

ard of living. Additional land might solve this problem for a short while, but it would not be the permanent solution, for with the increasing birth rate, the present situation would develop again in the future. Because of the lower standard of living on the reservation, the Indian is turning more and more to wagework off the reservation. Being unskilled in 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 scene, while semiskilled and skilled workers are in demand. The Indian represents a valuable source from which to fill that need. This increasing demand for skilled workers has been recognized by Federal and State Governments with appropriations for vocational training rising from \$3,039,061.15 in 1918 to \$184,761,217.75 in 1955. S. 3416 would extend this training to Indians who cannot take advantage of vocational programs because of the remote location of most reservations.

"For many years people have been prone to consider the Indian as an agriculturist, but actually there has been a changing pattern in effect brought about by the inadequate resources on the reservations to support the population and the desire of many Indians to follow some other kind of work. A study of the work experience of 301 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 be of great value in preparing and orienting participants in the Indian relocation program, and second, it should stimulate industries to locate near Indian reservations. 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 trained under this program would command a higher salary and be able to adequately support his family at a decent standard of living. In turn, individual Indians would cost the Federal Government less in special services and begin paying higher income tax, thereby beginning a circle. As the individuals 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, whereas 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, 1962, there were 1,283 individuals in training. There were 346 applicants waiting on registers at the various training destinations, and 624 applications were in process at various reservations. If the additional funds authorized by S. 1868 are made available, many more applications are expected. The increase in funds resulting from legislation enacted by the 87th Congress has proved 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 \$7,500,000 can be expected to finance the cost of 2,470 institutional training units and 1,370 on-the-job training units (in varying stages of training), during 1 fiscal year. An appropriation of \$12 million would increase the number of training units to 3,906 institutional training units and 1,500 on-the-job training units.

The Department of the Interior informed the committee that it expects to request approximately one-third of the increased funds made available by this legislation in each of the next 3 fiscal years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Did I correctly understand that Calendar No. 425, Senate bill 1915, is being considered by the policy committee?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be considered by the policy committee. In response to the question raised by 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 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 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 greatest present 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 fair share of jobs. Therefore, a number of the measures dealing with unemployment are of great importance in the area of assur-

ing 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, 1963]

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 mainly 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 always been annoyed by resident or visiting petitioners. Though the right to petition a government for redress of grievances was granted by King John to his barons in Magna Carta and guaranteed to all Americans in the first amendment on December 15, 1791, Congress has usually been irritated whenever large numbers of their fellow citizens showed up to protest.

In 1836, the House of Representatives even adopted a gag rule to the effect "that no petition, memorial, resolution, or other paper praying 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 Congressman John Quincy Adams, this was repealed, but the leaders of Coxe'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 here indicates the extent of the gap between white and Negro thinking—this in a city that is 53 percent Negro and whose public schools are almost 85 percent Negro.

Despite all the hubbub of the last few days, the Congress has scarcely noted the full objective 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 preferential treatment on jobs.

Asa Philip Randolph, the 74-year-old director of the march, emphasized the point here this week. Getting jobs away from whites to give to Negroes, he said, was no solution to the problem. A vast increase in the economic growth of the Nation was needed to wipe out unemployment for all, and only special training and treatment for Negroes would enable them to work effectively in an automated society.

This, of course, is precisely the problem Washington has not been able to lick, and there is even less likelihood that the Kennedy administration will get its economic growth and full employment programs through the Congress than its civil rights program.

In July there were 3,382,000 whites unemployed in this country and 939,000 Negroes. In other words, the Negro unemployed percentage was over double the white—11.2 percent to 5.1, and in some cities, Chicago for example, the Negro unemployed were over 17 percent.

EQUALITY OR PREFERENCE?

This problem is not getting better, but worse. The demand for skilled workers and the scrapping of unskilled workers are increasing faster than the training and education of the Negro. Meanwhile, the Negro population is increasing faster than the white—25.4 percent Negro in the fifties to 17.5 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.

Already some of the President's advisers are insisting that only an ambitious public works program, on top of all the other tax, training, 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 has so many other problems that he cannot take on another at this time.

Accordingly, this week's march on Washington is not the end of the Negro drive for civil equality but also the beginning of a drive for economic preference and full employment. This may "annoy" Washington, but the American Negro has obviously decided that he has to annoy the white man to wake him up.

