

soldiers—have won every medal for bravery our country bestows. The bullets of our enemies do not discriminate between Negro marines and white marines. They kill and maim whomever they strike.

The American Negro has waited long for first-class citizenship—for his right for equal justice. But he has long accepted the full responsibilities of citizenship.

If there were any doubt, one need only look to the servicemen who man our defenses. In Vietnam, 10.2 percent of our soldiers are American Negroes bearing equal responsibilities in the fight for freedom—but at home, 11 percent of our people are American Negroes struggling for equal opportunities.

The bullets at the battlefield do not discriminate—but the landlords at home do. The pack of the Negro soldier is as heavy as the white soldier's—but the burden his family at home bears is far heavier. In war, the Negro American has given this Nation his best—but this Nation has not given him equal justice.

It is time that the Negro be given equal justice. In America, the rights of citizenship are conferred by birth—not by death in battle.

It is our duty—as well as our privilege—to stand before the world as a nation dedicated to equal justice. There may be doubts about some policies or programs, but there can be no doubt about the rights of each man to stand on equal ground before his government and with his fellow man.

On June 4, 1965, at Howard University, I spoke about the challenge confronting this Nation—"to fulfill these rights." What I said then has even greater importance and meaning for every American today:

Freedom is the right to share fully and equally in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

But freedom is not enough. You do not wipe away the scars of centuries by saying: Now you are free to go where you want, do as you desire, and choose the leaders you please.

You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and then say, "You are free to compete with all the others," and still justly believe that you have been completely fair.

Thus it is not enough just to open the gates of opportunity. All of our citizens must have the ability to walk through those gates.

This is the next and more profound state of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity—not just legal equity but human ability—not just equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and as a result.

For the task is to give 20 million Negroes the same chance as every other American to learn and grow, to work and share in society, to develop their abilities—physical, mental and spiritual, and to pursue their individual happiness.

There is no single easy answer to all of these problems.

Jobs are part of the answer. They bring the income which permits a man to provide for his family.

Decent homes in decent surroundings, and a chance to learn—an equal chance to learn—are part of the answer.

Welfare and social programs better designed to hold families together are part of the answer.

Care of the sick is part of the answer. An understanding heart by all Americans is also a large part of the answer.

To all these fronts—and a dozen more—I will dedicate the expanding efforts of the Johnson Administration.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 15, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT'S CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM FOR 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the legislation recommended by the President to eliminate discrimination in residential housing on account of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I believe that this kind of discrimination, no less than discrimination in education, in employment, or in public accommodations, is profoundly inconsistent with the American ideal of equal opportunity for all of our citizens. The time has come, I believe, to recognize that the right of a person to obtain housing without discrimination must prevail.

Experience has taught us that the deprivation of opportunity suffered by Negroes and by other groups in this country is not the result of any single discriminatory practice. Rather, it is the result of a number of discriminatory practices which reinforce each other and perpetuate the cycle of deprivation. In order to correct the situation, it is therefore necessary to move on a number of fronts simultaneously.

For instance, equal opportunity in employment cannot be fully realized if there is not also equal opportunity in education. As long as the ideal of the neighborhood school prevails equal opportunity in education is likely to depend on elimination of discriminatory practices in residential housing. The President's new proposal for a fair housing act thus is a valuable reinforcement of the purposes expressed in all legislation that strikes against discrimination.

This legislation would also have the advantage of stabilizing property values and of discouraging unscrupulous speculation in the real estate field. We are all familiar with so-called blockbusting tactics which are designed to convince white property owners that their neighborhoods will soon be filled with Negroes, in order to frighten them into selling their homes at a loss and moving elsewhere while their houses are resold to Negroes at great profit. The proposed legislation will attack such tactics directly.

It has often been said that racial and religious prejudices depend upon the absence of sufficient contact between different racial and religious groups. In their mutual isolation, persons of dif-

ferent backgrounds are likely to entertain false or distorted ideas about one another. By helping to break down the barriers of isolation that perpetuate this sort of ignorance. A fair housing act such as the President has proposed would be a major step toward improving the moral atmosphere of our society.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to give enforcement power to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is a necessary measure, and there should be little dispute concerning it. In 1964 this body affirmed the principle of equal employment opportunity. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibited discrimination on account of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex in hiring, promotion, working conditions, apprenticeship training, and the practices of labor organizations. However, the enforcement scheme provided in the 1964 act was not a strong one. Indeed, it has proved to be inadequate.

Now, 3 years later, it is our duty to call upon the experience derived from subsequent congressional committee hearings, from State and local fair employment practice agencies, and from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to perfect that scheme.

