

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)

6. An unalterable policy of all school personnel must be one which will insure the gradual mastery of English by all pupils in the schools.

7. Special instructional programs for these students are not designed to isolate them, nor are they established to make better Mexicans of them. These programs propose to develop a more positive self-concept in these students. Therefore, measures should be taken to help these students gain a pride in their ancestral culture and language. Through these programs their educational opportunities will be enhanced and this will help them mature into more worthy and more valuable American citizens.

8. The ultimate success of any educational program is intimately related to the aptitude, the professional preparation, and the attitude of the individual teacher. It is strongly recommended that schools recruit more Spanish-speaking teachers and aids.

9. Schools, colleges and universities must conduct research in bilingual education. They must train special teachers to meet this special challenge. They must also develop materials which will be used in the more imaginative and realistic programs for the Spanish-speaking child.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been most valuable in promoting better education in America. But it is not enough by itself. There are still countless districts and schools which have not yet received the help they so urgently need. The Federal Government must assume the responsibility of providing economic aid which will stimulate guided innovation and research at the state, as well as at the local level, as recommended to and by the NEA-Tucson Survey.

NEED FOR A NATIONAL URBAN DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on April 28, Mr. Jonathan Lindley, a Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce, delivered a most interesting paper before the National Planning Association on the subject of "The Economic Environment and Urban Development." Mr. Lindley, who was formerly a staff member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, has pointed out that we need to have a national policy to order future urban growth. During the decade of the 1950's, 10 million people migrated from rural to urban areas and a similar population movement is expected during the 1960's. Many of these migrants are pouring into our already overcrowded large central cities creating problems of unemployment and social disorganization.

Regardless of the future pattern of urban growth, it is absolutely imperative that we formulate an adequate national urban development policy. We cannot continue to pour money into our cities without an increasingly critical examination of the underlying economic and population trends affecting urban growth.

What is true in housing and urban development is no less true for other domestic programs. We must have rational planning, based on the best and most pertinent data available, which takes into account social as well as economic considerations. In this connection, I have introduced proposed legislation providing for a Council of Social Advisers, and an annual social report by the President.

Mr. Lindley's remarks are especially pertinent to the need which my bill seeks to meet; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Paper by Jonathan Lindley, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy Coordination, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, presented to Eighth Annual Conference Center for Economic Projections, National Planning Association, April 28, 1967)

The subject of this panel is general enough to permit a participant to choose from a wide range of subjects. I intend to explore some of the *determinants of our physical and social environment*; how they have changed in the past; and how and why they will change in the future.

I should add that I do not approach this subject as a simon-pure social scientist, but merely as a harassed bureaucrat who takes comfort in that paradoxical admonition, "never let the facts stand in the way of the truth". Much of what I have to say rests on a shaky foundation of fact and data. Much is simple observation and intuition. However, from this assortment of information and reflections, I hope to provide a viewpoint which may help to predict more accurately our future physical environment needs.

ESTIMATING FUTURE NEEDS

Our physical and social environment is affected by the places where people live and work. Given modern technology, it tends to be the human environment that shapes the physical environment rather than the reverse process which is more characteristic of technologically primitive societies.

By definition, much of our physical and social environment is *locationally oriented or determined*. Many of the physical and social environmental problems and needs of the next decade will be shaped by the way of life—in terms of location—that our population will choose in the future; or by the way of living that the *population will be forced* to choose because of the forces affecting population migration and location.

Attempts to define physical environmental needs through estimates of population growth and composition that are solely aggregative in character may obscure many, if not most, of the problems of the physical environment that are caused by the shifts in location of that total population over time.

Therefore, in order to look ahead intelligently and plan for—or as the case may be, against—the future physical environment, we need some estimate of not just the gross population growth and the composition of that population in the future, but some idea of where that population will be located—in the rural hinterlands, in the major urban complexes, or elsewhere—and perhaps more importantly why the population will locate in those places. Once we have an estimate about the location of the future population—and perhaps more importantly the determinants affecting that location pattern—then we may be in a better position to predict, understand, influence, and perhaps control the future problems of our physical environment. To establish the framework for an adequate policy for the future physical environment, there are four issues which I intend to discuss:

The trends in the location of people and the influence of jobs;

Some causes of job and population migration;

The resulting need for an integrated economic-urban development policy;

Some implications for investment in physical and social facilities.

THE LONGRUN TREND: THE LOCATION OF JOBS AND PEOPLE

Because of the rapid growth in productivity in agriculture and the depletion of mineral and other resources in many rural hinterland areas, over 10 million persons migrated in the 1950-1960 decade from the rural areas to urban areas.

