

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 3

FEBRUARY 8, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1968

(PAGES 2603 TO 3952)

this question in great detail but I would like to give you my beliefs, which were the basis originally for my proposal, and the reasons why in my judgment, IFTA is worthy of serious consideration.

1. IFTA could provide the economic base to support the capacity of the United Kingdom to continue to perform a significant economic and political role in the world.

2. IFTA could result in the harmonization of national economic policies of its members without encroaching upon essential national political sovereignty.

3. IFTA could meet this need described in Prof. Franck's paper "... Britain needs an association with other states which will preserve her freedom of initiative in the Afro-Asian part of the Commonwealth, while relating the British home market and defence establishment to much larger units to effect economies of scale and provide a growing home market for her industrial production."

4. IFTA could also be looked upon as a means to strengthen sterling and the U.S. dollar as international reserve currencies. Britain's membership in a large and viable industrial and trading community would strengthen world confidence in the viability of the sterling and take the pressure off the U.S. dollar.

5. IFTA could well represent the next practical step after the Kennedy Round to liberalize world trade. We are now facing a situation where regional trade groupings will be a fact of life and where the unconditional most-favored nation principle will become applicable as between trading communities or associations rather than nations. The paper submitted by Theodore Gelger and Sperry Lea to the U.S. Congressional Joint Economic Committee's hearings on future U.S. trade policy last year conclude that the free trade area concept promises to be relevant for the United States in any eventuality. If the next attempt at trade negotiations by the traditional multilateral approach fails—or, even possibly, is insufficiently promising to be attempted—then we would shift to the only other approach that is sanctioned by GATT, establishing a free trade area among willing countries as the first move toward a more generalized agreement.

On the other hand, if another round of multilateral negotiations succeeds, then we would find ourselves so close to free trade that the GATT countries could commit themselves to full free trade at a fixed date and undertake other commitments as if they were in a formal free trade area.

6. The IFTA idea is also very relevant to the United States in its future relations to continental western Europe, which even after de Gaulle could very well be unwilling to accept our long cherished concept of an Atlantic Community unified economically and politically. IFTA could then be an excellent parallel grouping to the EEC, pursuing parallel goals.

I would be the last to deny that it would be easy to bring IFTA into being in view of prevailing opinion in the three countries involved or that it does not involve costs. You will find, however, that the three country studies show that the costs are acceptable, especially in view of the benefits to be shared, and in fact, preferable to those involved in permitting Britain to continue its drift and isolation.

I congratulate the participants of this conference for investing their time and energy in this exercise. I am confident that you will debate the studies presented to us in the most considered and practical terms. I hope you will be convinced as I am that the IFTA proposal deserves the same kind of consideration in Washington, Whitehall and Ottawa.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penal-

ties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, history is an elusive thing to attempt to predict or out guess. Those who engage in it professionally are called fortune tellers. Sometimes they operate in violation of the law.

However, I make a tentative prediction about a particular verdict of history which, in my judgment, is nonetheless solid and assured; namely, that Lyndon B. Johnson will be reported to future generations as being the one President who, more than any other man who occupied that office, advanced the cause of civil rights in this country.

Mr. President, in fair weather and foul, his courage and effectiveness as President are a record that history will not avoid giving a glowing account of.

I make that rather broad suggestion as I rise to advise the Senate that a few minutes ago I received a letter from the President of the United States which with your leave, Mr. President, I should like to read in full. I shall make no further comment about it. The letter speaks eloquently for itself, and I hope that it will persuade many of us with respect to our attitude on the vote on the cloture motion tomorrow:

DEAR PHIL: Again this week, the Senate of the United States is a crucial arena for human rights.

The issue is whether we will continue to move toward equality as a fact, as well as an ideal, in America.

We have made extraordinary progress in the past decade. Nevertheless equal justice is clearly not a reality for millions of Americans today. The civil rights legislation now pending before the Senate—about which you have asked my views—will not in itself achieve equality for every citizen; but it is a vital step along the way. Both conscience and reason insist that it be passed.

In one title of the pending legislation, we seek new and clear authority to punish those who would use violence and intimidation to prevent others from exercising the rights of American citizenship: the right to vote, to go to school, to obtain a job, to serve as a juror, and to use public facilities.

There should be no question about the exercise of these fundamental rights. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that their exercise is protected by law against those who would use force to deny them.