Mr. CLARK. Mentioned in Mr. Res-ton'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 Be 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 becalmed congressional session of 1963 is developing a climate ripe for the first reform of Congress since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. The demand for improvements from both inside and outside Congress has now reached such a point that it is entirely possible that some first step, such as the creation of a commission to study the much-studied question of reforming Congress, may be taken before the end of the year. Yet so difficult and intricate are the obstacles in the way of congressional reform that it is doubtful whether this first step, even if followed by the appropriate succeeding steps, will lead in the end to any real change in the way Congress works.

The abnormally long and generally unproductive session of 1962 was the direct cause of a good deal of reform talk when Congress reconvened this January. It was generally believed, however, that this talk would disappear once Congress got down to the task of legislating. The fact that the talk has grown louder instead of being silenced is proof enough that Congress has never really got down to that task this year. Congressional Quarterly, a private legislative news service, reports that Congress has completed action on only 5 percent of President Kennedy's requests and those bills were of a minor nature.

In all fairness to Congress, its record of very nearly complete inactivity this year is not entirely of its own making. When the same party controls both the Presidency and the Congress, as is now the case, the pace of legislation is usually set by the President and, for tactical reasons, 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; because there was never any possibility of final action on the tax bill before the autumn, Mr. Kennedy was setting the stage for a long, unexciting session. Secondly, the eruption of the Negro crisis and the introduction of broader civil rights legislation, to which the President attached great importance, killed whatever chance had existed for other bills and raised the possibility of the first year-around session of Congress since the war.

Actually, the first session of the 86th Congress will have nothing to be ashamed of if it adjourns shortly before Christmas after passing tax reform and civil rights bills; other sessions of Congress have accomplished far less without being subjected to nearly as much criticism. But month after month of inactivity this year has exposed the rusty condition of the congressional machinery and has made the legislative branch a favorite target of columnists and leader writers; it has even made some members of Congress self-conscious. The demand for reform is no longer limited to liberals with little influence, such as Senator JOSEPH CLARK, a Democrat from Pennsylvania, and Senator CLIFFORD CASE, a Republican from New Jersey. It is significant that an immensely influential Democrat, Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma, is renewing his interest in the subject; in 1946, as a Member of the House of Representatives, he drew up, with the late Senator Robert La Follette, the last reform act.

All this has led to great expectations among the press and the academic community of a new day dawning on Capitol Hill. Such euphoria is based on the faulty notion that reforming Congress is very much like reforming a corrupt police force or a vice-infested city, a nonpartisan affair upon which all men of good will can agree. On the contrary, few issues bear more connotations of partisanship and ideological conflict. Although a majority of Congress certainly agrees that some kind of reform is in order, the gulfs between the kinds of reform which are actually proposed are close to unbridgeable.

What Senator CLARK has in mind, for instance, is not so much congressional reform as congressional revolution. His detailed program would shatter the existing congressional power structure, destroying the weapons often used by the conservative southern Democratic oligarchs to thwart the will of the majority. This clearly political objective lies behind Mr. CLARK's proposals for imposing strict majority rule in the Senate, stripping committee chairmen of their immense powers and diminishing generally the discretion given to committees. In fact, some of his proposals, such as a rule which would require standing committees to report

every administration bill by July 4 of each year, seem no less than an attempt to superimpose a quasi-parliamentary system on the present one. But Congress has no more intention of adopting the Clark reforms than of voting itself out of business.

On the other hand, when southern conservatives, such as Senator BYRD of Virginia and Senator McCLELLAN of Arkansas, talk about congressional reform they really mean a reform of existing congressional budgetary procedure, a goal which the liberals can agree with in principle. But, in detail, the conservative proposals—the McClellan plan for changing the budgetary process, for example—would mean much tighter congressional control over spending, including a congressionally-imposed ceiling on expenditures. This, in turn, could be achieved only by establishing a legislative budget which would take priority over the President's annual budget, thereby cutting deeply into one of the executive branch's most important powers. Senator CLARK and other liberals regard the McClellan plan as closer to retrogression than to reform.

On its face, the question of congressional ethics, a favorite preoccupation of some liberal reformers, particularly those in the Republican Party, would seem to be one area free of ideological controversy. Although Congress imposes on officials of the executive branch an over-zealous interpretation of the statutes which deal with conflicts of interest, its own Members are not bound by these statutes at all. In view of this, the proposals of the liberal Republicans—to limit the outside employment of Members of Congress, who would be given a compensatory increase in salary, and to require disclosure of holdings of securities of over \$10,000 in value—would seem moderate enough. Yet these proposals have little more chance than Mr. CLARK's more revolutionary ones. Most Congressmen insist that the voters can be counted on to get rid of Members who are guilty of unethical behavior, a doctrine which would make some sense only if the electorate were given far more information about congressional behavior.

