

FOOD FOR FREEDOM

Our Humanitarian Tradition -  
Feb. 2

American Private Enterprise Under  
the Alliance for Progress Attacks  
World Food Problems - March 8

The War on Hunger (By Herb Waters)  
May 19

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 advise on the state's interests. A similar organization would be desirable for federal multi-service centers.

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

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

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

"The (state) legislature shall provide for the performance of services it seems necessary or advisable in unorganized boroughs, allowing for maximum local participation and responsibility . . . Cities . . . shall be a part of the borough in which they are located . . . A home rule borough or city exercise all legislative powers not prohibited by law or by charter . . . Agreements including those for cooperative or joint administration of any functions or powers, government, with the State, or with the United States, unless otherwise provided by law or charter. A city may transfer to the borough in which it is located any of its powers or functions unless prohibited by law or charter, and may in like manner revoke the transfer. . . ."

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

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

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

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

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

During its first two years of existence the Association engaged in various activities re-

lying mainly on voluntary part-time assistance. With the advice of a technical advisory group, ABAG decided to initiate a continuing program of regional planning with permanent staff supported by Federal "701" funds. This program has produced a preliminary regional plan with special consideration given to parks and open space, refuse disposal, shoreline development and transportation.

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

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

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

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

#### OUR HUMANITARIAN TRADITION

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

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

Human nature has changed little in 1,900 years. In areas where hunger and starvation are a grim possibility, order and progress are difficult to maintain.

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

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

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

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

I want to call particular attention to President Johnson's announcement that \$25 million of title II funds will be made available to CARE and other voluntary agencies for use in the Bihar and Uttar Pradesh states of India. I am most hopeful that this recommendation will

help us reach such areas of need which would be difficult to reach through regular programs.

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

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

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

Also most encouraging is President Johnson's continued emphasis on the priority of self-help in hungry nations, together with his positive report on the progress India has already achieved. I have stressed for almost 2 years that the key to narrowing the gap between population growth and food production is an intensive effort to help food-deficit nations develop agricultural self-sufficiency. To that end I offered amendments to the food-for-peace legislation and the foreign aid bill last year to provide greater U.S. emphasis on encouraging adaptive agricultural research in food-short countries. Both were adopted by the Congress. I proposed an amendment allowing use of excess soft currencies for agricultural development, which was also adopted. I am therefore happy the President continues to emphasize this most important area of self-help, recognizing that U.S. food aid—whether alone or jointly—can be no more than a temporary expedient tiding nations over the dangers of outright starvation and famine.

#### THE CONSULAR CONVENTION

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

The Lippmann column draws its message from testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations this week of two eminently qualified men, George Kennan and Edwin Reischauer and states that the Consular Convention has been blown

up into a test of whether or not the United States can proceed to work out better relations with the Soviet Union.

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

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

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

**TODAY AND TOMORROW: TWO LEADING AUTHORITIES**

(By Walter Lippmann)

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

The contest over ratification turns on a question of great importance to the whole conduct of U.S. foreign policy. It is whether international communism is still essentially the same conspiracy which it was understood to be 20 years ago after World War II. The hard opponents of the Consular Convention believe that the Soviet Union today is no different than it was in the time of Lenin or Stalin. The hard proponents of the escalated war in Vietnam believe that the real adversary is the international communism of the post war era.

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

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

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

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

Reischauer's testimony was deeply at vari-

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

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

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

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

**WHERE HAVE ALL THE SPIES GONE?**

(By Art Buchwald)

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

The treaty has had tough going in the Senate because Hoover is said to be against it on the grounds that it would only give the Russians a chance to set up more spy cells in the United States, and that it would give the FBI more work to do. Hoover raised the question of whether the G-men could control the new threat of espionage.

This attitude about spies and espionage came as a surprise to those of us who have been raised on movies and magazine articles about Hoover and the FBI. The one thing we could always be certain of, until Hoover started writing letters to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was that the FBI could catch any spy a foreign power tried to plant in the United States. The impression that has always been given is that the more spies the Communists sent to this country, the better the FBI liked it. And every time the FBI rounded up a Soviet spy ring the Nation cheered and the President gave Hoover another medal.