The main change effected by the proposed act is to vest in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to issue cease-and-desist orders for the enforcement of present rights. This power, no different from that possessed by regulatory agencies such as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, is surrounded by appropriate safeguards including a fair hearing and judicial review. Such a power would serve to effectuate the Commission's attempts to achieve voluntary compliance, which remains the basic thrust under the act. Enforcement power in the Commission is also desirable in order to achieve uniform nationwide standards, speed of enforcement, reduced costs to the parties, and to lessen the burden on the Federal district courts.

Such policy considerations demonstrate the advisability of the President's proposal. More fundamentally, the needs of the country demand its enactment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the views expressed by our President with reference to the need for the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967.

The field of human rights has offered challenges which the Congress in recent years has met with wisdom, courage, and conviction. If we are to witness continued progress in this area of our national life, it is necessary that each Congress seriously consider and provide needed supporting legislation to strengthen and expand the gains which have already been achieved.

The Civil Rights Act of 1967 is necessary and timely and I urge its swift enactment. The racial injustice of past decades has inflicted a heavy toll upon its victims and the Nation. The cost in freedom to these people, particularly to those in the Negro community, is incalculable. They have been caught in what President Johnson has called a seamless web of discrimination, a web that frustrates all efforts to escape from poverty, discrimination, and despair. In order to allow them to liberate themselves the entire structure of discrimination must be dismantled.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 have resulted in encouraging progress; however, too much of the age-old structure of discrimination remains. The Civil Rights Act of 1967 addresses itself to problems of racial injustice which demand congressional action—discrimination in jury selection, housing, and employment. The act also provides effective new deterrents to crimes of racial violence.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that we meet our continuing responsibilities by early passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1967.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we must strive to make real for every American our ideals of equal justice and equal opportunity. I urge the prompt enactment of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967.

An important part of the act would reform the system for selecting juries in the Federal courts. The Congress has a responsibility to make the Federal judicial system a model one in every respect. This means that the manner of selecting juries in the Federal district courts must be free from the face or appearance of unfairness.

At present, the district courts utilize a variety of methods of selection. Many use the "keyman" system, under which the jury officials ask prominent members of the community, the so-called keymen, to supply names of persons they consider to be suited for jury duty. The keymen tend to choose persons from their own social and economic classes. Frequently, the result is that less prosperous citizens and members of minority groups are not adequately represented on jury panels.

A jury which does not represent a fair cross section of the community is inconsistent with the traditional concept of jury impartiality and with the fundamental theme underlying American jurisprudence—the equal protection of the laws. To make sure that Federal jury panels are truly representative, nationwide reform of Federal jury selection is necessary. The Civil Rights Act of 1967 will achieve that goal.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President on his civil rights message and add my support in particular to his renewed proposal for legislation to bar discrimination in the sale or rental of housing.

The nationwide scope of the problem needs no proof. In city after city, the Negro is confined to limited areas, unable to escape overcrowding or inferior housing even when he can afford to better his circumstances.

As the President pointed out in his

message, it is not only the Negro who suffers from these conditions. The community at large is harmed as well. Poor housing invariably is accompanied by poor schools, unemployment, the deterioration of family life and a substantial welfare burden. Racial discrimination is the common factor in all these ills.

The ghetto can no longer be ignored. Its effect on those trapped within it and on those outside is too great and too serious.

The President responded wisely to this need with comprehensive legislation. We must enact a law that bans discrimination in real estate transactions across the board, in sales, in financing, and in rentals. Government, whether at the national, State, or local level, can and should take the lead.

Federal legislation in this field is, after all, no novelty. In 1866, Congress enacted a statute which provides that all citizens in every State and territory shall have the same right to buy and rent real property that is enjoyed by white persons. That law is still on the books—section 1982 of title 42, United States Code—but it needs companion legislation to give it teeth. That is what we must now provide.

After Congress made it unlawful for anyone to discriminate in public accommodations in 1964, we saw a broad, heartening tide of voluntary compliance with the requirements of that law. All the dire predictions of disruption and resistance came to naught. It is fair to say that hotel and restaurant operators today have an easier—and more profitable—time of it than before that act, because they can now relax and freely serve every proper customer.

I believe we will witness the same result by putting a fair housing statute into effect.

Once the law lays down a uniform obligation, the myth of financial loss from the desegregation of a neighborhood will be laid to rest once and for all. And once that occurs, the time will be near when America has removed from the windows of every citizen's home the imprisoning bars of bigotry and bias.

I urge the Congress to carry out the President's recommendation and to do so promptly.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the civil rights proposals offered today by President Johnson. The proposed bill is addressed to the most serious problems which now confront members of racial minorities, and, in a larger sense, all Americans.

