

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 8

APRIL 10, 1968, TO APRIL 26, 1968

(PAGES 9407 TO 10822)

The main lesson taught by the lengthy negotiations was the insight into Communist negotiating tactics. Initially, the U.N. side thought the talks would be over quickly. But the Communists showed great patience in not yielding on an issue—and the U.N. side more than matched the Communists.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, one of the negotiators, has written:

"It is essential, of course, in dealing with these people that you have no personal feelings whatsoever. Emotion can never affect a conference at all. The only possible way of winning, in such a conference, as this, is by coldly calculating every move and every statement and exercising the maximum amount of patience, calmness and stamina."

#### TESTIMONY OF FORMER SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on March 21, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs was privileged to hear Hon. Paul H. Douglas testify on housing legislation. Former Senator Douglas is one of the most qualified persons in this country to discuss housing legislation by virtue of his long experience on the Housing Subcommittee and his legislative contribution to our housing and urban programs. In addition, he is presently serving as the Chairman of the President's Commission on Urban Problems, and he and the Commission have traveled throughout the country to hear from local officials and residents on the success of our present programs. I know that Senators are anxiously awaiting the finding of this Commission.

Mr. President, I do not think I am alone when I say that the testimony of Senator Douglas is some of the best ever presented to the subcommittee. It outlines the present problems involved in the operation of our housing programs and then offers constructive solutions to meet these problems. I was especially concerned with the statements regarding the need to develop a large Federal program to encourage the use of new technologies in the housing construction field. I think that this is one of the finest proposals to come before Congress in a long time. If we are to develop large-scale programs to house our low-income families we must have technological breakthroughs. In the past, however, we have been passive in our efforts and hoped that the breakthrough would somehow emerge without governmental assistance. The Douglas proposal, on the other hand, offers a dynamic means to encourage this necessary experimentation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of former Senator Douglas be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### TESTIMONY OF PAUL H. DOUGLAS BEFORE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, MARCH 21, 1968

Chairman Sparkman and members of the committee, I wish to thank you for the honor which you have paid me in inviting me to testify so that I appear before you not at my own request but at yours. I appreciate that fact. Let me also say immediately that while I am supporting the main thrust of President Johnson's housing program, I had absolutely no part in its preparation. I there-

fore have no pride of authorship to defend. Similarly, while I have been acting as Chairman of the Presidential Commission on Urban Problems, that Commission has, I think, properly decided not to issue any interim reports or recommendations. I therefore speak only for myself, but with their permission, and having endured me for 18 years you can discount what I have to say to the degree which you may desire.

During this last year, however, I have visited with other members of the Commission some 19 cities where we have held over 40 days of hearings, consulted with hundreds of experts on building codes, housing codes, zoning, taxes, and subdivision and development standards. We have visited the slums and the ghettos, examined public housing, 221(d) (3), and urban renewal projects, and looked at new methods and technologies for building. In addition, we have studied the huge volume of reports, books and articles which have poured from the press.

Because of my non-participation in the Housing Message I cannot and should not attempt to discuss the minutiae of the measures which are before you. With your indulgence, therefore, I shall try instead to outline the general principles which lead me to support the main features of the program.

1. *My first point is that in my judgment we should plan to build at least 2.0 to 2.2 million housing units a year, or over 500,000 to 700,000 more than our average for the last five years.* While we have made general progress in the field of housing during the last 19 years by building at a faster rate than that at which new families have been formed, there is still great need. In 1950 the Census listed 20 million housing units or 45 percent of the total as being either substandard or overcrowded. By 1960, this official figure had been reduced to 15 million and today it may be between 12 and 13 millions. The Census figures are not too reliable and there is a good deal of evidence that the improvement largely came in the introduction of sanitary facilities on farms and in relatively small towns. Even if we take 12½ million units as the figure for unsatisfactory housing, about 50 million people would be involved. We cannot wait for the slow march of time to deal with this deficiency. We should remember also that building virtually stopped from 1929 to 1946 and that there will be a delayed retirement of the pre-1929 and pre-1900 units during the next third of a century. New York City alone has 40,800 structures containing 335,000 units and housing about one million people—structures built before the 1901 building code went into effect. A large proportion of these, particularly on the Island of Manhattan, should never have been built. They are now over two-thirds of a century old and by the end of the century they will be over a hundred years old. Many were built in the 1880's and 1890's for the immigrant tide and, although their walls are sound, they should have been rehabilitated or replaced before now.