If the truth be known, Hoover's Department thrived on Soviet spies. It was the stuff FBI legends were made of, and there wasn't a man, woman or child in this Nation who didn't sleep better at night, knowing that as hard as the Commies would try to penetrate our secrets, Hoover and his gallant agents would stop them.

But now for the first time Hoover has indicated that he would be hard put to keep track of Soviet spies if we permitted the Russians to open consulates in our major cities. He has said in effect that the FBI could no longer guarantee us protection against those who would be sent to this country to steal our blueprints and to microfilm our defenses. Hoover unknowingly sent shudders of fear down our backs, because if he can't protect us against the dastardly Soviet spy system, then who can?

Obviously it isn't a question of manpower, because all Hoover had to do is go before the Senate and explain the new spy threat

to them. In exchange he would get all the men he needs.

Money is also no problem, because the greater the espionage, the more funds Congress will give him to fight it.

So the only thing one can guess is that Hoover is getting tired of catching spies. A man who has caught as many as he probably wants to take it easy, and there is nobody in this country who would begrudge him this.

It would be unfair for the Government to burden the FBI with new problems, just because the Administration wants to work out a detente with the Soviet Union.

If the Senate turns down the consular treaty for no other reason than to give Hoover a much needed rest, I would be the last to criticize them.

The only thing that worries me is that without fresh spies, where will the FBI get new plots for its television series?

**AN ECONOMIST TALKS SENSE ON HOW TO REVITALIZE THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY**

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, it was, today, my privilege to conduct a hearing on my bill, S. 49, the Gold Mine Revitalization Act, and S. 615, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]. The purpose of both bills is, in different ways, to increase the production of gold in the United States and restore the gold mining industry to prosperity. The objective of both bills is one which must be achieved.

In the course of the hearing I conducted today, the subcommittee was honored by the testimony of Rev. Edward A. Keller, C.S.C., who testified consultant to the gold committee of the American Mining Congress. Father Keller is an associate professor of economics at the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., and is well qualified to testify not only as to the economics of gold mining but to meet the arguments raised by the Treasury Department against legislation to aid gold miners on grounds that it would disrupt the international monetary system. I have never agreed with the position of the Treasury Department on this matter and neither have my colleagues in the Senate. Thus, it was enormously refreshing to hear the testimony of an economist with the knowledge of Reverend Keller who gave it as a scholarly opinion that legislation to provide incentive payments to gold miners would not be interpreted abroad as a devaluation of the dollar nor would such an action change in any way international monetary relationships.

Since Father Keller presented such an excellent statement on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his statement be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

**GOLD MINES ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967**

(Statement of Rev. Edward A. Keller, C.S.C., before the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, in re. S. 49, Feb. 2, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Reverend Edward A. Keller, C.S.C.; I am an Associate Pro-

ing smokestacks, soft-coal furnaces in homes and offices, cars, diesel trucks, freight yards and coal-carrying barges on the Monongahela.

During that last week of October, 1948, there was one other ingredient: A weather freak that meteorologists call a "temperature inversion." Hot, moist air entrapped stagnant air below it. It could not rise or blow out.

Donora was airtight in its polluted pocket for five days.

Normally, warm air rises to the cooler atmosphere above, carrying many pollutants with it into the upper regions. During a temperature inversion, a lid of hot air prevents this circulation. Temperature inversions are not common. But neither are they a rarity, 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 horseshoe 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 19 years ago.

"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 night. I walked home, and it was hard to climb the hill. I put 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 night Mrs. Miller and her husband drove to a nearby town.

"We drove out of the garage and there were white tire marks in the black-coated ground. When we opened the door and walked in, our friends said: 'You are alive. We've been trying to reach you. They say you are dropping like flies in Donora.'"

"The thing is that we didn't know the extent at the time. You felt ill yourself but didn't realize how many others were ill."

"It seemed like the typical smoky atmosphere of autumn, maybe a little worse. We were used to a dose of fumes from the mills. It could make you feel nauseated at times."

