

He replies, "You said a mouthful about preserving the Union, but have you forgotten about my statement calling on Americans not to violate the laws, to have full reverence always for law and order, never to redress any grievance by mob action? Yet riots this year in Harlem, Philadelphia, Rochester, and other places have cost 5 lives, nearly 1,000 injuries, and more than \$6 million in property damages. And these terrible acts have been done by some of the very people for whom I gave my life." So spoke the Great Emancipator and I have never seen such sadness and disappointment in a human face. And now I cross the Tidal Basin to find out what is on the mind of Thomas Jefferson.

And right there stands Mr. Jefferson, a fine figure of a man, if I ever saw one. "Hello, Mr. Jefferson," I greet the founder of the

Democratic Party, "It must be quite a satisfaction to you to realize you started the very political party that now controls the White House, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. Have you any misgivings about the whole business in this election year of 1964?"

"Well, Congressman SILER, you are a Republican from the mountains of Kentucky. But you and many others have often quoted me as saying that the Government that governs the least governs the best. I believe it then and still believe it now. Yet right here are the plain figures—more than 2 million people are working for the Federal Government; it has more bureaus than ever before; it is meddling in more things, clear out to the heads of the hollows, than ever in history; it has a Federal budget of \$98 billion

that is never in balance; it has a Federal debt of more than \$300 billion that no one plans to reduce. Do you think I could sleep if I were still living at Monticello? Why, I would be taking 10 aspirins daily and 2 tranquilizers every night. Congressman, you are a Republican and I am a Democrat. But we see many things very much alike. If you were running this year, I think I would vote for you. And, if I were running, I think you would vote for me."

"Of course, Mr. Jefferson, you bet your boots I would. But not for bigger, bigger, bigger government."

Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, America's great trio. While we hail them, we do not heed them. And that is a very poor memorial indeed.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, make us aware of the fact of Thy presence at all times in our midst, especially in the sanctuaries of our hearts.

For the President of these United States and the elected servants of this body, we pray during these moments. We also pray for the citizens of this great Nation. Help us all, O God, without whom we are lost.

We need not summon Thee to be with us, for Thou art here. Rather, we pray, open Thou our eyes of faith, that we may be guided by light, even in darkness. Unstop our ears, to hear great calls of life from God and mankind. Make our minds sensitive, and our hearts submissive, for present-day needs and challenges.

On this anniversary day of the ratification of our Constitution, we pray for Thy continued guidance of great leaders. Guide our courts, as they interpret the Constitution; enlighten our leaders, as they guard it and debate it; give the people a deep appreciation of it, so as to act and live in such a way that they will deserve its freedom.

We pray in the name and spirit of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. INOUYE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 16, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— WITHDRAWAL OF NOMINATION

A message in writing from the President of the United States, withdrawing the nomination of Charles E. Casey, of California, to be a member of the Board of Parole, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. INOUYE, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a decree (and translation thereof) in homage to the 188th anniversary of American independence issued on July 2, 1964, by the President of the Argentine National Senate, and a resolution passed on the same date by the Argentine Senate in support of the decree, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., protesting against any attempt to thwart the Supreme Court decision relating to legislative apportionment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CONSTRUCTION, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (PART 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1330)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk my individual views on S. 1658, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the central Arizona project. My views are in vigorous opposition to S. 1658.

Earlier, on August 6, at page 17853, the Senate received a report on the bill. Consent was asked for and obtained that the report be printed together with such additional or individual views as would be subsequently filed. I now file my views.

I ask the Chair to advise me. Is the Senator from California correct in his understanding that his individual

views will be printed as a Senate document to the same extent and number as the report on the bill itself has previously been printed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The views of the Senator from California will be printed as a Senate report and will constitute part II of that report.

Mr. KUCHEL. And the number of copies of that part II will be the same as the number of copies of the original?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The individual views of the Senator from California will be received and printed.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3197. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

INCREASED MILEAGE FOR NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate Highways from 41,000 to 50,000 miles.

The completed portions of the Interstate System have already produced numerous benefits to the public, including great savings in traveling time. And the completion of the entire authorized program can be expected to produce additional benefits. But the increasing growth of our population and the increase in motor vehicle use make it advisable that the Interstate System be expanded from its presently authorized 41,000 miles.

Even now, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has requests from various States, including New Jersey, for an additional 20,000 miles of highway, over

and above the existing authorization, which they cannot consider because all of the mileage authorized under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 has been allocated.

Particularly significant in New Jersey is the pressing need for an expressway to link Trenton with the shore areas. But as I have already stated, because all mileage in the Interstate Highway System has already been allocated, New Jersey is unable to get additional 90-10 Federal funds for this much needed road. There are also other expressways needed in our State that cannot be built for this same reason.

As is known, Mr. President, funds for the construction of the Interstate System are derived from the trust fund which was established by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, and which is replenished through taxes on petroleum products used in motor vehicles. Because this fund is self-sustaining, and because the revenues are derived only from those making use of our roads, there is no additional tax assessment needed from other sources.

Mr. President, those portions of the Interstate Highway System that have already been completed and are in use have certainly proven their worth. Now, there is a clear need for additional mileage in this system, and I hope the Senate will give early consideration and approval to my bill, which would expand our great Interstate Highway System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3197) to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further morning business?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATOR STROM THURMOND OF SOUTH CAROLINA BECOMES A REPUBLICAN

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, speaking as one Senator from this side of the aisle, I welcome the decision which was made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], which he announced to the people of his great State last night.

I know that the question arises as to committee assignments, seniority, and so forth. My understanding is that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

THURMOND] would like to remain on the Committee on Commerce, and on the Committee on Armed Services.

I happen to be the second ranking Republican on the Committee on Commerce. The Senator from South Carolina is senior to me on that committee.

I am happy to move over to the No. 3 chair. In fact, I shall be glad to move down to the No. 15 chair if we ever have 15 Republicans on that committee.

Mr. President, I have been asked to read this message to the Senate from the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who is unable to be in the Chamber today.

He says:

Every true Republican rejoices at Senator STROM THURMOND's decision not only to support GOLDWATER but also to become a Republican Senator.

I regard it as one of the most dedicated and courageous actions that I have observed in my political career. Senator THURMOND has placed country above party. He has taken a course dictated by his conscience to preserve the solvency, the integrity, and the traditions of our Republic.

Mr. President, I have talked on the telephone with the ranking Republican member on the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and he echoes the sentiments which I have just expressed and which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expressed. The Senator from New Hampshire asked me to indicate his sentiments to Members of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon, I received a telegram from the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], not only requesting, but also directing that I make all the necessary arrangements to provide a seat for him on the Republican side of the aisle. This would come as fortification of the observation and statement he made yesterday, to the effect that he was changing his political affiliation.

It is a rather interesting aspect of history how strong the influence of tradition can be as it impels men to accept the politics and religion of their forebears. Tradition has been described as a whole bundle of customs, usages, the impact of personalities, and the events of history which, in large and small measure, have an impact on the conduct and behavior of people in every generation.

Frankly, the impact of tradition is so strong that many persons, I am sure, practice and pursue the policies and doctrines of the organization with which they are associated, rather than to forsake the label, even though they may be at great variance with the mainstream of thinking of the party or group. But, now and then a person high in the faith, or high in the party, has been moved to make a change in an open and forthright manner which all can see and all can observe.

Frankly, to take such a step requires a high degree of moral courage. If anyone has any doubt on that subject, let him back himself into a corner, ask himself that question, and insist that he get

an answer from his own conscience. Then he will discover that it requires some courage to cut the ties, to abandon tradition, and to make that kind of change. But, in some quarters there are persons, I suppose, who, when they make this change, are even suspect as to the motives and the reasons for so doing. Yet, not to do so seems to mean a great, constant, and continuing unhappiness with associations, principles, and doctrines with which the person does not agree. And, somewhere he is constantly confronted with that challenge in the hope that he can develop some serenity and felicity of mind that would make him a more useful member of the faith or the organization with which he is identified.

Such transformations may be comparatively rare. But they are not new in our history. Probably the classic example is Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln served one term in Congress, in 1847 and 1848, as a member of the Whig Party. But, when the great confrontation of this challenge that was looming on the horizon of the Republican Party came about, Lincoln then forsook the Whig Party and became a member of the Republican Party.

There was still another, and that was Hannibal Hamlin, who was Lincoln's Vice President in his first term. Hannibal Hamlin was a great classical scholar. He had pursued a political career as a Democrat. As I recall, he served two terms in Congress, having been elected to that office as a Democrat. But, ultimately he changed his affiliation, and so became Vice President on the Republican ticket in 1860.

There is precedent and there is reason for the course which our distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], is pursuing. I salute him for his resolute courage that caused him to forsake the political label that he has borne with distinction for a lifetime. He has been Governor of his State. His State has sent him to this body, and, on one occasion, by an amazing political phenomenon—a write-in campaign in which he received more than 150,000 votes. I salute him for identifying himself with the Republican Party in which he finds principles and policies which he can more readily accept and under whose rooftop he will probably find it more congenial.

We extend to him the hand of Republican fellowship, and we bid him thrice welcome. Moreover, we shall welcome all who believe that under the Republican banner they can render more useful and effective service to the Republic.

I note with some interest that this historic incident—and I think it must be regarded as something of an historic incident, when a man of such stature in his party, in his State, and in his Nation, changes his political affiliation—occurs on the 187th anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States. I do not believe that there is a single Member of this body who will not agree that STROM THURMOND is dedicated to that doctrine, to its meaning,

and to the Nation for which it was conceived. I do not believe a single Member of this body will deny that the doctrines and the guidelines of the Constitution of the United States have been the Holy Writ that somehow managed and guided the political behavior of a great citizen of the country. So, in all this, he is attuned with Republican faith. I salute him for his moral courage and for his deep conviction that brought about this transformation.

Mr. President, he will be sitting in this tier of this distinguished Chamber, in the third row. There are now four seats placed there—one for him, the newest acquisition of the Republican Party.

THE PLAIN DEALER ENDORSES JOHNSON AND HUMPHREY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Plain Dealer, one of the two daily newspapers in my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, and certainly one of the great newspapers of this Nation, has called for the election of President Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President. In a front-page editorial on September 13, 1964, the editors of this outstanding newspaper said:

Based on what we think is best for the people of this country we believe the Government of the United States should be run by the two nominees most competent to do the job. For this reason the Plain Dealer endorses Lyndon B. Johnson for President and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

This great newspaper over the years has a great history and notable tradition for fine public service. Incidentally, this fine newspaper endorsed and supported Thomas E. Dewey, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon and other Republican candidates for President in the recent past.

Mr. President, under the guidance and leadership of its extremely capable publisher and editor, Tom Vail, the Plain Dealer has shown itself to be a mighty force for progress in my State. Therefore, its endorsement of the Democratic ticket this year is of more than usual significance.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

THE PLAIN DEALER ENDORSES JOHNSON AND HUMPHREY

The Plain Dealer supports the election of President Lyndon B. Johnson for President of the United States and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

Our support of the Democratic candidates is based on one consideration alone; namely, what two men are best qualified to carry the awesome burdens of the greatest power on earth?

In keeping with the vigorously independent politics of this newspaper we have given no consideration to party affiliations.

Our decision is reached after the most thorough investigation, observation and

comparison with the Republican ticket represented by Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER for President and Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER for Vice President.

Our publisher and editor, members of our Washington bureau, and many other experienced staff members of this newspaper have talked to and observed the candidates under various conditions.

All have given serious consideration to everything the candidates for President and Vice President have said and written.

In our view President Johnson has demonstrated since the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy, November 22, 1963, that he understands the Presidency and that he can cope with its responsibilities.

In less than 11 months the President has established himself as a leader in his own right.

He has proved to be amazingly effective in dealing with the Congress.

We feel this is an important relationship for a strong Chief Executive.

President Johnson's generally moderate stand on economic issues has reflected, in our opinion, the mood of the country and represents a responsible attitude during a period of unprecedented prosperity.

In foreign affairs where the slightest misstep can now mean the destruction of mankind, President Johnson has shown profound respect for the high stakes involved.

In a long political career Lyndon B. Johnson has been an effective prominent figure in the legislative branch of the Government, most recently as Senate majority leader.

The President's selection for Vice President of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a nationally known personality and respected legislator himself, we feel adds strength and energy to the team.

In recent years Senator HUMPHREY has shown a capacity to grow and mature, indicating that greater responsibility outlined by President Johnson for the vice-presidency should further add to the growth of HUMPHREY's capabilities if the Johnson-Humphrey ticket is elected November 3.

While every democracy thrives on a vigorous and competent opposition, we do not feel Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER are up to the highest standards of Republican presidential and vice presidential candidates.

Senator GOLDWATER's record as a Senator does not impress us.

His statements during this campaign have been confusing and, more importantly, indicate lack of a thorough knowledge about the Government of the United States and the great issues of the day.

While most of Senator GOLDWATER's fellow Republican legislators worked for civil rights legislation and many other controversial but constructive measures, Senator GOLDWATER failed not only to go along with his fellow Republican legislative leaders, but also failed to offer constructive alternatives.

We do not think GOP Vice-Presidential Candidate Congressman MILLER has established a record in the Government or a stature with the public high enough to recommend him for the great and increasing responsibilities of the vice-presidency.

In keeping with the best traditions of American journalism we do not intend by our endorsement to support everything President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY may do or say during the current campaign.

Nor will we discount completely everything Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER may do or say.

We will continue to give fair and complete news coverage to both tickets, regardless of our editorial opinion.

Based on what we think is best for the people of this country we believe the Gov-

ernment of the United States should be run by the two nominees most competent to do the job.

For this reason the Plain Dealer endorses Lyndon B. Johnson for President and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Vice President.

HATE BOOK, "NONE DARE CALL IT TREASON," A HOAX AND FRAUD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, one of the biggest and most dangerous propaganda hoaxes of our time is the John Birch hate publication titled "None Dare Call It Treason."

This scurrilous document is craftily designed to destroy confidence in both major political parties and to undermine basic faith in our free democratic institutions. It is a devil's brew of half-truths, distortions, and outright lies.

On July 22 the New York Times quoted John Birch officials to the effect that promoting "None Dare Call It Treason" was a prime Birch project. In Cleveland, Ohio, William Shepler, an admitted official of the John Birch Society, arranged distribution, and wholesalers get their copies from the American Opinion Library, an offshoot of the Birch Society.

The real purpose of the book is made clear on page 231 where the reader is urged to join the John Birch Society and two other intertwined organizations and told how to go about doing so.

I am grateful that the National Committee for Civic Responsibility has exposed this document as "at best an incredibly poor job of research—at worst, a deliberate hoax and a fraud." The National Committee for Civic Responsibility is a nonpartisan, nonprofit Cleveland group, one of whose purposes is to "expose the use of calumny and deception" by both rightwing and leftwing extremists.

Mr. President, on September 12, 1964, there appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal, one of the great newspapers of Ohio and of the Nation, an excellent article entitled "Hate Book by Missourian Called 'Poor Research Job, a Hoax, Fraud.'" This article details clearly the fraudulent and deceptive nature of this lunatic extremist rightwing fringe propaganda sheet. I commend it to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Sept. 12, 1964]

NATIONAL COMMITTEE'S CHARGE—"HATE" BOOK BY MISSOURIAN CALLED "POOR RESEARCH JOB, A HOAX, FRAUD"

The controversial "hate" book "None Dare Call It Treason," by John Stormer, has been labeled as "at best an incredibly poor job of research—at worst, a deliberate hoax and a fraud."

This characterization comes in a scathing report issued by the National Committee for Civic Responsibility (NCCR) and introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative CHARLES VANIK, Cleveland Democrat.

It also was one of two books named last week by State Democratic Chairman William Coleman when he asked the Ohio State Fair manager to halt political activity at a

Fair booth operated by the American Opinion Society.

NCCR is a nonpartisan, nonprofit Cleveland group formed last year with one of its purposes to expose the use of calumny and deception by both right- and left-wing extremists.

Stormer is a Missouri Republican whose book has caused a storm of protest in many sections of the country when it was introduced.

NCCR said it attempted to get additional information about the book but found: "This seems to be the only publication of the Liberty Bell Press, Florissant, Mo., a suburb of St. Louis. There is no telephone listed."

NCCR said the book is distributed in Cleveland area by Klein News which receives its supply from William Shepler, "area coordinator of and public spokesman for the John Birch Society in Cleveland."

The NCCR report says of Stormer's book: It contains 818 references, supposedly substantiating the material, but "in case after case, the author has subverted references to give a totally false impression."

A major portion of the documentation is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or testimony given congressional committees "but in most instances he fails to give the name of the person whose testimony he relies upon."

In 79 instances Stormer uses as his authority "biased rightwing publications" such as Human Events, the Dan Smoot Report, America's Future, and publications of the Birch Society.

In some cases dates of cited references were as much as a year off, in some cases words were added to the direct quotations of witnesses before congressional committees.

Sometimes references were not complete enough to allow checking, as in one case where the citation is to "House Document 227, page 4" but with no indication of the year or the session of Congress in which it was issued, or in another case when Stormer cited "Consul General for Yugoslavia v. Artukovic" without mention of where, when or by whom such a hearing was conducted.

NCCR's report lists reference after reference that has been distorted by Stormer, giving the direct quotation from the book and then the exact language of his reference.

However, NCCR was especially intrigued by one statement in Stormer's book for which no citation was listed. Following is the statement, quoted from page 205, paragraph 4 of Stormer's book:

"If U.S. proposals for arms control and disarmament are accepted, U.S. military forces will be transferred to the U.N. peace force, which is directed by the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, who has always been a Communist."

A reader would conclude the above observation was Stormer's own. However, as NCCR points out: "Dozens of rightwing organizations have circulated this myth, and, by quoting each other, have compiled an extensive file of meaningless documentation."

The myth was conclusively exploded May 2, 1963, by Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, California Republican.

KUCHEL spoke out after John Rousselot, Birch Society officer and ex-Congressman, made the same charges in a California speech entitled "Disarmament—Blueprint for Surrender." However, Rousselot spoke of a "Russian general" directing U.S. Armed Forces, rather than Stormer's "Communist under secretary."

"Those fantastic charges," KUCHEL said, "are false—completely false. But when one who was * * * a Member of Congress * * * utters such a cry, there are Americans who listen and believe."

"There is no Russian colonel, or general, or military or civilian individual who is 'secretary of the United Nations' or 'under secretary of the U.N. Security Council.'"

"Let the record be clear that there are 19 under secretaries of the Security Council, of which 13 are filled by Americans or representatives of our allies and of which two are Soviet bloc nations."

"None of them has anything to do with the command of any joint U.N. military operations. There is no world police force in the U.N."

The NCCR says that the thrust of Stormer's book "is to present a picture of the United States as a nation doomed to defeat by communism as the direct result of treason in our schools, churches, universities, newspapers, television, radio, Government agencies and top officials."

The committee looked into Stormer's book at the request of NCCR's president, Thomas C. Westropp. He is executive vice president of the Women's Federal Savings & Loan in Cleveland. He is also regional first vice commander of the American Legion.

The Ohio American Legion had authorized distribution of Stormer's book. As a result of NCCR's report, the Legion has canceled distribution plans, pending further investigation.

The committee, made up of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish clergy, a judge and university official, methodically took what it felt were the most serious charges made by Stormer's book. They started by checking his references.

Two examples will indicate what they found:

Stormer, page 58: "Weapons and ammunition were supplied to the underground in Cuba by the CIA in such a way as to insure that they could never be used."

Stormer gave as his documentation a column written by Edith Roosevelt in the Shreveport Journal, September 15, 1962.

NCCR says: "If Edith Roosevelt, a frankly partisan rightwing writer had made such a charge, it would not necessarily have been an accurate statement. But the fact is, she said no such thing."

"Edith Roosevelt writes that the CIA dropped caches of weapons and ammunition at random freedom-fighter depots in the expectation that the underground would be able to mount a coordinated attack in which ammunition and weapons would be properly distributed."

"She quarrels with this concept and points out that this resulted in some weaponry not having proper ammunition."

"At no time does she say or even imply that this was done to insure that they could never be used."

In another case (ch. 8, reference 29) Stormer accuses Time magazine of lying in order to discredit Senator Joseph McCarthy. He used as a reference the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 14, 1951.

NCCR says: "Congress was not in session on November 14, 1951, consequently, there is no RECORD for that date."

In his book Stormer recommends that readers join the John Birch Society and other rightwing organizations. Of this suggestion, NCCR says:

"While Robert Welch, founder and leader of the John Birch Society, honestly stated his conviction that 'Communist influences are now in full working control of our Federal Government,' Mr. Stormer seeks to brand every U.S. President since Herbert Hoover as a traitor."

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S SUPPORT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Post published a story on page 2 referring to the formation of a Pilots for Goldwater Commit-

tee. Tuesday, one of the exuberant members of this group asserted that 77 percent of the pilots are supporting the Arizona Senator for President.

On page 6 of yesterday's Post, there is a news story detailing the Senator's reception in Atlanta, Ga. After reporting on the sale of Confederate flags and confetti, the article states:

One group of teenage girls had their arms in slings and carried signs proclaiming, "We'd give our right arm for BARRY."

It would appear from these two news reports, Mr. President, that the Senator is drawing strong support from two special groups of voters—crippled right-wingers and those who are up in the air.

WOMEN OF GREAT ABILITY CAN ACHIEVE WITH DETERMINATION AND TALENT—TRIBUTE TO MISS F. LOUISE LELAND

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, Virginia London, of the Bangor Daily News, has written an excellent story on one of Maine's outstanding citizens—Miss F. Louise Leland of Bar Harbor. I am very proud of Louise Leland for she dramatically illustrates what women of great ability can achieve with determination and talent. I ask unanimous consent that this very interesting article be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MISS LELAND OF BAR HARBOR: BANKER FOR 56 YEARS

(By Virginia London)

In 1908, Miss F. Louise Leland, of Bar Harbor, embarked on a career that was, at that time, almost unheard of for a woman. She was just out of high school and teaching a summer school session at Moro Plantation in Aroostook County when she was contacted by officers of the Bar Harbor Banking & Trust Co. with the offer of a position as bookkeeper and teller.

Her employers had approached the idea of hiring a woman with caution and, as she learned later, had carefully checked the opinion of 3 year-round and three summer residents to get their reaction to this novel move. Miss Leland laughingly recalls one solemn opinion given—"I don't believe that little girl can hurt the Bar Harbor public."

That she was successful in overcoming the reluctance of both men and women to have a "female" take their deposits or cash their checks is evident in her appointment to assistant treasurer in 1933—making her one of the first women in Maine to hold a position as a bank officer. In 1953 Miss Leland was elected to a vice-presidency by the directors.

She is not certain what influenced her to accept the position, it might have been the challenge involved, but she is not overlooking the \$7 per week salary which her employers reminded her frequently was a good start for a girl.

She recalls being told by customers that this new idea would never work. But eventually, her sense of humor and genuine liking for people won them over. Some of her most reluctant customers became her best friends.

Today, Miss Leland is a folksy person, friendly—and still retains that sense of humor that carried her through the early years. She is a woman who is well informed on affairs both current and historic and is

noted for her pithy observations which usually cut through to the heart of the subject being discussed.

Miss Leland's position in the bank during the time she refers to as "Bar Harbor's Golden Age," brought her in contact with the "cream of our country" who came to summer in the area.

Her customers included some of the most famous names and families of the time—Henry Morgenthau, Maurice K. Jesup, R. L. Stevenson, Arthur Train, Mary Roberts Rinehart, Joseph Pulitzer, Jane Addams, Walter Damrosch, Fritz Kreisler, Ernest Schelling, and J. P. Morgan, Sr., who asked her to change the first \$500 bill she had ever seen. Over the years she made many lasting friendships among the hundreds of summer residents.

Her successful career in banking was paralleled by a total involvement in community affairs. "You can't help getting into all these things if you have any heart at all" is the simple explanation she offers for her interest in the people, projects, and problems of her community.

The civic, club, and school and community fund activities, reflecting her contribution to the area are too numerous to list here, but they include more than 15 organizations. She is interested in politics and was the first ballot clerk for the Republicans when women were granted equal suffrage.

She dismisses all of this lightly, declaring, "I guess I just can't be a deadhead on a committee, but it sounds a lot more important than it is. I just try to be a useful citizen."

As one might expect, Miss Leland also treats her retirement just as lightly. "I retired officially January 1, 1956, but it never made much difference. Only that I come in now depending on the needs of the bank." Except for a period of hospitalization last year, her first in 75 years, she is at work nearly every day handling the payroll for the bank and its four branch offices.

From her own experience, Miss Leland feels there is a definite place in banking for women. "It's gratifying for me to see more women moving into this field." She is of the opinion that women could fill more officer positions if they wished to.

"Perhaps it is because they don't go after these positions. It seems that most women like to see a job well done, but they don't want the power that position, money, or politics can give them, as men do."

Miss Leland has a home in Salisbury Cove where she lives during the warm months. She moves into Bar Harbor only for the colder part of the winter. She has no desire to travel—her people, her bank, and home fill her life.

"I'm really a smalltown person—the places I'd like to go, I've been; and the places I have never been would take some planning to reach."

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator permit me to place in the RECORD a brief statement, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SIMPSON. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that he be allowed to yield to the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

STRIVING FOR IMPARTIALITY IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there has been much discussion recently about conflict of interest in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. This is a serious problem and deserves a maximum of soul searching and the judgment of our wisest minds.

Not to be overlooked is the third branch of Government—the judiciary. The Judicial Conference of the United States has acted promptly in this matter; a year ago it approved a resolution recommending that judges decline to participate as directors or officers in business corporations of any kind.

Judge Simon E. Sobeloff, the highly respected chief judge of the court of appeals for the fourth circuit—he is a former Solicitor General of the United States and a former chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals—has written an instructive article on the need for impartiality in the Federal courts. It is a notable review of the entire subject, and adds greatly to our understanding of this delicate area.

My attention was attracted to Judge Sobeloff's reference to two pending bills relating to judicial conflicts of interest. One, by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, would forbid any Federal judge from participating in any enterprise organized for profit except in the role of stockholder. The other bill, introduced by the late Senator Estes Kefauver shortly before his death, would require judges to submit annual financial reports.

Whether they are approved or not, Judge Sobeloff calls these measures significant because, in his view, they represent a continuing effort to free the judiciary from outside influences and to assure the public that judges would not be affected by competing financial interests.

I was also pleased to see the author's comments on a recent book by a distinguished Washington lawyer, Joseph Borkin, entitled "The Corrupt Judge," in which he recommends that the Supreme Court require Federal judges to submit confidential financial reports for its inspection. Judge Sobeloff believes this suggestion has merit because it gives the Supreme Court discretion in dealing with special situations and, as he says, the High Court "could determine where to draw the line with justice to the public interest and to the judges."

Judge Sobeloff concludes that, although the Federal judiciary has an excellent record, "the process of refining our standards is a continuing one." He believes firmly in the principle "that judges are not only expected to be impartial but are charged with the responsibility of avoiding all appearance of partiality." Certainly, we can all agree to that.

Judge Sobeloff's views should be of great interest to the Congress and the public. I ask unanimous consent that this article—entitled "Striving for Impartiality in the Federal Courts," in volume 24, No. 3, summer 1964 issue of the Federal Bar Journal—be printed in the RECORD.

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

STRIVING FOR IMPARTIALITY IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

(By Simon E. Sobeloff, Chief Judge, Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit; former Solicitor General of the United States, and former Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals of Maryland)

"Conflicts of interest" is a phrase much used these days. While the subject is more often discussed in relation to the other branches of Government, the judiciary has not escaped scrutiny.

