

U.S. Congress.
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 18

AUGUST 22, 1967, TO AUGUST 31, 1967

(PAGES 23451 TO 24928)

mechanisms designed to relate research findings and basic data to the processes of decisionmaking and to provide for effective interaction between decisionmakers and faculty members.

To realize these objectives the program of the center, emphasizes:

The provision of research professorships—as described more fully below—and research scholarships, fellowships, and assistantships.

The provision of a physical location where scholars—both faculty and students—concerned with urban life may meet together to work, to discuss, to interact with one another and with members of the community.

The provision of a specialized urban library and data collection, staffed by librarians, statistical clerks, and assistants with special interests in urban subjects and located so that the research professors have easy and continued access to these resources.

The provision of a small administrative staff to plan and administer center activities.

In addition, as part of the university's centennial celebration next year \$70,000 has been allocated for seven symposia. The symposia will seek to "bring the virtues of intelligence and good will to the resolution of questions and problems regarding the nature of our cities."

Third, Wayne several years ago—in cooperation with the University of Michigan—established the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. A basic function of this institute is research activity.

Work has ranged from studies of discriminatory practices in employment, to pilot research on community mobilization and Federal programs designed to aid the disadvantaged, to study of the hardcore unemployable, to study of manpower adjustment to technological change, to preretirement education.

In addition, the institute has initiated an impressive new journal, *Poverty and Human Resources Abstracts*. Issued bimonthly, it contains 50 abstracts of material, published and unpublished, in the critical problem areas of poverty, human resources, manpower development, and social legislation.

Fourth, Wayne State University has an extremely active division of urban extension. Its activities have included training for Headstart teachers, establishing a degree program in police administration, and administering the Applied Management and Technology Center. Another activity was "Detroit adventure," a project to bring cultural activities to students in the intercity.

Fifth, discussions are now under way for an exchange of personnel and ideas between the Center for Urban Studies of the City University of New York, and Wayne.

Mr. President, as I said, Detroit prior was a fascinating laboratory for students of urban affairs. Since the riot this fascination has magnified. Wayne already has been contacted by a number of persons seeking use of facilities—or financing—for valuable studies.

Some research to determine the whys of the Detroit riots already is underway.

A \$130,000 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health put researchers on the streets of the wrecked area while snipers were still at work. The goal is to determine what causes riots and what sociological, physical, and welfare changes are needed to avert future uprisings.

A grant request from the Department of Labor for a study of the selectivity of the rioting and looting is in process of submission.

Mr. President, there is no question that much more could be done—and must be done. Other centers are at work. All labor under the shortage of funds. All could profit from a central informational clearinghouse.

We need information, much more information, if we are to lick the problem of our cities as we have licked other problems. It seems to me that President Johnson was entirely right in proposing that an independent institute could aid in this job.

The financing for such an institute could, I believe, be shared by Government and private sources. Indeed, this would be the ideal way, for then the research could go on with a beholdence to no one. That way the facts can be unearthed and the chips can fall where they may.

Mr. President, for decades this country has been able to achieve amazing defense and aerospace goals by pulling together impressively well coordinated and effective research and technological complexes.

When we wanted to create an atomic bomb, we teamed intellectuals with engineers, theorists with technicians, academicians with industrialists.

When we wanted to whip the problems of space, we again assembled an impressive research and technological complex drawn from Government, universities, and industry.

These complexes have been created by public funds to attack massive problems.

Well, the problems of our cities are certainly massive. Would not these problems respond to the same sort of attack? Should we not be willing to make the same sort of commitment?

An Institute of Urban Development would be a useful first step toward such a commitment.

We have already wasted 5 months when we could have been learning how such a commitment would be most effective. Again, I join in the President's request that we establish this Institute—and quickly.

OPEN HOUSING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, open housing is at the heart of the major problems of our big cities. Obviously, its lack means, for instance, the continuance of segregated schools and a lack of equal opportunity in those schools.

At the same time, open housing has been all too often misrepresented. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, contributed substantially to the removal of current misunderstandings in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. I ask

unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT ON S. 1358, THE FAIR HOUSING ACT OF 1967, AND RELATED BILLS

(Statement by George Meany, President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Aug. 23, 1967)

Mr. Chairman, my name is George Meany. I am president of the AFL-CIO. I am glad to have this opportunity to present our views on S. 1358, which you introduced by Senator Mondale and 21 other Senators of both parties.

I would also like to comment briefly, during the course of my testimony, on S. 2114 and S. 2280, offered by Senator Hartke.

