

leased or sold on the basis of racial principle.

I hope that the Senate will agree to this amendment.

I know of no single action we could take that would contribute more to understanding, to compassion, to the commitment of this country, than the simple matter of Congress declaring that we have had the last of segregation in the sale and rental of living quarters in our country.

Some say that this is not a popular measure. I do not believe it. I have always spoken up for fair housing, and I have done so in circumstances and under conditions in which the public knew where I stood, in which those who have opposed fair housing have had due notice and plenty of political remedies, and they have tried.

I believe that fair housing is a difficult issue only if it is not explained. I believe in the decency of our country and our people, and I do not believe that if they are presented with this issue, there would be any result other than a resounding and unquestioned decision in favor of decency and fairness.

We have heard the same argument in opposition to fair employment. We have heard the same argument in opposition to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We have heard the same argument in opposition to the Public Accommodations Act.

Time and time and time again, we have been told these are unconstitutional, only to have the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously show its constitutionality. And the same will be true if we adopted fair housing.

Time and time again, we have been told it is politically impossible for this Nation to work its conscience and do what is right on this issue of humanity, only to find that where it has become a political issue, the American people almost invariably have decided the issue in favor of decency and humanity.

In Minnesota we have one of the strongest, if not the strongest, fair housing laws in the country. I have yet to see one proponent of that measure be hurt politically because of his support.

This is an issue of decency. This is an issue in which men of good will, regardless of political party, will, when they understand it, rise to support those who have discharged their responsibility to their fellow men, to their religious principles, and to the concept that, in final analysis, every man is a child of God. That is the issue we have before us today.

I hope we will act with responsibility, without emotion, and yet with proper human concern for the enormous ramifications of the principle involved.

How do you tell someone who believes in this country, who happens to be black, who speaks up for moderation in our Nation, that a Congress can refuse to adopt such a measure and yet claim to be committed to the principle of living together? I say that the charge in that case would be unanswerable. Now is the time to do our duty.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. It has already been printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the introduction of this amendment brings before the Senate what must be considered, of all issues affecting civil rights, one of the most urgent matters of our day. In considering the proposed legislation, we will be entering an area too long neglected by the Senate, an area whose neglect by public authority has contributed more than most people realize to the strife and tension which so sorely try American society in our time.

Fair housing is not a political issue, except as we make it one by the nature of our debate. It is purely and simply a matter of equal justice for all Americans.

If we but look beyond the petty fears and hostilities which have too often marred our national life, we would have no difficulty in seeing that legislation of this kind is clearly required by the ideals and principles on which this Nation has been built. Who among you would say that the cherished dream of a decent home for every American should be abandoned to the ignoble dictates of prejudice and avarice? Yet, in effect, this is the practical result of the outdated customs which have persisted in many communities in this country.

Every argument of principle and pragmatism tells us that the time has come to take action to liberate all Americans from these unhappy practices. The issue is often posed in terms of a contest between human rights and property rights. Even in those terms, I cannot believe that a majority of this body, nor a majority of all Americans, would cast their vote for things instead of people. In the hierarchy of American values there can be no higher standard than equal justice for each individual. By that standard, who could question the right of every American to compete on equal terms for adequate housing for his family? But we know that in 1968 the competition remains less than equal.

Congress and the American people have come far in recent years toward recognizing the awful reality which we have tried to hide from ourselves. We can now see that discrimination is a powerful and ugly force eroding our efforts to achieve the fundamental goals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. We can recognize the manifold and insidious ways in which discrimination works its terrible effects on many of our fellow citizens.

But to recognize an evil is not to eradicate it, and we have been content too long with exhortation rather than action in this field. Millions of Americans have been denied fair access to decent housing because of their race or color. If we perceive this reality, on what possible grounds can we delay the evident remedy?

In this confused and painful period of our national history, we may take some hope from our postwar progress in other questions of civil rights. There have been earnest attempts to alleviate the in-

justices which kept many Americans from the voting booth. There have been respectable achievements in opening public accommodations to all of our citizens.

But in the critical areas of housing, education, and employment, change has been intolerably slow. It is in these realms that one finds the basic explanation for the malaise which disturbs America. It is in these realms that one finds discrimination still in the saddle and justice trampled underfoot. It is in these realms that our country must achieve its professed ambitions of equal justice under the law, or fall in the most noble aspects of the American experience.

It is in these realms that the Senate must provide the leadership to which the vast majority of concerned and well-intentioned Americans can rally. Without such leadership, without the voice of the Senate proclaiming the true and better spirit of the American citizenry, we must reckon with the danger that baser instincts will continue to prevail in too many sections of our country.

I have stressed that our ideals call us to act on this subject. I cannot fail to add, however, that other less lofty considerations also compel attention to these issues. It is my sober judgment that the issue of fair housing has become nothing less than the first priority in any approach to dealing with the urban crisis in which we are embroiled.

This in no way implies that fair housing is a panacea or anything approaching it. It is to argue that, to the extent we make progress in this area, we may be able to moderate our difficulties in the other critical areas to which I have referred, education and employment.