Presently under consideration in Congress are two proposed laws relating to conflicts of interest in the judiciary. One H.R. 6048, by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, is intended to amend 28 U.S.C. 454 to read as follows:

"A justice or judge appointed under the authority of the United States who engages in the practice of law or, other than in the capacity of a stockholder, participates in an enterprise organized for profit, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."¹

The other bill, S. 1613, authored by the late Senator Estes Kefauver, provides for the establishment of an office of reports in each judicial circuit, to which each judge in the circuit is required to submit annual financial reports. These reports would be available for inspection only by members of the judicial council of each circuit. At the time of this writing no action has been taken on either bill nor have any hearings been held. Whether ultimately passed into law or not, these bills are significant because they represent a continuing effort, begun long ago, to free the judiciary from outside influences and to assure the public, for whom the courts exist, that its judges will be unaffected by competing financial interests.

IMPARTIALITY IN GENERAL

Impartiality is among the most important virtues for a judge and at the same time one of the most difficult to acquire. It is difficult to attain because its scope is broad and unclear. The Webster's Dictionary definition of the word as "freedom from bias or favoritism; disinterestedness; fairness," falls in many situations to provide a practical answer. As applied to the judiciary, the concept encompasses objective as well as subjective fairness. It is a familiar axiom, but worth repeating, that it is not enough for a judge to be impartial; he must also avoid the appearance of partiality. "Our courts," Arthur T. Vanderbilt has declared, "are utterly dependent upon public respect for the law as an institution and upon public confidence in the integrity of the judiciary."²

When a judge so much as appears to be partial, even if in truth he is not, the public's confidence in him is lost.

In addition, there are both obvious and obscure influences which may affect a judge's view of a case. Prejudgment, favoritism, and corruption are examples of the obvious, and therefore need no elaboration. At the other end of the spectrum are more subtle influences arising from the judge's own personality.

A man's background, his education, his associations, shape his outlook. Justice Cardozo recognized this when he wrote: "Deep below consciousness are other forces, the likes and dislikes, the predilections and the

¹ 28 U.S.C. 454 presently in force reads: Any justice or judge appointed under the authority of the United States who engages in the practice of law is guilty of a high misdemeanor.

² Rutgers L. Rev., Special Number 1-34 (Nov. 1948).

prejudices, the complex of instincts and emotions and habits and convictions which make the man, whether he be litigant or judge."³ To achieve impartiality a judge must guard against distortion of his perspective, even by these subliminal forces. A judge, as Learned Hand aptly phrased it, should allow himself only one bias, "a bias against bias."

A. History of conflicts of interest in the judiciary

From the earliest time, the ethical behavior of judges has been the subject of concern. Two frequently quoted passages of the Bible are specifically directed to the moral conduct of judges. The first reads:

"And I charged your judges at that time, saying Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him.

"Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man."⁴

The other points even more directly to the problem we are considering:

"Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not respect persons, neither take a gift; for a gift doth blind the eyes of the wise, and pervert the words of the righteous."⁵

Socrates, in defining the qualities of a judge, says:

"Four things belong to a judge: to hear courteously; to answer wisely; to consider soberly; and to decide impartially."

Not so long ago, in the reign of the Tudors, it was a general practice for judges to accept gifts from litigants. During the 15th and 16th centuries it was common for suitors to present New Year's gifts to judges. Lord Bacon (1561-1626), whose essay, "Of Judicature," is a classic in the field of judicial ethics, confessed that as a judge he had acted corruptly, although he explicitly disclaimed having sold his judgment. He affirmed that he never "had a bribe or reward in his eye or thought when he pronounced any sentence or order."⁶ It would overstrain credulity to accept this assertion of resolute judicial impartiality notwithstanding the receipt of bribes. It is one of the ironies of history that some of the noblest ideals of judicial ethics, later adopted in our American "Canons of Judicial Ethics," were phrased by Bacon.

Sir Matthew Hale (1609-76), Lord Chief Justice in the reign of Charles II, was the exception rather than the rule in his stern view of conflicts of interest. He has been characterized as "one of the saints of the law" and is credited with formulating one of the earliest, if not the first code of judicial ethics. His "Eighteen Principles" form the foundation of modern codes. Significantly, he recalls the Biblical injunction referred to above, and states as his 16th principle: "To abhor all private solicitations, of what kind soever, and by whomsoever, in matters depending."⁷

³ Cardozo, "The Nature of the Judicial Process," 167 (1921).

⁴ Deuteronomy 1: 16, 17.

⁵ Deuteronomy 16: 19.

⁶ Bond, "The Growth of Judicial Ethics," 10 Mass. L.Q. 1 (1924).

⁷ A quaint story is told of Chief Justice Hale in 2 Campbell, "Lives of the Chief Justices of England" 214 (1873). A prominent gentleman, owner of a deer park, had been in the habit of giving a deer to the visiting judge. This had been the custom of his family, and he undertook to follow it even though he was the plaintiff in a case over which Lord Hale was to preside. The rest of the story is reported as follows:

"The JUDGE. Is this plaintiff the gentleman of the same name who hath sent me the venison?"

The suggestion has been voiced that conflicting interests influenced judges in some important decisions in the early history of this country. For example, it is widely suspected that Chief Justice Marshall had a strong influence in the case of *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*⁸ and its predecessor, *Fairfax's Devisee v. Hunter's Lessee*,⁹ even though he disqualified himself from participating in the two cases. Marshall and his brother had a direct financial interest in the cases, as their title to a large tract of land depended upon the outcome. While Justice Story wrote for the Court in both cases and based the decisions, which were favorable to Marshall, on a treaty between the United States and England, "[It] has been commonly supposed that Marshall practically dictated Story's two opinions * * * and certain writers have stated this to be the fact. Story himself, 15 years afterward, declared that the Chief Justice had 'concurred in every word of the second opinion'; yet in a letter to his brother concerning the effect of Story's opinion upon another suit in the State court at Winchester, involving the same question, Marshall says: 'The case of Hunter and Fairfax is very absurdly put on the treaty of 94.'"¹⁰

The latter assertion, made by Marshall more than a decade after the favorable decisions, would tend to rebut the implication from Story's letter that Marshall had collaborated in the opinions.

Indeed it has been affirmed, and not without historic basis, that in the primitive days of our highest Court practically every member was financially interested in some case coming up for final decision.¹¹ And Justice Story, during many of the years that he sat on the Supreme Court bench, was president of a bank.¹² This would be unthinkable behavior for a Justice today.

While the question of competing financial interest still remains a subject of deep concern, one problem which plagued the judiciary of old England has been removed in this country. The early English judges were a "servile bureaucracy" holding office at the King's pleasure. Federal judges, however, by constitutional right, "hold their offices during good behavior, and shall, at stated times, receive for their services, a compensation, which shall not be diminished during their continuance in office."¹³

"The JUDGE'S SERVANT. Yes, please you, my Lord.

"The JUDGE. Stop a bit then. Do not yet swear the jury. I cannot allow the trial to go on till I have paid him for his buck.

"The PLAINTIFF. I would have your Lordship to know that neither myself nor my forefathers have ever sold venison and I have done nothing to your Lordship which we have not done to every judge that has come to this circuit for centuries bygone.

"MAGISTRATE OF THE COUNTY. My Lord, I can confirm what the gentleman says for truth, for 20 years back.

"OTHER MAGISTRATES. And, we, my Lord, know the same.

"The JUDGE. That is nothing to me. The Holy Scriptures says, 'A gift perverteth the ways of judgment.' I will not suffer the trial to go on till the venison is paid for. Let my butler count down the full value thereof.

"PLAINTIFF. I will not disgrace myself and my ancestors by becoming a venison butcher. From the needless dread of selling justice your Lordship delays it. I withdraw my record.

"And so the trial was postponed."

⁸ 14 U.S. 304 (1816).

⁹ 11 U.S. 379 (1813).

¹⁰ 4 Beveridge, "The Life of John Marshall" 167 (1919).

¹¹ Myers, "History of the Supreme Court" 273 (1912).

¹² Id. at 269.

¹³ U.S. Const., art. III, sec. 1.

B. Canons of judicial ethics

It was in recognition of the need for a systematic statement of principles governing judicial ethics that the American Bar Association, in 1924, adopted its formulation of canons for judges. These canons, in slightly modified form, have become accepted guidelines for proper judicial behavior. They not only admonish judges to avoid actual conflicts of interest but also warn them to avoid giving just cause for suspicion of such conflicts. Thus, the fourth canon states the "Caesar's wife" doctrine: "A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety."

DISQUALIFICATION

That a judge should not sit in a case in which he has an interest is a firmly established principle, for by doing so he would in effect be judging himself—a task no man can be expected to perform impartially.¹⁴ Lord Coke called this a principle of natural law. And the Supreme Court has held in *Tumey v. Ohio*¹⁵ that a defendant in a criminal case is unconstitutionally deprived of due process of law where the trial judge's compensation was the fine imposed in case of conviction.

This doctrine has been embodied in a statute, 28 U.S.C. 455, which disqualifies a judge from hearing a case in which he is interested.

"Any justice or judge of the United States shall disqualify himself in any case in which he has a substantial interest, has been of counsel, is or has been a material witness, or is so related to or connected with any party or his attorney as to render it improper, in his opinion, for him to sit on the trial, appeal, or other proceeding therein."¹⁶

Under the statute the initial determination as to extent of interest is addressed to the sound discretion of the judge himself, and his decision is not to be reversed unless he has acted arbitrarily.¹⁷

He is expected, however, to form his opinion "in accordance with those settled and well-known principles intended to secure absolute impartiality of trial and judgment."¹⁸

In the absence of an explicit statutory command, the "Canons of Judicial Ethics" are a judge's best guide to "settled and well-known principles." While they contain little

¹⁴ In re *Murchison*, 349 U.S. 133 (1955).

¹⁵ 273 U.S. 510 (1927).

¹⁶ 18 U.S.C. 201-218, respecting bribery, graft and conflicts of interest, applies as well to "officers and employees" of the "judicial branch" of government as to the executive branch, and, in a more limited sense, the legislative branch. Section 203, for instance, makes punishable, *inter alia*, the receiving or agreeing to receive, asking, demanding, soliciting, or seeking any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered either by himself or another by anyone at a time when he is an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government, in relation to any proceeding, application, request for a ruling or other determination, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other particular matter in which the United States is a party or has a direct and substantial interest. Section 205 makes punishable the acting as agent or attorney for prosecuting a claim against the United States or for appearing before a department, agency, or the like, in the matter of such a claim by one who is an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government.

For a complete discussion of these provisions, see Perkins, "The New Federal Conflicts-of-Interest Law," 76 Harv. L. Rev. 1113 (1963).

¹⁷ *Voltmann v. United Fruit Co.*, 147 F. 2d 514 (2d Cir. 1945).

¹⁸ In re *Eaton Electric Co.*, 120 Fed. 1010, 1011 (S.D. Ga. 1903).

which would not naturally occur to practically all judges even if they had not been written, they may prove helpful to a judge in doubt.¹⁹

Specific provision is made in 28 U.S.C. 144 for a district judge to "proceed no further" if a "timely and sufficient" affidavit of personal bias or prejudice is made against him by any party to any proceeding pending before him. But we deal here with less direct challenges to judicial impartiality.

Basically there are two general classes of conflicts of interest which may impair a judge's impartiality in a particular case—relationship to the parties and pecuniary interest. Both are treated in the Canons and in congressional enactments.

A. Relationship to the parties

A judge should not act in a case where a near relative is involved. To be a disqualification, however, it is said to be necessary for the relative to be a technical party to the case. Thus in one case, the fact that the son-in-law of a judge in a bankruptcy proceeding was secretary and director of the bankrupt was held not to disqualify the judge because the bankrupt was the party to the case and not the son-in-law.²⁰ While the statute quoted above falls to define the degree of relationship which will constitute disqualification, one Federal case suggests the fourth degree of consanguinity or affinity.²¹

Close relationship of blood or friendship to an attorney in a case may also be a disqualification, but only if the judge finds that the circumstances will "render it improper, in his opinion," to sit.²² The judge's determination is reviewable only for an abuse of discretion.

Disqualification is mandatorily required, however, whenever a judge has been of counsel for either party in the case before him.²³ This includes a judge, who as U.S. attorney had been of counsel in the same criminal prosecution.²⁴ On the other hand, the mere fact that the judge had served one of the parties as attorney in another case does not require his disqualification.²⁵

¹⁹ Madden, "Is Justice Blind?" the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 60-66 (1952).

²⁰ *In re Fox West Coast Theaters*, 25 F. Supp. 250 (S.D. Cal. 1936), aff'd, 88 F. 2d 212 (9th Cir.), cert. den., 301 U.S. 710 (1937).

²¹ *In re Eatonton*, 120 Fed. 1010 (S.D. Ga. 1903). See also 18 U.S.C. 1910 which provides: "Whoever, being a judge of any court of the United States, appoints as receiver, or trustee, any person related to such judge by consanguinity, or affinity, within the fourth degree—shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

²² *Voltmann v. United Fruit Co.*, 147 F. 2d 514, 517 (2d Cir. 1945). See also *Weiss v. Hunna*, 312 F. 2d 711 (2d Cir. 1963); *MacNeil Bros. Co. v. Cohen*, 264 F. 2d 186 (1st Cir. 1959).

²³ 28 U.S.C. 455. *United States v. Vasilick*, 160 F. 2d 631 (3d Cir. 1947).

²⁴ *Roberson v. United States*, 249 F. 2d 737 (5th Cir.), cert. den., 356 U.S. 919 (1958); *United States v. Maher*, 88 F. Supp. 1007 (N.D. Me. 1950). Cf. *Adams v. United States*, 302 F. 2d 307 (5th Cir. 1962).

²⁵ *Darlington v. Studebaker-Packard Corp.*, 261 F. 2d 903 (7th Cir.), cert. den., 359 U.S. 992 (1959) (mere fact that a judge who formerly was an active practicing attorney had as a client in former years one of the parties before him did not require the judge to disqualify himself, but question was a matter of judgment to be determined by the judge within his conscience); *Voltmann v. United Fruit Co.*, 147 F. 2d 514 (2d Cir. 1945). On the same point, the Supreme Court said in

Beyond actual disqualification, Canon 13 of the "Canons of Judicial Ethics" admonishes a judge not to permit "his conduct to justify the impression that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any party or other person." As in so many areas of judicial ethics, compliance with the spirit of canon 13 is left to a judge's conscience and commonsense.

The American Bar Association's Committee on Professional Ethics has had occasion to interpret canon 13. In a formal opinion²⁶ the committee held that a judge should, when feasible, avoid sitting without colleagues in a case where a near relative is counsel. It may fairly be said that he should not sit at all, for his relationship may be thought to have influenced his colleagues as well as himself. In a subsequent informal opinion the committee considered it not improper for a judge to sit in a case where his son was a salaried associate of the law firm representing one of the parties. The opinion discouraged this, however.²⁷

Another informal decision assessed the propriety of a judge participating in a case where his former firm is counsel.²⁸ The committee held it not improper but advised that he should decline to sit in the following three classes of cases where his former firm is counsel (a) where the case was in the firm at the time he was a member; or (b) where a regular client of the firm at the time he was a member is a party to the case; or (c) where a son or other near relative, employed by the firm, had actively participated in the case, either in the trial court or on appeal.

B. Pecuniary interest

A judge with a direct pecuniary interest in the outcome of a case or owning property that will be affected by a suit over which he presides should disqualify himself.²⁹ If, however, the interest is slight and remote, he is not disqualified. For example, a judge would not be disqualified from trying a suit involving the validity of a county bond issue merely because he is a taxpayer.³⁰ Also, a

Carr v. Fife, 156 U.S. 494, 498 (1895): * * * the ground of objection was that the judge had been, prior to his appointment, attorney for some of the defendants on matters not connected with the present case, we do not perceive that he was disqualified from trying the cause. In such a state of facts, the judge must be permitted to decide for himself whether it was improper for him to sit in the trial of the suit.

²⁶ ABA Opinion 200, "Opinions of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Grievances," 403 (1957).

²⁷ ABA Opinion C-383 (Nov. 22, 1960). The committee stated that "good taste and the desire to avoid any seeming impropriety might dictate that the particular judge not actually participate in the decision in a case where the son had actively participated in the case either in the trial court or on appeal, unless it became necessary for him to do so where there was a tie vote of the remaining members of the court."

²⁸ ABA Informal Decision 594 (Oct. 22, 1962).

²⁹ One member of the committee would omit (b). He was of the opinion that there is no more reason for a judge to recuse himself in such a situation than where a personal friend is involved.

³⁰ *In re Honolulu Consol. Oil Co.*, 243 Fed. 348 (9th Cir. 1917).

³¹ *Wade v. Travis County*, 72 Fed. 985 (C.W.D. Tex. 1896), aff'd., 81 Fed. 742 (5th Cir. 1897), rev'd on other grounds, 174 U.S. 499 (1899). See also *In re Puget Sound Power & Light Co.*, 18 F. 2d 57 (9th Cir. 1927).

past pecuniary interest in the subject matter at suit is not a disqualification.³²

To avoid problems stemming from conflicting financial interests, the Canons of Judicial Ethics offer a number of suggestions. Canon 32 warns a judge not to "accept any presents or favors from litigants, or from lawyers practicing before him or from others whose interests are likely to be submitted to him for judgment." In a formal opinion, the American Bar Association's Committee examined the case of a lawyer who made a loan to a judge on a second mortgage having no investment value.³³ Viewing the loan as one out of the usual course of investment because of the worthlessness of the mortgage, the committee expressed the opinion that the judge had violated Judicial Canons 4 (the "Caesar's wife" doctrine) and 32.

More broadly, Canon 24 holds it improper for a judge to accept "inconsistent duties * * * [or] incur obligations, pecuniary or otherwise, which will in any way interfere or appear to interfere with his devotion to the expeditious and proper administration of his official functions." This canon has evoked a number of interesting pronouncements from the bar association's committee.

In one, it was declared improper for a judge to conduct a newspaper column of comment on current news items and matters of general interest.³⁴ In another,³⁵ the committee reversed a previous opinion³⁶ and found it proper for a judge to be a member of the National Guard or the Reserve Officers Corps. The earlier opinion had ruled such membership improper because the "offices of judge and of soldier belong to different departments of government, one being judicial and the other executive in its nature, and might easily involve conflicting obligations." The reversing opinion recognized the possibility of conflicting interests but thought that they did not necessarily exist.

C. Business activities

While no Federal statute now limits a judge's business activity, Canon 25 admonishes him not to "enter into any business relation which, in the normal course of events reasonably to be expected, might bring his personal interest into conflict with the impartial performance of his official duties." Canon 26 states that a judge should "abstain from making personal investments in enterprises which are apt to be involved in litigation in the court." And Canon 29 advises him to "abstain from performing or taking part in any judicial act in which his personal interests are involved." The American Bar Association's committee has ruled that a judge should not permit the firm of which he was formerly an active member to continue to use his name.³⁷ In another opinion, interpreting Canon 29, the committee concluded "that a judge should not perform a judicial act, involving the exercise of judicial discretion, in a cause in which one of the parties is a corporation in which the judge is a stockholder."³⁸

However, in one case it was held that ownership of 20 shares of common stock of a corporation which had issued 13,881,016 shares of no-par common stock was not such a "substantial interest" as to require disqualification.³⁹ Few would contend that an interest so highly diluted offends the spirit

³² *In re Sime*, 22 Fed. Cas. 145 (No. 12860) (C.C. Cal. 1872).

³³ ABA Opinion 89, supra, note 26, at 199.

³⁴ ABA Opinion 52, supra, note 26, at 140.

³⁵ ABA Opinion 215, supra, note 26, at 429.

³⁶ ABA Opinion 22, supra, note 26, at 98.

³⁷ ABA Opinion 143, supra, note 26, at 303.

³⁸ ABA Opinion 170, supra, note 26, at 343-344.

³⁹ *Lampert v. Hollis Music, Inc.*, 105 F. Supp. 3 (E.D.N.Y. 1952).

of the canon, but the case illustrates how far-reaching the rule is.

D. Participation in private corporations

A major question which had long persisted relates to the extent a Federal judge may without impropriety participate in private corporations. In an opinion issued in 1943 the committee pronounced it improper for a judge to serve as a director of a bank,⁴⁰ but apparently the practice was not abandoned. One of the proposed statutes noted at the beginning of this article, H.R. 6048, would prohibit any association with a business corporation, beyond stock ownership. The other statute, S. 1613, would require Federal judges to make reports of their financial interests.

One can readily see that if a judge serves as an officer or director of a commercial enterprise, not only is he disqualified in cases involving that enterprise, but his impartiality may also be consciously or unconsciously affected when persons having business relations with his company come before him.

The Wall Street Journal published an article on May 2, 1963, which stirred much comment in judicial and other circles.⁴¹ The writer reported the surprising extent to which certain Federal judges had been active as directors of banks, insurance companies, and other business corporations. It is only fair to note that the article made absolutely no suggestion questioning the integrity of these judges, but it is no reflection on them to observe that the situation portrayed is pregnant with temptations and tends to excite grave doubts and misunderstandings. The only safe course, as the Judicial Conference of the United States formally determined in September 1963, is for judges to divorce themselves entirely from participation as directors or officers in business corporations of any kind.

E. Action of the judicial conference

While the conference declared its agreement with the principle of H.R. 6048, which would ban all connection other than as stockholder, it disapproved the bill "as drafted, [because it] could be so broadly construed as to make it practically impossible for a justice or a judge to participate in the most minor financial transaction, and further, * * * if enacted [it] would become effective immediately, which would not give judges enough time to comply with its provisions prior to its effective date."⁴² The conference adopted a resolution recommending that if there is to be legislation it should specifically declare what is forbidden and should also allow a reasonable time for compliance, as follows:

"No justice or judge appointed under the authority of the United States shall serve in the capacity of an officer, director, or employee of a corporation organized for profit. This statute shall take effect 90 days after the date of its enactment."⁴³

While the resolution differs from the bill as drafted, it adheres to the bill's basic objectives.

Many judges immediately withdrew from all forms of participation in business enterprises beyond stock ownership, and it is most unlikely that any Federal judge would be so unmindful of the high prestige of the judicial conference as to disobey its expressed views. In the light of this judicial self-discipline, it is doubtful that Congress will feel the need for legislation.

⁴⁰ ABA Opinion 254, supra, note 26, at 508.

⁴¹ Landauer, "Ethics Debate Stirred by Federal Jurists Who Sit on Company Boards," Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1963, p. 1, col. 1.

⁴² "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" 62 (1963).

⁴³ Ibid.

Also disapproved by the judicial conference was the bill requiring financial reports from judges, because "regardless of the merits of the proposal, Federal judges should not be singled out from other officials of the U.S. Government to make such reports."⁴⁴ Some may quarrel with the reason assigned for the thesis is supportable that judges are different from other officials of the Government. Unlike Members of the Congress, judges need not stand periodically for election, and in the public mind they are set apart from other officials in that a stricter standard of impartiality is expected of them.

Joseph Borkin, a distinguished member of the Federal Bar Association, has written an interesting volume entitled "The Corrupt Judge,"⁴⁵ in which he recounts the careers of three Federal judges⁴⁶ whose dishonorable behavior brought disgrace upon the bench. In a brief concluding chapter, Mr. Borkin addresses himself, not only to the problem of corruption, which happily is rare,⁴⁷ but to preventing lesser threats to judicial fairness. He considers legislation a risk, both because it would increase congressional control over the judiciary and because it "might tend to exaggerate the extent of judicial corruption."⁴⁸

His proposal is that the Supreme Court, under its rulemaking power, shall require Federal judges to submit confidential financial reports to it. In his opinion, the public's confidence in the judiciary will be enhanced if it knows that the Supreme Court has been informed of the business interests of Federal judges. The possession of this information, Borkin reasons, would enable the Court, under its supervisory power over the Federal judiciary, to formulate any necessary controls.

One merit of Mr. Borkin's suggestion may be that in the exercise of such supervision the Supreme Court could formulate appropriate rules to deal with a special situation that gives concern to a number of judges who have served as directors of family holding corporations. In many instances the corporation was formed for valid tax or estate reasons or merely to free the judge from the daily activities of business while retaining ultimate control over his and his family's investments. Such a corporation does not ordinarily engage in commercial activities likely to involve conflicts of interest. It is really the alter ego of the judge.

It is arguable that just as a judge may retain title to land or other income-producing property, it should be equally permissible for him to join the property in a single corporation for convenience of management. Literally the resolution forbids a judge serving as a director. Even if the resolution of the judicial conference were to permit a judge to pass on the question for himself, he would be reluctant to do so. Yet the

⁴⁴ Note 42, supra, at 63.

⁴⁵ Borkin, "The Corrupt Judge" (1962).

⁴⁶ Chief Judge Martin T. Manton of the Second Circuit, a man of the first magnitude of distinction, J. Warren Davis of the Third Circuit, and District Judge Albert W. Johnson of the Middle District of Pennsylvania. For an interesting sequel to two of Judge Davis' corrupt decisions, see Judge Soper's opinion in *Root Refining Co. v. Universal Oil Products Co.*, 169 F. 2d 514 (3d Cir. 1948), where a specially constituted court, designated by Chief Justice Vinson, vacated the earlier judgments.

⁴⁷ In the entire history of the Federal judiciary there have been only eight impeachments, of which four resulted in convictions. In a few other instances, judges were allowed to resign and impeachment proceedings were either not voted or abandoned. Borkin, supra, note 45, at 219 et seq.

⁴⁸ Borkin, supra, note 45, at 209.

Supreme Court, in the broad perspective gained from the possession of all the facts, could determine where to draw the line with justice to the public interest and to the judges.

JUDGE'S PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

A somewhat different, but related, problem arises as to a judge's proper role in community affairs. Canon 25 states that a judge "should avoid giving ground for any reasonable suspicion that he is utilizing the power or prestige of his office to persuade or coerce others to * * * contribute * * * to charitable enterprises."

In 1942 the committee ruled that a judge should not permit the use of his name in pamphlets, booklets, or similar publications for the purpose of solicitation of funds for charitable purposes.⁴⁹ The same principle has been applied to soliciting funds for civic causes, such as art museums.⁵⁰ Clarifying its views, the committee later said that canon 25 does not require "members of the judiciary to separate themselves from the social responsibilities necessarily incident to good citizenship, good moral character and to the religious convictions in which they have been reared."⁵¹ Nevertheless, the committee is of the opinion that solicitation should be left to others than members of the bench and that judges should not permit their names to be used in solicitations.

Aside from these two prohibited areas, the committee expressed its belief that there is "a considerable realm of activity in which a judge might appropriately participate in the philanthropic, civic and ecclesiastical life of the community."⁵² Wisely, the committee did not attempt to define this area. One example of permitted activity, however, was identified this past December when the committee held it not consistent with the canon for a judge to serve on the board of directors of a nonprofit hospital.⁵³

It has been the practice of many judges to appear and speak at public dinners sponsored by charitable, educational, and religious groups. A judge should certainly abstain from asking for funds, and if direct solicitation is to take place at a meeting it is better for him to absent himself. It may be argued that a judge should refrain from participation in any public meeting of a charity, even if there is no personal solicitation and the purpose is merely to stimulate general interest in the organization, because, concededly, an ultimate objective is to encourage financial support. But surely it is not the intent of the canons to eliminate such innocuous activity on the judge's part. Nor does it appear to be the desire of the American Bar Association's Committee on Judicial Ethics to preclude judges from lending their prestige generally to worthy public institutions, apart from the use of their names in their fundraising campaigns. Such impersonal gestures, expressions of sentiment and confidence, are unobjectionable.

What is objectionable, however, is for a judge himself, or through his secretary or other agent, to urge attendance at these functions or to solicit contributions or the purchase of tickets from sponsoring organizations. The judge should be scrupulous to avoid any action which might carry an implication, however tenuous, that those refusing to share his enthusiasm may fall into disfavor with him.

It is impossible to identify the precise point at which well-meant civic activity may

⁴⁹ ABA Opinion 238, supra, note 26, at 474.

