

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 10

MAY 15, 1967, TO MAY 24, 1967

(PAGES 12519 TO 13966)

economic development strategies and are not coupled with a complementary national urban growth strategy. To put it another way, these are efforts to create employment opportunities without the necessary complementary policies of supporting a rapid expansion in the physical development of the community such as housing for low income families—urban streets and roads, schools, residential water and sewer, etc. Effective efforts have yet to be made to relate a growth center industrial or business development strategy with a complementary national resettlement assistance policy and manpower training and development policy to assist in the transition from rural life to an urban employment environment.

Although the medium sized urban center has already shown signs of offering the greatest attraction for unplanned industrial and economic development, the economic and urban planners in the country have not yet made any real and practical efforts to capitalize on this great economic growth potential. We have preferred to talk of more exotic, and admittedly more intellectually stimulating concepts, such as new towns and revitalized central cities. However, recognizing the technological possibilities of satisfying our most adventurous dreams, it is essential to come to grips with our real lack of resources and the potentially high economic costs involved to accomplish our idealized ends. Realizing this, then, we should look to a comprehensive growth center strategy as a possible solution to our major national problem of finding employment for our dispossessed workers of the future, and indeed of the present. I suggest that the growth center offers the fundamentals of that solution.

1. Substantial physical plant is already in place. We should reinforce and strengthen it.

2. The job growth potential is there and growing. In this country we cannot, nor do we even want to interfere directly with the future location pattern of job opportunities by using direct controls over industrial location. Instead we should use the existing growth process and reinforce it to solve our massive problems.

3. The socio-economic problems of the medium sized urban centers are still open to solution. They have not yet grown and intertwined themselves to create massive rehabilitation requirements that have welled up in our major urban centers.

The growth center, in other words, is a place of natural growth in which we can bunch and mass both private and public development and planning efforts. Such efforts would not only include urban development assistance but also education assistance, employment services and economic development assistance. By concentrating national policy instruments on an urban growth center strategy, we avoid dissipating our efforts by focusing on the technical and esthetic appeal of new towns or investing heavily in a massive physical rehabilitation of the urban cores in an attempt to revive an out-moded type of central city economy.

IMPLICATIONS FOR OUR FUTURE ENVIRONMENT

What I have attempted to do is illuminate some aspects of the dilemma that faces us in attempting to prepare for the effects of future population growth and movement.

I indicated at the onset that many of the problems of our physical and social environment are closely related to the places where people live and work. Hopefully, these comments have sketched out at least a plausible explanation of where people are likely to live and where the jobs are going to be created in the next decade. Given this overview it has been possible then to indicate some of the choices and more important the *apparent constraints* on choice that we will face in attempting to assimilate a growing

and moving population into future job locations.

The crucial issue now is to begin to evolve a rationalized economic development—urban place strategy to guide us through the alternative choices that must be made. Once we have made these choices we will then be in a better position to know *what* kinds of physical and social needs must be anticipated in the next decade, *why* they will arise, and *where* these needs and facilities should be located to most efficiently meet our national needs. In short, we will then be in a position to construct some sort of rational priority system to allocate our scarce resources to meet burgeoning environmental needs and to devise better systems of influencing or regulating our environment at the Federal, state and local levels.

THE WAR ON HUNGER

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently, in Boston, at the 65th Annual Convention of the Millers' National Federation, Mr. Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for the War on Hunger, delivered a speech on the world's No. 1 problem.

Mr. Waters builds the case for serious and concerted action by the United States and the other developed countries of the world to meet this major crisis in world policy.

In order that it may be brought to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S NO. 1 PROBLEM: HUNGER

(Remarks by Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for War on Hunger, Agency for International Development, Department of State, before the 65th Annual Convention of the Millers' National Federation, Boston, Mass., May 2, 1967)

I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss with you the world's number one problem: Hunger.

Concern over that problem is rapidly extending into many groups in American life and internationally—agricultural groups, health organizations, foreign policy associations, development economists, and the agribusiness community generally. Certainly one group that *should* be vitally concerned is your own great flour milling industry, so intimately connected with feeding our own nation.

Eliminating hunger is your business—and you have certainly succeeded in this country. Your know-how, your enterprise, and the efficiency of your milling industry, coupled with the productivity of the American farmer, has helped make food abundance and food availability become taken for granted in this country. Perhaps too much so, I'm afraid.

