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EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

AUG 29 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974
Sponsor - Sen. Bayh (D) Indiana and 27 others

Last Day for Action
September 7, 1974 - Saturday

Purpose

Extends existing juvenile delinquency program for one transition year, creates two new National Institutes and an Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Department of Justice, establishes an independent coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and a National Advisory Committee, authorizes new categorical grant programs to deal with juvenile delinquency and runaway youth, and amends certain U.S. Code criminal sections on juvenile delinquency.

Agency Recommendations

Office of Management and Budget
Disapproval (Veto message attached)

Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Disapproval (Veto message attached)

Department of Justice
Approval

Civil Service Commission
Approval

Department of Labor
Defers to other agencies [Informally]

Discussion

S. 821 would substantially revise and extend existing Federal laws and agency responsibilities related to juvenile delinquency. It would place the principal responsibility for Federal juvenile delinquency in the Department of Justice, establish new organizational entities there to conduct research on and carry out
juvenile delinquency programs, and establish new Federal juvenile delinquency and runaway youth grant programs.

The enrolled bill would authorize total appropriations of $380 million for fiscal years 1975-1977 for the new grant programs authorized by the bill; of this total $85 million would be authorized for fiscal year 1975. The latter authorization would be in addition to amounts included in the 1975 budget for juvenile delinquency and runaway youth activities in Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW); namely, approximately $140 million for juvenile delinquency activities in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) appropriation and $15 million for juvenile delinquency and runaway youth activities in HEW. (In its views letter on the enrolled bill, Justice estimates that the budget impact for the start-up year could be held to $25-30 million with over half of this being made available from reprogrammed LEAA reversionary funds.)

The appropriation authorizations in the existing Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act administered by the Department of HEW expired on June 30, 1974. The former Administration proposed legislation to extend that Act for 3 years and to continue HEW's emphasis on the coordination of various youth services. That proposal also would have added a new program of research and demonstration grants in the field of youth development, with particular emphasis on the problem of runaway youth.

The major provisions of S. 821 are summarized below.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

S. 821 would establish three new organizational entities in the Department of Justice:

(1) An Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, headed by an Assistant Administrator, would be established in LEAA to implement overall policy and develop objectives and priorities for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. Specifically, that Office would be empowered to:

-- establish policies, priorities, and objectives for juvenile delinquency programs,

-- assist other Federal departments and agencies with program development,
--- implement, coordinate and evaluate all Federal juvenile delinquency activities,
--- submit an annual report to the President and Congress on Federal juvenile delinquency programs,
--- develop annually a comprehensive plan for Federal juvenile delinquency programs and submit it to the President and Congress,
--- provide technical assistance to Federal, State and local governments, courts, public and private agencies, institutions and individuals on juvenile delinquency programs.

LEAA would be authorized to transfer appropriated funds to any Federal agency to develop or demonstrate new methods in juvenile delinquency prevention and rehabilitation and to coordinate its juvenile delinquency functions with those of HEW. In addition, the President would be required to annually submit a report to the Congress containing a detailed statement of any action taken or anticipated with respect to LEAA's annual report on juvenile delinquency activities.

(2) A National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention would be established in the new Office to serve as an information clearinghouse and to conduct research, demonstration and evaluation activities. It would also provide programs to train individuals who are working or are preparing to work with juveniles and juvenile offenders and develop standards for the juvenile justice system.

(3) A National Institute of Corrections would be established within the Bureau of Prisons to serve as a clearinghouse for information on correction, including programs for the prevention of juvenile delinquency and to assist and advise on improvements in corrections programs at all governmental levels.

In addition to the three new organizations, S. 821 would establish:

--- a Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, chaired by the Attorney General and composed of Cabinet members and other Federal executives. The Council would be an independent agency in the Executive
branch, and would coordinate all Federal juvenile delinquency programs and make recommendations to the Attorney General and the President.

-- a National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, composed of 21 members appointed by the President. It would advise LEAA on juvenile delinquency policies and programs.

The former Administration opposed (a) the establishment of the new organizational entities as unnecessary and (b) the centralization of control over all Federal juvenile delinquency activities in one department as unwieldy.

S. 821 would also establish a new juvenile delinquency formula grant program. LEAA would be authorized to make grants to States, based on approved State plans, for planning, establishing, operating, coordinating and evaluating juvenile delinquency education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs. Funds would be allocated annually among the States on the basis of relative population of persons under age 18. No State would receive less than $200,000, and the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands would each receive at least $50,000.

S. 821 would require that at least two-thirds of the funds received by a State be expended through local government programs (this requirement could be waived by the Administrator if services are organized primarily on a statewide basis); at least 75 percent of the funds would have to be used for "advanced techniques" which are listed in the bill.

The bill would also authorize a new project grant program under which LEAA would make grants to and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, or individuals for "special emphasis prevention and treatment programs."

S. 821 would authorize appropriations for the above formula and project grant programs of $75 million, $125 million and $150 million for the fiscal years 1975, 1976 and 1977 respectively. In addition, it would require LEAA to maintain the same level of financial assistance for juvenile delinquency programs provided in fiscal year 1972; that level was $136.2 million.
The 1975 Budget includes an estimated $140 million for LEAA's juvenile delinquency activities, $11 million for HEW's juvenile delinquency activities, and makes no provision for the new formula and project grant programs which would be authorized by S. 821.

