CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The ACTING LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 705 (H.R. 2516), a bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 705, H.R. 2516, a bill to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending amendment is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale), which deals with housing.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the pending amendment would provide for an opportunity for all Americans throughout this country to buy or rent housing without discrimination. I intend to speak in favor of the amendment. I earnestly hope the amendment will be adopted. I believe it should be.

Mr. President, last year we saw violence and rioting in the streets of our major cities—New York, in Detroit, in Milwaukee, and elsewhere. The crisis in our central cities has been a subject of national concern and has been recognized by the President and Congress. The President has taken steps to deal with the problem of urban violence and civil disorders.

The whites have escaped their responsibilities by fleeing to the suburbs, taking with them the central city’s tax base and source of civic leadership. The process of moving to the suburbs and the outlying areas for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class. Not many from the ghetto can qualify in the changing job market.

While employment is booming in the suburbs, it has been declining in the central city. The economic functions of central cities have been gradually changing from manufacturing centers to centers for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class.

The whites have escaped their responsibilities by fleeing to the suburbs, taking with them the central city’s tax base and source of civic leadership. The process of moving to the suburbs and the outlying areas for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class. Not many from the ghetto can qualify in the changing job market.

The whites have escaped their responsibilities by fleeing to the suburbs, taking with them the central city’s tax base and source of civic leadership. The process of moving to the suburbs and the outlying areas for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class. Not many from the ghetto can qualify in the changing job market.

While employment is booming in the suburbs, it has been declining in the central city. The economic functions of central cities have been gradually changing from manufacturing centers to centers for finance, marketing, and corporate management. The skill requirements have correspondingly shifted from unskilled and semiskilled to highly skilled in the technical, managerial, and professional class.
portions of our central cities. And yet a considerable fraction of the potential supply of labor to fill these jobs has been left behind in the central city ghettos. Moreover, our urban mass transit programs, which subsidize the affluent suburbs, have been of little comfort to the ghetto resident. One of the conclusions of the McCone Commission, following the Watts riot, was that there was a severe lack of public transportation from the ghetto to sources of employment. According to Charles M. Haar, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for Metropolitan Development:

The high cost of transportation—in both time and money—prevented residents of Watts from achieving access to other parts of Los Angeles and exaggerated the isolation of the community.

When looked at cold经济 terms, the obvious solution to the problem of the ghetto is a policy of open housing. If there is an imbalance between people and jobs, then move the people to the jobs. This simple solution is frustrated by the low unemployment rate and the high economic cost. There is a loss to our national economy through the underutilization of our labor supply. And there is an ultimate social cost of discrimination which culminates in sharply increased expenditures for welfare, crime prevention, and municipal services. One study has shown that public expenditures in the slums are nine times greater than tax revenues. I wonder how long General Motors would tolerate one of its divisions running such a loss. Fortunately, we as a nation do not keep our books as efficiently as General Motors.

There are three basic approaches to the problem of the central city ghetto.

One is to continue our present policy, which is basically a no-win policy. The existing programs of HUD and OEO and other agencies might be marginally expanded, but it seems clear that the magnitude of the problem far exceeds the resources the Federal Government is presently willing to commit. For example, 18 years of our public expenditure for welfare, crime prevention, and sanitary home for every American family. The consequences of our no-win urban policy are likely to be found in more crime and violence and a perpetuation of poverty from one generation to the next.

A second policy has already been called the Marshall plan for the ghettos. There is no doubt that if we are willing to pour $30 billion or more a year into the ghettos, they can be made a safe, decent, and sanitary home for every American family. The consequences of our no-win urban policy are likely to be found in more crime and violence and a perpetuation of poverty from one generation to the next.

A second policy has already been called the Marshall plan for the ghettos. There is no doubt that if we are willing to pour $30 billion or more a year into the ghettos, they can be made a safe, decent, and sanitary home for every American family. The consequences of our no-win urban policy are likely to be found in more crime and violence and a perpetuation of poverty from one generation to the next.

Mr. President, the fair housing bill now before the Senate is a modest attempt to insulate that every American family can buy or rent a home free from racial discrimination. But more importantly, it commits this country to a basic policy to end housing discrimination in housing.

Those who are anxious to secure the rights of fair housing for all Americans have sometimes been critical of landlords, real estate developers, rental agents, and the like, for their discriminatory practices. This is not to say that increased expenditures may not be needed in the short run.

Aside from economics, there are serious social questions involved in a policy which is basically aimed at bribing a generation of Negro militants into docility. Suburban Americans can purchase tranquility while still preserving the ghetto, if they are willing to pay the price—but it is likely to be exorbitant, both in economic and social terms.

A third approach might be termed a policy of dispersal through open housing. This approach would look to the eventual dissolution of the ghetto and the construction of low and moderate income housing in the suburbs and outlying portions of central cities. It would mean providing ghetto residents with access to better housing, to improved job opportunities, to better education, and to a sounder environment in the suburbs. Such a policy would be in harmony with basic economic trends and would clearly be the cheapest of the three alternatives. But it does imply an end to the practice of racial discrimination, which has heretofore kept our suburbs virtually 100 percent white.