There is every indication that the growth in productivity in agriculture and extractive industries will continue over the next 10 years and consequently that the migration of people from rural to urban areas will also continue.

Because the future location of both people and job opportunities is crucial to the Department of Commerce's area and regional economic development mission, the Economic Development Administration is attempting to generate some rough estimates which would indicate the future nature and location of areas of potentially high and persistent unemployment. To do this requires estimating future employment and population trends and disaggregating these national trends in order to analyze a subnational or area economy.

Some of the preliminary results of EDA's projections on the location of jobs and people are now available. From these estimates, EDA has derived some indication of the relationship between county size and projected employment growth rate for the period of 1960-1975. The following table summarizes that data:

Relations between county size and projected employment growth rate for 1960-75¹

1960 counties or local governments with population of—	Number of counties	Percent with projected employment growth less than the national average
Less than 10,000.....	823	82
10,000 to 50,000.....	1,652	71
50,000 to 100,000.....	292	28
100,000 to 500,000.....	239	25
500,000 to 1,000,000.....	49	65
Over 1,000,000.....	16	87

¹ Assuming 4 percent national average unemployment rate.

The results are quite startling.

They show that job growth in both low population counties and counties with a large population, such as counties containing or included in major urban complexes, will be at a much lower rate than that of the national average. On the other hand, those counties of moderate size, with a population of 50,000 through 500,000 will have a job growth rate significantly greater than the national average.

However, the data in Table I is aggregated in terms of county or local government units, and for many purposes it would be very helpful to know what the future population migration and job location specifics would be for major metropolitan areas since they include such a large percent of our total population, and what the future trends for job and population location might be *within* the major urban complexes in the next decade. Therefore a second set of estimates (under different assumptions) was made of both population and job growth in the major urban complexes. The question asked was: "Assuming no migration occurred into or out of major complexes of over 1 million population, what would be the relationship between future jobs and future population both for major metropolitan complexes and within these metropolitan complexes?" Table II summarizes the data from these projections.

Short-fall of jobs in major urban areas assuming no migration—Urban complexes of over 1,000,000 population, 1966-75 migration required to balance people with jobs, assuming 4-percent rate of unemployment

[Millions of people]

	Total		Exclud- ing Cali- fornia, 25 largest complexes
	10 largest com- plexes	29 largest com- plexes	
1975 population if no migration occurs into or out of the complexes	63.0	96.6	72.6
Migration required by 1976 to balance people and jobs, total	-4.0	-4.6	-7.1
Cities less suburbs and outer ring counties	-5.9	-7.4	-8.4
Associated suburbs and outer ring counties	+1.9	+2.8	+1.3
Migration ¹ required to balance jobs and people as percent of 1975 population	-6.3	-4.8	-9.8
Comparable 1950-60 migration rate (percent)	+6.5	+10.0	+6.1

¹ + indicates in-migration; - indicates out-migration.

THE POTENTIAL MISMATCH OF JOBS AND PEOPLE

Again the results are startling.

The data suggests that the major urban complexes face a serious problem of providing their population with jobs in the future and therefore that a large-scale economic adjustment process is going to have to take place *within* the urban complexes. The data leads us to this conclusion even though the data has been based on the most optimistic assumption of no additional migration to our major cities. Indeed, the estimates indicate that in order to achieve an unemployment rate of 4 percent, there must be a net outmigration of population of 6.3 percent from our ten largest urban complexes and 4.8 percent from our 29 largest complexes over the period 1960-1975. This substantial imbalance exists even while taking into account the offsetting growth of jobs in the suburbs of these cities.

Moreover, if we relax the "no migration" assumption underlying the figures in Table II, the problem looms even larger. Some other studies have shown that the rural poor will continue to go to the major cities although perhaps at a somewhat slower migration rate. It is this segment of the migrant group that has great difficulty in preparing to cope with and surmount the economic, cultural, and social environment of the central city.

In short, it appears that there may be a major mismatch in the future of the projected location of people and jobs in most major urban centers.

I do not pretend to be either a statistician or an econometrician. However, imperfect these estimates may be, if they at least tend in the right direction they signal difficulties ahead. Our success in attempting to overcome the problems of the unemployed, the poor, and the minorities will hinge to a considerable extent on solving the predicted locational job population mismatch. In a broad sense, the estimates begin to define the trend in future urban, social, and economic problems.