Runaway Youth

While S. 821 places responsibility for Federal juvenile delinquency activities in Justice, it would place program responsibility for runaway youth in HEW. HEW would be authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance to localities and nonprofit private agencies to establish, strengthen, or fund existing or proposed runaway houses—locally controlled facilities providing temporary shelter and counseling services to no more than 20 runaway youth. The Federal share of the grant would be 90 percent for the acquisition and renovation of existing structures, the provision of counseling services, staff training and the general operating costs of such facilities.

The bill would require HEW to gather information and conduct a comprehensive statistical survey on the characteristics of the runaway youth population and to report the results of the survey to Congress by June 30, 1975. HEW also would be required to make an annual report to the Congress on the status and accomplishments of runaway houses.

For each of fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977, $10 million would be authorized to be appropriated, plus $500,000 for a comprehensive survey by HEW of the runaway population. The 1975 Budget for HEW includes $4 million for runaway youth activities.

Other Provisions

In addition to establishing new juvenile delinquency and runaway youth grant programs, S. 821 would extend the appropriation authorization for the existing Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act administered by HEW for one year through 1975 with an authorization of "such sums as may be necessary." It would amend that Act to authorize HEW to make one-year grants to any State, nonprofit private agency, institution or organization for assisting the demonstration of innovative approaches to youth development and the prevention and treatment of delinquent behavior. The intent of Congress is to provide a year of transition, with no HEW program activity under that Act beyond June 30, 1975.
Title 18 of the U.S. Code, would also be amended by changing provisions dealing with delinquency proceedings in the courts, custody, detention, hearing, records, commitment and parole in cases involving juveniles. The purpose of the amendments, according to the Committee reports, is to "guarantee certain basic procedural and constitutional protections to juveniles under Federal jurisdiction."

Arguments in favor of approval

1. S. 821 reflects Congressional sentiment that Federal efforts to deal with a major crime problem (a large proportion of all serious crime is committed by juvenile delinquents) have been inadequate and too fragmented to accomplish anything. Congress apparently believes that single-agency policy direction and control for all Federal juvenile delinquency programs would be more effective.

2. In recent years LEAA has emerged as the lead Federal agency in providing funding to State and local governments for juvenile delinquency programs. It currently is working with 50 State planning agencies in developing plans and programs to prevent and reduce crime and delinquency by juveniles.

3. Justice believes that the bill should not be looked on as a new Federal program, but "rather as a restructuring of present operations and a supplementation of current authority and responsibility to provide, through individual State plans, for comprehensive funding to all elements of the State, local and private system which impact on crime control efforts."

4. Although the authorization levels in S. 821 are high, Justice believes the budget impact for fiscal year 1975 can be minimized.

5. The bill received overwhelming support in both Houses of Congress (88-1 in the Senate and 310-14 in the House); the conference version was agreed to by voice vote.

Arguments against approval

1. The effectiveness of present juvenile delinquency programs has not been evaluated, and no analytical basis exists which would justify a major increase in the present level of Federal financial effort. The establishment of new Offices, Institutes, and the authorizations for new grant programs totaling $380 million over 3 years could add
substantial costs to the Federal budget with at best uncertain potential for improving present juvenile delinquency efforts. This should be viewed in the context that State and local governments spent $10.2 billion for criminal justice programs in 1971. Approval of the bill would strongly imply Executive intent to provide increased funding for Federal juvenile delinquency programs, basically a State and local government responsibility.

(2) Through the proposed new formula and project grants the bill would establish a full-scale categorical federally financed service delivery program, which would duplicate many of LEAA's existing programs and, to a more limited extent, HEW's. Federal efforts in the juvenile delinquency area already cover planning, diversion, rehabilitation, research and development and drug education and counselling.

(3) The establishment of five new organizational structures--an office, two institutes, a coordinating council, and an advisory committee--to carry out an expanded juvenile delinquency effort creates highly over-structured coordinating and operating mechanisms, which could impair the effectiveness of the Government's juvenile delinquency activities. Also, these organizations would require additional personnel and increased administrative costs to achieve objectives which can be met as well under the existing more simplified organization.

(4) The requirement that the proposed National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention develop Federal standards for the juvenile justice system runs counter to the former Administration's policy which emphasized State and local government responsibility. Moreover, there is no available data nor agreement among experts on what would constitute appropriate standards.

(5) Implementation of the Runaway Youth grant program is likely to involve the Federal Government in a long-term high cost service maintenance operation. Estimates of the number of runaways each year range from 450,000 to 2,000,000. A center with a capacity of 20 persons might serve 800 during the course of a year. Such a center is likely to cost $100,000 to establish and have operating costs of $200,000 per year. Thus a program to serve all runaways would require a minimum of 550 centers, with capital costs of $50 million and annual operating costs of $100 million. Costs could well range up to five times these estimates.
The bill submitted by the former Administration had as a basic premise the idea that both Justice and HEW have contributions to make in the juvenile delinquency area. S. 821 would centralize all Federal juvenile delinquency activities in Justice and phase out nearly all HEW involvement. There is at present no analysis which would indicate that this is a proper move, nor that it would improve Federal planning and administration of juvenile delinquency programs.

HEW suggests that a veto might possibly be sustained, noting that earlier this year the House rejected, by a vote of 144 to 210, an amendment to transfer the HEW juvenile delinquency programs to Justice.

Recommendations

HEW recommends that the bill be disapproved. It objects to the phasing-out of virtually all its juvenile delinquency prevention activities and the transfer to Justice of the primary responsibility for Federal juvenile delinquency programs.

Justice recommends that S. 821 be approved. In its views letter, the Department states:

"Passage of S. 821, by an overwhelming vote of both Houses of the Congress, represents a continuation of the strong Congressional commitment to reduce juvenile delinquency in the United States, to keep juveniles from entering the treadmill of the criminal process, and to make an impact on our nation's crime problem. Its passage is particularly significant because of recent increases in the nationwide rate of serious crime, and clear indications that a majority of this serious crime is committed by juveniles.

