcommittees fragmentarily served or ill-served and, often, largely in the hands of staff. At the same time, younger members of the Senate are insufficiently used in the basic decision making processes. In this fashion, the principle of equality among all members tends to be honored more in form than in substance. So, again, whatever the decisions of this Conference, I would hope that they will include recognition of the principle that whoever seeks assignment on this new Committee should be prepared to yield, now, a major
Committee assignment which he already holds. By the same token, it would be my hope that this Conference will consider selecting the first Chairman of the new Committee on the basis of its best judgment as to who among those designated is prepared and equipped to make the greatest contribution of knowledge, time and effort to its operation.

With that by way as background, I should like, now, to put the following question of procedure:

Is it the wish of the Conference that the Steering Committee shall proceed in the customary manner to select the Democratic nominees for the Senate Budget Committee?

If the Conference votes negatively on this question, the Chair will open the matter for discussion and will entertain from the floor suggestions on how to proceed in this matter. If the Conference votes "aye" it would be my intention to call a Steering Committee meeting in the very near future to prepare the slate of proposed Democratic Members for the new Budget Committee.

What, then, is the decision of the Conference?
Mr. introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on ______

A BILL

To establish a National Commission on Domestic Needs

(Insert title of bill here)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight Assessment Act of 1974."

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that --

(1) the current roles of the Federal Government and of State and local governments in economic regulation, planning, and development and in the conduct of public programs should be reassessed at the highest level in order to avoid economic and social dislocations and material shortages, both domestic and international;

(2) the measurement and projection of the levels of natural, social, economic, and technological capabilities and resources must be coordinated and improved, and
(3) public and private agencies and organizations which are engaged in the measurement and projection of supplies and inventories of natural resources, agricultural commodities, and manufactured products have not effectively coordinated their efforts, and have not provided a basis for a rational and comprehensive approach to the assessment of our national asset and how best to use them.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) There is established as an independent instrumentality of the Federal Government a National Commission on Domestic Needs and Economic Foresight (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be comprised of 16 members selected as follows:

(1) The President, in consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives, shall appoint 8 members of the Commission from among persons in private life, of whom one shall be representative of the Agricultural community, one shall be representative of organized labor, two shall be representative of consumer and environmental organizations, two shall be representative of producing and manufacturing business, one shall be representative of the financial community, and one shall be representative of the international trading community.

(2) The President shall designate four senior officials of the Executive Branch, to serve without additional compensation as members of the Commission.

(3) The President of the Senate, after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, shall appoint two Senators to be members of the Commission and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House of Representatives, shall appoint two Members of Congress to be members of the Commission. Members appointed under this paragraph shall serve as members of the Commission without additional compensation.

(b) The Commission shall rotate from among its members a Chairman and Vice Chairman which officers shall rotate between the Executive and Legislative Branch designees and those appointed from the private sector.
(c) Each member of the Commission appointed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) shall be entitled to be compensated at a rate equal to the per diem equivalent of the rate for an individual occupying a position under level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, when engaged in the actual performance of duties as such a member, and all members of the Commission shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

Sec. 4. (a) It shall be the function of the Commission to conduct an investigation of existing techniques for the measurement and projection of supplies of natural resources, agricultural commodities materials and manufactured products, to determine what public and private organizations are currently involved in such measurements and projections, and to make a full report to the President and to the Congress recommending the establishment of an independent agency to provide for a continuing and comprehensive examination and analysis of the economy of the United States and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) The Commission shall include in the report required by this section specific and detailed recommendations to assure that the independent agency will be representative of the Executive and Legislative Branches and the Private Sector and will have adequate authority and resources to make a continuing study of and periodic reports with respect to—

(1) the existence or possibility of any long- or short-term shortages or market adversities affecting the supply of any natural resources, raw agriculture commodities, materials, manufactured products (including any possible impairment of productive capacity which may result from shortages in energy producing materials, plant or equipment, or capital investment) and the reason for such shortage or adversities;

(2) the need for, and the appropriate type of action necessary to increase the availability of the items referred to in clause (1), or to correct the adversity affecting the availability of any such items;
(3) the need to develop additional or alternative sources of scarce materials or commodities and the need for governmental action, if any, in order to encourage private market conduct which will best achieve balanced national and international economic growth with minimal short-term dislocations or short-term dislocations or shortages;

(4) the appropriate role of government in the economic life of the United States,

(5) the appropriate relationships between government and the private sector, in such areas as education, employment, environmental protection and improvement, health care, housing, and transportation, in achieving vital national objectives, taking into account the need to make the most efficient use of available resources; and

(6) the long-term objectives for the economy of the United States, establishing rational relationships between the domestic economic policy and the foreign economic policy of the United States, regulation of imports and exports in order to assure the participation by the United States in the international economy.

(c) In addition to its functions under subsection (b), the agency shall coordinate information with respect to the economic life of the United States,

(d) The Commission shall prepare and publish such periodic reports and recommendations, as required by Sec. 4, as it deems appropriate, and shall transmit a final report with its recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than December 31, 1974.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Sec. 5. (a) The Commission is authorized to establish such advisory committees as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out specific analytical or investigative undertakings on behalf of the Commission. Any such committee shall be subject to the relevant provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
POWERS

Sec. 6. (a) Subject to such rules and regulations it may adopt the Commission, though its Chairman shall have the power to--

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director at not to exceed, $40,000 per annum, and such additional staff personnel as is deemed necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to Chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule under section 5332 of such title; and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 a day for individuals.

(b) The Commission or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, as it may deem advisable.

ASSISTANCE OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Sec. 7. Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the Federal Government, including the Congress, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, and independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman, such data, reports, and other information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.