

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)

Mr. Kelner's article from the New Republic of September 2, 1967, printed in the RECORD.

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

HIGHWAY MURDER

Fifty-three thousand Americans will die on our highways this year. Their deaths will not be accidental, but caused by recklessness. The auto makers think they are the whipping boy of the highway accident problem and they are partly right. They brought federal regulation on their own heads by their procrastination, but the apathy of the auto industry is shared by every segment of our society.

Our psychology is that the serious injury, the "bad one," always happens to the other guy. We lawyers handle human wreckage—the man whose leg is cut off by a speeding car, the woman who is decapitated. Most of us believe it never can happen to us.

Travel by automobile is the most dangerous. For every 10 billion miles of travel, five train passengers die, 13 bus passengers die, 14 airplane passengers die, but by automobile there are 570 fatalities for the same number of miles of travel. The federal government requires periodic examinations and strict licensing standards for airplane pilots, but automobile drivers have a field day. I strongly disagree with Ralph Nader and others who seem to think the safety automobile will greatly reduce the annual toll of highway deaths. The safety automobile, when it comes, will hardly make a noticeable dent on the death and injury statistics for another 10 years. Ninety-five million autos now crowd our highways and over nine million new autos are produced annually. Autos now in use will take at least 10 years to wear out and be replaced. Deaths are likely to reach 100,000 annually by 1977.

Perhaps 90 percent of all deaths and injuries can be blamed on the American driver. With our population nearing 200 million, and three-car families becoming commonplace, it is time to set proper standards for our 130 million drivers, many of whom not only drive while drunk or nearly so, but speed, tailgate, bob and weave in traffic, fall asleep at the wheel, fail to use seat belts or to insist that passengers use seat belts, fail to drive defensively, jump traffic signs and traffic lights, fail to yield the right of way, ignore the other fellow's rights.

To compound the problem, we allow every Tom, Dick and Harry to drive. Dr. F. H. Mayfield, Cincinnati neurosurgeon, estimates that more than six million of the country's drivers are subject to convulsive diseases. How many of our millions of older citizens have lost their reflexes, their ability to react to highway traffic emergencies? How many of our millions of persons with defective eyesight still have licenses to drive? In most states the only vision test ever given is when the driver's license is first granted. Human vision is presumed never to deteriorate with the passing years.

In Pennsylvania, a motorist was killed when he crashed into a tree. He was totally blind. An eight-year-old boy beside him directed his driving. In Florida, a highway patrolman stopped a man who was traveling 26 mph down the middle lane of a highway with a posted minimum speed of 40. The driver admitted his eyesight was too poor to read the signs. He could see where he was going only by looking down to watch the dividing line.

In 30 states licenses are renewed by mail—a lucrative mail-order business.

About half of all auto fatalities are caused by drinking drivers. In most states intoxication is presumed shown by a percentage of 0.15 alcohol in the blood. North Dakota is the one state in which 0.10 percent is

presumptive evidence of intoxication. Drinker-drivers with blood-alcohol levels between 0.5 and 0.15 percent are the bulk of the problem; the extremely intoxicated driver, as a rule, is taken off the road either by himself, his friends, or the police. The drinking-driver does not recognize that his judgment, reflexes and vision have been impaired.

Among other things, we should:

Drop the permissible blood-alcohol rate for driving to .05 percent in every state. (No more than one drink for the average drinker.)

Adopt "implied consent laws" in every state. Under these, a driver's license is automatically revoked if he refuses to submit to chemical tests when arrested on a drunken driving charge.

Today, our 50 states present a spectacle of chaos, with laxity and no uniformity in licensing of drivers. Congress should enact legislation requiring every driver crossing a state line to obtain a license from a Federal Bureau of Drivers' Licenses, under the newly created Federal Department of Transportation. The system of licensing would require written certification by a licensed physician that a driver—

(1) has minimum prescribed visual capacities;

(2) does not have specified physical ailments such as epilepsy, diabetes, palsy or other disorders which make his driving hazardous;

(3) can respond with reasonable alacrity to highway emergencies under modern high-speed highway conditions;

(4) is free from prescribed mental and personality aberrations resulting from designated mental diseases and disabilities;

(5) is certified by his physician not to be a chronic alcoholic, or dependent on or addicted to tranquilizers, narcotics or drugs.