The benefits of an open housing policy are numerous. For example, it is estimated that Negroes living in the ghettos would be brought on a par with white education when Negroes are concentrated in all black central city schools. Thus, continued residential segregation will perpetuate the transmission of frustration from one generation to the next. This vicious cycle can be broken by giving the Negro child the same educational opportunities which white children receive.

Second, a policy of dispersion will move Negro residents closer to job opportunities, with a constant reduction in welfare and unemployment compensation payments.

Third, by dispersing Negro residential opportunities throughout a metropolitan area, the social unrest and violence in the ghetto is diminished. A famous historian from the University of Wisconsin, Frederic Jackson Turner, observed that the existence of a western frontier served as a safety valve to alleviate social upheaval in our cities during the 19th century. A man and his family could always escape the intolerable living conditions through open housing. He is locked in. In the long run, I believe America must move toward dissolving the ghetto simply because no other solution will work. The only question is when. I believe the time is now.

Mr. President, the fair housing bill now before the Senate is a modest attempt to ensure that every American family can buy or rent a home free from racial discrimination. But more importantly, it commits this country to a basic policy to end housing discrimination in housing.

Those who are anxious to secure the rights of fair housing for all Americans have sometimes been critical of landlords, real estate developers, rental agents, and the like, for their discriminatory practices. This is not to say that increased expenditures may not be needed in the short run.
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A third approach might be termed a policy of dispersal through open housing. This approach would look to the eventual dissolution of the ghetto and the construction of low and moderate income housing in the suburbs and outlying portions of central cities. It would mean providing ghetto residents with access to better housing, to improved job opportunities, to better education, and to a sounder environment in the suburbs. Such a policy would be in harmony with basic economic trends and would clearly be the cheapest of the three alternatives. But it does imply an end to the practice of racial discrimination, which has heretofore kept our suburbs virtually 100 percent white.
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have freedom of choice in selection of their homes.

In 1960, 44 percent of all nonwhites lived in substandard housing as compared with 13 percent of all white families. Nearly half of the nonwhites who lived in overcrowded homes were of that 19 percent of the whites. Thirty times as large a proportion of nonwhite families, 28 percent, lived in overcrowded homes, as did white households, 10 percent; and this overcrowding was prevalent in all income classes.

For example, of nonwhite families with incomes of $6,000 or more, 25 percent lived in overcrowded conditions. This compares with only 9 percent for whites in the same income classes.

Mr. President, the crises in our cities demands responsible action by Congress. To ignore the rising tension is folly.

Just over the weekend, President Johnson said that he anticipated, unfortunately, that, whereas we are likely to have a hot summer, indeed, in our big cities because of racial tension, we could expect many more hot summers in the future before our problems are solved. I am sure the President shares my conviction that the violence and the tragedy will go on and on in our cities. The costs of segregation will be far, far worse in the absence of fair housing legislation.

To adopt overly repressive police state methods to repress unrest would be a national tragedy. To talk big and do little can only add to the disillusionment and deepening despair of our Negroes.

Congress can and should act. A program of fair housing can offer a significant improvement in our urban problems:

Fair housing is morally right. It is economically sound. It is socially responsive. It is legally and constitutionally correct. In short, a fair housing law is a commitment to uphold American ideals. It permits millions of Americans to participate in the mainstream of American life. It removes the depressing and degrading experience of racial discrimination which can wound for life man's inner dignity. Who among us can say such practices should continue unchallenged?

Mr. President, I was presiding in the Senate last week when the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Tydings] was speaking in support of the pending amendment. In the course of his address, he and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] enlivened the discussion by making the point that if open housing can reduce the likelihood of riots in the big city ghettos, why is the problem so acute, why the riots last year since 30 percent of our people now live in jurisdictions which have some type of open housing law? Why do we still have the problem? I should like to answer that question. I could not do so, unfortunately, last week, because I was presiding. I should like to answer that question with reference to Milwaukee, because in Milwaukee we have a situation in which the city is theoretically covered by a fair housing law. Wisconsin has passed legislation which provides for fair housing, or open housing. The trouble is that it is not the consistent enforcement of one thing applies in most of the States that now have such legislation—that is, the exemptions are so big that only a majority of housing units are covered and the very great majority of homes are not covered. This means that most homes are closed, they are not available to the minority family, the Negro family, that wants to make a purchase.

This is especially clear in the city of Milwaukee, because every day since last summer there have been marches in this city. There have been protest marches by minority groups protesting one issue and one issue only—not the absence of jobs, nor educational opportunity, but the failure of the city council to enact a far-reaching open housing ordinance. It is true that if we should enact this program, it will not solve the problem overnight. Many other things have to be done. But I believe we overlook the decisive psychological impact of saying to minority groups that they are free to buy a home anywhere in America where the home is for sale. I do not think the argument that the Mondale-Brooke amendment would do. After all, can we do less? We should have done this long, long ago.

As I have said, the economic reasons for doing this are clear and emphatic. The moral reasons are undeniable. I do hope the Senate agrees to the pending amendment.