It seems that most of the people of Donora had grown accustomed to the acrid air and sooty fallout. Mrs. John Tokach, who then worked in a zinc plant, remembers the gray smoke that seeped into the offices so she couldn't see 10 feet away. Sometimes 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 wily as ever. He was busy sending out inhalators and oxygen tanks on the Friday night of the smog.

"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.

Funeral services for most 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 Schwerha, who then ran the largest funeral parlor in Donora and is now retired, was to recall later:

"I think I have never seen such a beautiful blue sky or such a shining sun or such pretty white clouds. Even the trees in the 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 put washing equipment on some 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 schools.

"It keeps the children warm. Soft coal is easier on the taxpayer," Mrs. Costa explains.

Today Donora lives in the reality of a dwindling population 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 of 1967. 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:

#### LABOR APPLAUDS 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 proposals 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 *Wall Street Journal* reported.

In a statement adopted 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 recognition 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 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 contract 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 comparatively near future.

In Chicago, on September 1, 1964, Dr. Raymond Ewell, in an address given before the Division of Fertilizer and Soil Chemistry, American Chemical Society, said:

If present trends continue, it seems likely that famine will reach serious proportions in India, Pakistan, and China, followed by Indonesia, Iran, Turkey, Egypt and several other countries within a few years and then followed by most of the other countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by 1980. Such a famine will be of massive proportions affecting hundreds of millions, possibly even billions, of persons.

In neighboring Latin America, the population growth statistics are staggering. In 1920, Latin America had 90 million inhabitants. By 1960 the population increased to 212 million. In other words, in 40 years there was an increase of 250 percent. If this situation prevails until 1980—a mere 13 years from now—the 212 million of 1960 will have grown to almost 400 million.

Among all the multiple problems emerging from this awesome growth, the immensely important need of human nutrition becomes immediately apparent as well as demanding of our attention and scientific know-how to create carefully prepared programs to alleviate this insistent pressure.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in his message on foreign aid said:

We will wage War on Hunger. Together, the world must find ways to bring food production and population growth into balance.

The Agency for International Development and the Pillsbury Co. have responded to our President's admonition and have launched the first phase of a planned 3-year program designed to increase supplies of protein foods in developing countries.

The Pillsbury Co., one of America's great private enterprises, has developed a vast knowledge derived from its 98 years in the food business and, in its contract with AID, continues to participate in the vanguard of food production in the markets of the world.

Pillsbury has developed and now will test a new complete nutritional food that will supplement the diet and fur-

nish 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 Alliance for Progress 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."

CNF—Pillsbury's "complete nutrition food"—will be produced in El Salvador as a formulated drink using production 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 cottonseed, peanuts, and soybeans. Local Salvadoran labor will be used and the plant and business will be financed in part by Salvadoran capital. All of this induces a greater measure of self-help by the people of El Salvador in the development of their own economy.

President Johnson recently asserted:

The only obligation ties to our aid is the recipient's obligation to itself . . . to mobilize its own resources as efficiently as possible.

El Salvador is doing this.

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 which should do so much to alleviate the immeasurable problems in food production that are developing ahead of us.

#### HENRY R. LUCE

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, William H. Ewing, of Honolulu, editorial consultant to the 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 journalism—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 is over. Henry Luce 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 that he could only stand 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 famous man. He was slightly deaf, which he made no effort to conceal. But he was not old in any sense. He did not talk a great deal, preferring to listen. When an occasion arose to speak he spoke immediately.

Once, we were arranging a luncheon for Dr. Edward Teller, the physicist, who likes to talk and talks very well indeed. I offered to invite a general officer known to be highly articulate. "Now wait a minute," Harry said, "Which do we want, the general or the scientist? We can't have two stars." "What about you?" I said. "Oh, me. I just listen." And he did.

Reporters have written that he barked 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 publications have taken the newspapers to task. This is a curious thing. Publishers and editors rarely are willing to talk to reporters.