It is true that the civil rights measures passed in 1964 and 1965 have made significant dents in the wall of prejudice; however, the wall still stands in many places, and will no doubt remain standing until Congress acts. We must insure that there is justice in our courts, equal opportunity in employment, equal opportunity for all Americans to occupy decent housing without discrimination, and protection against acts of racial violence.

The last Congress made an unsuccessful attempt to translate these noble objectives into accomplishments. The 90th Congress can and must accomplish what the 89th did not.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to state my strong support for the Civil Rights Act of 1967 proposed by the President today. This proposal responds to urgent problems that together represent the most important domestic issue of today—the need to assure social justice and equality of opportunity for all American citizens.

The proposed act would reform the present Federal jury selection system to assure that Federal juries are drawn from a cross-section of the community and that no person is excluded from consideration as a prospective juror on account of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status. It lays down detailed selection requirements to achieve these objectives.

The act deals with discrimination in State court juries. It would forbid State jury officials to make any distinction in the qualification or selection of jurors for State and local grand or petit juries on grounds of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or economic status.

The act would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to confer on the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission needed powers to hold hearings and issue orders enforceable in the courts against discrimination in employment. It is modeled on the enforcement powers of other Federal regulatory agencies, such as the National Labor Relations Board, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Experience has shown that efforts to conciliate employment discrimination disputes are much more likely to be successful where the agency has the power to initiate enforcement proceedings against recalcitrant persons engaged in unlawful discrimination. Since economic factors have been shown to be especially critical in moving toward genuine equality for all Americans, it is essentially important for us to provide the Commission with the tools it needs to help eradicate discrimination in employment.

The serious and persistent employment problems confronting minority group members, and Negroes in particular, will not, of course, be resolved solely or even primarily through commissions such as this, no matter how effective they may be. We desperately need to concentrate on creating more jobs, on providing better education and on developing more broadly based job training programs. But equal employment opportunity commissions are important if new and better training are not to be thwarted at the employment office.

The act seeks to end discrimination in residential housing. It would prohibit housing discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin, and it would confer enforcement powers on the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Generally, the enforcement scheme is similar to that which the bill would create in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with respect to employment discrimination.

One of the traditional rights of an American is that of freely selecting a home in which to live, subject only to

what his means permit. Today, however, that right does not exist for many Negroes. Ghetto living is their common fate.

We can and we must do better, and title IV of this act, although it can and should be strengthened, would make that progress possible.

The act also addresses itself to the problem of racial violence. It would prohibit forcible interference with participation in a specified group of activities in which discrimination is already prohibited by Federal law. Appropriately, severe graduated penalties are provided if a violation results in serious injury or death.

Mr. Speaker, these protections are reasonable and long overdue. I urge the House to give them early consideration, to strengthen them where appropriate and possible, and to take a further major step to insure that equality of opportunity of the practice as well as the principle of this land.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the speedy consideration and enactment of the legislative proposals included in the President's message on civil rights. As the President so eloquently pointed out, there are pressing needs still to be met. Indeed, in some areas, notably education and housing, the Nation may be worse off today than it was a year ago, and becoming even worse. This House responded dramatically to the Nation's needs for equality of opportunity in voting and public accommodations and in other areas; let us now continue to fulfill our commitment to eliminate bigotry and prejudice wherever they can be found. Much, unfortunately, remains to be done.

We have yet to act to prevent the widespread exclusion of most Negro citizens from good housing. Some years ago the Civil Rights Commission pointed out that housing seemed to be the one commodity not available to all who could afford to pay. The effects of these exclusionary practices are manifold—they perpetuate slums, contribute to crime and delinquency, to the breakdown of the family, to poor health, to inferior schooling. They exacerbate racial tensions. They isolate our Negro and white citizens from each other at a time when citizens ought to live together in harmony.

Federal legislation is the only adequate answer to the problem. It would prohibit discriminatory practices in every aspect of the sale, rental, and financing of housing. It would outlaw blockbusting. It would reach real estate brokers and others who exercise effective control over the housing market.

Fair housing laws are already on the books in a number of States and cities. Indeed, the District of Columbia has such a law promulgated by the District Commissioners. Experience has shown, however, that local laws cannot cope with a problem which is national in scope.

I urge the Congress to act with dispatch to enact a Federal fair housing bill into law.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, we pride ourselves on having a government of laws. Respect for the law is essential for the survival of our Nation. Just as we

demand such respect from all citizens, those of us in government must insure that our legal institutions function in accord with our ideals.

