

Racial Violence in Minneapolis -  
Mayor Naftalin - Aug. 30

Urgency of passage of Civil Rights - Sept. 12

Role of Profits in Christian Family  
Life - Sept. 13

Sen. Hart & Sen. Mondale Address  
Mississippi Young Democrats - Oct. 19



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 30, 1966

No. 145

## RACIAL VIOLENCE—STATEMENT BY THE MAYOR OF MINNEAPOLIS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, America's great cities are, as every Member of this body knows, plagued by many problems, not the least of which are outbreaks of racial violence. These outbreaks cause substantial disruption in human relations, and in many cases worsen the physical condition under which people in congested urban areas must live. It is clear that new lines of communication between people in our cities are as vital to their renewal as expanded freeways and modern buildings. I am pleased to be able, as a Senator from Minnesota, to bring to the attention of the U.S. Senate the statement of the Honorable Arthur Naftalin, mayor of the city of Minneapolis, in regard to the recent riots on the North Side of Minneapolis. I am proud of the manner in which this outbreak of violence was handled, and I ask unanimous consent that it be brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate.

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

STATEMENT OF MAYOR ARTHUR NAFTALIN,  
MAYOR'S REPORT, WWTC RADIO, AUGUST 7,  
1966

I welcome this opportunity to discuss last week's disturbance on the North Side. I am eager to clarify certain points and to review the policies we have been following.

I should like to begin by noting that the events of the week have had two quite different reactions from the community.

One response has been that of concern and constructive cooperation. The police department, our settlement houses, our leading business firms, our social welfare agencies have all given truly magnificent support to programs that were quickly undertaken.

Unfortunately, there has been a second reaction that is most disturbing. Many individuals have called or written—in a few cases they have sent telegrams—to express opposition to a program aimed at providing job opportunities for young men and women and boys and girls who have been without jobs for a long period of time.

Many of these expressions have been threatening and unusually personal. It comes as a shock to discover that there are many people who do not understand the need for different programs to meet different types of situations. They represent a blind refusal to examine objectively the causes of the problems before us.

Thus, at one level our community is strong and responsive. It is prepared to face responsibly and humanely the serious questions raised by the disturbance. At another level there is a critical need to awaken the public to social conditions that desperately need attention.

When the disturbance occurred, followed by reports of possible increased violence, we had two choices before us. We could intensify police action, calling in men from other sections of the city, and, in effect, converting the area into an armed camp. Or we could recognize that underlying the disturbance are deep-seated conditions that demand prompt and effective attention.

Several days before the disturbance occurred I spent a full day on the North Side visiting with various groups. I stated at that time that I was greatly concerned about joblessness among North Side young people. Later, after the disturbance had occurred and in meeting with Governor Rolvaag and with a large number of community leaders, this fact was confirmed by group after group of responsible citizens.

We arrived at a strong consensus that what was needed was not vigorous and overwhelming action on the part of the police department but rather prompt and effective and sincere efforts to deal with the causes of the unrest, and this is what we resolved to do.

We decided to begin with the problem of unemployment. We appealed to leading business firms. We said to them, "Please look at these young men and women and let's develop immediately opportunities for them."

This program is under way and now we must turn to housing and we must look at parks and recreation and we must look at the management of police problems involving members of minority groups.

At this point I should emphasize the fact that the decisions we made—for example the decision to maintain as normal police operation as possible—were arrived at co-operatively and with the full participation of the police department itself. I want to stress this fact, which I think is very important, that, in this process of continuous discussion, we have achieved a most unusual degree of communication—communication between the police department and the non-white community, communication between and among many lawyers of white and Negro leadership. I believe we have for the first time reached in depth many, many people in the Negro community whom we have not previously been in contact with.

I must state this point very clearly: The individuals who want trouble in the community are so few they can be counted on two hands, but these few people will exploit the despair, the restlessness, the feeling of helplessness on the part of other Negroes, seizing leadership from people within the community who sincerely want to develop decent standards of living for all of the people, black and white.

What we have been able to do, as a result of our intensive activity during this week, is to establish excellent communication and to develop the beginnings of a bulwark against irresponsible and destructive leadership. It is making it possible to take constructive steps that are long overdue in developing critically needed programs.

Thursday night I met with North Side businessmen. One of the men made a brief statement to the effect that the problem on the North Side is the product of neglect. I

think this is precisely the term that explains the problem. There has been neglect on the part of the city government, neglect on the part of the North Side merchants, neglect on the part of business generally, on the part of labor, and neglect on my part, too. There has been neglect on the part of everyone.

At this critical moment we do not need any recrimination. What we do need is constructive cooperation that will provide, first, proper and adequate police protection, and I can assure the public that we will provide such protection for property and for the life of every individual citizen.

Second, we must provide an effective attack on the conditions that breed social unrest. We are on our way now but we must not let go. We must provide jobs for our young people and we must provide decent homes for everyone. We must make certain that there are decent recreational programs and meaningful opportunities not only for jobs, but also for training and for counseling.

Let me emphasize a further point. There is no intention on my part or on the part of the police department to condone or excuse or forgive any kind of crime. All violations of the law will be punished. Violators will be apprehended and prosecuted with the full force of the law. But while our police operations proceed, we are going to make certain that where there is distress, where there is unemployment, that we will identify every family and every individual in need and we will make every genuine and sincere effort to help that family or individual. This is our proper responsibility.

I say candidly and directly that there will be police protection, that we will apprehend and prosecute violators with full and due process of the law and we will make a full attack upon social conditions in our city that must be corrected.

I have great pride in Minneapolis as I have said many times. I say again tonight, we have within our power to make the City of Minneapolis the model city of America. We can develop a pattern of human relations in which every individual does have equal opportunity in our economy and in our society. We must recognize our potential and we must be prepared to realize it.

There is much that we can learn from this disturbance. It can give us a new awareness and a new alertness.

To those who have called my office complaining that our policies are rewarding vandalism, I say, truthfully, plainly and directly, that this is not the case. Our policies recognize the fact that conditions that breed social unrest demand our attention.

We cannot afford to have Negroes fighting whites and whites fighting Negroes. We are all part of one large community and there is room for all of us in our strong and productive economy. We must share in the growth and strength of our society. To do this we must have constructive and tolerant outlooks. That is what we are seeking and that is what we must achieve.

29.1 per cent in the \$150,000-to-\$200,000 bracket. After that, it falls.

Mr. Pechman did not argue that the preferential tax treatment of capital gains should be abandoned. But he did urge that capital gains be taxed when the property was transferred to the owner's heirs upon his death. Congress has refused to tax them, although President Kennedy proposed this in 1963.

Mr. Pechman said that the double exemption for the aged—the non-taxable status of Social Security payments and the special tax credit for other retirement income—benefited aged persons with high incomes more than those with low incomes.

"It would be fairer," he said, "to remove the additional exemption for age, make retirement income fully taxable, and use the revenue to raise Social Security benefits for all the aged."

One of the best ways to help all low-income persons would be to increase their standard deduction, Mr. Pechman said.

He proposed increases that would have the effect of removing entirely from the tax rolls single persons with incomes of \$1,200 or less, married couples with \$2,000 or less and couples with two children and incomes of \$3,600 or less. The cutoff point would move higher with more children.

This change would cost the Government only about \$1.8-billion annually in revenue, Mr. Pechman said, compared with the \$5.5-billion cost of raising the present \$600 exemption to \$800 for everyone, which has frequently been proposed.

#### URGENCY OF PASSAGE OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is essential that the civil rights bill pass the Senate at this session. We are not dealing with some distant goal which can be achieved as well next year as this. The passage of the bill is a matter of prime national urgency.