New physical and eye examinations and doctor's certification would be needed for license renewal.

FAIR HOUSING AND THE LOCATION OF JOBS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one of the most disturbing results of racial discrimination in housing is the loss of job opportunities for minorities. For a variety of reasons, many industries have been moving from the central city to the suburbs in the last decade. These are the industries that hire the unskilled or the semiskilled.

These industries offer great opportunities for the unemployed or the underemployed in the center city, but the jobs are out of the reach of the center city poor. The poor cannot find the transportation to the jobs nor can they find homes in the neighborhood of the new jobs.

Mr. President, this problem was pointed up at the hearings on the fair housing bill yesterday when Mr. Roy Wilkins, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, testified. He stated that during a recent trip to Detroit he talked to a Negro auto worker who told him that his plant had moved 20 miles away from Detroit and that he and his Negro coworkers were forced to commute over 40 miles a day to their jobs. The white workers, however, were able to purchase homes near the plant.

Inequality is the only way to describe this situation. The whites are allowed complete freedom of choice as to where they wish to reside and are, therefore, free to apply for any job for which they are qualified. The Negro, on the other

hand, must look for jobs only in certain areas, or be ready to commute many miles, if needed transportation is not available.

Mr. President, this is a problem that is becoming more and more serious. The jobs are leaving the cities. This trend will be difficult to overcome. An article by Dorothy Newman in the May 1967 issue of the Monthly Labor Review, documents the extent of this move. More than 62 percent of the valuation of all new industrial building permits in the period between 1960 and 1965 was outside the central city.

The article ends on what I consider a tragic note. Dorothy Newman points out that there are jobs in the suburbs, but these jobs are often inaccessible to the Negro. The result is that the unused skill potential in the center city is not transferred to meet the opportunities of the suburbs.

This is a situation that the Federal housing law could help to correct. It would permit the minority group member to seek employment where there are opportunities and then obtain living quarters near the job. Without fair housing the situation will only get worse: more and more jobs in the suburbs, and more and more unemployed in the ghetto.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the article by Dorothy Newman be printed in the RECORD to document the seriousness of this situation.

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

THE DECENTRALIZATION OF JOBS—JOB OPPORTUNITIES MULTIPLY IN THE SUBURBS, OUT OF REACH OF THE CITY-CENTER POOR

(By Dorothy K. Newman)

The unemployment rate has remained below 4 percent for almost a year now—for the first time in over a decade. Nevertheless, 3 million or so persons are unemployed, plus an uncounted number underemployed, in terms of capacity for more or higher level work. At the same time, many jobs are vacant; these vacancies exist along the full range of skills, but especially at the upper and lower ends of the occupational ladder.¹ Thus it appears that matching jobs with workers is one of the more intractable problems in the present economy.

One of the prime causes of this failure to match available jobs with available personnel is the movement of new jobs into the suburbs² and out of large central cities. It is in these cities that unemployment, underemployment, and poverty are greatest.³

NEW BUSINESS BUILDINGS

The steady trend of this movement is illustrated by the concentration of new factory and commercial buildings in the ring of metropolitan areas rather than in the central city, as evidenced by data on the value of building permits issued, both recently (1960-65) and since 1954.⁴ (See table 1.) In the same periods, also, a relatively large proportion of community buildings, such as schools and hospitals, has been constructed in the suburbs instead of the city. These buildings represent a large capital investment, leading to substantial increases in suburban employment, especially in industry, retail and wholesale trade, and business, professional, and technical services. Many of the jobs created are within the capabilities of the people who need employment opportunities, but most of the new jobs are too distant and difficult to reach.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 1.—PERCENT OF NEW PRIVATE NONRESIDENTIAL BUILDING OUTSIDE THE CENTRAL CITIES OF STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (SMSA'S), BY REGION, 1960-65 AND 1954-65¹