Pending legislation before the Senate also seeks to ensure that every American has the opportunity to provide a decent home for his family. Segregation in housing—the product of long-standing discriminatory real estate practices—has compounded the Nation's urban problem. Minorities have been artificially compressed into ghettos where unemployment and ignorance are rampant, where human tragedies and crime abound, and where city administrations are burdened with rising social costs and falling tax revenues. Fair housing practices—backed by meaningful Federal laws that apply to every section of the country—are essential if we are to relieve the crisis in our cities.

From every moral and practical standpoint, these measures are necessary. The wrongs they address are urgently in need of redress. Together with the other measures I have recommended to combat discrimination—particularly in the fields of employment and jury selection—they respond to the elemental demands of equal justice in America. They should be adopted without delay.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan for yielding to me to permit me to associate myself with his observations regarding the remarkable and very courageous role of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, on behalf of the objective of a nation in which race shall be irrelevant.

In the short period since I came to the Senate, I have seen his leadership in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and have observed his leadership earlier, before coming to the Senate, on the moving Civil Rights Act of 1964. I have seen, first hand, throughout my nearly 3 years in the Senate, the truth of what the Senator from Michigan has just observed; namely, that we have never had in the White House a President who has worked so hard, so creatively, and so courageously on behalf of the cause of human rights as our President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

In the letter which the Senator from Michigan has just read to the Senate, the President once again demonstrates his selflessness and his devotion to this uncompromisable objective, if we are going to have a truly United States.

I join the Senator from Michigan in expressing the most profound appreciation to our President for his courage and his vision at this critical moment as we approach the vote on the cloture motion tomorrow afternoon.

I hope that the Senate will, by adopting the cloture motion, go on to express what is clearly the majority will of the Senate and achieve much higher ground in determining our future progress, for all the reasons which have been expressed by so many Senators during recent days of debate.

If I may say so, the Senator from Michigan has honored the President, an honor which the President deserves; but I think that the President, in dispatching his letter to the Senator from Michigan, also rightly honors the leadership which the Senator from Michigan has provided on the issue on which we are about to vote tomorrow.

For just as the President of the United States has established an unparalleled record in the executive branch, so has the Senator from Michigan established a similar record of selfless, creative devotion to the cause of human rights in the Senate.

I am proud to honor not only the President of the United States but also to join him in honoring the Senator from Michigan.

If I may make one further observation, I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVIRS] and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE]. I think that one of the most exciting things about the civil rights movement is that it is a bipartisan effort. It is not a Democratic effort or a Republican effort, it is an effort by all decent men to erase the disgrace of racism from American society.

I am proud that they would join us and

work alongside us to achieve this great objective.

It occurred to me, as the Senator from Michigan was reading the President's letter, that it would be a remarkable demonstration of the same kind of bipartisanship, if the bipartisanship which has been shown in the Senate could be matched by expressions from the various candidates for the Presidency of both political parties as well, if we could show, as we approach the cloture vote tomorrow, that not only is the President in favor of the measure now pending before the Senate but also that we have the support of every other candidate for the office of President in the coming election.

This, I think, would give us the kind of bipartisanship that would be even more effective tomorrow as we approach this important matter.

I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the words of President Lyndon Johnson as expressed in his letter are most eloquent and most courageous. They come at an important time in the deliberations of the Senate. Tonight, when we are on the eve of one of the most important votes that will be taken in the Chamber during this session of the Senate, I think it is certainly fitting and appropriate that we have these words of wisdom from the President.

I have served as a member of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. It was a Commission that was appointed by the President at the height of the unrest and turmoil in our country in 1967. It was formulated as a result of the riots which were tearing the hearts of Americans in urban centers, at a time when racism was sweeping across the country.

The Commission has been deliberating day and night, trying to find the cause of those riots, why they happened, how they happened, and what can be done to prevent them from happening again.

One of the questions which took much time of the Commission, as to which much testimony was heard, was the question of housing in this country. The amendment which is presently before the Senate does not force housing on any one person or any one particular group, but it does say that a man can live in housing that is within his reach, regardless of his race or creed. That is what the amendment is for. It is certainly important, at this critical time in the history of the United States, that the Senate of the United States stand up and be counted on this important measure.

So when I say that we are on the eve of the most important vote which we shall probably take in this session, I say it with much forethought.

I am certainly proud to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and the distinguished

senior Senator from New York on this important legislation.

