

An analysis prepared at the request of the Joint Economic Committee shows that there would be an absolute gain in the American gross national product of an estimated \$13 to \$17 billion annually if there could be an effective utilization of Negroes on the basis of their present state of training and education, thus contributing measurably to our national productivity, if nondiscrimination became real, rather than as it is now, so often honored in the breach rather than in performance.

I thank the Senator for his most pertinent observations.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator from New York says is quite correct.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to say that at last I find myself in a position where I can agree, in part at least, with the position of the distinguished Senator from New York on these matters. I fully agree that vocational education ought to be stepped up as is provided in the proposed program. I fully agree that job training, meaning apprenticeship and training for advancement, ought to be stepped up at a greater rate. I would be happy to vote for provisions of that kind, together with a substantial appropriation of funds therefore, if we were permitted to do so.

The Senator from New York has placed his finger upon an important part of the program, upon which I believe all Senators could agree, if only the drastic and, we feel, coercive provisions were not included, provisions which we believe would only get the country into greater confusion and turmoil, if enactment of them is accomplished.

I realize that the distinguished Senator from New York does not agree with my last conclusion. Nevertheless, I desire to have the RECORD show that there are features in the proposed civil rights legislation upon which I believe all of us could agree, and which would be more meaningful in connection with the permanent advancement of the economy of the minority groups in question than anything else we could do. I only wish we had the opportunity to deal with such proposals separately.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I believe there will be such an opportunity. Bills will be coming before the Senate which will provide this opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield the floor?

Mr. CLARK. I yield the floor.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD GERMANY— TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the speech delivered in this Chamber a few days ago by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] specifically as it pertains to our foreign policy toward Germany and the anxieties expressed by the West German Government in connection with the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

Senator MORSE emphasized that we should strive now to the best of our abilities for a relaxation of tensions between ourselves and the Soviet Union, and that recognition of East Germany should not, in this case, be the single dominant factor in our considerations. He further stresses that if future unification of Germany "is a practical objective and not just a pious dream, it can only be reached by negotiations, and that those negotiations must take place among the Soviet Union, East Germany, West Germany, France, Britain, and the United States."

As Senator MORSE suggests, it is time that we ought to say to West Germany, or to any nation, "We are going to determine American foreign policy in the best interests of America." I congratulate Senator MORSE for raising this question and wish that all our decisions in the field of foreign policy could provide affirmative answers to the same question.

His question, too, reminds me of Lord Palmerston's famous statement:

We have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.

This means that policies must be determined by national interests, that national interests can and do change in a changing world; that it is the national interests which must be followed and which must determine policy and that the policies in themselves are not immutable. This sound advice should certainly apply to our American policy toward Germany. We must always ask ourselves the question: Where lies our American national interest? In other words, our national interests should determine our foreign policy and not vice versa.

I regret that I was not able to be present to hear the address by the senior Senator from Oregon, but I take this opportunity to commend him particularly for his most constructive and enlightened views.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Few commendations have meant as much to me as the commendation just uttered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I want him to know that a considerable amount of my thinking on the German problem has been influenced by a notable speech he made earlier in this session of Congress. I look upon him as one of the Members of the Senate having most perceptive knowledge of the German question.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of a number of nominations which have been reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations at the desk, reported by the Committee on Armed Services, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The legislative clerk read sundry routine nominations reported today by Mr. RUSSELL from the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The questions in on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am proud to announce that 16 people have traveled the thousands of miles between Utah and Washington to participate today in the march on Washington for jobs and freedom.

The arrival of this delegation from Utah is particularly meaningful, because less than 1 percent of the population of our State is Negro, and civil rights have never been a paramount problem. But Utahans have an abiding interest in the national ceremony taking place today here in Washington, and our delegation exemplifies Utah's dedication to the right of free petition, to the right of free movement, and above all, to freedom of the spirit.

During the past months, we Americans have been dramatically confronted with the stark truth about discrimination and race relations in the United States. We have all been made aware of the need for immediate and meaningful action to insure the American Negro the full citizenship and equal rights to which he is entitled, by both the law of the land and all natural law of "right and wrong," for the American Negro has served notice that he is no longer content merely to watch, to wait, and to hope for these rights.

As a result, a great national debate is now taking place, in individual homes and in group meetings across the Nation, as well as here in the Congress. In good faith, all Americans—northerners and southerners, colored and white—seek to find the solution to this most pressing problem.

In at least one respect, Mr. President, the search for this solution is an extremely difficult task. The problem of civil rights for the Negro is deeply rooted in our history and tradition. As we are all well aware, it began more than 300 years ago, when the first slave ship landed on the shores of Virginia, and discharged its human cargo into the chains of bondage. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that the issue has been beclouded by emotionality. Fears, fancies, and years of distrust and distortion have surrounded the question of civil rights. Moreover, the question is not alone a legal one. It has social, economic, moral, and even psychological aspects and overtones which must be considered and weighed.