Type of new nonresidential building	Percent of valuation of permits authorized for new nonresidential building					Type of new nonresidential building	Percent of valuation of permits authorized for new nonresidential building				
	United States	North-east	North Central	South ²	West ²		United States	North-east	North Central	South ²	West ²
	1960-65						1954-65 ⁴				
All types ³	47	53	49	34	53	All types ³	49	55	51	34	55
Business.....	47	54	47	33	52	Business.....	46	56	50	33	50
Industrial.....	62	71	59	46	69	Industrial.....	63	73	59	47	72
Stores and other mercantile buildings.....	52	68	57	34	56	Stores and other mercantile buildings.....	53	69	55	33	58
Office buildings.....	27	26	30	22	32	Office buildings.....	27	25	31	20	32
Gasoline and service stations.....	51	61	52	39	57	Gasoline and service stations.....	53	66	54	40	59
Community.....	45	47	47	33	53	Community.....	45	52	50	33	57
Educational.....	45	47	46	34	50	Educational.....	50	53	54	36	58
Hospital and institutional.....	35	35	36	20	48	Hospital and institutional.....	36	38	36	21	50
Religious.....	55	66	57	42	60	Religious.....	54	67	55	39	62
Amusement.....	47	41	60	46	45	Amusement.....	48	48	51	41	50

¹ Data for groups of years are used to avoid erroneous impressions from erratic year-to-year movements in building construction.
² Data for southern and western SMSA's reflect a more significant degree of annexation and area redefinition and are therefore less reliable than figures for other regions.
³ Includes types not shown separately and excludes major additions and alterations for which type of building is not known.

⁴ Excludes data for 1959, for which comparable information is not available.
 Source: Unpublished data of the Bureau of the Census, tabulated at the request of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Based on a sample of over 3,000 permit-issuing places.

The trend to place new structures in the suburbs—particularly those devoted to factories and trade, and, to a smaller extent, to schools and hospitals—is especially marked in the North, where central cities of the largest SMSA's tend to be old and the flight of population to the suburbs has been going on for many years. Northern cities are frequently handicapped by narrow streets, one-way traffic patterns, obsolescent structures, and rapidly changing neighborhoods. A metropolitan-area view of city planning is only beginning, that might, in the future, accommodate city industrial parks and shopping centers. At the same time, large cities are the locus of the largest and oldest urban slums, and the magnet of most Negroes migrating from the South to seek jobs and improved living conditions.⁵

The ring is not as likely to be the location of new office or amusement buildings as the central city, which is usually considered the hub of business services and finance, as well as of the arts and other entertainment. However, in a number of the 14 areas selected for study,⁶ these new structures (in addition to new business buildings) were concentrated outside the city proper either in the past 5 years or during the past decade. (See table 2.)

In 10 of the 14 metropolitan areas (Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Dayton, Detroit, Indianapolis, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San Francisco, and Washington), more than half the permit valuation for new amusement buildings in 1960-65 was for construction outside of the central city. In 6 of the 14 SMSA's (Boston, Chicago, Dayton, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Washington), more than half the value of new office buildings in 1960-65 went to the ring. The average permit value of new office and amusement buildings (as of most new building) is lower outside than inside the central city, where construction costs tend to be higher. Therefore, the higher ratio of outside to inside central city building shown in tables 1 and 2 involves either more or larger buildings in the ring, and, consequently, even greater job opportunities than the permit value of new building construction itself would indicate.

TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

This substantial outmigration of facilities precedes and also mirrors the huge increase of business and employment in the ring, where population growth is greatest also.

Department store sales, for example, have risen much more in the outskirts of major metropolitan areas than in their central cities. Payroll employment⁷ has soared in the suburbs compared with the SMSA as a whole (and, therefore, compared with the central

city) in virtually all the SMSA's studied for which estimates of change could be obtained. (See table 3.) For example, from 1950-65, total payroll employment increased more than 40 percent in the Washington, D.C., suburbs and in those of New Orleans, Atlanta, and Detroit, while the increase in the total SMSA in each of these places was substantially less than 40 percent.

