

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 2

JANUARY 25, 1967, TO FEBRUARY 7, 1967

(PAGES 1423 TO 2878)

grams and through supplementary grants for certain Federally assisted development projects, additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities for making comprehensive metropolitan planning and programming effective."

All over the country in the legislative sessions of January 1967, state legislatures will be considering the means and methods of organizing for metropolitan planning and programming (which must mean political decision making at the metropolitan level) in order that their metropolitan areas may most effectively comply with the beneficial provisions of this legislation.

The question again becomes one of determining the form and responsibility of such regional organizations. Set forth below are a series of recommendations which in the author's opinion could provide for sound political decision making and action at the metropolitan regional scale:

1) Definition by the states of regional planning, decisionmaking, administrative district areas comprehending the entire territory of each state.

2) Enabling legislation permitting the establishment of regional-decision making bodies in each district either under general law or by charter. The establishment of such regional decision making bodies should be by local option but until a decision making body is established, the states should exercise all of the powers of a regional agency.

3) The form of organization and manner of representation should be adaptable to local conditions. One form that should be given consideration would be: A directly elected legislative body with final decision authority in all regional matters but with a council of local governments having:

a. Limited veto powers which could be overridden by the directly elected legislative body and

b. Limited powers to initiate proposals requiring consideration by the regional legislative body.

4) Provisions for adequate professional staff and secretariat for each regional agency.

5) Such regional organizations to be charged with the performance of several clearly defined regional functions, perhaps paralleling those of Title II of the "Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966" cited above. For those functions for which the regional government is responsible, there must be in addition to construction and operational authority a grant of taxing powers and police powers adequate to execute and carry out the projects and to issue regulations. In some instances, functions now performed by states should be re-assigned to the regional organizations, e.g., urban freeway planning and construction, as a part of a comprehensive regional approach to transportation, making possible an integrated land use-transportation development program.

6) All other local functions, as at present, would be vested in cities and counties. There should be a clear preference for units of general purpose local government (cities and counties) over special purpose districts. There should also simultaneously be a revitalization of the county as a unit of general government and redefinition of functions as between cities, counties and regional organizations.

7) The regional organization and the powers that it is to exercise should be flexible in order that the regional organization may take on additional functions as the need is clearly seen and as necessary planning is accomplished to define the direction in which the regional organization should go, and the manner in which the regional interest should be expressed.

8) The regional organization should be given the authority to reorganize, restructure, consolidate, abolish or otherwise deal with special districts within the area of juris-

dition of the regional general government. This authority quite probably should be coupled with certain performance criteria and be subject to review and approval by an appropriate state agency. The performance criteria would deal specifically with the level of detail of necessary planning needed in order to absorb or take over such functions and the adequacy of financial plans to carry on without disruption to the work of the special districts.

9) The planning responsibilities of the regional organization should be clearly set forth. It should be as broad as the legislative and action responsibilities of the regional organization and should be broad enough, further, to identify emerging regional problems to be tackled at the regional scale. Planning responsibility should encompass the full range of the governmental responsibility and include such things as educational planning and planning for human resources and governmental organization in addition to environmental planning.

10) As an adjunct to but not as a part of regional government, state and federal multi-service centers should be established in each region. Each center should be headed by representatives of the governor and President respectively.

11) A state coordinator, not connected with any department or agency, should head the State Center to obtain cross-the-board implementation of state programs in accordance with regional and local comprehensive plans and consistent with state objectives and standards. He would be the governor's man in the field concerned with effective inter-relationships of programs and the cooperation of state officials in the field with their local and federal counterparts. He should have a competent staff to assist him and have a status which would be above all other state agency officials operating in the field. Through the staff, the center would provide information on state programs and policies and advise on the state's interests.

12) A similar organization would be desirable for federal multi-service centers.

The specific nature of legislation and the course of action in each state will depend on local factors. In most instances an evolutionary approach will probably be needed moving from some kind of informal association or voluntary organization to a legally established regional decision-making body with powers to act on regional problems. In other cases it may be possible to establish a statewide system of regional decision-making at the outset.

An example of the latter kind of action is from Alaska where provisions for a statewide system of boroughs were included in the State Constitution made effective when Statehood was granted in 1958. Article X of the Constitution provided that:

"All local government powers shall be vested in boroughs and cities . . . the entire State shall be divided into boroughs . . . The standards shall include population, geography, economy, transportation, and other factors. Each borough shall embrace an area and population with common interests to the maximum degree possible . . . Each city of the first class, and each city of any other class designated by law, shall be represented on the (borough) assembly by one or more of its council. The other members of the assembly shall be elected from and by the qualified voters resident outside such cities . . .