The remaining aspect of congressional reform concerns procedure and in all probability any reform plan adopted by Congress after all the study commissions have had their say will deal almost exclusively with procedural reform, just as did the La Follette-Monroney Act. This might include a set time schedule for consideration of appropriations bills or even a recognition that legislating is a year-around job which requires Congress to be in session all year apart from a summer holiday (the requirement of the La Follette-Monroney Act that Congress must adjourn each year by July 31 was last obeyed in 1956). Moreover, the Senate may relax its procedures to make it easier for committees to meet while the Senate itself is in session and tighten them to insist on germaneness of debate under certain conditions, changes which would make filibusters, like that expected next month over civil rights, a trifle harder to keep going and slightly less burdensome. This is the kind of reform now advocated by Senator MONRONEY and this is the kind of reform, if any, that will be passed.

Such minor steps might help Congress to operate more smoothly in normal years through, given the unusual set of circumstances prevailing this year, it is unlikely that they would have made much difference to the melancholy 1963 session. In a broader sense, however, it is a little absurd to believe that a few changes in procedure will do much to cure the deep spiritual malaise that has been afflicting Congress for a decade or more. Indeed, the very unwillingness of Congress to venture on a bold program of self-reform is itself a symptom of that malaise.

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 shall be glad to yield as soon 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 Presidency 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 our duty or obligation to act 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 is a little absurd to believe that a few changes in procedure will do much to cure the deep spiritual malaise that has been afflicting Congress for a decade or more. Indeed, the very unwillingness of Congress to venture on a bold program of self-reform is itself a symptom of that malaise.

With that conclusion I agree, but I have not given it hope. I urge upon my colleagues a further and careful consideration of the entire program of congressional reform, in the hope that in due time this program may be placed in a position in which it can measure up to the responsibilities that confront us in a constantly shrinking and ever-changing dynamic country and dynamic world.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe the distinguished Senator is much too modest in his reference to the statement of the London Economist, that he is a liberal with little influence. I do not agree with that statement. I believe he is a liberal, and I am sure he has decided influence in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. No words could be sweeter to my ear than those just uttered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to hear the Senator say that. With reference to the criticism which the London Economist, at a distance of 3,000 miles, has leveled at an institution which only yesterday showed that it knows how to move very rapidly when a national crisis impends, I believe the Senator should take such criticisms with a grain of salt. At no time during my service in the Senate—a period of about 17 years—when any great crisis faced the Nation, involving the question of the national security, has there 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 reexamine their criticism, if they propose to be fair.

So much for that.

I should like to make one further comment. I noted with interest that the Senator read from the invitation which all of us received from the committee which planned and is carrying out the march on Washington, taking place today. The Senator from Florida received one of those invitations. I thought that little good psychology and little courtesy or good manners was involved in the way the invitation was phrased, in that it requested us to come to listen to the "demands" of our constituents. I thought it would have been much more appropriate if we had been requested to come to listen to or hear a petition. We have been told that this was being done under the constitutional right of petition. As I understand, it is being done under two constitutional rights, the right to petition, and the right to assemble; and I agree with the Senator with his statement in that regard. I wonder if the Senator had the same reaction that the Senator from Florida had to the use of the word "demands," in connection with an invitation which should at least have been courteous and based on a sincere desire for Members of Congress to attend the affair at the Lincoln Memorial to listen to persuasive facts—not to demands.

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 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 out of context. It would be wise 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 ordered 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 Joachim Prinz, Mr. A. Philip Randolph, Mr. Walter Reuther, Mr. Roy Wilkins, and Mr. Whitney Young, cordially request the attendance of JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., at the Mass Assembly for Jobs and Freedom, Wednesday, August 28, 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, 27.

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 of your constituents for 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 of Congress, where business was being transacted, to go down there to listen to the "demands" of these people. The Senator from Florida feels 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 irritation 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 did not take it amiss. I hope very much that other Senators will not, though I appreciate the views of the Senator from Florida on that subject.

In the substantive point which the Senator has raised, it is one of the real aspects of this situation; namely, 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 gearing 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.

The specialized aspect, however, requires attention. I believe that there is a very good case for a specialized effort, from the standpoint of making it possible for Negroes to compete on the basis of the possession of equipment and training. I am against quotas for jobs, but I believe that in this connection they should receive preference, because there exists an opportunity for real nondiscrimination.