The differences in employment change between city and suburbs are pronounced—and consistently greater in the ring—in manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, and services.⁸ These industries account for 2 of 3 employees on nonagricultural payrolls. Their employees are concentrated in clerical and sales work, in skilled and semi-skilled industrial production, and as service workers outside of private households. In 1964, over 3 of 5 of all heads of families in central cities were in such occupations.⁹ It is likely, therefore, that many central-city residents might qualify for new openings in the suburbs. Early in 1967, about 60 percent of those unemployed 15 weeks or more were last employed in such jobs.

Despite the sharp employment increase in the ring, most payroll employment remains in the central city in all of the SMSA's studied, except Boston and San Francisco-Oakland. In every case, however, the proportion of employment in the ring has risen, and in most instances, substantially, as the following tabulation indicates:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percent of payroll employment outside the city-county ¹	
	1959	1965
Total of 12 SMSA's ²	23	27
Atlanta.....	11	13
Boston.....	59	61
Chicago.....	10	12
Cleveland.....	6	7
Dayton.....	14	14
Detroit.....	20	26
Indianapolis.....	9	10
New Orleans.....	18	22
New York.....	15	19
Philadelphia.....	40	45
San Francisco.....	53	57
Washington.....	38	46

¹ Excludes Government workers and the self-employed. For definition of central city, see table 3, footnote 1.
² Excludes Los Angeles and St. Louis.

Source: County Business Patterns (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1959 and 1965.)

RESIDENTS OF THE CENTRAL CITY

In 1964, of all the working age people in SMSA's who were poor (according to the Social Security Administration Index), half the whites and 80 percent of the nonwhites lived in the central cities.¹⁰ And for every major industry and occupational group,

whether involving relatively low-paid business repair services or higher paid professions, median family income in 1964 was lower among city than suburban residents.¹¹

The incidence of unemployment and poverty in central cities is greatest among Negroes.¹²

In 1964 (the latest year for which such figures are available), the median income of all nonwhite households in the central cities of SMSA's was \$3,656 compared with \$6,034 for white central-city households. Even among those who worked full time all year, the median for nonwhite households was \$5,292 compared with \$7,718 for the whites.¹³

TRANSPORTATION, INCOME, AND JOBS

Getting to a suburban job, therefore, imposes a greater burden on central city residents than is experienced by the suburban commuter to the city. Thus, transportation difficulties particularly affect Negroes, who are frequently confronted with discriminatory housing practices in the ring.

Public transportation to the suburbs is usually expensive, often circuitous, or simply not available. Detailed fare schedules from the American Transit Association show that fares on public transit lines from the central city to the closest suburban area range from 30 cents one way in 1 of the 14 SMSA's studied to 65 cents in another. The distances for which public transportation is provided vary, but it is obvious that a minimum of \$3 a week (or almost \$15 a month), plus more than an hour a day, including transfers and waiting, would have to be spent by a city resident to work in the suburbs. Furthermore, rush-hour schedules are not usually arranged to speed transit users to the outside in the morning and to the inside in the evening, as is frequently done for commuters in the opposite direction.

There is substantial evidence that central city residents using public transport spend more money and time to reach suburban jobs than those commuting to the city.¹⁴ Those wanting jobs at a substantial distance, or beyond bus or rapid transit lines, pay an especially high price. According to estimates by the Traffic Commission of New York City, it would cost a worker in Harlem \$40 a month to commute by public transportation to work in an aircraft plant in Farmingdale (Long Island), in a parts plant in Yonkers or Portchester (Westchester), or in a basic chemical plant or shipyard on Staten Island. The estimate includes \$1.50 a week for the New York City subway, \$30 a month for a commutation ticket on the Long Island or New Haven railroad, and \$3 a week for transportation from the suburban station to the plant. The public transit cost for a Bedford-Stuyvesant resident to work in the same place would be nearly \$50 a month.