We are pleased that S. 1358 is a bipartisan bill from its inception. Surely the long-delayed achievement of equal rights and equal justice for all Americans is not a proper matter for political dispute.

Let me emphasize our profound conviction that the bill before you is extremely important. It is not just a piece of housecleaning, aimed at picking up a few loose ends left over from the Civil Rights Act of 1964. On the contrary, its ramifications extend into many areas of civil rights already dealt with by that and other measures.

It is not an exaggeration to say that open housing is absolutely essential to the realistic achievement of such accepted goals as desegregated schools and equal opportunity. Indeed, until open housing becomes an operating fact, much of the statutory civil rights progress of recent years—great as it has been—will be no more than inoperative theory.

Schools are the most obvious example. The typical public grammar school is a neighborhood operation. The composition of the student-body, therefore, is determined by that of the residents. The result can, in effect, be de facto segregation.

To some degree this has always been true. In the long history of this country there have been neighborhoods which were in effect segregated by nationality. Some of them are with us yet. Those neighborhoods have had, in their own way, segregated schools.

But the problem of the Negroes is different. The Irish, the Italians and the other nationality groups had one ultimate weapon—mobility. They could and they did move out of their ghettos as their means permitted. Yes, they met some resistance, but it was seldom more than social ostracism of short duration.

Negroes simply do not have that kind of mobility. They may spend their working hours as part of a thoroughly-integrated work-force, but they come home at night to a segregated neighborhood, with its segregated school for their children.

Local school officials, under pressure from the federal courts, have contrived a variety of devices to overcome de facto segregation. These devices may well be necessary as stop-gaps to meet the immediate need; but in the long run, the soundest way to attack the segregated neighborhood school is to attack the segregated neighborhood.

This has long been an objective of the labor movement. The 21 fair housing laws that have been passed by state legislatures, and the 43 enacted by cities and counties, were warmly supported and often initiated by organized labor. In the words of the Sixth Constitutional Convention of the AFL-CIO, in December 1965:

"A key feature of labor's housing program is its drive for equal housing opportunity for all Americans. There is no place in Amer-

ica for racial ghettos. Equal access, without regard to race, creed, color or national origin, to every residential neighborhood in every American community should be assured for every family in America."

Moreover, we have fitted our actions to our words. More than 150 housing projects have been sponsored by trade unions and others are on the way. One of the earliest, built by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers in New York City, is now 40 years old. All these projects, large and small, are available to tenants or buyers without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

The experience of the labor movement amply proves that integrated housing works; that people of different races can live in harmony as neighbors. It should also help put to rest the only other argument against open housing that deserves any consideration at all—the notion that neighborhood standards decline when Negro families move in.

This is an ancient superstition, perpetuated by far too many unscrupulous real estate agents. But the fear it arouses in the hearts of some home-owners cannot be ignored. In the generally affluent society of recent years, vast numbers of young families have bought homes of their own. These homes represent, in most cases, the biggest investment they will ever make, not only absorbing their accumulated savings, but also involving a long-term mortgage obligation of substantial size. The loss of this investment would be a disaster.

Therefore the fears—though baseless—should not be denounced with righteous indignation, but dissipated by exposure to the truth.

Actually, it is our belief that the fears are not as widely held as some assert, especially if they are not drummed up by reactionaries, racists and real estate profiteers. A very heartening example was the gubernatorial election in Maryland in 1966, which I am sure the members of the committee remember. One candidate based his entire campaign on the slogan, "Your home is your castle"—which in this case meant total opposition to open housing. He went down to a resounding defeat at the hands of an electorate in which a great majority were registered members of his own party.

Most encouraging of all were the heavy votes against him in the "bedroom" communities in Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, where the immense population growth of recent years has been largely comprised of the young families I mentioned earlier. In the face of a campaign designed to capitalize on their fears, these voters ignored their party affiliation in order to repudiate a racist appeal.

They were right, not just morally but in terms of dollars and cents. For the old superstition about neighborhood standards and property values is simply not true.

It has its foundation, of course, in the unhappy fact that a great many Negroes live in slums. But the Negroes did not create the slums; they inherited them from other ethnic groups that were lucky enough to escape. And what they inherited was bad housing made worse by time and by lack of maintenance by its absentee owners.

There is no need to go beyond the limits of the District of Columbia to learn that neighborhood standards are not a matter of race. Let any skeptic take a tour—not a traditional tourist's round of national monuments, but a tour of the places where the city's Negroes live. He will find shameful slums; he will also find block after block of spic-and-span houses, bright with flower beds and well-kept lawns.