I yield the floor. Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for his very enlightening and persuasive remarks to the Senate on the importance of open housing legislation and a champion of open housing legislation. I think it is highly significant that this statement was made by the Senator from the great State of Wisconsin, where, as he has said, day after day there have been marches, not so much for jobs, not we can do less, but for open occupancy in housing.
movement to the suburbs. As a separate political entity, the city has, with growing force, been deprived by the expanding rings of suburbs of the resources it needs to set its house in order.

The newly emergent residential patterns have thus transformed segregation from a problem in an already segregated South (though posing a moral dilemma for the entire nation) into the hardest kind of practical economic problem afflicting all the urban areas.

But the problem no longer stops at the city line. Today, segregation increasingly threatens the rational planning and development of metropolitan Philadelphia. Suburbia is spreading in a variety of ways, and at a ferocious rate. In metropolitan Philadelphia, for example, while the population of the "urbanized" or heavily built up area grew by 24 percent during the 1950's, its geographic spread doubled. This reckless consumption of land cannot continue much longer. Municipalities are already grappling in various ways with the challenge of making more effective and intelligent use of land within feasible commuting distance. The aim of their plans is to keep the metropolitan area fit places in which to live, with a satisfaction of all the various elements that together constitute an adequate human environment: homes, commercial and cultural centers, adequate transit facilities, industries, parks, and other necessities and amenities.

In metropolitan Washington regional planning agencies recently devised a "Plan for the Metropolitan District" as a general set of principles for meeting the needs of a population that is expected to grow to more than twice its present size before the end of the next decade. The plan suggests that the future growth be channeled along six radial "corridors" extending outward in star fashion from the central city. Highways and transit lines would run alongside the corridors; centers of commerce and various service areas would be located at appropriate intervals. To preserve as much of the green countryside as possible and to provide an ever-present specter of race. To be successful in realizing their diversified goals, the town planners have to be faced with the problem of making modern living possible within economic means.

In the event that the new towns, despite the hopeful prospect they represent, also confront the ever-present specter of race. To be successful in realizing their diversified goals, the town planners have to be faced with the problem of making modern living possible within economic means. The most comprehensive of the new towns will require a large number of service workers - including manual laborers, domestics, custodians, and sales people, to mention only a few categories. Today, the only significant, if any, for these occupations is the Negro population. Furthermore, civil rights laws now require equal access by all citizens to employment opportunities. Thus, in the event that the new towns will be located too far from the central cities for easy and economical commuting, thus, in all likelihood, the workers will have to be housed in the towns themselves.

But on what basis? Will the new towns contain, from the outset, pre-planned ghettos? If not, how is integration to be accomplished, given the differential income levels of the people involved and the many problems connected with providing low-cost housing for Negroes? An additional obstacle is that the ever-present specter of race. To be successful in realizing their diversified goals, the town planners have to be faced with the problem of making modern living possible within economic means. The most comprehensive of the new towns will require a large number of service workers - including manual laborers, domestics, custodians, and sales people, to mention only a few categories. Today, the only significant, if any, for these occupations is the Negro population. Furthermore, civil rights laws now require equal access by all citizens to employment opportunities. Thus, in the event that the new towns will be located too far from the central cities for easy and economical commuting, thus, in all likelihood, the workers will have to be housed in the towns themselves.

But on what basis? Will the new towns contain, from the outset, pre-planned ghettos? If not, how is integration to be accomplished, given the differential income levels of the people involved and the many problems connected with providing low-cost housing for Negroes? An additional obstacle is that the ever-present specter of race. To be successful in realizing their diversified goals, the town planners have to be faced with the problem of making modern living possible within economic means. The most comprehensive of the new towns will require a large number of service workers - including manual laborers, domestics, custodians, and sales people, to mention only a few categories. Today, the only significant, if any, for these occupations is the Negro population. Furthermore, civil rights laws now require equal access by all citizens to employment opportunities. Thus, in the event that the new towns will be located too far from the central cities for easy and economical commuting, thus, in all likelihood, the workers will have to be housed in the towns themselves.
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As segregation continues to grow and Negroes reach numerical predominance in more and more urban centers, do the majority of Negroes remain poor? As the nation's industrial and commercial life find themselves less and less able to cope with their problems, financially and in every other way, what will be the answer for the metropolitan complexes where two-thirds of America's population currently reside and where as much as 85 per cent of the nation may live by the year 2000?

Aside from these large and basic questions of public policy and social change, residential segregation has grown to mean more personal and individual level. And the personal damage is not to Negroes alone. Many of the neighborhoods newly entered by Negroes in the last two decades have been occupied by middle-aged and retired white families who often look upon their current homes as being their last—and whose emotional relationship to both house and neighborhood is based upon ties of familiarity and friendship built up over many years. These occupants feel deeply threatened by the threat of Negroes to their tranquility. The stress is mental stress, misery, and loneliness, as well as a sense of overwhelming personal loss at being "forced" to leave a home and neighborhood with which they have had such close personal ties. And the changes will be to individual families but to institutions as well as a sense of overwhelming personal loss at being "forced" to leave a home and neighborhood with which they have had such close personal ties.