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT OF NEW PRIVATE NONRESIDENTIAL BUILDING OUTSIDE THE CENTRAL CITIES OF 14 SELECTED SMSA'S 1960-65 AND 1954-65¹

Type of new nonresidential building	Percent of valuation of permits authorized for new nonresidential building in—													
	Atlanta	Boston	Chicago	Cleveland	Dayton	Detroit	Indianapolis	Los Angeles	New Orleans	New York	Philadelphia	St. Louis	San Francisco	Washington
1960-65														
All types ²	47	64	65	56	62	69	41	59	42	38	65	41	60	74
Business.....	44	68	64	60	66	69	49	60	49	39	70	39	63	70
Industrial.....	71	81	77	61	56	70	52	85	58	61	75	67	84	96
Stores and other mercantile buildings.....	44	74	67	74	78	80	55	63	66	64	75	75	72	91
Office buildings.....	25	52	58	38	53	55	21	41	10	21	52	32	38	58
Gasoline and service stations.....	63	91	54	57	98	58	54	60	60	51	66	55	72	76
Community.....	60	61	64	44	49	71	33	61	37	31	60	37	58	77
Educational.....	59	63	64	51	28	68	24	61	35	29	67	67	57	57
Hospital and institutional.....	59	38	56	15	56	61	14	72	44	25	38	35	52	78
Religious.....	69	92	73	84	56	81	56	69	35	77	86	62	62	86
Amusement.....	31	59	80	60	99	86	58	35	41	19	59	85	74	96
1954-65 ³														
All types ²	43	68	63	58	(⁴)	71	44	62	(⁴)	44	67	(⁴)	63	64
Business.....	41	70	61	59	(⁴)	73	50	63	(⁴)	44	69	(⁴)	64	62
Industrial.....	66	82	73	60	(⁴)	75	61	86	(⁴)	75	76	(⁴)	84	84
Stores and other mercantile buildings.....	40	74	67	73	(⁴)	77	52	66	(⁴)	71	72	(⁴)	72	89
Office buildings.....	21	51	39	37	(⁴)	58	21	41	(⁴)	18	51	(⁴)	37	47
Gasoline and service stations.....	60	82	59	62	(⁴)	65	56	62	(⁴)	65	73	(⁴)	73	81
Community.....	48	67	66	44	(⁴)	70	40	63	(⁴)	38	68	(⁴)	64	64
Educational.....	57	72	69	61	(⁴)	79	46	59	(⁴)	34	72	(⁴)	73	57
Hospital and institutional.....	32	41	58	33	(⁴)	62	10	70	(⁴)	32	43	(⁴)	53	61
Religious.....	59	86	68	81	(⁴)	74	59	70	(⁴)	61	80	(⁴)	65	75
Amusement.....	30	64	75	57	(⁴)	43	52	50	(⁴)	33	72	(⁴)	55	95

¹ Data for groups of years are used to avoid erroneous impressions from erratic year-to-year movements in building construction. Data for southern and western SMSA's reflect a more significant degree of annexation and area redefinition and are therefore less reliable than figures for other regions.

² Includes types not shown separately and excludes major additions and alterations for which type of building is not known.

³ Excludes data for 1959, for which comparable information is not available.

⁴ Not available.

Source: Unpublished data of the Bureau of the Census, tabulated at the request of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Based on a sample of over 3,000 permit-issuing places.

Persons whose incomes are most limited are most likely to use public transportation to work.¹⁶ Also, public transit usage declines with auto ownership; auto ownership rises with earnings, even in the suburbs.

Most nonwhite families living in central cities do not have an automobile. Fewer than half owned a car in 8 of the 14 central cities in the SMSA's selected for study. The six cities where half or more of the nonwhite families owned a car were all in the Midwest or the West, where median incomes are highest.¹⁶

Irrespective of earnings, however, central city residents and workers tend to use public transit most. The accompanying chart shows

the patterns in six of the SMSA's. This is a reflection of convenience and availability, since a large percentage of workers in SMSA's live and work in the central city. Almost all the rest live in the ring and work either in the ring or in the central city. The smallest proportion usually are those who travel from the city to the suburbs.