If there is to be any hope of moderation in the solution of our racial problems, we must prove that Government can move effectively to close the gap between the goal of equal rights for all and the reality of discrimination. The bill contains practical measures toward providing equality in the administration of justice and in the opportunity for obtaining good housing. The passage of the bill would strengthen the hands of those who claim that the democratic and peaceful processes of our Government are able to cope with the pressing need for action in civil rights. Failure to pass the bill will only play into the hands of those who are preaching that nonviolent processes cannot do the job. Such a failure will cause good men to lose faith in their Government.

The denial of equal justice is one of the areas where the Nation most shockingly falls short of its promise of equality and fairness. It is also one of the most frustrating and dangerous areas of all. Our Constitution, which leaves many rights to implication, is specific in guaranteeing due process of law and equal protection of the laws. It does this in recognition of the fact that injustice must be corrected at law; otherwise, the victim is left to seek revenge by force. Equal justice is central to a peaceful and ordered society.

We have seen enough of unequal justice in our society. Murderers of civil rights workers or Negroes are tried by

all-white juries and go free. Negroes tried for crime face equally all-white juries, and conviction follows, especially if the crime has any racial connotations. If we are shocked by this sordid spectacle, think how it must grind away, day and night, at the Negro for whom the law becomes a threat rather than a protection.

Titles I and II of the bill would effectively end jury discrimination in Federal and State courts. Title V would make it a Federal crime, with appropriate penalties, to intimidate or harm persons in the exercise of their civil rights. These provisions would redeem the word of our Government that all men are entitled to receive equal justice. We cannot afford to leave that pledge unfulfilled.

The other area of pressing need is in housing. The pressures mounting in our segregated ghettos need no illustration; they are all too apparent to anyone who reads the newspapers.

Title IV of the civil rights bill is a modest measure indeed. My own State of Minnesota, like several others, has an open housing law which is broader in its application than title IV. Experience with Minnesota's law shows that it certainly does not revolutionize housing patterns, and title IV would not either. But it would at least offer a glimmer of hope to Negroes who now have no escape at all from the ghetto—and a glimmer of hope, however faint, is badly needed in the steaming pressures of our slums.

To turn our backs on title IV, a measure which covers less than half of the Nation's housing, is to say an unqualified "no" to the problems of the ghetto. But the problems will not go away merely because we refuse to act upon them. If we simply preach peace and pass the buck, our failure will pursue us all.

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966 must become law if we are to answer the demands of the day, and of many days to come.

#### THE ARMS RACE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the distinguished editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, Mr. Norman Cousins, has written a most significant editorial which appears in the September 10 issue of the Saturday Review.

The article spotlights the barrier to further progress on disarmament and nuclear controls. I think it should be read by every Member of the Congress and by those in policymaking positions in the executive branch.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cousins' editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Saturday Review, Sept. 10, 1966]

#### THE PRESIDENT AND THE ARMS RACE

For almost nine months, delegates from eighteen nations met in Geneva under the auspices of the United Nations to try to find a way of giving reality to a proposition that all believed to be essential. The proposition was that the spread of nuclear weapons must be stopped. Yet the common purpose that brought these delegates together was not accomplished. They adjourned last week

without the agreement that all had declared to be in their own stark self-interest.

One of the difficulties was that the nations with a potential nuclear capacity did not think it fair to be asked to forego making nuclear weapons unless the nations already making them would agree to stop doing so and would start to cut back.

This particular problem, however, was not the major sticking point at Geneva. The major sticking point was that the United States and the Soviet Union were deadlocked on the question of West Germany. The United States insisted that any treaty limiting the spread of nuclear weapons had to take into account existing U.S. commitments to its military alliances. The USSR interpreted this position to mean that the U.S. wanted a non-proliferation treaty that would make an exception for Germany.

As the Geneva deadlock continued month after month, the terrifying possibility of a world nuclear arms race became increasingly clear. Finally, a possible compromise was advanced—not in the Palais des Nations at Geneva but in the United States. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara acknowledged, tacitly at least, that the concern over West Germany's access to nuclear force had to be met. He proposed a consultation procedure inside NATO which would give West Germany a voice in nuclear decisions but which would keep nuclear weapons out of German hands.

Many of the delegates at Geneva were encouraged by this proposal. They felt it represented a good test of Soviet sincerity; if the Russians really wanted to stop nuclear diffusion in the world, the McNamara formula offered a reasonable and workable way of getting on with the job.

But the Soviet position was never put to the test. Incredibly and inexplicably, the United States made no attempt at Geneva to put forward the McNamara compromise proposal. An apparent division among U.S. policy-makers had come to the surface. Confronted with an opportunity to break the deadlock, the United States backed away. The Geneva conference ended without the agreement that all agreed was imperative.

Why? Why did the United States shun the formula on West Germany that might have produced a treaty? A possible clue came last week when a U.S. State Department disarmament consultant, on a television program, asserted that the State Department didn't go along with the McNamara proposal because it would encourage the Russians to believe that they could violate American policy and impair our freedom of decision. That is, we should not give weight to Russian objections just to obtain agreement. With equal emphasis, he declared that the McNamara formula would offend West Germany.

The same day this interpretation of U.S. policy was being advanced, President Lyndon B. Johnson, speaking at Idaho Falls, made an eloquent and striking plea to the world's nations to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. He called statesmen to rise above narrow, irrational approaches to world problems. He defined a larger interest than the old and cramped national ones. He urged the Soviet Union in particular to put aside the "dogmas and the vocabularies of the Cold War."

"While differing principles and differing values may always divide us," the President said, referring to the United States and the Soviet Union, "they must not deter us from rational acts of common endeavor."

The juxtaposition of the record at the Geneva Conference with the remarks of the State Department consultant and the President's talk at Idaho Falls raises somber and disquieting questions. Is the consultant's interpretation correct? For if it is, then the nation is faced with something far more serious than the matter of tactics in negotiating with the Soviet Union; it is faced with



national policies cannot be predicated on opinion polls.

I ask unanimous consent that Howard K. Smith's analysis of the meaning, if any, of the latest public opinion polls regarding the Presidential office be printed in the RECORD.

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

DOES JOHNSON'S POPULARITY SLIP MEAN ANYTHING?

(By Howard K. Smith)

There are a great many things the President might do about his sagging stock on the opinion polls. Probably the single most useful recourse would be to shrug it off with a little philosophy.

Measured by the standard of most of his predecessors, he is not doing nearly as poorly as the polls or the Washington press corps suggest. But corrosive criticism and bouts with popular disillusion are almost non-constitutional requisites for the job. And past examples suggest the present time is about right for popular favor to reach the bottom.

It was within months of FDR's 1936 landslide victory that his stock began to sink, beginning with his ill-fated court reform and ending with the ensuing and disastrous off-year election of 1938. It was about two years after Harry Truman's stunning upset triumph of 1948 that his poll rating attained what is still the record low for Presidents—26 percent. In 1962, John Kennedy's popularity enabled his party to confound the tradition that the in-party always loses in off-year elections and win his party a net gain of seats in Congress; yet a year later his influence was so low that his legislative program had completely jammed on Capitol Hill.

The trouble is, we still personalize our complaints, and what better person to blame than the one whose actions fill a third of the average front page each day and whose face appears on television more often than Walter Cronkite's. Also, when people give a man a spectacular triumph they also unconsciously hang expectations on him that no human can fulfill. So, comes the pendulum swing from charisma to disenchantment.

In this situation even the most trivial features of a President are picked at. Not long ago I read a list of scathing comments about the President on everything from his absence of style and his cornball mannerisms to his vulgar jokes and lack of dignity in public. At the end it was revealed that not Johnson but Abraham Lincoln had been the butt of these comments by his contemporaries.

Among the comforts of a philosophical attitude is the observed fact that people often tend to say one thing when airing views that won't affect national actions, and to behave differently in that periodic moment of truth in the voting booth. As a friend of mine who hated Truman said when I asked why he did not mark his ballot for Dewey:

"Hell, I was only talking then; now I'm voting."