We should also frankly face the fact that we will need an appreciably increased volume of home construction in the next 15 or 20 years. In the first place, unless destroyed by nuclear war the population is probably going to increase appreciably. One should be chary about these prophecies since 40 years ago the demographers estimated that our population would hit a plateau of 167 million by about this time and then remain constant or slightly decline. However, we reached 200 million last fall and we are increasing at a natural growth rate of slightly over 2 million a year plus 300,000 to 400,000 new immigrants. The Census has now come out with no less than four projected estimates of total population in 1990,<sup>1</sup> ranging from about 256 to 300 million. Projected to the year 2000,

this would have a range from something around 280 to over 340 million. I tend to favor the lower figure because of the great recent reduction in the crude birth and net fertility rates. But I would not object strenuously if one fixed the most probable figure at 300 million.<sup>2</sup> We shall therefore have to take care of from 80 to 100 million more people in the next third of a century, or as many as we have added during the last 50 years. Assuming that the 4 member family will continue to be the standard, this will require in itself the construction of from 20 to 25 million housing units or an average annual rate of 700 to 800 thousands units merely to take care of the numerical growth rate. At least we should start out at that rate and only revise it if the growth rate is altered.

But this is only the beginning. We will also need to replace housing which will normally wear out, to eliminate the existing excessive stock of substandard dwellings, and to provide for the added demand created by the net migration from the country and the small towns to the metropolitan areas. We should realize that of the 46 million housing units which were extant in 1950, all but a relatively small minority had been built before 1929, since the depression and the war had largely stopped home building. We have therefore a very large stock of housing which is now over 40 years old and a considerable volume that is from two-thirds to three-quarters of a century old. Where the structure is still sound, these buildings need not be scrapped. I know of houses in New England which are over 200 years old and are still not only adequate but also charming. With American life what it is, however, I would not expect the future life of most American housing to exceed a hundred years and possibly it would be as low as 75 years. The pre-1900 housing units should therefore be expected largely to disappear and to do so rather rapidly between now and the year 2000, while the 1900-1929 units will also begin to phase out during this period. While it is difficult to make an estimate, I would guess that not far from 15 to 20 million units will need to be retired during the next third of a century alone, or an average annual rate of from 500 to 600 thousand.

Then there is the internal migration of people. From 1940 to 1966, the total farm population decreased from 30.5 million to 11.6 million. This was an absolute decrease of 19 million people and of somewhere between 4 and 5 million households. Despite the valiant efforts of the mobile homes industry, these folks, unlike the snails, did not bear their houses on their backs. New housing had to be constructed for them in their new locations while the old deserted houses fell into ruins, as is visible to everyone who drives through the countryside. Those who left the small towns for the cities and suburbs experienced much the same needs. To the degree that they merely replaced families which moved out, they could take over the housing being vacated by oldsters. But to the degree that they represented a net addition, new units had to be constructed for them. This has concentrated the need, as expressed by the market, during the last 20 years in the suburbs of the stand-

<sup>2</sup> I favored this figure myself before the continued reduction in the birth rate of last year. Thus the crude birth rate fell from between 24 and 25 to the thousand in the late 50's to 18.5 in 1966 and 17.9 in 1967. In 1955, the death rate was 9.3 and in 1960, 9.5. It remained relatively constant at this figure and was 9.5 in 1966. This gave a gross fertility rate of 0.9 percent. The net immigration for the 7 years 1960-66 came to an average of approximately 360 thousand a year or about 0.2 percent. The total growth in 1966 was 2.1 million instead of the 3.0 million of 1961.