"This bill is also significant as the first crime reduction legislation presented by Congress to President Ford for signature. It gives the President an early opportunity to demonstrate his desire to cooperate with the Congress, inasmuch as S. 821 was passed in both Houses with overwhelming majorities."

OMB recommends that the bill be disapproved. The combination of the budget threat associated with acceptance of the bill, the unwieldy organizational features of the bill and
the further directed Federal involvement in what is basically a State and local area of responsibility are, in our view, compelling reasons to return this bill to the Congress without your approval.

We have prepared the attached draft of a veto message for your consideration.

Director

Enclosures
Honorable Roy L. Ash
Director, Office of Management
and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Mr. Ash:

In compliance with your request, I have examined a facsimile of the enrolled bill, S. 821, "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974."

The bill would create a Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Office within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), Department of Justice. The Office would provide comprehensive national leadership for attacking the problems of juvenile delinquency, assure coordination of all delinquency-related activities of the Federal government, and make grants to States, local governments, and public and private agencies through existing LEAA funding mechanisms. These grants would be for the purpose of encouraging the development of comprehensive programs and services designed to prevent juvenile delinquency, to divert juveniles from the juvenile justice system, and to provide community-based alternatives to juvenile incarceration. Other significant features of the bill include the creation of a National Institute of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and a National Institute of Corrections, as well as a comprehensive amendment of the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act.

Passage of S. 821, by an overwhelming vote of both Houses of the Congress, represents a continuation of the strong Congressional commitment to reduce juvenile delinquency in the United States, to keep juveniles from entering the treadmill of
the criminal process, and to make an impact on our nation's crime problem. Its passage is particularly significant because of recent increases in the nationwide rate of serious crime, and clear indications that a majority of this serious crime is committed by juveniles.

This bill is also significant as the first crime reduction legislation presented by Congress to President Ford for signature. It gives the President an early opportunity to demonstrate his desire to cooperate with the Congress, inasmuch as S. 821 was passed in both Houses with overwhelming majorities.

In 1968 Congress passed the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act. Congress assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) responsibility for national leadership in developing new approaches to the problems of delinquency and coordination of Federal efforts. In 1972, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act extended authorization for funding this program to June 30, 1974. Section 404 of the enrolled bill would further extend the authorization for one year for phase out purposes.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, enacted in 1968 proved to have a significant effect on the Federal government's juvenile delinquency efforts. Over the years since 1968, LEAA with its larger resources and the unique block grant funding process, which placed decision-making authority with State and local governments, has funded hundreds of millions of dollars in programs for juvenile delinquency prevention and juvenile justice. This activity was reinforced in 1971 when an amendment to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act expressed Congressional intent that LEAA should focus even greater attention on juvenile programs. This concern was again expressed in the Crime Control Act of 1973, the legislation extending LEAA for three additional years, when Congress required that each State include in its criminal justice planning process a comprehensive plan for the improvement of juvenile justice. LEAA has responded to this direction by establishing a juvenile delinquency initiative as one of its major thrusts.

S. 821 was introduced to strengthen Federal efforts in juvenile delinquency prevention and control. LEAA has been decided upon by Congress as the appropriate lead agency in juvenile delinquency prevention and control programs. This transfer
provides continuity to existing programs, while at the same time consolidating Federal initiatives to address the problems surrounding juvenile delinquency. Thus, the bill should not be looked upon as a new Federal program, but rather as a restructuring of present operations and a supplementation of current authority and responsibility to provide, through individual State plans, for comprehensive funding to all elements of the State, local, and private system which impact on crime control efforts. In addition, the same emphasis provided to the area of corrections as a result of the 1971 amendments to LEAA's authorizing legislation would now be directed to juvenile prevention and diversion efforts.

Although the funding provisions of S. 821 are not fully commensurate with the block grant concept behind LEAA, a precedent for the funding mechanisms of this legislation was set forth in 1971 with the addition of a Part E to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, which provided for grants for corrections institutions and facilities.

The bill authorizes $75 million in FY 75, $125 million in FY 76 and $150 million in FY 77. The budgetary impact of this legislation can be minimized somewhat. LEAA estimates that costs could be held down to $25 - $30 million in the start-up year with well over half of this amount obtained by reprogramming of LEAA reversionary funds.

Juvenile delinquency is a grievous problem of national proportion. Its cost in human terms is beyond measure. By the economic scale, however, juvenile crime now costs the United States billions of dollars per year. Through the programs authorized and the resources provided by this bill, a more earnest attempt could be made to reduce this great human and economic loss. It should also be noted that considerable cost saving, benefits, and efficiency would result from the fact that existing LEAA and State administrative and block grant funding mechanisms can easily be used to administer this revised program. As a result of the federal government's commitment to increased State responsibility, a network of fifty-five State planning agencies, plus numerous sub-state regional planning units, are actively working to determine the various States' particular criminal justice and law enforcement needs and to channel resources to meet those needs. Individuals at both the State and Federal levels have thus developed the contacts in the communities and the
expertise required to cope with the problems associated with juvenile delinquency. What these people are now requesting are the additional resources necessary to allow application of this experience in a manner that would have a meaningful impact on juvenile delinquency.

