and of living. Additional land might solve this problem for a short while, but it would not present a permanent solution, for as the increasing birth rate, the present situation would develop again in the future. Because of the growing demand for labor and the reservation, the Indian is turning more and more to wage labor. Although any trade, the Indian usually works as a laborer at lower wages. Low wages, in turn, create problems of poor health, housing, clothing, food, and sanitation.

"Laborers are fast disappearing from the labor market, semiskilled and skilled workers are in demand. The Indian represents a valuable source from which to fill the need." Senator Mansfield, receiving a large number of skilled workers have been identified by Federal and State Governments with appropriations for vocational training, rising from $3,000,000,000 in 1916 to $750,000,000 in 1986. S. 3416 would extend this training to Indians who cannot take advantage of existing programs because of the remote location of most reservations.

Repeatedly years people have been prone to consider the Indian as an agriculturist, but actually there has been a changing pattern in each Indian country about the increasing resources on the reservations to support the population and the desire of many Indians to follow some other kind of line of work. As the work experience of 1,101 Indians from 1946 through June 30, 1952, indicates that 220 were engaged in agricultural occupations and 23 in construction work in 1946. The year 1952 found 34 in agricultural occupation and 128 engaged in construction work of some kind.

"The training program contemplated by this bill will have two purposes. First, it should provide a value in preparing and orienting the Indian in the relocation program, and, second, it should stimulate interest and further research.

Although the relocation program is of recent creation, it appears obvious that since the marginal reservations cannot support their growing populations, it is imperative that some of the tribal members be equipped with vocational skills which will encourage them to seek employment elsewhere.

The program envisioned in S. 3416 would be of direct benefit, not only to the individual Indian, but to the Nation. The Indian knows that under this program would command a higher wage and be able to adequately support his family at a decent standard of living. In turn, individual Indians would not rely on Government in special services and begin paying higher income tax, thereby beginning a circle. As the individual began supporting themselves, and paying taxes, the Federal Government would be training others. Another point to be considered is that for every individual Indian trained and earning a good living, the Government will not have to support his children. If he remains on the reservation as at present, the Government would be required to give him, and later his children, special services.

NEED

The number of Indians who are qualified and wish to participate in the program greatly exceeds the number for which funds are available. As of November 30, 1965, there were 1,285 Indians in training. There were 1,265 applicants waiting on registers at the various training destinations, and 624 applications were in process at various reservations. The additional funds authorized by S. 1866 are made available, many more applications are expected. The increase in funds resulting from legislation enabling the Department of the Interior to make available \$10,000,000, in turn, creates a demand for and to the Indian. Although the relocation program is one of the greatest present demands of the Indian, it is important to appreciate that unemployments is one of the most significant difficulties in the way of a successful granting to our Negro citizens of their civil rights. The invitation which has been received by all Senators to view the demonstration this afternoon contains on its face a request that we appear "to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom."

At the very heart of the discrimination against our Negro citizens is their inability to obtain their share of jobs. The work of the members of the House and Senate are inadequate due to the increasing popularity of the program with young Indian people. Also, increased costs of institutional training have reduced the number of Indian participants in training.

The Department of the Interior estimates that, on the basis of present costs, an appropriation of $12 million would increase the number of training units to 3,900 training units and 1,500 on-the-job training units. An appropriation of $12 million would increase the number of training units to 3,900 training units and 1,500 on-the-job training units. The Department of the Interior informed me that the committee has requested an appropriation of approximately one-third of the increased funds made available by this legislation in each of the next 5 fiscal years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did I correctly understand that Calendar No. 45, Senate bill 1915, is to be considered by the policy committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be considered by the policy committee. In response to the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Robertson), I announced that the pending business on Tuesday would be Senate bill 1716, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; and that possibly, following action on that bill, S. 1915, the so-called dairy bill, in which the Senator from Wisconsin has such a long abiding and intense interest, may be the next order of business.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator very much. This dairy bill is vitally important to Wisconsin as the Nation's dairyland; but I want to serve notice on my colleaguesank you to the Senator from Wisconsin, but I want to serve notice on my colleagues that it is of important and substantial benefit to virtually all of the 50 States. Milk is the No. 1 cash farm crop in America. Passage of this bill can put dairy farm income on the road to recovery and cut the cost of the farm program at the same time.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one of the serious problems confronting the country and the Nation today has to do with the President's civil rights proposals. Today in Washington a large number of American citizens, said to be in the neighborhood of 100,000, are demonstrating. Yet in connection with the President's proposals for civil rights—which I strongly support—it is important to appreciate that unemployment is one of the most significant difficulties in the way of a successful granting to our Negro citizens of their civil rights.

The working out of the Senate's resolutions dealing with unemployment are of great importance in the area of assuring equal opportunity to all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color.