In the future, relatively few new employment opportunities will be created in or around urban places of 20,000 or less population. Most jobs will be created in communities of 50,000 or more population. Therefore one ought to look at the future national "jobs" landscape as a system of urban places.

SOME CAUSES OF POPULATION AND JOB LOCATION

Again, reverting to the role of an observer of the scene rather than a social scientist,

it seems to me that the following factors have been important and will continue to be important in determining the location of people and jobs.

1. Rural unemployed and underemployed are attracted to the large cities because they feel that the number of job alternatives would be maximized in a large city, even though the probability of their finding a job may in fact be the same or higher in the smaller urban areas. Migrants seek the large urban centers with the greatest number of job alternatives because they do not have even primitive information about job opportunities elsewhere. There is no adequate system of employment vacancy information. If there were an adequate national job information system, and if migration were based on job need alone, preferences for relocation might be quite different.

2. Small towns and villages are losing their economic function as local agricultural or other market distribution centers. The spatial dimension of the local agricultural market has changed drastically in the last 30 years. Farmers no longer sell their products to outlets in local markets. They now sell their products in regional or national markets. Both advanced farm technology and improved transportation systems have caused drastic changes in the location and manner in which agricultural products are sold or processed.

In a similar manner, the "trade centers" for other rural-based economic activities have shifted away from small towns to larger urban centers. An examination of the changes in size of urban places over the last 15 years corroborates this thesis. Small towns and villages, under 10,000-20,000 population, are disappearing except as residential or special purpose satellites of larger communities.

3. Historically, many agricultural communities have ill-treated the poor and especially the Negroes. On the other hand, big cities have traditionally attracted the impoverished and the minority groups. Consequently the Negroes have flocked to the large cities because a friendly (Negro) community exists there. In this manner migration to large cities becomes self-reinforcing.

In a very real sense, Negroes are following normal patterns of past minority groups that have made their betterment from an urban base. However, there is one important difference. This wave of urban in-migration does not have the prospect for job growth that the earlier waves have had owing to the move of the old urban industries that offered work for the unskilled out of the central city.

4. Finally, large urban areas have the welfare and public relief services necessary for temporary support of a migrant in an alien social climate. Some form of public assistance is necessary to tide over the migrant poor until they succeed in finding jobs. Few such amenities exist in rural towns. As I have said, many small rural towns have shown hostility rather than empathy for the disadvantaged.

Indeed, some economists have argued that the increased rate of urbanization that apparently has taken place recently has not been in response to attractive economic advantages in the large cities. Rather, this increased urbanization is the result of the very severe economic and social pressures in the rural areas. In other words, it has been the *push of poor rural conditions rather than the pull of urban economic opportunities*.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE LARGE CITIES

At the same time that the large flow of migrants has moved and very likely will continue to move from the hinterlands to urban complexes, crucial changes have been and are being effected in the economic environment of the large metropolitan areas. Again, it is the dynamic changes *within* these complexes that will define the physical en-

vironment of tomorrow. Some of the factors responsible for these dynamic changes are:

1. **Changing Industrial Location Factors**—Traditionally, industrial location has been determined largely by both a closeness to raw or processed materials and by a closeness to final markets. With a new kind of goods and services being produced in the new growth industries and with the improvement in transport facilities, traditional plant location criteria are becoming less important. Increasingly, location decisions are determined by the availability of urban amenities such as good water and sewer systems, good schools, vocational training facilities, and junior and technical colleges.

2. **Changing Industrial Technology**—A number of factors have been working to change the economic function of the central city. As industries using unskilled and semiskilled labor have become increasingly mechanized, there has been a shift in production techniques from those that could be accomplished in multi-story loft buildings to techniques that require single-story production lines and extensive plant and land sites. Land costs in the central city have driven these industries to the suburbs and elsewhere, but these are the very industries offering the greatest potential source of jobs of semiskilled migrants settling in the urban complexes.

3. **Transportation**—The Interstate highway system has also had a substantial effect on the economic and industrial face of the central city. As the circumferential highway networks around major cities are being completed, with radials coming into the city, many urban industries are moving to the suburbs. The traditional reason for locating distribution activities within the city was fast access to the total metropolitan area. But now it is easier to serve a large urban area from the rim of a circumferential highway in suburbia than it is from the congested hub of a metropolitan area.

4. **Costs of Services**—As our large cities continue to grow it appears that there are substantial diseconomies of scale. Costs of public services tend to rise far more rapidly once the city reaches a multi-million population. This either contributes to a rapid tax increase or to a decrease in the quality of public services, or to both. At any rate, these increased costs have been a major factor in encouraging industry to relocate in suburban areas.