With voting-booth perspective, which swallows near-up wrinkles in long-trend contours, Mr. Johnson's record cannot but appear inordinately impressive. His immediate predecessor's slogan was, get the country moving. But when Kennedy died all had stalled. Johnson's job was, in Pierre Salinger's words, "about like taking over the driver's seat of a bus that had run up against a brick wall. You had to get that bus started again, and you had to get it through that brick wall—but how?" There are not many precedents for the skill with which Johnson got it started and through the wall.

The troubles in our cities cannot be shrugged off. They demand prompt and vigorous remedy. Still, in a real sense they

are the noises of progress. It is true that desperate people don't make revolutions; it is rather people who have had a whiff of success and felt the first flow of democratic power into their spirits.

The economy's main trouble is the threat of "over-heating." How much more welcome a problem that is than the way the motor went cold in three recessions in the eight Eisenhower years. Then we shuddered at Allen Dulles' announcement that our economic growth rate was but a fraction of Russia's. Now, our growth rate has simply traded places with Russia's.

The President's weakness is said to be foreign affairs. Yet the intervention in the Dominican Republic, so fiercely assailed at the time (by this reporter among others), turned out pretty well.

In a year of our really resisting in Viet Nam, the mood of all Asia has changed. The assumption that China would inevitably come to dominate the continent has been defused, and a kind of spiritual rebellion against Peking's influence is spreading. In fact, so disastrous has been the year for China that we have a new fear that she may resort to irrational actions to try to rescue her prestige.

The President has to face the fact that vigorous Presidents don't get an even break. Since he insists on remaining in that condition, it is going to be tough, at least until election time.

#### FIRST ANALYSIS OF OUR TAX SYSTEM SINCE 1964 SHOWS DESIRABILITY OF INCREASING STANDARD DEDUCTION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the first study of the tax system since the tax reductions and reforms of 1963 and 1964 was released yesterday by the Brookings Institution.

I have not yet had a chance to read the whole study, but the newspaper accounts have been highly enlightening. Joseph A. Pechman, the author, found that one of the fairest ways to help lower-middle-income families, at a relatively modest tax loss to the Government, would be to increase their standard deduction. As one who has for years advocated an increase in the standard deduction, I am glad to see support for this proposal coming from the results of an impartial economic analysis.

Mr. Pechman made several recommendations which deserve careful consideration. In his opinion, one of the best ways to help all low-income persons would be to increase their standard deduction. In this regard he advocates measures which would have the effect of removing entirely from the tax rolls single persons having incomes of \$1,200 or less, married couples having incomes of \$2,000 or less, and couples having two children and incomes of \$3,600 or less. The cutoff point would move higher with more children.

Mr. Pechman's analysis, which shows us what effect our tax system is actually having on the taxpayer, whether married or unmarried, rich or poor, should serve a very useful purpose in suggesting ways of making the system more equitable and more efficient in furthering desirable national goals.

I ask unanimous consent that an account of the study, published in the September 12, 1966, New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TAX STUDY FINDS SINGLE PERSONS PAY UNFAIR RATES—ECONOMISTS, IN FIRST SURVEY SINCE 1964 BILL, ALSO CALLS EXEMPTIONS IN-EQUITABLE

(By Eileen Shanahan)

WASHINGTON, September 11.—The income tax law discriminates heavily against single persons not only in its rates, but also in the system of personal exemptions, a noted tax economist said today.

He is Joseph A. Pechman, director of economic studies for the Brookings Institution, who has made the first complete study of the tax system since the tax reduction and reform bill was enacted in 1964.

Among his other findings were these: Persons with annual incomes between \$100,000 and \$200,000 pay higher taxes proportionately than any other group, and notably more than persons with annual incomes of \$1-million or more.

Tax provisions to help the aged actually help well-to-do older persons considerably more than they help those in modest circumstances.

One of the fairest ways to help lower-middle income families, at a relatively modest tax loss to the Government, would be to increase their standard deduction.

The plight of single persons was discussed at length in Mr. Pechman's study. He said the "split income" provisions of the tax law, which permit married couples to pay substantially lower rates than single persons, were unfair.

#### EXEMPTIONS ASSAILED

Under the split income provision, married persons are allowed to treat their income as though each partner had earned half of it. The tax rate imposed is the rate that applies to half the total income.

The split income provision is justified, Mr. Pechman said, on the ground that married couples have heavier expenses, particularly the expenses of raising children. But even married couples who have no children are allowed to split their incomes for tax purposes, he noted.

He also argued that the personal exemption of \$600, which can be claimed by each taxpayer for himself, his spouse and dependents, was unfair to single persons.

The system assumes, he said, that it costs twice as much for two persons to live as it does one. This, he said, is not so. Studies of family budgets indicate that it costs about three-fourths as much for one person to live as it does for two, he said.

The taxes paid by the wealthiest persons are relatively small primarily because of the special treatment for capital gains, the study found. Capital gains—investment profits—are taxed at half the rate of other income or 25 per cent, whichever is lower.

Extremely wealthy persons have such large capital gains, Mr. Pechman found, that those with annual incomes of \$1-million or more actually pay out only 26.7 per cent of their total income in Federal income taxes.

This is a smaller proportion than that paid by any group with incomes between \$100,000 and \$1-million, and is only fractionally higher than the proportion paid by those with incomes between \$50 and \$100 thousand.

The top tax rate, under the 1964 law, is 70 per cent. This applies to incomes of \$200 thousand or more for single persons and \$400 thousand for married couples. Under this rate, if there were no special tax provisions, persons with incomes of \$1-million or more would pay 69.3 per cent of their total incomes in Federal income tax.

The typical family with a total income between \$6,000 and \$8,000 pays 8 to 9 per cent of it in Federal income taxes. From that level of income to the \$200,000 mark, the percentage paid in income taxes rises steadily to

example, will have 28 wheels and will operate with less pressure in its tires than the ones now in use.

Requirements to lengthen and strengthen runways are mounting while the FAA goes from year-to-year with a fairly stable budget for its Federal aid to airports program.

It now has 730 requests pending which total \$250 million. The budget for fiscal year provided \$71 million to be used with local matching funds for runway and ramp construction and improvement. Morrow says \$157 million per year is needed over the next five years.

#### CRISIS "UNAVOIDABLE"

"It's too late to avoid a crisis," Morrow said. "The question is how long are we going to dally along before we do something."

Morrow advocates having the FAA take over the role of comprehensive planning, covering everything from airport access roads to restrooms to predicting the use and impact of new planes being developed.

"I don't think the FAA has any divine guidance, but I think we can take the leadership in development of a blueprint for air transportation so all of us working in this area can draw from a master blueprint," he said.

Presumably such overall planning would get high priority attention by the proposed Department of Transportation which has been approved by the House.

The measure is expected to come before the Senate soon. Sen. MIKE MANSFIELD (D-Mont.), the majority leader, has predicted it will be approved, establishing the second new cabinet level department of the Federal government in two years.

#### THE ROLE OF PROFITS IN CHRISTIAN FAMILY LIFE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago Mr. Harry Heltzer, president of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing—3M—Co., gave an address to a regional convention of the Christian Family Movement in St. Paul, Minn. He dealt with the role of business in solving the problems of poverty in our society.

His speech sounds the best note in American business today—a note of "moral responsibility in this matter of providing opportunity to all men."

As Mr. Heltzer points out, the central problem of poverty is not the shortage of jobs, but the lack of skills and motivation on the part of those who are victims of educational and cultural deprivation. Mr. Heltzer represents responsible industry in supporting an attack on this problem. His own words best set forth the challenge:

If we really are ready to accept the moral and the economic challenge of such an undertaking, we should be ready to see it through. This is an assignment that can never be accomplished with halfway measures or wavering dedication. There is a responsible role in it for every one of us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Heltzer's thoughtful and stimulating speech be inserted in the RECORD.