In this morning's New York Times appears a thoughtful and provocative article by the well-known columnist, James Reston, pointing out, among other things, the importance of the job implications in connection with civil rights. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this column may appear in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1965] THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN AND ALL THAT (By James Reston) Washington, August 27. The reaction of the white or northwest section of Washington to this week's big Negro demonstration is mostly one of annoyance. For a whole day, inhabitants of this privileged sanctuary won't be able to buy a drink at a bar, or get a taxi downtown, or count on the colored cook coming in for dinner. Think of the white man's burden.

The white folks in the Capital have been always been annoyed by resident or visiting petitioners. Though the right to petition a government is a guarantee of American freedom, a demand for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, or any State or territories of the United States in which it now exists, shall be received by this House or entertained in any way whatever.

Later, under the leadership of Congressmen John Quincy Adams, this was repealed, but the leaders of Cozy's unemployment marchers were arrested anyway for walking on the grass, and this stubborn resentment against complaining demonstrators still exists.

JOBS AND FREEDOM

The fact that annoyance is still the white resident's principal reaction to the march has no relevance. It indicates the extent of white and Negro thinking—this in a city that is 55 percent Negro and whose public schools are almost 90 percent Negro.

Despite all the hubbub of the last few days, the Congress has scarcely noted the full consequences of the protest. The demonstration was not designed merely as political agitation for the passage of President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, but was officially titled the "March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom."

The jobs part of it may prove to be tougher in the end than the freedom, for the Negro leaders are not only asking for equal opportunity in the field of civil liberties but for equal treatment under the law.

Asa Phillip Randolph, the 74-year-old director of the march, emphasized the point here this week. Getting away from whites to give to Negroes, he said, was no solution to the problem. A vast increase in the economic growth of the Negroes would enable them to work effectively in an automated society.

This, of course, is precisely the problem with which Washington has not been able to come to grips, and there is even less likelihood that the Kennedy administration will get its economic program past the Congress through the Congress than its civil rights program.
In July there were 3,382,000 whites unemployed in this country and 639,000 Negroes. In 1960, the unemployment percentage was over double the white—11.2 percent to 5.1, and in some cities, Chicago for example, Negro unemployment was over 17 percent.

Equality or Preference?

This problem is not getting better, but worse. It is not just a matter of the scrapping of unskilled workers are increasing faster than the training and education. Meanwhile, the Negro population is increasing faster than the white—26.4 percent Negro in the fifties to 17.8 percent white.

Even within the Kennedy administration there is no agreement that its economic proposals would meet the Negro's problems, even if they were all approved by the Congress, which they certainly won't be. Some of the President's advisors are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, relieving, and relief programs, will really deal with Negro unemployment in the cities. The President is not agreeing yet, not because he is convinced they are wrong, but merely because he does not want to disagree with other problems that he cannot take on at this time.

Accordingly, this week's march on Wash­ington, D.C. of the Negro deprived civil rights by the white majority is the beginning of a drive for economic preference and full employment by Negro Sheridan Washington, but the American Negro has obviously decided that he has to learn the white man to wake him up.

Mr. CLARK. Mentioned in Mr. Names­ton's column is the impact on the entire civil rights problem of congressional re­organization. It has long been my view that the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of this body is how we can modernize, streamline, upgrade, and render more demo­cratic the rules, customs, manners, and procedures under which the Senate of the United States operates. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

The Economist of London, under date of August 10 this year, has an extremely interesting article, entitled "Can Congress Get Reformed?" I find myself in disagreement with some of the statements in this article, particularly its reference to me as "a liberal with little influence." Nevertheless, the article is well worth reading. I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

**CONGRESS REFORMED?**

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The curiously beamed congressional ses­sion of 1963 is developing a climate ripe for the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of the Senate of the United States. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

It has long been my view that the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of this body is how we can modernize, streamline, upgrade, and render more democratic the rules, customs, manners, and procedures under which the Senate of the United States operates. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

The economist of London, under date of August 10 this year, has an extremely interesting article, entitled "Can Congress Get Reformed?" I find myself in disagreement with some of the statements in this article, particularly its reference to me as "a liberal with little influence." Nevertheless, the article is well worth reading. I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

**CAN CONGRESS BE REFORMED?**

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The curiously beamed congressional ses­sion of 1963 is developing a climate ripe for the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of the Senate of the United States. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

It has long been my view that the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of this body is how we can modernize, streamline, upgrade, and render more democratic the rules, customs, manners, and procedures under which the Senate of the United States operates. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

The economist of London, under date of August 10 this year, has an extremely interesting article, entitled "Can Congress Get Reformed?" I find myself in disagreement with some of the statements in this article, particularly its reference to me as "a liberal with little influence." Nevertheless, the article is well worth reading. I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

**CONGRESS REFORMED?**

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The curiously beamed congressional ses­sion of 1963 is developing a climate ripe for the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of the Senate of the United States. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

It has long been my view that the most important item which should be, but is not, on the agenda of this body is how we can modernize, streamline, upgrade, and render more democratic the rules, customs, manners, and procedures under which the Senate of the United States operates. I have had occasion to refer to this subject before, I shall do so many times again.