Fair housing does not promise to end the ghetto; it promises only to demonstrate that the ghetto is not an immutable institution in America. It will scarcely lead to a mass dispersal of the ghetto population to the suburbs; but it will make it possible for those who have the resources to escape the stranglehold now suffocating the inner cities of America. It will make possible renewed hope for ghetto residents who have begun to believe that escape from their demeaning circumstance is impossible.

Most important, in my judgment, this legislation on so vital a matter will offer desperately needed evidence that the American political process remains the most viable and responsive institution yet conceived by man. When the relevance and potency of our institutions come into question, as they have in many quarters, there is no other way to restore public confidence than by demonstrating the capacity and willingness of political leaders to act. What stands between us and action are myths and ghosts, the ancient hobgoblins that opponents of fair housing always invoke.

Most of these myths are unworthy of comment, but we do best to confront even unworthy demons in the light of day. There are those who raise the specter of economic loss if fair housing laws open white communities to Negro families. In one study of 20 neighborhoods in San Francisco, Oakland, and Philadelphia, covering a period of 12 years, property values either remained stable or

increased in 85 percent of the relevant cases. If there is any truth to this myth at all, it is rooted in the unequal access which Negroes have had to housing; this inequality has made possible the worst forms of price gouging on the one hand and blockbusting on the other. Where the entire housing stock is open to all Americans, it is wholly reasonable to expect a neutral impact on housing prices.

There are also some few who raise the claim that the Government is already moving rapidly enough in this field. True enough, between 1950 and today the Federal Government has completely reversed its racial policy, moving from officially sanctioned housing discrimination to a Presidential order in 1962 nominally eliminating discrimination in federally assisted housing. Yet the effect of these moves has been minimal. In 1962 nearly 80 percent of federally subsidized housing remained occupied by one race. And today the Executive order covers only a fraction of the total housing stock. Secretary Weaver estimates that only 40 percent of the stock has been subjected to Federal nondiscrimination rules. We are all familiar with the dreary cycle of the middle-class exodus to the suburbs and the rapid deterioration of the central city. I firmly believe that nothing is so essential to breaking this cycle than prompt action on fair housing legislation.

As the exodus has progressed, more and more jobs and businesses have followed the middle class to the suburbs. The tax base on which adequate public services, and especially adequate public education, subsists has fled the city, leaving poverty and despair as the general condition of the ghetto dwellers. We cannot immediately recreate adequate services in the central city, but we must move toward that goal. At the same time we can and should make it possible for those who can to move to where the better schools and services, the decent homes and jobs are most plentiful. That is the simple purpose of this bill.

Fair housing legislation has been labeled "forced" housing. I believe that the true "forced" housing is exactly that situation in which the ghetto dwellers find themselves—trapped in the slums because they can go nowhere else. The States are concerned that the Federal Government is attempting a further usurpation of their power. But if the States are not inclined to follow the doctrine of the 14th amendment surely the Federal Government has the duty to insure that they can no longer ignore it.

Mr. President, finally, some are worried that this legislation will both invade their privacy and tamper with their right to sell their homes to whom they please. On the contrary, this bill is aimed not at privacy but at commercial transactions. It will prevent no one from selling his house to whomever he chooses so long as it is personal choice and not discrimination which affects his action.

With the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 there came a gradual but basic shift in attitude toward discrimination in public accommodations. It is my hope and my prayer that the American people will respond to the passage of open housing legislation in the same

spirit. The job that faces us is one that must be done.

Mr. President, Negroes in big cities usually pay rent just as high as most whites, but receive much less for their money. Moreover, since they have lower income, paying equal rents works a greater hardship on them. These conclusions can be demonstrated by data from the 1960 census for Chicago.

There both whites and nonwhites paid median rents of \$88, and proportions paying rents below that median were almost identical. However, units rented by nonwhites were typically smaller and in worse condition; 30.7 percent of all nonwhite units were in deteriorated or dilapidated areas as against 11.6 percent for whites. They contained more people.

The median household size was 3.53 for nonwhites against 2.88 for whites.

Authoritative figures prove conclusively that Negroes paid significant extra housing costs in 1960 as a result of racial discrimination against them by whites.

The major mechanism through which this took was housing. Prior to 1948, direct exclusion of Negroes from white residential areas was legally enforceable by means of restrictive covenants incorporated in property deeds. After the Supreme Court declared this unconstitutional there was a shift to other means of discrimination. The two principal means are a conspiracy by white realtors to refuse to sell or rent to Negroes in all-white areas, and withdrawal of whites in areas where Negroes begin to live in sizable numbers.

Many States have now outlawed racial discrimination by realtors in the sale or rental of housing, though such laws do not always cover all forms of housing. These laws have, as yet, had no measurable effect in breaking down patterns of racial segregation.