An illustration of the effect of convenience and availability is seen in the influence of a rapid transit system, such as a subway or railway, on public transportation use. This is revealed by results of a multiple regression analysis, which introduced seven selected determinants of public transit use in the 14

SMSA's studied. Of the seven variables used (auto ownership, land area, population density, income adjusted for price and city budget differences, sex, color, and whether or not a rapid transit system is available), clearly the most significant and influential was the availability of rapid transit. The seven indicators together explained virtually all of the variability in public transit use for each group of residents for which the regression was run,¹⁷ except for those living and working in the ring. Even for the latter, well over half the variability is explained; availability of rapid transit remains the most influential determinant.

TABLE 3.—PERCENT CHANGE IN PAYROLL EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED SMSA'S AND IN THEIR RING, BY INDUSTRY GROUP, 1959-65¹

Standard metropolitan statistical area	All industries		Manufacturing		Trade				Construction		Transportation and public utilities		Finance, insurance, and real estate		Services	
	Total, SMSA	Ring	Total, SMSA	Ring	Retail		Wholesale		Total, SMSA	Ring	Total, SMSA	Ring	Total, SMSA	Ring	Total, SMSA	Ring
					Total, SMSA	Ring	Total, SMSA	Ring								
Total of 12 SMSA's ²	12	30	4	15	15	39	8	46	18	31	14	19	14	55	30	55
Atlanta.....	32	51	21	39	26	58	38	138	67	80	35	130	44	88	37	81
Boston.....	9	14	-24	-2	14	24	7	37	27	31	-1	18	12	23	32	42
Chicago.....	10	34	6	27	16	47	9	60	5	6	(³)	11	10	30	24	60
Cleveland.....	10	36	3	34	14	35	5	9	18	10	16	33	20	29	27	71
Dayton.....	17	20	11	20	12	8	33	(³)	36	27	23	20	10	11	42	48
Detroit.....	16	48	11	36	16	57	11	76	14	80	7	67	10	276	34	82
Indianapolis.....	11	25	10	20	-1	29	14	10	8	8	14	13	14	20	24	52
New Orleans.....	24	54	26	12	14	77	-1	17	53	151	20	48	18	125	34	73
New York.....	9	37	1	15	11	40	4	66	4	24	20	19	7	51	26	58
Philadelphia.....	9	22	1	12	11	37	3	44	8	14	23	4	17	41	28	49
San Francisco.....	19	27	6	13	25	37	10	29	19	19	12	21	31	35	36	50
Washington.....	34	61	34	75	28	58	24	57	43	59	10	13	47	106	47	78

¹ Excludes government workers and the self-employed. Employment in the ring is estimated from employment outside of the county in which the central city is located. The central city and county were coterminous in both years in New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. For the following the ratio of the central city to central county employment in 1960 was 107 in San Francisco-Oakland, 89 in Boston, 70 in Indianapolis, 68 in Chicago, 64 in Detroit, 61 in Atlanta, 53 in Cleveland, and 52 in Dayton. Since the central county was used to establish the central city, the figures for the ring underestimate the suburban trend in all central cities which are smaller than the central city-county.

² Excludes Los Angeles and St. Louis; for Los Angeles, data for the central city-county do not permit close enough approximation with the city proper, and for St. Louis, data are not yet available for 1965.

³ Less than 0.5 percent change.

Source: County Business Patterns (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1959 and 1965).

Dependence on public transit among poor and relatively low-paid workers lends importance to the change in public transit costs as well as the level. Fares for public trans-

portation have risen twice as fast as the cost of buying and operating an automobile since 1957-59. The rate of increase is more than for any other group of commodities or services in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index, with the exception of

medical care, and even exceeded medical care in Atlanta, Boston, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia.¹⁸

Of all who traveled from home to work in 1960, the smallest journey-to-work group (less than 10 percent of the total) commuted

from central city to the suburbs. This percentage is surprisingly small, considering that high unemployment rates and low-income populations are concentrated in the city, whereas employment opportunities are expanding in the outskirts.