"The (state) legislature shall provide for the performance of services it deems necessary or advisable in unorganized boroughs, allowing for maximum local participation and responsibility . . . Cities . . . shall be a part of the borough in which they are located . . . A home rule borough or city may exercise all legislative powers not prohibited by law or by charter . . . Agreements including those for cooperative or

joint administration of any functions or powers, government, with the State, or with the United States, unless otherwise provided by law or charter. A city may transfer to the borough in which it is located any of its powers or functions unless prohibited by law or charter, and may in like manner revoke the transfer. . . ."

The boroughs have been established and are now beginning to function as metropolitan and regional governments. The Alaskan boroughs which have now been operational for two years have quickly grasped the desirability of relating resource and urban development. Planning and decision making in most boroughs now embrace both resource management and urban development.

In California the Association of Bay Area Governments provides an example of evolution towards statutory regional government. ABAG was originally organized in 1961 under joint exercise of powers legislation as a voluntary association of counties and cities with the following functions specified in the By-Laws:

1. *Review of Governmental Proposals.* The review of proposals for metropolitan area or regional governmental units or agencies, and the making of appropriate policy or action recommendations.

2. *Study of Metropolitan Area Problems.* The identification and study of problems, functions and services in the San Francisco Bay Metropolitan Area, and the making of appropriate policy or action recommendations.

3. *Other Functions.* Such other metropolitan or regional functions as the General Assembly shall deem appropriate for the Association.

During its first two years of existence the Association engaged in various activities relying mainly on voluntary part-time assistance. With the advice of a technical advisory group, ABAG decided to initiate a continuing program of regional planning with permanent staff supported by Federal "701" funds. This program has produced a preliminary regional plan with special consideration given to parks and open space, refuse disposal, shoreline development and transportation.

Recognizing the problems of mounting effective action through a voluntary association, the ABAG General Assembly is now asking for state legislation to establish "Regional Home Rule" through a permanent regional decision-making body for the nine counties with powers to act in four specific areas:

1. Regional planning
2. Solid waste disposal
3. Regional parks and open space
4. Regional airports

These are functions not presently covered by the several single purpose regional districts in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Effective legislation creating the machinery for responsible political decision-making, planning and action, at the regional scale will provide a first vital step towards the actions that must come. Here, within this format, the issues can be debated, dialogue can take place, common problems can be recognized and solutions can be hammered out. Planning at the regional scale can be an important tool of elected public officials. Through planning, the issues can be analyzed, alternatives examined and decisions made.

#### OUR HUMANITARIAN TRADITION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, over 1,900 years ago the Roman philosopher, Seneca, said:

A hungry people listens not to reason nor cares for justice nor is bent by prayers.

Human nature has changed little in 1,900 years. In areas where hunger and

starvation are a grim possibility, order and progress are difficult to maintain.

With this thought in mind I welcome the recommendations of President Johnson to provide food aid to India through an international consortium. Such an approach has many advantages. But the principal advantage, in my opinion, is the promise of larger and more effective aid than would otherwise be possible.

Feeding the hungry people of other countries is a long tradition with the United States. Since the beginning of this century, our farmers have brought forth such bounty that we have been able, far more than any people in world history, to share our food abundance with those in need.

In the World War I period, almost 50 years ago, U.S. food saved millions of men, women, and children from starvation. Again, during and after World War II, supplies from the United States combated hunger in war-torn areas and hastened reconstruction. The current food-for-peace program—and the consortium proposed to help India—falls into the same pattern. As President Kennedy once expressed it:

We share our abundance with the needy because it is right.

I want to call particular attention to President Johnson's announcement that \$25 million of title II funds will be made available to CARE and other voluntary agencies for use in the Bihar and Uttar Pradesh states of India. I am most hopeful that this recommendation will help us reach such areas of need which would be difficult to reach through regular programs.

For we owe the voluntary agencies a great debt of gratitude for their service. Through these dedicated organizations—private welfare, church affiliated, and international—the United States has distributed commodities having a cost value approaching almost \$3 billion—of which India has received \$245 million. This distribution has checked hunger and starvation, and shows the worth of the people-to-people approach.

There is no one best way to help a nation that needs assistance. I am sure we will keep on doing what we have been doing—but let us hope that our efforts will be reinforced by the efforts of many others. The consortium program outlined by President Johnson in his special Indian food aid message is a sound step toward building a grand alliance of nations to do battle with our greatest enemy—hunger.

I offered an amendment to the landmark food-for-peace legislation last year expressing the sense of the Congress that we should expand such international food efforts. I was most gratified that the committee approved this amendment, and that it became a part of the new law. The President's consortium proposal is fully within the spirit of this congressional declaration, and will receive, I hope, our widespread support.