A recent exhaustive study of such segregation reveals its presence to a very high degree in every single large city in America. Minor variations exist between North and South, suburbs and central cities, and cities with large and small Negro populations. But in every case Negroes are highly segregated; more so than Puerto Ricans, orientals, Mexican Americans, or any specific nationality group. In fact, Negroes are by far the most residentially segregated group in recent American history.

The authors of one study devised an index to measure overall segregation. The values indicate the percentage of nonwhites who would have to shift from the block where they live to some other block in order to provide a perfectly proportional, unsegregated distribution of population by block in that city. The mean segregation index for 207 of the largest U.S. cities was 86.2 in 1960. Index values were somewhat high in the South, a mean of 90.9, than in the Northeast, with a mean of 79.2, the North-Central, with a mean of 87.7, or in the West, with a mean of 79.3. But only eight cities have values below 70, whereas over 50 have values above 91.7.

Two additional findings from that study are extremely significant.

First, this nearly universal pattern of residential segregation cannot be explained as resulting from economic discrimination against all low-income

groups. Careful analysis of 15 cities indicates that white upper and middle-income households are far more segregated from Negro upper- and middle-income households than some white lower-income households.

Thus, racial discrimination appears to be the key factor underlying housing segregation patterns.

Second, the degree of racial segregation rose significantly in all parts of the country from 1940 to 1950, but declined slightly in all parts, except the South, from 1950 to 1960.

The average segregation index value for all 207 cities was 85.2 in 1940; 87.3 in 1950, and 86.2 in 1960.

From 1950 to 1960, only 15.6 percent of all cities in the North and West experienced segregation index increases as compared to 77.8 percent in the South. This shift in the North and West was undoubtedly affected by the outlawing of racially restrictive covenants in 1948, plus the end of the general U.S. housing shortage in the mid-1950's.

Nevertheless, the decline in segregation even in the North and West was relatively small. From 1950 to 1960, regional average index scores dropped 4.7 points in the Northeast, 1.5 percent in the North Central, and 6.5 points in the West.

These figures indicate that any really large reduction of residential segregation through "natural" developments in the near future is extremely unlikely.

Mr. President, many expect a ruling from the Supreme Court on the Jones against Mayer case to take some action on fair housing. But are we to wait until the Court acts? If Congress waited in the area of segregated education, surely Congress should speak forthrightly on this matter and not wait for the Court to lead where the elected representatives should be in the vanguard.

Mr. President, already we can see that the fair housing principles are being accepted in many States and localities. The National Committee to End Discrimination in Housing estimates that 60 percent of the American population is already covered by some form of fair housing legislation. These statutes are far from uniform and are very uneven in coverage and enforcement. But they reflect, in my opinion, receptivity to action in this field which should end congressional timidity once and for all.

Mr. President, I now refer to a statement concerning the Fair Housing Act of 1967, in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, first session, under the paragraph heading "The Ghetto and the Master Builder."

The words are these:

We make two general assertions: (1) that American cities and suburbs suffer from galloping segregation, a malady so widespread and so deeply imbedded in the national psyche that many Americans, Negroes as well as whites, have come to regard it as a natural condition; and (2) that the prime carrier of galloping segregation has been the Federal Government. First it built the ghettos; then it locked the gates; now it appears to be fumbling for the key.

Nearly everything the Government touches turns to segregation, and the Government touches nearly everything. The billions of dollars it spends on housing, highways, hos-

pitals and other community facilities are dollars that buy ghettos. Ditto for the billions the Government has given to American cities and suburbs in the name of community planning—money which made it simple for planners to draw their two-color maps and to plot the precise locations of Watts, Hough, Hunter's Point and ten-thousand other ghettos across the land.

At present the Federal example is murky; it has an Alice-in-Wonderland quality that defies easy summation. On the one hand, the Government is officially committed to fighting segregation on all relevant fronts; on the other, it seems temperamentally committed to doing business as usual—which, given our current social climate, means more segregation. It hires many intergroup relations specialists—HUD has forty-seven—but deprives them of the power and prestige to achieve meaningful integration. Similarly, it cranks out hundreds of inter-office memoranda on how best to promote open occupancy, but it fails to develop follow-up procedures tough enough to persuade bureaucrats to take these missives seriously. The Federal files are bulging with such memoranda—and our racial ghettos are expanding almost as quickly.

The road to segregation is paved with weak intentions—which is a reasonably accurate description of the Federal establishment today. Its sin is not bigotry (though there are still cases of bald discrimination by Federal officials) but blandness; not a lack of goodwill, but a lack of will. The Federal failure to come to grips with segregation manifests itself in all kinds of oversights. For example, a recent FHA pamphlet for house-buyers includes an italicized explanation of Federal antidiscrimination rules and regulations. Good. It also includes a photograph of a house in a suburban subdivision which had won an FHA "Award of Merit" for community development. Bad—because the subdivision was all-white, and its builders, according to a state human relations official, "discouraged Negro families from buying." Nobody checked this out before publishing the pamphlet because nobody cared enough to ask the right questions.