The effects of precipitate change are particularly sad in ethnic neighborhoods where much of the community's life has centered about the home. Most Negroes and Hispanics, and many other minorities as well, often include kinsfolk as well as friends. In such cases, the change is painful not only to individual families but to institutions and societies as well. And the changes often take place so precipitously that they surpass the capacity of the community's life to center about the home. Most Negroes and Hispanics, and many other minorities as well, often include kinsfolk as well as friends. In such cases, the change is painful not only to individual families but to institutions and societies as well. And the changes often take place so precipitously that they surpass the capacity of the community's life to center about the home.

In a word, when such stress occurs, residential segregation is or has become central to major domestic problems of the nation. There is no way to determine the ultimate sum of the costs involved in this process, but it may be that it can be calculated to have cost the nation many billions, not in dollars alone, but in human suffering as well. The cost is measured in stress, misery, and loneliness, as well as a sense of overwhelming personal loss at being "forced" to leave a home and neighborhood with which they have had such close personal ties. And the changes will be to individual families but to institutions as well as a sense of overwhelming personal loss at being "forced" to leave a home and neighborhood with which they have had such close personal ties. The effects of precipitate change are particularly sad in ethnic neighborhoods where much of the community's life has centered around the home.

Mr. President, this is a problem we have only begun to recognize in the very recent past. For although the rights of Negro citizens have been afforded to Negroes for decades, other forces, wider and newer than those we have considered, have been undermining the situation. Let me again refer to the notable research of Eunice and George Grier:

The background to all that has happened lies in certain facts concerning the rapid urbanization of the nation. The census, which has been periodically taken since 1790, tells us the story. The first enumeration, designed to plot the peripheries of the nation's growth, posed a giant barrier to the free dispersal of the growing Negro populations. The findings of a market analysis conducted by the Philadelphia office of Pennsylvania's Institute for Urban Studies at the peak of the postwar housing boom in the mid-1950's were quite typical. At that time in Philadelphia, the average house selling for $12,000 or more in Philadelphia had been purchased by Negroes—a fact which the authors laid mainly to economic incapacity. This phenomenon continued to be seen in the modest new house in Philadelphia's suburbs.

But this is only part of the story. Federal policies and practices in housing reinforced this process. The FHA, for example, "nailed" more Negro cities and the white suburbs. In part, this was intentional. From 1935 to 1950—a period in which about 15 million new units were constructed—20 per cent of those areas which Negroes entered, were unchanged in another 41 per cent, and declined in only 15 per cent. These were the primary reasons for the decision to sell the property values and thereby undermine home ownership programs. FHA actually drove out of business some developers who insisted upon open policies.

More recently, a number of studies by competent housing economists have cast serious doubt upon the thesis that Negro entry lowers property values. Laurenti, in his thorough analysis entitled Property Values and the Housing Market, came to the conclusion that Negro entry lowers property values, and that these preferences were probably neither foreseen nor understood by the FHA. Indeed, this success can be counted as one of the major achievements of a nation which has never been satisfied with small accomplishments. Almost every year following World War II more than one million dwelling units were constructed and occupied, a figure which is double the rate at which new families were formed. And, despite rapid population growth during the fifties, the 1960 Census showed that Americans were far better housed than ever before. Overcrowding and "doubling up" (two or more families in one dwelling) had been considerably reduced. So had dilapidated and otherwise substandard housing. To a great extent the nation benefited from this widespread improvement—even Negroes, though they continued to be less adequately housed than whites.

Nevertheless, the private enterprise system was able to house the enormous increase (from about 6 million to 54 million) in only sixty years. The private enterprise system was able to house the enormous increase (from about 6 million to 54 million) in only sixty years. The increase in the nation's history took place within 212 metropolitan areas.

As the background to all that has happened lies in certain facts concerning the rapid urbanization of the nation. The census, which has been periodically taken since 1790, tells us the story. The first enumeration, designed to plot the peripheries of the nation's growth, posed a giant barrier to the free dispersal of the growing Negro populations. The findings of a market analysis conducted by the Philadelphia office of Pennsylvania's Institute for Urban Studies at the peak of the postwar housing boom in the mid-1950's were quite typical. At that time in Philadelphia, the average house selling for $12,000 or more in Philadelphia had been purchased by Negroes—a fact which the authors laid mainly to economic incapacity. This phenomenon continued to be seen in the modest new house in Philadelphia's suburbs.

But this is only part of the story. Federal policies and practices in housing reinforced this process. The FHA, for example, "nailed" more Negro cities and the white suburbs. In part, this was intentional. From 1935 to 1950—a period in which about 15 million new units were constructed—20 per cent of those areas which Negroes entered, were unchanged in another 41 per cent, and declined in only 15 per cent. These were the primary reasons for the decision to sell the property values and thereby undermine home ownership programs. FHA actually drove out of business some developers who insisted upon open policies.