We are so spoiled by having more than enough for so long that it is difficult for us to grasp the fact that the world as a whole has less than enough—and the situation is getting worse, instead of better.

We are just really beginning to comprehend the seriousness of the spectre of hunger confronting the world.

Already, half the world's people experience chronic hunger or serious dietary deficiency.

Each day about 10,000 people—most of them children—die in the underdeveloped countries as a result of illness caused by malnutrition.

Diet-deficit areas include all of Asia except Japan; all of the Middle East except Israel; all of Africa except its southern re-

gions; almost all of Central America and the Caribbean; and the northern parts of South America.

What is more, population in these areas is increasing so rapidly that the hunger gap may become far more severe in the immediate future.

We need to be concerned. With all of our pride in modern progress, it is in *our time*, in *our generation*, that the world is facing a breakdown in its ability to feed itself.

For the world as a whole, down through history, we have always been able to more or less keep up with food requirements. Of course, we had occasional great famines in the past, as a result of drought cycles—but they were distortions of the trend, not part of a trend itself.

The trend through history has always been in the right direction. Mankind has always been able to increase his farm productivity at a faster rate than the growth of the world's population.

We had new frontiers to open, new land to develop. We had major technological breakthroughs in farm mechanization, new advances in plant and soil science.

Somehow, we always managed to keep ahead of the number of mouths to feed.

That is no longer true today.

In simplest terms, population has been rising faster than food production. It is simply a case of the stork outrunning the plough.

There is less food per capita in the world today than a year ago.

In the less-developed world, where food deficiency is already the greatest, agricultural production is far from keeping pace with the growth in population. The rate of increases of food production in the developing world slowed since 1960, while population has continued to rise by 2½ to 3 per cent annually.

For the world as a whole we have been barely breaking even in recent years. But in 1966, when world population grew by 70 million, food production stood still.

For the past six years, the world has eaten up more basic food grains than we have produced. We have eaten up our so-called "surpluses". We are rapidly eating up our secondary reserves, land previously withheld from production.

Prior to World War II, many of the less developed countries were major food exporters. This is no longer true. The less developed countries had a food grain deficit in 1966 on the order of 16 million metric tons—25 million tons this year.

If present production, population, and consumption trends continue, that deficit confronting the less-developed countries—the "food gap"—will reach 42 million tons of additional food grains needed annually by 1975 and 88 million tons by 1985—just to feed themselves at existing inadequate levels.

Population alone is not creating these food shortages. As economic conditions and incomes improve in the less-developed countries, people eat more food and they buy better food. In the United States, Canada, and some European nations, people are already fairly well fed, so that if a person is paid two or three dollars more per month, he may spend only two or three cents of it for food. But in the less-developed countries, a very high proportion of a man's wages, perhaps as much as 70 or 80 percent, is spent for food; and if his income increases by a few cents a month, he probably will spend most of it for food.

The fact is that economic progress has brought increased purchasing power, most of which has been quickly channeled into buying better food and more of it. Yet better food, notably meat, milk, eggs and poultry, increases demands on an agricultural system because of the animal feeds required to produce it.

The significance of these facts—in terms

of world stability, peace, further economic progress—is plain.

If developing countries cannot meet these accelerating qualitative and quantitative food demands, the bill for failure will be paid in political and social unrest among people no longer content with silent suffering. It will be paid in the stifling of economic and social development, in malnutrition—and, eventually, in widespread famine.

And if we let that happen, the bill for failure may be far more costly to the world than whatever it may cost to win the War on Hunger.

That is why President Johnson, in his State of the Union Message of January 10, declared:

"Next to the pursuit of peace, the really greatest challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost.

"The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here and we must get on with the job.

"We believe three principles must prevail if our policy is to succeed.

"First, the developing nations must give highest priority to food production, including the use of technology and the capital of private enterprise.

"Second, nations with food deficits must put more of their resources into voluntary family planning programs.

"Third, the developed nations must all assist other nations to avoid starvation in the short run and to move rapidly towards the ability to feed themselves.

"Every member of the world community now bears a direct responsibility to help bring our most basic human account into balance."

We in the Agency for International Development have geared ourselves to meet that challenge. We have given the War on Hunger our highest functional priority. We are calling on all nations to join us in this task. We are convinced it is basic to all the rest of our objectives—international understanding, cooperation among nations, progress toward a better world.