What adds to the murk is officialdom's apparent belief in its own sincerity. Today's Federal housing official commonly inveighs against the evils of ghetto life even as he pushes buttons that ratify their triumph—even as he ok's public housing sites in the heart of Negro slums, releases planning and urban renewal funds to cities dead-set against integration, and approves the financing of suburban subdivisions from which Negroes will be barred. These and similar acts are committed daily by officials who say they are unalterably opposed to segregation, and have the memos to prove it.

The words have lost their meaning. Many housing administrators in Washington have on their office wall a framed reproduction of a statement President Johnson made to his Cabinet on April 25, 1965: "The Federal service must never be either the active or passive ally of any who flout the Constitution of the United States. Regional custom, local traditions, personal prejudices or predilection are no excuses, no justification, no defense in this regard." But when you ask one of these gentlemen why, despite the 1962 fair housing Order, most public housing is still segregated, he invariably blames it on regional custom, local traditions, personal prejudices of municipal housing officials.

The upshot of all this is a Federal attitude of amiable apartheid, in which there are no villains, only "good guys"; a world in which everyone possesses "the truth" (in the files, on the walls), but nearly everyone seems to lack a sense of consequences. In such a milieu, the first steps toward a genuinely affirmative policy of desegregation in housing are endlessly delayed, because no one is

prepared to admit they have not already been taken.

"The rule is," said the Queen to Alice, "jam tomorrow, and jam yesterday—but never jam today."

In other words, our Government, unfortunately, has been sanctioning discrimination in housing throughout this Nation. The purpose of this bill, as well stated by my able colleague from Minnesota, is not to force Negroes upon whites. It is to give black Americans an opportunity to live in decent housing in this country.

In the summer of 1966 and the summer of 1967 our Nation witnessed its greatest shame. If we are to avoid a recurrence of this unsightly, unconscionable bitterness between white and black Americans, it is incumbent upon our Government to act, and to act now. The most important action that we can take is to enable black Americans to live in decent housing; and this amendment is intended to do exactly that.

The fears and myths I have spoken about have been aired time and time again. Whenever there was a debate on open occupancy, whenever there was an attempt by the Federal Government to move against discrimination and segregation, these same myths, these same fears, have been argued in debate.

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

Mr. BROOKE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. First, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his characteristic courage and strength of leadership on this issue. The Senator from Massachusetts terminated a very important study trip through Africa and flew several thousand miles to assist me as cosponsor of this measure and be ready this afternoon with his proposal. In addition to that, he prepared the most impressive remarks by which we have just been benefited.

In each of our comments, we emphasized many of the material aspects of this problem, whether it is the quality of housing or the quality of education, the availability of decent employment, the environment in terms of water, air, and transportation, law enforcement, playgrounds, and all the other aspects of a desirable community; but I wonder if perhaps more important than any of those is the psychological insult and the impact of that insult upon the ghetto dweller.

I asked these questions of Mr. Algeron Black, who testified on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union. The questions and answers appear on page 178 and 179 of the hearings. I think this is one of the most brilliant expressions of this aspect of the problem. I said to Mr. Black:

I particularly liked the sentence in your testimony that goes as follows:

"Deeper than the material and physical deprivation is the humiliation and rejection and what this does to human beings."

This past Sunday in the New York Times supplement there was an article by a Negro sociologist talking about the impact of conditions of oppression on the mental outlook of the Negro male. And it points out in effect

we have given traditionally in the United States the Negro the option of risking his life or losing his manhood.

And while that ancient option that was once true in the South is no longer as much true as it was, in the North we have this kind of repression in housing and living conditions by which we crowd Negro America into the rotting cores of our central cities. And it is today's grace from a material standpoint, but its cost in terms of the impact that flows from the humiliation and the insult of segregation is an incalculable cost that perhaps is even greater.

This was his response. He said:

I am also former chairman of the New York State Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, the first State committee of its kind to pioneer with State legislation and from which was born the National Committee Against Discrimination, whose representatives and officers you will hear this afternoon. I am chairman of its board of directors.

This is the point he made, which I thought was powerful and unanswerable. He said:

The real evil in the ghetto effects is the rejection and humiliation of human beings. As former chairman of the Police Complaint Review Board of New York City, I found that the most humiliating and injurious thing that police can do is not physical but psychological and spiritual, when they humiliate a man in the presence of his wife or his children. This is the enraging and destructive thing to a man's soul—and the injury it does to a child's psyche—because the man, who is supposed to protect the family, to make the home, and is made to feel that he is nothing by one who represents the authority of society.

This sense of humiliation goes all through the ghetto. It is the primary cause of the frustration and rage in the youth which has acted with such violence in the recent riots. In the ghetto no matter what they do, what they become, they don't get anywhere. They feel they are in a cage. And this is why this bill is of crucial importance now.

I think that is one of the most remarkable and unanswerable arguments I have heard for the importance and the immediacy of this measure. It is hard to quantify and make tangible this psychological problem; and yet, when I go into the ghettos, as I have, and talk to ghetto residents, they seem to be trying to express something different from the physical problem, although that is important, and I believe that Mr. Black expressed the result of the humiliation of segregation better than I have heard it expressed by anyone else.