⁵⁰ ABA Informal Decision 327 (Aug. 17, 1960).

⁵¹ ABA Informal Decision 603 (Nov. 2, 1962).

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ ABA Informal Decision 706 (Dec. 6, 1963).

fall under the shadow of possible coerciveness. No purely mechanical rule will serve all our needs. Here, as in many areas of ethics, a conscientious judge's sense of propriety and taste should steer him on a proper and useful course.

There may well be room for some differentiation between the permissible activities of trial judges and appellate judges, or, more likely, between judges speaking in their own localities and those appearing before audiences in distant places. A judge addressing lawyers and others with whom he is in daily official contact may expose himself to suspicion of coercion more readily than one whose jurisdiction is more widespread and whose personal contact with his hearers is remote. This is not the place to make a final judgment as to the possible merits of the above suggestion, but both bench and bar may benefit from careful exploration of this phase of the subject.

CONCLUSION

When a man takes his seat on the bench, his relationship to society automatically changes. Justice Frankfurter, answering the question, "Does a man become any different when he puts on a gown?" said, "If he's any good, he does."⁵⁴ The black robe is a powerful symbol, meaningful to the judge and to all who may come within the range of his authority. All stand when the judge enters the courtroom, and the manner in which he is addressed, "Your honor," attests his special status. Among Federal officers, only judges serve for life and are constitutionally shielded from reduction in pay. In return for the veneration and the singular privileges, the public expects, and rightfully demands, that the judge shall live up to his honored position. But the danger of conflicting interests lurks wherever there are men, and it would be naive to expect judges to be superhuman.

A judge's self-imposed disqualification in a particular case is not always an adequate remedy. In a multiple-judge court, there is still the danger that he may wittingly or unwittingly influence, or be thought to influence, his colleagues who do consider the case. If a judge disqualifies himself because of stock ownership in a publicly held corporation, few would suggest that his interest would infect his colleague who substitutes for him. Yet if a judge were an officer or director of a commercial enterprise and stepped aside for that reason, his successor judge could be under some embarrassment because persons may believe that he may not completely ignore the interest of the judge who has withdrawn. The far better course is to avoid the conflict.

We have come a long way toward a better understanding of what impartiality demands. Despite the rare but highly disturbing lapses, the Federal judiciary need not be ashamed of its record; but the process of refining our standards is a continuing one. A recognition of this truth is at the heart of the recent resolution of the judicial conference, which will be viewed by bench, bar, and public as a sound step—for if judges are to preside as trusted arbiters of the marketplace, they should not participate in the market's operation. Unquestionably there is need for the further refinement of our thinking in this area. Bar associations, the organic instruments of practicing lawyers, can, in conjunction with the judges, help significantly. Judicial self-discipline should then provide the necessary measures.

It is fitting to conclude by returning to the thought expressed earlier in this article—a thought central to the entire subject—namely, that judges are not only expected to be impartial but are charged with the re-

sponsibility of avoiding all appearance of partiality. Only in this way can the honored symbol of the judicial institution continue bright and undiminished.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I ask the indulgence of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to yield to me briefly?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming yields to the Senator from West Virginia, and the time will come from the time granted to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time I consume be not deducted from the time of the Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator.

SENATOR RANDOLPH REFUTES SENATOR SIMPSON ON REASONS FOR SALE OF LIVESTOCK IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on September 14, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] referred to an Associated Press dispatch from Lewisburg, W. Va., which dealt with the disposal by auction of the Morlunda herd of Hereford bulls and cows.

The article carried the comment by the reporter, John Hall, that—

Sources close to the family stated the sale was undertaken to avoid both corporation and personal income taxes.

Our colleague from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] commenting on the article, used this as further justification for his opposing the Appalachian Regional Development Act and implied that the conditions which brought on this public auction of a valuable Hereford herd were created by an unfavorable tax climate in the State of West Virginia. The able Senator from Wyoming stated:

It is the responsibility of every State to provide a climate to make it possible for business to grow, to progress, to flourish. When businesses are forced to the auction block because of the tax structure of that State, such a climate has not been provided. This situation, unfortunate as it is, substantiates my conviction that this proposed legislation (the Appalachian Regional Development Act) is not an aid but a hand-out.

It is not my intent here to defend section 203 of S. 2782, the pasture improvement section. As the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] stated on September 15, the majority leadership has already accepted an amendment deleting that section, and I have served notice that I shall attempt to amend this program in the next Congress to provide for assistance of this sort to Appalachian farmers.

However, I choose at this time to correct the entirely unwarranted inference of the junior Senator from Wyoming regarding the relationship of the West Virginia tax structure to the disposal of the Morlunda herd. A member of my staff spoke yesterday with John Hall, the

author of the article referred to by the Senator from Wyoming, and received his categorical statement that the sources referred to in his story were speaking of Federal corporation and personal income taxes and not the tax structure of the State of West Virginia.

Though I am not personally informed as to the reasons why the Nelson family chose to dispose of such a large part of their livestock at this time, it is reasonable to presume that the capital gains benefit in the disposal of animals valued at such figures as \$4,600, \$8,200 and \$29,500 would have some bearing on the matter.

My office has been further informed by the author of the article that the Nelson family is not going out of the cattle business. On the contrary, some 60 or 70 of the 115 bulls were not disposed of in the recent auction, and it is my information that Morlunda Matador the 10th, a bull valued in the neighborhood of \$100,000, is still retained. It is my understanding that the Nelson family is transferring their operation from one of breeding stock to raising steers for commercial beef.

If the article referred to by the Senator from Wyoming has any bearing on the Appalachian regional development program, it would seem to indicate that, contrary to the position of the minority, at least some parts of Appalachia offer conditions favorable to cattle raising. It would, therefore, seem to add to rather than detract from the long-term justification for such a program as that originally recommended in S. 2782.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMPSON. I will yield if it does not come out of my time.

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

ALASKA CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending S. 49, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, with House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 49) to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, to cooperate with the State of Alaska to study and report on the manner and extent to which the United States shall participate in the celebration in 1967 of the centennial anniversary of the purchase of the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Congress hereby recognizes the Alaska Centennial Celebration (hereinafter

⁵⁴ Frankfurter, "Chief Justices I have Known," 39 Va. L. Rev. 901 (1953).

referred to as the "celebration") to be held at various locations in the State of Alaska during 1967, not only as an observance by the people of the forty-ninth State, but as an event of national significance.

SEC. 2. (a) To implement the recognition declared in the first section of this Act, the President, through the Secretary of Commerce, may, in his discretion, cooperate with the Alaska Centennial Commission in the planning of the celebration and may, in his discretion, conduct a study to determine the manner in which and the extent, if any, to which the United States shall be a participant in and exhibitor at the celebration.

(b) The study authorized in subsection (a) may be made, in the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, by personnel of the Department of Commerce or under contract by one or more recognized professional experts in the fields of historical observances and industrial showmanship; and the findings derived from such study, together with such recommendations as the Secretary may deem appropriate (including detailed recommendations with respect to the manner and extent of United States participation in the celebration and the estimated itemized cost of such participation), shall be submitted to the Congress not later than March 15, 1965.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$15,000 to carry out this Act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for recognition by the United States of Alaska's one hundredth anniversary under the American flag, and for other purposes."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on August 20, 1963, the Senate passed S. 49, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Alaska Centennial Commission, and for other purposes.

On September 1, 1964, the House passed S. 49 with amendments.

The sponsor of the Senate bill has advised the Committee on the Judiciary that he desires that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I therefore move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 49.

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

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives amending Senate Concurrent Resolution 92.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 92) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 2, strike out line 2; on page 2, strike out line 3; on page 2, strike out line 10; on page 2, strike out line 25; and on page 3, after line 21, insert:

SEC. 2. The Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of the alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act

of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

XXXXXXXXXX Anghelatos, Franghi.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Senate Concurrent Resolution 92, to which the Senate agreed on August 6, 1964, recorded congressional approval of suspension of deportation in 52 cases in which the Attorney General had suspended deportation pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended.

On September 15, 1964, the House of Representatives agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 92 with amendments to delete four cases and to add the case of one applicant for adjustment of status under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended. One of the cases deleted has been withdrawn by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move, therefore, that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate Concurrent Resolution 92.

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

The motion was agreed to.

SENATOR THURMOND IS WELCOMED INTO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am delighted to take the floor in extending a warm and genuine welcome to Republican Senator STROM THURMOND. There is no Member of the U.S. Senate for whom I have greater respect and admiration. The courage and forthrightness of his decision and the eloquence, logic, and veracity of his speech last night have quadrupled my already high esteem for this Senator who has cast aside the shackles of an antidemocratic Democrat Party.

Let us look briefly at the background of this man who has had the resolve to take this virtually unprecedented step and join the party to which his convictions and his philosophy are wed.

Senator THURMOND, as we all know, is distinguished as a scholar, as a soldier, as a statesman, and as a lawmaker. STROM THURMOND is one of the Senate's distinguished band of Senator-generals. He has a war record that few can equal. He volunteered for service the day the United States declared war against Germany. He served with headquarters of the First Army from 1942 to 1946. He saw action in the European and Pacific theaters and participated in the invasion of Normandy with the 82d Airborne Division. His plethora of decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal with the V, the Army Commendation Ribbon, and the Purple Heart.

Throughout his long and illustrious political career, this newest Republican Member of the Senate has displayed a closer affinity to principles than to political litany.

None can forget his dramatic march from the Democrat National Convention in 1948, after which he became a Na-

tional States Rights candidate for President of the United States.

STROM THURMOND's first term in the Senate came as a result of a write-in campaign in 1954, and his dramatic resignation as a Senator 2 years later fulfilled a solemn pledge made to the people of his State. As history shows, STROM THURMOND was renominated and reelected and renominated again in 1960 with a vote nine times that of his opponent.

Across this great Nation, Americans of every political persuasion are asking themselves today what were the factors in Senator THURMOND's decision to turn from the Democrat Party and join the Goldwater Republican Party. What causes a man to turn his back upon the party under whose banner he has served in the Senate for a decade? The answers to those questions are contained in Senator THURMOND's stirring address delivered last night to the people of his State:

The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

I read Senator THURMOND's speech and, like most Americans, I watched him on the television screen. Never have I endured such an emotional impact. It is an articulate, forceful, and dramatic speech—but it is much more than that, for it indicates the hundreds of hours of soul searching, and the weeks of introspection, from which came this decision. As with every decision that he has made throughout his long and furiously independent career, his action was forthright, sincere, and dynamic.

I quote again from the text of my colleague's speech:

The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of government, has sent our youth into combat in Vietnam, refusing to call it war, and demanding of our youth the risk of their lives without providing either adequate equipment or a goal of victory.

And to those who would say, as the President had planned to say at Miami this week, that Cuba is no threat to the United States and that the administration has acted wisely and purposefully in the Caribbean, Senator THURMOND said:

The Democratic Party, as custodian of government, faltered at the Bay of Pigs and in the Cuban crisis of 1962—at the very moment when victory was at hand—and thereby forfeited Cuba to Soviet domination, subjected our Nation to the peril of an armed enemy camp 90 miles from our shores, and opened the doors of the hemisphere to Communist subversion.

Speaking from the professional knowledge gained as a general in the Army of the United States, Senator THURMOND warns that:

The Democratic Party has attempted to degrade and downgrade our men in uniform in order to discredit their warnings of the grave dangers to our security from the administration's weak and senseless defense policies.

It is impossible to read Senator THURMOND's speech without asking, "Can the Democrat Party be the power which purportedly commands the allegiances of 60 percent of the American public? Can this be the political party which controls the Congress and controls the Senate and the White House?"

When the distinguished minority leader spoke of former President Herbert Hoover at the Republican National Convention, he remarked that no man had been so "drenched in contumely." My only regret in regard to Senator THURMOND's courageous decision is that he, too, will be "drenched in contumely" by the Nation's leftwing press, by hate mongering cartoonists like Herblock whose cartoon in this morning's Washington Post hits a scurrilous and all-time low, by those who pay lipservice to our Constitution as they seek to destroy it, by those whose concept of foreign policy is represented by the umbrella of Munich, and by leftwing extremist groups, such as the ADA.

Senator THURMOND will feel the slings and arrows of an outrageous press. He will feel the sting of the most foul-mouthed vituperation imaginable coming from a Democrat who is a past master at authoring the loquacious garbage of which political smear is forged.

No man is more aware of this than Senator THURMOND, but as he told a hushed and reverent Nation last night:

In the final analysis, I can only follow the course which in my heart and conscience I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country, and the freedom of our people.

I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a course which I am convinced is right.

Even as I welcome this courageous American patriot to the Republican side of the Senate floor, I find myself suspecting that his forthrightness and courageousness will provide the impetus for other worried cognizant, and courageous Democrats to do the same. I say to them: If you believe in our principles, we are glad to have you.

Senator THURMOND has cast aside the shackles of a misled and mistaken Democrat Party to work for the election of the one man who can reverse America's headlong rush toward socialism—the man who even now is carrying his message to the Nation.

As the new Republican told his people last night.

The party of our fathers (the Democrat Party) is dead. Those who took its name are engaged in another reconstruction.

The principles of our forefathers live now in the course of a presidential nominee. The man who has gained the Republican nomination for President against all the odds and opinion polls, and who now has control of the Republican Party, is one who believes in and abides by our Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask that the full text of Senator THURMOND's dramatic speech before the people of his State be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I reiterate that I am delighted to welcome my friend, colleague, and neighbor—whose office is next door to mine—to the Republican side of the Senate of the United States.

Our cause has suffered in his absence. It is enhanced by his presence. He has served in the Senate with honor, distinction, probity, and wisdom—and always with intellectual honesty and a complete moral commitment to his task.

Again I say, "Welcome, Senator THURMOND. You are among friends who admire and respect you." We agree completely that in the struggle facing our party and the Nation "the future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake" as you said so eloquently last night.

I can think of no more fitting termination to this welcome than to echo your own warning:

If the American people permit the Democrat Party to return to power, freedom as we have known it in this country is doomed, and individuals will be destined to lives of regulation, control, coercion, intimidation, and subservience to a power elite who shall rule from Washington.

EXHIBIT 1

TELEVISION ADDRESS OF SENATOR STROM THURMOND TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA ON THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL RACE, SEPTEMBER 16, 1964

My fellow South Carolinians, it has been wisely said that, "For evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Particularly is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis.

The people of South Carolina have placed me in a position of trust in the National Government. From this position, I have observed at close hand the conduct and factors which have brought about this crisis. I would, therefore, be most derelict in my duty were I at this time to remain silent.

I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

The Democratic Party has used the Government as a propaganda machine to distort the truth and deceive the public to the extent that a sub-Cabinet official can publicly defend the administration's "right to lie" and remain in office, unrebuked.

The Democratic Party has invaded the private lives of people by using the powers of government for coercion and intimidation of individuals.

The Democratic Party has rammed through Congress unconstitutional, impractical, unworkable, and oppressive legislation which invades inalienable personal and property rights of the individual.

The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in government and party offices.

The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of Government, faltered at the Bay of Pigs and in the Cuban crisis of 1962—at the very moment when victory was at hand—and thereby forfeited Cuba to Soviet domination, subjected our Nation to the peril of an armed enemy camp 90 miles from our shores, and opened the doors of the hemisphere to Communist subversion.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of Government, has sent our youth into combat in Vietnam, refusing to call it war, and demanding of our youth the risk of their lives without providing either adequate equipment or a goal of victory.

The Democratic Party now worships at the throne of power and materialism.

The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

The Democratic Party, as custodian of Government, has adopted the practice of taking your money by taxation and then using that money to attempt to buy your votes.

The Democratic Party is attempting with alarming success to change the Congress from an independent body representing the people to an amen chorus for Presidential proposals.

The Democratic Party has endangered the security of the Nation by negative decisions on military preparedness, preoccupation with bilateral and unilateral steps toward disarmament, and by use of the military services domestically as instruments of social reform.

The Democratic Party has attempted to degrade and downgrade our men in uniform in order to discredit their warnings of the grave dangers to our security from the administration's weak and senseless defense policies.

The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action, the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments.

The Democratic Party is converting our constitutional federated Republic into the same type of disciplined and submissive servant of an elite power group as it has made of the Democratic Party itself, as all

who watched the Democratic convention on television can bear witness.

The top leaders of the South Carolina Democratic Party have chosen to abandon the traditional independence of the State party, and to lead the people of South Carolina down the road to serfdom mapped by the National Democratic Party. The party of our fathers is dead. Those who took its name are engaged in another reconstruction, this time not only of the South, but of the entire Nation.

If the American people permit the Democratic Party to return to power, freedom as we have known it in this country is doomed, and individuals will be destined to lives of regulation, control, coercion, intimidation, and subservience to a power elite who shall rule from Washington.

Fortunately, for those of us who cherish the traditional freedom entrusted to us by our forefathers, there is another choice this year. Although the party of our fathers is dead, the principles of our forefathers live now in the cause of a presidential nominee. The man who has gained the Republican nomination for President against all the odds and opinion polls, and who now has control of the Republican Party, is one who believes in and abides by our Constitution. He has demonstrated his fidelity to freedom, independence, and the Constitution by his actions and his votes in the U.S. Senate. I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of Government and rule themselves.

I cannot foretell what success will reward Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's efforts to return the National Government to its constitutional role and our Nation to its rightful place of strength and respect in the world. Nor can I predict with certainty how long those ideas and ideals of Senator GOLDWATER which I share will prevail in the councils of the Republican Party which he now heads. I do know that we have a fighting chance under BARRY GOLDWATER's leadership and that we are welcomed to his banner.

I know also that the course for the Democratic Party has been set toward socialism and arbitrary rule. I know further that the Democratic Party's line of succession is Hubert Humphrey and Robert Kennedy, with Walter Reuther and Joseph Rauh pulling strings behind the scenes.

I have worked within the framework of the Democratic Party, because experience proves it necessary to work within the framework of one of the two national parties to be effective. I have, nevertheless, maintained independence of judgment on issues and have conscientiously tried to represent the people of South Carolina, seeking to protect their rights and freedom. I shall always maintain my independent judgment and action and put the people of South Carolina first. To do this in the future I must work within the framework of the Goldwater Republican Party.

For me, there is no alternative. The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake, and this requires that I do everything in my power to help BARRY GOLDWATER return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency. This also requires that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government.

It will be a long and hard struggle, with many battles to be fought. At this time, one objective takes precedence over all others—electing BARRY GOLDWATER President. As we give the presidential race our undivided effort, I hope all our people, and particularly our young people whose future hangs in the balance, will join this cause with enthusiasm.

To my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion. But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country, and the freedom of our people.

I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has given a powerful and brilliant welcome to our colleague, Senator STROM THURMOND, who has elected to cross the aisle and join the Republican Party, in his deep conviction that the Republican Party is the party that basically can restore this country to a Federal system of government and insure the country against slipping either rapidly or surreptitiously into a socialism which neither the Founding Fathers contemplated nor the people of this country contemplate now.

Those of us who know STROM THURMOND—and I think all of us do—unite in the opinion that he is a man of deep spiritual and political convictions, and that he is now exhibiting, as he has exhibited in the past, the utter courage to stand by those convictions.

He will be criticized by many, of course. He is aware of that. Manifestly, his change of affiliation, or his change of party association, is not motivated by any illusion on his part that he will advance his own selfish political fortunes. He knows the dangers. He knows the perils of the step that he has taken.

He undoubtedly is not motivated by any sense of selfish, personal advancement. He is, as we know and as we are all convinced, motivated by a deep sense of patriotic responsibility.

There is no person in the Senate, no person in my acquaintance or of my knowledge, who has a deeper or more vigorous patriotism for the preservation of his country and our system of government than has STROM THURMOND.

We welcome him because of his integrity of purpose, because of his courage, because of his convictions, and because of the disabilities for himself which he knows he is creating by this move.

We also know that the move comes from that conviction of sincerity and deep obligation to the country which he loves. Whether there are those who agree or disagree with him is beside the point. He has seen what he believes to be his overriding duty in his conscience and under his patriotism and under his devotion to the system of government which he, and, I am convinced, most of the American people, if they understand the situation, would like to preserve. He is laying his political life and his friendships on the altar of freedom and that system—and let the consequences be what they may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My own feeling is that the consequences which will flow from this act of conscientious righteousness, in doing what his convictions tell him he must do for righteousness, political or moral, in the long run and in the end, will be consequences from which STROM THURMOND will come out with honor, and in which his memory and his associations will be applauded for his honesty.

We welcome him, as we welcome any person of good will and sincerity who wishes to join us in our cause this year, which, without the same or exact meaning, but by paraphrasing the words which the President used the other day, means that this election is the most important election that we shall ever see because it will direct the future course of history of this country, and will direct the future course of this country, but not along the lines that the Democrat philosophy would take us; will determine whether we shall slip further into centralized government and contribute further to the destruction of our Federal system of government, and will determine whether we shall preserve the Government of the founders of this country, a Government of private responsibility and private enterprise and freedom today, which has made this country great.

I respect STROM THURMOND, and as an individual I welcome him to the ranks of those of us who sit on this side of the aisle, in conscience and in fairness and in political responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that I could not be present in the Chamber earlier at the time Republican Senators were conveying greetings, a warm welcome, and sincere appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], on the occasion of his leaving the Democratic side of the aisle to come over and become a member of the Republican Party.

I was busily engaged with the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations, of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is the chairman, while we were writing, and I am happy to say agreeing upon the Billie Sol Estes report which was approved this morning and will be printed and released before the end of the month. I could not leave that important assignment. That is my reason for speaking now.

Mr. President, this is indeed a historic occasion. I do not wish to let the event go by without some comment on it.

This is almost an entirely unprecedented action in the history of the Senate. I have had some research made by the Library of Congress on the subject. There have been similar actions, but, so far as the researchers have been able to discover, nothing identical with the action announced last evening by the Senator from South Carolina.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for example, who used to sit on this side of the aisle, resigned from the Republican Party and became an independent in October of 1952, the researchers of the Library of Congress advise me.

However, he did not join the Democratic Party at that time. It was a matter of 3 years later, on February 17, 1955, when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] announced that he would become a Democrat, moving his seat to the other side of the aisle.

This record, for the benefit of historians and researchers in the future who may wish to find this information, appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 18, 1955.

The Senator from Oregon first publicly hinted at the fact that he was about to switch from the Independent Party—which he had organized and was operating as a solo venture up until that time—in a television interview on January 13, 1955. The following month, he joined the Democratic Party.

In the early 1900's, two Senators—Fred Dubois, of Idaho, and Henry M. Teller, of Colorado—switched parties as the result of monetary issues involving silver—lent the circumstances, the issues, backgrounds, and the procedures were quite different from those applicable to Senator THURMOND's historic and dramatic decision.

There is no record in the history of the Senate of a Senator moving, by one fell swoop, from the Democratic side of the aisle to the Republican side of the aisle, or from the Republican side of the aisle to the Democratic side of the aisle, without doing so by intermediary steps and affiliations.

This is an occasion which I am confident historians will be discussing a hundred years from now, and upon which political scientists and others will be currently commenting upon day after day, week after week, month after month, for a considerable number of years.

Mr. President, let me relate an interesting anecdote which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] told me one day when I was visiting him casually.

He told me that his grandfather ended his service in the War Between the States in April 1865. At that time, he was one of the soldiers of the South. He had no horse, no mule—no means of transportation. The Senator from South Carolina told me about the experiences of his grandfather, who walked the entire distance home to Columbia, S.C., to help undertake the long and painful task of rebuilding and reconstructing the South. It is interesting that today, almost 100 years later, another courageous Thurmond has taken another walk.

Mr. President, I believe that it took as much courage for the Senator from South Carolina to walk from the Democratic side of the aisle to the Republican side of the aisle to establish his new political home as it did for his grandfather, when he walked from Appomattox, Va., to Columbia, S.C., after the War Between the States.

Today, the shortest and most direct path to human freedom and opportunity in this country, under the concept of government that rates the private citizen in importance above the Federal politician, is that short but significant walk of 5 feet from the Democratic side of the aisle

to the Republican side of the aisle in this Chamber. We have an unprotected and unguarded boundary. There are no armed forces on either side. We welcome recruits and the country will be well served as our troops are reenforced.

Speaking as a Republican Senator, if there are others who feel motivated, as did the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, to make that walk of 5 feet over here, we have an abundance of seating capacity. We shall welcome you with open arms. We shall recognize that this is indeed a mark of statesmanship.

It so happens that the senior Senator from South Dakota takes some special pleasure and gratification on this historic occasion. This action is in conformity with a formula of procedure which the senior Senator from South Dakota started advocating nationally in the late forties and to which I have devoted a great deal of time and effort ever since.

I have made upward of 100 speeches on this general theme. Incidentally, six or eight of them, at least, were made in the great State of South Carolina. I have discussed this pattern of performance in more than 40 States of the Union. I have also discussed it on television and radio network programs. I have discussed it in speeches before partisan and nonpartisan groups. I once had the pleasure of appearing jointly on a national network show on this theme with Eleanor Roosevelt. I am happy to record that she agreed with me that there was merit in the concept that we should begin a realignment of political forces in America, that such a realignment was long overdue, that we must establish clarity of posture and eliminate confusion of conviction within both of our major political parties. Thus, individual voters, patiently waiting for that day which comes on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November every 4 years, will have a clearer choice when it comes to voting not only for President and Vice President, but also for Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

There is no merit or need to detail why there is this complexity, confusion, and conflict within our major parties. Frequently the differences between members of the same party in the Senate, and in American political life, are, in fact, greater than the difference between members of the two different parties. The least that can be said in criticism of this situation is that it gives the poor voter a pretty foggy and inadequate choice when he is trying to vote a ticket to set the pattern that he would like to have America follow.

The idea occurred to some of us late in the forties, that by a transmigration of political forces in America, we could retain all the benefits and guarantee a two-party system without the fragmentation which has occurred within both parties. Since at least 1936, or the National Convention immediately following that one, we have come closer in this country to having a four-party system than an effective two-party system. There are two Democratic Parties. There are two Republican Parties. Frequently, the wings of the two parties are

in greater conflict than the conflict between parties in political, economic, and social problems, and in platforms, and pieces of legislation.

Senator THURMOND's action is a good omen. I would dare to hope that there are others in the Senate or the House who would make the same trek in the interest of bringing to the American public a better and clearer choice for a sharper difference when it comes to decision time in voting in our national elections.

I would not be at all surprised to learn that several Representatives might follow the sterling and courageous example of the Senator from South Carolina. I am sure that even those who may disagree with his decision will have to attribute to him a degree of political courage which is too seldom evidenced in this Republic.

I believe that for every public official—every Senator, Representative, Governor, or legislator, for every elected official great or small, and for every former public official now in private life, who makes this choice, takes this walk, and places his convictions in the party with which he feels most comfortable, and which is more closely identified with his picture—that for every citizen in past or present public life, who makes that determination, there will be 1,000, perhaps 10,000 people, in private life who will say, "This is also the proper thing for me to do."

In this country, we are properly dedicated to a two-party system. But, to serve the American will and to get the optimum results from the advantages of a two-party system, it is important that parties stand for something clear, something definite, and definable, something specific, something homogeneous, something in which the members of the party can consistently work as a team for the achievement of their goals. When parties become opportunistic, members of the party tend to differ too greatly from the membership of their own party. It is proper and appropriate therefore that there be on occasion this shift from one party to another.

We are all dedicated primarily to America. And, we are dedicated to great causes. We should not remain slaves to a party label. We should not become captives of a party designation.

It seems to me that, too frequently, our associations in this country are confused by semantics. Members seem to feel that because they have traveled for so long with colleagues in a certain party, they should become partisans ahead of patriots, that they should move in the direction that the party chiefs demand, that they should yield to the urgings of the leaders of the party team, or that they should succumb to the pressures or the twistings of people high in office within that particular party.