How can we expect a better world—how can we expect to have more productivity, more education, more wealth, more equality and opportunity for all men—how can we realistically expect these things when each day more men die or are debilitated by hunger?

We can't. And that is why we have no choice but to wage "War on Hunger".

The magnitude of the challenge is staggering. Projections of increasing food demand over the next two decades now make it clear that we and other abundantly-producing nations cannot continue to fill the growing supply gap of the developing nations, whatever our willingness to share our own production.

We can be justly proud of what we as a nation have done in sharing our food abundance with the world. But we are approaching the breaking point—not in our willingness to bear the financial burden of food aid, but actually in our ability to produce enough to meet our own demands, our commercial export requirements, and also fill the increasing supply gap of countries unable to buy their food requirements.

Even if we could produce enough, none of us want to see huge populations building up overseas that would continue to be dependent on relief food shipments from the United States or elsewhere. In the long run, this would not really contribute to future well-being.

But if we are to avoid this mass dependence on food aid—and if we are to avoid famines certain to result when we reach the breaking point of the amount of food aid that even we can provide—the only answer is greater concentration of our efforts to stimulate agricultural development in the

areas of the world now so dependent on external food assistance, matched by simultaneous efforts to curb population growth.

They are the two sides to the same coin: increasing farm production, and slowing down the rate of population growth.

Perhaps not everyone fully grasps the cumulative effect of present population growth rates on the world.

It took us from the beginning of time until 1830 to reach our first billion of world population. It took only a hundred years more until 1930 to reach the second billion. By 1960, only thirty years later, we had the third billion. At the rate we are going, we will reach the fourth billion by 1975.

Unless we change that growth rate, it will take only 10 years more, until 1985, to reach the fifth billion, and then only eight years more, until 1993, to reach the sixth billion. By the year 2000, only seven years later, demographers tell us we will be confronted with 7 billion people in the world.

How are we going to feed them?

The world's population is doubling every 35 years at the present rate of annual increase—about two percent per year.

If the world had faced an annual two percent increase in population since the time of Christ—and if there were only two people, a man and woman, in existence at that time—the experts tell me that today the world would be covered by a layer of humanity 100 feet deep.

It is obvious that we cannot go on producing people at that rate. If we are going to win the "War on Hunger", food production must go up, but population growth must go down—both are essential.

With all the knowledge that man has accumulated since the beginning of time, with all the new lands we have had available to develop and exploit, with all the new technology we have devised, we are still barely able to feed the world today. In fact, we are not able to feed it adequately.

Yet we now face the task of feeding twice as many people within the next 35 years—as well as an urgent need to feed them better. We now know that malnutrition in early years stunts mental and physical growth, handicapping children who survive.

None of us can afford to ignore the situation.

Whatever we have been doing, it has not been enough. The tragic fact is that the world has not improved the situation very much. Things are getting worse, not better. How long are we willing to let this continue? We have great new technological resources. We can do things never before believed possible. What possible excuse can there be for not applying our skills to the problem of feeding the hungry? We know there is no one simple or easy solution. We know from experience in our own country the complexities of modernizing agriculture. It took us a span of almost a century. We haven't that much time to spare, in getting the job done in the rest of the world. Our challenge is to speed up this modernization process—whatever it takes to get it done.

We are going to have to look at general government policies and services, including budget allocations to agriculture; and decisions with respect to pricing and producer-incentives, land tenure, taxes, and agricultural credit.

We are going to need greater attention to new technology, including research, extension education, with especial attention to the development and introduction of improved seed varieties of breeds of crops and livestock and better practices for their production.

We are going to need vastly stepped-up physical inputs for production, including fertilizers, pesticides, seeds and machines, with appropriate attention to their marketing, distribution and cost as well as availability. We are going to need more adequate

marketing systems, improved transportation and storage, and the creation of better processing facilities.

But above all, we are going to need involvement of farm people of the world themselves, continually seeking to help themselves.

That is what we in the Agency for International Development are trying to do—help people help themselves. We and other aid-donors—and please understand that all developed nations of the free world are joining in this effort to assist the world's developing nations—know that our governments alone cannot win this struggle for progress.

We can act as catalysts. We can stimulate governments and people of the less-developed countries to do a better job for themselves. We can help provide them an opportunity for more effective self-help, by providing the external assistance they need until they can become self-sustaining. But the biggest part of the job is up to them.

We know it can be done. Many nations have proven it.