More recently, a number of studies by competent housing economists have cast serious doubt upon the thesis that Negro entry lowers property values. Laurenti, in his thorough analysis entitled Property Values and the Housing Market, came to the conclusion that Negro entry lowers property values, and that these preferences were probably neither foreseen nor understood by the FHA. Indeed, this success can be counted as one of the major achievements of a nation which has never been satisfied with small accomplishments. Almost every year following World War II more than one million dwelling units were constructed and occupied, a figure which is double the rate at which new families were formed. And, despite rapid population growth during the fifties, the 1960 Census showed that Americans were far better housed than ever before. Overcrowding and "doubling up" (two or more families in one dwelling) had been considerably reduced. So had dilapidated and otherwise substandard housing. To a great extent the nation benefited from this widespread improvement—even Negroes, though they continued to be less adequately housed than whites.
smaller families, older couples, single persons, people with low or precarious earnings, families who sought dwellings for rent rather than for purchase, and families who desired the convenience of living in the central city. The FHA, VA, and public housing programs have helped meet the pent-up housing needs of Negroes and re­

duced the in­

idence of blighted housing.

The differences between the two programs thus reinforce each other in their effects upon patterns of residence. While the FHA and VA programs are based upon maximum rather than minimum income levels. Under these conditions relatively small numbers of whites can qualify because of the low income限额 standard. In many areas, even where con­
scious efforts are made to attract an inter­
racial clientele, the great majority of resi­
dents of these FHA and VA projects are Negroes. The FHA and VA programs, therefore, the suburbs were the only practical areas in which to solve their hous­
ing needs. In this way, the FHA and VA pro­grams have helped promote White dominance—the quicker the transition of Negroes to the suburbs, the greater the White renatal clientele, the greater the White dominance of the suburbs, public housing has helped enhance Negro dominance in the cities.

The most revolutionary change that the federal government's major housing programs has subsidized low­
income public housing, administered by the Public Housing Administration through local housing authorities. The eligibility requirements for public housing are based upon maximum rather than minimum income levels. Under these conditions relatively small numbers of whites can qualify because of the low income限额 standard. In many areas, even where con­scious efforts are made to attract an inter­
racial clientele, the great majority of resi­
dents of these FHA and VA projects are Negroes. The FHA and VA programs, therefore, the suburbs were the only practical areas in which to solve their hous­ing needs. In this way, the FHA and VA pro­grams have helped promote White dominance—the quicker the transition of Negroes to the suburbs, the greater the White renatal clientele, the greater the White dominance of the suburbs, public housing has helped enhance Negro dominance in the cities.

The second of the federal government's major housing programs is urban renewal. Established by the Housing Act of 1949, its chief goal is to combat­
physical decay in the central cities. In a sense, it is a supplement to the FHA and VA programs, since, among other things, it attempts to draw back to the cities the more prosperous of the families who have left it. While urban renewal projects have usually cleared blighted sections and replaced them with housing units priced in the middle­
to upper­income brackets. Most often, as might be expected, the occupants of the site before renewal have been low­
income members of a racial minority. They have been displaced by housing which, for economic some­­
what larger families, older couples, single persons, people with low or precarious earnings, families who sought dwellings for rent rather than for purchase, and families who desired the convenience of living in the central city. The FHA, VA, and public housing programs have helped meet the pent-up housing needs of Negroes and re­

duced the in­

idence of blighted housing.
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the decision was inapplicable to its operation. Finally, late in 1949, it removed the model covenant and all references to neighborhood race in the deed and the VA, which had ruled that the insured property they acquired (usually under foreclosure proceedings) would be made available to all buyers or renters regardless of race; the administrative head of the FHA had instructed local offices to take "active steps to encourage the development of demonstrations that the Federal Government is not willing to locate in areas"; both the FHA and VA had signed a series of formal agreements of cooperation with state and local agencies responsible for enforcing laws and ordinances against housing discrimination; the government had dropped a system of racial quotas in housing built for persons displaced by urban renewal; and it also had banned discrimination in a special loan program to assist the elderly in their housing needs.

These regulations and directives clearly represented a significant broadening of the directly discriminatory policies pursued before 1950. Yet their practical effect on the rigid, undeniable, and sometimes overt segregation that had developed over the years was very small. In 1962, federal reports revealed that nearly 80 per cent of all public housing projects serving a federal subsidy were occupied by whites. Segregated projects were located as far North as Scranton, Pennsylvania, and Plattsburgh, New York—and, as might be expected, in practically every locality in the South. The vast majority of new suburban housing backed by FHA and VA mortgage guarantees was occupied exclusively by white families. A scathing report of March 1963 found that only 10 per cent of new renewal sites were made available to both Negroes and whites; but they were limited mainly to the largest cities of the North and West and to areas of relatively low or close to luxury levels. Where integration existed, it was largely the result of state and local laws rather than national directives. Only seldom, moreover, was integration the result of market forces.

Nonetheless, by 1962, partly because of the ineffectiveness of previous changes, it had become clear that the broad problems of discrimination and segregation in housing could not be interwoven to be solved with piecemeal changes in federal policy. The first step toward a more comprehensive approach came in August 1962, when President Kennedy issued an Executive Order barring discrimination in all housing receiving federal aid after that date. At the end of April 1964, it was estimated that 932,000 units of housing had come under the directives of the Order. In June 1964, it was estimated that between 12 and 20 per cent of all new residential construction was covered.