<sup>1</sup> See Statistical Abstract, 1967, p. 4, 8-9.

ard metropolitan statistical areas whose population has increased more rapidly than any other group. The Census shows a quite extraordinary rate of mobility. In 1966, out of 188 million people, 12.7 million or approximately 7 percent, were living in a different county than that in which they resided in the preceding year. In 1960, approximately 30 percent were living in a different house in the same county as in 1955 while 19 percent lived in a different county. On the whole, it would seem that an allowance for internal migration of 10 million units in the next third of a century would not be excessive. This would average out at about 300,000 units a year.

There are also two minor factors which need to be noted before we come to the replacement of substandard and grossly overcrowded units. These are:

(1) The need to allow a vacancy factor on the increased annual volume of housing of from 750,000 to 800,000 units. The generally agreed on rates are 1½ percent for single family homes and 5 percent for apartments. This would give a probable combined total of 3 percent or about 20,000 to 25,000 units a year.

(2) The fact is that new standards of housing including, but by no means limited to the electrical and mechanical systems needed for air conditioning, will make an added volume of housing obsolete, even if structurally viable, and will lead to its retirement. The same factor will operate in the demand for a greater degree of privacy and protection against noise. This estimate will vary but I will roughly guess that 2½ million will be placed in this category or an average of 75,000 a year. This would raise the yearly total needed to 1,650,000.

We now come to the substandard and overcrowded units which we need to remove from the market and replace with better and more decent housing. The 1960 Census listed the substandard units which should be removed at 11.4 million units and the crowded households in standard units at 4.0 million. The number of the former by now has probably been reduced to somewhere between 9 and 10 million units. One's estimate of the annual addition needed depends on the rate at which we decide to remove these units. If we were to wait until the end of the century to get rid of them, this would mean an added annual volume of approximately 300,000 a year and move the total yearly needs to 1,950,000. If the decision should be to do it in 12 years or by 1980, this would mean an additional annual increment of 750,000 and an annual total of 2.4 million. If we do it in a decade, then the annual addition would be 900,000 and the total annual units needed would be around 2.55 or 2.6 million. Although I have not seen HUD's work sheets on this question, I suspect that their figures roughly agree with mine and account for the President's call for 2.6 million a year for 10 years or 26 million for the decade.

If this volume could be reached and if the country would really carry through with it, I would agree. But I would like to remind you that the average annual volume during the last six years has been 1,450,000<sup>3</sup> and that this goal would call for an annual increase of 1,150,000 more units than this or about 80 percent, more than we have been turning out. I doubt if we could or would keep up that pace. I therefore choose an admittedly more modest goal of replacing the substandard units in 20 years. This would mean adding 450,000 units a year and bring the total to 2.2 million. This I think is supportable although it is slightly above 50% more than we have been building in the last six years and 65% more than last year. At the very least we should build 2.0 millions a year or

slightly more than 500,000 above our past six year average.

I therefore came out at a somewhat more conservative figure than the Administration—although this depends largely on a matter of judgment as to how fast we can and should move.

2. *The people who need the added housing are the poor and the lower middle income group who at present cannot afford to pay for decent housing.* The poor can be defined according to the rigorous standards set by Mollie Orshansky and the Social Security Administration as urban—families of 4 who have to live on less than \$3300 a year. There are about 30 million of these folk in the country or a little less than 16 percent. This is also about the average for the central cities of the standard metropolitan statistical areas where they number approximately 10 million. Another 8 percent are on the fringes of poverty or have an annual gross income of \$3300 up to \$4400 or \$4500 a year. About 5 million will be in this group in the central cities. Then another 25% will be in the lower economic middle class from about \$4500 to a little less than \$7000 (i.e., the economy budget plus 50%). This will include 15 million more of the urban disadvantaged.

A few years ago the poverty ratio was only 10% in the suburbs. This would have given a total of 6 million poor and another 3 million of the near poor and not far from 10 million of the lower economic middle class. Consolidating these figures for the two thirds of the population or 130 million who live in the 231 standard metropolitan statistical areas we get very roughly.

1. The poor (under \$3335) = 16 million:  
(a) Cities = 10 million, (b) The suburbs = 6 million.

2. The near poor = 9 million (\$3335-\$4500):  
(a) Cities = 6 million, (b) Suburbs = 3 million.

3. The lower economic middle class (\$4500-\$6800) = 33 million: (a) Cities = 16 million, (b) Suburbs = 17 million.

If we say that the poor and near poor should not under any circumstances pay more than 25% of their income for rent, and preferably nor more than 20% we get the following *maximum amounts* which these groups can pay.