5. **Efficient Industries for Central Cities**—The new or expanding industries in the city have tended to be those that either use land intensively, can be housed in high rise buildings, and/or those that require face to face or personal contact daily to carry out their functions. These latter are typified by most of the professions. These growth industries in the central cities require, in general, a high level of academic and/or technical skills. They are, in short, white collar jobs with relatively high entrance requirements. On the other hand, major opportunities for unskilled migrants predominantly occur in low paid temporary service type jobs, offering little opportunity to accumulate sufficient resources or skills for upward mobility.

THE SUBURBS—TECHNOLOGY, ECONOMICS AND PLANNING

Although the suburbs are actively seeking the relocation of business firms from the central city, the economics of suburban life discourages migration of the rural unskilled and semi-skilled to the suburbs. Some of these factors are:

1. **Costs of Physical Plant**—Each new migrant to suburbia tends to require an increase in public plant and equipment, such as, schools, roads, water and services. There is no excess capacity of these public services. It has been estimated that each new migrant requires an investment in public facilities of tens of thousands of dollars. In the cities, on the other hand, the spatial dimension of

public facilities is fixed—new roads do not need to be built, water and sewer lines do not need to be extended. They are simply utilized more intensively, although, to be sure, in many cases, with sharply increasing marginal costs. Also because of the changing age composition of a fairly stable population size, there may be excess capacity in some types of facilities.

2. *Traditional Land Use Patterns*—The shape of configuration of the American city, particularly the old industrial cities of the east, is in a sense unique. Most of the older cities in other countries are extremely compact. This physical outlay was decreed by the need for a compact or a high density system to protect against attack by enemies. However, in the eastern part of the United States, the threat of the Indian attack disappeared at a very early stage in our nation's urban development thus allowing a spilling over from traditional city boundaries.

Secondly, there has been a pattern of "land sprawl" in our suburbs, encouraged by such institutions as FHA mortgage insurance.

Finally, many American cities "developed"—grew rapidly—at the height of the age of mass transportation, during the age of the great rapid trolley systems of 1890-1930.

All of these factors have encouraged low density patterns for residential purposes outside the central city and resulted in an inefficient and costly system of personal living facilities.

3. *The Intellectual Bias of Planners*—Moreover, in the past land-use planning in the U.S. has had an intellectual bias. Good land planning has meant large lots for individual homes and much open space. This is probably an historical reaction to the crowded and degraded industrial cities of the industrial revolution. In short "good planning" has meant a system of low density land use—the attempt to recreate, according to Frank Lloyd Wright, the English manor house on millions of quarter acre lots. "Good zoning" has traditionally made inexpensive housing for lower skilled workers extremely difficult to build in suburbia. In the opinion of some observers, zoning and other devices of local government have been used deliberately as effective tools to exclude minority groups from suburbia.

However, even in the absence of any overt or active policy or discrimination, the economics of suburbia coupled with traditional precepts of good land use planning mitigate against the assimilation of any core city population that is attempting to relocate near the industry which has moved to or developed in suburbia.

In short, the economics of suburban settlement tend to drive the migrant from the rural hinterlands into the core city even though his potential employment opportunities may rest elsewhere.

AN INTEGRATED URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY

There is widespread agreement that local problems of environmental control such as air and water pollution cannot be dealt with in a local context. We understand that to deal adequately with such pollution problems we need some sort of a national or regional policy framework. However, it is not at all clear we fully comprehend that many of the other problems of physical development cannot be resolved on a local basis. It is true that there is now a wide-spread recognition that many problems of the cities must be approached from a metropolitan-area point of view and that some limited forms of metro-government or metro-authorities are essential. However, as I have tried to illustrate, for those problems of the physical environment that relate to the location of people and the places that they work, even metro-area concepts are far too small to provide an adequate base for planning future needs and analyzing future problems.

In short, we need a national urban-economic development policy framework that addresses itself to the question of how and where can future population growth be assimilated in the most efficient manner.

Framework for a national policy

In view of limited resources any national policy that is developed should be based on *prescriptive rather than curative* premises. Future urban America should be viewed as a system where people will *work* as well as *live*. A policy for a national urban-rural balance based on this view should be guided by the following constraints and conditions:

1) The low income and unemployed are not leaving rural areas fast enough to assure high levels of employment and income in the rural areas.

2) The unskilled and semi-skilled tend to migrate to the core or central city.

3) New jobs are not going to be created in our major urban centers to soak up this migration.

4) The "growth" industries of the central city essentially require white collar and technical employees.

5) Industrial job opportunities for unskilled or semi-skilled are moving from the central city to suburbia and smaller urban areas.

6) It appears that the *minimum size* of the community that can provide employment opportunities is growing. Economic development based on high productivity industries requires a minimum or agglomeration of infrastructure and complementary economic activities from which a take-off to sustained growth can be made. Small towns of less than 25,000 to 50,000 in general do not appear likely to achieve that scale.

7) Smaller towns particularly those under 10,000 to 20,000 population then will have difficulty in surviving as employment centers although they may be successful as limited-purpose small towns such as retirement villages, recreation and vacation communities near the mountains and water, and bedroom satellite communities of the larger urban centers.

8) At the same time, it may be that multi-million population urban complexes suffer from such massive growing pains that the marginal costs of living or doing business are climbing so sharply so as to discourage future economic growth.

Multi-million population centers are seeking massive external financial assistance to survive. It may not be a wise investment to pay the costs of any *further growth*—or the costs of attempting to create employment opportunities on a massive scale in these complexes.

In short, it appears that there is a *maximum size* in terms of economic efficiency for cities—and if these thoughts and propositions have any validity, it may be highly inefficient to pump in massive external assistance to help maintain the *economic growth* of our large cities.

Of course cities will need help for many other purposes such as to renovate blighted and decayed physical structures. There are many sound reasons for extending external aid to cities other than to generate economic growth and jobs in the urban cores. However, perhaps future financial assistance to such cities should be predicted on their undertaking other steps such as massive education and training efforts to assist the city population to find jobs elsewhere.

Three choices: Suburbia, new towns, growth centers

Essentially, there are the three types of urban places where the growth of employment opportunities could be accelerated for rural (and possibly urban) migrants.

Suburbia: As far as suburban employment opportunities are concerned, the most pressing need here is the provision of adequate housing within reasonable commuting dis-

tance from suburban employment locations. There probably is no need to provide assistance to establish employment opportunities on the periphery of the great urban centers. These centers and their peripheries have a very powerful economic development growth-dynamic that is self-sustaining.

New towns: A new town policy is being vigorously pursued in England and other places to relieve the over population and congestion of the great urban centers. These "overspill" cities are designed to house or support *relocated* population of the great urban centers. Although new towns have received much publicity and strong support from the planning profession, they have not been entirely successful. There are basically three reasons:

First, they are essentially a planning device. Inadequate attention has been devoted to developing the employment base of the new towns. Location decisions for new towns have not been made to maximize the possibility of new industrial development.

Second, new towns seem to be designed to appeal to people already living in—and attached to—urban centers.

Third, in terms of physical design, there tends to be monotonous repetitiveness. Charles Abrams, the American planner, has commented, "I never have seen a planned community I wanted to live in." In short, they tend to be dull places in which to live—often lacking the excitement of the "downtown".

In England, at least, new towns have been extremely expensive to create requiring a public investment of \$15,000 to \$20,000 per family. Again, using England as an example, government controls over private investment are used to try to direct industrial growth into new towns. This is a policy instrument that is not likely to be used in the United States.

Attempts at new towns in the United States have not yet been successful. Reston has been growing slowly and for the near future will tend to be a bedroom community—not a new town with a self-sustaining economy. Columbia, although planned as a community with an internal economy, is still in its infancy. In addition, U.S. new towns have been catering to and probably must cater to the middle to upper income groups. Perhaps in time we will learn enough about the economies of new towns to make them an effective instrument of national employment and urban development policy.

Certainly we should not give up on new towns. However, the difficulties in aggregating sufficient land-holdings to build new city-economies near to existing metro areas mitigate against a national policy that relies heavily on new towns to soak up both the new and moving population in the next 10 to 15 years. New towns are technically feasible. It remains to be seen if they are economically feasible.

Growth Center Strategy: It is the cities of 50,000-500,000 in population that have already shown the greatest potential for job growth. Using them as a strong point, it makes good sense to build a growth center strategy on that natural economic growth process.

The growth center strategy is an attempt through public policy to reinforce the natural growth in population and employment of many of the urban communities of 50,000 through 500,000 and to attempt to divert the future flow of rural migrants to them away from the center city of the large cities. Already, there exists a substantial literature about the need to focus regional development efforts around so-called growth centers. The European countries, Canada, and the Appalachian Regional Commission are pursuing some form of regional economic development policy that relies on a growth center strategy.

However, these efforts in the U.S. are still in their infancy. Moreover, they are isolated

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