Mr. BROOKE. I certainly concur in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and I am very grateful for his generous remarks. I assure him that I am deeply proud to be associated with him in the sponsorship of this important amendment.

I wholeheartedly agree with what Mr. Black said in testimony before the Senator's committee. The psychological impact is a great impact. It is a profound one. I can testify from personal experience, having lived in the ghetto, what it does to the inside of a man to live in such shameful conditions, to be in an area which has been marked for second-class citizens, in an area which few are able to escape.

Oh, I must confess that I was one of the lucky ones, that I did escape from the ghetto, that my parents were able

to educate me and we were able to, move out into a better neighborhood. But there are millions of my brothers who have not been able to escape, who still live in ghettos, who still live in indecent housing, who still lack a quality education, who still are unemployed or underemployed. So I know the psychological impact of which Mr. Black speaks.

This year, I have served on the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, with the opportunity to go to Detroit, to Newark, to Roxbury, and to other places around the country, and to talk with people who live in the ghettos, who every day experience the shame and the ignominy, who find it impossible to move out of those areas of squalor, and who feel so strongly that they are being denied their rights. I have seen the impact upon them, and I know very well what they mean when they say, "It is not just the fact that I am the last hired and the first fired; it is not even the bad conditions under which I am forced to live; but it is that I do not feel like a man, that I am denied the right to feel, to act, and to stand as a man, to live with human dignity. That is what is most important to me, I want to feel like a man. I want to act like a man. I want to live in dignity."

Time after time, I heard this testimony from the lips of those who lived in the very areas—the real areas—that have plagued our country with violence and bloodshed this year.

They told me that when a policeman approaches them, it is not so much that he makes an arrest, but that he treats them like dogs.

What they are really asking for is respect as individuals. They do not want to be denied it merely because their skin happens to be black.

This is what Mr. Black was talking about when he appeared before the Senator's committee. I think the material things are important, and quite rightly, but they are only secondary to that psychological lift that could be given to black America if it could only be given the opportunity to live where it pleased.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I said earlier that the statement of Dr. Black was the best on the subject I had ever heard. I have just heard a better one, on the psychological and spiritual aspects of this problem, from the lips of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

I think his words should be engraved in gold and brought to the attention of every American. I think if they were, the response of Congress would be immediate, swift, and favorable on this issue.

One of the questions we faced during the hearings, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, was: How important is fair housing as a part of the total spectrum of needs in the American ghetto?

The Senator from Massachusetts is well aware, both from his experience on the riot commission and from his other experiences, that there are those who say that this is a sort of nominal, vestigial, relatively meaningless aspect of the total spectrum of answers to the problems in our ghettos.

One of the things that impressed me

during the hearings was the number of times and the number of sources which stated that that was not the case, that this is not only an important aspect of the solution, but an indispensable feature of any adequate solution.

I asked Mr. Wilkins—who, incidentally, is from Minnesota; you will find most of the key leadership of any decent organization originated in that State: Mr. Wilkins, who was born there, Clarence Mitchell, who learned everything he knows there; Whitney Young, who would not have gained leadership without his experience there; and the same is true of many others—whether that was true.

Mr. BROOKE. Will the Senator yield, and say all those who were not born in Massachusetts?

Mr. MONDALE. I decline to yield to say that.

Mr. Wilkins' answer to that question, which appears at pages 119 and 120 of the record of the hearings, was as follows:

I might say as sort of a confession that while I have always believed that housing and employment and schools are the inseparable trio that must be dealt with as far as the ghetto living is concerned, I have been a little astonished to discover in recent years the tremendous feeling about housing, and even more so than unemployment. Ordinarily we would say unemployment is No. 1. I personally say schools are No. 1, but I think unemployment is only about a nostril behind, you might say, but I have been astonished to find the number of persons who consider housing. The refusal of housing as a crushing rebuttal of their human—the position as human beings as citizens. There is nothing more humiliating to a father and a mother and two small children when he is on the threshold of a successful career or looking forward to it, and he wants to purchase a home, and somebody tells him you can't do it because you are black. This hurts his wife, it hurts his children. It is a crushing thing. He would say, "Well, I would rather almost work as a day laborer if I could be free to pick my house, and I would rather not be what I am, a college graduate, and so on, if I could choose." So in that sense, I guess it is the No. 1 consideration. As you said, an important part, I would say almost that it is almost No. 1 if not No. 1.

Mr. President, this is one of the most distinguished, experienced, and committed Americans in this field, and he says, in a reasoned answer, that this may very well be the single most important issue that we face and must successfully deal with, if we are to solve this problem.

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

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am very pleased to hear the distinguished Senator from Minnesota speak so highly of Mr. Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Roy Wilkins is truly one of the greatest leaders in the fight for civil rights the Nation has ever known. He is well respected and able. And he is a man who thinks well and acts with conviction.