One ideal is trial by an impartial jury. The surest way to achieve impartiality is to have juries which fairly represent a cross section of the community. No group should be subjected to arbitrary exclusion. Now, in too many instances, juries are not as representative as they could and should be. This can mean, or appear to mean, that the jury selection process is infected by discrimination. I submit that we, as a nation, can afford neither the fact nor the appearance of discrimination in this vital element of our judicial system.

The proposed Civil Rights Act of 1967 will remedy the problem of jury discrimination in both State and Federal courts. A detailed procedure is set forth for selecting Federal jurors. The proposed system is a workable one, and it will mean that, in all Federal district courts, juries will be properly representative. Adoption of this needed reform will bring us to the goal of impartial juries.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse the President's proposal to outlaw racially motivated acts of violence. We are all too familiar with the brutal acts committed against Negroes and civil rights workers in the recent past. The shooting of James Meredith on a Mississippi highway last summer and the beatings of Negro children who attempted to attend recently integrated schools in Grenada, Miss., last fall underscore the need for congressional action.

Of course, the major responsibility for prosecuting acts of violence rests in local law enforcement authorities. In most places local authorities enforce the law vigorously and evenhandedly. In such places there is little need for Federal prosecutions. However, in a few places, where resistance to equal rights for Negroes is acute, local officials have sometimes not carried out their responsibilities in protecting Negroes who attempt to assert their rights. In such places Federal prosecution is imperative to protect the rights and the physical security of Negroes and their supporters.

In addition, when the violence is intended to prevent the exercise of affirmative Federal rights, the will of Congress is being flouted. When this occurs a crime is being committed against the National Government, the prosecution of which should be lodged, where necessary, in the Federal Government and courts.

The existing Federal penal statutes against crimes of racial violence are inadequate because they cover only actions by public officials or conspiracies in which public officials are somehow involved. Also because these statutes are worded in general terms, they do not always give clear warning of what kinds of conduct are prohibited and impose an unnecessarily heavy burden on the prosecutor to prove a violation.

The administration's bill will remedy these defects in the existing Federal criminal law by clearly reaching private acts of violence and by specifically enu-

merating the kinds of activities which will be protected.

We cannot allow acts of racial violence to go unpunished. To do so encourages criminal elements to try to impose segregation upon Negro citizens by lawlessness. The Attorney General must have effective means to prevent and punish such acts of violence. The legislation proposed by the President meets the need and I urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the civil rights message and recommendations of the President. If adopted, they will move us another milestone toward our declared goal of equality of opportunity and justice for all citizens. Some will, of course, attack these efforts to continue the 100-year-old quest for full citizenship as demanding too much and in too short a time. If it appears to include too much, it is because we have left undone in the past too much unfinished business which denied to some of our citizens those things others have enjoyed from the beginning of our Nation. Actually, if people acted as they should no legislation would be needed.

As to the question of what speed we should use in bestowing full citizenship on our citizens, it should be remembered that the first civil rights law, later emasculated, was enacted in 1866. This marked the beginning of a long, slow, and tortuous effort to do what we are still trying to do in this proposal. It has been almost 200 years since we declared to the world: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." It is sure that in the world of international tensions and scientific development today, time is no longer on our side.

In terms of world history, the United States lagged behind in freeing its slaves. England did so in 1838, as had most other European nations by this time. Most of the newly created independent South American countries acted before 1854. Today, as the leader of the free peoples of the world, can we afford to lag in the fulfillment of our national purposes which are so vital to our survival and continued preeminence?

Civil rights today have mistakenly become identified with violence in the streets. We condemn this violence as self-defeating, and repugnant to our way of life. But at the same time let us condemn and act to remove the causes that have led ordinary and unorganized people to turn to such outlets to express their frustrations with and their alienation from American society.

I represent the area which has been incorrectly referred to as "Watts" which was the scene of serious disorders in August 1965. This is one of America's largest segregated ghettos containing over 300,000 Negroes, half of who live at or below the poverty level. Since 1960 the median income has fallen by \$400. Property has become more delapidated while rents have risen. Unemployment is over 10 percent in a labor market area that is boasting of a 4.5 percent rate. Thirty-one men out of every 100 are not even counted as unemployed or in the labor force because they have given up looking for jobs that do not exist for them. Since August 1965, welfare cases

have risen. And education in our community schools, upon which we depend for great hope to achieve employment and to mold the character of our people, has become more segregated and worse since 1954.

Add other factors to this situation: bad transportation, inadequate health facilities, racial discrimination, and archaic welfare laws, and a feeling of hopelessness, disappointment and anger—and you have the profile for disorders which can erupt into violence and spread to the larger community.