1. The metropolitan poor—maximum \$335 = 16 million: Rent, 25% (yearly \$840, monthly \$70); rent, 20% (yearly \$680, monthly \$57).

2. The metropolitan near poor—maximum—\$4400 = 9 million: Rent, 25% (yearly \$1100, monthly \$92); rent, 20% (yearly \$880, monthly \$73).

3. The lower economic middle class—\$4500-\$6800 = 33 million: Rent, 20% (yearly \$1360, monthly \$115); rent, 16% (yearly \$1080, monthly \$90).

I think these rough figures will show that the poor cannot afford to rent decent housing in the metropolitan areas. And the near poor will have great difficulty in doing so. This will also be extremely difficult for the lower economic middle class.

It should be noted that half of the poor are abjectly poor—a total of 8 million with incomes under \$2200 and with a maximum monthly rental they could afford of \$45.00.

If it is difficult for the poor to rent existing housing, it will be even more difficult (1) for them to finance new housing or (2) for private enterprise to build new housing to rent to them. Taking the maximum housing cost which can be privately financed as 2½ times the yearly income, none of the poor can afford more than an \$8,500.00 unit. Nor can any of the near poor afford more than an \$11,250.00 unit. The lower economic middle class cannot afford more than \$17,000.

It should be realized that these amounts

are all that those at the very top could afford. The entire group below the upper limit could afford less. Thus the eight percent of the abjectly poor could not afford to pay more than \$5500 per unit; the remaining eight percent of the poor could afford more than \$5500, but less than \$8500. The eight percent near poor could afford to pay between \$8500 and \$11,250 per unit, etc. But that would be all.

I think it is obvious that the 16 million poor cannot be properly housed at present costs without receiving outside subsidies of one form or another—and that this is particularly true of the abjectly poor. Similarly, the near poor will need appreciable subsidies while the lower sections of the lower middle income class will need some help at present costs if they are to be housed decently. Like the President, I favor tackling this problem, but I would favor eliminating it over 22 years instead of in 10 to 12 years. I therefore suggest that the 500,000 units a year to eliminate substandard housing be directly geared for the poor, the near poor and the lower middle class. With a total of 10 or 11 million units we can provide decent housing for 40 to 44 million people. This should take care of the 25 million who are now farthest down and for at least half of the lower middle economic class. The back of the problem would be broken. If we continue to make progress in reducing the number of the poor and near poor, the total can be scaled down by abbreviating the number of years, but we can start at this pace. I suggest that of the half million units a year, about a yearly total of 300,000 of these, or 6.6 million altogether be built for the poor and that 200,000 a year, or 4.4 million altogether be built for the lower middle income class.

3. *I think we can adopt a mixture of plans, similar to those the President has suggested.* I suggest that we provide about 30 percent of the amount in public housing which needs to be speeded up. Here we get a complete subsidization of interest and also lower local tax charges. This program should be primarily for the poor but we can strive to effect as great an economic and racial mixture as possible.

Building in the future should be conducted as far as possible on scattered sites. Opportunity should be afforded for families to stay on in their apartments or houses by paying more than maximum rent as their income rises. Opportunity should also be given to purchase possibly through the condominium or cooperative method.

4. *I believe that about 25 percent of the total can be financed by rent supplements with the government picking up that portion of the cost which the individual family cannot pay.*

Another 20 or 25 percent can be met through the various forms of 221(d)(3) with help given to the sponsors as the President recommends.

An added 20 to 25 percent can be helped to purchase individual homes.

5. *The administration has chosen the most effective way of getting a large volume of annual construction at a minimum of annual expense, namely, by subsidizing the interest rate.* Thus, in public housing where all of the interest rate is subsidized, a 4 percent interest rate would normally lead to the construction of 25 times as great a volume of housing construction. Here a \$400,000 annual payment would lead to \$10 million worth of housing. The total payment would, however, of course lead to the cumulative assumption of the interest.