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

ROLE OF PROFITS IN CHRISTIAN FAMILY LIFE  
Remarks by Harry Heltzer, Christian Family Convention, August 20, 1966)

In considering the subject may I quote: "We are now engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure."

Abraham Lincoln said that a century ago when the people of this country were split by a rift so deep that only armed conflict could resolve the issue.

Today we are armed for another campaign within our borders. This one to bridge the gulf that prevents some of our people from enjoying the fruits of our economy.

Some social critics seem to regard this campaign as a test of whether the economic system to which this nation is dedicated can long endure.

If our concern with poverty in the midst of plenty constitutes a test of our basic economic institutions, then I, for one, am not worried over the eventual outcome.

No economic system that man has devised has yet done a perfect job of protecting all its people from want. Yet I submit to you that our notion of individual determination under free enterprise has come a whole lot closer than any other.

Let's take a look at the record. The business statistician measures our economy in terms of gross national product—that is, the total value of all goods and services produced during a year. In these terms our total wealth has grown a hundredfold in the past century—from less than 7 billion dollars in Lincoln's time to more than 676 billion dollars this past year.

And mathematically we can determine that the average family today has an annual disposable income of about \$7,500.

These are comforting statistics. They measure accomplishments in which we can take justified pride. Yet there is a hazard in relying too much on gross measurements. When we do this we run the same risk as the statistician who drowned while wading a pond that averaged only two feet in depth.

This fellow came to grief because he relied entirely on generalized information and ignored the individual problem.

The parallel is that while there is value in national economic statistics for our country—our economy is actually based wholly on the individual. Our system will work only as long as it remains responsive to the needs of the individual.

What free enterprise really means is that the individual has freedom of choice in the line of work he goes into . . . in the amount of work he wants to do and the amount of wealth he accumulates . . . and most important of all—our system gives any man the right to look back on his accomplishments and reflect with pride that "I did this with my own efforts."

We can find the origins of this emphasis on the individual in the earliest reaches of American history. The majority of the early colonists came to these shores seeking individual freedom in religious belief, in political view and in economic opportunity. When the first colony was established at Plymouth it was their intention to provide for the general welfare on a share and share alike basis. All harvested crops and other foodstuffs were placed in a common storehouse to be distributed according to need.

As praiseworthy as this may have been on a humanitarian basis, it ignored man's desire to shape his own destiny. The men of that colony knew their wants were to be provided for even if they didn't get out and hustle—so most of them just coasted along and the colony suffered severe famine.

Then the rules were changed so that any man reaped what he sowed and the bounty of the land became a reality. It was only then that the first Thanksgiving became an appropriate celebration.

Since that day we have progressed only through the initiative of individuals expressed in the settling of frontiers and the development of the resources with which this land is blessed. We have progressed through the individual creativity expressed in the development of the electric light, the airplane, the hamburger and the hula hoop.

Our system has been productive—but perhaps not perfect. Throughout the years the distribution of our wealth has never been equal. But then it is not intended that it should be. We believe that only as a man sows, shall he reap—according to his own efforts.

On the other hand, opportunity has not been distributed equally either. This inequality is certainly not intended under our system and this is the problem we want to examine today.

We have all heard stories and innuendos of duplicity and greed in business. Perhaps some of these have basis—most do not. I believe you will find the businessman's outlook on the general welfare a lot closer to the moral viewpoint than you may have thought.

All of us in this group would quickly subscribe to our moral responsibility in this matter of providing opportunity to all men. Our participation in a program of this type attests that fact.

The businessman is equally interested in ridding the land of poverty and want. Why? Well, principally, it's just good business.

It is the irony of our time that the same newspaper that reports the problems of the unemployed and the under-employed on page one will also carry column after column of "help wanted" ads in the classified section. At the same time that thousands are suffering the frustrations of joblessness and want, business and industry—and for that matter, government and education—are searching fruitlessly for qualified people to fill thousands of essential jobs.

The basis of our poverty problem is an imbalance between the jobs available and the qualifications of the people eager to fill them.

The march of progress is all but doing away with the menial jobs that demand very little of the jobholder. Digging, carrying, loading and sweeping are now almost always done by machine.

This trend has taken place in response to the demands of all of us as consumers for the increased efficiency of mechanization to produce ever better goods at most attractive prices.

While mechanization and automation have eliminated some jobs, studies have proved that for every two jobs made obsolete in this way, three more are created. And the frosting on the cake is that the newly-created jobs are always more challenging, better-paying jobs than the ones they replaced because they are more productive of the goods and services demanded by the consuming public.

The reverse side of the coin is that while these jobs may be more rewarding—so are they more demanding of the skills and capabilities of the men who hold them. Industry is desperately in need of men and women who can fill these jobs well. When an operation is mechanized by any company, the usual practice is to re-train the displaced workers for new jobs—better jobs. But the individual who first approaches the job market with no skills to offer that the public is willing to buy, finds his chances are pretty slim.

During the Great Depression of the 1930's we were able to put thousands of unemployed people to work on a massive program of construction of roads, parks, monuments and other public works. But the same solution will not work today. The public works program created jobs where none existed. But a make-work program would not solve today's problem of preparing potential wage earners to fill available jobs where they are vitally needed and face promising futures. Today we are in a period of high prosperity and high employment. Our unemployed people find themselves in that situation not because there is a shortage of job opportunities but because they, as individuals, lack either the required skills or motivation or both.



What we must be able to do is to motivate and to train presently unemployable people so they can meet the requirements of the competitive job market and enjoy the opportunity to become productive citizens. This is what we are attempting to do in the programs popularly known as the war on poverty.

But if we really are ready to accept the moral and the economic challenge of such an undertaking we should be ready to see it through. This is an assignment that can never be accomplished with halfway measures or wavering dedication. There is a responsible role in it for everyone of us. These are roles calling for a great measure of what is often called "enlightened self interest."

The shortest route to failure in our war on poverty is to consider the campaign as one we can simply consign to our public agencies. True, we do need government action on the matter because we are dealing with groups of people outside the reach of the job market.

But if government agencies are to be successful in carrying out their part of this war on poverty, it will require that private business is able to offer permanent employment opportunities. Each segment has a role to play.

Without attempting to minimize the job our public agencies must carry in a war on poverty, I point out that the role of government is to regulate. I am sure that my colleagues representing government here today will agree that their organizations do not create wealth. The role of government is to provide a climate in which wealth is created by private business and industry producing useful goods and services.

The contribution that government can make is significant—but it is necessarily limited. The thing that public programs can do is to prepare people for productive employment. Beyond that point there must be rewarding jobs available—and, I say again, most of these jobs must be provided by private business.

While every war requires its share of emergency legislation, we shouldn't attempt to repeal the law of supply and demand for this campaign. This fundamental economic principle provides that the selling price of any item is established by the need of those who would buy it. With reference to the job market, there are good wages being offered for a large supply of jobs right now because of an unfilled demand for qualified people to fill them. Here is the ready-made solution to our poverty problem \* \* \* if only we are astute enough to take advantage of it.

But we sometimes seek overly simple solutions to complex problems. It may seem simple enough that if every major employer absorbed just a few hundred needy on their payrolls the poverty problem would be licked. It is a compliment, of sorts, that the field of business is considered capable of carrying this extra load. But such a proposition could lead to a two-fold tragedy.

First, such a step would legally describe the people it covers as economic cast-offs who have no social role to play. By robbing them of motivation and opportunity we would effectively deny them the chance of ever bettering themselves.

Certainly we have had enough experience with adopting peoples as wards of the government—or of society—to be aware of the hazards of this course.

The second concern is in the ultimate economic consequences of attempting to create job opportunities where there are none. Because business today is good—there are plenty of job opportunities but only for those who can reach the high level of efficiency that current conditions demand. The employer who takes on a staff of people not prepared to produce efficiently is faced with

a considerable cost for which there is no offsetting gain in income.