Mr. President, at this time, as I stand on the Republican side of the aisle in an election year, I certainly want to commend the President for what he has done at this important time in sending this letter to the Senate. I pray that my distinguished colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, will heed the advice of our President at this time; that they will join together, Republicans and Democrats, in voting for cloture tomorrow afternoon.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota when he says that not only does the able Senator from Michigan honor the President in bringing forth his message to the Senate; the President honors him and those who are associated with him in this vital cause.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I wish to join Senators MONDALE and BROOKE in their commendation of the President of the United States. I subscribe to that commendation. It is very much in the spirit in which all of us have spoken here this afternoon in recognizing the important contribution to a successful result which the leader of the party of the President of the United States would give by way of impetus by this letter.

It is a fact that President Johnson, when he was majority leader of the Senate, and before and since, has been counted in the ranks of those who sincerely and deeply advocated legal measures to implement the constitutional guarantees of equal opportunity. This is a part of the history, as Senator HARR has properly said, of that effort.

Mr. President, civil rights, as has been said time and time again, must be bipartisan. Neither party has the strength to enact civil rights laws by itself, even at the lowest ebb of one party. Notwithstanding that the count is now about 2 to 1, Democrats versus Republicans, it is still impossible to marshal every vote on the Democratic side. By the strange anomaly of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which has not been enacted—to wit, the rules of the U.S. Senate—two-thirds are required to do anything in the civil rights field, in view of the very deep feeling of our southern brethren on this subject, rather than a simple majority. Hence, the President knows, from his vast parliamentary experience, that this is the moment in which to intervene; and the President's perception and experience should not be lost on the country. Let those who would make our fellow citizens feel that they are strongly in favor of legislation to implement equal opportunity for all Americans understand that it is this cloture vote that counts, and that no matter how they may vote, pro or con, on amendments or various other procedural steps, what counts in the ability to actually get legislation passed is the cloture vote.

That unique situation obtains not only for one House of Congress, to wit, the Senate, but it obtains for the Congress, because we all know that the rules of the

other body permit civil rights legislation to be passed—and, indeed, that is what happened in 1966—and then to be defeated and frustrated in the Senate, because cloture is unable to be effected.

So let the country note carefully that the President understands, and the people of the country should understand, what this means in terms of our ability to pass civil rights legislation.

Second, every American, I feel, in his heart is very worried about the situation domestically, especially since we have had the experience of rioting and disorder that we had last year. We pray that all of us will use our utmost devotion to avoid such an eventuality this year. But certainly the President understands—and if there is any lack of understanding on the part of others, Senator BROOKE certainly can enlighten them—that this is one answer to help to alleviate the grievances of Americans, legislation for the protection of individuals seeking to assert their civil rights, and the protection of those who would help each other to obtain the essential dignity of being able to get housing which a person desires. That is what counts. It is deeds that the minorities of the big cities want to see, not more words; and the passage of this law represents another one of those deeds which can be enormously effective in letting the great mass of the people feel that justice is being done and that extralegal means are unnecessary and are antisocial and should be dealt with as all antisocial movements should be dealt with, instead of being condoned because of the deep feelings of injustice which animates those actions.

So I join Senators in welcoming the President's letter, in noting its historic importance, in a completely bipartisan spirit, and in emphasizing the necessity for the action recommended, based on the President's perception of the needs of our country.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota, and I shall try to obtain by tomorrow some expression of opinion from each of the Republican candidates. I think that is an entirely valid point. Just as the President has spoken, there is no reason why they should not speak. I shall make an effort on that score, and I know the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] will join me in that effort.

The important thing is to make the country feel that we are like minded in this effort, and also to emphasize that this is the breakoff, this is it, this is what counts.

I, too, took pleasure in noting that the President did address Senator HART personally; and there is no question about the fact that that is a tribute to his leadership as well as his deep understanding of the issues at stake.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New York for their most impressive and impartial observations as we near the hour of voting on this cloture motion.

I strongly commend the Senator from New York for his characteristic strength and courage on this question, and for his candor in expressing the hope that everyone who is now seeking the office of President of the United States might

join the President to demonstrate that in that arena as well as in the arena of the U.S. Senate, men of good will join together in unison in urging that once and for all we remove the curse of racism from our country.

I commend the Senator from New York for the very clear and candid statement he has made.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I shall resist the temptation not to keep my word. I said I would add nothing. I do, however, wish to thank my very good friends for the kindness of their words and the appropriateness of the comments.

Let us all hope that tomorrow, as the Senator from New York has stated, is really the payoff day.

I remember, more than a year ago—though I can only paraphrase his words—that when we approached the rollcall on the question of whether we supported the action of the Vice President which would have enabled this body by majority action to write its rules, the Senator from New York, as I remember, just before that vote said, "Let everybody understand just exactly what we are about to do. The fate of civil rights legislation in this Congress will hinge largely on the outcome of this vote."