In the case of rent supplements, the rent is subsidized. In the case of the 221(d)(3) and home purchase programs the interest rate is to be subsidized down to one percent depending on the income of the individual family. There are real questions as to whether the lowest income groups should be encouraged to buy private homes if they have to pay for the amortization of the mortgage debt on their property: If they have to

<sup>3</sup> Economic Indicators, February, 1968, p. 20. This does not however include mobile homes.

<sup>4</sup> I.e., cities of over 50,000 population which probably now include some 63 or 64 millions of people.

sell their houses after a few years, their thin equities are likely to be wiped out. These will be dollars which they cannot afford to lose and to accumulate which they will have had to make great sacrifices.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me turn to the question of "What to do and how to do it." All of us are thoroughly familiar with the problems we face. But the answers are more difficult. I would like to make some constructive suggestions about how we might get the job done.

First of all, of course, Congress must authorize and provide the funds for programs to do the job whether the job is to be done in 12 years or in two decades as I have suggested. But funds and authority are not enough and alone will not get the job done.

One of the most crucial problems and past deterrents to building houses for low income Americans is the problem of sites to build on. Time and again when one complains at the slowness of the public housing or moderate income programs, the problem of sites is given as a major roadblock.

There are many more sites than people imagine. There is a lot more land on which to build than is generally understood. The facts are that in the 228 SMSA's there are 38.4 million parcels of taxable realty of which 7.2 million parcels or 19 percent are vacant lots.

It may be pointed out that SMSA's include not only central cities but suburban areas as well and that this is not a true measure of the number of vacant lots in central cities. That is true, but the facts are that in 119 of the 130 cities over 100,000, there are 11 million parcels of which 1.3 million or 11.8 percent are in vacant lots. It may surprise some to know that the figure for New York City is 8.1 percent, 11.0 percent for Chicago, and 9.4 percent for Los Angeles. When we add to this the number of sites on which there are dilapidated buildings, many of which are owned by the cities as a result of the default in taxes, the number of sites is greatly swelled.

By using scattered sites and by building non-institutional types of public housing, these vacant lots could supply much of the need for sites for public housing and moderate income housing in our central cities.

Second, there is a large amount of government owned land on which housing can be built. The President has begun this by proposing the National Training School site for a new town in town here in the District of Columbia. This program can be greatly expanded as a source of sites. I should add a warning, however, that such sites not end up as sites for luxury housing but that we make certain that a considerable proportion of low and moderate income housing to meet our most desperate housing needs is built on them.

Third, there are large numbers of VA and FHA foreclosures each year. Some of these could be leased by public housing authorities to house those public housing families who were "upwardly mobile," as the phrase goes.

In fiscal 1967 there were 21,217 VA claims (tantamount to foreclosure) and in calendar 1967 about 53,000 FHA foreclosures of which 44,062 units were sales housing and 8,886 units were in 67 projects. Some of these could be used.

Fourth, there are urban renewal sites. The latest figures I have are that less than half of all the urban renewal sites have been committed, that is to say that there are commitments to build specific buildings on them. Not all of these sites would be appropriate for public or moderate income housing. But in view of the crisis in our cities, I believe that a re-examination of the existing sites should be made to see if a great many more of them cannot be used for public housing and for moderate income housing. The vast empty acreage I have seen in Cleve-

land and Detroit, to name only two cities, makes me believe that this is so.

Under Urban Renewal approximately 400,000 units have been demolished. By definition, most of these were units where low income citizens lived. The number of units planned, under construction or completed in Urban Renewal areas is approximately 200,000 or one half the number demolished.

Only about 20,000 public housing units have been located on urban renewal sites, or one-twentieth of the number of units destroyed and one-tenth of the units planned, under construction, or completed on Urban Renewal sites.

Some specific instances may be helpful. In Detroit since 1956, according to the Riot Commission, 8,000 housing units have been demolished by Urban Renewal. Only 758 units of low or moderate income housing under Federal programs have been built in that period. Very few, if any, of these are on Urban Renewal sites.

In New Haven since 1952, 6,500 units have been destroyed by Urban Renewal and highways. These have been replaced, according to the Riot Commission, by only 951 units, about evenly divided between public housing and the moderate income program.