His only course is to add this cost to the price of his goods. This places it squarely up to you, the consumer—and we have a wealth of experience indicating that buyers just won't buy when faced with a price increase they feel is unwarranted. This not only dooms the artificially-created job—but places the jobs of thousands of presently employed qualified workers in jeopardy.

It is no exaggeration to say that success in business and industry depends in great measure on management's ability to hire with discretion. The greatest contribution business can make to a war on poverty is to stay in business—and stay profitably in business—to continue to meet payrolls, buying goods and services, paying taxes and using a portion of its profits for reinvestment in the business so that this cycle of opportunity repeats and repeats.

Business can afford to offer employment only to those persons whose skills are useful in the operation of the business—and even then, only to the number of persons needed to produce just enough goods to meet present sales volume. While there may seem to be short-range benefits from hiring a few additional people, including some below required skill levels, such a practice may well create a bigger economic problem by jeopardizing the future of what may otherwise be a successful, profitable business.

It is unfortunate that the word "profit" has acquired some unfavorable connotations. Profit is simply the gain that is earned through venturing investment capital and hard work. The promise of this gain is certainly an important motivating factor for most businessmen. But it is more than that. Because profit is the means of expanding each business and industrial organization, it is also the means of expanding the total economy. It is, therefore, the means of creating new and better job opportunities and for this reason it is as important to every employee and job applicant as it is to the owners.

I think some of the possible misconceptions about profits originate from the vague notions that profits disappear into an Ebenezer Scrooge-type accounting house where they benefit only the miser who accumulates them.

Actually, profits very rarely sit around and accumulate anywhere. Nothing moves faster nor works harder than a dollar in profit.

I say this because it is out of profits that new manufacturing plants and office buildings are paid for. It is out of profits that research is financed to seek out products and services which lead to new opportunities. It is out of profits that taxes are paid to support our common programs.

At 3M, for example, we are presently investing some \$41 million a year in research—looking for new products or ways of improving existing ones. The only sources we have for this money is from the profits of previous sales.

This heavy investment in research is the key to growth in our company. As the result of this growth we were able to provide new jobs and job promotions to thousands of people during the past year. And I would stress that these were not merely jobs—they were good jobs.

This same process must go on in thousands of large and small companies all over the nation if business is to be able to fill its responsibility of offering productive employment to those in need of it.

But I would be equally candid in pointing out that these jobs that come about through our advancing technology can provide opportunity only to those people who are ready to accept the responsibility we must place on them. Today even most of the starting

jobs we have to offer demand at least a high school education including a good grasp of the basic sciences, mathematics and the communications skills. Most of this preparation—and the motivation that underlies it—must be carried out in the family and in the schools, churches, and other institutions of the community. This is where each one of you has an important role to play.

Our war against poverty must not be limited to war against economic poverty—but also must be concerned with poverty of the soul as well.

The most essential ingredient in the preparation of any citizen is the preparation that makes him or her want to become a productive member of society. There is nothing more tragic than the person who wants only to sit quietly under the money tree and gather a few windfalls to meet his needs. While this man may be secure from poverty of the pocketbook and hunger of the belly, he most certainly will suffer poverty of the soul. He will never be able to stand straight and tell the world: "I did that!"

It is unfortunate that scriptural references have often been taken so literally to suggest there must be a breach between Godliness and material possessions.

I can't help but believe that any man's contemplation of the meaning of life and his relationship to the Almighty might be drowned out by the rumbling of his empty stomach. Isn't it more likely that if we can relieve economic hardship and demonstrate just reward that other opportunities of life can better assume their right dimensions?

Through the satisfaction of effectively meeting earthly responsibilities I wonder if we can't stimulate spiritual probing?

This, I believe, is a most proper concern of the Christian family and I feel that you, ladies and gentlemen, are to be commended for participating in this type of program.

I believe that when Christ seemed to speak out against the wealthy, he really was concerned with the undue preoccupation with accumulation of riches. Certainly extreme concern with affluence is the origin of just as many family problems as is poverty. What we are concerned with in our churches and our communities is the whole man—the balanced man—who carries his spiritual and his material values in their proper perspectives. It is this same whole man that the business world is eager to hire.

There is one more aspect of this field of economic opportunity that we should take up here as a responsibility both of business and of the Christian family.

We are all aware that opportunity is not equal among all our people and that the distribution of opportunity has been especially unequal to members of certain minorities among our populations.

I doubt that anyone here today has ever intentionally denied opportunity to a Negro, Mexican-American, Indian or member of any other minority group. But we may have been either indifferent or simply unaware of the need to provide equal opportunities.

In this regard, I would like to cite 3M as an example. I have been with the Company for more than 30 years. And for all of that time, and I don't know how many years before, the Company has had a stated policy of hiring the most qualified persons available without regard to race or religion. And we have lived up to this policy for as far back as I know anything about it. Certainly long before Civil Rights became a major issue, 3M hired without bias.

Our only concern has been to get qualified people. We don't seek and don't deserve any particular credit for this policy. We were simply following the dictates of good business. And any member of a minority group who applied for a job at 3M found that his

application was considered strictly on the basis of his qualifications for a particular job.

However, through the years we made no particular effort to make our hiring policies known to minority groups. For one reason, I think we were a little fearful of appearing to claim credit where none was deserved. The fact is, as we have since learned, members of minority groups tended to stay away from our employment offices either because of timidity or the desire to avoid the repetition of previous, embarrassing situations they had encountered elsewhere.

We now talk about our willingness to offer equal opportunities. For example, locally, we have worked with Mr. Cecil Newman, the publisher of the Negro newspapers—the St. Paul Recorder and the Minneapolis Spokesman. Mr. Newman occasionally carries a news item about a Negro who has taken a job at 3M. His articles invariably point out that jobs are available at 3M for qualified Negroes.

Our recruiting practices now also include advertising in minority newspapers, working with organizations representing minorities and participating in programs to encourage members of minority groups to prepare themselves and to look toward us as a potential employer.

All of us are gaining a better grasp on our moral responsibility in this matter of human rights. Yet it is interesting to consider how closely our economic self-interest parallels the moral view.

These are my thoughts on the role of profits in Christian family life. It is through the creation of profit that we cannot only provide for our material needs but contribute to the spiritual satisfaction that comes from achievement.

I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to offer these ideas to a group of this type, for after all, our national economy must first be understood if it is to continue to function and serve us all . . . and you can help.

We can't have the fruits of our economic system without having the system itself. And we cannot afford a weaker system because the size of the golden egg can never exceed the dimensions of the goose.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### MRS. MARY T. BROOKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is S. 3553.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3553) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Brooks.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized under the previous order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1966

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14765) to assure nondiscrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to facilitate the desegregation of public education and other public facilities, to provide judicial relief against discriminatory housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes.

#### ADDITIONAL SIGNERS OF CLOSURE MOTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be added to the cloture motion and that the Senator from Rhode Island be allowed to sign the motion.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONDALE] be added to the signatures on the cloture motion.

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

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to sign the cloture motion, which I believe is pending at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, contemplating that the civil rights bill would be debated at some length, I have made extensive preparations to engage in a series of speeches in opposition to the bill to fully explain its defects before we reached a vote on final passage.

In view of the present parliamentary situation, however, there is the probability that it will not become necessary for me to speak on all aspects of the measure or to speak in detail regarding it. Should the pending cloture motion be unsuccessful there may be a withdrawal of this measure and further effort to enact it dispensed with at this session of Congress. Of course, I may be expressing a wish that may not materialize. If further persistent effort is made after an unsuccessful cloture vote, if cloture is unsuccessful, I shall speak in more detail about the measure than I shall do today. If cloture is successful, of course, my opportunity to discuss the bill in detail and at length, and to point out all the evils it contains, may be limited. Mr. President,

the citizens of this country who are not fully cognizant of the violence that the bill contains deserve the benefit of full discussion of it. The Congress should not enact a bill—this bill—which would do serious injury to the personal liberty of individuals and would generally undermine the great freedom that our people have heretofore enjoyed without full and free debate.