Of the men who did travel to the ring in 1960, half were craftsmen or production workers and another 13 percent were in professional or technical work. Of the women, about 1 of 5 were clerical or production workers. These occupational distributions for those traveling to the suburbs are not greatly different from those of the major group, which both lives and works in the central city. The occupational distribution of central city-to-suburb commuters varies most from the suburban residents who commute to the city and who are more likely to be in professional and managerial work. The central city-to-suburb commuters' occupational pattern differs little from those who live and work in the ring. Among the latter, the proportions of men and women are about the same, and, as in all four journey-to-work groups, women tend to be much more concentrated in clerical and service jobs than the men. The men predominate in industrial jobs. They are not more professionally oriented than in the other groups and are less so than among the commuters to the city from the ring.

Even without a detailed occupational classification, it is possible to judge that a great many of those who work in the suburbs (or of those engaged to work in the new job openings there) are paratechnical, subprofessional, clerical, sales, or semiskilled employees in plants, stores, warehouses, hospitals, and the like. These are the kinds of jobs for which the unemployed and underemployed in cities could be hired directly, or trained by employers or the Government with little effort or expense. But these jobs are not accessible or always open to unemployed or underemployed city dwellers, many of whom are Negroes. This significantly limits the contribution expanding job opportunities in the ring could make toward overcoming the competitive disadvantage and unused skill potential of those living in the city.

FOOTNOTES

* Of the Division of Economic Studies, Bureau of Labor Statistics. With the assistance of Laura L. Irwin and Sylvia S. Small.

¹ See "The Economy in 1966," *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1967, p. 5.

² "Suburbs" and "ring" are used interchangeably in this article to represent the entire area outside of the central city or cities of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, as defined by the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.

³ See *Income, Education, and Unemployment in Neighborhoods*, a series of reports on 34 cities by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, based on 1960 Census data for Census tracts (January 1963); "Poverty Areas of Our Major Cities," *Monthly Labor Review*, October 1966, pp. 1105-1110; from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Special Census Survey of the South and East Los Angeles Areas: November 1965* (Series P-23, No. 17, Mar. 23, 1966); *Changes in Economic Level in Nine Neighborhoods in Cleveland: 1960 to 1965* (Series P-23, No. 20, Sept. 22, 1966); *Characteristics of Selected Neighborhoods in Cleveland, Ohio: April 1965* (Series P-23, No. 21, Jan. 23, 1967); and Mollie Orshansky, "The Poor in City and Suburb, 1964," *Social Security Review*, December 1966, p. 30.

⁴ Data on the valuation and number of nonresidential buildings authorized by building permits, by type of building, in individual localities and counties throughout the country are compiled by the Bureau of the Census from almost all known permit-issuing places. These comprehensive statistics are available for individual localities and areas, and are used to develop national and regional estimates. For a large proportion of Stand-

ard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's), reports from building-permit officials on building permits authorized in the individual localities or counties that comprise the SMSA's are complete or virtually so. The data for this section of this study are based on information for selected SMSA's for which the data are complete or virtually so, and on Census estimates for 4 regions and the Nation.

The valuation placed on a building at the time of permit issuance varies from the true construction cost, and is usually somewhat lower. The differences between permit valuation and final construction cost are assumed to be relatively consistent within localities and are estimated not to affect the trends and relationships reflected in the data presented in this article.

Permits which are issued are almost invariably used, according to special Census surveys. For further information on the building permit series, see *Construction Statistics, 1915-1964: A Supplement to Construction Review* (U.S. Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration, 1965). See also Bureau of the Census, *Construction Reports*, Series C-40 and Series C-42.

⁵ *The Negroes in the United States* (BLS Bulletin 1511), pp. 3-17 and 66-70. See also *Census of Population: 1960, Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas*, PC(3) 1D, lists 1, 2, and 3 on pp. XVI-XIX, and table 1 (U.S. Bureau of the Census). See J. R. Meyer, J. F. Kain, M. Wohl, *The Urban Transportation Problem* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1965), chapters 1 and 2 and accompanying footnotes to related literature.