Especially important in the civil rights message is the President's proposal to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. When title VII was added to the Civil Rights Act in 1964, the Commission was given little more than conciliation authority on a case-by-case basis. The Federal law is substantially weaker than two-thirds of those now existing in 35 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, in which the power to issue cease-and-desist orders is included.

Without equal employment opportunities which a strong Commission can help to assure, millions of our fellow citizens will continue to exist without decent housing, decent education, and human dignity. And potential for explosive situations will continue to exist in our major cities throughout America.

I firmly believe all decent Americans, if properly told the facts, will support the President's courageous stand and approach to bringing order out of the chaos that has recently existed in race relations in America, for his approach recognizes the essential dignity of individuals to earn a living, to live in a decent environment, and to achieve their full potential in life. If Americans cannot stand for this, the hope of the world for security and peace is, indeed, a sad illusion.

This, the 90th Congress, can renew our hope in equality, not that which is merely proclaimed in oratory, but an equality of opportunity for achievement available to every citizen proud to be an American.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my enthusiastic support for the President's message to Congress on civil rights. At a time when various commentators have claimed that the President cannot expect to get any legislation through Congress and should, therefore, aim a little lower, the President with this message has emphasized his desire not to compromise with principle.

The President's decision to persevere in the drive for social justice for Negro Americans comes at an important moment in history. At a time when some people have discounted the importance of domestic programs and appropriations, maintaining the expenditures for Vietnam preclude answering our problems at home, the President has reemphasized the need to continue the drive for true freedom for all Americans.

In a 1965 speech at Howard University, the President spoke of the challenge confronting this country—to fulfill its citizens' rights:

Freedom is the right to share fully and equally in American society—to vote, to hold a job, to enter a public place, to go to school. It is the right to be treated in every part of our national life as a person equal in dignity and promise to all others.

With his message to Congress on civil rights, the President has placed before the American people a specific proposal that will go a long way toward bringing to fruition the drive for freedom for all Americans. His message hopefully will receive the full support of Congress.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to hear the President proposing so strong a package of civil rights proposals.

Although some of these were explored by the 89th Congress and contained in the bill which passed the House, they failed of enactment and require further consideration by the current Congress.

I should like to comment today on two elements of the President's proposal.

First, I am pleased that he has included fair housing legislation.

Today, more than ever, housing is one commodity which is not freely available to everyone who can afford to pay for it. Much of the housing market throughout the country is closed to large groups of citizens, chiefly Negroes, for reasons unrelated to their character, education, position in life, or ability to pay and care for property.

The result is an ever-increasing concentration of racial ghettos—rundown, depressed areas deprived of adequate schools, recreation centers, health facilities—all sources of high crime, high disease, high tension.

These housing inequalities have already been with us much too long, unfortunate byproducts of a prejudice which has no place in this land. It is time to end these discriminatory practices—and the legislation the President is proposing can lead the way for the Nation.

In protecting the right of all citizens regardless of race, religion, or national background to purchase or rent newly constructed or existing housing anywhere, the proposed bill does no more than justice requires.

There are many citizens who do not want to participate in these discriminatory practices but are the victims of various pressures they cannot resist. This measure will give them the protection they seek.

There are others who prefer to exploit the situation for personal greed and other reasons. This measure will give such persons the prodding they merit.

I am particularly gratified that the President has recommended legislation pertaining to the selection of juries in Federal and State courts. I had sponsored similar legislation in the 89th Congress.

The Federal district courts now use a variety of methods of picking jurors. Too often, the means of selection tend to exclude members of minority groups and persons of low income. This is true in all parts of the United States; the problem of nonrepresentative jury rolls is not restricted to one section of the country.

In a number of cases, the Federal appellate courts have dealt with the matter

of jury discrimination. It seems clear, though, that what is needed is overall reform of Federal jury selection and that this can best be achieved by legislation. Of necessity, judicial decisions pertain to individual cases, to limited aspects of jury selection, and to particular areas.

It is shocking to learn that in some States women are excluded from jury service. It is equally disturbing that women in other States are either excluded from jury duty unless they volunteer or are given an absolute right to be excused because of their sex. Such State laws result in a disproportionately small number of women serving on juries in those States.

It seems to me that women are entitled to serve on juries on an equal basis with men and have an equal responsibility. I recognize, of course, that motherhood must necessarily be considered as grounds for being excused on occasion.

In short, I look forward to the opportunity to study the details of the President's proposals and would hope they will receive congressional consideration promptly.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge enactment of the President's civil rights proposals. This much needed legislation will help to make a reality the equal rights and opportunities to which every American citizen is entitled.