In appearance Mr. Luce gave the impression of a venerable lion, with hair brushed straight back to form a graying mane framing his angular face with the firmly-set mouth and keen eyes beneath bushy brows. He was a tall man, probably over six feet, causing him usually to stand leaning slightly forward to catch the words of the person addressing him. He took to aloha shirts at once on arriving in Hawaii. They became his standard garb unless the occasion called for something dressier.

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 this observer the most remarkable thing about Time Magazine is the fact that, over a period of more than 40 years, it has remained so constant to the image created in the 1920'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 because Henry Luce was still around.

Even after his retirement as editor-in-chief he was constantly trying to anticipate the course of national and international affairs—the important things. For example, he knew while on a visit to Honolulu 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 end 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, more personal areas. Once, ordering a drink, he asked for Cutty Sark. "That's what the President drinks," he explained with a twinkle. "I figure if it's good enough for Johnson it's good enough for me."

When it came to politics he allowed Clare, his wife, to do most of the talking, which she was quite able and willing to do. Once he was asked whether he had followed Clare into the Catholic Church. (The story, no doubt apocryphal, is still told of the time when Clare, a fresh and enthusiastic convert, on a visit to the Vatican tried to interest the Pope in joining the Church.) Luce said no, that after Clare found the true faith she tried to bring him into the fold, but he told her he thought he would stick with the Presbyterians.

Mrs. Luce, whose talents and accomplishments are many and varied, admired her husband greatly. "Harry is the smartest man I ever met," she said once. "But I never heard anybody call him an intellectual. And I know the reason why. You have to have a reputation as a liberal, a Democratic liberal, at that, and then everybody starts calling you an intellectual."

The Luces had one or two changes of plan after acquiring the Orvis property on Kahala Avenue, one plan being to raze the old structure and build an entirely new house. Luce became concerned over speculation that, in time, the strip between the avenue and the beach might be rezoned for apartments. "How long do you think that might be?" he asked me once. "Ten years?"

I said I didn't know.

"Well," he said, "I expect to live longer than 10 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 apartment house going up beside me."

Time, circumstance, industry, imagination, perseverance, all these and more go into the making of a man like Henry Luce. Among other characteristics he understood the peculiar bond of mutual respect and appreciation that exists among people—not all of them—who process information into news. He made a great deal of money but it was his feel for news that made it possible. Some people have it and some haven't. It is the difference between being a pro and not being one. Henry Luce was a pro.

—WILLIAM EWING.

#### LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I regret that a longstanding previous engagement in my State of Alabama made it impossible for me to be present yesterday to vote on the final passage of S. 355, the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 which passed the Senate 75-9. Had I been here, I would have voted for the bill.

It is my privilege to serve on the joint committee which recommended this proposal. I know how diligently the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the chairman of the joint committee, has worked over the months, first to help formulate this bill of needed changes and then to provide the leadership on the floor of the Senate for its passage by the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has done an outstanding job, and I am pleased to have been associated with him.

The bill was thoroughly and carefully considered in committee and extensively debated in the Senate. I am hopeful that the House will take the measure up soon, which may lead to its early enactment.

#### AFL-CIO APPRAISES THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, probably no American organization has a deeper interest or greater stake in the success of the war on poverty than the AFL-CIO which represents more than 13½ million union members and undoubtedly, also, represents the sentiments and hopes of millions of others who are unorganized.

Recently at its midwinter meeting the AFL-CIO executive council subjected the 2-year-old war on poverty program to a careful scrutiny and appraisal. The AFL-CIO finds itself in an excellent posi-

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 planning 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 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 so rapidly that the hunger gap may become far more severe in the immediate future.

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

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

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

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

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

That is no longer true today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The fact is that economic progress has brought increased purchasing power, most of which has been quickly channeled into buying better food and more of it. Yet better food, notably meat, milk, eggs and poultry,

increases demands on an agricultural system because of the animal feeds required to produce it.

The significance of these facts—in terms of world stability, peace, further economic progress—is plain.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But if we are to avoid this mass dependence on food aid—and if we are to avoid

famines certain to result when we reach the breaking point of the amount of food aid that even we can provide—the only answer is greater concentration of our efforts to stimulate agricultural development in the areas of the world now so dependent on external food assistance, matched by simultaneous efforts to curb population growth.