⁶ The 14 SMSA's selected for study are among those for which building-permit data were most comprehensive and comparable, based on evaluation by experts in the Bureau of the Census. These SMSA's were studied also for the effects of annexation, and for changes in definition during the period 1954-65. The effects, while relatively sizable between some years for a few areas, could not be said to bias the results in any area for cumulative data covering 5 years or more.

⁷ Excludes the self-employed and Government workers.

⁸ See also "Transportation Implications of Employment Trends in Central Cities and Suburbs," by Edmond L. Kanwit and Alma F. Eckart, presented at the 46th annual meeting of the Highway Research Board, in Washington, D.C., January 1967, especially pp. 10-15.

⁹ Orshansky, op. cit., table 7, p. 31.

¹⁰ For a few readings on the extent and influence of residential segregation, see George and Eunice Grier, *Equality and Beyond: Housing Segregation and the Goals of the Great Society* (New York, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1966); Harry Sharp and Leo F. Schnore, "Changing Color Composition of Metropolitan Areas," *Land Economics*, May 1962; and Karl and Alma Taeuber, *Negroes in Cities* (Chicago, Aldine Publishing Co., 1965).

¹¹ Census Bureau, op. cit., Series P-60, No. 48, Table 8, pp. 20-21.

¹² Orshansky, op. cit., pp. 30-31; see also footnote 2.

¹³ See "Income in 1964 of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Metropolitan-Non-metropolitan Residence," *Current Population Reports, Consumer Income*, Series P-60, No. 48, table 1, p. 13 (U.S. Bureau of the Census). Data relate to families and unrelated individuals.

¹⁴ Meyer, Kain, and Wohl, op. cit.; a national study of urban transportation patterns by John B. Lansing, *Residential Location and Urban Mobility: The Second Wave of Interventions* (Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, 1966); and independent analysis of Cleveland and Washington, D.C., transit schedules.

¹⁵ These data are chiefly from the *Census of*

Population: 1960, Journey to Work, PC(2)-6B, table 2, and *Census of Housing: 1960, United States Summary*, HC(1), No. 1, table 19 (U.S. Bureau of the Census). Additional tabular material is available upon request to the author.

¹⁶ *Census of Housing: 1960, United States Summary, States and Small Areas*, HC(1), No. 1, table 19 (U.S. Bureau of the Census).

¹⁷ Those living and working in the central city; living in the central city and working in the ring; living in the ring and working in the central city; and living in the ring and working in the ring.

¹⁸ Public transit fares outside as well as inside the central city are used in computing the Index.

SENATOR DOMINICK PINPOINTS FALLACIES OF GUN BILL ARGUMENTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency has held 11 days of hearings thus far this summer on the pending Federal firearms legislation: the administration proposal, amendment 90; Senator Donb's bill, S. 1; and my own, S. 1853; and S. 1854.

In my opinion, a most succinct and helpful presentation to the subcommittee was made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who clearly delineated the fallacies in the arguments of those who would have us enact all-encompassing Federal regulation of firearms.

At the same time, however, the Senator from Colorado underlined the need to regulate the abuse of firearms. He expressed agreement with the necessity of certain corrective amendments to the Federal Firearms Act and to the National Firearms Act and said:

Enactment of these proposals coupled with vigorous enforcement would close existing loopholes in the law which have been a source of aggravation and frustration for our law enforcement personnel.

Mr. President, it was with great pleasure that I noted Senator DOMINICK's endorsement of the approach I have taken in my bill, S. 1853. I welcome the reasoning he expressed to the subcommittee and urge the Members of the Senate to consider seriously his logical analysis of the problem. Let us pay heed to his call that:

Any federal legislation be acted upon with a calm sense of deliberation and awareness of the need for balance and reason.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMINICK's testimony of July 28, 1967, before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PETER H. DOMINICK ON FIREARMS LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, JULY 28, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee: I am delighted to be here this morning to testify on the various proposals pending before this subcommittee on federal firearms legislation.

Coloradans have a vital interest in these bills. We probably have a greater percentage of our population as legitimate owners and wholesome users of firearms than most states in the country.