The American people, through the Agency for International Development and its predecessor foreign assistance agencies, have helped 27 countries reach the point where they are self-sufficient or no longer need our help:

The countries of Western Europe, aided under the Marshall Plan, now share the burden of Free World assistance to the less-developed nations;

So does Japan;

Taiwan also is now giving aid instead of receiving it;

Turkey, Korea, Mexico and Venezuela are moving rapidly towards self-support.

Millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have also benefitted directly from AID-assisted programs in education, health, and rural and urban development, but their countries have not yet conquered obstacles to economic development allowing them to stand on their own feet. They still need our help, and the help of other developed countries fortunate enough to share in high living standards and continuing economic growth.

One thing stands out in common among the "success stories" of economic development. The nations that have been most successful have not neglected agriculture; rather, they have given a high priority to agricultural development.

Other countries have tried to "leapfrog" too soon into industrial development, without first meeting their basic needs for food production. They have given agriculture too low a priority. They have neglected the farm people making up the vast majority of their population. And now they are paying a price for it—the price of threatened famine, and a breakdown of the entire investment in economic growth.

The world has now become aware that no nation can neglect its food producers.

Even in our own country we learned that lesson the hard way, in bygone years.

In summary, let me outline a three-point strategy that is evolving by which both the developed and developing worlds may frustrate the catastrophe implicit in recent trends:

First, the developed world must use its own land and technology to produce food for the developing world's needs until that world can feed itself;

Second, the developed world must simultaneously do all it can to transfer applicable portions of its technology of food production to the developing world while also affording those that are serious about population control the help they need to achieve it; and

Third, the developing countries must sacrifice, invest, train, legislate and reform on an adequate scale and for as long as necessary

in order to master their own agriculture and the size of the population it serves.

Plainly, the third element of strategy is the key to the rest. The United States and other developed nations can provide interim food relief, a deep reservoir of experience and successful technology, and a measure of persuasion. But, in the end, the developing countries must rescue themselves.

In the United States, the increasingly coordinated effort to meet our responsibilities under this strategy, and to mobilize a concerted world-wide response, is called the War on Hunger.

Two major government programs constitute the American arsenal for waging the War on Hunger:

1. The Foreign Economic Assistance Program administered by A.I.D., which furnishes American skills, commodities and financing to help developing countries grow more of their own food and implement programs in family planning; and

2. The Food for Freedom Program, under which A.I.D., the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State work together to use American food supplies to battle hunger and malnutrition, stimulate agricultural improvements abroad, promote economic development, and build markets for U.S. farm products.

To emphasize the importance attached to this effort and to better coordinate its elements—food, family planning, nutrition, agricultural, technical and financial assistance—President Johnson this March created a new central staff office in A.I.D. devoted to the War on Hunger, which I have the privilege—and challenge—of heading.

President Johnson has called this the greatest challenge to the human family, next to the pursuit of peace.

Quite frankly, I regard it as *part* of the pursuit of peace—and that is why, at the outset of my remarks, I called hunger the world's Number One problem.

The food problem may be of fateful significance to the future course of the world.

In an age of rising expectations, a hungry world is a potentially explosive world. The failure of the underdeveloped countries to produce more food could lead to political turmoil, and the breakdown of order.

To those of us used to abundance, the spectre of a savage struggle for food and survival among hundreds of millions of people may seem far-fetched. Yet, as Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified before a Congressional Committee last year, "Unless we act now to meet the problem of hunger, we may have to act later to prevent people from seizing the food production resources of their neighbors".

Back through history, if famine existed in one part of the earth, it barely touched the rest of its people. That is no longer true. We live in a new era of rapid communication. What happens in one quarter of the globe can no longer be ignored by the rest of the world—for the sake of our own security.

Hunger used to be the silent enemy of man. Starvation used to be the silent way of death. Not any more. Instead of silence, today it can mean a resounding roar of violence.

Today, we are talking about the fate of millions; yes, hundreds of millions; not just thousands, who used to suffer in famines.

Today, people know they no longer have to die of starvation, passively and quietly—not bothering the affluent of the earth.

People on the edge of starvation are desperate as well. In today's world, desperation can only mean destruction.

Can we risk such destruction?

Can we quibble about the cost of helping others to win this War on Hunger, when the stakes are so great?

These are the questions the American people, and people of the developed free world, must answer and answer soon. *Time is running out.*

NEW HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION NEEDED

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the problem of waste and inefficiency in the management of our public affairs is growing daily more serious. Overlapping programs are sapping the strength of many worthwhile Government efforts.