I wish to direct special attention to the proposal for criminal legislation dealing with racial violence. Such legislation will put an end to acts of racial terrorism that have too long gone unpunished and have too often deterred the exercise of Federal rights. While it is true that apprehension and punishment of those who perpetrate crimes of violence is ordinarily a matter for local authorities, when effective protection and prosecution is absent, and Federal rights are denied, Federal intervention is warranted.

I think it might be useful to try to place the new proposal in its historic context. Apart from section 11(b) of the Voting Rights Act of last year, it will be, when enacted, the first Federal criminal law adopted to deal with civil rights problems since 1875. The last statute enacted to deal with racial violence—section 241 of title 18—dates back to 1870. The general statute making official misconduct a Federal crime—section 242—originated in the first Civil Rights Act of 1866.

These old laws were designed to deal with problems similar to those which confront us today. In the post-Civil War era the great promise of the 14th amendment—taking a giant step from the older notion that all men are created equal to the radical idea that they must be treated equally—was broken in large part by acts of terror and violence perpetrated by the Klan and others. The Federal Government attempted to deal with this threat—which was nothing less than lynch law, although through the haze of history some have tried to paint a more honorable picture of that era. But the criminal statutes proved largely ineffective—some were declared void by the Supreme Court, others were construed grudgingly, and many were ulti-

mately repealed in post-reconstruction days when the American conscience seems to have failed utterly.

Oddly enough, when a renewed effort was made in the 1940's and early 1950's to breathe life into these statutes, they were again viewed narrowly by the courts, as in the *Screws* case in 1945 and the *Williams* case in 1951. Then came *Brown* against Board of Education in 1954, the park, theater, and other public facility cases following it, and the acts of Congress of 1957, 1960, 1964, and 1965, which greatly expanded or gave meaning to the rights which Negroes were entitled to assert. The response to this legal revolution harked back to the old days of reconstruction. Again, men took up the gun and the club and sought to preserve the caste system by violence. The newly won rights of Negro Americans are once more threatened by the Klan and other night riders.

The proposed new criminal legislation is our answer to this new challenge. It imposes criminal sanctions upon private individuals or public officials who, by force or threat of force, injure, intimidate, or otherwise interfere with any person because of his race, color, religion, or national origin and because he seeks to engage in any of nine specified kinds of activities. The areas of activity protected are voting, public education, public services and facilities, employment, housing, jury service, use of common carriers, participation in federally assisted programs, and public accommodations.

The bill is designed to meet the needs of the time, and to avoid the limitations which render the existing laws so difficult to enforce. This law should make clear our commitment to law and order and the free exercise of Federal rights.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the President's message calling for new civil rights legislation is timely and to the point. I am certain that the Congress will give it early, earnest, and thorough consideration.

New Federal legislation is particularly necessary to deal with the problem of crime and racial violence.

Where those who administer and enforce the laws do so without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, perpetrators of racial crimes will ordinarily be apprehended by local police and appropriately punished by local courts. But as we are all painfully aware, in some communities, this is the exception rather than the rule. Where this is so, Federal action is necessary to guarantee the free exercise of Federal rights.

However, Federal legislation against racial violence is not required merely because local officials have failed at times in their responsibilities. Recent experience shows that racial violence has often been resorted to in order to prevent the exercise of affirmative Federal rights. In those instances, the crime is against the National Government, and the prosecution and punishment of those so engaged should be entrusted to Federal prosecutors and courts and not to local officials alone.

Prompt enactment of the administration's proposals is needed if we are to progress toward equality and justice for all Americans.

But that is only half the story. Every right requires a reciprocal duty. That duty is to abide by and obey the law. Performance of this duty is a positive aid to proper and expeditious law enforcement.

It is the duty of all decent citizens to participate in law enforcement. Instead of turning our backs on the crimes we witness, we must give every possible assistance to the police and other law enforcement officers.

We complain too frequently about the laxity of law enforcement but do nothing to improve the situation.

Here, too, we must be colorblind. None have a right to demand anything but equal treatment by the law and before the law. Peaceful petition and demonstration has its place and useful purpose in our democracy.

Riotous and violent demands and demonstrations have no place in our society and must be prosecuted as vigorously as every other crime.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, every fairminded American should take his hat off to President Lyndon Johnson today for the strength of character, the consistency, and the firm belief in equal justice that the President has expressed in his message on equal justice. The detractors and the critics are always quick to look for defects and flaws. Thus there were many who doubted, after Congress' failure to enact a fair housing bill last year and the recent elections, that the President would follow through with his pledge to achieve equal justice for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or national origin. The President's message proves how wrong the critics were.