It is good for America that the Senator from South Carolina has taken this courageous action, this salutary action, this action as a step in our political realignment which is surely in the interest of a better America.

There are two ways in which this realignment of parties—to which, as I say, I have devoted at least 15 or 16 years

of study and exploration—might operate. It is good that we now give some additional thought to where this can eventuate and what might happen as a result of this example which we have witnessed here today.

There could be, and perhaps there should be, a sort of realignment of parties across the country by individual voters at the precinct, county, and community level. There should be an Operation Reregistration, perhaps, in many areas of America. I am free to grant if that occurs, there may be Republicans who will register Democratic. If they feel that the philosophy, principles, platforms, programs, and policies of the Democratic Party as it is presently constituted and is presently operating are more in harmony with their personal convictions, so be it.

I am confident, too, that there are many areas of the country, North, South, East, and West, in which people who are now registered as Democrats might in "Operation Reregistration" go individually and collectively to the place at which they have the party registration office within their respective counties and register over as Republican. I point out that that is one thing that might well be done to help effectuate a meaningful party realignment in this country. Each individual citizen should search his soul on an occasion like this to see whether he is comfortably, conveniently, consistently and happily registered within the political party in which he shares the goals and programs toward which that party is moving.

If he does not, in good conscience, by reregistration, in a movement from one party to the other, following the Strom Thurmond example, he serves himself and his country best by identifying himself with the party in which he does find himself happy with his associates, where he finds himself in harmony with most, if not all of the party's objectives, where there is a maximum of creative opportunity for him and a minimum of hypocrisy—which is always involved when citizens belong to a party and find themselves in great disagreement with the bulk of the objectives which the party espouses.

I hope that this realignment process will continue. It would be good insurance and help to save our two-party system. It is the best way I know of to prevent a rump party from developing, or the development of third, fourth, and fifth parties to the point we lose the manifest advantages of a two-party system.

One of the great virtues of our country is the fact that we have maintained a two-party system for so long. We maintain that system effectively and enduringly, however, only when political parties have significance, when they have meaning, when they have teamwork, when they have members who in general and on the basic issues believe in the causes embraced by the respective parties. When parties become merely an opportunistic bridge over which candidates can walk to obtain office, while assuming none of the obligations of party membership, and accepting only a very few of the purposes and policies of the party in

which they are registered, political parties become a device for deceiving the people and confusing the situation instead of a device for serving the people and our country well.

Mr. President, I refer Senators and others to the entire text of the statement made by Senator STROM THURMOND in his television and radio address to the people of South Carolina, which was placed in today's RECORD by Senator SIMPSON while he was speaking on this subject earlier today.

In addition to political realignment, which is a responsibility of individual citizens, a decision for them to make, and an opportunity for them to achieve, I suggest that at a national conference held here in the Mayflower Hotel—and I shall insert in the RECORD the specific date when it was held, for I must check the records in my office—under the auspices of the then Senator Owen Brewster, of Maine, and the senior Senator from South Dakota, the possibilities of political realignment were discussed and a report was issued thereafter. We recommend some steps which could be taken in that direction.

We recognized that we would run into difficulties primarily from what is called the courthouse crowd. I suppose perhaps in some places where mayors are elected by political designation, it could be called the city hall crowd. But I speak primarily of the courthouse crowd. For example, we found that there are many sheriffs, auditors, and county officials in strong Republican States and in certain counties—for example, counties in the State of South Dakota which have never in the lifetime of the State voted Democrat—comprising the county courthouse crowd who would say, "Do not redesignate the names of the parties. If you put some other label on them, there goes our meal ticket. There goes our assurance of reelection. So long as we can be renominated as Republicans, we are home."

In my home county of Lake County, which is a fine county in South Dakota, we at one time elected a dead Republican county commissioner over a live candidate running on the Democratic ticket. I think it was an improvement, at that, over the other choice. But it shows what happens. The courthouse crowd recognizes how important an established party designation actually is. It is a tough nut to crack.

At the conference held in 1951, I believe it was, we were trying to find new labels for the parties which would tend to make it easier for people presently dedicated to a party to dedicate themselves to principle instead.

What is true of the county courthouse crowd in certain strong Republican counties is equally true of the county courthouse crowd in areas of the South, which, I am sure, since the War Between the States, have never voted Republican. I am confident that in Senator STROM THURMOND's own State of South Carolina it will be found rather difficult for a sheriff in South Carolina in some county, or some other county official, even to consider the possibility of dropping the label of the Democratic Party

and accepting another label, because there would go his meal ticket. There would go his job insurance. So the idea of renaming the parties fell by the wayside. We ran up against the difficulties facing the county courthouse crowd, North and South, Republican and Democrat, rural and urban when it came to bringing about that kind of "Operation Reregistration," required to produce a wholesale realignment of parties by changing the names of the parties themselves. I still think, however, it is highly important to America that there be some type of action to provide more cohesion, more consistency, and more significance to each of our existing political parties whether or not their names or labels are ever changed or modified.

For the information of the Senate and for students of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an insert from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 8, 1951, which reports in full the 1951 Mayflower Conference on Political Realignment to which I have alluded.

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

IS THERE NEED FOR A SOUTHERN DEMOCRAT-NORTHERN REPUBLICAN POLITICAL ALLIANCE?

(Extension of remarks of Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, October 8, 1951)

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, so many Members of Congress have made inquiries about the recent developments leading to the creation of a Committee To Explore Political Realignment and the basis upon which this committee is studying the causes and cures for present trends toward socialism in America that I am asking consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short summary of some of the background data which lead to the decision to devote continued effort and study to the proposal. The information in the summary outlines the reasons for this approach to an analysis of our political and economic problems, and it indicates how interested citizens can get in touch with the committee of distinguished and informed Americans who have undertaken to explore areas of political activity and cooperation which are beyond the immediate concern of either of America's two major political parties.

Many Americans are beginning to realize that our traditional two-party system, which means so much to the continuance of our free way of life, is in danger. We are approaching a situation—if we have not already reached it—in which we are operating with a two-party system in name and a four-party system in function.

This grows out of the fact that differences between segments within each of our two major political parties are actually often greater than the differences between the two major parties themselves. It also reflects itself in a similarity of stated platform purposes in the planks of national party platforms—"me-toolism"—and subsequent repudiation of these planks and purposes by many, perhaps a majority, of the Members of Congress to whom most of them are directed. As a consequence of the lack of realism which is thus manifesting itself in present political groupings, which appear to be based much more upon geographical, traditional, or historical factors than upon a grouping around basic economic, social, and political concepts—Mr. and Mrs. John

America, the voters to whom the country belongs and who are supposed to direct its destiny, find themselves confused, frustrated, and disillusioned when they have their opportunity one Tuesday in 4 years to vote for or against a candidate for President and a set of policies to be followed for the next 4 years.

In 1948, over 40 million Americans stayed away from the polls and refused to vote in a national referendum in which they were given no clear-cut choice between platform promises and between the pronouncements of the presidential candidates. Either way, the voters figured, they would get about the same foreign policy, about the same trends toward more boards, bureaus, and coercive commissions in Washington, about the same shirking away from a bold return to the concepts of home rule, private enterprise, individual initiative, and the reward-of-merit opportunity system which has made America American.

In a great speech which has been widely quoted and frequently reread, Donald R. Richberg, of Charlottesville, Va., once executive director of the NRA and now a member of the law faculty at the University of Virginia, highlighted the foregoing and many other facets of the political phenomena which today in America keep like-minded Americans from voting for the same candidate for President, and in support of the common ideals and objectives which they share and hold. Speaking on September 11 before a New Haven, Conn., audience comprised in large part of the members of the industrial and business fraternity of Connecticut, Donald Richberg took as his theme "The Murder of a Candidate"—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 14, 1951, page A5605—and warned America how our entire way of life was in dire danger because of the political unrealities and shackles involved in the present picture. Richberg is a prominent member of the executive committee of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment and his address at Yale merits careful study by all citizens desiring to do something more effective toward stopping our drift toward socialism than merely to curse their misfortune or to cry out in futile consternation at the future they confront.

On September 14, 15, and 16, a 3-day conference was held in the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington to determine whether like-minded voters whose party registrations differed but whose affinity to principle was identical could work, plan, and vote together. The question considered at this conference, which was attended by about 100 important Americans about equally divided between southern Democrats and northern Republicans, was this direct and simple one. Is it desirable and can a way be found for Americans who think alike to have a method of voting alike effectively regardless of how they are registered politically and of where they live geographically?

The 3-day conference answered the first part of that question decisively and affirmatively. Unanimously it was agreed that it is desirable. The creation of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment was the result of the determination of the conference to find an equally decisive answer to the question, "Can a way be found?"

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a digest of an address which I delivered at the closing banquet of the conference which organized and set in motion the Committee To Explore Political Realignment. I hope serious students of what is being undertaken by this committee will read Donald Richberg's speech entitled "The Murder of a Candidate," but the background data and information set out in my digest may be helpful in suggesting some of the causes and some of the cures for the present dangers as they are developing in America with steadily increasing speed and potency.

This digest also helps to clear up any misunderstanding about what the new committee proposes to do or not to do.

Most emphatically, it is not the plan of the committee to organize or promote or propose a third party in America; rather, it represents a determination to strengthen our two-party system by giving new strength and significance to each of two major party groupings.

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

"SHOULD NEED FOR A SOUTHERN DEMOCRATIC-NORTHERN REPUBLICAN ALLIANCE IN 1952 BE EXPLORED?"

"Several times in our earlier American history, we have had a realignment of our political parties and a regrouping of American voters around the most urgent and significant issues of the era. Each time this has occurred, it has provided a good tonic for our country; our people have forged ahead to new levels of economic opportunity and individual freedom.

"There are many in America who think that political and economic trends over the past 15 years and the current basic issues confronting our voters today indicate that need for another regrouping of political adherence. It has been suggested that for the election of 1952, at least, steps be taken in that direction by exploring the possibilities, the potentialities, and the practical procedures involved in developing a workable political formula which would enable Americans who think alike to vote alike for President and Vice President in the next election.

"Prior to 1936, the so-called two-thirds rule operating in the convention of the National Democratic Party gave the 11 traditionally Democratic States of the South a near veto in the nomination of party candidates and, as a consequence, in the formation of dominant party policies. At the 1936 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, however, that two-third rule was abrogated. The results of the elimination of the two-thirds rule have been significant and prophetic in both the Democratic and the Republican Party positions on the new issues that have arisen in our country. In the Democratic Party, elimination of the two-thirds rule has shifted the balance of power away from the States of the traditionally Democratic South to the States of the North which, whether or not they vote Democratic in November, have power enough and votes enough in the convention to enable the large city delegations which predominate in those States to write the platform and nominate the Democratic candidates.

"In each successive Democratic convention since 1936, the southern delegates have consequently played a smaller and smaller role in determining convention decisions. As a result, the traditional allegiance of the Democratic Party to States' rights has been abandoned. Platforms have been written containing planks repugnant to the people of the South. Candidates are chosen who ignore or openly defy the opinions of southern voters. No effort is made to meet the wishes of southern citizens. Convention speakers actually castigate and criticize southern voters and viewpoints as "reactionary"—or even worse.

"After the convention, the major candidates do not campaign in the South, relying upon the conviction that 'the South is in the bag'—'it will vote Democratic regardless'—there is no other place for the South to go. In recent campaigns, except for four States in 1948, that attitude has paid off in votes for the fair deal high command. The Democratic machine has won—even though the objectives and principles of a large majority of southern citizens have lost.

"As a consequence, each succeeding Democratic convention courts the North and evi-

dences contempt for the South more and more openly and flagrantly. The result has been a steady shifting to the left—toward the concept of completely centralized Government in Washington—toward an American brand of socialism—toward the death of all the rights of all the States. Put in its bluntest terms, many northern Democratic voters are vehemently and vigorously anti-southern.

"How did the abrogation of the two-thirds rule in the Democratic convention of 1936 affect the Republican Party and its attitude? Viewing the statistics of their humiliating defeat in 1936, as Republicans met in convention in 1940, party leaders realized that the new political alliance of the big city Democratic machines of the North who play politics for profit and the leftwing pressure groups who play politics for power with the unhappy but traditionally and habitually Democratic voters of Dixie had evolved a vote-getting if not a public-serving formula which could control the country. Recognizing the great obstacles involved and the inevitable delays in building a Republican-winning party in the South, the Republican convention in 1940 started turning its eyes to what appeared to be the only available votes with which to win a national campaign. Consequently, 'me-tooism' in Republican circles was actually born at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 and the successful Democratic campaign which followed. In 1940, the Republican platform and the Republican presidential candidate moved in the direction of what the New Dealers (Democrats) were offering to present voters. True, the Republican strategy of 'me-tooism' failed—but it gained votes over the disastrous results of 1936. In 1944, and again in 1948, Republicans felt compelled to move even further in the direction of offering a platform and a campaign designed to appeal to northern voters of our metropolitan cities and the organized pressure groups to whom it had been demonstrated the new strategy of the New Dealers (since 1936) was so successfully appealing in each succeeding campaign. Believing itself to be unable to garner sufficient votes to win in the South, the Republican Party began offering almost identical appeals to the same group of voters that the Democrats had wooed and won in the North—especially in our industrial States with the largest metropolitan cities. In 1948, more than half of our American voters stayed home from the polls because they felt themselves deprived of a clear-cut choice of issues and objectives in that political campaign.

"Thus, American political history has witnessed some striking and basic changes since 1936. Tragically, organized political and pressure groups in some 11 vast metropolitan cities of the North have thus come to have the balance of power in political campaigns and are largely calling the tune to which presidential candidates of both parties are compelled to dance. The results are today clearly apparent in the trends of our national policies which are veering away from basic American concepts of limited government, individual freedoms, and States rights toward various shades and degrees of some type of European socialism and centralized power.

"Only an informal, unorganized, intermittent alliance comprised in the main of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in Congress has prevented these trends from becoming even more destructive and disastrous. In each Congress since 1936, this congressional alliance between North and South has operated with increasing effectiveness and frequency but it—alone—has been unable to stop the continuing extravagances in both fiscal and political policies. Trying to direct the destiny and direction of government from the congressional level against the resistance and over

the objections of a determined President is like trying to operate a railroad train from the caboose.

"If more is to be done than to apply the brakes, slow down the trends, and bring about minor economies in government, it is necessary to elect an engineer to man the White House locomotive who agrees in principle with the trainmen in the caboose. Election of such an engineer is what is made exceedingly difficult by our prevailing unrealistic, unrepresentative political party groupings in which geography, tradition, and comparatively meaningless political labels combine to defeat that objective.

"The importance of allying like-minded voters in America by some political formula enabling them to give effective expression to what is the major viewpoint of our citizens is highlighted by the tragic experience of Great Britain from which intelligent Americans should draw a realistic lesson.

"Great Britain is now in the throes of socialism precisely because in that country the opposition to socialism is divided into two political groupings by unrealistic devices just as today is the case in the United States. Both the Conservative and the Liberal Parties of Great Britain oppose socialism. This is evidenced by the fact that all Members of the House of Commons from both of these parties voted against the nationalization of steel which is a step that breaks the back of private enterprise and individual ownership wherever it occurs. The Socialists had a bare majority in the House of Commons which enabled them to put through that nationalization of steel by a narrow but effective margin. However (and this is the important point) had there been no Liberal Party candidates for the House of Commons in the last election and had the voters thus had to decide definitely between Conservative or Socialist (Labor) candidates, it is a reasonable assumption that the vast majority voting Liberal Party (against socialism) would have voted Conservative Party (also against socialism). Had this occurred in the large number of British constituencies in which all 3 parties had candidates in the field and in which Socialist candidates consequently won, there would now be a majority of 29 Conservative Party members in the House of Commons. In that event, steel would never have been nationalized in Britain and the Socialist scourge would have been ended in that country in the last election.

"The British experience is almost an exact parallel of what is happening in America. It is a stern warning to us all as to what may happen and as to what seems likely to happen unless we find a way so that those who think alike can vote alike for President here in the United States.

"If nothing is done to change the political thinking and performance of leaders in the ranks of our two major political parties, it is now entirely probable that again in 1952 we will find neither political platform providing American voters with a consistent pattern of opposition to totally centralized government, current trends toward socialism, bureaucratic extravagance, and that neither political party will raise the standard of States rights which of and in itself has done so much to prevent the total centralization of power in Washington which is an essential prelude for any form of totalitarianism.

"How then is it possible to regroup political strength in the United States to give those who oppose the welfare state here the maximum opportunity for success and to preserve our 2-party system as an effective device for registering realistic political convictions?

"At the start it should be noted that there are various approaches, methods, and degrees of change and modifications in established procedure which might be employed

in the next election. The merits and demerits as well as the practical application of these various methods should be carefully surveyed. At this time, no single source has available sufficient factual data to suggest the adoption of any one specific form of procedure. There is, however, the maximum method and the minimum method (and several methods in between) for approaching an effective combination of like-minded voters in determining the decision this country confronts in 1952.

"The maximum method would be to have the southern Democrats and northern Republicans, who have been cooperating in Congress, evolve from their informal alliance a formal, continuing, and cohesive organization. This would mean a courageous reorganization of both Houses of Congress before next year's political conventions. It would mean that these like-minded legislators (representing in large part Democrats of 11 Southern States and Republicans of Northern States) would elect leaders of both Houses, select committee chairmen, and form themselves under some such name as the southern Democrat-Republican alliance to designate the group. If this were done, some southern Democrats and some northern Republicans might prefer to move out of such a regional regrouping of congressional legislators as here suggested and find their place among the members of the loyal opposition. Once such adjustments were made, however, this southern Democrat-Republican alliance could then call upon the country to elect a President and Vice President whose position on political and economic issues would be in harmony with it, and those preferring to support the doctrines of the Fair Dealers and leftwingers would be forced to hold a convention to nominate an opposition ticket whose standard bearers would share platform convictions with those who would then be in a cohesive minority in both Houses of Congress.

"Such action in Congress might well require more political courage and risk than it is realistic to suppose will be demonstrated, but it is one direct and clear-cut method for making the election of 1952 a definite choice between two clearly conflicting philosophies of government. From such action could come a permanent, political realignment in America which would give every voter in his own precinct a clear-cut choice between philosophies of government and which would give the members of each party a cohesive quality which now is sadly lacking. Such a regrouping of American sentiment into homogeneous, realistic, operating party units would provide America with an effective and responsible two-party system with sufficient room between the positions of the opposing parties to attract a substantial group of independent voters whose allegiance would intelligently be sought in each election by each major party as then constituted.

"It is extremely unlikely, however, that this maximum method will be employed by Congress under prevailing circumstances. Before Congress would break with tradition and with existing majority and minority alignments, it would probably require one or more of the following eventualities: (1) The emergency of a vital, urgent issue virtually requiring a permanent rather than a temporary alliance of cross-party members to resolve the issue; or (2) a great ground swell of grassroots sentiment reflecting itself clearly in Washington as an indication that the home folks behind both parties to such an alliance were insisting upon it; or (3) the impetus of many resolutions and expressions by groups of citizens, associations, organizations, and possibly even official urging of conferences of Governors or other elected public officials. Hence, it seems probable that if the North-South political alliance is to operate effectively for the 1952 election

one or more of the minimum methods will be employed.

"The minimum method, which would at this time seem to be more realistic and probable than the maximum method, would involve only comparatively safe steps to be taken by delegates at both of the major political conventions.

"For example, Republicans at their convention would: (1) Adopt a platform consistently and clearly opposing further centralization of power in Washington and dedicating the party to a rational and realistic implementation of the great American doctrine of States rights and limited government; (2) faithfully pledge themselves to meet the so-called civil rights issue within the purview of the doctrine of States rights by encouraging an improved economic status and equality of opportunity for minority groups through utilizing State governments and State-appointed boards and commissions to implement and enforce constructive State laws and regulations; (3) nominate a President and a Vice President willing to fight a hard-hitting, honest campaign on basic American doctrines and who are personally popular and acceptable to the voters of the South.

"Southern Democrats at their national convention should: (1) Seek the restoration of the two-thirds rule; (2) endeavor to have the convention pledge itself to the rational and realistic application of the doctrine of States rights; (3) induce the convention to avoid committing itself to a compulsory national FEPC and other coercive and authoritarian steps in the field of civil rights and economic endeavor; (4) nominate candidates who will faithfully pledge themselves to stand on such a platform and to conform with it when elected.

"Should both conventions write such platforms and nominate such candidates, the trend toward national socialism would be stopped regardless of which party won the election because collectivism cannot engulf this country if States and individuals are permitted to exercise their independent judgment on political, economic, and social issues.

"Should the Republican convention write such a platform and nominate such candidates and the Democratic National Convention, because of domination by big city, northern Fair Dealers, write a Fair Deal pro-Socialist platform and nominate Harry Truman or somebody to the left of him, southern delegates and other States rights minded delegates might walk out of that convention and thus set the stage for other steps and activities leading to the formation of an effective southern Democrat-northern Republican pattern of cooperation in 1952 either in the November election at the electoral college level, or in the determination of the presidential contest in the House of Representatives should that be necessary.

"What are some of the steps and tactics that might be employed in such an eventuality to bring the effective voting strength of like-minded Americans together (regardless of geographic location or political preference) at either the electoral college level or at the level of the House of Representatives should the election be decided there?

"Some steps and methods for evolving such a pattern of effective cooperation on a working alliance for 1952, include the following:

"1. Preconvention conferences between leading southern Democrats and northern Republicans might determine in advance of the conventions that the Fair Deal crowd and Trumanism will again (for the fifth time) control the Democratic National Convention. By that time, it might be clearly indicated that the Democratic National Convention moved by the compulsion of pressure groups and big city machines is certain to offer America a platform and a slate of candidates dedicated to the superstate, an American

version of Fabian socialism, and the complete destruction of the rights of States and perhaps of private enterprise and our established financial structure. In that event, Republicans might well consider nominating as a vice presidential candidate a Jeffersonian Democrat, selected through consultations with southern leaders to run with a Republican candidate for President who is personally acceptable to Dixie and who will run on a platform adopted by the Republican convention which is consistent with the viewpoint of sturdy Americans in both South and North who believe in the rights of States, the rights of individuals, and the American concept of limited government; or

"2. Following nomination by the Republican convention of Republican candidates for President and Vice President who on their records and by their personalities and convictions are acceptable to the South, these candidates might early in the campaign pledge themselves to select three or four prominent, capable, and popular southern Democrats for some of the more important Cabinet positions. In that way, the electorate, both north and south, would be offered an all-American team selected from both sectional majorities as a choice against the Fair Deal team now in control or seeking election on the so-called Democratic ticket. In that way, too, the identity of the membership of both teams would be in large part known to the electors so their choice in November could be based on complete information and a clear-cut idea of what to expect from each team; or

"3. Either separate State Democratic conventions or an all-South Democratic convention could be held in Dixie after the frustrations and disappointments at the National Democratic Convention. Out of such activities could come southern Democratic candidates to run on the ballots of Southern States under the Democratic banner, or, as an alternative, a series of favorite-son candidates each of whom would appear as the Democratic candidate for President on the ballots of his particular State. Either technique would subtract from the Truman ticket substantially more electoral votes than the States' rights movement received in its surprisingly successful effort in 1948 which demonstrated to America that there is a limit to the insolence, derision, and abuse that the voters of the South will countenance and accept from the leadership of the National Democratic Party. This method could easily give the southern electors an effective balance of power at the electoral college level or in the House of Representatives—wherever the election is decided, if the northern Republicans won a minimum of 138 votes of the 403 outside the South, an achievement they have not made alone since 1928. It could very probably result in either a Republican or a southern Democrat ending up as President—possibly with a President from one party and a Vice President from the other. It seems clear that electors who are pledged to oppose Trumanism but who are unattached to either major candidate would determine the final choice for President unless without the votes of the South to help bolster the forces of Truman, the Republican candidate should win in the November voting. Some people have referred to southern electors selected by either of the foregoing methods as free electors. Certainly they could contribute historically to a free America; or

"4. Southern Democratic convention action—by individual State parties or an all-Dixie convention—could select Democratic electors running in the Democratic column with the regularly nominated Democratic candidates for State and local office, but pledged openly to support the Republican nominees for President and Vice President. This would add southern voters to the ticket opposing Trumanism rather than simply

subtracting southern voters from the Truman ticket. Either course or some modification of suggestion 3 or 4 would give individual voters in the South a clear-cut choice in November between candidates favoring the States rights or candidates favoring the police state concept included in the welfare state.

"Other suggested courses of action are open to southern Democrats and northern Republicans sincerely eager to mark 1952 as the end of our trends toward total centralized political power and economic socialism. All of them recognize that to make such an effort of 'allied political forces' successful in 1952 both parties to the alliance (North and South) must be treated as equal partners. Seniority status in Congress, patronage considerations, et cetera, for participating southern Senators and Congressmen must be respected and protected. The goal of such a regrouping and realignment of voting forces in 1952 is to make neither the southern Democratic Party nor the Republican Party the sole beneficiary of ensuing victory. The real beneficiary must be America, and those Americans who want to reinstate and reinforce our American success formula of individual initiative, private ownership, free enterprise, and the safeguarding of the rights of States and the rights of individuals. This is the essence of personal liberty, the operation of which has made our country great and kept it strong; this is also the essence of the great American concept of limited government in contrast with the European concept of limited freedom for the individual as permitted by an all-powerful central government.

"To this end, a Committee To Explore Political Realignment might well be created from among representative and respected southerners and northerners, equally included, so that the full possibilities and potentialities of various courses of action might be studied and appraised and so that a single course of action could be recommended if the committee's research develops a formula which promises success.

"It might be possible for a Jeffersonian Democrat or a Republican advocate of the limited-government concept to win a presidential election under existing unrealistic political groupings even though they virtually confine Republican vote-getting opportunities to 36 of the 48 States and at the same time virtually deny Constitution-minded Democrats of the South any effective voice in either the National Democratic Convention or the November election. However, to maintain in power a national administration dedicated to American concepts of limited Federal Government, private ownership, individual liberties, and solvent fiscal policies, it is highly desirable, perhaps necessary, to find a method for offsetting and defeating the existing alliance by which pressure groups and northern Democratic city machines utilize the voting strength of Southern States in the electoral college to support policies antagonistic to the American pattern of economic and political behavior. Exploration of all practical procedures by which southern voters who support our constitutional concepts can use their votes to reinforce those precepts rather than to reject them would, therefore, seem to be in the public interest.

"Few should disagree with the objective of evolving political procedures whereby the same political and economic concepts can be represented both in the Congress and in the White House and its associated departments of government. It has been many years since this situation has prevailed in Washington. Only as this situation is recreated and implemented can an effective two-party system bring to this country the great advantages and dividends which are inherent in our cherished two-party political system."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, neither the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] nor I myself is a member of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment, although both of us attended the Mayflower conference in mid-September and although both of us for many months have been conferring with people from throughout America who are earnestly searching for an effective formula by which to provide every American voter with a clear-cut choice and an effective ballot in 1952. We declined membership on the committee roster in the conviction that nobody presently active in the political life of our country as an officeholder of important public trust should attempt to influence the decisions and deliberations of the committee. The committee's exploratory activities must not and will not be in support of any specific candidate, either Republican or Democrat. The committee is equally divided between Democrats and Republicans—it is truly a bipartisan, objective, determined public-serving effort to study, analyze, and report on the political practices of our times and to recommend to the country in due course the steps it believes Americans can take between now and that important Tuesday in 1952 when the whole destiny of human liberty may well be determined by what happens at the polling places of America.

For the information of all interested Americans, however, who may want to correspond with the committee members or its staff, or who may want to have a part in the great task of constructive service it has undertaken, I submit a statement of facts which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

"Officers of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment:

"Cochairmen: Albert W. Hawkes, Montclair, N.J. (Republican), and Edward A. O'Neal, Florence, Ala. (Democrat). (Mr. Hawkes is a former Senator from New Jersey, a former national president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Mr. O'Neal was for 16 years the national head of the American Farm Bureau.)