Unhappily, we did not prevail. The Vice President's action was not supported, and we are still stuck with rule XXII. Tomorrow, I suspect, will be a rather dramatic test of the proposition whether it continues to be true that the Senate, on an important national question, is not permitted to work its will.

That is not good, by anybody's standards. Let us demonstrate tomorrow that two-thirds of us here are willing that a majority of the Senate make the decision.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recently I had occasion to address the Senate regarding the pitfalls and drawbacks of the pending proposed Civil Rights Act. At that time, I also sent to the desk a proposed amendment to the pending measure, to be entitled the "Civil Obedience Act of 1968."

My amendment would seek to recognize the fact that with rights go responsibilities.

This proposed amendment is designed to overcome the present misguided thinking of many militant forces that they will attain untold rewards by criminal acts or violence based upon their own hatred and ignorance. I can assure them that this is not the case. My proposal will insure that they are held responsible for their unjustified actions—just as any other citizen would be.

As I pointed out in my prior remarks, the basis for my proposal stems from the riotous conditions that have plagued the United States for the past 4 years, and which were predicted for the summer of 1967.

Unfortunately for all Americans, the prediction of racial violence for the summer of 1967 came true in full measure. In a total of 76 major incidents spread over practically every State of the Union, north, south, east, and west, wholesale Negro violence was an almost nightly affair in the streets of our cities. Nearly 100 persons were slain and nearly 2,000 injured. Police reported 4,289 cases of

arson alone. Over 16,000 rioters were arrested. The estimated property loss was in the neighborhood of \$160 million. The estimated economic loss to riot-torn businesses was over \$504 million.

Mr. President, these riots occurred in spite of the civil rights bills that had been passed in 1964, 1965, and prior years. The riots tended to demonstrate that merely by passing civil rights bills you do not stop riots, and you do not stop lawlessness. Sometimes you merely encourage more of the same. Legislation is needed to prevent that type of thing for the future. We may very well need it badly here in the District of Columbia before the year is out.

What we once characterized as a national shame and tragedy has now evolved into a state of emergency which threatens the entire social and economic fabric of this great republic.

What lies ahead for the coming summer? We can turn again to the prediction of a very reliable, responsible publication, which was right last year, for its prediction for this year. I refer to U.S. News & World Report. On January 8, 1968, the magazine which accurately predicted last year's holocaust said this:

A record year for riots has barely ended—and already Americans are hearing this warning: The next 12 months may be worse than the last.

This is heard not only from militant Negro leaders who talk of "black revolution" and "guerrilla warfare," but also from public officials from positions to size up the outlook and from social scientists who study riots and their causes.

Nearly all agree on these things:

The conditions of poverty, unemployment and slum housing that disposed Negro masses toward rioting last summer still exist, almost unchanged.

The mood of Negroes is becoming more angry and more belligerent.

Organized groups of Negroes are plotting new tactics of violence.

A group of "black nationalist" leaders has told President Johnson's Commission on Civil Disorders that the next riots will involve guerilla action.

Targets, they say, will be public utilities, expressways and other key facilities. The avowed aim of this group is to destroy the "white system."

A prediction of "violent and bloody revolution" has come from Harry Edwards, a militant Negro leader who teaches sociology at San Jose State College of California. Writing to police departments in northern California, Mr. Edwards said:

"Battle lines are being drawn. A condition of open warfare between the police and the black community and certain white allies is developing.

"Let there be no mistake, gentlemen. We are no longer talking about bricks and bottles. We are now talking about a state of total, hostile and aggressive guerilla warfare carried out on streets and highways of our communities."

Stokely Carmichael, originator of the "black power" movement, says, "Our movement is progressing toward an urban guerilla war within the United States itself."

Former Vice President Richard Nixon said in a recent speech: "Violence in our cities takes on more of the aspects of guerilla war."

A sharp increase in gun sales has led U.S. Senate investigators of last summer's riots to believe that firearms are being stockpiled for use in next summer's riots.

Past rioting has been concentrated in the "long, hot summer." But Floyd McKissick, national director of the Congress of Racial

Equality, now is warning whites to start worrying about a "long, cold winter."

The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Negro head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, announced he will lead a massive campaign of civil disobedience next spring. A march on Washington is to be staged simultaneously with other demonstrations throughout the nation.