Congress should now act speedily and affirmatively on the President's recommendations. To do less is to default on our own pledges and our responsibilities.

I endorse President Johnson's proposals on civil rights contained in his message.

We began in 1964 to deal with racial discrimination on a broad front. With the passage of the 1964 and 1965 Civil Rights Acts there were advances. But the efforts initiated by those acts must continue.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was only a beginning; a start down the road toward equal opportunities for all Americans. We could not expect that one act of Congress to remedy all the problems which need legislative attention. There is much to be done.

The promise of equality of opportunity was made with the ratification of the 14th amendment. Under section 2 of that amendment we are given the responsibility of enforcing its mandate and making its promise a reality to millions of Americans. We would be derelict in our duty if we ignored this responsibility or satisfied ourselves by meeting it halfway. I wholeheartedly support the President's commitment toward achieving the goals that were envisaged by the framers of that amendment and look forward toward enacting the President's proposals.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the President's civil rights proposals for 1967. Too often it has been said by a few that the move-

ment to guarantee to a minority of Americans the rights engaged by most other Americans has gone too fast or too far. The contrary is true. Progress in civil rights has not been fast enough. These needs of our society have waited too long for fulfillment. It is especially true in the civil rights area that justice delayed is justice denied.

So long as there is widespread discrimination in the opportunity to obtain jobs, or to receive equal treatment on the job commensurate with each worker's ability, or a general denial of a man's right to compete in the housing market on the basis of his financial ability and so be able to raise his children out of the narrow and corrupting atmosphere of the slums, then there is a need for progress in civil rights. So long as no Federal law protects men, women, and children from violence and harassment for exercising their constitutional rights, or so long as there is room for procedures that will further guarantee fairness and justice in the selection of juries, then there is need for civil rights legislation. This bill deals with these problems and offers solutions to them. Solutions must be provided, and that is why I urge the Congress to enact the President's proposals into law.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to heartily endorse the President's proposals in the field of civil rights.

Under the present system, jurors for the Federal district courts are selected in a variety of ways which often results in the exclusion of members of minority groups and persons of low income. This, unfortunately, is true in all sections of the country. I agree with the administration that there is a need for the reform of procedures for Federal jury selection. The proposed reforms will, I believe, resolve this inequity.

Likewise, in the States there is a need to eliminate all forms of discrimination in the selection of jurors to serve the State courts. The proposal of the administration does not establish detailed procedures for jury selections, as has been done with respect to Federal courts, but it sets forth certain standards prohibiting discrimination in State jury selection on account of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or economic status. Failure of a State to meet these standards could result in injunction proceedings against State jury officials.

Another important provision of the civil rights legislation would be to afford protection to all citizens who seek to engage in any lawful enumerated activity such as voting, public education, public service, and so forth. It would impose criminal sanctions upon anyone who, by force or threat of force, intimidates or interferes with such activity.

One of the proposals would also authorize the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to issue judicially enforceable cease-and-desist orders which would eliminate a time-consuming and expensive lawsuit by the individual who has been discriminated against.

The Civil Rights Commission, which has done yeoman service as a factfinding agency and, unless extended by this Congress, expires on January 31, 1968. I am in complete agreement that the

Commission's activities should be extended for an additional 5 years.

I urge that my fellow Congressmen act promptly on these measures.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the President's civil rights proposals for 1967 begin where past legislation left off and continue the constant struggle to expand the frontiers of freedom and justice.

Past legislation has given us effective means to deal with voting discrimination, school desegregation, and discrimination in public accommodations. While these problems are not altogether solved, legislation has brought solutions much closer to reality. But we are still confronted with problems for which we have provided no legislative solution or for which our past efforts have proved inadequate. Our experience with discrimination in voting shows that past legislative efforts must sometimes be improved. Our experience in the field of public accommodations shows that a comprehensive law against discrimination in commercial transactions is especially effective in enlarging equality for all citizens.

The President has proposed means to begin solving the threat to our moral and physical strength posed by unhealthy slums and ghettos which in turn are caused by segregated housing and unequal job opportunities. The President also proposes more effective means for dealing with violence and harassment of persons exercising constitutional rights, and new procedures for guaranteeing fair and unbiased juries in accordance with constitutional requirements. All of our knowledge and experience in the field of civil rights legislation shows the need for and workability of President Johnson's proposals for this year. I urge that the Congress act promptly to adopt these measures.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President on his thoughtful message on civil rights. The President again has set an agenda for equality before the Congress. His proposed civil rights bill is similar to the civil rights bill of 1966 which we passed. The House exercised its responsibility only to find the bill killed in the Senate. So once again we have the responsibility to pass meaningful civil rights legislation.