But the segregation that had developed in previous years still remained. Charles Abrams summed up both this the value of the Executive Order shortly after it was issued in the following way:

"The Executive Order will . . . touch only a small fraction of the existing housing problem. Any real gains are to be made, its coverage must be 'widened or more individual state laws laboriously sought. The President's Order is a small step toward breaking the bottleneck in housing discrimination. It has not been designed to deal with the existing residential segregation. Led by the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing—a small and meagerly financed organization which grew out of the first successful campaigns for housing laws in New York—religious, civic and labor groups in many parts of the country have spearheaded similar efforts toward this end. The resulting laws have provided a foundation upon which other types of private effort could build."

"Nevertheless, its importance cannot be discounted. It represents a small but important step toward breaking the bottleneck in housing discrimination. It has not been designed to deal with the existing residential segregation."

In cooperation with the Federal National Mortgage Association, the right to issue insured loans from government funds at below-market interest rates to family owners and investors occupied by families with incomes too low to acquire new homes in the private market. This indirect form of subsidy was intended to provide a larger number of Negroes and Whites; but they were limited only to create truly equal opportunity for all, but also to solve the many domestic problems which stem from inequality and artifices that have not yet completely been prepared to move beyond mere non-discrimination and good will—in a sense, beyond equality—into an area of positive and aggressive action in which Negroes and Negroes should and are ready done. It will require a massive national effort, calling upon the full resources of both the public and private sectors.

It is not clear that the fundamental resources it needs to solve the problem is fortunately clear. What is required is less the creation of new mechanisms than the effective of the basic tenets of American democracy. For example, it needs not be attempted through forced redistribution of population. Force is not only intolerable, but unnecessary. The basic problem is that people is so great (about half of all house- holds moved during the latter half of the 1950s alone) that redistribution can be achieved with little difficulty. The choice—if sufficient resources are applied to make socially desirable patterns of residence as attractive to the public as socially unattractive ones have been—is to staff the

Nor is it necessary to attempt a rigidly planned dispersal of Negro households. The

the segmented market in the public housing program, where Negroes predominate, has sought to stabilize the public housing program, where Negroes predominate, to housing for persons displaced by urban renewal, and also it was due to在我所归属的。
The following are some specific measures which would help achieve the goal.

A total strategy for desegregation. The segregation problem is too complex to be solved by a central federal agency possessing the authority to translate plans into effective action. This agency must have the power to draw together federal operations in this area and the resources of the states, local authorities, and private power organizations. This requires systematic planning, and it must be directed always to a clear and unwavering set of goals.

BROADENED FEDERAL INCENTIVES FOR EFFECTIVE ACTION. The newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development can be such an instrument—if it can overcome the handicap of its origin in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, a loosely knit combination of independent agencies, and achieve better coordination of individually powerful organizations than has the similarly amalgamated Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This will not be easy.

The President has proposed one of the most acceptable means of applying governmental leverage in a democratic system—specifically the use of Federal subsidies and the implementation of the limited education. The most important need of the minority poor is for decent jobs at a decent pay. Economic measures can and must be devised to achieve that objective. Low-income minority persons should be trained for the specific kinds of jobs which will be made available in the new, comprehensively planned, and coordinated metropolitan areas. Housing should be planned for them close to these new job opportunities. Similarly, relocation from urban ghettos will think of others which would be of value:
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The importance of a seller's right to select the purchaser was an illusion.

One of these witnesses stated:

An experienced real estate broker knows that up until the time the race question entered the picture not one seller in a hundred was being so discriminatory as going to buy his house so long as the buyer had the money and met the seller's terms.

In other words, the sale of a home is a commercial transaction. The test applied is purely a financial one, except where the factor of race, religion, or national origin is involved.

Furthermore, they emphasize the contrast between States with open housing legislation and those without—these same builders testified that when operating in different States, even at the same time, and with otherwise identical developments, they never sold homes in their developments and have experienced no friction or economic loss of any kind.

Because of the economic factors involved, the passage of fair housing legislation will not cause a deluge of Negroes into white neighborhoods and create new ghettos. The District of Columbia has a fair housing ordinance which allows Negroes to move into previously all-white areas of the city. There are Negroes in Chevy Chase, Maryland, where the present speaker lives—and American University Park, but their numbers are regulated strictly by their ability to pay.

I am proud that in the block in which I live resides a magnificent Negro family.

Mr. President, I should like to emphasize one point. The Real Estate Association persists in talking about the precious right of the seller not to sell. Several of the subcommittee's witnesses agreed that in their experience as real estate brokers that the prejudice which has been substantial—they had not become parties to nor had heard of any transaction in which someone, exercising the "right not to sell," had refused to sell for any reason whatsoever when the buyer was steady, willing, and able to purchase.

Mr. President, the hearings on the Fair Housing Act of 1967 before the Sub-committee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency heard from a distinguished panel of realtors. That testimony begins on page 390 of the hearings.