I think it is very appropriate that the Senator from Minnesota has cited Mr. Wilkins' testimony before his committee. I know that Mr. Wilkins has given

his entire life to this subject and is certainly an expert on these matters.

Mr. Wilkins states, as the Senator pointed out, that housing is almost the number one priority. He gives his reason, as he always does.

I think that we should take heed of this.

As I said, I served on the President's Commission for Civil Disorder. Mr. Wilkins is also a member of that commission. I think that if he were to testify before us now, after his service on the Commission, he would be even stronger in his convictions concerning the importance of housing. We have seen what has happened in the ghettos as the whites have moved out of the inner city into suburbia. We not only find decay and deterioration in the central city, but we find also that business has moved out of the ghettos into suburbia with the white population.

On the floor of the Senate in the last session of Congress, we debated the question of whether Federal funds should be spent for the location of certain industries out in suburbia where Negroes are unable to live and be near their jobs.

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

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that when we had the matter of the Weston, Ill., 200-Bev. appropriation before us last year, the testimony was that if a Negro obtained a job in that Federal facility—the largest perhaps that we have ever created to this time—he would have to commute on an average of 74 miles a day because he would have to come from the ghettos of Chicago.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator is correct. That is one of the examples that we gave. I think it is a very flagrant and startling one. I am sure that we could give other examples that certainly point to the need—very great need—to open up housing. Obviously any Negro that has to travel 74 miles a day cannot hold the job. He would not only be denied housing, but he would also be denied employment by reason of that fact.

Where are the schools the worst? They are worst in the central cities where the Negroes are living today, and from which they cannot escape. So, we have education and employment affected by housing.

I would certainly place housing as the top priority. I think it is very important, because if Negroes are able to live where they want, then they will be able to get these jobs.

Again, in the last session of the Congress, we had legislation proposed for government incentives to be offered for the location of industry in areas where Negroes were living. If Negroes could live anywhere, we would not have to relocate industry all over the country.

We are trying to keep Negroes living in segregated ghettos in the Nation, and what we need to do is to destroy these ghettos.

That will not happen overnight. It will take time. However, I think, as the able Senator from Minnesota well set forth in

his opening statement, there will not be this great rush to the suburbs. There never has been. As people are educated and have the opportunity and the wherewithal to move, they ought to be able to move. That is all that the amendment would provide.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Massachusetts pointed that out.

I included before an observation to the effect that all of the horror stories of the real estate lobby have proven to be untrue. They have not proven to be true in those States which adopted reasonable and meaningful fair housing laws.

I speak from personal understanding because my State has one of the strongest fair housing statutes in the country. We have had it for some years. We strengthened it again in 1967.

One of the witnesses before our committee was Kennon Rothchild, one of the remarkable citizens from my State, president of the mortgage bankers of the State at the time he testified, and a former chairman of the State commission against discrimination, and a common realtor in his own right. Mr. Rothchild pointed out what had happened in Minnesota when we passed the law.

If we were to believe the real estate lobby, disasters and holocausts were shortly to be the standard diet for Minnesota, and we would have anarchy. In fact, all of these horror predictions proved to be totally false. The effect has been that slowly and responsibly, without any fanfare, several hundred families have been permitted to move into those homes that they could afford.

There has been not a single instance of violence, virtually no instances of deep and serious community problems. It has worked out beautifully. And while it has not worked perfectly, it has been a definite, encouraging, exciting, and inspiring experience.

It is hard to find a person in Minnesota who is opposed to fair housing. During the days when the real estate lobby was predicting what would happen, I would say that most Minnesotans were opposed to and fearful of what would happen.

I am reminded of an experience I had as a student when we were making a survey of a community in a wealthy part of South Minneapolis. One of the persons who lived there was a man who later became famous. He is a man by the name of Carl Rowan, a good friend of mine.

A questionnaire had been prepared by the department of sociology. The first question was, "Did you know that a Negro lived in the community?"

The first housewife whom I asked the question said, "No. Is that true?"

The second question was, "Has it affected the real estate values?"

She said, "It certainly has."

And I think this shows the groundless fear and suspicion that we have.

This was the case of a Negro family that lived in a house because it could afford to do so and was permitted to do so because some realtor—thank God—was not a segregationist. That family lived there with no difficulty whatever. Indeed, most of the people in the community did not know it. And the only time any of the citizens became concerned was when

they learned about it long after the fact. The fears simply were not realized. It is not a problem. It is something that we think is a problem because we are ignorant. We live in separate, segregated communities, and we have to go on what is not truth but caricatures, not friendship, but the fears of a people alienated from each other.

I am distressed that there are still so many in American society who still harbor these fears which are so groundless.

Mr. BROOKE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I am very proud that I come from a State that also has fair housing legislation. I certainly agree with my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, that the fears that were voiced when this legislation was proposed were groundless.

People are now living in integrated cities and towns in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Giving a personal reference again, I now live in an integrated district in Massachusetts, in Newton Centre. Many other Negroes live there as well. People of the Jewish faith, protestants, Catholics, all live together, without incident, and they do well. In Washington, I live in Tiber Island, which is integrated, again without incident.

It is difficult for me to comprehend how fears, as my colleague from Minnesota has stated, still persist so widely, when actually there has been more integration in housing in the South than in the North. When one goes down South, he will find Negroes and whites living side by side to a greater extent, I believe, than he will find in the urban centers of the North. This has gone on for generations and generations, and whites have not moved out necessarily because there was a Negro living beside them. I believe that is just a myth. It is one of those myths that was dragged out to scare people about the problems they will encounter if there is integrated housing.

For a moment, let us explore the reverse of such legislation. Suppose all the Negroes lived in all the cities of the Nation and all the whites lived in all the suburbs. That is the trend as it is presently going, because there has been great migration to the great urban centers of the North, particularly. But even in the South more Negroes have left the farms and have gone into the central cities of the South, and the whites have escaped and gone to suburbs in the South, as well as in the North. They are finding that the cities are breaking down behind them: great leadership, competition in schools, the tax base—all go down, as property devaluates in the urban ghettos. The problems of the central cities magnify to the point of explosion, as they did in 1966 and 1967.

Do we want a nation in which all the blacks live in the city and all the whites live in the country? I do not believe we do. I do not believe it would be helpful for this Nation. I do not believe this Nation will exist with an urban black population and a suburban white population.

I believe that all we are saying in this amendment is that we are giving the opportunity for people to live where they

want to live and where they can live. I believe it has well been pointed out that nothing is being forced upon anyone. A person can sell his property to anyone he chooses, as long as it is by personal choice and not because of motivations of discrimination.

This is sound legislation. It is good legislation. What is more important, it is needed legislation. It is almost what I would like to call essential legislation. In fact, I will call it essential legislation.

I do not want to say what our Commission on Civil Disorders will report. We hope to report on or before March 1 of this year. We have been studying this very problem—among other problems, to be sure. The problem of housing certainly has been one of the great priorities in that Commission in finding the causes for the explosions of 1966 and 1967, so that we can prevent them in the future.

So I am indeed very grateful to my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, for his able presentation of the amendment and for the opportunity to work with him in the proposal of this essential legislation.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his most useful and important contribution to this discussion.

I believe his experience on the Commission on Civil Disorders uniquely qualifies him to speak as an authority on the relationship between this measure and the problems with which that Commission deals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which has previously been called up be considered as having been read for all purposes under rule XXII.

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

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

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. As I have previously mentioned, Massachusetts has been a leader in fair housing. As attorney general of my native Commonwealth, this legislation is of special concern to me.

I recall that my distinguished colleague from Minnesota was also the attorney general of his great State. We served together, as he will recall, in committees of the attorneys general of the Nation.

I know that the fair housing principle has the strong support of my constituency. I believe that most Americans are prepared to support the same principle. Someone once said that most Members of Congress—and I would say most members of our society—usually want to do the right thing; they just need a good excuse to do it. I believe that that truth was never more relevant than in respect to fair housing. The Members of Congress must know what is the right thing to do in this field.

What better excuse for action could there be than the imperative pressure to relieve the unbearable tensions in the ghetto, to make it possible for ghetto residents, by dint of their honest labor, to earn and acquire a better home for themselves and their families? What

higher purpose could any legislation serve than to restore the faith of all Americans in the possibility of realizing the constitutional promises of equal opportunity for all citizens?

That, Mr. President, is the purpose of this proposal. In my opinion, the Senate should not miss this precious opportunity to vindicate the aspirations of those who have, for so long, been denied a fair chance to acquire decent housing.

Mr. MONDALE, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

We have had similar experiences, having served as the chief lawyers of our respective States. Both of us have been active on this issue on the State level as well. I was pleased to be one of those who helped frame our fair housing law and to be active in that movement from the beginning, and to have been the law enforcement officer first vested with the responsibility of the enforcement of that measure. The belief I have always had in the elimination of discrimination has been strengthened by that experience. Not only am I more persuaded that the objective is right, but also that it is achievable in a reasonable and responsible way. The experience of the Senator from Massachusetts is obviously similar, and I am grateful to him for having mentioned that aspect as part of this discussion.

STRIKE BY SEABOARD COAST LINE TRAINMEN

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been shocked to learn this afternoon that without any notice at all the operating trainmen and other employees of the Coast Line Railroad have gone on strike. I do not know anything about the merits of the controversy. I do know something about the cruel imposition which has been caused by having a strike on this important railroad at this very time when our perishable commodities, both citrus and vegetable, are moving at their greatest volume.

I am not surprised to have received within the last few minutes wires which I shall place in the Record. The first telegram I have is from James S. Wood, chairman, Tampa Port Authority, which reads as follows:

TAMPA PORT AUTHORITY,
Tampa, Fla.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge immediate action to settle strike of Seaboard Coast Line trainmen. Work stoppage affecting economy of Tampa area in peak shipping season. If prolonged will result in prohibitive demurrage because of ships waiting to load in port.