The economist of London, under date of August 10 this year, has an extremely interesting article, entitled "Can Congress Get Reformed?" I find myself in disagreement with some of the statements in this article, particularly its reference to me as "a liberal with little influence." Nevertheless, the article is well worth reading. I commend it to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?
Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator mind if I withheld yielding for a moment or two? I wanted to say, as I am through, it will not take me long. This article places some of the blame for some of the slow pace in which the Congress has acted this year on the President. It states:

"When the same party controls both the President and the Congress, as is now the case, the pace of legislation is usually set by the President and, for tactical reasons—"

With that statement I agree. But I am in disagreement with the following statement, which is that:

"Mr. Kennedy has consciously slowed the pace. In the first place, he made it clear from the outset of this session that he was interested primarily in the passage of a tax reform bill and in little else."

I do not agree at all with that statement. The President has sent to us 104 separate recommendations for legislative action, in my opinion, it is not feasible to attack on them, one way or the other, to pass them, defeat them, or modify them, but to do something about them. I do not think the Economist is correct in making this particular statement.

The article, however, ends with a rather melancholy conclusion. It states:

"It has been through a period of about 17 years—when any representative of the American people saw the problems of the national security, there has been a failure to act swiftly, as was the case yesterday, on the threatened railroad strike. Then, I believe, critics of our system must have had every reason to regard their criticism, if they pressed to be fair."

So much for that.

I should like to make one further comment. I noted with interest that the Senator has taken such a strong position."

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to my friend from Florida, first, that I agree that the meeting today in Washington is being held under the constitutional right of petition for the redress of grievances. That is essentially the intent behind the invitation, regardless of its semantics. We are requested to come and listen and to come and listen to what they have to say with respect to what they consider to be their constitutional rights for jobs and freedom. Perhaps I read from the invitation a little bit out of context. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the entire invitation be printed in the Record at this point, and I make that request.

There being no objection, the invitation was considered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Mathew Ahmann, the Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, Mr. James Farmer, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Mr. John Lewis, Rabbi Josephine Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young, cordially request the attendance of JOSEPH B. CLARK, Jr., at the Mass Assembly for Jobs and Freedom, Wednesday, August 29, 1963, at 2 p.m., at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D.C., to hear the demands of your constituents for jobs and freedom. March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, 170 West 130th Street, New York City, 2112.

R.S.V.P. (This card will admit you to the section reserved for Members of the Congress of the United States.)

Mr. CLARK. I point out that a number of eminent American citizens, of both the white and Negro races, are hosts and that they "cordially request" our attendance at the mass assembly. Then the invitation refers to the "demands of your constituents."

Perhaps I would have phrased it differently. Personally, I take no offense at it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
Mr. CLARK. I yield.
Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the Senator if it is not true that the word "demands" is printed in italics, whereas the rest of the invitation is not.

Mr. CLARK. No. If the Senator will look over my shoulder at the invitation, he will see that the words "cordially request the attendance of" are also in italics.

Mr. HOLLAND. The words "cordially request the attendance of" are in italics. Later the words "to hear the demands" were added. Jobs and freedom are also in italics.

The Senator from Florida had a distinctly adverse and irritated reaction to the use of those words. He thought that very poor psychology and very poor courtesy was shown in asking Senators and Members of the House to leave their respective Chambers, ignore business, being transacted, to go down there to listen to the "demands" of these people. The Senator from Florida thought it was a very poor word to use, and that it was a discourteous word to use, a word which did not leave in the proper attitude the recipients of the letter.

Mr. CLARK. I do not share the invitation of the Senator from Florida.
Mr. JAVITS. On the first subject I would say that I, too, join with the Senator in feeling that I should attend the rally, and I will. I believe that the expressions which were used in the invitation are expressions of intense belief which those who are demonstrating hold on the subject of their demonstration. I do not take it amiss. I hope very much that other Senators will not, through their appreciation of the position of the Senator from Florida on that subject.

In the substantive point which the Senator has raised, it is one of the real assets of this situation—the economic side and the job side. Anti-discrimination alone does not solve it, because though we would give opportunities, we do not wish, and would not, preempt the opportunities of others, because that would not be justice.

There is, of course, the general effort which must be made, and on which we have fallen down very badly, and that is in connection with the matter of the endemic unemployment problem, and the getting up of the American economy to a higher note of employment and productivity. I have given my prescription for that, as has the Senator from Pennsylvania, who is as ardent as I am.

I would receive preference, because there exists an opportunity for real nondiscrimination.