"Executive secretary: Joe T. Lovett, Columbus, Ohio, past State commander of the Kentucky Department of the American Legion.

"National treasurer: John W. Finger, 960 Park Avenue, New York City, recent past president-general of the Sons of the American Revolution.

"Members of the executive committee: Albert W. Hawkes, chairman, Montclair, N.J.; Edward A. O'Neal, Florence, Ala.; Edward R. Burke, former Senator from Nebraska; Donald J. Cowling, former president, Carleton College; Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey; Horace A. Hildreth, president, Bucknell College, ex-Governor of Maine; Felix Morley, author and educator; Donald R. Richberg, University of Virginia Law College.

"Headquarters of the committee is in Washington, D.C. Address: Suite 302, The Kass Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington 5, D.C. Telephone: RE 7068.

"A long time ago Mr. Justice Chase put it well when he defined the United States as 'An indestructible Union of indestructible States.' It is the hope of the Committee To Explore Political Realignment that it may make a constructive contribution to the indestructibility of a free America and of the home rule authorities and rights of each of its States and all of its citizens. The committee seeks support and counsel as it forges forward toward that goal."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, STROM THURMOND has picked up the flag and carried it proudly. He is marching to the stirring tune of "Dixie." He has made the walk from the wrong side to the right

side of the aisle in the Senate in conformity with the dictates of his judgment and his conscience. He has shifted from a party in which he has found himself unhappy to a party in which, I hope, he will find himself happy. I am sure that he will be happier over here if we can bring about a more general realignment of the party postures in this country. His action is certain to hurry that important result.

Mr. President, I wish now to allude to a second type of political element which is possible, feasible, and, I am beginning to surmise, is also probable. We gave some thought to that. The conference to which I have called attention, by the way, was addressed by Donald Richberg, one of the great early New Dealers, one of the fine erudite Americans of his era, who at that time was either dean of the Law School of the University of Virginia or the head of a department down there. I am not sure which. In all events by 1951, Richberg had broken completely with the New Deal and its paternalistic programs. Under Dr. Richberg's guidance and direction in that weekend conference we gave a great deal of thought to another type of political realignment. I should like to describe what it is because it is really foursquare in many ways with the action taken by Senator STROM THURMOND.

Mr. President, I allude to these subjects in some detail today because, this concept is not a "Johnny come lately" procedure for the senior Senator from South Dakota, and having worked at it so long, and I realize that not only will historians read the RECORD that we are writing today, but that many people, curious about why such an historic event should occur as it did and when it did, will read the RECORD currently to try to write some interpretative reports, editorials, and comments about the signs of our times.

This other type of political realignment is one which could occur on any day in the U.S. Senate or in the House of Representatives. It might logically, I suppose, occur on the opening day of any Congress. But it does not have to do so then. It would mean only a reorganization within the Senate and within the House of Representatives whereby we would elect our presiding officers, our committee chairman, and name our committee members on the basis of the members of those bodies who have the greater degree of compatibility with each other, caucusing together, quite regardless of party label, while an opposing group of Senators and Representatives, also with the greater degree of compatibility, would caucus together in another room, quite regardless of party label, thus creating a congressional majority and a congressional minority reflecting a cohesion of convictions instead of merely convenience of party labeling.

What would we then have? We would then have in the Senate and in the House a working majority and a working minority, and within the ranks of both we would have a degree of compatibility and homogeneity and consistency and comradeship, so that instead of taking 10

months of a year for a Congress to do what it should do in 6, we could accomplish our work and get back to our home areas to discuss public affairs with the people on a logical schedule of congressional business.

One of the current difficulties, as we all know and as we see it here now, is that we cannot even pass the foreign aid bill because the party in power which, until yesterday, exceeded us 2 to 1 in number, has such disunity and disagreement among its own members that it cannot even agree upon a legislative schedule.

Mr. President, this is a strange sight we see here, in the middle of a campaign. We strive with great vigor to get enough Members of the House and Senators on the floors for live quorums so that we may not have to adjourn because of absenteeism which has become notoriously bad. We try to meet, but we spin our wheels and accomplish nothing, because one-third of the Members of the Senate would like to be, and should be, home campaigning, and all the Members of the House would like to be, and should be, home campaigning. And that is precisely where many of them are today, while a few of us remain here accomplishing precisely nothing.

Why this delay? Why this dilatory action? Why this ineptitude? Why this great inability of the great Senate of the United States to function on such a routine piece of legislation as deciding how much we should make available in foreign aid by an authorization act to meet the responsibilities of this great country in the year ahead?

There is within the party of the majority here such a sharp division that we are confronted with inaction and we cannot move and we cannot turn a wheel; so time marches on, but there is no progress and no action.

Let us envision what might happen if there were more Senators and more Representatives, if there were enough Senators and Representatives, on the opening day of the next Congress to meet and organize the committees and organize the respective Houses on the basis of compatibility of convictions regardless of party. We could put one label on one caucus room which says "whites," and a label on another caucus room which says "blues." Nobody would want to enter through a door which bore the label "reds," so we would not put that label on a door. We merely confine the labels to "whites" and "blues"—neither Republican nor Democrat, but one group having a set of principles to which the white group is going to subscribe, and another group embracing a set of principles to which the blue group is going to subscribe. Then we would say, "We invite to the caucus room marked 'blues' all those who agree with us." The same applies to the "whites." We will take any legislator into those caucus rooms who desires to enter and appoint him to a committee. Let us call everybody in the House or Senate either a "white" or a "blue" until we can think of a better name to designate what would then comprise a meaningful and homogeneous "majority" and "minority" party. Labels do not mean much. I hope freedom

never succumbs in this country because of labels, or because we are slaves to a semantic situation. I hope that self-governing people, after nearly two centuries, can find a way to escape such a trap, such slavery, and such danger, resulting from conformity to party rather than to purpose or to principle.

Thus Congress could be realigned. Among the 100 Members of the Senate surely there are more than half who would agree on one set of convictions and something less than half who would agree on another opposing set of convictions. The majority and minority leaders would be selected accordingly. Then there would be a group with a consistent opinion, a majority, which could get something done, and we would not be grounded on the shoals of inaction.

The party in power is now hamstrung because the commander is leading an army which is riding off in all directions, completely divided against itself. We can no longer distinguish friend from foe or supporter and opponent by party labels.

This could happen. It could happen tomorrow, if we had the courage—which we do not. This could happen at the beginning of the next Congress, if such were the desire. In fact, it might happen then.

I write the suggested formula into the RECORD primarily because the people have something to say about it. The people have something to say about whom they send here. The people have something to say about whether we should return or remain at home. Their letters and counsel and telephone calls and visiting delegations have something to say about how we act when we are here, how we vote, and how we respond to legislative proposals.

So, if the people of America would like to have a Congress in which there is a majority which means something, which is marked by unity instead of disunity of both the majority and minority, in which Representatives and Senators would reflect the objectives, ideals, and dreams of the people back home, instead of what is written in some party platform or pasted up in some party label, or requested by some top-ranking politician, so candidates are forced to say, "Yes, I am a Democrat, but I am against this great major accomplishment of my party. I disapprove of these tactics. I do not like this or that running mate or that platform." What does it mean? It would be so much better to have the convenience and effectiveness of traveling along life's road with like-minded people.

There is a third way in which the people of America can recapture self-government, a third way in which the people of America can start governing themselves again, a third way in which the people at home once again can become more important than Federal politicians in our scheme of things, a third way in which the people can urge those who represent them, with success, to represent them as they were elected instead of living in an era of responding whenever Federal politicians say, "You must do this or that," or "You have to have

signboards on roads, or you cannot have them, or we are going to give you money or take it away from you," and other kinds of pressure from the center to the periphery.

The pyramid of government is upside down today, because the great power is exercised by a few at the narrow top. That should be only the peak, with the strength of the pyramid in the bottom, moving toward the top, reflecting the desires of the people instead of responding to the demands of the Federal politicians.

What is this third way? We should reform the electoral college system, which is so inequitable, so iniquitous, and so unjust that I can say without fear of contradiction, successful or unsuccessful, that the rottenness incorporated in our present electoral college system comprises the taproot of all the evils that plague the desires of freemen to stay free in America today. This is an electoral college system by which the victor, the winner, can report at the electoral college level his success and at the same time take all the votes of the loser—steal them, if you will—and add them to his own, and report those votes to the electoral college, in direct opposition to the way in which they were cast.

I wonder how many Americans who understand the evils of the electoral college counting system really believe we can continue to function as freemen in America based on a formula so false, so wrong, and so wicked?

In 1960, two colleagues, or former colleagues, two fine young men, were running for President. I knew them both very well. I served on committees cheek to jowl with both of them. When the votes were counted in California, Dick Nixon, the favorite son, had won. It was not what we call an overwhelming victory; it was only by a fraction of 1 percent of the votes in California. What happened at the electoral college? When it came up at the electoral college and where the chairman of the electoral college committee called the roll, and the name of California was called, what happened? Did he say that Dick Nixon had won by less than 1 percent of the votes cast in California? He said nothing of this kind. Under the wrong rule which is in existence, as he had the right to do, he said:

Mr. Chairman, California voted unanimously for its favorite son, Dick Nixon. We did not give that Downeasterner Jack Kennedy a single vote. Nixon got them all. Put California down as voting unanimously for Nixon.

Does that make sense? Is that fair? Could it happen in a football game? If the presiding officer's alma mater were playing against its biggest rival, and the score was 7 to 6, but the local newspaper reported it as 13 to nothing, the alumni and students would lose no time in tearing down the building of the newspaper that reported such a fiction.

But that happens under the electoral college system.

What happened in New York? The Downeasterner Jack Kennedy succeeded in carrying the State of New York. New York State has 43 electoral votes. It is

true that Jack Kennedy barely carried the State of New York, by almost the identical fraction or percentage by which Nixon carried California; namely, less than 1 percent.

In the electoral college, however, when the time came for New York to report its vote, New York said:

New Yorkers are the friends of their neighbor from Massachusetts, and the State of New York votes unanimously for Kennedy. We did not give that westerner from out in California a single vote in the Empire State of New York. Kennedy got them all.

New York voted 43 to nothing for Kennedy in the electoral college. That is the only place where it counts. But New Yorkers cast almost as many votes for Nixon as they did for Kennedy.

How many think that is right? How many think that is fair? How many think that we can rescue freedom from the pressure groups of the metropolitan areas of this country with an unjust, unfair electoral college counting system such as that?

Would Senators like to know how unfair it is? Let us look at twins, two identical boys born out in Kansas. They graduate from school in their hometown. They dress alike, act alike, achieve alike. Then they go to college. They look alike, progress alike, learn alike, achieve alike. They each receive, as they should, a scholarship from Harvard University. They go to study law in their postgraduate years. Once again they live together, learn together, look, act, and achieve alike. Even friends cannot tell them apart. They both graduate summa cum laude with identically high grades.

Twin brother John moves to New York City to practice law. Twin brother Jim moves to Wilmington, Del., to practice law. After 30 years, what happens? They continue to progress. Each becomes chief justice of his State supreme court. Twin brother John is chief justice of the highest court of the State of New York. Twin brother Jim is chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Delaware. What identity of achievement. What equality of opportunity. It is a great manifestation of what can happen under the American system, indicating that people of equal ability, of equal striving, of equal hard work, of equal diligence, and of equal good character have achieved equal success.

What happens however, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, when they vote for President? Twin brother John goes to vote in his precinct in New York City and casts 43 votes for his choice for President, because when he pulls the election machine lever he puts in motion 43 electors. If his is the tie-breaking vote, he, in fact, elects 43 electors, and sends them to the electoral college.

But poor old twin brother Jim, voting at the same hour in the same election in Delaware, in his own precinct in Wilmington, when he pulls down the lever, votes only three times, activates only three electors. If he casts the tie-breaking vote in Delaware, three electors move into the electoral college and cast the determining vote.

We talk about civil rights. We talked about them quite a while in the Senate this year. What happens to the civil rights of twin brother Jim in Delaware? I will tell Senators what happens. He is not a second-class citizen, he is not a third-class citizen, and whether he is black or white, he does not have any worry when it comes to wondering whether another person will cancel out his vote, or that he will be denied the right to register or be denied the right to vote. Regardless of color or anything else, and by pure accident of geography, one individual American has 14 times as much voting authority as another individual American, purely by accident of geography.

I hope that the State of Delaware will go through with its plan to carry into the Federal court, within the next few months, a lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of the electoral college system, which grades an American's capacity to vote purely on his post office address and by accident of geography. The States should have this extra vote power, but not the individual citizen.

I defy anyone who reads the Supreme Court decision in the Alabama reapportionment case, with its pious comments about one man-one vote, and with its statement that a man who happens to live in a city should not be denied the same voting power that an individual who lives in the country has, to apply that reasoning to the electoral college system, and come up with anything other than the unanimous decision that the electoral college mechanism employed in this country is unconstitutional and invalid and iniquitous and injurious to the functioning of freedom in this country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is making a fine argument. I wonder how he can contend that the Constitution itself is unconstitutional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me, inasmuch as the electoral system is written into the Constitution and, I believe, was a part of the original Constitution, that to challenge the constitutionality of the electoral college might be to challenge the Constitution itself as being constitutional.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the Senator will find the specific mechanism that the Senator from South Dakota complains about is not written into the Constitution. I am referring to the general ticket, winner-take-all system by which electors are now named. In fact, it was not employed in the first three national elections. The first three national elections in this country employed the district system of choosing electors. The breakdown as to the establishment of electoral strength by States is in the Constitution, but not the en bloc kind of system about which I complain.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me recite some history in this connection, because historians should write more about this point. I believe that in the first three national elections every elector in the electoral college—as the Senator from Louisiana properly points out, the electoral concept is employed in the Constitution—was selected by the voters of his State voting for two electors at large, because the State had two Senators, and voting for the electors which each State gets because of its representatives from special presidential election districts, which in the main were synonymous with congressional districts. This is referred to as the district system. It worked very well. But even away back yonder, in the dim and distant past, there must have been something in the drinking water of the city of Boston, Mass., which produced shrewd politicians. The politicians of the city of Boston went to the legislature of the State of Massachusetts and said:

We can have a great deal more influence in this young country of ours, in its swaddling clothes, in determining who will be President if the legislature will pass a law requiring all the electors in the State to vote as a bloc for whichever candidate for President gets one more than half the votes in the State of Massachusetts.

It appeared to be a good idea, and the legislature bought it. So at the next electoral college, to the disappointment and disillusionment of the other young States in our Commonwealth at that time, they learned that Massachusetts had decided to vote for only one candidate or the other, throwing the whole kit and caboodle of electoral votes one way. Naturally Massachusetts practically elected the President by itself.

All of us have listened to the interesting speeches of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER]. He looks so young, I dislike to call him senior. But the senior Senator from Wisconsin, by whose courtesy I now have the floor, has given many economic discourses, from which we have learned much. He has spoken on the subject of "Gresham's Law of Money." Gresham's Law of Money teaches us that bad money drives good money out of circulation. Senators know that; our guests in the gallery know that.

If anyone has two \$1 bills in his pocket, and, under the economics of the New Frontier, he must now have \$2 if he expects to buy \$1 worth of merchandise, and if one of the bills is a brand-new dollar bill, which was picked up in Washington, where the currency is printed, and the other is an old, crumpled one that he brought here from home—a dog-eared piece of currency—when he decides to buy something for \$1, I will wager that the one he gives to the merchant will be the dirty one, rather than the new one.

That works all through human life. Bad legislation drives out good legislation. A bad practice, such as that initiated by the politicians in Boston, will drive out good practices.

So every other legislature in our young country said, "We will get even with those canny New Englanders. We will catch up with the shrewd politicians of Boston. We will, by legislation, also compel our presidential electors to vote en bloc. We too will employ the winner-take-all sys-

tem." So the fat was in the fire, and it is still there.

In the State from which the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] comes, the legislature, which had been struggling with this problem for a long time came close to passing a State law making it illegal to bind the electors of Louisiana to vote in the same way. Souder heads said, "This is not the way to correct the situation." There is an organization there to correct this electoral college namby pamby but by using State action only it was pointed out, "This is going to hurt Louisiana. It will put us in a bad light. It must be done on a national basis."

At the desk, waiting to be voted on—we could vote on it today, but I am afraid we will not vote on it or anything else today; that is certain—is Senate Joint Resolution 12, which would correct this situation. It provides that it would be illegal for State legislatures to require electoral college groups to vote as a unit. Presidential electors would be required to vote in conformity with the way in which they were elected by the people of their States, two at large, and one from each of the congressional or electoral college districts from which they get their electoral representation. This is called the district plan of reforming the electoral college. Adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 12 would correct the current evils in our electoral college disparities and injustices.

That one simple step, that constitutional amendment, a Senate joint resolution, jointly sponsored by Republicans and Democrats, on which the Senate voted one evening a few years ago—it was not an identical duplication of the one now at the desk, but was close to it—carried by an overwhelming majority, but it lacked the constitutional two-thirds majority required to get it before the people. That is the proper way in which the government can be given back to the people. It will be tough on politicians. We would not be able to push folks around any more anywhere. We would have to shine our own shoes, because nobody would kiss our boots any more. It would put the people on top, where they belong. If we can alert the people of America to the fact that freedom does not come easily, but that they must work for it, fight for it, and understand the mechanism for maintaining it, I believe that most of the problems that plague us will disappear.

So I repeat since this is a historic occasion. I came over from the committee room to discuss extemporaneously some of the challenges, some of the procedures, some of the mechanics by which we can get the kind of country that we want and desire; that is, one that will reflect faithfully and completely the wishes of the people of America; the wishes of a majority of the people; undivided, unconfused by artificial party labels made possible by realignments in Congress or in the country as a whole; a government which will reflect the majority and minority viewpoints, not party labels; and by working out a formula for voting in the electoral college which will give every American like influence in the selection of his President, regardless of

where he lives, regardless of whether he is in the city or in the country. Each American will then vote for three electors, two representing the State at large, as Senators do, and one from the electoral college district in which he lives. There would then be no first-class or second-class Americans. There would be no first-class or fourth-class Americans, like the people of Delaware are, like the people of Vermont are, like the people of all States of the Union which have only one Congressman are. There would not be any 10th-class citizens, such as we are in South Dakota, where we have 4 electoral votes compared to New York State's 43, and such as the people in Hawaii are, where, there are also only 4 electoral votes. That is not fair. People are people and should have equal authority as individual voters, so it is time the people demand that Congress begin to make some reforms in the machinery of freedom before it falters and fails.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks sundry speeches, statements, comments, reports, and articles which I have accumulated over the past 15 years, dealing with the subjects which I have been commenting upon this afternoon.

Mr. President, back in the late forties and the early fifties, a great Texan and a great American by the name of Peter Molyneaux edited a serious-minded magazine called the Southern Weekly. Mr. Molyneaux became a great supporter of party realignment and the various steps and procedures being discussed and proposed for achieving that goal. As indicative of some of the thinking of that day I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial by Peter Molyneaux as it appeared in the March 7, 1951, issue of the Southern Weekly.

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

[From the Southern Weekly, Mar. 7, 1951]

COALITION THE ONLY WAY TO SAVE
FREEDOM

(NOTE.—Republican Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, tells Young Republican leaders this course is necessary to stop "today's drift toward the shoals of national socialism." A notable speech.)

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a conventional Republican from one of the strongest Republican strongholds in the country, on February 25 proposed an unconventional blueprint for victory in the presidential election of 1952 to a national meeting of Young Republican leaders assembled in Washington from approximately 40 States of the Union. Senator MUNDT suggested that "the way to save freedom and protect individual and property rights in this country is to develop an election formula whereby the people of both political parties on each side of the Mason-Dixon line can join their forces and their votes in a great national effort to elect a President and a Congress dedicated to restoring the Federal Government to its proper sphere of activity and thus putting a permanent end to today's direful drift toward the shoals of national socialism under the banners of Fair Dealism."

Tracing the process by which individual freedom and private ownership have been losing ground all over the world, Senator MUNDT said: "For 20 years the areas of human freedom and the functions of freemen

have been growing sickeningly smaller all around the globe. Even Britain has succumbed to national socialism. In the United States we have been moving steadily and sadly in the same direction although not to the same degree as many of the European powers. Unless we can stop this drift—unless we change this direction in America, it is only a matter of time before we, too, shall be added to the casualty list of free peoples who have surrendered their individual rights, their property rights, their States rights, and the rights of decision to the all-powerful state. Here, too, we are finding Federal politicians today pushing around more private citizens by Executive action than in any era of our history. Only an informal, inadequate, and intermittent coalition of southern Democrats and northern Republicans in the Congress has protected our precious individualized and community rights from being destroyed in America. Such an unorganized and leaderless defense line cannot permanently protect this country against those who would magnify the Central Government and minimize the rights of individual citizens and their respective State governments in this Republic."

MUNDT urged the National Federation of Young Republican leaders to "give serious study to the fruitful possibilities of saving our freedom formula in America by developing a blueprint for victory in the presidential election of 1952 so that those who think and act alike in America—and whose Senators and Congressmen vote alike—can vote victoriously for the same presidential candidate, be he from the North or the South."

Reducing his theories to practical proposals for procedure, MUNDT outlined a six-step program for "harnessing together in a victorious presidential campaign those in America who place principle above partisanship and those who hold fast to the constitutional principles which have for so long so well protected our community and individual rights.

1. The Republicans should for the first time since the turn of the century hold their national nominating convention after the Democrats rather than before them. The melancholy record of five successive Republican defeats should indicate that such a change in procedure does not represent a very dangerous Republican gamble.

2. In all likelihood, the Democratic National Convention will nominate President Truman for another term "or somebody to the left of Truman—somebody who actually believes in the programs of nationalization and socialism (medicine, health, housing, education, farming, power, banking, insurance) that Truman has rendered lip-service to support." The Democratic Convention will also most certainly include planks and programs moving toward the socialization of the foregoing services—and perhaps others. This seems inevitable because in the 1936 convention when the Southern Democrats lost the two-thirds rule which enabled them to direct the destinies of their party they fell off the back of the Democratic donkey and under its heels and there seems no likelihood that they can ever again wrest control of the party away from its left-wing elements, its city machine bosses, and the leaders of various pressure and propaganda groups.

3. Let the sturdy southern Democrats who approve States rights and abhor State socialism then "walk out and go home" as they did 4 years ago. Let them send emissaries to the Republican convention to "talk turkey" about the desirability of nominating candidates and writing a platform acceptable to the South and consistent with its historic concepts.

4. If the Republicans will nominate such candidates (for example, Taft, of Ohio, Byrd, of Virginia, Eisenhower, of New York, or Russell of Georgia; and others who could be suggested), our Jeffersonian Democratic

friends could then hold State or regional conventions to place these same candidates on the ballot as the regular Democratic nominees where that is possible and as "coalition Democrats" or "States rights Democrats" in other Southern States. At the electoral college these votes could all be merged together to elect the candidates supported by many Republican States in the North and by the Southern States delivering their votes to them as Democrats or as dissenting partisans.

5. Once such a team of candidates is elected by coalition efforts of the North and South, the Senators and Representatives from the cooperating areas would be pooled in the Senate and the House, their seniority rights would be interwoven with each other, and committee chairmen selected from whichever group had the ranking legislator. Federal patronage could temporarily be handled on the same basis.

6. A few months after such coalition candidates had assumed office in the White House and the Congress, a national convention could be called to select a name, a symbol, and a set of principles for the coalition forces. Suppose they chose the name of Freedom Party and the Statue of Liberty as a symbol with a careful definition of the appropriate scope and function of the Federal Government as basic party doctrine. Those out of power would then be forced to form an opposition party and with two new political parties, each with a definite set of principles, we would have an honest, meaningful, party realignment in this country. Party labels would mean something again; individual voters would know what they were voting for in supporting public officials; county and State officials would change their allegiance from Republican or Democrat to one or the other of the two new parties.

MUNDT called attention to the fact that "in this country we have changed party designations several times." "Each time," he said "it has been a good tonic for America and we have moved forward into a new era of progress. People have revived their interest in government. With such a new alignment of parties, now, it is a safe assumption that the discouragingly small number of voters now going to the polling places would sharply and continuously increase. Voters could then vote for a principle rather than a party label."

Drawing upon the experiences of Great Britain as an example, MUNDT said: "I have made a careful study of the manner in which inadequate and unworkable political alignments in Great Britain have contributed to its collapse into the pitfalls of national socialism. Both the Conservative and the Liberal Party members oppose socialism as indicated by the vote of a fortnight ago when all Liberal and Conservative Members of Parliament voted unanimously against the nationalization of steel. What would have happened if in the last general election in Britain those voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament had voted for the Conservative candidates? The results show their own parallel with our American predicament. Had there been no Liberal Member of Parliament candidates and had the voters voting for losing Liberal Members of Parliament voted Conservative, the Conservative Party would have gained 71 seats in the House of Commons. Added to the 272 they actually won, this would have given the Conservative Party a majority of 343 or 29 more than needed to control the House of Commons. Thus socialism prevails in Britain because in the last election the British people were divided by artificial barriers and unworkable political alignments just as today those in the South and the North who oppose big government are divided by historic, semantic, and artificial party labels. We can most surely avoid the fate of Britain where

private ownership and individual initiative have been taken over by the palace politicians by meeting the issue head-on in America and placing behind one presidential candidate the voters of both political parties whose legislators in Congress have joined together repeatedly to prevent socialistic programs from being adopted here.

Using the 1948 presidential election as an example, MUNDT said: "Had we been able to merge the votes behind the men who have fought together in Congress into a great national effort to elect a President in 1948, the Fair Deal would have been routed in our last election. Add to the four States where Dixiecrat candidates won, the electoral votes of Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia where voters have steadfastly and emphatically supported anti-New Deal Senators, and Harry Truman would have received 93 less electoral votes than he did in 1948. Deduct 93 from the 303 which he received and you have 210 votes or 56 less votes than needed for election. Thus it can be seen that if those whose votes in this country have clearly demonstrated they do not want reckless extravagance, a breakdown of States' rights, complete domination by the Federal Government and a whole catalog of socialistic experiments in America had an available political formula whereby they could merge their strength and marry their votes in the electoral college, a conservative, business-minded, constitutional adherent can be elected in 1952."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, another approach to the question of political realignment in this country is disclosed in a debate over the American Forum of the Air in which Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and I engaged on Sunday, July 15, 1951. For a discussion of differing points of view on this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a transcript of that debate, entitled, "Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?":

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

THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR, SUNDAY, JULY 15, 1951

DO WE NEED A REALIGNMENT OF OUR POLITICAL PARTIES FOR 1952?

(Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota; Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the American Forum of the Air).

ANNOUNCER. Good evening. It's time again to join the American Forum of the Air. Each week at this time the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., one of the Nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, presents the American Forum of the Air. Dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues vital to you and your country.

Tonight the American Forum of the Air presents a discussion of the vital topic "Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?" Here with us this evening to discuss this problem are Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, who says: "A coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats control the legislative program in Congress in many instances. By uniting in a new political party, southern Democrats and Republicans can elect a President of their choosing in 1952."

And Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, who says: "For an election to be meaningful, our political parties must stand for specific issues. Only when each party stands by a clearly defined plat-

form can we be certain of government by the rule of the majority."

And now, here is your moderator, who 23 years ago, found the American Forum of the Air, Theodore Granik.

Moderator GRANIK. Both Republican and Democratic Parties have started to prime their heavy artillery for the election of 1952. The target is you and your individual vote. Before every election, efforts are made to strengthen party unity. But Senator MUNDT, in a forthcoming Collier's article, advocated formation of a new political party, with southern Democrats joining Republicans. Now, how would such a proposal affect our national life? Could a new party elect a President and control Congress?