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

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

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

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

How are we going to feed them?

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

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

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

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

Yet we now face the task of feeding twice as many people within the next 35 years—as well as an urgent need to feed them better. We now know that malnutrition in early years stunts mental and physical growth, handicapping children who survive. None of us can afford to ignore the situation.

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

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

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

We are going to need vastly stepped-up physical inputs for production, including fertilizers, pesticides, seeds and machines, with appropriate attention to their marketing, distribution and cost as well as availability. We are going to need more adequate marketing systems, improved transportation and storage, and the creation of better processing facilities.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So does Japan;

Taiwan also is now giving aid instead of receiving it;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Second*, the developed world must simultaneously do all it can to transfer applicable portions of its technology of food pro-

duction to the developing world while also affording those that are serious about population control the help they need to achieve it; and

*Third*, the developing countries must sacrifice, invest, train, legislate and reform on an adequate scale and for as long as necessary in order to master their own agriculture and the size of the population it serves.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Can we risk such destruction?

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

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

#### NEW HOOVER-TYPE COMMISSION NEEDED

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. President, while the problems of pollution are serious and research to solve them is needed, the incredible proliferation of uncoordinated projects mentioned by this study is a classic case of bureaucratic overkill. When programs are allowed to develop without thought to their interrelationship, the left hand often 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 annually on research and development in its own laboratories, but it does not know exactly how many laboratories it has, where they are, what kinds of people work in them or what they are doing.

The Secretary of Labor has testified before Congress:

There are 15 to 30 separate manpower programs administered by public and private

agencies, all supported by federal funds, in each major U.S. metropolitan area.

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

Mr. President, it was estimated recently by the Tax Foundation, Inc., that the average American will spend two hours and 25 minutes of his 8-hour working day this year to earn the money he needs to pay for his 1967 taxes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HOW YOUR TAX MONEY IS WASTED

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

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

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

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

Four federal and three state and county agencies have been fighting since early last winter, trying to pass the buck to one an-

other for the oversight. The Bonneville Power Administration is involved. So is the Rural Electrification Administration which has had the money available for some months to extend the power line to the Indian village. National Park Service still can't decide whether to let the line go overhead or underground (the line would cut across Olympia National Park).

The blacked-out Redskins are an apt illustration of a pervasive federal ailment. President Johnson is still keeping the lights down low at the White House. But waste—much of it concealed and some of it exposed—continues to permeate the federal establishment.

And while office heads diligently follow the Chief Executive's admonition to economize on filing cabinets and paper clips, you can easily obtain a government grant to study everything from why butterfly wings are yellow to the history of comic strips.

Waste running into the hundreds of millions abounds in the national government at a level unprecedented in history. It's all around you. Some of it is shocking, but most of it is accepted as a necessary way of life in a big government.

The staff director of one of the most important committees of Congress—one charged with keeping a close rein on federal spending—finished flipping through the 1,916 pages of the 1968 national budget during an interview with a *Nation's Business* editor then shrugged his shoulders:

"Government waste? It's all over the place. But how do you root it out?"

"The sad fact is the government has grown so huge you just can't put your finger on where and how all the money is being spent."

"We look for waste all the time but it's elusive. Not even the hardest-working committees of Congress or the army of auditors 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 taxpayer, the businessman, many members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike.

Flagrant examples of bungling abound: Luxury lodges in Oklahoma, ARA financed, \$600,000 in the red. Cost: \$10 million.

Housing built so deep in the boondocks that Rio slum-dwellers prefer their shantytown shacks. Cost: \$3.5 million.

USDA rush order for typewriters to meet a deadline that didn't exist. Cost: \$1.5 million.

WAVE barracks in Maryland, built after Navy ordered the women shipped to Florida. Cost: \$1.2 million.