The simple exercise of observation should be even more persuasive than statistics, but statistics are also available.

Many studies have shown that Negro homeowners are just as concerned with neighborhood standards and just as diligent in maintaining them as any other group. One such

study that came to this conclusion should, in this context, be above suspicion; it was conducted more than 20 years ago by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

The matter of property values has also come under scrutiny. I am sure the members of the committee are familiar with the study by Dr. Luigi Laurenti, undertaken for the Commission on Race and Housing and published in 1960. It covered 20 neighborhoods in San Francisco, Oakland and Philadelphia where Negroes had moved in over a 12-year period. In brief, the results showed that in 85% of the cases, property values either rose or remained stable. In the other 15%, there were moderate declines. But most significantly, there was no pattern attributable to the entrance of non-whites; other influences, taking effect simultaneously, had more effect. Similar studies in Chicago, Kansas City, Detroit and Portland, Oregon, conducted independently by others, came up with the same findings.

Therefore the ancient superstition is no more than an evil falsehood, and the bill you are considering should go far toward wiping it out. And it should also go far toward retraining those who perpetuate it.

In this connection I am referring particularly to Section 4(c), which as I read it would forbid discriminatory references in real estate advertising.

In addition to the intrinsic merit of this provision, I have a special interest in it. And I question whether it goes far enough to meet the subtle discriminatory appeals of much real estate advertising.

Let us consider the peculiar posture of the daily press on this matter.

A considerable number of newspapers, to their great credit, have warmly supported the cause of open housing. One of them is a paper which I suppose all of us read every morning—the *Washington Post*.

Most of these same papers—perhaps all of them—have real estate sections at least once a week, crammed with advertising, much of it from real estate developers and real estate agents who are dedicated to the preservation of racial discrimination. One of these papers is the *Washington Post*.

On July 24 the *Washington Post* published an editorial, one of many on the general issue, offering commendations to the Montgomery County, Maryland commissioners for enacting a fair housing ordinance. As a citizen and a homeowner in that county I was moved to write to the *Washington Post*, as follows:

"Dear Sir:
"As a resident of Montgomery County, I join with the *Washington Post* (July 24) in hailing the new fair housing ordinance. It is, as you say, 'a standard of single importance' dealing with 'the most urgent domestic issue of this decade.'

"It is, I am proud to report, a decision that is four-square with the policy of the AFL-CIO.

"My purpose in writing, however, is to suggest that the *Washington Post* is in a unique position to aid the cause of fair housing by simply instructing its advertising department to abide by the principles that its editors espouse.

"I propose a simple declaration that the *Washington Post* will accept real estate advertising only from advertisers that guarantee the property, either for rent, or for sale, is available without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.

"Such a decision to put principle before profit could set 'a standard of national importance' for newspapers throughout the nation and I urge that the *Washington Post* establish this standard."

As we all know, Mr. Chairman, the *Washington Post* publishes many letters from readers, even critical ones. Sometimes, if it feels aggrieved, it follows a critical letter with a defense, in italic type. A newspaper or magazine can take criticism in stride, if

it has any sort of case, because it always has the last word.

However, the *Washington Post* did not follow this course. It did not publish my letter at all.

Instead, I received a letter dated August 10 and signed by James J. Daly, vice president and general manager of the *Washington Post*, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Meany:
"The Editor of *The Washington Post* has referred to me your letter of July 24, commenting on the Montgomery County fair housing ordinance and proposing that *The Washington Post* adopt a policy that it will 'accept real estate advertising only from advertisers that guarantee the property, either for rent or for sale, is available without regard to race, creed, color or national origin.' I appreciate this opportunity to comment on your proposal.

"I feel that you must be familiar with what I consider to be the extremely fine historical record that has been made in the field of real estate advertising by *The Washington Post* over the past several years. Long before there was any legislative action by any governmental body in this field, *The Washington Post* adopted standards of advertising acceptability which were designed to discourage, if not prevent, the advertising of property on a discriminatory basis of race, creed or color. Our policy, our views, and our objectives have certainly not changed, and we welcome the progress that has been made in the public field to facilitate the implementation of these wholesome and non-discriminatory objectives.

"However, upon reflection, I am confident that you will realize the dangers of adopting a policy of affidavits of guarantee or any other form of prior restraints upon advertisers of any kind respecting their intention to comply with the law. We would regard this as an abuse of both the authority and responsibility that a free press possesses in the fields of news and advertising.