I hope that the new political complexion of the House will not deter us from this purpose. For, as the President's message in quoting his eloquent remarks at Howard University points out:

This is the next and more profound stage of the battle for civil rights. We seek not just freedom but opportunity—not just legal equality as a right and a theory, but equality as a fact and as a result.

Civil rights legislation which abolishes discrimination in housing, provides for nondiscriminatory jury selection, protects those exercising their constitutional rights, would take us another step down the road to full equality for all our citizens. Whispers of backlash and memories of riots must not stand as roadblocks in this journey.

I am sure that the Judiciary Committee of the House under its able and dedicated chairman will examine the President's proposal with its usual care. I hope the committee will consider im-

provements. There is no bill that cannot be improved.

On the opening day of this Congress I again introduced a number of civil rights bills concerning discrimination in housing, intimidation of those exercising their civil rights, jury selection, and the powers of the Attorney General to intervene in civil rights cases. I believe that on several points these bills provide a more effective means of combating racial discrimination. I hope that the committee will study these and the proposals of other Members when they consider the administration bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to make another significant contribution to racial justice. I urge Members of both parties in both Houses of Congress to join with the President and take this opportunity—not only for those who have been denied their rights, but for the entire Nation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago the Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1866, which provided that:

Citizens of the United States . . . without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, . . . shall have the same right, in every State and Territory in the United States, . . . to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property.

That promise, unfortunately, never became a reality. It is therefore with a sense of rededication that I join the President in support of his new and revised proposals to outlaw discrimination in housing.

The right to buy or rent a home is a fundamental and significant freedom. On it may depend the ability to live in a safe and secure place and to raise one's children in a wholesome environment or send them to a good school. The unrelieved crowding of racial ghettos is denying decent living conditions to their inhabitants at almost any price, and it creates a shortage of living space that encourages exorbitant rents and sloppy maintenance so that the dwellers there must, in fact, pay an unfairly high price for the inadequate housing they obtain. A Federal program to prevent discrimination in housing will be an important step toward eliminating such injustices. It will insure to every American what so far has been the privilege of only some: the right to move to as good a home and neighborhood as one's finances and personal situation permit.

I am very pleased to note that the proposed open housing legislation will include enforcement provisions similar to those which I included in my amendment to the 1966 civil rights bill. That amendment which proposed the establishment of a Fair Housing Board similar to the National Labor Relations Board was the only strengthening amendment accepted as a part of the bill which the House passed during the 89th Congress.

Of equal importance to the outlawing of discrimination in housing, and in some respects of even greater importance, is the need to insure equal opportunity in employment. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act constituted a major step toward assuring equal employment in many segments of our economy. However, in view of the experiences of the

last 2½ years it has become obvious that the equal employment provisions of that act require stronger enforcement procedures to back them.

I am pleased at the President's proposal to put additional teeth in the equal employment provisions of the Civil Rights Act for I am convinced that in large measure good schooling, good housing, and so many of the other advantages of life are directly dependent upon a person's ability to obtain and hold a good job. This being so, every citizen must be given equal opportunity to compete for available work.

The President's seven-point civil rights program is most encouraging and significant. Many Negro Americans had begun to despair at the failure of the 1966 civil rights bill and the apparent waning interest of the country in the continuing battle for equality for all Americans. The President has reinforced his commitment to guaranteeing the rights of every American citizen in today's message; I only hope that the 90th Congress will be equally committed in its efforts to enact these proposals into law.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson now has fastened our attention on the greatest piece of unfinished business in the field of civil rights ending racial discrimination in housing.

Adequate housing, like food, is a prime necessity of life, not only for every individual, but also for the development of sound families and sound communities. Furthermore, as a practical matter, equal opportunity for access to good housing is usually necessary to provide equal access to good schools or good jobs.

The nonwhite citizen who is denied the opportunity to buy or rent a home for his family that other citizens with similar incomes can easily obtain may suffer triple injuries.

His family cannot live in a community with better schools.

He cannot live near places of possible employment for which he may be qualified.

He is forced to pay a higher price for the inferior housing to which he does have access. These are burdens an American citizen should not have to endure.

Ending discrimination in housing would mean that any family, rich or poor, would be able to buy or rent whatever housing it could afford to pay for, without regard to race.

To most Americans, this is no revolutionary right. It is perhaps the most basic and important right of all.

Let us therefore act now in this last major area of legal reform while the focus of public and world attention is still on our national record in civil rights, to complete the job and assure its success.

TO PROTECT THE AMERICAN CONSUMER—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 57)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole