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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 ideas and advise on the state's interests. The center could become a clearing house for local factors. In most instances an evolutionary approach will probably be needed moving from some kind of informal association or voluntary organization to something that would be a legal expression of a local decision-making body with powers to act on local regional problems. In other cases, it may be advisable to establish a wide 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 the Boroughs which shall be established in the State shall be divided into boroughs... The standards shall include population, geography, history, to share resources and other factors. Each borough shall embrace an area and population with common interests to the maximum degree possible... Each Borough shall have one vote and 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 qualified voters resident outside such boroughs."

"The (state) legislature shall provide for the performance of services it seems necessary or advisable allowing for maximum local participation for regional governmental units or agencies, and review of proposal for metropolitan area or regional governmental units or agencies, and review of proposal for metropolitan area or regional governmental units or agencies, and review of proposal for..."

With this thought in mind I welcome the recommendations of President John Kennedy. These, as a part of the regional scale will provide a first vital step towards the actions that must come. Here, within this framework, the counties, the boroughs, cities, can take place, common problems can be recognized and solutions can be hammered out. Planning at the regional scale can be done in a new and systematic fashion. 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 John Kennedy, as a part of the regional scale 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 has been 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 contributed to hungry 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 in 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, public health, education, and international—the United States has distributed commodities having a cost value approaching almost $3 billion—which India has received $245 million. This disaster relief has helped to reduce 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 out-

The CONSENSUAL CONVENTION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Mr. Walter Lippmann and Mr. Art Buchwald are two columnists of distinction whose views on foreign relations are widely read in America and whose methods of impressing their thoughts on American readers are generally quite different. In this morning's Washington Post, however, Mr. Buchwald is quite aware, and he is writing in the un concessional 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 course of action this Nation should give us serious food for thought on the these columns be printed in the RECORD.

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: TWO LEADING AUTHORITY

(Statement of Rev. Edward A. Keller, S.C.S.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as chairmain of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it is my privilege to present a hearing on my bill, S. 49, the Gold Miners Revitalization Act, and S. 615, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern].

AN ECONOMIST TAKES SENSE ON HOW TO REVITALIZE THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY
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The hearing is being held under the authority of the Senate to work out a detente with the Soviet Union.

If the Senate turns down the consular treaty, it will be in effect telling Hoover a much needed rest, I would be the last to criticize them.

The only thing that worries me is that without fresh ideas, where will the FBI get new plots for its television series?
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ing smokestacks, soft-coal furnaces in homes and buildings, coal-burning engines, and coal-carrying barges on the Monongahela.

On that last week of October, 1948, there was one other ingredient: A weather freak that meteorologists call a "temperature inversion." The combination of a free air temperature and a ground temperature generates a stagnant air below it. It could not rise or blow out.

Donora was airtight in its polluted pocket for a few days.

Normally, warm air rises to the cooler atmosphere above, carrying many pollutants with it. During a temperature inversion, a lid of hot air prevents this circulation. Temperature inversions are not common. But neither are they forgotten, particularly in the lovely Indian Summer days of late fall and early winter. This small steel town is pocketed amid 500-foot-high bluffs on a sharp horsehoe bend in the twisting Monongahela 30 miles south of Pittsburgh. Poisoned air can't move out if there is a temperature inversion.

"It's like putting a lid on a kettle," Mrs. Miller explains. She remembers watching the borough's Halloween parade on a Friday night of the smog.

"It was murky and hard to see," Mrs. Miller recalls. "I was a member of the church choir and we had sung at a funeral that day. I was cold andhard to climb the hill. I put on a handkerchief over my mouth and nose. The air was acrid. I could feel it in my nostrils and down my throat. The handkerchief was black when I reached home."

The next morning Mrs. Miller and her husband, Mr. Miller, were both sick.

"We drove out of the garage and there were white tire marks in the black-coated ground," Mrs. Miller said. "We then worked in a zinc plant, remember the gray smoke that seeped into the offices so the office girls became sick with 'zinc plant jitters.'"

But by the fourth night of Donora's smog siege, it was clear it wasn't the normal fall haze. People were collapsing on the streets and in their homes.

John Volk was Donora's fire chief then and still is, as wary as ever. He was busy sending out inhalators and oxygen tanks on the Friday night of the town.

"Suddenly it struck me that the cars wouldn't idle. There wasn't enough oxygen in the air.

On Saturday night it started to sprinkle, and a Sunday rain washed out the dirty air. Funerals of the victims—five women and 15 men, most elderly with cardiac or respiratory histories—were held Tuesday after two days of drenching rain.

As Rudolph Schweria, who then ran the largest funeral parlor in Donora and is now retired, likes to recall later: "I think I have never seen such a beautiful blue sky or such a shining sun or such perfect weather. In the town cemetery seemed to have color. I kept looking up all day."

The following Monday, Donora held a meeting. A state of emergency had been declared.

The zinc plant cut back operations for several weeks. A town ordinance forbade refuse-burning in backyards. The mills agreed to drop all tumor emission on smokestacks. About 40 smog victims got an expense-free vacation in North Carolina.

Then people went back to work and their daily routine.

Today heavy black smoke pours from one of Donora's mills. "It keeps the children warm. Soft coal is easier on the taxpayer," Mrs. Costa explains.

Today Donora lives in the reality of a dwindling industry and the need for jobs and factories. The smog of two decades ago is not forgotten but it is something in the past.

"It would be sad if we hadn't learned something from the tragedy," says Mrs. Miller.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, this week's issue of The Machinist, the publication of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, reports that the AFL-CIO's executive council has expressed enthusiastic support for President Johnson's Right of Privacy Act. This support is, indeed, welcomed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the March 2, 1967, article published in The Machinist:

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

LAW APPLIES BAN ON BUGGING

The AFL-CIO Executive Council has expressed "enthusiastic support" for President Lyndon B. Johnson's far-reaching proposal to ban electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping.

If enacted by Congress, the President's proposal would prohibit employer bugging and wiretapping of workers on the job. According to the Wall Street Journal such snooping is increasing.

One national detective agency was recently quoted as reporting that its undercover operations are up 10 percent over a year ago.

Phones of employees with access to company secrets are commonly tapped, the American Chemical Society, reported.

It seems that most of the people of Donora had grown accustomed to the acrid air and had "learned to live with it," Mrs. Miller recalls. The time they were told to move to a clean area was "very frightening."

It seems that most of the people of Donora had grown accustomed to the acrid air and had "learned to live with it," Mrs. Miller recalls. The time they were told to move to a clean area was "very frightening."

The Wall Street Journal reported, "In a statement made at its mid-winter meeting, the Council noted that "successive constitutional conventions of the AFL-CIO have reiterated the concern of American labor for full protection and protection of the right of privacy."

Existing law on this subject, the statement continued, is "totally unsatisfactory," partly because of the development of new types of bugging and partly because of the way the Department of Justice interprets the law.

The Council said that labor welcomes and endorses the proposals sent to Congress by President Johnson and the Attorney General.

The proposals would ban all wiretapping and mechanical and electronic eavesdropping, whether by labor or law enforcement officials or private citizens.

The sole exception would be that the President could authorize wiretapping and eavesdropping by Federal security agencies in circumstances where he finds the security of the nation to be at stake.

Even then, no evidence so obtained could be used in any court.

AMERICAN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS ATTACKS WORLD FOOD PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to another dramatic and positive step toward the accomplishment of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

On Friday, February 24, 1967, a vital new program in the war against hunger was initiated by the signing of a commitment between the Agency for International Development and the Pillsbury Co. of Minneapolis.

A fact of life—daily becoming more acutely discernible—is that population is rising at a much faster rate than food production. The result is deprivation and suffering and the undermining of efforts to promote economic and social progress.

World per capita food production is declining and is now less than it was in the 1930's.

Even at realistic maximum rates of world food production, including our country and its surpluses, total food output will probably be insufficient to prevent mass starvation in several of the lesser developed countries in the coming years and for years.
lish quantities of marginal food components, particularly for the young and the expectant mothers.

The area for initial work will be undertaken in El Salvador. That country has accomplished great gains under the Agricultural Adjustment and Progress Act and has been one of the more important elements figuring in the success of the Central American Common Market which has been characterized by President Johnson as "one of the most promising innovations in the developing world."

CNP—Pillsbury's "complete nutrition food"—will be produced in El Salvador as a formulated drink using judgment of equipment and facilities available there and will be composed of protein materials which can be produced in ready supply in the Central American area, such as cotonnose, peanuts, and soybeans. Local Salvadoran labor will be used and the plant and business will be financed in part by Salvadoran capital. All this has been a greater measure of self-help by the people of El Salvador in the development of their own economy.

President Johnson recently asserted: "I am pleased, indeed, to offer my congratulations and best wishes to the people of El Salvador, the Pillsbury Co., and the Agency for International Development for success in this unique undertaking. For many years I have been in favor of developing what I call the immeasurable problems of food production that are developing ahead of us."

HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. NOUYE. Mr. President, William H. Ewing, of Honolulu, editor-con­

founded Honolulu Star-Bulletin, is one of Hawaii's finest journalists.

Bill Ewing is a "newspaperman's newspaperman" who writes with great style and clarity. For many years he was managing editor and editor of Hawaii's largest newspaper.

This week, Bill Ewing paid tribute to a fallen giant in the field of American Jour­

nalism—Henry R. Luce.

I ask unanimous consent that Bill Ewing's reminiscences of Mr. Luce be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 4, 1967]

HE WAS A PRO

I did not know Henry Luce very well. Well enough to call him Harry without feeling either familiar or presumptuous. I stood somewhat in awe of him. He had accomplished so much in so little time. To have ended his career so soon seemed almost as tragic as his death last Tuesday at 68. In other words, the more creative one has been, the more far-reaching the change when creativity and clarity in a big newspaper is achieved what is given to very few men, the fact of leaving the imprint of himself, his ideas and his personality, on the time he lived in. But after this, the greater the by and watch it slip through his fingers.

Such thoughts occurred to me as I watched him enjoying his grandchildren on the beach at the Outrigger or listening quietly to lesser people who courted the company of a man admired by many, whose style he made no effort to conceal. But he was not old in any sense. He did not talk a great deal. His presence was a great inspiration to speak he spoke immediately.

Once, we were arranging a luncheon for Mr. Edgar Robinson which he likes to talk and talks very well indeed. I offered to invite a general officer known to be highly skilled at the dinner table to carry some of the burden. "Which do we want, the general or the scien­

tist? We can't have two stars," "What about you?" I said. "Oh, me. I just listen." And he did.

Reporters have written that he had talked at them and there is some justification for this criticism. He had a staccato way of speaking with a tone of finality in whatever he said. So far as the reporters were concerned, he probably had been taken over the jumps in the newspapers often enough to justify his wariness. Just as his own publica­

tions bore the weight of his talking. This is a curious thing. Publishers and edito­

tors rarely are willing to talk to reporters.

I am pleased, indeed, to see impres­

sion of a venerable lion, with hair brushed straight back to form a gray mane fram­

ing his angular face with the firmly-set­

ter eyes beneath bushy brows. He was a tall man, probably over six feet, probably over six feet, and not fat. He wore a pair of glasses and a smile, and always had a twinkle.

I thought that he was at his best when a diplomat and not a statesman, as "one­

who writes with great style and clarity."

It's important to see that theU. S. is the only obligation ties to our aid is the

commitment to bring him to what the

international press has called "a visit of

serious people who courted the company of a

famous man. He was slightly..."

He was asked whether he had followed

the 1929. The people who edit it have been

the most remarkable thing about Time

the extent to which he continued to

influence Time's policies after retiring as

the magazine has

changed very little. And this is probably

true. The extent to which he continued to

influence Time's policies after retiring as

editor-in-chief in 1964—to become editorial

chairman—can only be estimated but it must

have been considerable. To observe this

most remarkable thing about Time Maga­

azine is the fact that, over a period of more

than 40 years, it has remained so constant to

the image created in the 1930's by Luce

and his partner, Briton Hadden, who died in

1929. The people who edit it have been

switched many times but the magazine has

changed very little. And this is probably

true because Henry Luce was still around.

Even after his retirement as editor-in­

chief he was asked to anticipate the

course of national and international af­

airs—the important things. For example,

in the summer of 1965 the plans of the Johnson

Administration, then unannounced, for

a big buildup in Vietnam. He believed it

would work, too. He thought the war would

come sooner than it has, that the pressure

simply would be too great for the enemy

to withstand. Of course he was not the

only one who was mistaken. The President,

for example.

He respected Mr. Johnson's strength of

purpose, which was natural, this being one

of his own outstanding characteristics. He

let his regard for the President spill over into other personal areas. Once, ordering

a drink, he asked for Cutty Sark. "That's

what the President drinks," he explained


MR. LUCE, whose talents and accomplish­

ments are many and varied, admired her hus­

band greatly. "Harry is the smartest man I

ever met," she said once. "But I never heard

him talk about intellectual, or know the reason why. You have to put your

reputation as a liberal, a Democratic liberal, as I heard him talk about intellectual, or know the reason why. You have to put your

"Luce had one or two changes of plan after acquiring the Orvist property on Kahala

Avenue, one plan being to raise the old structure and build an entirely new house. Luce

proceeded to a big buildup in time, the strip between the avenue and the

beach might be reserved for apartments. "How long do you think that might be?" he

asked once. "20 years," "Democrat."

I said I didn't know.

Well," he said, "I expect to live longer than 100 years." (This was in the summer of 1966.)

"But I'd like to feel some assurance that for

at least that long I wouldn't have an apart­

ment house going up beside me."
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 strategy to guide us through the alternate limitations that we may 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. And 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.

Without objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

World’s No. 1 Problem: Hunger

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.

Concern over that problem is rapidly extending into many groups in American life and the business community. May I mention the health organizations, foreign policy associations, development economists, and the agricultural press in general. 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 taken for granted in this country. Perhaps too much so.

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 beginning to comprehend the seriousness of the specter of hunger confronting the world.

Already, half the world’s people experience chronic hunger due to 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 regions; almost all of Central America and the Caribbean; and the northern parts of South America.

What is more, population in these areas is increasing faster than agricultural production 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 next generation, through history, we have always been able to more or less keep up with food requirements. Of course, we occasionally were 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, that would be released from the need to produce subsistence foods through in farm mechanization, new advances in plant and soil science.

Moreover, we were encouraged to keep ahead of the number of mouths to feed.

That is no longer true today. In simple 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 greatest, agricultural production is far from keeping pace with the growth in population. The rate of increase in the developing world slow 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 1965, 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 “surplus.” 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 export nations. Developing countries in Africa had a food grain deficit in 1965 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 the growing population.

Population alone is not creating these food shortages. As economic conditions and income opportunities in the developing countries rise, 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 to meet his basic food needs. But in the developed countries, a very high proportion of a man’s wages, perhaps as much as 70 or 80 percent, is spent on food. If the income increase by a few cents a month, he probably will spend most of it for food.

The economic progress has brought increased purchasing power, most of which has been quickly channelled 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 our security, stability, peace, further economic progress—is plain.

If developing countries cannot meet these shortages, or the quality of life, the future of the government food demands, the bill for failure will be paid in political and social unrest among the people, greater content with silent suffering. It will be paid in the attendant economic and social development, in malnutrition—and, eventually, in widespread famine, too.

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 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 meet it, with the help of every friend of freedom.”

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

The developed 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 and planned population control.

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

“Every member of the world community now bears a direct responsibility to help the world face its 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 coordination, more opportunity and equality for all men—how can we realistically expect these things when each day sees four million men die or are debilitated by hunger?

We can’t. And that is why we have no choice but to wage this 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 in our ability to produce enough to meet our own demands, our commercial export requirements, and also fill the increasing supply gap in the countries unable to buy their food requirements.

Even if we could produce enough, none of us could see huge populations building up overseas that would continue to be dependent on relief food shipments from the United States. In the longer run, this would not really contribute to their capacity to be self sufficient.

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
can be provided—the only answer is greater concentration of our efforts to
stimulate agricultural development in the areas in question, so derived from
external food assistance, matched by simul-
taneous efforts to curb population growth.

They are the keys to the problem: increasing farm production, and slowing
down the rate of population growth.

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

If the world had faced an annual two per-
cent increase in population since the time of
Christ—and if there were only two people
in existence at that time—the experts tell us that today the world
would be covered by a layer of hu-
nanity 100 feet deep.

It is obvious that we cannot go on pro-
ducing people at this rate. If we are going to
be the "War on Hunger", food produc-
tion must go up, but population growth
must go down—both are essential.

What we want to say is that man has ac-
cumulated since the beginning of time, with
all the new lands we have had available to
develop and exploit, with all the new tech-
nology 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
that man has accumulation in early years stunts mental and physical
growth, handicapping children who survive.

None of us can afford to ignore the situa-
tion.

Whatever we have been doing, it has not
been enough. The tragic fact is that the world cannot afford to lose much. Things are getting worse, not better.

How long are we willing to let this con-
tinue? We have gross new technological re-
resources. We can do things never before be-
lieved 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
importance of food production in the
future. It took us a span of almost a century.
We haven't that much time to spare, in
giving the job done in the rest of the world.
Our challenge is to speed up this moderniza-
tion process—whatever it takes to get it done.

We are going to have to look at general
government policies and services, including
burdening agricultural innovation and innova-
tions with respect to pricing and producer-
icentes, land tenure, taxes, and agricul-
tural research.

We are going to need greater attention to new
technology, including research, exten-
sion education, with special attention to the
development of improved seeds and livestock
and better practices for their production.

We are going to need vastly stepped-up
physical inputs for production, including
fertilizers, pesticides, better seeds, mechanized
land and services, with appropriate attention to their market-
ning, distribution and cost as well as avail-
ability. Thus, the developing countries must
charge marketing systems, improved transportation and
storage, and the creation of better pro-
duction to the feeding famine.

But above all, we are going to need in-
volvement of farm people of the world them-
selves, continually seeking to help them-
sever.

That is what we in the Agency for Inter-
ational Development are trying to do—
helping nations, 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 govern-
ments alone cannot win this struggle for

We can act as catalysts. We can stimulate
governments and people of the less-devel-
opped countries to do a better job for them-
selves. We can help provide them an opportu-
nity for more effective self-help, by pro-
viding the external assistance they need un-
til the day they can stand on their own feet. 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 prede-
cessor foreign assistance agencies, have
helped to develop the idea that they are self-sufficient or no longer need our
help.

The countries of Western Europe, aided
under the Marshall Plan, now share the bur-
den of Free World assistance to the less-devel-
opped areas.

So does Japan.

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

Millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Lat-
in America have also benefited 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 de-
veloped countries fortunate enough to share
in high living standards and continuing eco-
nomic growth.

One thing stands out in common among the "success stories" of economic develop-
ment. The nations that have been most suc-
cessful in agricultural development, rather, they have given a high priority to
agricultural development.

Other countries have tried to "leapfrog"
too soon into industrial development, with-
out 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 cases of newly industrialized
famines, and a breakdown of the entire investment in econ-
omic 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 hypoe years.

In summary, let me outline a three-point
strategy that is evolving by which both the
inadequacies of development and a new
breakthroughs adapt the catastrophes implicit in recent
trends:

First, the developed world must use its
own knowledge and experience of providing food for the developing world's needs until that world
will be able to feed itself.

Second, the developed world must simul-
taneously do all it can to transfer appli-
able portions of its technology of food pro-
duction to the developing world while also
affording those that are serious about popu-
larly afford the help they need to achieve
and

Third, the developing countries must sacri-
ifice the use of their resources to give the
adequate scale and for as long as necessary
in order to master their own agriculture and
then, with 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
relief, aid research, assistance in 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 co-
ordinated effort to meet our responsibilities
under this strategy, and to mobilize a con-
certed world-wide response, is called the War
on Hunger.

Two major government programs consti-
tute the American arsenal for waging the
War on Hunger:

1. The Foreign Economic Assistance Pro-
gram administered by A.I.D., which furnishes
American skills, commodities and financing
to help developing countries grow more food,
by implementing programs in family planning;
and

2. The Food for Freedom Program, under
which A.I.D., the Department of Agriculture
and the State Department cooperate to use
American food supplies to battle hun-
ger and malnutrition, stimulate agricultural
development, promote economic de-
velopment, and build markets for U.S. farm
products.

To emphasize the importance attached to
this effort and all that it implies—the ele-
ments—food, family planning, nutrition,
agricultural, technical and financial assist-
ance—President Johnson this March created a
new central agency, the Office of World
Hunger, to coordinate the work of government,
private agencies and the American people
in the worldwide fight against hunger.

President Johnson has called the hunger
problem the greatest challenge to the human family except 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 sig-
nificance to the future of the world.

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

To those of us used to abundance, the
suffering of a savage struggle for food and
survival among hundreds of millions or peo-
dles may seem far-fetched. Yet, as Secretary
of State Dean Rusk testified before a Con-
gressional Committee last year, "Unless we act
now to meet the problem of hunger, we may
have to act later to prevent people from
dying of starvation, passively and qufu.

Back through history, if famine existed in
one part of the earth, it barely touched the
rest of its people. That is not longer true. We
live in a new era of rapid communication.

What happens in one quarter of the globe
can be seen instantly by the rest of the world—for the sake of our own security.

Hunger used to be the silent cause 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. Nothing need bother 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 avert destruction?

Can we quibble about the cost, of helping each to win this War on Hunger, when the same are the questions the American people, and people of the developed free world may 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 Committee on the Operation of Government, to make appropriate recommendations to the Congress. In 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.

My reason for 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 doesn’t 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 a year on research and development in its own laboratories, but it does not know exactly how many laboratories it has, what they do, 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’s 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 billion spending of 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 the waste and duplicity is readily at hand. For example, at present there are approximately 33 Federal agencies engaged in 396 consumer protection activities. These agencies are engaged in 296 consumer protection activities.

The deficit of the Post Office has risen from $333 million in 1943 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. Economy, Mr. President, is 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, as follows:

How Your Tax Money Is Wasted

Uncle Sam, still trying to right some of the wrongs imposed on the Quinault 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 Quinault Indians. The first units, completed this winter, boast the latest in gracious, all-electric living-electric water heating, electric washers and dryers and electric hot-water heating.

In February the first seven families abandoned their old shacks and moved into their new dwellings. But one thing was missing: Electricity. The nearest power line was 12 miles away in the community of Queets, and somebody had neglected to consider that you need electricity to bring a livable home into your all-electric home.

The Quinault are a proud 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 is charged the money available for some months to extend the power line to the Indian village.

National Park Service still can’t decide whether it will let the line go underground (the line would cut across Olympia National Park).

Mr. President, the article notes:

Your Tax Money is Wasted. The Government waste? It’s all over the place. But do you know how much?