"On the other hand, you can be sure that in applying our standards of advertising acceptability we will continue to refuse to accept copy which we believe is detrimental to the objective of non-discriminatory practices. Thank you again for your thoughtful letter."

Mr. Chairman, it would be an exaggeration to say that I was shocked by Mr. Daly's letter, but I was certainly saddened by it.

I freely acknowledge that the *Washington Post* long ago began rejecting real estate advertising labelled "whites only" or—conversely—"colored". By the moral standards of the publishing industry it took an advanced position.

But the display advertisements in the *Washington Post's* real estate sections drip with discrimination. What is meant by a phrase like "a private community"? Or "conventional mortgages only"? Or by "with club membership you become eligible to buy"? Any sophisticated reader can understand all this, and we think Mr. Daly and his colleagues are sophisticated. They know the people whose money they are taking.

In attempting to hide all this under a specious paragraph about "freedom of the press", Mr. Daly is insulting my intelligence. I did not appreciate this when I received his letter and my feelings have not mellowed in the two weeks since.

It is indeed ironical that the news column in Section A of the *Washington Post* can report in honest detail a demonstration or a court action against a discriminatory developer, while the real estate section will not only carry the same developer's advertising, but a puff story on the special merits of his enterprise.

One example is the Levitt organization, which discriminates nowhere, any more, except in the Washington area. Mr. Levitt has quite candidly said that he is following "local customs" in his three developments

here. His operations get respectful, if not worshipful, treatment in the real estate pages of the *Washington Post*, whose editorials deplore him.

Let me say flatly that the *Washington Post* has every legal right to pursue this devious course, under present law. We do think the readers of the *Washington Post*, which applies such lofty standards of conduct to others, are entitled to know what standards it sets for itself.

I have devoted this much attention to the *Washington Post* because it symbolizes an ailment that corrupts newspapers with the loftiest editorial principles. Actually I am flattering the *Post*, by saying, in effect, if it can happen to the *Post*, it can—and does—happen to papers everywhere. So I support Section 4(c), and an even stronger one if possible.

In the broader sense, of course, we in the AFL-CIO support all the provisions of this bill. We are in complete accord with its objectives and we believe its administrative structure is designed to reach those objectives speedily, effectively and fairly.

Now let me say a few words about Senator Hartke's two bills, both designed to meet a major problem facing Negroes who can afford to buy homes and who want to buy homes but are thwarted by the discriminatory practices of certain private lenders.

Everything that I have said about real estate interests applies, Mr. Chairman, with equal vigor to banks, mortgage loan agencies and other private lending institutions who engage in discriminatory practices. There must be some way in which this practice can be halted by the federal government and the Senator has proposed alternative ways of dealing with this problem. Like the Senator, we want these practices halted and we trust the committee will examine his proposals with care and adopt a measure to right this wrong.

But there is another point that must be made, even though it is not within the scope of the legislation now before you.

It is a variation in detail, but not in spirit, of a point we stressed in every civil rights struggle.

We said then that an equal right to be served in a hotel or restaurant was an empty right to a man without money. We said that an equal opportunity on the job was meaningless when there were no jobs to be had.

And so it is with open housing. A statute which establishes the right of every American to rent or buy any living quarters he wants and can afford is clearly necessary, and this bill will do it. But to have meaning—in the same sense that this bill will give meaning to other aspects of civil rights—open housing must go hand in hand with enough housing and housing available at price levels workers can afford.

Because of long neglect and inadequate appropriations, the housing legislation already on the books has never fulfilled its stated purposes. It must now be reawakened.

The facts are appalling. Low-cost public housing was launched by the Housing Act of 1937. In 1949, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill authorized the construction of 135,000 housing units a year. But by 1966, all the units built over 30 years could house only 605,000 families. There are 11 million urban families whose incomes are below the top limits for public housing tenants.

This is only one example of the immense backlog of housing needs. And as we all know, matters get worse day by day. In the next 20 years there will be more than 20 million additional households in America—65 million more people, at least 80 percent of them added to the urban areas where the housing deficiencies are already unbelievable.

A massive effort, both public and private, is essential.

The bill you are now considering should in itself widen the role of private builders, for they will be serving a substantial seg-

ment of the population they previously shunned. But to the extent that private construction falls short—and it is bound to—federal projects must fill the gap.

Let me make an analogy. Over the years we have said, and we still say, that when unemployment is a problem, the Federal Government must be the employer of last resort.