On January 11, I introduced a bill to establish a Commission on the Operation of the Executive Branch to revitalize the organization and functioning of the Federal Government. This measure, which has since been cosponsored by 41 Senators, would authorize the Commission to examine the operation of the executive branch for a 2-year period and then to make appropriate recommendations to Congress.

Such a review should be thorough, objective, and bipartisan, without any bias toward or against any particular program or philosophy of government. It simply would be an attempt to improve the quality of American government.

Mr. President, the need for such a study is evident. In the 12 years since the last Hoover Commission submitted its recommendations, the operations of the Federal Government have expanded tremendously. Unfortunately, however, the ability of the executive branch to manage these increased responsibilities has not grown apace.

Evidence of the waste and duplication which now plagues many Federal programs is amply documented in the May issue of *Nation's Business*, in an article entitled "How Your Tax Money Is Wasted."

In the field of environmental pollution for example, the article notes that the Government is conducting research in 192 laboratories administered by nine separate departments and agencies.

Mr. President, while the problems of pollution are serious and research to solve them is needed, the incredible proliferation of uncoordinated projects mentioned by this study is a classic case of bureaucratic overkill. When programs are allowed to develop without thought to their interrelationship, the left hand often does not know what the right hand is doing.

In the area of research and development, for example, a special study by the Library of Congress notes:

The Federal Government now spends nearly \$4 billion annually on research and development in its own laboratories, but it does not know exactly how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work in them or what they are doing.

The Secretary of Labor has testified before Congress:

There are 15 to 30 separate manpower programs administered by public and private agencies, all supported by federal funds, in each major U.S. metropolitan area.

These are but a few illustrations. Many others could be mentioned. They all serve to show, however, the staggering cost of government and the widespread problem of overlapping projects.

Mr. President, it was estimated recently by the Tax Foundation, Inc., that the average American will spend two hours and 25 minutes of his 8-hour

working day this year to earn the money he needs to pay for his 1967 taxes.

These taxes are required to finance the \$4,281 a second it costs to run the Federal Government—that is \$4,281 every second, of every day, of every week, of every month, of the year.

One reason for this tremendous cost is the need to provide additional services as our population expands. The war in Vietnam is another.

Waste and duplication, however, need not be tolerated, especially when evidence of its existence is so readily at hand. For example, at present there are approximately 33 Federal agencies engaged in 296 consumer protection activities. There are 220 grant-in-aid programs administered by 16 separate departments and agencies. The deficit of the Post Office has risen from \$363 million in 1955 to \$1.2 billion today.

Wastefulness in general, and of public funds, in particular, is unjustified. Nonetheless, economy for economy's sake is as shortsighted as the philosophy of solving all problems by spending more money. Continuous thoughtful planning and coordination of effort is essential if programs in need of funds are to get them and unproductive projects are to be eliminated before the drain they cause on the public purse becomes too burdensome.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from *Nation's Business* be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW YOUR TAX MONEY IS WASTED

Uncle Sam, still trying to right some of the wrongs inflicted on the American Indian, was determined to bring Twentieth Century living to the small Quinault tribe which inhabits the rich fishing and timber country of Washington State's lush Olympic Peninsula.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs last year launched a \$200,000 project to provide some 20 all-electric homes for the Quinaults that would be the envy of any Indian. The first units, completed this winter, boast the latest in gracious, all-electric living—electric ranges, electric refrigerators, electric baseboard heating, electric washers and driers and electric hot-water heating.

In February the first seven families abandoned their run-down shacks and moved into their new dwellings. But one thing was missing: Electricity. The nearest power line was 15 miles from the tiny Indian community of Queets, and somebody had neglected to consider that you need electricity to bring livability to an all-electric home.

The Quinaults are a stoic people and they improvised in the best tradition of the frontier Redskin. They bought kerosene lamps, gasoline heaters and stoves.

Four federal and three state and county agencies have been fighting since early last winter, trying to pass the buck to one another for the oversight. The Bonneville Power Administration is involved. So is the Rural Electrification Administration which has had the money available for some months to extend the power line to the Indian village. National Park Service still can't decide whether to let the line go overhead or underground (the line would cut across Olympia National Park).

The blacked-out Redskins are an apt illustration of a pervasive federal ailment. President Johnson is still keeping the lights down low at the White House. But waste—much