In Newark, the figures are 12,000 units destroyed since 1959 by Urban Renewal and highways. There, 3,760 units of public housing and moderate income housing have been built, according to the Riot Commission figures.

I commend the Urban Renewal Agency for instituting a new policy of giving priority in the future to low income housing needs. But, this is prospective, as it normally takes over four years from the time a plan is submitted until the first spadeful of dirt is dug on new projects. Implementation of this policy is a very long time away. I think there should be a review of existing sites and some urgency put behind using some of them for our low income housing needs now.

Finally, the suburbs must be opened up for low income housing. The Civil Rights bill just passed by the Senate is, of course, a minimum. But other things must be done. Let me suggest a few.

While it is a complex problem, I think we should consider means of amending State enabling acts to allow central city housing authorities to lease housing in the suburbs and perhaps to build on scattered sites. There would have to be limitations so that the central city would not merely shift its problems to some one else. These might include a limit on the proportion of their public housing which could be leased in the suburbs, a limit on the amount to go to any one place, and some means of providing the localities with the funds for the additional costs for community services which accompany the building of any public or moderate income, or for that matter, private housing. This would allow for some reasonable dispersal of public and moderate income housing. The central cities cannot bear the entire burden alone.

State action could help in this matter too. New York is now proposing that the powers of the State be exercised to allow for wider dispersion.

In addition, it may be necessary for the Federal Government to build directly if all other means fail.

These, then, are ways to overcome the problem of sites. I think it can be done and that there is far more land available than people often imagine.

In addition to providing an adequate number of sites, a real effort must be made to reduce costs. What we want to do is to make it possible for a larger number of Americans to be able to rent or buy their own housing through the private market mechanism. Further, we want to reduce the amount of the subsidies which are necessary to provide decent housing in a suitable living environment for those with incomes so low that they are unable to do so for themselves.

Ordinarily it costs two and one half times one's income to sustain the purchase of a house. A family with a \$7,000 per year income could afford a \$17,500 house. While millions of Americans now live in housing which originally cost less than that amount, it now costs about that much to produce a new house either privately or under public housing.

If we could reduce the costs by \$2,500, we would make it possible for all those Americans in the band of income from \$6,000 to \$7,000 to afford their own housing and to buy it on the private market. In addition, we would reduce the amount of subsidies necessary to be paid out as we would reduce the upper income ceiling for subsidies.

One of the main problems we face is that while numerous prototypes of new techniques in housing have been produced, almost none of them has been mass produced because of the limitations imposed by codes and zoning and the capital funds needed to get off the ground. Time and again our Commission has asked for good cost data only to find out that it is not available because only a prototype or demonstration model has been produced.

In order to remedy this problem I want to make the following suggestion. I think we should take one or two conventional methods of building—wood or bricks or both—plus about five new methods of building—concrete, plastics, the Dallas stack sack method, to name a few—and provide a means of testing these to see if we cannot get a major reduction in costs.

We could build them on government land in order to avoid the problems of codes and zoning. I propose that we build a thousand units of each type per year for five years, or from 25,000 to 35,000 units in all. Cost systems should be set up and detailed cost records kept. This would answer the question of whether and how costs can be reduced through the use of new techniques. The results would then be available to be applied on a mass scale throughout the country.

Cost reductions, however, should not be limited merely to the construction itself. Land costs, financing costs, closing costs, legal and other professional fees, union and code restrictions, to name some of them, are often as important as construction costs. The fact is that we may get a significant lowering of costs through small decreases in the numerous kinds of costs which are involved in building housing. We should not throw out any possible reduction.

Recently I visited the National Homes Corporation in Lafayette, Indiana which builds prefabricated houses. I think that there are distinct advantages of pre-fabrication over ordinary construction if it can be organized and applied on a mass scale.

First, there can be a reduction in man hours through the use of large scale production and mechanization.

Second, industrial rather than craft union rates would apply. Less skill would be required on the assembly line than on the site where the bulk of the work is now done.

Third, work inside the factory would be independent of the weather and not as now interrupted by snow, rain, or extreme cold.

Fourth, materials could be bought in large quantities and hence at lower prices.