If there were any doubts that fair housing legislation would not give rise to a new ghettos, the passage of fair housing legislation would be the most compelling single elements develop.
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The problem of poverty in the cities is the totally-related problem of segregated housing. These two monstrous national disgraces are really only one, Mr. President. I quote from an article by Loren Miller, entitled "Government Responsibility for Residential Segregation":

The total population growth for 1960's ten largest cities, from 1930 to 1960 was 3,480,295; the Negro increase was 3,222,347. Central city growth was Negro growth. The standard metropolitan area for those same ten cities is a Negro population increase of 1,042,448 from 1930 to 1960 of 4,174,337 and a Negro gain of 146,540. Whites outgained Negroes in the suburbs by some thirty to one.

The statistics confirm what the eye can observe. Residential segregation has been on the aggressive increase in the centers of our cities in the past three decades with a consistent exclusion of Negroes from outlying suburbs. Statistics confirm what the eye can observe—

The author states, and the eye can so observe within 5 minutes walking distance of this Chamber. Our cities do not merely contain ghettos, Mr. President; they are fast becoming ghettos. We stand in the center of a prime example of that process.

But, opponents of this legislation may say—the District of Columbia has a fair housing ordinance—why does that not operate to cure the problem of segregated housing? The answer is obvious. There is scant opportunity for Negro citizens of the District of Columbia to join their white coworkers in the suburbs. There has been great effort on the part of Negro citizens in all the areas surrounding this city to end segregation in the suburbs, but to date the victories in that effort have been minor ones, and the white workers—while suburban communities surround the declining central city as they have since this problem began to emerge many decades ago.

To refer to the statement I made some days ago, at the beginning of this debate, there is growing evidence, encouraging evidence, Mr. President, of the Negroes having licked their own economic problems, and they now enjoy middle and upper incomes from their employment; but thousands upon thousands of them, despite that fact, are nevertheless placed in the ghetto because they cannot exercise the right of all other American citizens to buy housing of their choice in some other location.

We had the testimony of a Navy lieutenant, who was assigned by the U.S. Navy to a post not more than 30 miles from where we are, who went to 39 different positions because he was a Negro and was turned down in every instance—a handsome, able young man, who had served this country for 8 years, who is good enough to defend this Nation, but is not good enough to live near us.

Washington is not unique. "Typical," would be the word. The same thing is heard in every one of the centers of American cities. This is the alienation and the separation of the races. The psychology of rejection which is found everywhere in the black cores of the rotting centers of American cities is fundamentally the rage and the frustration and the despair which we see expressed everywhere, and, tragically, even in the form of violence.

We tend to make our arguments on the basis of material problems, whether it be loss of jobs and business to the suburbs, a declining tax base, and the ruin brought on by absentee ownership of property.

The reason for this legislation may be summed up by quoting from former Attorney General Katzenbach's testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee in 1966:

By now it should be plain that a patchwork of State and local laws is not enough. The fact that a group of citizens is an illegal group is not enough. Court decisions are not enough. The limited authority of the executive branch is not enough. . . . Durable remedies for so enormous a problem as residential segregation and housing segregation should be based on the prescription and sanction of Congress. This is the all so more as the issue is national in scope and reaches most if not all sectors of public policy such as the rebuilding and physical improvement of our cities.

This legislation, Mr. President, will not bring an end to the ghetto. Only a concentrated, well-directed program of education, public housing, and job development will accomplish that huge task, and then only at the expense of many years of hard and dedicated effort.

But this legislation will help. It will offer hope for the many persons who have shown themselves and their neighbors that they can make it as worthwhile citizens—but who cannot convince the suburb that they can do this. The immediate improvement in living conditions for middle class Negroes who already can afford better housing—but cannot find it in the ghetto.

The side effects of this legislation would also be beneficial, Mr. President. It would, for example, restore honesty to the suburban apartment manager who now mishandles, avoids, or even lies to the Negro father who comes to him seeking a home for his family. It would help to restore as well the pride that many citizens feel, the pride of being a part of our city as they have since this problem began to emerge many decades ago.

We have waited long enough to enact this legislation. The need is clear beyond any possible dispute. It is time for action. Mr. President, we have heard repeatedly about the problems of the exploding American city. We have heard about the ghettos which we face together as Americans. I suppose there is no more humiliating experience for any father, mother, or a household, the sympol of authority in his family, than to go up to a house that is for sale, one which he can afford, one which his endeavors over the years have suited him to live in, and be told that this house is not available to him.

Negroes are a professions man. Two of our witnesses, Negroes who could not buy suitable housing, were typical. One was a Navy lieutenant with 8 years of experience, a handsome, impressive, young man. The other was a distinguished professor of literature, earning more than $11,000 a year in Philadelphia.

Both of them had spent months going to homes which had "For Sale" signs out in front, to homes which were listed in the newspapers, with their families, with their children, only to be rejected—not because they could not afford the property, but because they were not intellectually and in every other way suited to live in the neighborhoods, but simply because of their color.