Tonight the American Forum of the Air discusses this unusual political proposal so that you, the voter, may decide.

Now, Senator MUNDT, would the new party you suggest mean the end of the Republican Party, as such?

Senator MUNDT. Ted, if by the use of the words "as such" you mean the Republican practice of becoming the champion of lost causes in each of the presidential elections, I would say I hope yes.

If you mean, on the other hand, it is going to mean the end of the influence of the Republican Party, I would say quite the contrary would be the result.

What I anticipate is to have the Republican Party combine with like-minded Democrats of the South in positions which for a long time now have been upheld in Congress by a nameless, but working coalition, of southern Democrats and northern Republicans. It seems to me that the present Republican and Democratic Party alignments have become pretty confusing and comparatively meaningless to the average voter, because actually today the differences within the two parties are in many instances greater than the differences between the two parties.

What I envision is working out some kind of political formula to form an alliance in 1952, so that people in this country who think alike can vote alike for President regardless of where they live or to which particular party they happen to pay their allegiance.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY, what do you think of that alliance?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Granik, I say Senator MUNDT's proposal makes some sense in the nature of proposing that we get the political parties cleaned up or cleared up on the basis of issues. Yes, I am for a realignment of political parties, but I am not for a realignment of the political parties on the basis of a section of the country or a regional basis. I am not, for example, saying, "Let's realign the political parties by having the Republicans and southern Democrats get together, because there are all kinds of southern Democrats and there are all kinds of Republicans, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, and very rightfully so.

Differences within the political parties are frequently greater than they are between the parties. I think that is very true, particularly in the Republican Party, and I think it was equally true in many instances in the Democratic Party.

So I would just say this: If the Senator from South Dakota is proposing that he take the Dixiecrats of the South, who were able to carry four States in the last election, and put them in the Republican Party, as a Democrat—as a New Deal Democrat, a Roosevelt Democrat—I would welcome that. I would say more power to you, and the sooner that you can do it, the better.

If he is saying that what we ought to have is a strong two-party system in every State in the Union, I would say that is a distinct political contribution and I would say I would support his hand in it. Every State needs a strong two-party system. That

means the growth of the Republican Party in areas where the Republican Party is weak, and it means the growth of the Democratic Party where it is very weak.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT.

Senator MUNDT. I think there is some difference between my definition of a southern Democrat and that of Senator HUMPHREY when he speaks of an alignment along geographical lines. I simply use the term southern Democrat because that is the place in which most of the Democrats who are voting with the Republicans happen to live. We also understand there are some Democrats in the North who think more like Republicans than do some of the Republicans in the North. It is more an issue. I do not know what Senator HUMPHREY means by a Dixiecrat. I have a different definition of my own of a Dixiecrat. It happens to have a label with two eyes, and I think that a Dixiecrat is a Democrat who has his eyes open, that is all.

Senator HUMPHREY. I would like to give my definition of a southern Democrat. A southern Democrat is a conservative Republican with a southern accent.

Let us just get down to see whether or not this realignment that the Senator from South Dakota suggests would do what he wants it to do. Let us direct it to particular areas of the country. I happen to believe that some of the most positive liberal leadership in the U.S. Congress comes from our States in the South. I think that Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, from Alabama, deep in the South, are giving the type of progressive leadership which is a great tribute to the whole political background and culture of the people of the South. That is the kind of Democrat I want in the Democratic Party. That is the kind of Democrat who bulks for his section of the country.

What would this coalition that the Senator from South Dakota mentions now offer to the South? I think we ought to just think about that a little bit, because he is recruiting, you see, from the South.

Moderator GRANIK. What do you have to say, Senator MUNDT, about your recruiting?

Senator MUNDT. I will tell you what it would offer in the South. In the first place, the South is in a very unhappy position today since it lost the two-thirds rule in the Democratic National Convention in 1936. The southern Democrat is no longer at home in his own party convention because he has lost his veto power. So he goes to the convention and has to endorse a platform which he does not approve. He has to support a candidate with whom he is not particularly happy. Consequently, when he leaves the convention he feels he has had very little impact upon the trend of national affairs. Then comes September and October, the months of the Presidential campaign, and neither major party sends a candidate for President into the Deep South.

The Democratic Party says, "We've got him for nothing; why should we work after him?" The Republican Party says, "We can't get him anyhow; why waste our time and talents?" So the people of the South, who are among the best and most patriotic citizens of our country, are practically disfranchised when it comes to an election of the candidate for President. I think the first thing this would give the South is an impact on the selection of a candidate for President and, more and more, the selection of the correct government for emergency and peace, going in the correct direction.

Moderator GRANIK. Let me quote from an article in the New York Times of June 29, 1951:

"Paul K. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman, speaking in the presence of William M. Boyle, Jr., national chairman, and after a recent conference with the President, attacked the Dixiecrat congressional group as 'infamous reactionaires,' partners in an

'unholy alliance' with the Republicans and foes of the welfare of the people."

Would you care to comment on that, Senator HUMPHREY, or Senator MUNDT?

Senator HUMPHREY. I would make this general comment. It is perfectly true that in this 82d Congress, a number of really truly conservative Democrats of the South have joined together with a number of conservative Republicans of the North, and as such they are the majority within the present Congress. I do not think there is any doubt about that. That is why your price control program is being scuttled, that is why you are having trouble today with your foreign aid program. That is why we are having trouble with a number of other projects in the Congress, because on the basis of political philosophy, this group that is referred to in the article from which you quote—a group that agrees with the position of the Minority Leader in the Senate, Mr. Wherry—it is a group that agrees with the basic conservative philosophy of the Republican Party.

I say that the Senator from South Dakota is surely performing a service if he says they should go into the Republican Party, because, frankly, the Democratic Party does not need them and the Democratic Party will be able to gain new strength in other parts of the country, standing as a truly progressive and liberal party.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT, would you care to comment on this unholy alliance?

Senator MUNDT. Yes. It looks like an unholy alliance which is a constructive alliance and is making some recruits whom we will be willing to accept and welcome into our party, any person Mr. Fitzpatrick is trying to read out of his party. If Mr. Boyle and Mr. Fitzpatrick do not want them in their party, I feel they could form the gist of a mighty strong national administration.

I agree with Senator HUMPHREY, from Minnesota, in his respect for Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, of the U.S. Senate, but I would say that I am equally confident that the leadership of the South, as exemplified by Senator George and Senator Russell, of Georgia, and Senator Byrd of Virginia, and a number of others, is the kind of leadership that would appeal to whole multitudes of Americans.

I would like to add to the statement that Senator HUMPHREY made about what this alliance has done about price control. It is also this alliance that stopped the Brannan plan, it has stopped the socialization of medicine, it has stopped the public housing from taking over all public housing in all areas; stopped the socialization of industry as proposed by Senator BENTON the other day during the price control legislation. This alliance has tended to maintain the rights of the people and the rights of the States as against the strong over-powerful Central Government.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY. Senator MUNDT made a brilliant and powerful statement there. Let us take a little more critical examination of what great things could come and will come from this coalition that you are talking about. On the basis of the philosophy that is represented, for example, there would have been no TVA for my dear friends south of the Mason-Dixon line had this coalition been the fact. Shall we say there would have been a growth of monopolies because some of my friends in the South, who are liberal, like Senator LONG of Louisiana, Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee, have led the fight against the basing point bill. I maintain the South has a great deal to gain from the Democratic Party. It gained an agricultural program which the Republican Party never gave it when it was in control of Congress. The South gained a great deal in housing, and some of the most adamant

champions of cooperative housing, low rent housing, came out of the South to clean up their slums and also from the Northern cities, to lead their fight for both low rent housing and the minimum wage, to better the lives of the working people of the North and South.

I say that both the South and the North have a great deal to gain from a truly progressive, forward-looking Democratic Party, and I welcome the day (I hope the Senator will be able to convince every American by his article in Collier's that those who are of the vintage that believe in monopoly, those who believe in the bill to fix the freight rates, those who have opposed public health facilities, those that have been opposed to the foreign policy of this country, those who have been opposed to minimum wage), let them get into the Republican Party; that is where they belong.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT.

Senator MUNDT. The first basic concept of political philosophy, which I think would bring the North and South together, is that they concur in the fact that the doctrine of States Rights is a mighty important American concept toward good government. The difficulty with these New Deal, Fair Deal proposals is that they gradually take away from the people increasing amounts of their money and increasing elements of their power and transfer those to the direction of a few politicians here in the Capital City of America. It is that which we propose to eliminate, providing in its stead constructive Federal Government leadership, but having the implementation and the direction and management of these things in the hands of the people and in the hands of the governors and the legislatures of their own States.

I would presume that probably this new division of the political concept in America revolves around how large a Federal Government you want, whether the Federal Government should be empowered to do such things as public housing or whether it should be done through incentives on the part of the Federal Government, by local individual initiative, or by the support and cooperation of patriotic groups.

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that the Senator from South Dakota states his point of view with vigor and force, and I am happy he does, because this type of sharp debate on basic political philosophy is exactly what we need in this country. I want to outline again that had the kind of coalition the Senator from South Dakota is talking about been in this country in the past 20 years, the following things would not have happened:

First of all the per capita income of the people in the TVA area would not have doubled; they still would have been down in the depths of economic despair. I also would tell my friends of the Deep South that had this coalition existed, they would not have had the flood control, the public works, the canals, the public power, that has made their country today into a thriving, growing, prospering community. It is public power that has helped the South and the Far West and the Midwest, and it is this kind of an overall program of welfare and the assistance of the Federal Government to the States and to the people that has made it possible for all parts of America to grow and expand.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator MUNDT.

Senator MUNDT. It seems to me that what is involved is the fact that neither political party under its present name has an acceptable and understandable political concept. I think we can see in the disagreement between Senator HUMPHREY and myself tonight that there are two points of view shared by a good many Americans. One feels the central government should be empowered to provide nationalization of power, nationalization of health, nationalization of

housing, or education and what not, and my point of view is that it is not the business of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is to umpire, to provide the prods and induce the State legislatures and individual businesses and corporations to do those things which are right and proper. I think had we had this kind of realignment charged with the Government in the past 20 years, there are some other things we would not have had, either. We would not have a \$260 billion national debt that we now have, and we would not be passing the large tax bill, the largest in the history of America. We would not have government by edict and mandate, but government by legislation, which was the concept conceived by our forefathers in Philadelphia 150 years ago.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think we had better look into that. First of all, I do not think that either the southern Democrats or the Republicans could have stopped the debt. There happened to be a fellow around by the name of Hitler and another by the name of Tojo who had something to do with the war. They had brought on \$250 billion worth of that debt.

Senator MUNDT. That is the other side of the ocean. F.D.R. and Harry Truman had something to do with that, too.

Senator HUMPHREY. I gave him his time, and I will take my time, too.

The Senator makes these broad statements about whether we would not have had this debt. The debt is a war debt and he knows it as well as the Senator from Minnesota.

He says we have the choice of nationalization of health and education and housing. That is not the choice at all. The choice is whether or not the Government of the United States, which belongs to all of the people under the terms of the Constitution, is to help other people to lift their housing levels, to lift their educational levels, to lift their health standards. This is not the choice of nationalization or local health authority; it is a choice of whether or not you are going to have good health in this country, or poor health; a choice of whether or not you are going to lift the standards of education, a choice of whether or not you are going to have housing for human beings or no housing.

Senator MUNDT. May I put a little better definition on this choice? I do not propose that this realignment of political parties would place the northern Republicans and southern Democrats on platforms favoring disease and bad health at all. I do not think that is the choice in the first instance. It is a question of how to help them. Are we going to help them if a strong government is going by direct contact to interfere with the lives of the individuals on farms or homes, or wherever they find them? Or are we going to help them by expanding opportunities to force them to do the things they would better like to do, by their own power and for themselves?

Take the Missouri Valley, for example, where I live. There we are harnessing the river, providing hydroelectric power, providing soil conservation. But we are doing it by keeping control in the hands of the people in the valley. As against that in the TVA, the whole business is arranged by directors appointed by the President. The question is: Where does the ultimate authority rest? With the people in the valley, or in the White House?

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to answer, Senator HUMPHREY, before we take questions from the audience?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator has heard, I am sure, about the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers the Federal agencies that are handling the Pick-Sloan program and the Missouri Valley development, and he knows the States have nothing to say about it one bit. He knows

it is a Federal program. The difference is whether or not you have a coordinated, integrated program like the TVA, or a hodgepodge like you got out there, which the Hoover Commission said was costing double what it ought to cost because of conflict between the agencies. The Senator knows that.

Senator MUNDT. There is one other thing I know. You are talking about construction; I am talking about the administration of the project when it is completed, that I want administered by local direction.

Moderator GRANIK. Gentlemen, in a moment we will take questions from the audience.

But first, here is an important message.

The ANNOUNCER. Before we return you to the American Forum of the Air, brought to you each Sunday by the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., let me ask you this question: What does American freedom mean to you personally? For example, let's consider your job. Here in America, when you like your job you stay on it. If you don't like it, you look for something else. In America you can be a miner, machinist, grocer, baker, doctor, lawyer, or banker. You can be anything your own initiative, training, and experience qualifies you to be.

Yes, in America we're free to work at whatever job we choose. Under communism we would be forced to work long hours, at low pay, and shackled to a job we could never leave.

But remember this, freedom to work where we want to work is only one of the many freedoms we will lose if communism wins.

Now the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp. returns you to the American Forum of the Air.

Moderator GRANIK. Now we will have the first question from the audience; a young lady, a very charming young lady. Go ahead.

QUESTION. I am Bernice Teuteberg. I am a placement officer at the National Production Authority. My question is for Senator MUNDT. Do you consider the general attitude and policy of the southern Democrats to be typical of basic Republican policy?

Senator MUNDT. By and large, I would say yes. Of course, I agree with Senator HUMPHREY that you cannot take an area of geography and say that everyone in one area agrees with everybody in that area and disagrees with everybody in some other area. But I would say there is a greater affinity of interest between the southern Democrats and the northern Republicans than there is today an affinity of interest between the average southern Democrat and big city machines and leftwing fringe groups that have come to control the New Deal party of the North.

Moderator GRANIK. Senator HUMPHREY.

Senator HUMPHREY. I was just going to pick up that last comment. I am quite interested in that last comment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Moderator GRANIK. About the "fringe" comment?

Senator HUMPHREY. The "fringe" comment. I would just say if the Republican Party is going to accept the political philosophy and policy that has been enunciated by the Dixiecrat element of the southern Democrats, then the Republican Party tonight on this program is saying there will be no civil rights, because that is why they walked out of the Democratic Party. The Republican Party tonight is simply saying there will be no more of the Federal assistance in terms of public health; there will be no more assistance in terms of vocational education; no more assistance in terms of public works programs developing in the South and making it into one of the garden spots of America, as they justly deserve.

I want it quite clear that if the Republican Party wants to embrace that kind of philosophy we will be delighted to join the issue in 1952, because on that issue the Democratic Party will be back in power, with a true

majority in Congress and a President in the White House.

Moderator GRANIK. Do you want to comment on that Senator?

Senator MUNDT. Yes, indeed, because Senator HUMPHREY, while he does not seem to want to join this alliance would like the privilege of helping to write this platform.

Senator HUMPHREY. I helped on the last one.

Senator MUNDT. And some of the Democrats walked out and are trying to get into our party as a consequence this time. But, of course, that is not going to be the program at all. My choice would be the American voter when he has an honest choice between two legitimate positions in government. My position is that the rights of individuals and the rights of States are closely allied, and if you build a great big, strong superstate Government in Washington which infringes upon the local autonomies of the States and the local rights of individual citizens, you are marching directly down the trail of national socialism that we want to stop.

Senator HUMPHREY. I think I ought to make a comment on that because my friend from South Dakota gets these words that just dramatize some sort of theory or legend he has of this "monster government," this "great bureaucracy" that he talks about. Let us face up to it. What has the Federal Government done through its progress of grants-in-aid, which is the State, the New Deal program? What has it done? Lifted up the whole educational structure of every State in this land. What else has it done? Helping soil conservation to replenish the soil of this land; made possible electric power to 80 farms out of every 100 in America, making possible reclamation of the land and irrigation of the land. And I tell you there is no freedom lost in that; only the freedom to starve and freedom to be in misery.

Senator MUNDT. I say now that every one of those was supported overwhelmingly by the Republicans in Congress.

Senator HUMPHREY. Of course, that is not true.

Senator MUNDT. That is correct; those were supported and have been supported time after time. As a matter of fact, I have sat in the House time after time when by unanimous consent, without even a rollcall vote, millions of dollars were appropriated for soil conservation and appropriated for REA and things of that kind.

I am talking about the Brannan plan; I am talking about the things which the Senator from Minnesota is ducking in this debate.

Senator HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is not ducking a thing. The Senator from Minnesota is saying that when REA came up for vote in 1935, 77 percent of the Republicans in Congress voted against it. Now, of course, they are for it? Why not? It works. When the TVA was up in Congress, 66 percent of the Republicans voted against it. Now, of course, they have approved it because it works.

The same thing is true of the George-Bardon Act, that has two southern names on it. When it was up before Congress the Republican Party voted against it. And today they get the same new names against the same old names for the same old programs.

Moderator GRANIK. We have about 30 seconds for one more question. Can you give it to us quickly?

QUESTION. My name is M. Victor Rosenbloom. My question is for Senator HUMPHREY. Don't you believe that what we, as a country, need, is not so much a new party realignment against policies, but a strong, courageous conviction for basic party principles in the national interest?

Senator HUMPHREY. I believe that is very important because I think, as my friend from South Dakota pointed out very well tonight, that actually a party must stand for something.

Senator MUNDT. The big difficulty is now, as illustrated in 1948, that less than half the people went to the polls. Why? Because most of them felt there was not any great choice between the two platforms and two candidates. The average American feels he is entitled to a decision when he goes to the polls.

Moderator GRANIK. It is time for summary. Will you continue with your summary, please, Senator?

Senator MUNDT. Yes. In the 1 minute I have to summarize, let me say I think the South would benefit from this realignment program because it would be given a chance to give its free influence to nomination of candidates for President in the election and in determination of national policy. I think it would be beneficial to the Republican viewpoint because instead of being a sectional party, as we now are, operating in 36 States, trying to win a horseshoe with a three-legged horse, we would operate in every State in the Union, the way political parties ought to operate.

Primarily the American citizen would benefit because he would get a clear-cut decision of government, bearing the name of national socialism, regardless of the fancy name you call it. But when you place in the hands of a strong Federal Government control of the increasing amount of money that you earn and the authority that you have, you move in the direction of socialism. If he favors that, one party would move him in that direction. If he opposes it, the other party would move him away from it. That is an extreme way of stating the basic dividing line which it seems to me would operate under the kind of political alliance I envision for America.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you.

Now, Senator HUMPHREY, your summary.

Senator HUMPHREY. Rather than get into the realm of theory, as my friend from South Dakota takes us, as he stated in his extreme way, let me tell what I think would happen by the facts in the record by this kind of realignment. First of all, it would be wholesome because for the first time the American people would really know the Republican Party stood for the following things:

Opposed to American labor, because the Dixiecrat-Republican combination would stand for that; opposed to the extension of social security, because the Republican Congress fought social security, as did the Dixiecrat element of Congress; opposed to soil conservation, because in the Congress of the United States there has been a continuous attack upon that kind of great program; opposed to development of public power, which we had witnessed again just within the last week of Congress, where the Dixiecrat and Republican elements again voted against it.

I say if that is the kind of realignment we are going to have, I welcome it because I would like to have the American people truly know what the political parties stand for.

Moderator GRANIK. Thank you, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on "Do We Need a Realignment of Our Political Parties for 1952?" Our speakers have been Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota.

The ANNOUNCER. For reprints of this discussion, send 10 cents to Ransdell, Inc., Printers and Publishers, Washington, D.C. That is 10 cents to R-A-N-S-D-E-L-L, Inc., Washington, D.C.

This is the "American Forum of the Air." Next week the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.,

one of the Nation's largest producers of aluminum and brass products, will again present the "American Forum of the Air" in a discussion on "America's Role in the Defense of Freedom," based upon an article by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, appearing in the August issue of Reader's Digest. Our speakers will be Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio.

Each week at this time the "American Forum of the Air," dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, is presented so that you in your home may enjoy the authoritative discussion of the many vital topics of our time.

The "American Forum of the Air," founded and moderated by Theodore Granik, has been presented by the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp.

This program has come to you from the NBC Television Studios in Washington, D.C.

This is Ray Michael speaking.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, U.S. News & World Report did a full-length interview with me on this subject in which it featured the subject by using my picture on the magazine cover in its issue of August 3, 1951. As additional interest of the early and steadily growing interest in political realignment I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks the text of that interview entitled "New Political Alliance."

There being no objection the text of the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEW POLITICAL ALLIANCE

(An interview with KARL E. MUNDT, Republican Senator from South Dakota)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Can the Republicans win in 1952? If so, how—after 20 years of unbroken Democratic success?)

(Does the fact of the solid South leave the balance of power with certain northern groups? Is the North-South coalition in Congress a forerunner of the presidential campaign?)

(Senator MUNDT is one of a number of persons who have been thinking and working out answers to these questions. To get his answers, the editors of U.S. News & World Report invited him to their conference room.)

(KARL E. MUNDT was a teacher of speech and of social science before he began to apply both fields of knowledge in Congress. He was elected to the House from his native South Dakota in 1938 and moved on to the Senate 10 years later.)

(Senator MUNDT, now 51, has been a farmer and businessman as well as teacher and legislator.)

(In Congress he has been active in foreign affairs. He was a prominent member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Interest in the proposed North-South alliance recently has taken him into the South on many speaking trips.)

QUESTION. Senator MUNDT, what is your idea of a Republican-Democratic coalition in the South?

ANSWER. Our proposal isn't exactly a coalition in the South of the Democrats and the Republicans as much as it is an alliance between the Democrats of the South and the Republicans of the North.

QUESTION. In other words, each side would be free to retain its party identity?

ANSWER. Exactly. And it would merge them together at the electoral college level.

QUESTION. So that it doesn't involve any actual amalgamation of parties as such or interference with freedom of action on the part of either party?

ANSWER. That's correct. Because that is a very genuine stumbling block and we get away from that. We also get away from the

fact that it's pretty difficult in any short-pull effort to induce a majority in the South to join the Republican Party. So we're going to suggest they vote for antiadministration electors under the banner of the rooster, which is the Democratic emblem in much of the South.

Question. This actually then would be a three-party system, wouldn't it?

Answer. No. After a series of preliminary "make-ready" conferences before the conventions between like-minded Democrats and Republicans I believe the situation might well develop about as follows: In 1952, the campaign would proceed as usual in the North with voters choosing between the Democratic and Republican candidates in the customary manner. But in the South, if the Democratic National Convention is controlled by New Dealers who, it is expected, will nominate a candidate and write a platform which is distasteful and perhaps repugnant to the South, a new procedure would be evolved whereby citizens in the South would once again reassert their independence.

The procedure would differ from State to State, but in general it would follow these lines: In Southern States where the majority of the Democrats are not New Dealers—do not favor the "welfare state" nor the concepts of Trumanism—presidential electors would be selected to run on the regular Democratic ticket under the emblem of the rooster but pledged to the people not to vote for the candidates nominated by the Democratic National New Deal Convention. These electors might be committed in advance to vote for the Republican nominees if the preliminary alliance conferences establish the proper background for such a move. Or they might be what they call free electors, simply committed not to vote for Truman or any other welfare-state candidate for President.

Question. What do you think will happen in the South in the way of a countermovement by the officeholders and the Federal machine? They have considerable political power in the South, too—what will they do?

Answer. They can work it in one of two ways. In Mississippi, for example, they will organize a Truman Democratic group. They will put their electors on the ballot under the donkey instead of under the rooster just as they did last time; they will campaign valiantly for the administration and its electors and probably get less than 12 percent of the votes, because they got 11 percent for Truman last time. That is the way they will do it in Mississippi.

NORTH-SOUTH GROUPING COULD ELECT A PRESIDENT—COALITION NOW WORKING—WHY "DIXIECRATS" FAILED

Now in Arkansas, where the Governor is a New Dealer and may be able to control the electoral machinery, it is entirely possible that he will put the rooster and the Democratic label over the electors there who favor the Truman group, so that in Arkansas those Democrats who are opposed to Truman—who in my opinion are vastly in the majority—will hold a convention, select their own electors, get a name—call themselves Jeffersonian Democrats, Anti-Truman Democrats, Antisocialist Democrats, or whatever they want—put their electors on the ballot. And each group will conduct a fair and honest campaign in the South to determine once and for all whether or not the South favors the welfare-state concept of Government.

The Republicans will pull out, or, if necessary in order to keep the Republican Party alive in case this thing peters out—since there may be some State laws that if you don't have a man on the ballot you can't continue the party—they will put the Republican nominees on the ballot but the word goes around that Republicans should

vote in the box where the anti-Truman electors are listed.

In Texas a few weeks ago the Governor signed a new bill which facilitates this whole movement, and which was promoted in Texas by some of the folks interested in the alliance program and opposed to New Dealism in all its forms. This provides now that in 1952 for the first time in Texas you can cross-file. There is a device so that you can amalgamate and add together the anti-Truman votes for President. And that was done specifically by those, including the Governor, who are opposed to Trumanism in Texas. Now if in Texas—and that is the key State, really—we can get the ball rolling—and there is enough power down there and enough leadership down there, and enough genuine, rugged Americanism down there if you will find a harness that will fit it—we believe Texas can pull most of the South along on some effective program of political realignment.

TWO SETS OF ELECTORS

Question. What about the other Southern States?

Answer. In other States where the party machinery is controlled by Democrats favoring the Truman program, those opposing it would nominate electors and run them under some hyphenated Democratic label—"Jeffersonian-Democrats" or "Anti-New Deal Democrats," for example. In other words, much the same arrangement would be worked out as was done with the Dixiecrat movement in 1948, but instead of wasting votes on a splinter party with no national connections, the antiwelfare-state Democrats would go to the electoral college with electors ready, able, and willing to associate themselves with other like-minded electors in choosing an administration sympathetic with their viewpoint and consistent with their concepts. Under either arrangement, two sets of Democratic electors would be before the southern voters in November and they would decide once and for all in a fair and honest poll whether to continue to embrace the concepts of collectivism and complete federalism that are so apparent in the Truman program.

Question. Isn't there a commitment on the part of electors chosen on the regular Democratic ticket to vote for the nominee of the regular Democratic Party?

Answer. It depends on the terms on which they are nominated or selected. If they are selected at a convention down in the South with the understanding that they go as free electors or that they go as electors under the Democratic banners but pledged to vote for this alliance combination which has been worked up, then they're keeping faith with the voters and are in conformity with the law.

CONVENTION STRATEGY

Question. You speak of a convention held prior to the selection of the electors. Is that a State convention?

Answer. Yes. And it is also possible a "Dixie Democratic Convention" might precede these State conventions.

Question. Held before the national convention?

Answer. No, after the national convention. Let me outline this movement as we see it shaping up. We envision that, as we approach election time, it will really become clear to the Democratic South that the results of the Democratic National Convention are going to leave them very, very unhappy. So it has been suggested that delegates be selected by the Democrats in the South who will go to the national convention, making an effort to get a restoration of the rule requiring a two-thirds majority to secure a Presidential and Vice Presidential nomination—which they won't succeed in doing, but they can try. Making an effort to bring about a real ringing reaffirmation of the doctrine of States rights—which they will not be able

to do, but they can try. Making an effort to have one of their southern sons selected as a candidate for President on the basis that the South has provided the bulk of the strength of the Democratic Party for all these years—that they can do, but they will not succeed.