Numerous public and private organizations and institutions have emphasized the need for increased Federal resources, leadership, and coordination to help combat juvenile delinquency. The concepts encompassed in S. 821 have been endorsed by a wide range of public and private organizations, including numerous voluntary service organizations working directly with youth. The National Governors' Conference and National Conference of State Legislators both recently passed resolutions calling for establishment of this program in LEAA.

Senator Hruska's statement is particularly pertinent:

"This bill represents a culmination of years of hard work and the expertise and dedication of a great many individuals. The importance of this piece of legislation cannot be overstated. While we in government are attempting to achieve a balanced budget, certain crisis problems such as juvenile delinquency demand an immediate mobilization of Federal resources. The crisis of juvenile delinquency must be met."

The Department of Justice defers to the Office of Management and Budget concerning the significance and the extent of the fiscal impact of this bill.

For the reasons noted above, the Department of Justice recommends Executive approval of S. 821.

Sincerely,

W. Vincent Rakestraw
Assistant Attorney General
Mr. W. H. Rommel
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference
Executive Office of the President
Office of Management and Budget
Room 7201, NEOB
Washington, D. C. 20503

Dear Mr. Rommel:

This is in response to your request for the views of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on S. 821, a bill entitled the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974."

The ACIR has not examined the issues involved in the subject matter of this bill. From the standpoint of its intergovernmental effects, the Commission staff has no comment on S. 821.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Wayne F. Anderson
Executive Director
Mr. W. H. Rommel  
Assistant Director for  
Legislative Reference  
Office of Management and Budget  
Washington, D. C.  

Dear Mr. Rommel:

This will acknowledge receipt of your memorandum transmitting for our views and recommendations enrolled bill S. 821. "To provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes."

Although the provisions amending the Juvenile Delinquency Act and affecting the duties of magistrates, some of which do not appear in earlier drafts of the bill, are of concern to the federal judiciary, the views of the Judicial Conference have never been sought by the Congress on this legislation and accordingly no recommendation is made.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William E. Foley  
Deputy Director
Dear Mr. Ash:

This is in response to your request for the Commission's views on enrolled S. 821, a bill "to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes."

The Commission has not previously had the opportunity to comment upon this significant and far-reaching proposed legislation. We defer to the Departments of Justice and Health, Education, and Welfare on the bill's overall merits. We do have some objections to a few of the personnel provisions, which we discuss below for the record. However, these objections notwithstanding, we recommend—from the standpoint of the bill's personnel provisions—that the President sign enrolled S. 821 into law.

Section 201(c) provides that there shall be an Assistant Administrator at the Head of the Office of Juvenile Justice who shall be nominated by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. We find it unusual that the executive level for this position has not been specified.

Section 201(g) would amend section 5108(c)(10) of title 5 United States Code by increasing the number of quota supergrade positions for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration from 22 to 25. As stated in Public Law 87-367, dated October 4, 1961, the Congress did not intend for agencies and departments of the executive branch to attain additional supergrade spaces through the enactment of laws outside the jurisdiction of the proper House and Senate Committees.
Section 202(b) provides the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, authorization to select, appoint, and employ not to exceed three officers and to fix their compensation at rates not to exceed GS-18. Further, section 528(b) of Part C "Conforming Amendments" provides that the Administrator may place three positions in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 under the General Schedule but without regard to 5 U.S.C. 5108. For the reasons outlined above, we object to these provisions as well.

We also find that the language of sections 201(g), 202(b), and 528(b) is quite unclear as to (a) whether the bill is attempting to authorize 3, 6, or 9 additional supergrade positions; and (b) the nature and extent of the Civil Service Commission's authority over these additional supergrade positions.

We have no objection to any of the other personnel provisions of enrolled S. 821.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

Chairman
This is in response to Mr. Rommel's request of August 23, 1974, for a report on S. 821, an enrolled bill "To provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes."

The enrolled bill would:

--establish the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention within the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), Department of Justice;
--assign to the Administrator of this Office the function of overseeing all Federal juvenile delinquency activities;
--establish a Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention as an independent organization in the Executive Branch of the Federal government, and authorize to be appropriated for the Council such sums as may be necessary;
--authorize the Administrator to make formula grants to States and local governments, and to make grants to and enter into contracts with, other entities, in relation to various activities concerned with juvenile delinquency;
--establish within the Office the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency, with information, research, and training functions;
--require that funds at least equal to the level provided for juvenile delinquency programs assisted by LEAA in FY 1972 would have to be made available for this purpose from LEAA appropriations, and authorize additional
Administration sought a three-year extension, with some modifications, of DHEW programs concerned with juvenile delinquency prevention. In subsequent testimony both our Department and the Department of Justice supported the Administration's position in this regard.

Our Department's focus is on the preventive aspects of juvenile delinquency as part of the whole area of youth development, rather than on juvenile delinquency as a part of the correctional system. The approximately 100 programs funded by DHEW are concerned with the provision of comprehensive services in a variety of areas--such as health, employment, and crisis intervention--to over 100,000 youth. Clearly, our Department has the necessary expertise to deal with these preventive aspects. In addition, the recipients of grants in this area are public and private agencies which, over many years, have built up a viable working relationship with our Department.

Finally, the authorizations provided in the bill for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency in LEAA were not requested by the Administration, are not needed, and are inflationary. Indeed, the enrolled bill creates an entirely new LEAA categorical juvenile delinquency program and explicitly authorizes funding for this new program, which would be in addition to appropriations already requested by the President's budget for LEAA juvenile delinquency activities. These provisions fly directly in the face of repeated Administration opposition to such new and excessive authorizations.

