

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 115—PART 6

MARCH 20, 1969, TO APRIL 1, 1969

(PAGES 6921 TO 8378)

be double the mortgage requirement for today's new residential building.

"Projections of capital flows," he said, "show that the total of investible funds will not be growing at this rate, meaning that mortgages will require a bigger share of the credit pie, perhaps as much as one-third compared with today's one-fourth.

"And if the experience of the past few years is any indication of the housing industry's ability to attract financing when money is scarce, then our 10-year housing program may well run out of credit before it runs out of carpenters."

Reviewing the labor and productivity problems, Mr. Christie said that in 1968 about 3.25 million workers were involved in the creation of \$84-billion worth of residential and nonresidential construction. That averaged a little over \$25,000 of construction a man. In 10 years, measured at today's prices, the \$84-billion will be more than \$125-billion.

Ten years ago, he continued, 2.75-million workers turned out total construction valued at \$66-billion, again at 1968 prices.

This was \$24,000 worth of construction a worker. Since then the rate has grown an average of only 1 per cent a year, compared with a productivity growth rate of 2.5 per cent for the economy as a whole.

If there was an improvement in construction productivity beyond the 1-per-cent-a-year rate, the industry would need 4.5 million workers to meet the demands of 1978.

This, Mr. Christie said, implied the need for a net gain of nearly 1.25 million workers, or a growth rate in the work force of 3.25 per cent a year for the next 10 years, about twice as fast as the nation's total labor force will be expanding.

Mr. Christie cautioned that productivity measures were "crude at best," since there was no separate productivity index for the housing industry. If there were, it would probably show a better result than construction as a whole.

PREFABRICATION A FACTOR

One reason for this was said to be the expanding acceptance of prefabrication in home building. Another is the growth in production of mobile homes from 100,000 a year to more than 300,000 during the last decade.

Mr. Christie said mobile homes did not enter into the calculation of output per construction worker "simply because there units are not considered construction, nor are the people who build them considered construction workers".

The economist said he was convinced that there was more improvement in productivity than was shown by statistics. If the industry could count on an annual gain of 2 per cent, it would cut down the labor force requirement to meet the housing goal from 3.25 to 2.25 per cent.

Summing up his analysis, Mr. Christie said that instead of reaching the 3.3 million annual rate of housing starts in the final years of the program, the rate would flatten out to about 2.5 million in the middle nineteen-seventies. This would mean:

The 10-year total may fall short by perhaps three million units.

Manufactured units will play a large part, particularly in meeting the six-million-unit target of low-income, publicly sponsored, multi-family housing.

Housing costs will continue to rise sharply over the next decade.

There is need for substantial modification of building codes and union work rules. These may be the most critical areas of all.

SOME CRITICISMS

Dr. Reeder had this to say about improved productivity: "The answer lies not in new materials or dramatic breakthroughs in the building process, but in applying techniques that are already" known in the industrial field.

The du Pont specialist asserted that the

techniques were rarely applied because most builders operated on too small a scale to utilize prefabrication and mass production of components and subassemblies.

Many governmental regulations, such as building codes and plumbing, electrical and mechanical codes as well as zoning ordinances hamper technological progress, Dr. Reeder said.

Some labor practices prevent the introduction of cost-saving technology and union work rules often make construction manpower inefficient and costly, he added. Another criticism was:

Lenders have been reluctant on occasion to provide mortgage funds for nontraditional dwellings and material suppliers may have been suspicious of innovations that threatened to displace their materials.

Finally, he said, consumers were not always enthusiastic about new materials and designs associated with modular or industrialized housing.

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we all know that a "thin" anti-ballistic-missile system is to be deployed in Montana and North Dakota. What we do not know—and what has never been satisfactorily explained—is why.

In a very thoughtful and penetrating editorial on Sunday, March 15, the St. Paul, Minn., Pioneer Press asks some questions on this subject which should be of interest to us all.