Then after they have watched the convention, over their protests, renominate Truman or somebody to the left of Truman, when they have watched the convention, over their protests, put planks in the platform which are repugnant to the people of the South, when they have heard some of the "liberal" leftwing element of their own party stand up at their own convention and insult them to their face by calling them Bourbons and reactionaries and snarl at them at the convention as they sometimes sneer at them on the floor of Congress, it's expected then that having been insulted, having been rejected, having been disillusioned, they'll be ready to go home and assert their independence as they did in 1948.

Now the difficulty in 1948 was that when they went home they had no place to go, just a little branch-line railroad called "Dixiecrat," which had no real destination but was simply a protest vote that didn't have any genuine effectiveness other than to demonstrate that there is a limit somewhere to the insults southern voters will endure.

WHAT DIXIECRATS LACKED

Question. What do you mean by no effectiveness?

Answer. No effectiveness because the Dixiecrats had no national connections or cohesion. It just appealed to voters in a few States, and never in their most optimistic dreams did the Dixiecrats expect to succeed in electing a President.

Question. Did they have a separate set of electors in 1948?

Answer. Oh, yes; they had a separate set of electors in 1948. They carried four States. Thirty-nine electors voted for Thurmond and Wright. It wasn't enough to turn the tide but it was a surprisingly significant vote considering the short time in which they had to work. It demonstrated that the spirit of independence still thrives in the South.

Question. Well, after a Democratic convention such as you outline, then what happens?

Answer. Then they go home and they hold a convention precisely as they did last time. But instead of doing what they did last time, which was a futile splinter-party gesture, they then agree to select electors to run as Democratic electors pledged to vote at the electoral college for some other candidate than that nominated by the New Dealers at the Democratic National Convention. Perhaps they may even be pledged to vote for the alliance choice, that is, for the Republican nominees selected at the Republican Convention. Having agreed to this joint program, they then hold their State conventions to put the Democratic electors on the ballot and conduct a campaign in the South strictly between Democratic parties.

You'd have the Truman Democratic Party, the Administration Democratic Party, which would probably be referred to by its opponents down South as the Socialist fringe of the Democratic Party, and you'd have the States' Rights Democratic Party, the Constitutional Democratic Party which would be referred to down there as the Jeffersonian Democrats or the Democrats who are in favor of reestablishing States' rights, and their electors would go to the electoral college with that purpose.

Now preliminary to all this, some work must be done both by Republicans and by the anti-New Deal Democrats before either convention in order to set the stage for the

kind of political-alliance operation we've been talking about. It's our thought that these preliminary meetings can be held in large part between Democrats in Congress and Republicans in Congress who, over a period now of about 15 years, have been working together in an alliance which is not a theoretical factor at all but which is an actuality in Congress today.

So that, probably in the Senate or perhaps in the Senate and the House, preliminary considerations would be given to these following objectives: that at the next Republican Convention—coming as it must now ahead of the Democratic—having in mind the possibility of what will transpire and what I believe at that time will look like the inevitable outcome of the Democratic National Convention, we should give some thought in the selection of our nominee for President to a man who is personally acceptable to the South. Some of our potential candidates are, some of them are not. But if we decide that we're going to court the South—not capture it, but court support in the South—that we should give some thought to that in the selection of our candidates, and, we should also give some thought to southern concepts in the writing of a platform.

Question. In civil rights?

Answer. In civil rights, in education, in socialized medicine, in all matters leading to the concept of the super-state and the preservation of the States' rights concept. We could come out strongly in our Republican platform stating a position that we recognize the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide leadership in making living conditions better and in making health and educational opportunities better, and in eliminating discriminations, et cetera, but we propose to approach these objectives within the purview of the doctrine of State's rights.

PLATFORM PROBLEMS

Question. Do you think the Republicans who have already voted for FEPC (Fair Employment Practice Commission) and for other measures of civil rights will be able to remain silent?

Answer. No, I don't think they will be silent. I think they will present their point of view before the platform committee. I think they'll argue in favor of a Federal centralized approach to the problems of education, of health, of housing, and of discrimination. But I propose that those of us in the Republican Party who oppose centralization of power and up to now have remained comparatively silent do not remain silent any longer.

I propose that we present the fact that, if we're going to have a party that presumes to be against this superstate and the complete centralization of power in Washington, we have got to recognize the doctrine of States' rights, which is a peculiarly and uniquely American concept in government.

Question. Is there a possibility that these Republicans who are ardently in favor of civil rights may go out and try to get electors in their States and do the same thing to the Republicans?

Answer. I think that's a possibility. I think that, if this program works out, there is going to be some migration in both directions from one party to the other. But I think that the country desperately needs today a party alignment in which there is a recognizable and defensible philosophy of government imbedded within each party. We lack that today.

EFFECTS IN NORTH

Question. Won't you, as a practical matter, be up against the fact that in the Northern States you will be driving the Democratic Party to be the civil rights party—as it has to be to win the votes in Harlem and elsewhere—and that those Republicans who

feel the same way about civil rights will join with those Democrats and carry most of these Northern States?

Answer. No, I don't think that they will. There is, of course, some fear of that on the part of some northern Republicans. There is some pretty clear-cut evidence, however, that there is a tremendous amount of theory in that connection not substantiated by fact, as there is in connection with the alleged opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill. I mean the election of Taft in Ohio pretty well knocked into a cocked hat a lot of theories about labor's attitude toward the Taft-Hartley bill.

Now we believe that in the groups, in the colored organizations, among the colored population, and in places where FEPC has been a very definite issue, there are a great many people there who also believe in the doctrine of States rights. We can present a pretty good Republican position, for example, to those who believe in FEPC who are largely in the northern cities. We can say: "What party was it that freed the colored men? It was the Republican Party. What party was it that has given the colored man his best opportunity to succeed in this country? It has been the Republican Party under Republican government. What kind of States have given them State FEPC's, to give him a better chance and an opportunity? It has been almost without exception Republican States under Republican Governors empowered by Republican legislatures."

Question. Do you think the South would accept the program that these States have adopted in the North?

Answer. The South is completely willing. I have discussed it now in almost every State of the South. The South is not inhabited by sadists who are desirous of penalizing the black man and kicking him around because they enjoy it. Actually, a great many Negroes in the South are very happy and are making rapid progress both economically and politically. The South is confronted with a very realistic problem because, in many areas, over half the people are of the colored race.

Southerners have no desire to hold the Negro down. They want to promote programs in an area where by evolution and by education they must work out a harmonious adjustment. They're not even opposed to State FEPC legislation. They told me in Mississippi: "We're perfectly willing to have an FEPC in Jackson, Miss., manned by Mississippians, progressing at the Mississippi level, at the Mississippi speed to meet Mississippi conditions. What we are afraid of is an FEPC manned in Washington by northern theorists and 'liberals' who decide to provide in Mississippi the kind of conditions for the colored man that you can provide in New Jersey or New York." And they say it simply won't work, because conditions are different in the South. So they're willing to do that.

There has been a definite movement in many of the Southern States by which the State and its public officials interest themselves in improving the lot of the colored men. In many areas it has eliminated by State action—and I think that's the right way to do it—the poll tax. They've passed laws against lynching and have done the things that the northern theorists who want to produce utopia out of a hat like a rabbit in 15 minutes by Federal legislation have been unable to do by Federal coercion.

Question. Whom do you have specifically in mind as candidates who might be acceptable to the southern Democrats and the northern Republicans?

SUGGESTED CANDIDATES: TAFT, EISENHOWER, BYRD, RUSSELL

Answer. We have tried to keep strictly away from getting a movement of this kind identified with any candidate, because then it becomes the football of every other candidate not associated with it. In talks on

this, because everybody thinks in terms of candidates as a tangible outcome of the movement, I have said: "Look, I think a movement of this kind could revolve around and could succeed with two candidates selected almost indiscriminately from the following four." Then I have suggested the names of Taft and Eisenhower and Senator BYRD and Senator RUSSELL, and have said that it wouldn't make much difference to me which of the four were at the top and which of the four were Vice President. I think they are four sound Americans who basically would lead this country back to a premise of sound government and sound fiscal policy.

HOW TAFT STANDS

Question. Isn't Taft's position on civil rights, however, pretty generally unsatisfactory to the South?

Answer. Not nearly as unsatisfactory to the South as Dewey's position on civil rights was 4 years ago. Taft has been a middle-of-the-roader on civil rights. We haven't had a vote directly on it. There have been votes on cloture and on other maneuvers which don't look like a vote on a FEPC but which actually were related to it, and he has leaned a bit toward the FEPC crowd, but he hasn't been out giving speeches about it, he hasn't been crusading for it. They have a pretty good respect in the South, I think, for Taft's basic philosophy of government. He is in opposition to the concept of the strong centralized authoritarian power. He is a resister and supporter of States rights.

THE KEY: STATES RIGHTS

Question. If Taft abandons, however, a Federal FEPC platform, how much chance does he have for carrying a lot of these areas in the North?

Answer. That goes back to what we were discussing—whether we propose to present to the American voter this time a clear-cut philosophy of government built around States rights in a platform which consistently revolves around that concept. We should not again throw the voter another crazy quilt like we threw him last time in a platform where we say in one breath we're 100 percent for the rights of the individual and the rights of the States and in the next breath we're 100 percent for giving politicians in Washington the power to tell him who he can hire in his business. Now, Americans generally are just plain basically sound. If we present them such a bewildering jigsaw puzzle as we had in the Republican platform last time, in which we tried to say all things to all men—which to those interested in FEPC talked like it was going to create in Washington the authoritarian power that they have in Moscow, but, in terms of business and farming, talked as if it was going back completely to the original Jeffersonian concept of States rights—we fall in our duty to speak frankly to the voters.

Question. In your concept, you would have a Democrat on the ticket, wouldn't you?

Answer. Yes, that's at least one possibility. First, we should get a candidate personally acceptable to the South. Second, we must explore with the South its desire as to whether it would prefer to have a southern Democrat running as Vice President. If we find that it would prefer to have that, and we can determine that by the preliminary conferences, then I think we should say frankly, too, in the Republican Convention: "This time we're trying to win a victory for America. We're not so much interested in partyism and partisanship as we are in basic principles. So, we suggest that with our Republican candidate for President we nominate—let's say, just for an example—Senator BYRD of Virginia or Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia as Vice President."

That's one conceivable possibility. Another conceivable possibility growing out of the preliminary conferences is this: How

would it be, some have conjectured, if in the Republican campaign this time—with this alliance movement in mind and the possibility that some of these southern statesmen would prefer not to run as Democrats for Vice President under the Republican banner—if we nominate the best cast of Republican leaders we can secure as President and Vice President and then, 6 weeks or 2 months before the voting time, our presidential nominee, having consulted with his advisers, announces then the identity of his Cabinet, if he is elected? And in that list include three or four distinguished southern statesmen as Secretary of Agriculture, as Secretary of War, as Secretary of Commerce, wherever you're going to put them.

Suppose the Republican nominee for President announces on the 1st day of October that, if he is elected President, he's going to have a Cabinet composed of A, B, C, and D and Senator DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia as Secretary of Defense—don't you believe that this would help make it easier for southern voters to support the alliance? Or, perhaps, if Senator BYRD could be induced to become Secretary of the Treasury, it would help cement the forces favoring a real Democratic-Republican alliance in 1952. I use the names of RUSSELL and BYRD merely as illustrations—perhaps other equally good southern Democrats could be named so RUSSELL and BYRD could continue their fine leadership in the Senate.

KEEPING POWER IN CONGRESS

Question. This is in addition to a Democrat for Vice President?

Answer. It could be in addition to or in lieu thereof. It's just one proposed type of strategy. Here's something more which is essential. In these preliminary conferences, if the alliance is going to win, we've got to come to an understanding with the southern leaders in Congress as to what happens to their seniority. That's not unimportant in elections in the South. A Senator and Congressman, I think, has more prestige there than he does in the Middle West. And I think a southern Congressman or Senator probably has a little better personal following than has been developed in many other areas.

Now these officials are important cogs in the electoral machinery and you can't very well expect 15 or 20 southern Senators and Congressmen to get enthused about crusading for a principle and a cause and a ticket which, if it wins, means that they are committing political suicide in Congress and stepping out of positions of importance into positions of unimportance. So we've got to come to an understanding with them that, if this thing operates, the seniority status of the cooperating southern Congressmen and Senators will be sustained.

So it is recommended that in the organization of the new Congress, assuming that the alliance elects its candidates for President and Vice President, that we caucus together on a basis of position rather than a basis of party. The Members of the Senate and the Members of the House would have a caucus, therefore, of the Republicans and the southern Democrats who have participated in this program for the establishment of the organization of the Senate and for the organization of the respective committees with each man maintaining his seniority status regardless of party. As an example, this would mean that if Senator George, of Georgia, participates—and, if the program works, Georgia and such States must participate—he would retain his chairmanship of the Senate Committee on Finance because he's the oldest ranking member of either party on that committee. We would put the members around the table in conformity with their seniority status to comprise a majority reflecting a position on principle, not merely a political party.

Question. You'd like to have Speaker Rayburn on your side, wouldn't you?

Answer. I'd like to have him on our side and I have a hunch that, if things worked out so that he could do that and still be with his own group in Texas, he'd love it.

Question. Then he could be Speaker of the House under your program?

Answer. He could be Speaker of the House under our program—the caucus of like-minded House Members would determine that by their votes.

Question. In other words, you people are willing to make concessions and have got to make concessions in order to accomplish this particular objective, which is a party that is committed to your philosophy?

Answer. Precisely. Because there isn't any chance, in my opinion, for the Republican Party, without making concessions, to get the votes it needs in the South. And, frankly, I don't see any very likely place you can pick up this extra million votes in the North. Certainly to do so you would have to make some concessions to whatever new element in the North you were trying to attract.

EISENHOWER'S STRENGTH

Question. How about Eisenhower?

Answer. That might do it. I think that occasionally a man comes along or perhaps an issue that can unite the country—there may be something involved in the war issue. But I'm looking at the long pull. Suppose we win in 1952—what do we do to stay in following 1956? We would be forced to begin at once, throwing out lures to exactly the same people to whom the New Dealers have cast their seductive bait. As long as we divorce ourselves from over 100 electoral votes in the conservative South, it means that the balance of power in this country is certain to be in the hands of the leftwing groups. So that, to stay in, we Republicans would have to make concessions to the same group to whom the New Dealers now cater so zealously. And I'm no more desirous of seeing the country veer over toward national socialism with a Republican in power than I am with a Democrat. Now there's some pretty good historic background from which we can draw a lesson.

Question. How much damage would be done to the alliance idea if the Democrats should nominate a southerner, Fred Vinson, for instance?

Answer. I would assume that if they were to nominate a real southerner running on a platform even remotely acceptable in the South, there would not be an alliance idea in 1952. It would defer and delay such a movement. Now in my opinion my guess would be that Fred Vinson would come close enough to answer that definition to make the alliance unworkable, although I am impressed by the number of people in the South interested in this movement who seem to think that Fred Vinson would not be completely acceptable to them.

Question. You've got to have some name down South besides a Republican. You can't have a group of electors pledged to vote for a Republican ticket—isn't that true?

Answer. The electors will be Democrats. They will be pledged to oppose the Truman administration.

ANTI-TRUMANITES THIS WAY

Question. But they can turn but one way and that's to the Republicans?

Answer. I don't think that's particularly going to hurt. I don't think if these other preliminary steps have happened, if they can show them about the seniority-status agreement, if they can show them a vice-presidential nominee or Cabinet members. I believe the anti-Truman electors can win in most of the South. The difficulty is not with the leadership and the business echelon.

Now we have made a study of what this alliance has been doing because this isn't something which is just pulled out of the air.

This is something which has been functioning now since 1936 in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Since 1936 this informal Republican-Democratic congressional alliance has functioned successfully on 35 important and significant rollcall votes; 9 have been in opposition to some suggested step toward socialism; 18 have been in protection of our private enterprise system; 3 have effected important economies; 2 have been on foreign affairs; and 3 were crackdowns on subversive activities both in and out of Government. These were times when, because of the alliance of the people of the South, Democrats, and Republicans of the North, victories have been won in the votes of Congress. We can provide the date, we can provide the evidence, we can provide the rollcalls as proof.

They did this not once but 35 times since 1936. We simply propose to expand this "congressional alliance" so it can become effective in electing a like-minded President.

Question. If you work out this arrangement to take care of seniority problems for southern Democrats in the House and in the Senate, wouldn't that mean that whether or not the Republicans won the election, they would control Congress?

Answer. No. We wouldn't control it but the alliance group or coalition would control it—the alliance, as we prefer to call it, because a coalition seems to mean to many people in the South that the Democrats and the Republicans merge their identities in the South, and that's pretty difficult to do.

Question. So that the alliance would organize Congress?

Answer. The alliance controls it now. They don't organize it but they could organize it and they could establish a committee setup and conduct the majority caucus.

We now have an occasional alliance but it's spasmodic, it's intermittent, it's leaderless, it's thrown together as a creature of necessity and only on certain issues.

It has worked since 1936. And it's working more frequently all the time. It's accelerating. Already it has been the determining factor several times in the current session of Congress.

SENIORITY FOR ALL

Question. When you spoke of seniority, you didn't mean just chairmanships, you meant, too, that individual Members would not lose their seniority positions, didn't you?

Answer. Correct. That's exactly what we have to protect and that is almost a "must." And that's a new feature of this program. That's one of the new elements of our present proposals.

Question. Do you have time to get this operating this year—it isn't long?

Answer. No, it isn't long but we can move mighty fast. I would say that there is a good possibility of it moving next year if Harry Truman is renominated.

Question. Well you're assuming that—

Answer. If he is not renominated, it injures the chances of the alliance. But if instead of Harry Truman they nominate Justice Douglas, I would say you haven't injured its chances very much. If instead of that they nominate Chief Justice Vinson, I would say you have injured the chances more seriously.

Question. Unless Vinson's declarations and a platform make it clear that he has taken the northern point of view?

Answer. In which case it actually might facilitate the alliance, because you know how people are. If one of your own turns his back on you, you get pretty desperate and disgusted.

Question. You have an alliance now but the ultimate aim is a party, isn't it?

Answer. Yes. If this thing should work in 1952, we would suggest that in 1953, after the first session of Congress, that there be a post-presidential election convention, led by this President and this Vice President and

this positional majority in Congress who would have control of the White House and the Congress. But they have no name. They have no national organization. They have no party. They say, "Well, how about making this thing permanent, get organized so that 3 years from now we can have our own ticket in the field? Let's see if we can't agree on a set of principles built around this dictum of an indestructible union of indestructible States. Let's see if we can't find a label and develop an organization, with a chairman, and find a suitable party name."

Some have suggested that the party then be called, in the South, the Democratic-Republican Alliance for the next election, and that they work with this new political organization under that name. In the North, it would be called the Republican-Democratic Alliance. The two would stem from the same central headquarters. In other words, it would be the same organization, with the order in which the alliance is listed reversed in the North and the South.

This would enable all like-minded people, you see, to join up with the new party. It would compel the opposition viewpoint to organize a second party, and call themselves New Dealers, or Fair Dealers, or Socialists, or whatever they prefer. Then you'd have two real political parties. Each would stand for something definite. The voter would get a choice. For the first time since the War Between the States, the South would get the benefit of a two-party system at the local level, from the standpoint of local campaigns—and that's important because if you don't have that, you soon develop corrupt machines. The biggest dividend, I think, would be that the voter then could go to the polls and help direct the destiny of his Government because he would know he was voting for one concept of government or the other. Within each party there would still be great issues, of course, but you would have a basic philosophical and political basis for cohesion and agreement. We used to have that in the past but that's gone. We don't have any basic difference between our two political parties as they now operate.

A VOICE FOR THE SOUTH

Question. How about the Dixiecrats?

Answer. I believe that that is a movement which has terminated. I think that the people who belonged to it and who lead it are looking for some other more effective device for the elections which lie ahead. I believe they, and many others in the South are eager to associate themselves with some national movement to once again give the South a strong voice in the selection and the election of our Presidents.

During the late forties and early fifties, a great many newspapers began devoting editorial space to the possibilities and potentialities of party realignment either within the Congress or among the general voting. At first the idea was interpreted as embracing the idea of a third party but as time wore on a more accurate understanding of what is involved began to emerge. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an open letter to the Minneapolis Star, published in Minneapolis, Minn., in which I endeavored to correct some of the early misunderstandings and misapprehensions in the proposed procedures of political realignment.

It will be noted that fully 14 years ago, the patterns were being proposed and formulated which today have been so dramatically employed by Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina by his action in moving from the Demo-

cratic side of the Chamber to the Republican side of the Senate thus making party realignment a significant part of our current American history.

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

[From the Minneapolis Star]

EVERYBODY'S IDEAS: SENATOR MUNDT DEFENDS HIS NEW PARTY PROPOSAL

TO THE EDITOR: I have read with interest the honest and analytical discussion (Mar. 28) by Wilbur Elston of your Washington bureau, under the heading, "What Chance Has Senator MUNDT's New Party Idea?"

Elston's article raised five important questions indicating problems which must be overcome if a political realignment such as I have been proposing is to succeed. Since he placed those questions before your readers, it occurs to me some of them might be interested in the answers.

Elston's first question was: "How would this coalition, of Republicans and southern Democrats, keep the support of liberal Republicans?" The answer: That all depends upon what is meant by a "liberal Republican." To me an honest "liberal" is one who abhors and resents equally both economic and political monopoly.

I define a "liberal" as one who would keep in the hands of the people the maximum of governmental authority and the greatest degree of direction over individual activity. I believe that "liberals" of this type should join their efforts to stop the trends toward the all powerful Federal Government.

I think many such "liberals" would welcome the opportunity to cross party lines to support candidates dedicated to the maintenance of personal freedom, individual enterprise, private ownership, and States rights.

Question No. 2: How could Republicans be persuaded to give up their claims to choice committee chairmanships? It is proposed to merge the seniority rights of all Congressmen and Senators from States participating in the alliance to elect an antisocialistic candidate for President.

Thus both southern Democrats and northern Republicans would have their seniority status protected. As members of the majority group in Congress, Republican Members would have more influence and authority certainly than as ranking Members of an ineffective minority, which except for 2 years has been the Republican position for more than two decades.

Question No. 3: "How could the coalition reconcile the divergent views of southern Democrats and Republicans on foreign policy even if it could be got together on domestic issues?" It is not hoped or expected that there would be unanimity among the majority group on either foreign or domestic policy.

On the domestic front, it might approach near unanimity on most issues—economy, the rights of States, protection of individual enterprise, etc. In foreign policy, a friendly, working team in which the executive officials and the Congress would have mutual respect for and confidence in each other should certainly evolve a less controversial foreign policy than, for example, the present one for Asia.

Question No. 4: "With the industrialization of the South and the further emancipation of the Negro, wouldn't a coalition with the conservative southern Democrats benefit the Republicans only temporarily?" That is possible and it might be desirable.

I believe firmly in the two-party system. Against the proposed "alliance" of like minded Southern and Northern voters there would certainly be formed an alliance of opposition—a second national political party advocating a contrasting set of policies and principles. It would be useful if the Presi-

dency and control of Congress would occasionally switch from one party to the other.

A big disadvantage of the present political alignments is that neither party really considers the South in selecting candidates, writing platforms, or seeking votes in the Presidential sweepstakes. Both Presidential candidates ignore the South after the political conventions.

At convention time the South is ignored by the Democrats and it contributes little to the Republican convention since its delegates represent an area already written off from Republican prospects as "traditionally Democratic." In reality the Republican Party does not operate in more than 36 States—probably less—in the all-important Presidential determination.

Question No. 5: "In view of the Republican gains in such States as Maryland and Oklahoma in recent years, wouldn't Republican leaders gain more by putting their money and effort into organization work in Southern and Border States?"

In my opinion, No. We Republicans are great on optimism and overconfidence in the odd numbered years but usually short on victory in the years of Presidential decisions.

It will take many years to establish an effective Republican organization in at least 12 of the Southern and Border States. In most of them, no Republican runs for county or State office in the vast majority of counties. In many of them Republican leadership is inadequate and inexperienced. In some, Republicanism is scarcely respectable.

If we had generations in which to work, the Republican Party might truly become a national rather than a sectional party but the shift toward socialism has been so swift and has gone so far, I believe it must be stopped before the slow processes of "re-educating the South" can become effective. A working political alliance between North and South could help achieve victory against Trumanism in 1952—it could shortly afterward evolve into a permanent political grouping which for a time might be called the Democratic-Republican alliance. It could bring about the creating of two major political parties—each national in character, each with a definite set of principles.

KARL E. MUNDT,

U.S. Senator from South Dakota.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for a strictly and traditionally Southern viewpoint on political realignment in the early 1950's, a Southern Democratic editor, James M. Thomson, of Virginia, wrote, financed, and circulated a pamphlet entitled, "Sound Democrats and Republicans Should Combine for Country's Sake." While Mr. Thomson weaves into his discussion some elements and aspects not a part of the thinking and concepts which I utilized in my advocacy of political realignment I ask unanimous consent to insert his presentation in the RECORD at this point to help round out the picture as it appeared to various people some 14 or 15 years ago.

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

SOUND DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS SHOULD COMBINE FOR COUNTRY'S SAKE—FRINGE VOTERS, SPLINTER PARTIES AND MINORITIES DETERMINING AMERICAN POLICY FOR PAST 20 YEARS—THE MUNDT PLAN PRACTICABLE (By James M. Thomson, Gaylord, Clarke County, Va.)

Small minorities and splinter parties have set the policies and largely dominated the Government of our great country for 20 years. Our young people, a majority of our qualified

voters, who have come of age in that period have not known normal government under the traditional American system. As a result the healthy and sane, progressive and balanced American system established by the founders of our Republic is known and remembered only by the older Americans. These younger people have seen emergency piled on emergency, and they have seen emergencies created as a pretext for changing, curtailing and destroying their liberties and rights. They have seen tax piled on tax until their freedom, their earnings, and their savings are by way of being destroyed.

The shrewd demagoguery by which Mussolini took over Italy, Hitler took over Germany, and by which Lenin and Stalin took over Russia, has been imported, given an American label, and put to work to create an American executive bureaucracy and dictatorship. We all know that the dictatorships of Italy, Germany, and Russia evolved quickly into warlike and bloody tyrannies. America needs a reorganization of parties now if she is to avoid the road which most of the world has traveled since World War I.

Recently a U.S. Senator, KARL E. MUNDT, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which he has made in various places pointing out quite clearly some of the reasons for the political distortion of the will of a majority of the people in England and in America. Senator MUNDT from unimpeachable figures shows that the Conservative and Liberal Parties combined could have easily elected a safe majority of the British House of Commons. Both oppose the Socialist dictatorship which is being created in England. They divided their votes and handed England over to socialism. Senator MUNDT's figures on England are irrefutable. From England's example and from the Senator's long fight against communism in our own country he recognizes the danger of the splinter party domination of our own Government in years past. And as a remedy Senator MUNDT, a liberal Republican from South Dakota now advocates the political merger of those Democrats and Republicans of America who believe in constitutional government. Senator MUNDT is no demagog, no dreamer. He is comfortably situated politically and must be credited with motives of sincere patriotism in the stand he now takes.

THE SOCIALIST-COMMUNIST COMBINE

Senator MUNDT evidently believes a reorganization of parties would result in the Socialist-Communist and radical political elements of our country assembling in an opposition party. As matters stand these elements are in both our national parties. We have, in reality, four or even five political parties in our National House and Senate. This constitutes the same danger for the United States that it has constituted for Russia, Germany, Italy and other European countries—notably France. As politics is a business that now absorbs just about a third of all the wages, profits, and earning power of every American, every major politician knows what has happened to our country. But as this vast tax revenue taken from the people provides jobs and keeps many politicians in office and power there are many politicians who are neither as patriotic nor as candid as is Senator MUNDT.