I have been informed by Congressman William A. Steiger of Wisconsin, who introduced the Administration bill and who refused to sign the conference report on the enrolled bill, that he favors a Presidential veto of the enrolled bill, will support such a veto on the Floor of the House, and believes there is a fair chance to sustain a veto. The
juvenile delinquency appropriations of $75 million for FY 1975, $120 million for FY 1976, and $150 million for FY 1977;

--provide specific, statutory language for a grant program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for localities and nonprofit private agencies for the purpose of developing facilities to deal with the immediate needs of runaway youth, and authorize to be appropriated for this purpose $10 million for each of the fiscal years 1975, 1976, and 1977 ($4 million is requested by the Budget for runaway youth programs for FY 1975);

--require the Secretary of DHEW to carry out, by the end of FY 1975, a comprehensive statistical survey of the runaway youth population, and authorize to be appropriated for this purpose $500 thousand;

--amend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act by authorizing the Secretary of DHEW to make grants to States and other entities for demonstrations of innovative approaches to youth development and delinquent behavior;

--extend the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act programs of DHEW for one year by authorizing to be appropriated for FY 1975 such sums as may be necessary ($11 million is requested by the Budget for these programs, exclusive of runaway youth programs, for FY 1975);

-- specify certain procedures to be followed in Federal courts with respect to juveniles;

--establish a National Institute of Corrections within the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The legislative history of the enrolled bill makes clear the bill's intent to phase out, over a one-year period, all involvement of this Department in juvenile delinquency prevention and related youth development activities, except for runaway youth, and to assign to LEAA all responsibilities in the area of juvenile delinquency. We feel this approach, which amounts to the elimination of all but $4 million of this Department's proposed FY 75 expenditures in this area, is ill-advised. H.R. 13737, the Administration bill on juvenile delinquency, recognized that both we and the Department of Justice have important, but differing, contributions to make to this area. Accordingly, the
Honorable Roy L. Ash

House, when considering its version of the enrolled bill on July 1 of this year, rejected, by a vote of 144 to 210, an amendment to transfer the DHEW juvenile delinquency programs to LEAA.

We recommend that the enrolled bill not be approved and enclose a draft veto message.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Title]

Enclosure
TO THE SENATE

I am returning to the Congress without my approval S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

I fully agree with the Congress that juvenile delinquency is a serious national problem. I do not believe, however, that this bill is an effective answer to that problem.

Over the past three years the Federal Government has spent nearly half a billion dollars on various juvenile delinquency programs, including research and demonstration efforts and financial support through LEAA to State and local governments. Most of this Federal financial support has come in the form of decisions by State and local governments on how to spend the LEAA block grant funds. These individual governments, after examining their problems, needs and priorities, have determined how available Federal funds can best be allocated to reflect their priorities between juvenile delinquency and other important crime prevention activities. This is as it should be.

Crime prevention and control, including juvenile crime, is and must remain a basically State and local responsibility. The Federal role in this area, apart from general financial support through the existing LEAA mechanism, should be research, development and demonstration—producing answers which can be applied as appropriate by State and local governments.

S. 821 is deficient in several respects. First, it interferes with the appropriate division of responsibility between the Federal Government and State and local governments outlined above by limiting the flexibility now
available at the local level in the use of Federal funds in the law enforcement area. The bill would establish new unnecessary categorical grant programs and would create several new Federal organizations to administer these programs and to implement other provisions of the bill.

Second, the bill authorizes increased appropriations of $380.5 million for fiscal years 1975-1977 for juvenile delinquency activities, thus creating pressures for an increasing Federal assumption of financial responsibility for State and local program activity. The bill also mandates that the use of approximately $140 million per year of LEAA funds for juvenile delinquency activities be maintained, even through priorities for the use of these Federal law enforcement assistance funds may change.

Third, S. 821 would phase out nearly all the involvement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the problems of juvenile delinquency and would assign most responsibilities to the Department of Justice. Both of these Departments have contributions to make in this area. Both should be able—as was contemplated in the Administration's proposed legislation—to continue their respective roles.

In lieu of S. 821, I urge the Congress to reconsider the Administration's proposal to extend HEW's authorities for another three years and to fund juvenile delinquency efforts at levels which match our knowledge and ability to use Federal resources effectively and efficiently.
FOR ACTION: Jame Cavanaugh
Graff Shepard
Bill Buchen
Bill Timmons
Dave Gergen

FROM THE STAFF SECRETARY

DUE: Date: Wednesday, September 4, 1974 Time: 2:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

ACTION REQUESTED:

_____ For Necessary Action

XX For Your Recommendations

_____ Prepare Agenda and Brief

_____ Draft Reply

_____ For Your Comments

_____ Draft Remarks

REMARKS:

No Action, As_pr
M. C.

Please return to Kathy Tindle - West Wing

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please inform the Staff Secretary immediately.

Warren K. Hendriks
For the President
Date: August 29, 1974  Time: 10:30 a.m.

FOR ACTION: James Savannaugh  cc (for information): Warren K. Hendriks
Geoff Shepard  Jerry Jones
Bill Buchen
Bill Timmons
Dave Gergen

FROM THE STAFF SECRETARY

DUE: Date: Wednesday, September 4, 1974  Time: 2:00 p.m.

SUBJECT: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency
Prevention Act of 1974

ACTION REQUESTED:

-- For Necessary Action  XX. For Your Recommendations
-- Prepare Agenda and Brief  ____ Draft Reply
-- For Your Comments  ____ Draft Remarks

REMARKS:

Please return to Kathy Tindle - West Wing

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a
delay in submitting the required material, please
telephone the Staff Secretary immediately.