We say with equal conviction that when other alternatives have failed, the Federal Government must be the landlord of last resort.

One way or another, there must be adequate housing for all—open, yes, but adequate, too.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in giving our wholehearted support to this bill, we ask you and the other members of the committee to support in turn the other measures that are needed to make it meaningful.

A recent column by Msgr. George Higgins points out that a white gangster would have less trouble buying a home in an "exclusive" neighborhood than a Ralph Bunche or a Thurgood Marshall.

Your bill would overcome that kind of outrage—one that offends the whole concept of American society. If it is accompanied by a bold, broad and imaginative program to provide enough housing—adequate housing for all Americans, of all races and all levels of income, the dream of a truly better life will be much closer to fulfillment.

THE TAX MESSAGE: "A STUDY IN IRRELEVANCE, AN EVASION OF RESPONSIBILITY"

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, Professor Romoser, of the University of New Hampshire, says that the President's tax message is "a study in irrelevance, an evasion of responsibility."

Professor Romoser's analysis of the inverting of priorities is particularly telling. I am sure many of his colleagues in the University would share such views on this vital issue—an issue that transcends economics—an issue that is inextricably involved with the war in Vietnam, with the riots in the cities, and the faltering of our national drive for progress.

I ask unanimous consent that Professor Romoser's letter to the *New York Times* be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

NEW TAX MEASURE

TO THE ERROR: President Johnson's tax message is a further demonstration of the disastrous political conditions now prevailing in this country.

The President proposes an inequitable tax surcharge, which will affect middle- and lower-income groups the hardest, and which is an evasion of the need to overhaul the distribution of tax burdens and plug the loopholes which benefit the well endowed.

The President requires additional money to further prosecute our disastrous policies in Vietnam, which are lacking in any tactical, strategic, political or moral justification.

The President emphasizes rigid economies in unspecified domestic programs. He thereby encourages those who, with monumental irrelevancy, seek the causes of civil disorders not in the failure of our leaders to create a livable society for the underprivileged, or in our own cult of violence in Vietnam and elsewhere, but in the activities of "agitators."

Like the President's other recent remedies for existing and looming dangers, the tax

measure is a study in irrelevance and an evasion of true responsibility. However, words have lost their meaning. Any deity the President seeks to invoke will certainly not understand a rhetoric in which incompetent policies are sought to be sanctified by invocations of "America's responsibility and purpose", and in which the Vietnam fiasco is identified with "the light of a proud tradition," as in the President's tax message.

One might, however, borrow from the President's favorite rhetorical stock the old saw: "God helps those who help themselves"—by sober and realistic policies attuned to demonstrable facts.

Until the latter come into being, we may undoubtedly look forward to a rapid increase in the strains which threaten the fabric of this country's existence.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP MAKING AN IMPACT ACROSS THE NATION

Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], has recently commented upon the leadership being reflected in the actions of this Nation's 25 Republican Governors. His eloquence in describing how these Governors, as well as other Republicans, have faced up to today's problems by offering fresh new ideas for solutions is worthy of the attention of each of us.

The need for new approaches and new ideas for solutions to our national problems have never been more pressing both in the foreign and domestic fields.

From this great supply of talent we can expect to continue to receive effective responsible leadership. I commend Senator SCOTT for his recognition of this leadership and ask unanimous consent that his comments be printed in the RECORD.

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

I am happy to be in a progressive Commonwealth, led by a progressive Governor, and to visit with you who are members of a vigorous, hard working and revitalized Party, whose valiant efforts returned Massachusetts to constructive Republicanism and sent to us in Washington your splendid and popular new Senator Ed Brooke, to carry on in the tradition of Massachusetts' great Senator Leverett Saltonstall.

Republican leadership and Republican programs are making an impact in 25 of our 50 States with Republican Governors, from New England to Alaska. A majority of all Americans live under Republican State Administrations. Republicans control the Governorships of States with over 108 million population, while Democrats govern in States with 80 million persons.

Floundering, ineffective State government has been rejuvenated when Republicans moved into the Statehouse. Bankrupt, debt-ridden State treasuries have been rescued with no loss in services and benefits to the citizens. This is true in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York and other Republican States in the Union. Honesty and good government have been reinstated in places where those words had gone out of use.

Republican Governors have not been content to languish as satraps of the Federal bureaucracy. They have piled up impressive accomplishments of their own.

This same kind of Republican leadership and imagination can work the same miracles in Washington.

In the States, Republicans have come forth with fresh and exciting ideas and programs. The voters have responded.