If his campaign does not bring "positive" action by government officials, Dr. King says, "I would be the first to admit that this coming summer can be much worse than last summer."

There are many who predict that Dr. King's demonstrations themselves will lead to violence.

It is not only Negro radicals who talk of the possibility of racial strife in terms of revolution.

The Sunday Star, of Washington, D.C., in a recent editorial, said this:

"In the United States today, there exist all the ingredients that could combine to produce major civil strife on a nationwide scale."

Richard H. Sanger, a former diplomat who has made on-the-spot studies of insurrections in other countries, says he sees signs of open revolt developing in this country.

"I fear we have witnessed only a beginning," Mr. Sanger told U.S. News and World Report in a recent interview. "The demonstrations may well become more violent and the rioting get worse unless something drastic is done."

Demands are growing for extraordinary efforts. Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City said in a recent speech:

"To re-establish peace in our cities, we shall be obliged to concentrate the full powers of both the public and private worlds upon bringing constructive, positive change to . . . areas of our cities."

"Unless this is done," Mayor Lindsay has warned, next summer "probably will be worse—more festering, more inflamed and infinitely more perilous."

President Johnson's riot-study group has given a clear sign of how seriously it regards the situation. The commission announced in December that it will hurry up the final report on its months-long investigations. The report, with recommendations for action, is now scheduled to be presented before March.

One member explained that the inquiries brought to light a "situation so critical we cannot afford to waste time."

Along with demands for action to improve the status of Negroes come demands for stronger action to put down riots when they develop.

President Johnson, in a December 19 news conference, said this:

"We have more violence that we want, and more than we should have—more than we are going to be able to tolerate."

Thus, Mr. President, we see to our collective horror where what had part of its origins in a doctrine of civil disobedience has developed into violent attempts to tear down the existing social order and replace it with a form of jungle anarchy.

Put forth ostensibly to aid the quest of the Negro American to raise his station in life, this nihilist doctrine has not only stalled the tremendous progress this race has been making, but indeed has caused them to lose much precious ground.

Destruction will never bring progress, hate will never breed love, wanton, senseless violence has never been a precursor to true peace and harmony.

Led by false prophets, the Negro has in many cases become his own worst enemy and the greatest obstacle to his own progress.

Somehow, the Negro in this Nation must find it within himself to take full

advantage of the great benefits which this Nation offers to all its citizens.

No nation, no people, have ever developed a society the equal of what Americans enjoy today.

We will continue to make progress unless those dissidents who seek to destroy, rather than build, gain the upper hand.

Mr. President, it is in that light that I intend to offer my amendment to the pending civil rights measures when the times becomes appropriate.

With respect to the open-housing proposal, those who argue for such legislation do so on the prediction that such a law would enable the Negro to leave the ghetto. This is hollow reasoning, for it fails to consider the economic realities surrounding the Negro in the ghetto. There is indeed a danger that a fair-housing law not only will fail to improve the lot of the Negro; I worry, frankly, that it will further damage this country's already precarious race relations by being nothing more than a empty, frustrating promise to the Negro. This sort of thing is almost certain to engender more criticism from those who hurl charges of white hypocrisy at those who claim to be giving the Negro equal rights.

Not discrimination, but lack of money, is what prevents our Negro citizens from owning good housing and enough property. I have no doubt that when the Negro has enough money to buy property and to pay for good housing, he will find that the right to own his property exclusively and to sell it to whomever he pleases is as precious a right to him as it has been to those citizens who have exercised that right since the beginning of American history.

I should hope all of my colleagues would see the wisdom of seeing to it that the Negro moved up to the enjoyment of such rights and privileges, rather than having him serve as the instrument by which such freedoms were removed from everyone. If we do not do it this way, the eventual result will be that others will have been lowered to his level, rather than he having been elevated to theirs.

It would be a sad travesty for the Negro to find that he had achieved the rights of so-called first-class citizenship, and then to discover that his new station was no better and little different than the second-class citizenship of a bygone day.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that I will be permitted to outline four basic reasons that compel me to offer my strong opposition to the measure before us today.

First. The right of a person to own and dispose of his property at his own discretion—and to choose his associates—is fundamental to liberty and freedom.

Second. The crying need for the Negro in America today is self-help. Most Negroes cannot afford the housing which this bill would make available. For this reason, the bill is unnecessary and would only give birth to more senseless Government regulation and redtape.