JAMES S. WOOD,
Chairman.

Mr. President, another telegram is from Dade County, the county where Miami is situated, which is very much to the point. That telegram is signed by the Dade County Growers Exchange, Inc., Princeton, Fla., and reads as follows:

PRINCETON, FLA.,
February 6, 1968.

HON. SPESSARD HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Regards Seaboard Coast Line strike, request all possible speed settlement due to

volume perishables moving from South Florida area at this time.

DADE COUNTY GROWERS EXCHANGE, INC.
C. & C. PACKING CO.
C. C. CARPENTER FARMS.

Mr. President, a third telegram is from the Superior Fertilizer & Chemical Co. in Tampa, Fla., in which they state they have enough materials for only 2 days, at the peak of their fertilizer output season. This is the season for the fertilization of citrus groves. That telegram reads as follows:

SUPERIOR FERTILIZER & CHEMICAL CO.,
Tampa, Fla., February 6, 1968.

SENATOR SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I was shocked to learn of the rail strike this morning. We are in the middle of our busy season and have less than two days supply of various materials in storage. We cannot truck sufficient materials to handle our business although we can gain partial relief. Our entire business is 75 percent dependent on prompt rail service at this time of year. We are not a large company and therefore cannot afford to absorb the substantial losses that can result if this strike is allowed to continue.

I hope you do not view this telegram as just another businessman bringing his point of view to your attention. I cannot think of anything that will injure our business more than a rail strike. Isn't there some way that service can be restored while issues are being negotiated?

We had no warning of this strike, therefore have not been able to build up any inventory. I urge you to give this matter your immediate attention.

JAMES S. WOOD,
President.

Mr. President, a fourth telegram is from J. H. Williams, Jr., president of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce stressing the untold economic damage this strike will have on industry—small businesses that will shortly be out of business as they maintain small inventories and will be unable to meet delivery commitments. This telegram reads as follows:

GREATER TAMPA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Tampa, Fla., February 6, 1968.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Even in early hours of strike of trained crewmen, the telephone is ringing—industry urgently calling for help. Companies with low inventory unable to meet delivery commitments and will shortly be out of business for the duration of strike. Others will soon feel the pinch and results will be layoffs of personnel and untold economic damages. Port will suffer severely. Respectfully and strongly urge that everything possible be done to halt strike, thereby avoiding serious injury to commerce and economic stagnation.

J. H. WILLIAMS, JR.,
President.

Mr. President, this is the kind of thing which completely alienates the confidence and respect of great numbers of our people in the railroad unions.

I have called the White House. I am told that they are immediately considering the matter. The Florida delegation in a letter signed by all of us, is requesting the immediate action of the President in the appointment of a fact finding board and assistance in getting the line running again.

I am told that the workmen of nine

lines take this position. I am not acquainted with the other lines involved.

I cannot say too forcefully that no action at this time of the year means utter confusion in the handling of perishable crops worth many millions of dollars and is a direct blow at the economy of my State, and could be perhaps ruinous at this time to hundreds, and perhaps thousands of growers.

The Florida delegation as a whole requests President Johnson to take immediate action to resolve this emergency. We expect the unions to realize the enormity of their actions, coming as this does without any warning or opportunity for industries to be protected, and at the height of our production season of highly perishable fruit and vegetable crops.

Mr. President, I shall not say more at this time but I do want the Record to reflect the tremendous concern of the entire Florida delegation, both Democrats and Republicans, and the fact that we expect the Chief Executive to move with all speed to bring the railroad back into operation.

We have also received some telephone calls of the same nature as the telegrams. I have not had the chance to reduce them to a written brief.

This is a calamity if it is allowed to continue. It is a manmade calamity against the good people of our State who are in the business of producing these highly perishable crops.

TRIBUTE TO TV STATION KVOO-TV IN TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in view of some of the irresponsible activities by certain segments of the news media—particularly TV—during the riots which occurred last summer, and the sit-ins and protest marches which have taken place recently in various parts of the country, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the policy of a great TV station from my own State of Oklahoma—station KVOO-TV in Tulsa.

Mr. Harold Stuart, president of Central Plains Enterprises, KVOO-TV's operating company, is personally responsible for this policy. Mr. Stuart has rendered much valuable service to his community and his Nation over a long period of years. He fully appreciates the responsibility that television has to report the news honestly and objectively, and at the same time his experience as an attorney and public servant provides him with a deep understanding of his responsibility for law and order.

Mr. Stuart tells me that he has discussed the problem of news coverage of riots and civil unrest with many of his colleagues in the television industry. I know that his views carry great weight, because of Mr. Stuart's outstanding service to the Nation as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force from 1949 to 1951, his service on the Board of Visitors of the Air Force Academy, and his far-reaching activities in the fields of education, transportation, petroleum and in the civic affairs of his community.

This policy problem is of growing significance to all television executives. My respect for Mr. Stuart's judgment in matters of serious public concern dates back to his early years as a common