

demand of their government. This is no easy task. Let me try to illustrate by a simple example.

In mental health, how do I arrive at a decision as to how much of the taxpayers' money is to be spent on the cure and the treatment of the mentally ill in our State? Well, first of all I must try to determine what are the needs—what the State can do to stamp out mental illness and improve the condition of those afflicted by it. Secondly, I must decide whether the program presented to me, including the costs involved, is adequate to meet these needs. And finally, it is my responsibility as Governor to determine whether, in view of its many other obligations, the State would be justified in spending this particular amount of money for this particular State service. In other words, if so much money is to be spent for education, so much for welfare, so much for highways, so much for correctional institutions, so much for conservation, so much for parks, so much for safety—how much can we allocate for mental hygiene? Mind you, I am giving you just one item in a budget which, when printed, runs to 827 pages. The point is, that one service and one function must be balanced against all others. And that is a point that many of our citizens fail to see.

In the field of public affairs, we hear a great deal nowadays about the so-called “pressure groups”—the organizations which set out to attain a single aim. It may be in public education, in mental hygiene, the elimination of water pollution, the improvement of our penal system or an infinite variety of other purposes. I prefer not to call them “pressure groups,” because from my knowledge of them I know that their objectives are good, and, for the most part, reasonable. They see conditions which they consider bad. They want to correct them. Who could find fault with this? And so, instead of “pressure groups,” I prefer to call them groups with limited interests. They believe strongly that we should expand our efforts in education, in the improvement of the condition of the mentally sick, in the elimination of water pollution, in the rehabilitation of prisoners, and so on. All of them are fighting for good causes. I rejoice in that fact. I encourage them to continue in their crusades. But the fact remains that the broad picture can be distorted by limited aims and prescribed points of view.

Men in public office have been accused of being the enemies of children because they dared reduce an appropriation for public education, or negligent of the welfare of the unfortunate victims of mental illnesses because they saw fit to postpone the building of a hospital. Is this reasonable? Is it fair? No. Groups and individuals of limited interests must learn to accommodate themselves to the wishes of other groups and