Warren K. Hendriks
For the President
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SUBJECT: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

ACTION REQUESTED:

- For Necessary Action
- Prepare Agenda and Brief
- For Your Comments

XX For Your Recommendations

Draft Reply

Draft Remarks

REMARKS:

Please return to Kathy Tindle - West Wing

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately.

Warren K. Hendriks
For the President
FOR ACTION: James Cavanaugh
Geoff Shepard
Bill Buchen
Bill Timmons
FROM THE STAFF SECRETARY

DUE: Date: September 4, 1974 Time: 2:30 p.m.
SUBJECT: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

ACTION REQUESTED:
- For Necessary Action
- Prepare Agenda and Brief
- For Your Comments

REMARKS:

Please return to Kathy Tindle - West Wing

PLEASE ATTACH THIS COPY TO MATERIAL SUBMITTED.

If you have any questions or if you anticipate a delay in submitting the required material, please telephone the Staff Secretary immediately.

K. R. COLE, JR. For the President
MEMORANDUM FOR:  MR. WARREN HENDRIKS
FROM:         WILLIAM E. TIMMONS
SUBJECT: Action Memorandum - Log No. 550
             Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

The Office of Legislative Affairs concurs in the attached proposal and has no additional recommendations. However, the President may elect to issue a signing statement to effect he aider not spend over 75 budget for this program.
Honorable Roy L. Ash
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D. C. 20503

Dear Mr. Ash:

This is in response to your request for our comments on enrolled bill S. 821, "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974." Our comments are limited to those provisions in which the Labor Department has a direct interest.

Section 223(a)(17) of the bill requires States to submit specific labor-protective plans, which must be approved by the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. If the President should sign the bill, we are prepared to consult with the LEAA on guidelines for implementing section 223(a)(17) and on employee protection problems, in accordance with the language of the Conference Report. We are concerned, however, about the impact of this provision because it deals with employees of State and local governments who may be covered by a civil service system. If it becomes necessary to implement section 223(a)(17), it should be done in such a fashion as to insure that the Federal Government interferes to the least extent practicable with the operation of the State and local civil service systems.

We note that the Act deals with Federal assistance to construction, but makes no provision for application of Davis-Bacon standards. This omission is an unfortunate departure from usual policy, in our view.
As to the remaining provisions of the bill, the Department of Labor defers to those departments more directly concerned. Because of the deficiencies we have noted in the imposition of Federal labor-protection standards, and the omission of Davis-Bacon coverage, we recommend that the President veto S. 821.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Secretary of Labor
To: Jerryفق
From: PAUL THEIS

We do not know yet whether the President will sign or veto S. 821 -- here is the final copy of the signing and veto statements.

I'd appreciate your thoughts.

Paul: I hope these are helpful. I wanted changes in 393, but we thought it best to do it all at once if possible.

PAUL THEIS
MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: KEN COLE
SUBJECT: Enrolled Bill S. 821 - Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974

Analysis

S. 821 places in Justice the main responsibility for Federal efforts in juvenile delinquency problems. It establishes two new programs to make policy and provide technical assistance to State and local governments, and a program on juvenile corrections matters. It further establishes a Coordinating Council and a National Advisory Council to oversee the programs. It authorizes a three-year $380 million Juvenile Delinquency Formula Grant Program in Justice (over and above their $420 million presently earmarked for juvenile delinquency). HEW is left with a $10 million Runaway Youth Program.

The Senate version passed 88-1 and the House version passed 310-14. The conference report passed unanimously by voice vote in both Houses.

Justice favors signature, suggesting the first year impact could be held to $30 million, and that it would be impolitic to veto a J.D. bill with the rising national crime rate. The original House version put the whole program in HEW, and Justice worked out a position with the Senate, which prevailed in conference, to place the program in Justice. HEW, of course, opposes the bill because it would virtually end that Department's role in this area. OMB opposes the bill because of its budgetary impact, its move away from revenue sharing, and its establishment of 5 new bureaucratic structures.

You have received a number of telegrams from Governors, including Wallace and Reagan, as well as from other lesser governmental entities and interest groups, asking that you sign the bill.
Timmons believes it highly unlikely that a veto could be sustained in the Senate, which will take it up first. Bayh, who is developing this issue for his reelection effort in Indiana, has convinced many of the old-line Senate Conservatives of the need for this sort of legislation. His joint letter with Senator Hruska is attached (Tab A). Al Quie thinks you should sign the bill, but admits it's complicated organizationally. Both Hruska and Quie suggest that even if a veto is sustained, the bill you will get from the next Congress will be much worse. Timmons concludes, "in view of the honeymoon with Congress, I cannot estimate the chances of sustaining a veto."

Recommendations:

**Sign S. 821**

Bill Timmons  
Phil Buchen - no objection

Politically, this puts you in a better position on the crime issue and avoids risking your first veto override.

**Veto S. 821**

Roy Ash  
Ken Cole  
Dean Burch

A draft veto message which advocates this Administration's originally proposed legislation extending the $15 million HEW Juvenile Delinquency Program is at Tab B. Throwing more money at juvenile delinquency will not solve the problem, and signing will undercut your budget austerity program.

Decision:

Sign S. 821  
(approve signing statement at Tab C.)

Veto S. 821  
(approve draft statement at Tab B.)
August 23, 1974

The President
The White House
Washington 25, D.C.

Mr. President:

The conferees have finished their work on the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, S. 821. The Senate and the House of Representatives have unanimously approved the conference report which adopts the Senate provision providing for administration of the program by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and retains key features of the House bill.