“The sad fact is the Government has grown so huge you just can’t put your finger on where all the money is being spent.

“We look for waste all the time but it’s elusive. Not even the hardest-working committee of Congress can sort out the many millions of dollars in the General Accounting Office can turn it all up.

“Suffice it to say, we’re doing the very best we can.”

WHY THEY’RE ALARMED

Everyone is alarmed over this proliferating Government waste—the taxpayor, the businessman, many members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Flagrant examples of bungling abound:

Library lodges in Oklahoma, AHA financed, $600,000 in the red. Cost: $10 million.

Housing built so deep in the boondocks that the housing commissioner must go by canoe to open it.

Housing in Maryland, built after Navy ordered the women shipped to Florida. Cost: $1 million.

Misfit locomotives shipped to Thailand. Cost: $1 million.

Groundwork is being laid for a broad-scale investigation by the House Appropriations Committee against wasteful and needless Government spending. Hereforon, such investigations have been undertaken by individual subcommittees, seldom if ever by the full committee itself.

The General Accounting Office, an independent arm of Congress, has been authorized to shift its attack in an effort to unearth even more waste than it has in the past. To boost its already formidable force of 2,200
Some 40,000 university professors are spending all or part of their time exclusively on research for Uncle Sam. This takes them away from the classroom.

At the same time the government spends millions on aid to higher education to produce the same kind of talent to make up for that deficiency.

A similar incongruity exists in the U.S. student exchange program. Thousands of foreign students come to this country to learn and then are unwilling to return home. But we have a way of correcting that. Our Agency for International Development furnishes money to support the very countries hurt by the "brain drain."
Mr. President:

I wish to commend the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Tydings) for his leadership in offering this bill to revitalize public housing. I know the Senator has devoted much time and effort in his search for a proposal to bring the concept of public housing into the '60's. It is a privilege to be a co-sponsor of this bill in the Senate.

The Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has just finished its hearings on the housing bills of 1967. One of the themes that was cited throughout these hearings is the lack of safe, decent, sanitary housing units for our citizens of low income. Although home ownership proposals, where much of our attention was focused this year, will assist to arrest this lack of decent housing, we must realize that the primary source for housing for the low income will for many years be public housing.

We cannot continue to criticize public housing as "high rise public slums," but rather we must attempt to
modernize the program and meet the objections of the critics. This bill is the first major proposal to re-vitalize public housing since 1949. Our ideas, our values, and our standards have changed since 1949, but public housing has not. It is no wonder that there are more and more critics of this program who view it as an outdated concept.

This bill will bring public housing up to date. First, the manner in which we treat public housing tenants will be brought up to date. Instead of viewing him as a recipient of public welfare and as a second-class citizen, this proposal makes clear that he is an equal citizen. It will give the tenant incentive by permitting him to purchase his unit. An increase in self-respect, pride, and a feeling of dignity are the results of home ownership. The first section of this bill will provide the mechanism for home ownership and yet keep the minimum monthly low enough to allow a family with an income of $3,000.00 a year to purchase this unit.

Second, the dwelling units themselves will also be brought up to date. The bill provides for money for the rehabilitation and modernization of public housing. This is over-needed. Some of our public units are a disgrace.
They look like barracks out of World War I or refugee camps. This is a situation that must be altered immediately. These buildings, if left this way, will have to be torn down, which will mean fewer and fewer units for those of low income. Third, the philosophy of public housing is brought up to date. In the past we have centered too much of our attention on the provision of a safe, decent place to live. This is not enough. The public housing dweller, like the middle-class citizen, needs to have a sense of community. This bill will foster such a sense of feeling of community by encouraging the use of resident counsels in planning for social services adjacent to the public housing unit.

Thus, Mr. President, I feel that the major revamping of public housing is necessary. It must be revitalized. This bill attacks the problems of public housing head-on and offers the necessary solutions to modernize the program.