Also most encouraging is President Johnson's continued emphasis on the priority of self-help in hungry nations, together with his positive report on the progress India has already achieved. I have stressed for almost 2 years that the key to narrowing the gap between

population growth and food production is an intensive effort to help food-deficient nations develop agricultural self-sufficiency. To that end I offered amendments to the food-for-peace legislation and the foreign aid bill last year to provide greater U.S. emphasis on encouraging adaptive agricultural research in food-short countries. Both were adopted by the Congress. I proposed an amendment allowing use of excess soft currencies for agricultural development, which was also adopted. I am therefore happy the President continues to emphasize this most important area of self-help, recognizing that U.S. food aid—whether alone or jointly—can be no more than a temporary expedient tiding nations over the dangers of outright starvation and famine.

### THE CONSULAR CONVENTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann and Mr. Art Buchwald are two columnists of distinction whose methods of impressing their thoughts on American readers are generally quite different. In this morning's Washington Post, however, Mr. Buchwald is quite serious and he is writing on the same subject as Mr. Lippmann—the proposed consular convention before this body.

The Lippmann column draws its message from testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations this week of two eminently qualified men, George Kennan and Edwin Reischauer and states that the Consular Convention has been blown up into a test of whether or not the United States can proceed to work out better relations with the Soviet Union.

Mr. Buchwald gives us a somewhat humorous, yet serious, look at the reasons being bandied about for not approving the treaty; namely, that it would create a problem for the Federal Bureau of Investigation by infesting major cities with new spy networks officially established through consulates. With his usual wit, Mr. Buchwald has deflated the argument, just as Mr. Lippmann has given us serious food for thought on the course of action this Nation should follow not only with respect to Soviet Russia, but with Asian nations as well.

I ask unanimous consent that both these columns be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### TODAY AND TOMORROW: TWO LEADING AUTHORITIES

(By Walter Lippmann)

In its substance the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union, which is now up for ratification by the Senate, is of relatively minor practical significance. All it would do is make trade and tourist travel between the two countries safer and more convenient. It has no real relation to the question of espionage. But because of the opposition to it, including that of the Director of the FBI, the ratification of this Convention has been blown up into a test of whether or not the United States can proceed to work out better relations with the Soviet Union.

The contest over ratification turns on a question of great importance to the whole conduct of U.S. foreign policy. It is whether international communism is still essentially the same conspiracy which it was understood to be 20 years ago after World War II. The

hard opponents of the Consular Convention believe that the Soviet Union today is no different than it was in the time of Lenin or Stalin. The hard proponents of the escalated war in Vietnam believe that the real adversary is the international communism of the post war era.

This week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has heard testimony on these questions from two distinguished diplomats and scholars. The first was George Kennan who is generally regarded as the leading American authority on Soviet communism. The second witness was Edwin Reischauer, until recently our Ambassador to Japan, who has known the Far East all his life.

Kennan told the Senate Committee that the 24-year-old pictures of communism was no longer a true picture. Reischauer told the Committee that the current official conception of our relations with Asia is mistaken, both as to the power and the threat of China and as to the power and influence of the United States.

If Kennan and Reischauer are right, then a successful foreign policy cannot be formed in this country until there has been a re-education of our people, starting with our officials.

"Many of us would be helped in our thinking about the problems of Soviet-American relations," said Kennan, "if we could free ourselves from the abnormal sensitivities and reflexes to which the extreme tensions of earlier decades have led and teach ourselves to think about Russia as simply another great world power with its own interests and concerns, often necessarily in conflict with our own but not tragically so—a power different in many respects, but perhaps no longer in essential ones, from what Russia would have been had there been no Communist revolution in that country 50 years ago.

Reischauer's testimony was deeply at variance with the current official conception of our role in Asia. He told the Committee that "we should seek to minimize our military involvement and military commitments in Asia." In saying this he was adhering to the classic American doctrine of no land war on the Asian continent, which was breached by President Kennedy and completely abandoned by President Johnson and Secretary Rusk.

As against Secretary Dulles and Secretary Rusk Reischauer said "we should not try to induce most Asian countries to align themselves formally with us."

He said "we should not sponsor political, social, or economic change in Asian countries, though we should be responsive to requests from them for aid . . . We run serious and unwarranted dangers when we take the initiative in sponsoring important internal changes in Asian lands or when our influence becomes so preponderant that we assume responsibility for the existence or nature of a regime."

These are weighty utterances which cannot easily be dismissed. They should not be ignored and every effort must be made to acquaint our people with them. For it would be impossible to name any two living Americans who can speak with greater or even with comparable authority about the problems confronting us with the Soviet Union and with the countries of Asia.

#### WHERE HAVE ALL THE SPIES GONE?

(By Art Buchwald)

As one of J. Edgar Hoover's most ardent admirers, I was very surprised to read of the FBI Director's stand on a proposed United States-Soviet consular treaty. It seems the Administration wants the treaty because it would mean that we could have consulates in several cities throughout the Soviet Union. In exchange the Soviet Union could set up consulates in U.S. cities on a *quid pro quo* basis.

The treaty has had tough going in the