The Press points out, for instance:

Three different sets of justifications have been put forward for Sentinel. First it was the "Chinese threat" only which was to be met. Then the Pentagon's public relations idea was to defend populous cities. After these two arguments were shot full of holes by critics, the Nixon administration came up with the new excuse that Sentinel is needed to protect the missile sites away from the cities. The whole history of ABM advocacy is marked by such deviousness.

Mr. President, in the past few weeks, in widely scattered parts of our Nation, in the shadow of incredible affluence that many take for granted, I have seen hunger and despair and degrading poverty the like of which I would not believe could have existed, had I not seen it with my own eyes.

And the ABM, as the Press points out:

Will drain off more billions of the nation's resources into military hardware at a time when vast sums are needed to solve festering domestic problems.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON'S DECISION ON ABM SYSTEM IS DISAPPOINTING

In a highly disappointing action, President Nixon has plunged ahead on the Sentinel antiballistic missile system.

This will not safeguard America against devastating nuclear attacks. It will not help cool down the nuclear arms race.

It will drain off more billions of the nation's resources into military hardware at a time when vast sums are needed to solve festering domestic problems. It may bring on another tragic round of escalation of nuclear armaments by the United States and Russia. It may in that way increase the danger of eventual catastrophe through war between the two great powers.

"The safety of our country," said the President, "requires that we should proceed now with the development and construction of the new system . . ." Yet in the same statement he makes this admission: "The heaviest defense system we considered, one designed to protect our major cities, still could not prevent a catastrophic level of U.S. fatalities from a deliberate all-out Soviet attack."

He added that such a heavy system "might look to an opponent like the prelude to an offensive strategy threatening the Soviet deterrent." Arguing that the lighter Sentinel system will not have similar effects is unconvincing.

The basic factor involved is a switch from reliance on the principle of deterrence, the "balance of terror" system prevailing for the past decade. At present the United States and the Soviet know that if the other launches a nuclear attack it will be followed by an equally devastating retaliation which would leave both countries in ruins.

The importance of this principle will not be changed by deployment of Sentinel, which the President admits cannot defend the people of the United States. History indicates that each defensive preparation is followed by increased offensive developments by an opponent to overcome the defense. If Russia builds an ABM designed to protect Moscow, the United States certainly will plan missile capabilities to overcome it. And vice versa. The Maginot Line concept of defense is even less applicable to nuclear warfare than to older conditions.

As for the unlikely danger of a threat from China, the principle of deterrence still holds. China knows an attack on America would bring its own obliteration. That remains the best guarantee.

Three different sets of justifications have been put forward for Sentinel. First it was the "Chinese threat" only which was to be met. Then the Pentagon's public relations idea was to defend populous cities. After these two arguments were shot full of holes by critics, the Nixon Administration came up with the new excuse that Sentinel is needed to protect missile sites away from the cities. The whole history of ABM advocacy is marked by such deviousness.

The conflict over ABM policy now will continue in Congress. Because of President Johnson's original embarkation on this route, the Executive Department has both authority and funds to make the beginning which President Nixon has ordered. A fight against further new appropriations, however, can be carried on in the House and Senate. Public sentiment will play an important part in what happens.

One possibility which Congress should consider is the establishment of a nongovernmental commission of qualified citizen advisers to make further studies and recommendations on nuclear strategies and policies.

Another aspect of the situation is future negotiations with the Soviet on nuclear armament controls. Just one day before Nixon's Sentinel decision, the Senate ratified the nuclear nonproliferation treaty by a vote of 83 to 15. The spirit of this agreement calls for restraint by the two world powers in their own armaments programs. The theory has been advanced that the Nixon Administration might use Sentinel as a bargaining ploy—if the Soviet cuts back its nuclear plans, the United States might do the same. This is a doubtful and tenuous approach, but there is a bare possibility it might bring results. We hope so.

STANDARDS OF DECENCY ON TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on March 16, 1969, Mr. Thad M. Sandstrom, general manager of WIBW-TV, Topeka, Kans., commented upon the character