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

Growing concern over the mushrooming scope of the problem is perhaps best illustrated in some recent developments:

The Joint Economic Committee of Congress, with a majority of its Democratic and Republican members approving, hoisted a warning flag against steadily mounting federal spending. It urged in a report:

"Federal expenditures that are not absolutely essential to national defense of our economic growth or welfare must be sharply reduced. Congress must find ways to reduce expenditures for fiscal 1968 by at least \$5 billion to \$6 billion per year."

Groundwork is being laid for a broad-scale investigation by the House Appropriations Committee against wasteful and needless government spending. Heretofore, 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, is quietly planning to shift its attack in an effort to unearth even more waste than it has in the past. To bolster its already formidable force of 2,200

auditors, GAO will start recruiting specialists in such fields as economics, industrial management, engineering, public and business administration, mathematics and other fields.

Chairman George Mahon of the House Appropriations Committee has called on each member of the House to tell him personally where every cent of "fat" can be slashed from the massive federal budget.

Rep. Mahon's concern came through loud and clear in these words:

"It does look a bit incongruous that at a time when the gross national product is estimated to be almost \$800 billion, and when the war in Viet Nam is requiring less than four percent of the gross national product, that we should be facing a budget deficit of between \$8 billion and \$18 billion in a single year."

#### THE TIP OF THE ICEBERG

Hundreds and hundreds of examples of sheer waste are brought to the public's attention each year. They are irrefutable.

Many do not exceed a few thousand dollars but others soar into the millions. This is the waste that comes to light. It may be only the tip of the iceberg.

Perhaps the single major culprit is duplication. Everywhere you turn you find one government agency's work overlapping another's. For instance:

Today, there are more than 260 federal poverty programs administered by 16 separate departments and agencies. Five agencies are involved in administering federal programs for community water supply, sewers and sewage treatment facilities. Almost 60 programs are devoted solely to vocational education.

"Such waste and inefficiency need not be tolerated," says Sen. James B. Pearson (R-Kans.). He is calling for a new Hoover-type Commission on government economy.

It takes people to run all these programs. They are not in short supply. The ranks of government workers is expanding constantly.

In December, 1965, President Johnson made headlines when he announced he was cutting the ceiling on federal employees by 25,000. Well, the ceiling was lowered, but not the number of men and women on the government payroll.

When the President assumed office in November, 1963, there were 1,444,409 civilian employees in the executive branch of government, apart from civilian employees in the Department of Defense.

By December, 1965, when he called for a lower ceiling, their numbers had risen to 1,493,214.

Since the ceiling was lowered, some 300,000 additional nondefense workers have been added. Including pay raises this increase is costing taxpayers another \$725 million annually.

Almost everyone you talk with—in Congress or in the government agencies—will say the place to look for waste is in the Department of Defense. With some \$75.5 billion, more than half of the budget, going into defense this seems understandable. However, it is also the most difficult area to smoke out evidence of waste.

Congressional committees devote endless hours going over defense spending, yet their members agree discouragingly this is an almost impossible task. Size, security and the inevitable confusion arising from the Viet Nam War make the Pentagon almost opaque.

It's just about anyone's guess how much money gushes down the drain in the government's far-flung research programs. At present \$16 billion is channeled into federal research and development. This means the government is supporting two thirds of the nation's R&D and financing 75 per cent of all research going on in universities.

Research provides a typical example of how the government operates.

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 the shortage of university instructors.

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. Many take up permanent residence here. Their own countries are angered over this "brain drain" by the United States.

But we have a way of correcting that. Our Agency for International Development turns around and trains scientists in the very countries hurt by the "brain drain."

#### WHAT LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOUND

A special study by the Library of Congress tells another aspect of the story:

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

If you're worried about environmental pollution, don't. The government has research under way in 192 laboratories run by nine separate agencies.

Once the government builds a laboratory it almost never closes it down. The Library of Congress even discovered that when Uncle Sam wants to undertake a new research project he doesn't always seek out an existing laboratory—he simply builds a new one.

The Library of Congress investigation turned up these findings:

Some agencies are uncertain about the existence or location of their own laboratories. In others, top management gives conflicting answers on the work being done.