Fifth, there is a saving in time of construction and thus a reduction in the cost of interim financing.

Sixth, there is a savings on vandalism and breakage during construction, which is a more important item than ordinarily known.

Seventh, there are savings to be made on engineers and other professional fees. The engineers and others are salaried employees and the cost per unit of such fees would be reduced.

Eighth, builders fees and markups would be lowered as the volume increases.

Ninth, there are almost no extras which add to the cost of almost any independently built house.

Tenth, there is virtually no lost time due to lack of materials.

Finally, prefabricated construction generally requires less maintenance, fewer repairs, less painting, etc., so that long term costs are reduced.

Specialization depends on the extent of the market. If the present deterrent of codes and zoning can be eliminated so that housing can be mass produced and sold, I believe that considerable savings in costs can be made. This is one of the major jobs which our Commission has before it and which we are working at diligently.

#### DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING: THE SOUL OF HUMANITY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the American dream has been with us since our beginning as a people. It has comforted us in our dark hours and prodded us in our comfortable ones. It is the American contribution to the soul of humanity. This dream is that every man can be free, with his opportunity limited only by his ability and the strength or his will and that government exists to achieve that dream.

It is ironic that in our own time the man who had this dream upon his lips, the man who moved the hearts of men throughout the world and called America to implement this dream, was black.

Martin Luther King, Jr., was a member of the only group who came to these shores against their will. Snatched from their ancestral home by Arab slave traders, carried in Yankee Clippers to work on Southern soil, this country greeted them with discrimination and exploitation.

This was Dr. King's history. But he became neither bitter nor beaten. Instead he called America back to its vision, back to its soul.

Mr. President, the human rights treaties are international expressions of the American dream. I urge the Senate to ratify the Conventions on Racial Discrimination and the Political Rights of Women. By such a course we hasten the day when all men shall be "free at last."

#### A QUARTER CENTURY OF CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Worker Protection-Fair Housing Act is now the law of the land, and I am proud of the role I played in its enactment.

In the past quarter century, I have sponsored or cosponsored more legislation to advance civil rights than on any other one subject.

The following is a list of those proposals:

##### IN 1967 AND 1968, 90TH CONGRESS

- S. 989, eliminates discrimination in selection of Federal juries.
- S. 990, establishes a U.S. Committee on Human Rights.
- S. 1026, Civil Rights Act of 1967.
- S. 1358, The Fair Housing Act of 1967.
- S. 1359, extends the Civil Rights Commission.
- S. 1362, protects against interference with certain rights.
- S. 1592, The National Home Ownership Foundation Act.
- S. 2388, amendment No. 371 to Equal Opportunity Act.
- S. 2938, extends Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

S. 2979, establishes a Commission on Negro History and Culture.

S. 3249, National Manpower Bill.

H.R. 2516, amendment No. 524 to Worker Protection-Fair Housing Bill.

##### IN 1965 AND 1966, 89TH CONGRESS

- S. 1497, civil rights protection, unlawful of-ficial violence.
- S. 1517, voter registration rights.
- S. 1564, Voting Rights Act of 1965.
- S. 1654, increased criminal penalties against those who interfere with the exercising of civil rights.
- S. 2548, prohibits transmission of material which defames racial or religious groups.
- S. 2846, makes it a Federal offense to take unlawful violence against civil rights workers.
- S. 2923, provides for fair jury selection under the Civil Rights Protection Act of 1966.
- S. 3101, establishes a U.S. Commission on Human Rights.
- S. 3296, assures nondiscrimination in public education, other areas.
- S. 3451, provides adequate housing credit in areas of civil disorder.
- H.R. 14765, amendment to Civil Rights Bill.