I do not, I repeat, believe that this outrage can continue, and that at the same time we can solve the problems of our exploding American ghettos. The situation is too great, too profound, too indefensible. It is an outrage to our concept and beliefs of freedom, and an outrage to anyone's belief in God. I hope that Congress will not undertake the task of providing them with safe havens; and at the same time we can solve the problems of our exploding American ghettos. It is a simple fact, and yet it is a profound concept that lies at the core and the heart of this serious social problem which we face together as Americans.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because so much of the argument we have heard here is not defensible.
outrageous course of segregated residential living, so that those who can afford to live in the ghettos do not have to. As with all other Americans, buy any house they can afford to purchase, and those who live in the ghettos but cannot afford to buy housing outside it will know it is their failure to solve their economic problems, and not their color, which pins them in the ghettos.

Mr. President, we have now discussed this fair housing proposal for more than a week. Many Senators have risen and given remarkable speeches, setting forth in detail the new knowledge we have about fair housing. The old scare stories of the real estate industry have now been exploded by the experience of several States and many other communities that now have fair housing laws and ordinances which in the main are operating effectively and, in an impressive way, helping to bring about a solution to this heartbreaking problem.

I believe the U.S. Congress is trailing behind the States and the local communities on this issue. That is certainly true in my State, for we have, if not the strongest, one of the strongest fair housing laws in the country. It was passed with bipartisan support. I would say one who would have to look hard, in our State, to find a single living Minnesota politician who is opposed to fair housing. All the scare stories have been forgotten; many of the realtors who opposed these proposals now support them; and, where once there was almost solid opposition, there is now almost solid support.

The experience we have had in Minnesota and in many other States. Therefore, for every practical reason and for every moral reason, the time has come for Congress to rendezvous with its conscience and adopt an effective fair housing amendment.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 507, 508, AND 513

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand three amendments, Nos. 507, 508, and 513, which the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) expects to propose to the pending bill. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments now be considered as having been read so as to meet all of the requirements of rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSPORTATION OF MEN AND EQUIPMENT TO THE WAR ZONE BY AIR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR RESERVE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the recent announcement that more combat troops would be sent immediately to Vietnam emphasizes the seriousness of the situation there. The decision to send additional men is now well known and widely publicized. I am confident that this will give new life to the whole highest traditions of our military services. They are, of course, part of the active forces.

There is one operation associated with this rapid buildup in Vietnam that has not been widely publicized. This is the work of the Air National Guard in helping to bring about a solution to this economic problem.

I believe the U.S. Congress is well aware of the fact that the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve will have in transporting men and equipment to the war zone. Simultaneously with the decision to send additional men to Vietnam, the Air National Guard was asked to provide 230 missions to and from Vietnam within the next 14 days. Within the first hour after the request was made the Air National Guard transport units throughout the United States had firmly committed 62 of the missions and five airplanes were available for take off within that hour.

In less than 24 hours the Air National Guard has committed the full 230 missions. Although many of the Air Reserve units have been called to active duty those remaining will fly 50 additional missions.

I emphasize that these air transport units are not on active duty. They are manned by men who are regularly employed in civilian life. They are asked to perform this additional duty on a voluntary basis, making it unnecessary to order them to active duty. Many of these men will be away from their jobs, others will take vacation time, but the significant point is these missions needed urgently to support the war effort in Vietnam will be flown.

Mr. President, this is not only a personal sacrifice to the men who are involved but it is also a considerable sacrifice to their employers. I believe we should remember that also.

This points out the very valuable contribution that National Guard units as well as all other Reserve and National Guard units are making to our national defense effort. It is further evidence that they are needed and must not only be continued but strengthened with the equipment and training necessary to make them a first line force.

Under the present plans of the Defense Department, four of the units that will be making these emergency flights to Vietnam are scheduled to be deactivated later this year. The fact that they are needed and must not only be continued but strengthened with the equipment and training necessary to make them a first line force.

There is also demonstrated the willingness of these men to serve their country. In paying tribute to those Air Reservists both Air Force and Navy who were called to active duty early this year and are now undergoing intensive training. These men answered the call of their country in the typical spirit that reservists have shown throughout the years. Many of them are now serving on active duty at some financial sacrifice, others have had their schooling interrupted, some have been called away from their jobs and professions at a very critical time. The over­ all picture has been one of willingness to fulfill their responsibilities which they accepted in joining the Reserve program. The Nation is indebted to them for their dedication, and for their desire to serve their country.

Mr. President, the unit which can be operated at about one-fifth the cost of a regular unit, and in which these men are kept in condition and ready to go on the shortest notice, prove the wisdom of our Reserve system. In paying compliments to these men, we must not forget the men who serve through the Selective Service System, and those who serve as professional soldiers. Those men continue to render fine military service in Vietnam. We have never been represented by finer American fighting men than we are in this war.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

At this point, Mr. Harr assumed the floor.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has brought to my attention and to the attention of the public a valuable contribution which is being made to the war effort. I know something about these men and the sacrifice these men are making, as well as the dedication they have.

There is also demonstrated the wisdom of keeping these two units in force at a time when the Department of Defense was insisting on taking them out.

I, too, hope that not only these units, but also the other units will be retained because the additional 10,500 troops being sent to Vietnam will have to be serviced. We do not know what supplies will have to be flown there, and sometime it is a matter of time to get there. These men have shown a readiness that is remarkable.

I hope the Department of Defense will not deactivate a single one of these units. They have done a great job.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I share his views.