This measure is the product of a three year bipartisan effort to provide a comprehensive Federal response to the problems of juvenile crime and delinquency prevention. It represents a culmination of years of hard work and the expertise and dedication of a great many individuals. The importance of this legislation cannot be overstated. While we in government are attempting to achieve a balanced budget, certain crisis problems, such as juvenile crime and delinquency, demand an immediate mobilization of Federal resources.

We respectfully request that this Act be signed into law.

Respectfully yours,

[Signatures]

United States Senator

[Signature]

United States Senator
TO THE SENATE

I am returning to the Congress without my approval S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

I fully agree with the Congress that juvenile delinquency is a serious national problem. I do not believe, however, that this bill is an effective answer to that problem.

Over the past three years the Federal Government has spent nearly half a billion dollars on various juvenile delinquency programs, including research and demonstration efforts and financial support through LEAA to State and local government. State and local governments have been privy to a great deal of Federal advice on how to spend the LEAA block grant funds. These individual governments, after examining their problems, needs and priorities, have determined how available Federal funds can best be allocated to reflect their priorities between juvenile delinquency and other important crime prevention activities.

This is as it should be.
Crime prevention and control, including juvenile crime, is and must remain a basically State and local responsibility. The Federal role in this area, apart from general financial support through the existing LEAA mechanism, should be research, evaluation and training -- producing answers which can be applied as appropriate by State and local governments.

S. 821 would not follow this pattern, and is deficient in several respects. First, by creating new categorical grant programs and a Federal bureaucracy to administer them, it interferes with the appropriate division of responsibility between the Federal Government and State and local governments outlined above by limiting the flexibility now available at the local level in the use of Federal funds in the law enforcement area. The bill also mandates the use of approximately $140 million per year of LEAA funds for juvenile delinquency by State and local governments even if those funds are wanted by those governments for other purposes, thus removing still more autonomy from local levels of government.

Second, the bill authorizes increased appropriations of $380.5 million for fiscal years 1975-1977 for juvenile delinquency
activities, thus creating pressures for an increasing Federal assumption of financial responsibility for State and local program activity. The bill authorizes $10 million annually for fiscal years 1975, 1976 and 1977 each in programs for runaway youths. However, this authorization has the potential to escalate astronomically if the Federal Government assumes exclusive responsibility for the entire runaway youth population -- a responsibility that up to now has resided primarily with local government. These authorizations are not provided for in my budget, and would work against the fiscal austerity we need at this time. I have said that in the fight against inflation I would keep the closest possible watch on all Federal programs and none would be sacrosanct. Even projects aimed at something as important as juvenile delinquency can and must be trimmed.

Third, S. 821 would phase out nearly all the involvement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the problems of juvenile delinquency and would assign most responsibilities to the Department of Justice. Both of these Departments have contributions to make in this area. Both should be able -- as was contemplated in the Administration's proposed legislation -- to continue their respective roles.
In lieu of S. 821, I urge the Congress to reconsider the Administration's proposal to extend HEW's authorities for another three years, to fund juvenile delinquency efforts at levels which match our knowledge and ability to use Federal resources effectively and efficiently, and to authorize sums, even for worthy purposes such as this, consistent with the fight against inflation.

# # #
SIGNING STATEMENT FOR S. 821

I have today signed into law S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. 

This is the first piece of legislation to reach my desk for action in the field of prevention and reduction of crime among our youth. Its passage by very strong votes in both Houses of the Congress represents a continuation of our national commitment to reduce juvenile delinquency in the United States, to keep juveniles from entering the treadmill of the criminal process and to guarantee procedural and constitutional protection to juveniles under Federal jurisdiction.

This national commitment is one of partnership with State and local governments which spend over $10 billion for criminal justice programs.

During the course of this bill’s passage through the Congress, the Executive Branch voiced serious reservations with regard to several of its provisions for organizational change and fund authorizations. I continue to be concerned about these provisions --
especially the threat they carry with regard to increased Federal spending at a time when the economic situation demands across-the-board restraint, especially in the Federal budget.

Therefore, I do not intend to seek appropriations for the new programs authorized in the bill in excess of amounts included in the 1975 Budget until the general need for restricting Federal spending has abated. In the interim, the estimated $155 million in spending already provided under current programs will provide a continuation of strong Federal support.

This bill represents a constructive effort to consolidate policy direction and coordination of all Federal juvenile delinquency programs. The direction of our Federal programs has been fragmented for too long. This restructuring of present operation and authority will better assist State and local governments to carry out the responsibilities in this field which are and should remain with them. The result will, I hope, be a reduction in the wave of juvenile crime with an attendant increase in the security of American citizens and more purpose, sense, and happiness in the lives of American young people.

# # #
TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I am returning to the Congress without my approval S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

I fully agree with the Congress that juvenile delinquency is a serious national problem. I do not believe, however, that this bill is an effective answer to that problem.

Over the past three years the Federal Government has spent nearly half a billion dollars on various juvenile delinquency programs, including research and demonstration efforts and financial support through LEAA to State and local government. State and local governments have been privy to a great deal of Federal advice on how to spend the LEAA block grant funds.

These individual governments, after examining their problems, needs and priorities, have determined how available Federal funds can best be allocated to reflect their priorities between juvenile delinquency and other important crime prevention activities.

This is as it should be.
Crime prevention and control, including juvenile crime, is and must remain a basically State and local responsibility. The Federal role in this area, apart from general financial support through the existing LEAA mechanism, should be research, evaluation -- producing answers which can be applied as appropriate by State and local governments.