Yet, in another respect, the search for a meaningful solution to this problem should not be difficult. It should not be difficult, because when we cut through these complexities to the heart of the problem, we are faced with but one simple, and fundamental, question to which we can give but one answer. That question is whether we, as Americans, are still committed to the principles of human rights and human dignity.

Mr. President, can there be any answer to this question but "Yes"?

It seems to me that all must recognize that what the Negro is asking of us today is neither new nor revolutionary. He asks only what those who settled this country asked, and what was achieved almost two centuries ago. He asks only that we extend to him the privileges which we have all come to expect and enjoy. What the Negro is saying to us today, with demonstrations and petitions, in essence is: "We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal." Certainly, these are not new words.

Early in life, every American child—Negro or white—learns the American creed. He recites the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. He reads the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. He studies about the American Revolution. And he is taught that with hard work, decency, and integrity, anything is possible in this wonderful land of ours. Yet, equally early in life, every Negro child learns that all he is taught to believe in does not hold true for him. He is a product of our American culture and American values; yet he cannot be a full participant in them. It is this situation which must be corrected, for I do not believe there is any way in which the perpetuation of this situation can be reconciled with our national conscience and belief.

At issue, then, is the granting of a full measure of human rights to every American. This can and must be done both by legislative action and by individual action. What this means is that we will have to take action to assure not only equal opportunity in housing, in ed-

ucation, in employment, and in voting rights, but also equal treatment and consideration in all areas of public activity.

We have all known for a long time that in many communities throughout the Nation the Negro is turned away from theaters, restaurants, hotels, and other places of business, supposedly "open to the public." This is both an injustice and an indignity. Those who would perpetuate this practice have put forth long and laborious legal arguments against legislation to assure nondiscrimination in places of public accommodation. They argue for the many rights of property, but not for the rights of persons. In doing so, they have attempted to surround the accommodations proposal with a smokescreen of legalisms—imposing and impenetrable. As citizens, and as lawmakers, I feel that we must dissolve that smokescreen, clear the air, and look first and foremost at the underlying human issue involved.

Deliberate and systematic discrimination—whether practiced overtly or covertly—denies the Negro of both his rights and his dignity. By displaying our lack of respect for him as a human being and as an American citizen, we rob him of his self-respect, and, in many cases, of his ambition, his initiative, and his pride. Our contempt for him as evidenced by his exclusion can become his own self-contempt. What, then, is left for any man?

Certainly, under our Constitution the rights of property deserve and demand protection. But the rights of man deserve and demand priority. Every individual has the right to select his own circle of friends and associates, and cannot and should not be compelled to open his home or private property to any person with whom he does not care to associate. However, this liberty does not give license to discriminate against a particular race or particular group when he opens his private property to the general public and invites the general public to come in and trade. Such discrimination is unwise and undesirable, and should be unlawful. This is the objective of the public accommodations proposal.

No responsible person is suggesting that the Negro or any other minority group be given preferential treatment in any area of American life. What we do propose, however, is that he be given an opportunity to compete on his own merit and to partake of the activities of this Nation according to his own desire.

Granted, the full realization of equality of opportunity—in practice, as well as in theory—will be some time in coming. Despite the action which we take today, the Negro must come from far behind. Long years of discriminatory practice have placed him in a disadvantageous position, and he will often lack the skills and education required in order to take advantage of the opportunities which are opened. Nonetheless, the opportunities must be there for him. When this is the case, then the Negro, himself, must equip himself to take advantage of what is available. We can open jobs on all levels to the Negro, but he must qualify himself for them.

To accomplish this and to implement the equal opportunity in which we all believe, the law and legal action are but limited tools. To be meaningful the law must be lived. Individual citizens and private organizations must take action on their own initiative—not because they are compelled to do so, but because they wish to do so. In this regard I am particularly proud of the practices of Federal agencies in my own State of Utah. These agencies and their personnel followed equal employment practices long before the President's Committee was established. Today, a little more than 1 percent of the total Federal employees in Utah are Negro—and this, as I emphasized earlier, in a State with a Negro population of less than 1 percent.

Mr. President, as each of us alone wrestles with this problem, let him remember some of the simple and proud facts of our own history: We are a nation of immigrants. Somewhere in the dim and distant past of each of us, there have been the sting of discrimination and the pain of prejudice. We should well be able to put ourselves in the shoes of those who are discriminated against today and view the problem from their point of view. If we keep our hearts and minds on the human side of this issue, I am confident that the right solution will be found—one in keeping with the finest traditions of this Republic.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. FRIDAY, AUGUST 30, AND FROM THEN UNTIL TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 9 a.m. on Friday, August 30, 1963, for a pro forma session, at which no business will be transacted; and that when the Senate adjourns on August 30, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Tuesday, September 3, 1963.

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

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives during the adjournment of the Senate, and that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that committees