There is an effort to pass this bill by elements outside of Congress. There are efforts to bring about the enactment of civil rights legislation by elements in this Nation that are today engaged in deliberate turbulence, strife, and turmoil, trying to intimidate the Congress into passing this measure and other measures like it. I hope that Congress never yields to those who would seek to appease these elements. I hope that the Senate in particular never yields to the pressures of coercion and intimidation by mob violence. It will be a sad day for our country if that character of influence ever dominates the legislative branch, or either of the other two branches of our Government. Those forces are present throughout the Nation today and they are resorting to those means to try to influence this legislation.

Mob violence in a civilized society is abhorrent. The people of my State—like the vast majority of citizens throughout the Nation—deplore such action. The mob, as an instrument of force, intimidation, coercion, and compulsion, has no place—no proper role—in a democratic society. It is completely inimical to every concept and ideal of government under a rule of law.

The heat of passion and anger generated by the mob stimulates uncontrolled emotions; dethrones reason; and incites to hate, violence, and destruction. Violence begets violence; willful destruction spreads. It becomes wanton and indiscriminate, and personal injuries—even death—ensue.

We have witnessed this in the past several months in many sections of our country. What I am saying is not theory and not speculation. It has already occurred.

Mob demonstrations and rioting harden and solidify prejudices. They can never and will never ameliorate them. The arena of violence is not the crucible for the resolving of issues, the solving of problems, or the fixing of responsibility.

Force, as a tool of the mob is not a valid instrument for the redress of grievances, nor is it the answer to the anger, confusion, and frustration that has been engendered by agitators and extremists. This is a lesson that civil rights leaders need to learn and that mob demonstrators and rioters should be made to observe.

I make this next statement with emphasis and with regret but I think it is necessary and appropriate that it be made at this time, because the circumstances and conditions pervading our country and the business of the Senate today make this statement proper. I want to state for the RECORD that when our Government, for political expediency or in an attempt to placate minori-



ties in their unreasonable demands, sorts to the force of punitive and unconstitutional statutes, it degrades the majesty of its authority, destroys confidence in its integrity, and ultimately invites the scorn and contempt of the very agitators it undertook to appease.

Yes, Mr. President, we are once again witnessing the technique of the double R operation—the Negroes riot and the Congress reacts. Four major civil rights bills have been enacted into law within the past 9 years. And now, the Congress is called upon again—nay, it is being told that yet another bill must be enacted in this civil rights shell game of delusion and deceit. In trying to comply and appease by meeting the unreasonable and illegal demands of these minority groups, we are indulging false hopes and pursuing an illusion. It is impossible to satisfy the incessant and insatiable demands of the extremists in the civil rights movement.

Mr. President, I know that the words of a southern Member of this body spoken with relation to the civil rights legislation are usually cavalierly dismissed without concern or consideration.

The charge is made that we are prejudiced, and everything we say therefore must be discounted or disregarded. But let no one be deluded into thinking that this pending civil rights bill, or any other civil rights bill for that matter, will abate or extinguish the flames of unrest, riots, and mob rule currently raging in the streets of many of our major cities. Another civil rights bill—another law—will not resolve any issues or solve the problems involved. Thus, the leaders of this Nation and others who are in the forefront of advocacy for these ineffective and harmful remedies are engaging in a lot of sham and pretense. They are simply creating false hopes in those who may be so gullible as to believe that this bill will serve as a palliative to the ills and sufferings that this civil rights controversy has fostered upon our Nation.

The Negro says he does not have a job. So he demonstrates and riots, and the Congress passes a civil rights law saying that he will have equal opportunities to get a job. But, the bill does not create any new jobs. So, a false hope and delusion is created; and, when the Negro awakens to the stark reality of the situation—when he finds that no job is immediately forthcoming to him—he demonstrates and riots again.

The Negro says that he has inadequate housing, and he demonstrates and riots about that. So, the administration sends this bill to Congress providing for open housing. But, would this bill really provide adequate housing for the Negro? Of course not. So, we go through the motions—in this case, an arduous process of cranking up the gigantic power of this Government to pass another law. But what will we accomplish? We will have simply turned some wheels, made some speeches, encouraged more agitation, and greater and more unreasonable demands. The Negro people will not be greatly benefited thereby, and we will have provided no real effective solution to the problem.

If our Government is really going to alleviate or eradicate poverty, ignorance, and inequality in all forms and if it is its purpose to eliminate personal predilections, prejudice, and bias wherever and whenever they exist, then I suggest it is embarking on the wrong course when it proposes to do this simply by insisting on the enactment of still another in a long series of civil rights bills.

Mr. President, we should know by now that a true and correct solution of these problems can only be found in and applied by the processes of evolution and not by the forces of revolution. But, if the force of revolution is to be our national policy and the instrument that we choose to solve our ills—if it is to be our vehicle of progress together with huge Federal spending programs designed to relieve the individual and the State and local communities from their proper responsibilities—then we must face up to the fact that the money presses will soon have to run day and night to print the currency, Government bonds, and other evidences of debt required to supply the funds that will be necessary to support such programs and policies. I do not believe this course can be pursued—that this can be done—without sacrificing our liberties and destroying our country in the process. That is too high a price to pay, Mr. President. Temporary political expediency may seemingly dictate such a course, but the bitter fruits of it will, in the end, be national disaster.

They are not going to solve or eradicate poverty in this country by simply pouring out money without requiring comparable and corresponding responsibility and action on the part of those whose distress it is sought to relieve.

I am convinced that we can successfully defend this Nation, our liberties, and our freedom against all external threats and dangers, but I am increasingly disturbed and concerned with the persistent assaults that are made on our institutions from within.

Mr. President, every riot in this country today, all of the riots that we have experienced, are, in their proper definition and interpretation, an assault upon our institutions. Every riot is an assault upon law and order, upon the law enforcement agencies duly constituted. Those who participate disregard the processes of justice, of the courts, and of the administrative powers that are duly constituted under the Constitution and laws of our Government.

The deteriorating sense of obligation that exists and the rising waves of irresponsibility sweeping this Nation today are distressingly alarming. The lawlessness, the riots, the looting, and the mobs are all symbolic of a nation caught up in turmoil with revolutionary tendencies toward social and political chaos that border on and which might well lead to anarchy.

I do not hesitate to say that the processes of anarchy are at work in this country. Every element, every segment, every organization that has ulterior motives against our Government is contributing to the distressing conditions that we are witnessing today. We need

desperately to return to reason, to restore respect for the fundamentals of our national Constitution. I say unhesitatingly that the Supreme Court of the United States ought to be the one to make the beginning, to make the start, because it has departed so far from reason that some of its decisions tend to encourage the practices and the actions that are being resorted to today to try to force and intimidate the Congress of the United States and the executive branch of this Government to take actions to placate those forces that demand the benefits, but shirk the responsibilities that belong to free men.

To repeat, we need desperately to return to reason, to restore respect for the fundamentals of our national Constitution, and to preserve order and enforce our laws with the paramount purpose of protecting society instead of interpreting and administering them to the advantage and accommodation of the criminal.

Law enforcement has deteriorated in this country, and it started from the top, when the Supreme Court began tampering with the Constitution and giving it interpretations that were never intended. That is when disrespect for the law began to arise, and civil disobedience began to become prevalent and to be the order of the day in many sections of our land.

New laws—and especially new civil rights laws—are not the answer to the problem of the Negro ghetto. Testimony in recent hearings held on urban problems by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations pointed repeatedly to the alleged need for more and more money if we are to end the blights of our cities. The cost to fulfill those needs for some 60 to 75 of our larger cities has been placed as high as \$250 billion. If we project the ratio of that figure to all cities in the Nation that have the same or comparable problems, the cost obviously will be so astronomical as to be prohibitive.