Third. If recent history is a guide, there is every reason to believe that enforcement of such a Federal law would be prejudicial, abusive and typically overzealous. We can assume that charged with the administration or execution of such a program would be a substantial number of liberal hotheads who would be

prone to disregard practical problems in their blind quest for total integration and "social justice." Proponents can argue it would not happen, but past events support my concern. Similar abuses have already been witnessed with respect to the 1964 civil rights law and the 1965 voting rights law. And the letter and spirit of the law notwithstanding, these abuses have become official policy.

Fourth. There can be little doubt that so-called fair housing would be detrimental to property owners even on a purely practical basis, over and above the deprivation of the basic rights commensurate with property ownership. Out of malice or whatever, some troublemakers could claim racial bias and could cause preliminary injunctions to be issued against housing sales and rentals—without even any testimony or defense. A home might be off the market until the rendering of a final decision—which, because of crowded court dockets, might be as far away as 3 years.

Mr. President, I believe that every man, with respect to his own property, should have the right to act to encourage the development and maintenance of the kind of neighborhood in which he wants to live and raise his children. A man's feelings in this regard do not necessarily spring from prejudice. He simply may not wish for his children to absorb the values and attitudes of a culture different from his own. He may wish for his family not to endure traits and habits of others which he deems distasteful.

I fail to see the fault of a housing developer planning a neighborhood to appeal to people with certain opinions of what is best for their families. There is nothing wrong with people wanting to keep their neighborhoods as they are, free from influences which they feel are alien and undesirable. It may very well be that their beliefs are wrong, but it should be their prerogative to make up their own minds and to pursue what is best, as God gives them the light to see the right.

Negroes, just as all other men, will also want to perpetuate their neighborhoods as they believe they should be.

When they earn enough money, they will want to engage in the same practices as other people. If this housing proposal is enacted, however, they will discover their new status sadly lacking, for it will not offer all of the advantages that it otherwise would have.

Both whites and Negroes would benefit from the Negro's raising his standards to those of whites, rather than pulling the higher standards down to his level. At present, few Negroes can afford the housing which the proponents of this bill hope to make available to them, so its provisions will serve primarily to encourage needless governmental regulations, redtape, and, in many cases, harassment. It is far better to encourage self-help among Negroes. When they begin to develop the skills and abilities necessary to hold higher paying positions which will enable them to purchase such housing, the Negroes who have obtained these levels will want to establish their own residential patterns, just as various groups of whites have done.

It would appear to be the better part

of wisdom for those who are striving so hard to push through this legislation to pause and take stock of the many genuine successes Negroes have achieved in past years—much, may I say, because of his own effort rather than theirs.

For example, in the past 15 years the number of Negroes enrolled in colleges has doubled. The number of Negro professional men has doubled in the past decade. Negro buying power has risen to \$30 billion from only \$3½ billion 25 years ago. Adjusting for differences in purchasing power, this represents an increase of nearly 300 percent.

These achievements did not grow out of mass marches and demonstrations. They did not come as the result of wanton violence in the streets. No Federal legislation brought about these successes. These are the achievements of old-fashioned initiative and hard work by individual American Negroes taking advantage of the great opportunities for self-improvement offered in our society.

The road to success is the same for the Negro as for the white man. It is not the self-defeating path of the protest march with its placards and songs, its fires and hurled stones. The achievement road is the uphill route where the climb is made only by those fueled with ambition and initiative and powered by hard work and tenacity.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST BE TOLD THE TRUTH ABOUT VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, administration spokesmen, including a special assistant to the President, a high military authority and our Ambassador to South Vietnam, now contend that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong general assault of January 30-31 constituted not only a major defeat for the Communists but that this general offensive, attacking some 31 cities from the Mekong Delta to the DMZ, has left the South Vietnamese Government and its army in a stronger position than ever before.

Their reason follows the line that these attacks in violation of the Tet holiday and because of their intensity and brutality have created hatred and indignation on the part of the dwellers within the urban areas toward the Communists. These spokesmen contend that because of the assault, the South Vietnamese citizens "have come closer to a sense of nationhood than ever before" and that "the Government pulled itself together and did a magnificent job."

Mr. President, at the very same day, the news services were carrying reports that many people in South Vietnam believed that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese had scored political and psychological gains. It has been reported that the people of South Vietnam have a renewed respect for the Vietcong and, in fact, many were seeking to contact the Communists in advance of the anticipated second wave of assaults. Dissatisfaction with the Saigon government's performance was expressed because it was felt that Saigon was unprepared, lacked intelligence and sufficient manpower to meet the threat. Urban dwellers expressed their fears and frustrations