

The imbalance in the setting of national priorities is not limited to the defense budget. Two-thirds of all Americans live in urban areas, and in recent years urban areas accounted for more than 80 percent of the national population growth. Yet those facts of life find no rational reflection in the budget. The total outlays for "community development and housing"—a group of programs that encompasses urban renewal—are estimated at \$2.3 billion in fiscal 1969 and less than \$2.8 billion in 1970. In the same years the expenditures on "farm income stabilization"—the farm price-support programs that raise the cost of food and clothing to the poor—are estimated at \$4.5 and \$3.9 billion respectively. A visitor from outer space might read the budget and conclude that ours is still a rural society.

Among the other misallocations are the \$219 million to be spent in the year ahead on the supersonic air transport and the nearly \$9 billion for highways. Neither sum is justified when outlays for urban mass transportation are limited to \$400 million.

It is commonplace to point to political obstacles whenever it is suggested that radical changes in budgetary priorities are required. But unless those barriers are surmounted, the social imbalance in the Federal budget will have even more disruptive consequences than would a lack of control on the fiscal side. The test for the incoming Nixon Administration will be to reorder the priorities and address itself at once to the ill-met needs of the cities.

Mr. ZWICK. May I just make one comment. On farm price supports, for example, I did a calculation last year on the 1967, 1968, and 1969 budgets. If you take the three last Eisenhower budgets, and the 1967, 1968, and 1969 budgets, you will find that the growth in those programs was much smaller than the tremendous growth in the social and urban programs.

I am still not saying that is necessarily the right mix. I am just saying there have been shifts and I thought that New York Times editorial missed that point. Obviously, they haven't had a chance to read the special analyses.

(The following was later submitted by the Budget Director:)

With the approval of the Joint Economic Committee, I would like to have inserted in the record the following letter, which I have sent to the Editor of the *New York Times* concerning the editorial of January 16 entitled "Unbalanced Budget Priorities."

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET DIRECTOR,
January 18, 1969.

THE EDITOR,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

SIR: I was dismayed by the inaccuracies and lack of sophistication in your lead editorial of January 16, entitled "Unbalanced Budget Priorities."

My heart was warmed—as would any Budget Director's be—by your assessment that President Johnson's 1970 budget "represents the most objective and authentic projection in many years." And, of course, there are always understandable differences in judgment. But the readers of the *Times* have the right to expect the same accuracy on the editorial page as they have become accustomed to on the news pages. Most of the judgments in this editorial are based on careless disregard for readily available facts in articles that appear elsewhere in the very same edition of the *Times*.

The editorial focused on the amount of resources which the Federal Government is channeling to urban areas. The President's Budget Message contains an entire section labeled "Aids to Urban Areas," reprinted in the same edition of the *Times* on page 20. However, the editorial writer appears to have read only the first paragraph.

After reporting correctly that the number of people living in metropolitan areas is almost two-thirds of our population and that more than 80% of our population growth between 1960 and 1966 did occur in such areas, the quality of reporting deteriorates. Outlays for the functional grouping "community development and housing," as used in the editorial, clearly fall short of all Govern-