Mr. President, these are some of the problems cited in support of this pending civil rights measure. But, this bill is really providing no answer to the problem. We are engaging in the perennial legislative shell game of delusion and deceit.

But not all are deluded and deceived, Mr. President. Let us consider the following excerpts from the subcommittee hearings to which I have previously referred. Claude Brown, a Negro and author of "Manchild in the Promised Land," in a response to the question of whether he anticipates the white and Negro communities working out some of the problems stated:

It has to be done, or else there won't be any working out of the problems. But so far, all the white community has tried to do is placate, you know, just keep the niggers cool, you know. Pass the civil rights bill. Most negroes who are aware of, who have been around, have the slightest bit of awareness of what is going on politically in the country, they take the civil rights bill as a new method of placating the Negro.

You know, it is like say 25 years ago they give us Joe Louis to identify with. Then let's say 18 years later they give us Ralph



by the Food and Nutrition Board of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. It is also difficult to prove that some of the claims on a label are false. The extensive and continued use of products by persons who believe they have a special dietary need can hardly be used as evidence that the products are useless or dangerous. It is not unthinkable that a consumer can experiment with himself and arrive at an assessment of his own peculiar nutritional needs without benefit of chemical tests, a physician's fee, and the cost and availability of the needed product through prescription.

The FDA's judgment of the adequacy of the American diet, without supplements, is too optimistic. Its emphasis on natural foods is well founded, but it is also misleading. Nearly 50 percent of American households have dietary practices which are substandard in one or more nutrients, and about 25 percent are known to be deficient with respect to calcium and vitamin C. These conditions are not necessarily associated with the low-income brackets of the population.

I have introduced a measure today, which would establish a consensus of the Congress that the FDA regulations on labeling and content of diet foods and supplements should not be made effective or enforced until Congress has by law conferred the authority to make such regulations on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There are several such resolutions now pending before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

In view of these resolutions and the mounting opposition from the pharmaceutical and health food industries, independent scientific authorities, and the public, the proposed regulations are not only in prospect of a rigorous dilution but are also in prospect of delay in date of effective application. There is reason to believe that the application of questionable and unnecessary requirements will not come about at all, and that other provisions will be stayed until acceptable compromises are worked out for all parties concerned.

#### JOHN CRAIN KUNKEL

(Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, in bidding au revoir, but not goodbye to JOHN CRAIN KUNKEL, I have some mixed emotions. He deserves and has earned the retirement he contemplates, but I regret his leaving our Public Works Committee.

Fully armed with facts and solid opinions, in every one of our debates and discussions, JOHN KUNKEL was a formidable ally, if he were on your side of an issue and just as equally influential if he were not. I have been associated many years with able men and women in this House and in keenness of mind and ability as a legislator to evaluate proposals and see their ultimate effect, JOHN KUNKEL had no peers.

If anybody lived up to the old remark that "he is a born Congressman," Mr. KUNKEL certainly does. He is the grandson, the great-grandson of Congressmen and a descendant of a member of the Continental Congress. He came to the House in 1947 equipped with much more than a fine inheritance in the public service.

Before his election from his Harrisburg district in Pennsylvania he practiced law, was a banker and a farmer. In addition to these vocations he was active in civic affairs, with particular interests in public health, hospitals, public libraries, education, and problems of youth. What he learned in these pursuits made him an invaluable fount of information and a wise counselor in our committee and in the House.

JOHN KUNKEL's broad culture, coupled with commonsense, was always evident within our Public Works Committee. His influence in creating the monumental public works guaranteeing our country's future growth cannot be calculated.

JOHN KUNKEL's monuments are spread across the country and they will endure long after anything we say here today. He had a lot to contribute and gave it to the people of his district, Pennsylvania, and our country. He gave it with devotion. In thinking of his noble service, I recall the lines of Emerson about a good statesman:

They build a nation's pillars deep and lift them to the sky.

Mrs. Fallon joins me in this expression of our gratitude for the work of Congressman KUNKEL, and we express our admiration to Kitty, his charming wife. Both of them have made substantial contributions and are deserving of many more happy years.

#### SENATOR HART AND SENATOR MONDALE ADDRESS MISSISSIPPI YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, when the Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi convened in Biloxi at the end of August, two distinguished Members of the Senate with outstanding records in the field of civil rights were there to address them. Both Senator PHILLIP A. HART, of Michigan, and Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, of Minnesota, challenged the Young Democrats to persevere in their efforts to bring vital new resources in talent and ideas to the Democratic Party in Mississippi.

Senator HART, who in recent days was floor leader of the majority in the Senate which attempted to bring the House-passed civil rights bill to a vote, observed in his remarks that prospects for a better life for all citizens in Mississippi, black and white, have been greatly enhanced by the landmark legislation passed by the 88th and the present Congresses. Senator MONDALE, who as chairman of the Credentials Subcommittee of the 1964 National Democratic Convention was instrumental in the adoption of the rule that no future Democratic convention would seat a delegation when a challenge showed that it had been selected by a discriminatory process,

praised the Mississippi Young Democrats for "the courage you have shown: To face the issue of race directly; to join the races in the exercise of political power; and to make race irrelevant as we press the attack on the problems of our society."

Mr. Speaker, I too have had the honor to address the Mississippi Young Democrats, both in their home State and in Washington, and I can attest to their courage and excellence of purpose. Their dedication to a fundamental precept of American life—that government and its representatives must strive to improve the welfare of all the people—is a vital reminder to all of us in elective office.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the addresses of Senator HART and Senator MONDALE to the Mississippi Young Democrats in the RECORD at this point:

SPEECH OF SENATOR PHILLIP A. HART BEFORE THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF MISSISSIPPI IN BILOXI, MISS., AUGUST 27, 1966

To begin, I must thank you for the very gracious invitation to speak here tonight. This is an organization dedicated to worthy purposes—purposes which I heartily approve although I cannot insure that my endorsement is going to win you any great added support.

Tonight, I am hopeful of discussing the national Democratic Party's programs and philosophies—all of them, not just the ones pertaining to civil rights.

After all, it is—and why blink the fact?—very tempting for any northern politician with a Negro constituency to come down here and raise hob with Mississippi for its racial attitudes.

It's such a satisfyingly safe course to pursue. You'll get applause from an appreciative audience back home and no boos from anyone who can vote for you.

So, historically, it's been easy for the northerner to come South and preach sanctimoniously about equal opportunity for all. It's been easy to maintain the comfortable pretense that all truly intolerable violations of human rights have been perpetrated in one section of the nation.

Well, that's nonsense and always has been. And I think a northerner ought to say it. Certainly there is racial prejudice in the North and it is no less lamentable there than it is anywhere else.

Yes, northern prejudice is less direct and more sophisticated but if you are on the receiving end, it is just as damaging to the human spirit.

So I'm not coming to Mississippi with a pious lecture on the value of brotherhood or virtuous exhortation to mend your ways.

But I am prepared to defend the Great Society programs as vigorously here as I do in Michigan. Because I am convinced they are sound programs—truly sound.

Not in the sense that they have short-range political benefits—although in most of the country they certainly do. But rather in the larger sense, the historical sense—in the conviction that 50 years from now or 100 there will be few citizens who will look back and think it was all a mistake.

After all, what is the Great Society? Prosperity? Liberty? Education? Opportunity? Economic security? Military strength? World leadership? Sure.

It is all of those things and yet that string of words provides an inadequate description.

I think of the Great Society as a massive conservation program—and certainly not one that the South—or any other section—can afford to miss out on.

It is a conservation program not of just natural resources but of human resources. And no segment of our society should reject it because it promises to benefit all segments.

Why should there be a War on Poverty? Why should there be Aid to Education? An Appalachia bill or other regional development programs?