Complete information on projects being undertaken by federal laboratories and the cost of those projects is not available.

The cost of research performed by these laboratories cannot be determined in a uniform manner because of variations in accounting for major items of cost, such as expensive equipment, even within a single agency.

Research activity hasn't escaped the attention of the Office of Economic Opportunity whose purpose is to concentrate on the so-called war on poverty. As of June 30, 1966, OEO had dished out \$7,788,365 on assessments, evaluations and inquiries. It is not yet clear how many people this has helped or will help remove from the public dole.

If heavy research spending will accomplish international control of arms the world is in good shape. The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by the late President Kennedy in 1962, already has kicked out \$25 million for various research projects. This is only slightly less than half of its total \$53.8 million appropriations.

No federal agency is willing to settle for less than the most ambitious research program as long as Congress keeps the money rolling in. At least one agency—the Atomic Energy Commission—was prepared to admit this. It happened during a hearing before a House appropriations subcommittee when the AEC appeared to justify a request of \$5.37 million for research on "terrestrial and freshwater ecology."

After an AEC witness reeled off a long list of items which the agency would research, acting Chairman Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.) interrupted to point out that the program as presented was projected at least five years ahead.

"What do you hope to accomplish by that time," Rep. Whitten inquired.

"By that time we hope to have an appropriation of \$20 million," the witness replied quite candidly.

The taxpayer gets nicked two ways when waste occurs in federally financed manpower programs, which now cost \$2.1 billion a year. When they flop, they miss the President's goal of transforming "tax eaters" into taxpayers.

#### COMPETING AGAINST EACH OTHER

In a recent survey of federal manpower programs for the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of Michigan and Wayne State University, Sar A. Levitan and Garth L. Mangum cite these "horror stories," admittedly not typical:

The personnel director of a large retail firm complained that job developers from as many as 70 different federally funded local programs visited his office regularly seeking jobs for their disadvantaged clients.

Operators of federally financed, on-the-job training programs, which reimburse employers for training expenditures, have been known to bid against each other with tax money to persuade employers to establish programs.

Employers already conducting employee training at their own expense have been offered training subsidies for these employees.

How can this happen? Testifying before Congress, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz gave a clue:

"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."

House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan is among a growing number of Congressmen disturbed over heavy spending.

"I'm talking about millions of dollars spent on beautifying America while the number of GI's killed or wounded passes the 50,000 mark in a war costing us nearly \$2 billion a month," he points out.

Rep. Ford says he checked into reports the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was planning to spend a half-million dollars to develop a dance and theater curriculum and found it was true. The curriculum was released under Titles 3 and 4 of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act.

That's Federal aid to elementary schools and high schools.

The money is to establish laboratory theaters in Providence, R.I., and New Orleans, La. The idea, Rep. Ford was told, is to find out how to use the arts to teach youngsters who can't learn from books.

#### THE FAT IN THE BUDGET

"The President's \$135 billion fiscal 1968 budget not only is fat—but it has plenty of fat in it," Rep. Ford asserts. "We in the Congress who care about the taxpayer intend to cut out as much of it as we can. We know we can do it without cutting necessary services. We know the people want it done."

The Economic Development Agency, while less controversial than the old Area Redevelopment Administration it replaced, has been getting its lumps in Congress for some of its lending practices.

EDA put up \$975,000 toward a \$1.5 million clay pipe plant at Seminole, Okla., a project criticized by a special subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. Said the subcommittee:

"The existing plants (in the area) have indicated that statistics will show that existing facilities serving the area have more than sufficient capacity of products available to serve the needs of the area and that the Administration did not properly investigate the markets before granting the loan."

Right now the agency is trying to bail out a project it inherited from the old ARA—two plush lodges with recreational facilities on a man-made lake in Oklahoma. They were financed by a \$1.3 million grant and a \$9 million loan.

So far, the operators of this taxpayer-supported spa have missed nearly \$10 million dollars in interest payments and a

REMARKS OF SENATOR WALTER MONDALE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
August 22, 1967

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 revitalize 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 his 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.



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)