S. 821 would not follow this pattern, and is deficient in several respects. First, by creating new categorical grant programs and a Federal bureaucracy to administer them, it interferes with the appropriate division of responsibility between the Federal Government and State and local governments outlined above by limiting the flexibility now available at the local level in the use of Federal funds in the law enforcement area. The bill mandates the use of approximately $140 million per year of LEAA funds for juvenile delinquency by State and local governments even if those funds are wanted by those governments for other purposes, thus removing still more autonomy from local levels of government.

Second, the bill authorizes increased appropriations of $380.5 million for fiscal years 1975-1977 for juvenile delinquency
activities, thus creating pressures for an increasing Federal assumption of financial responsibility for State and local program activity. The bill authorizes $10 million annually for fiscal years 1975, 1976 and 1977 each in programs for runaway youths. However, this authorization has the potential to escalate astronomically if the Federal Government assumes exclusive responsibility for the entire runaway youth population -- a responsibility that up to now has resided primarily with local government, private voluntary organizations. These authorizations are not provided for in my budget, and would work against the fiscal austerity we need at this time. I have said that in the fight against inflation I would keep the closest possible watch on all Federal programs and none would be sacrosanct. Even programs aimed at something as important as juvenile delinquency can and must be trimmed.

Third, S. 821 would phase out nearly all the involvement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the problems of juvenile delinquency and would assign most responsibilities to the Department of Justice. Both of these Departments have contributions to make in this area. Both should be able -- as was contemplated in the Administration's proposed legislation -- to continue their respective roles.
In lieu of S. 821, I urge the Congress to reconsider the Administration's proposal to extend HEW's authorities for another three years, to fund juvenile delinquency efforts at levels which match our knowledge and ability to use Federal resources effectively and efficiently, and to authorize sums, even for worthy purposes such as this, consistent with the fight against inflation.
I am returning to the Congress today without my approval S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. We all desire, of course, to deal with the serious problem of juvenile delinquency facing our country. This bill, however, does not take the best approach to achieve this desirable goal. The bill is intended to phase out, over a one year period, all involvement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the problems of juvenile delinquency prevention (except for runaway youth) and assign to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, in the Department of Justice, all responsibilities in the area of juvenile delinquency. This approach is ill-advised. Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Justice have important, but differing contributions to make in this area. The Justice Department, based on its expertise, can best concentrate on juvenile delinquency problems in the context of correctional systems, while the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, based on its expertise, is particularly able to focus upon the preventive aspects of juvenile delinquency as part of the whole area of youth development. In addition, the amount of funds authorized under the bill for juvenile delinquency programs in the Justice Department is excessive and inflationary.

I regretfully return S. 821 to the Congress and urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to H.R. 13737, the Administration's bill on juvenile delinquency programs.
Late Saturday, I signed into law S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

This is the first piece of legislation to reach my desk for action in the field of prevention and reduction of crime among our youth. Its passage by very strong majorities in both bodies of the Congress represents a continuation of our national commitment to reduce juvenile delinquency in the United States, to keep juveniles from entering the treadmill of the criminal process and to guarantee procedural and Constitutional protection to juveniles under Federal jurisdiction.

This national commitment is one of partnership with State and local governments through which, we spend over $10 billion per year for criminal justice programs.

During the course of this bill's passage through the Congress, the executive branch voiced serious reservations with regard to several of its provisions for organizational change and fund authorizations. I continue to be concerned about these provisions -- especially the threat they carry with regard to increased Federal spending at a time when the economic situation demands across-the-board restraint, especially in the Federal budget.

Therefore, I do not intend to seek appropriations for the new programs authorized in the bill in excess of amounts included in the 1975 budget until the general need for restricting Federal spending has abated. In the interim, the estimated $155 million in spending already provided under current programs will provide a continuation of strong Federal support.

This bill represents a constructive effort to consolidate policy direction and coordination of all Federal programs to assist States and localities in dealing with the problems of juvenile delinquency. The direction of our Federal programs has been fragmented for too long. This restructuring of programs will better assist State and local governments to carry out the responsibilities in this field, which should remain with them. Hopefully, the result will be greater security for all citizens and more purpose, sense, and happiness in the lives of young Americans.
signed into law S. 821, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974.

This is the first piece of legislation to reach my desk for action in the field of prevention and reduction of crime among our youth. Its passage by very strong majorities in both bodies of the Congress represents a continuation of our national commitment to reduce juvenile delinquency in the United States, to keep juveniles from entering the treadmill of the criminal process and to guarantee procedural and Constitutional protection to juveniles under Federal jurisdiction.

This national commitment is one of partnership with State and local governments which spend over $10 billion per year for criminal justice programs.

During the course of this bill’s passage through the Congress, the executive branch voiced serious reservations with regard to several of its provisions for organizational change and fund authorizations. I continue to be concerned about these provisions --
especially the threat they carry with regard to increased Federal
spending at a time when the economic situation demands across-
the-board restraint, especially in the Federal budget.

Therefore, I do not intend to seek appropriations for the new
programs authorized in the bill in excess of amounts included in
the 1975 budget until the general need for restricting Federal
spending has abated. In the interim, the estimated $155 million
in spending already provided under current programs will provide
a continuation of strong Federal support.

This bill represents a constructive effort to consolidate policy
direction and coordination of all Federal juvenile delinquency programs to
assist States and localities in dealing with the problems of juvenile delinquency.
The direction of our Federal programs has been fragmented for too long.

This restructuring of present operation and authority will better assist
State and local governments to carry out the responsibilities in this
field, which should remain with them. Hopefully, the result will be
security of all citizens and more purpose, sense, and happiness in
the lives of young Americans.

# # #