They are all really designed to one purpose: the elimination of human waste.

Why do we create national parks? Just to preserve trees and hills? No. It is done that the people will always have places to refresh and restore themselves.

When President Johnson talks of turning tax consumers into tax payers, he is talking conservation—conservation of money, yes, but more importantly, conservation of the human spirit.

When we set up a national health care plan for the aged, we provided our old people with far more than just money. We provided them with dignity.

This then, in my opinion, is the mark of the civilized nation: the willingness—no, the determination—to preserve dignity and opportunity for its people—all its people.

And in considering these programs, I would ask all reasonable men to ask this question about them: "Will they benefit me and will they benefit the nation?"

This is the essential question and not the query: "Will these programs benefit some fellow down the street of whom I disapprove?"

I know that this state's economy is on the rise. But it is also no secret, I think that Mississippi is not fully sharing in national prosperity.

And now, I suppose, we get to the real reason that I am grateful to be here tonight.

Because I know the Young Democratic Clubs realize that the Great Society can provide the tools to accelerate your state's climb up the economic ladder.

And I also am aware that this organization realizes that if the climb is to be truly successful, every citizen must have a rung on which to put his foot. Thank you.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS OF SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE TO THE YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF MISSISSIPPI, BILOXI, MISS., AUGUST 26, 1966

Nothing in recent months has given me more pleasure than the invitation to sound the keynote at this Convention of Young Democratic Clubs of Mississippi. You are not only the future of Mississippi politics; you are an absolute necessity for the sane political life of this nation.

You know that my special interest in your group arises from having been chairman of the Credentials Subcommittee of the 1964 National Democratic Convention. That Subcommittee dealt with the challenge of the Freedom Democratic Party to the seating of the Mississippi delegation.

That challenge justly brought about a ruling which marks a turning point in the life of the Democratic Party. For the Party had been lagging behind the national march of events. We had seen Civil Rights Acts come out of Congress. We had seen landmark Supreme Court decisions against voter discrimination and in favor of "one man, one vote." But our national political parties were routinely seating delegations with no thought of the discrimination at their base.

And so we adopted the rule that no future Convention would seat a delegation when a challenge showed that it had been selected by a discriminatory process. This historic action is the Civil Rights Act of the Democratic Party.

And I invite the Republicans to join us in this legislation, when they get around to it—if they want to get around to it.

The rule we adopted at Atlantic City arose from two considerations. First, from a desire for political rights for all persons,

which we knew had been denied. Second, it arose from a sincere belief that a broad and representative base in all states is a practical necessity for the health of the Democratic Party.

We hoped that the rule would breed strong local parties with a base in all groups of people within their states. Not a party anointed by fiat of the National Convention, but one growing from roots deep in its own state.

In short, we hoped for you, and for the party you are trying to build. And I can't begin to tell you how good you look to us now!

And in regard to the National Convention, let me say that, having presided at the birth of that rule, I don't intend to witness its death. I firmly intend at the 1968 Convention to honor the mandate of 1964—to oppose the seating of any delegation based on racial discrimination, and to support in its place any delegation sincerely trying to live up to the spirit of the rule.

And I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of delegates at the Convention of 1968 will do the same.

This means that either your approach to politics—a bi-racial, non-discriminatory approach—must be the pattern for Mississippi, or there will be empty seats at the National Democratic Convention in 1968.

I don't think that you will let this happen to Mississippi, and I hope and pray that other Mississippians won't either. You will have to fill those seats as a truly Democratic party, and I'll help you.

For those empty seats, and all that they signify would represent a tragedy of lost opportunity, because Democratic Party Government would be a great thing for Mississippi. And this Convention can forge its framework.

For the politics of the past is not enough for Mississippi. The Candidate elected by a narrow base of voters—even narrow among whites—with an even narrower financial backing, and tied to no particular issues, cannot do what needs to be done for this state.

Most of all, Mississippi can no longer afford to let racism be the specter presiding over every election—a dominating subject of every campaign and a real issue of none.

For race has been the curse of Mississippi politics. It has been the oratorical tool to inspire the fear of the voter, and to cheat him of any true political achievements.

These achievements include progress in civil rights, but they include as well the full range of liberal programs needed to benefit all of the people of the State.

By building a statewide party open to all races, you can release politics from the prison of racism. And you can present a stirring example to the rest of the nation.

For all of the nation is now coming to wrestle with problems of race and power. I hope that we have the courage you have shown:

To face the issue of race directly;

To join the races in the exercise of political power;

And to make race irrelevant as we press the attack on the problems of our society.

Here in Mississippi, your success depends upon a great deal of change, but great change, but great change is already under way. The face of Mississippi is changing even faster than the face of the nation.

In five years, the number of tenant farmers in Mississippi declined from 99,000 to 43,000. In the last ten years, 10% of the population of the state moved from the farm to the town or city. In each of the last two decades, 10% of the white Mississippians and 30% of the Negro Mississippians left the state.

And the Voting Rights Act is already having its effect—as you well know. In 1964, 35,000 Mississippi Negroes were registered to vote. In 1966, 159,000 are. And this promise is only beginning to be fulfilled.

The "one man, one vote" decision of the Supreme Court is helping to complete the political revolution. It is an empty promise indeed to recognize a right to vote and then to permit those in power to make it meaningless by unequal districting. Indeed, without the "one man, one vote" decision, the Voting Rights Act would be a total nullity.

With all this change comes the obsolescence of the old-style of politics. In the presidential elections, the old games of Dixiecrat, of unpledged electors, and of going over to the opposition no longer make any political sense.

For they place Mississippi so far from the mainstream of American politics that no one can afford to join her. In 1964 Republican candidate didn't realize this, and he courted and won the support of the old-style political South. But he paid so high a political price that I doubt that any presidential candidate will ever try it again.

And if one does, let it be a Republican. Let them play that game. We Democrats will look ahead.

For the changes in Mississippi permit you to fashion a new politics, free from the hobbies of racism.

This Convention can become the torch-bearer for the Democratic Party of Mississippi. It can do that by creating a program for the development of this State—a rounded program based on Democratic principles.

You can adopt a platform which will place some honest-to-goodness issues before the people of Mississippi—and they are starved for them. The old rhetoric has cheated them long enough.

There are plenty of liberal issues here. I can recognize them as issues of concern in my home state, which has a number of things in common with Mississippi.

We, Mississippi and Minnesota, have histories shaped by the same great river. We are both mid-way west. Our economies are traditionally based on agriculture. We both have, in the roots of our rural people, the strains of populism, with its potential for reform.

But there is a great difference between the two states as well, and it makes today's Democratic issues in Mississippi all the more poignant.

For we in Minnesota never had the politics of racism—as a matter of accident, not by any particular virtue of ours. And not having that legacy, we haven't had to pay the price.

What has been the price? No one can measure it for certain. And no comparison is accurate, or even fair. But a look at the areas of liberal concern in our two states shows a shocking disparity.

Mississippi, as you've often been reminded, is last of the 50 states in expenditures per pupil in primary and secondary school, while Minnesota is 11th.

As a result, 67% of Mississippi's young men called up by the selective service are rejected, and 56% of those are rejected for educational deficiencies. In Minnesota, 35% are rejected, of which 7% are for educational reasons.

In Mississippi, 51.6% of all the families in the state live below the federally established level of poverty. In Minnesota, it is 22%.

Mississippi's current unemployment rate is 5.3%. In Minnesota, it is 3.6%.

Mississippi has two-thirds as many people of voting age as Minnesota, but in 1964 only 409,000 Mississippians voted, while a million and a half voted in Minnesota.

The trouble with statistics is that it is too easy to forget that these are human beings. The Minnesota youth with a good chance of a thorough education, with the economic base in which he can find employment, can look to the future with high spirits and optimism.

He can stay in his state, secure in his opportunity, and motivated to participate in its government.





# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)