##### IN 1963 AND 1964, 88TH CONGRESS

- H.R. 7152, amendment to Civil Rights Bill. Senate Resolution 118, housing, loans without discrimination.
- S. 1732, public accommodations.
- S. 1731, administration civil rights proposal.
- S. 1693, U.S. citizens rights.
- S. 1591, prohibits discrimination in furnishing facilities for business under State licenses.
- S. 1590, public schools.
- S. 1219, make Civil Rights Commission permanent.
- S. 1218, hospitalization.
- S. 1217, accommodations at hotels.
- S. 1216, Federal assistance law enforcement.
- S. 1215, criminal civil remedies.
- S. 1214, voting.
- S. 1213, housing.
- S. 1212, prohibits discrimination in employment in Washington, D.C.
- S. 1211, equal employment opportunity.
- S. 1210, discrimination in employment.
- S. 1209, school desegregation.
- S. 1117, extends Civil Rights Commission.
- S. 773, prohibits racial discrimination in interstate employment.
- S. 772, public school desegregation.
- S. 666, protects citizens right to vote.

##### IN 1961 AND 1962, 87TH CONGRESS

- Senate Resolution 313, loans without discrimination.
- S. 2983, prevents exclusion of members of minority groups from jury service, 1957, title III.
- S. 2981, Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, prohibits discrimination by labor unions.
- S. 2980, desegregation of public schools.
- S. 2979, protects voting rights.
- S. 478, prohibits poll tax in Federal elections.
- S. 479, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.
- S. 480, prohibits literacy requirements for voting.
- S. 481, authorizes the Attorney General to bring civil injunctive proceedings to safeguard rights.
- S. 482, guarantees the rights provided by the 14th amendment.
- S. 483, extends indefinitely the Civil Rights Commission.
- S. 484, assists the State and local government to meet cost of school desegregation.
- S. 1253, discrimination in public conveyances.
- S. 1254, protects against bodily attack.
- S. 1255, amends existing civil rights statutes.

S. 1256, Federal Anti-Lynching Act, S. 1257, Indefinite extension of Civil Rights Commission.

S. 1258, Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act.

S. 1259, Federal Anti-Poll Tax Act. Senate Resolution 5, amends cloture rule of Senate.

Senate Joint Resolution 58, poll tax. Five amendments (to H.R. 7371) on Civil rights.

##### IN 1959 AND 1960, 86TH CONGRESS

- S. 435, Civil Rights Commission.
- S. 456, amends Civil Rights Act of 1957.
- S. 942, establishes a Commission on Equal Job Opportunity.
- S. 960, similar to S. 456.
- S. 2868, poll tax.
- S. 3001, provides enforcement of civil rights.
- S. 3821, strengthens civil rights.
- S. 3823, amends Civil Rights Act of 1960.
- S. 3829, enforcement of civil rights.

##### IN 1957, 85TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

- H.R. 1254, further secures and protects the civil rights of persons within the United States.
- H.R. 3088, similar to H.R. 1254.

##### IN 1956, 84TH CONGRESS (HOUSE)

- H.R. 10349, establishes a bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government.
- H.R. 10426, provides means of further securing and protecting the right to vote.
- H.R. 10428, strengthens the civil rights statutes.

I also supported civil rights measures from the 77th through the 83d Congress, including my testimony on FEPC before the House Education and Labor Committee in 1943.

I am especially proud of an editorial published in the Philadelphia Tribune of November 19, 1946, when I was a Member of the House, which said:

Congressman Hugh Scott, who was in Congress prior to joining the U.S. Navy, has an excellent record on FEPC legislation. His record is exceptionally good, since he has comparatively few colored voters in his district. It is a matter of principle with him and not smart politics simply to get votes.

#### LAWS MUST BE ENFORCED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a very fine editorial was published in the Wheeling, W. Va., News Register on April 15, 1968.

Entitled "Laws Must Be Enforced," the editorial pointed out that there is no excuse for open defiance of law for "the laws of the land must be upheld or we shall all be destroyed."

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

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

##### LAWS MUST BE ENFORCED

Each time there is an outbreak of civil disorder in one of our cities it is followed by loud complaints that authorities used unnecessary force in quelling the violence.

At week's end last week such accusations were being heard from cities where serious rioting erupted after the slaying of Dr. Martin Luther King. There may be an occasional abuse of authority but judging by all we have read and viewed on television, the most recent wave of destruction was handled with remarkable restraint on the part of police. In fact in some instances police and federal troops stood by and watched while looters pillaged stores in broad daylight.

It is hoped that the passivity of authorities during these recent orgies of vandalism and