The American Presidency is the greatest political prize in the world. An army and navy of over 3 million men, between 2 and 3 million civilian employees, billions of dollars in contracts, judicial appointments, control of expenditures for pensions, relief, subsidies, grants, control of conscription, of income tax, of farm and food prices, power to prosecute great or small business and great or small individuals—all these powers come under the Presidency. Also there is control of the radio, of a vast propaganda machine, of moving pictures, television, and control of money and credit through direct Government lend-

ing and through Federal inspection and control of banks. The vast Federal executive machine through direct and indirect control of tax money can buy votes, influence primaries and elections of Congressmen and Senators, and through its patronage and party powers can deprive Congressmen of legitimate patronage and can subject them to party discipline. Is it to be wondered at that profit from this system or fear of a growing tyranny paralyzes the spirit of so much of the American public?

THE SOUTHERN ACE-IN-THE-HOLE

How have the minorities been able to control the historic Democratic Party? The answer is simple. Votes in the electoral college determine the Presidency. The South and Border States of the United States have two-thirds of the electoral votes necessary for a majority of 266 in the electoral college. Southern Democrats normally dominate national elections in these States. They constitute the ace-in-the-hole for anyone achieving a Democratic nomination. The Republican Party, running on a Civil War record, was able for three-quarters of a century to count certain Northern and Western States as solidly Republican. But that condition no longer exists. It has not existed for many years. It will not exist again. The result is that the Republicans, cut out of this captive Democratic vote, have a fighting chance only among two-thirds of the electoral vote in the electoral college. The Democrats outside the South and Border States have to fight for only one-third of the electoral votes in order to secure an electoral college majority. For these votes they trade foreign and domestic policies and jobs with the Communist and Socialist controlled splinter parties of the North.

If a presidential candidate gets a majority of the electoral college—266—votes he is winner. And the winner takes all. So the Democratic candidates have to seek the electoral vote of only a few States. One of these is New York with about 10 percent of the votes in the electoral college. Add 10 percent to 33 percent and you have 43 percent; that leaves only 8 percent of the electoral votes in order to have a majority. In New York the oldtime Republicans have normally about 45 percent of the popular vote. The oldtime normal Democratic vote is about 45 percent. Ten percent is independent or doubtful. To win either party must get more than half of this doubtful vote. Result, a few hundred votes more than a popular majority in New York swings about 10 percent of the votes in the electoral college. The Democrats have to win a majority in only a few States to control the electoral college. The Republicans have to win almost all the States of the North and West to control the college.

NEW YORK AN EXAMPLE

Now let us take New York as an example of several States North and West with large populations and large electoral votes. There are several small tightly knit political parties in New York. Separately they appear unimportant. But united they cast some 400,000 or 500,000 popular votes. They are composed of voters tied together on racial, religious, or economic lines. Many of these voters cannot speak English. Many have never been west of the Hudson River. What has happened to their former homeland in Japan, China, Poland, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Puerto Rico, or any one of a hundred foreign countries constitutes a voting issue with them. Or putting a relative on relief or getting one a job may be the determining factor. While America slept the coldest-blooded, most unscrupulous country in the world has worked at the top among the leaders of these people. So Russian communistic tyranny has greatly influenced and often controlled these splinter parties in New York.

Space is lacking to go into the now rather well-known Communist technique in dealing with American city and industrial politics. The Old World is run by executive dictatorships. And the men who came into control of the deliverable margin of splinter party voters in New York traded with both parties for jobs and for legislative policies. The Federal service has been filled for a fifth of a century with keymen placed by these minority groups. The policies of the Government have been framed and carried out by these people. And Federal legislation has been shaped by them. Communist fellow travelers, Socialists, radicals, parlor pinks, theorists, and liberals. If you wanted to know the direction of the executive departments of the Government you consulted the organs of these minority groups, the Nation, the New Republic, and daily papers in New York and Chicago owned by Marshall Field, P. M. and the Chicago Sun.

All told these groups in New York and other key States probably commanded a million votes. But this million has been paramount in Federal policy and legislation. To those Democrats who sought the Presidency it gave the margin for victory, the last few inches in the race which put their horse first under the wire. Again these marginal voters have become so important in the minds of politicians that in a State like New York, for example, they virtually write the platforms and select the candidates for both of our great national parties. Wilkie and Dewey in platform speeches and policies advocated, were largely "me too" candidates for the Presidency.

CATER TO FRINGE PARTY

Thus in most matters of national policy the votes of America are controlled by this splinter controlled 5 percent in presidential elections. The reason is that the majority are divided into two parties operating under Republican and Democratic labels. And the tragedy of the situation is that a Republican national victory under present party divisions would not insure control of America by a majority of its voters. It would probably be only a temporary thing. For the Republicans to hold office would immediately have to cater to this fringe element in the doubtful States.

To effect a permanent realignment of parties it is necessary for the South and the Border States to move into a new party alignment. Three years ago some four Southern States moved away from old line Republican and Democratic nominees to a States Rights presidential ticket. State rights, local self government has today more of an appeal North than it has South. For the Communist-Socialist elements in the North are seeking to have the National Government confiscate the earnings and the accumulations of the people of the wealthier States and distribute some of this money where it will buy the necessary margin of electoral votes in the poorer States. They want to use the power over taxes to destroy the initiative and savings of people everywhere. And to this end they have made some converts in the South.

A curious political condition exists in the United States today. Nine out of ten southern Democrats who work for their own living and have no connection with the several million Federal payrollers or officeholders know that they have nothing in common with either New Deal or Fair Deal national policies. The southern lawyer, merchant, farmer, worker in Alabama, Texas, Georgia has identical interests in national economic, social and political problems with the lawyer, merchant, farmer and worker of Kansas, Indiana, Iowa, Nebraska. One votes a ticket with a Democratic label, the other a ticket with the Republican label, and thus they cancel out and kill one another's votes and allow a largely socialistic, alien minority element to govern our country.

NEGRO AND FOREIGN BORN

There has always been merit in a political issue which aimed at the protection of the weak and the poor. This issue has been variously used by the Republican Party to help and protect the Negro slaves and by the Democratic Party to help and protect the newly arrived immigrant. It is now being used by the New Deal Party to join the Negro who has been freed for almost a century and the recently arrived immigrant to oppress oldtime Americans, Democrats and Republicans alike. The fact is the oldtime party divisions and issues no longer exist. The Negroes of America are better off than are any members of their race anywhere in the world; and our foreign born are far better off than are any of the people in the countries from which they came.

They are welcome to have a party and to vote as they please in this country. They may continue to control the Democratic Party in name. But when the message is taken to the oldtime Democrat who votes 10 votes to their 1 the real Democratic Party will move away from them. This it should do. And the real Republican Party members should move away from its New Deal, Fair Deal Republicans and join with real Democrats who think as they do.

The people who can bring this about in the South and among Democrats are the rank and file of independent Democrats. When these independents associate themselves and let their local officeholders, their Governors, national committeemen and their Federal Representatives and Senators know that they are in earnest there will be no difficulty in most instances in the South. The officeholder naturally wants to hold his office. Moreover most of these southern Democratic officeholders are sick unto death of the things they have been forced to stand for and defend in their party's name. What's more, in a new victorious party they can continue to hold their patronage. That is the practical side. Today these southerners are really people without a party. There are very, very few "reactionary Republicans" who have not been more welcome at the White House and in our executive departments for 20 years past than have genuine southern Democrats. Very few of these real southern Democrats can run for office without either ignoring or repudiating their national administration. Socialism and communism are alien to the southern Democratic voter.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE THE ANSWER

While 4 out of 5 Americans will agree that there should be an amalgamation of people politically who think alike a great many people are under the impression this would be hard or impossible to accomplish. This is not true. Those who spread this idea are those who favor the status quo, who profit from the splinter party racket. What counts for the election of a President is a majority of the national electoral college. And the electoral vote of each State in the Union can be controlled by the people of that State. And not a majority, but a plurality of the voters of each State control the electoral vote. In the opinion of this writer whose lifetime has been spent in the South and Border States an amalgamation of the oldline Democrats and the oldline Republicans can carry almost every State in the Union, thus insuring the election of a President of their choice. This is neither a Socialist nor a Communist country. And it may be that the loss of countless thousands of our young men and safety from destruction of the liberties and the solvency of all the people of this country depends on some such program as this being worked out for our next presidential election.

As a college student I saw Grover Cleveland hand over the reins of Government to William McKinley. Nearly 40 years ago I attended my first national political conven-

tion. Subsequently I was privileged to take part as a delegate in a number of Democratic conventions. Of necessity I acquiesced in Franklin Roosevelt's first nomination. As a matter of conscience as well as conviction I could not support him, nor would I have supported anyone else for a third term. I accepted membership in a delegation to the Chicago Democratic Convention whose objective was opposition to Roosevelt for a fourth term. In that convention were many decent, high-grade patriotic men and women. Yet it represented an alltime low in national conventions. Its music and its program came from the political sewers of Washington and Chicago. In Hitler's palmy days he exerted no more control over the German Reichstag than was exerted by Roosevelt over this allegedly governing body of a once great national party. Roosevelt designated a Russian-born leader of one of New York's political minority blocks to pass on the eligibility of all candidates for Vice President. Roosevelt's payrollers and patronage beneficiaries were sufficiently numerous to insure his own nominations. A great element in the convention felt that Roosevelt was a sick, probably a dying man. The Wallace for President leaders acted as if they were convinced that in supporting Wallace they were nominating not a Vice President but a President. Wallace came within an ace of being nominated. Truman was the only possible alternative choice because barring Wallace he was the only candidate with convention strength who had received the blessing of Sidney Hillman.

BUYING VOTES WITH TAX MONEY

I was born in the Shenandoah Valley. My father was a Confederate veteran. His only brother, a Confederate officer, served throughout the war and was killed in the fighting around Appomattox. I like many others of Southern descent inherited my membership in the Democratic Party. It is a matter of conviction with me that a citizen should vote. So I voted for Wilkie, for Dewey, and in the last election I voted with enthusiasm for the Southern States Rights ticket, THURMOND and Wright.

I am now convinced that the next Democratic convention will be controlled by officeholders, Government contractors and beneficiaries of the present administration policy of buying alien and domestic influence with American tax money. To the extent of my small personal influence I will join with those independents who will work among the upstanding American elements of both parties to form a soundly progressive political party.

The Civil War should never have been fought. Almost a century has passed since it started. It was precipitated by a minority of hotheads and resulted from a splitting up of parties. Its result was economic slavery for black and white for several generations. If that war had not been fought slavery could not have lasted 20 years.

When America ceases to have in its population a majority of sane, patriotic and soundly progressive people this country will go the way of all the world leaders. It won't do for the outs to claim all the virtues and accuse the ins of all the corruption and decay which comes from too long terms of power. The coalition of sound Democrats and of sound Republicans that exists today in the House and Senate furnishes the basis for a sound political party. For example, George and Russell of Georgia, Wherry and Butler of Nebraska, are able men, patriotic and independent and politically as well as personally honest. Many other examples could be cited. All men of this type should be kept in office by an amalgamated party. Only by the coalition and organization of independent men of both parties can a new party be brought into existence. Once the will is expressed by enough people the way can easily be found.

Our America at war, loaded with debt, oppressed by unprecedented taxes, threatened with destructive inflation, burdened with a growing executive dictatorship, can no longer afford the destruction of substance and liberty which demagogues and incompetents would continue to heap upon it.

Sound Democrats, sound Republicans and sound independents can no longer afford to be governed by splinter parties and divided by false issues or matters of no moment.

The real democracy of the South, and of the Nation should organize and seek association with the real Republicans of the North. And the real Republicans should put aside their present hope of a partisan victory and align themselves with sound Democrats for the sake, not of political office but of the good of the United States of America. For at home and abroad we are in great peril.

Mr. President, South Carolina, because of today's action by Senator THURMOND, is certain to be much in the political news the next few months and years. Among the addresses I delivered in the South in support of a more realistic and meaningful political realignment in this country were two before conventions of the South Carolina State Bankers Association. In the second of these speeches delivered in Greenville, S.C., in 1956, I resumed and reinforced a theme which I had first presented to those bankers several years before. Eventually, the American Good Government Society put out in booklet form the text of that address entitled "The Key to the Future of American Politics" together with a foreword by then Senator John Bricker, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that address appear as a part of these remarks.

Under the subheading of "Five Suggested Remedies," will be found a discussion on political realignment—its need and its realities—as the picture looked to me in 1956, some 7 or 8 years after I first picked up the cudgels in support of such procedures.

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

THE KEY TO THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN POLITICS

(By Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, June 4, 1956)

FOREWORD BY JOHN W. BRICKER

In this address to the bankers of South Carolina Senator MUNDT goes to the heart of the political realities with which we in public life—in both parties—must contend.

Senator MUNDT has long been deeply concerned about the growing ideological divisions within both the Democrat and Republican parties. He is convinced, after long and careful study, that the only practical solution of this fundamental problem is a political realignment of the parties and a reform of the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President.

This speech should be read carefully and thoughtfully by every one who is concerned about the future of the United States.

THE KEY TO THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN POLITICS

(By Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, June 4, 1956)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on May 5, I had the opportunity to address for the second time the State convention of the South Carolina State Bankers Association. The meeting was held in Greenville, S.C.

My central theme was that it is fully as important that American businessmen understand the mechanics of politics and the science of political engineering as it is that they understand the mechanics of business and production or the science of economics.

My address was transcribed from the radio tape provided by the radio station broadcasting my off-the-cuff address to the convention, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

"Thank you, very much, indeed, Mr. Chairman, for that altogether too generous introduction.

"I suspect that during the past quarter of a century of world history there have been more important changes made than in any other like period of human history, and, in my opinion, none of the changes on the American scene is more important than this simple but incontrovertible fact, and that is that 25 years ago economics was the controlling factor of our political life, and today politics has become the controlling factor in our economic life. It seems to me that that tremendous change very well typifies many of the problems which confront us, and pretty well challenges our ability whether we are economists, businessmen, or politicians to try and find a way to correct any difficulties which may have eventuated from that strange reversal of the coin.

"In the early 1930's and in previous eras of American history, the economic tone of the Nation in large part determined the voting behavior of our citizens, and decided the fate of our various national administrations. We had slogans about the full dinner pail; campaign platforms, and campaign promises, and campaign pronouncements were made dealing with the unemployment statistics, dealing with the earning power of citizens, dealing primarily with the economic situation.

"Today, I think, few if any among us, will deny the fact that the Government has grown so strong and Federal spending has become so important that the political bias of our national administrations determine the economic tone of our Nation and the financial status of millions of Americans, whether they be workers or farmers or businessmen. Not all change in my opinion is progress, and, in my opinion, we have gone too far in the direction of gearing our prosperity curves and our individual financial success to the political philosophies which dominate the White House and the Congress. To return to an era in which the operation of economic principles and policies once again have a dominant part in determining our national destiny, however, is going to require a substantial shrinkage in the power, in the spending, and in the regulations of the Federal Government.

"America today is enjoying unprecedented prosperity. We hear of that as we study every financial report of virtually every successful corporation in the country. Optimism for the future prevails on every side. These rose-tinted conditions have developed from the fact that we now have a national administration which commands public confidence and a bipartisan Congress which respects private ownership and individual freedom. However, in any era, when the stock market stampedes up or down depending upon the readings of an electric cardiograph and when a public address by a member of the President's Cabinet can stimulate or retard vast industrial expenditures, there can be no denial of the fact that we are living in an era where political behavior has become the throttle which determines the speed or the success of economic expansion.

"This being true, and I believe it to be true, businessmen, including bankers—in-

cluding, may I say, especially bankers, because so much of the rest of the economic community rightfully depends on bankers for counsel and advice—businessmen then, especially bankers, must reexamine their political prejudices and preferences and performances. I think the same is true of labor whose success is tied in so closely with the success of business, but I am speaking here primarily to businessmen who, in my opinion, must become as well versed in what is good for them politically as they are trained in what is good for their institutions economically.

"To do less than that is to turn over the ultimate success of their enterprises to power-seeking professional politicians, who consider politics solely as a device for achieving office, and who use public power as a muclaginous device for holding them in their positions of prestige and importance as long as possible. Those tactics have destroyed the economic strength and the political authority of many of our Western democracies who less than 20 years ago were comparatively strong and stable. Those tactics, in my opinion, can devitalize America as well, and unless we pay as much attention to the political machines as we do the machines of commerce that we use in our offices and in our factories, it can very easily happen in this great country that we call America.

"Increasingly the strong arm of Government is moving into your shops, into your offices, into your every economic determination, and that my good friends, brings me to the theme which I desire to talk about. With that historic backdrop I think that I should discuss with you the machinery and the mechanics of politics as I have come to understand them after some 20 years devoted to a study and analysis of them from the inside, following, as the chairman has said, 10 years of study of them from the outside when I was engaged in teaching college youngsters about the basic tenets of America. Because of that, I appreciate this invitation even more to come down into the Deep South to think out loud with you for a while about some of these conclusions or conjectures which I have, because I know that here I have always received respectful and responsible attention to the analysis.

"As Dixie goes, so goes the world

"I come here not necessarily with any desire whatever to seek approval or acceptance of the suggestions that I made, but I always have the right to hope, and sometimes my hope is encouraged by some of the performances of recent history. I come here, however, primarily to discuss with you as honestly and as frankly and as faithfully as I can what I think is happening to America and what I think primarily can be changed in America only by the behavior politically of the people of the South.

"But I have a prevailing feeling which has continued to evolve to greater and greater clarity and greater and greater emphasis. I have a prevailing conviction that what happens in Dixie in the next 10 years is going to determine definitely what happens to America in the next 100. And this I also believe—that what happens in America in the next few years is going pretty clearly to determine what happens around the globe, because so many little people in smaller countries or less-developed areas are watching this great clash of the ideologies, hoping that our system will prevail, but fearful that it won't; so I think that our capacity to make America work well is going to go a long way to determine what happens in other countries of this great world of ours.

"I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to talk to important people in the most important area of the world, because what you do or fail to do, I believe, is going to determine the fate of humanity in the century just ahead. No other great area of the country

or, of the world, by its own free choice has such an opportunity, and with it, in my opinion, such a tremendous responsibility.

"The curse of modern government

"I think the curse of modern government around the world is the fact that steadily and continuously and perniciously it has been constantly expanding the power of its functionaries in the capital cities of each country of the world. Without exception, in the countries of importance, the power of people in political jobs like mine and in the executive department, and in the judiciary, and in the central cities of the land has been expanding steadily over the functions of people in private jobs like yours. It has brought disaster and war and unhappiness to large segments of the world. It has brought to Britain almost a collapse of its economic solvency. We in the United States have resisted this global trend more successfully than others, but few among us will argue that we have resisted it completely or enough.

"We have gone downward on the same train, down the same hill; our brakes have held us back a little, but not enough to protect our economic and political safety. I believe, and I may have said this when I was here before, that future historians writing about the America of the thirties and the forties and the fifties, and future histories written about the pages of America which are yet unknown, looking for a point of departure, looking for a place in which to put a thumbtack marking the time and the date and the hour and the place where America changed from a complete and faithful following of certain economic, social, and political concepts to something strangely and dangerously different, are going to find that place and mark that hour as the occasion of the great national convention of the strong and great Democratic Party, to which you belong, which was held in convention assembled in the year 1936, in the city of Philadelphia.

"I think they will mark that development in 1936 as they study what has been happening in America to such universally accepted American institutions and practices, for example, as private ownership, as our reward of merit system, as the great American concept of giving individual initiative unlimited opportunity to expand, or the great American and uniquely American concept of States rights and the feeling that in this Commonwealth of States, which makes up the Republic known as the United States of America, States have functions and States have privileges and States have rights, along with maintaining a meaningful, significant, effective two-party system with adequate political machinery to make it operate.

"As they inquire as to why America, blessed with all of those things preceding the thirties, has suddenly begun a concentrated attack upon them, all trying to devitalize and trying to stultify them, trying at times to destroy them, they will also have to analyze what developments followed your actions in that convention. Why did it happen to us? No other foreign country has adopted a formula of economic or political behavior even remotely approximating the successes we had achieved. We had lived well and had gone forward with great rapidity regardless of whether your party or mine was in power in the White House. Under Republicans and Democrats alike in Congress or in the White House, America had gone ahead. We had become the envy of the world, the only country compelled to erect immigration barriers to be safe from being flooded out by all the rest of humanity that wanted to locate here so that they could enjoy private ownership, to locate here so they could enjoy the reward of merit system, to locate here so that they could give their individual initiative a chance to expand, to locate here where they could uniquely be-

come a citizen of a state which had some rights and a governor and a supreme court and some mores and some customs and some laws of its own. From every other land they wanted to locate here because we had a two-party system. We had a political machine and political mechanics which made every man a king, gave every individual a right to help determine his own destiny. Why are we changing? Why have we changed? When did it happen and where?

"A turning point in American political behavior"

"Historians will have to answer that. I think, as I said, that they are going to pick the place that I have mentioned, and the Democratic convention of 1936 as the hour, and the change of your convention rules as the cause—when the South was reluctantly compelled to abandon the two-thirds rule. It was with far a less degree of reluctance, I am sure, than you would have shown had you known as clearly then what was going to happen as we all know now. In all of this, when the South was compelled to abandon the two-thirds rule in Democratic conventions, and at the same time retain the unit rule, which was a siamese twin companion of the two-thirds rule, we set in operation political machinery which has influenced completely our ensuing developments. The spirit of America has not changed; our basic goals have not changed; our objectives have not changed; but something has happened to the politics and the machinery of self-government in this beloved Republic of ours.

"This whole thing we call politics—or the mechanics of self-government. Thus, it is political engineering and the machinery of politics which has changed your lives and mine, and which has altered tremendously all predictions for our future. By projecting forward the trends of the past 20 years we can rather accurately predict what lies ahead for all of us unless some sharp and permanent political changes are made by you good folks of the Old South. We can now envision how political developments determine all human behavior and what you do or fail to do down here different from what has been your prevailing political behavior will call the tune for all Americans.

"It isn't only upon your traditional Democratic Party that the break with the past which took place at the Democratic National Convention of 1936 had a prophetic and determining impact. Actually that change in your convention rules had indirectly but definitely almost as important and lasting an effect upon our Republican Party. In a great two-party country like ours, the behavior and bias of one of our parties always tends to influence the behavior and bias of the other. Anything which succeeds steadily for the one is certain to be emulated by the other." Anything that brings defeat to the one is likewise avoided by the other. Thus, our two parties learn from each other, just as they tend to imitate and approximate each other at regular intervals.

"When for a long time—a sorrowful and mighty expensive long time, I might say—campaign and convention tactics which were designed to appeal to mass voters in big blocs (especially in our metropolitan cities of the North) brought stupendous and steady majorities to the Democratic or the New Deal Party, it was understandable and inevitable that my Republican Party started emulating some of those tactics. We started directing our appeals to those same bloc voters. Since, in the main, the interests and ideals of the South do not coincide with those of the CIO-PAC, or those of Americans for Democratic Action, or those of the "banana-bunch" type of voters who group themselves in ethnic, vocational, left-wing, or other pressure groups, it appeared for a time that the fine folks of the Old South were to

be left out of the picture altogether when it came to determining the political policies of either major party. You were on the way to becoming the world's largest group of enfranchised citizens whose voices were ignored in the making of party policy and in the selection of party candidates and whose votes were considered so safely in the bag that neither party paid you any heed.

"Then came 1948, when four courageous States of Dixie signaled to the rest of the country that they had had enough. No longer were they willing to be tied tight in the back seat to be taken for a ride in a political automobile which they were never permitted to steer.

"And then came 1952. I sometimes feel that the Divine Architect of the Universe, realizing that America is His last chance to make decency prevail, to make freedom function, and to give law-obeying citizens a civilization which they themselves can regulate and control decides at times to step in to help us all set America right. Recognizing, for example, that if peace and self-government collapse here, they will have failed all over, perhaps He moves in just 15 minutes before it is altogether too late in order to give Americans and America another chance.

"In all events, came 1952, and an unanticipated, and unexpected development took place. Americans, pretty much without any party designation whatsoever, turned to a great American leader in a military sense, who himself had no political designations whatsoever, and both parties sought to secure Dwight Eisenhower as their candidate for President. My party happened to succeed. I don't suppose he would have been a different individual had your party succeeded. In all events, pretty much by acclamation, joined in, I am proud to say, by five great southern Democratic States and encouraged by the rest of them, the country turned to someone outside of political life, and said, 'Mr. Eisenhower, you take over and be President of the country.'

"America now has a second chance—provided Dixie leads the way"

"That has given us a breathing spell; that has given us a chance for a second look. It has not, nor could it be expected to have, solved completely all of the problems and challenges that we were confronted with. It has not altered what, in my opinion, is positively going to eventuate as a result of what happened in that Democratic convention, or even what happened to my party as a result of that convention; it has not altered what is going to lie ahead once the Eisenhower era is over. I very frankly was one of those who thought for a long time after the President's unfortunate heart attack that he would not be able to become a candidate for office. I worried about that, because this I believe: Once Ike is no longer a candidate, America is going to face a showdown decision on basic principles, the verdict on which is going to dominate the lives of all of us for the rest of our existence. I expected that to come in 1956.

"I consequently worried about that 1956 decision, because I knew America wasn't ready from the standpoint of political engineering to make that verdict honestly and effectively and on basic principles devoid of antiquated partisan prejudices. We are not yet ready to avoid old political affinities or to eliminate a lot of cloudy fuzziness in our elective machinery which makes it pretty well impossible today for right-thinking people in America to unite on a basic issue, regardless of where they happen to live geographically or how they happen to be registered politically. Unless we can develop the necessary political machinery to do that, I am going to tell you before this address is over who is going to write the ticket for Uncle Sam, and you aren't going to like the

ticket, and neither am I. You aren't going to have anything to do about writing the ticket, and neither am I, unless down here you people rise up to one of the greatest challenges our civilization ever had and utilize the essential techniques of sound political engineering to help write the right kind of ticket for the country and the world.

"I know you are not ready for that in 1956, and that's one reason I am so glad that Ike's heart has restored itself to the point where he can run again and thus give America until 1960 to develop the necessary political changes to preserve our cherished freedoms.

"Some of you will like what I am going to say now, and some of you will dislike it, but I tell it to you as an observation I believe to be a fact; I think that if that heart holds up, as I believe it will, our present President is going to be reelected for a second term. I think our breathing spell, which looked like it was going to be cut short by 4 years, which wouldn't have given us much time for political engineering, is going to get a second breath, and that we will now have until 1960 to get ready for the showdown issues.

"I think this breathing spell, this era of moderation, this middle-of-the-road consolidation of our position, this resistance to further movements in the direction of socialism, will carry on under Eisenhower's leadership until 1960. If it does, the question is, 'Will we be ready then to answer the five prodigious questions you and I are going to have to answer then and could conceivably be called upon to answer even as soon as next November?'

"Five basic issues facing us now—or in 1960"

"The first question is, 'How big would you like to have the Federal Government become?' We have two opinions in this country. I don't discredit or disparage the patriotism of those who hold, as many do, that the Federal Government should grow on continuously. That 20 years from now State governors should not have any importance whatsoever, except to perform ceremonial functions like a British king. State legislatures even less. People are entitled to that opinion. The British have had a unitary system of government without a breakdown into states rights, and states capitals, and states functions for a long while. The British are a remarkable people. I have visited there many times. I respect their indefatigability and their courage and what they are able to do in their island kingdom. So few of them have affected the lives of so many. But that is something you have got to decide—how big do you want our Federal Government to grow? I'll make a guess with you. I know the people of South Dakota better than I know the people of South Carolina, but I can tell you this, that the people of South Dakota say, 'Our Federal Government has already gotten too big, we want it smaller.' I think you also believe that; I don't know; but if you believe that, I submit to you that we don't have the political machinery today with which you can effectively and easily join up with South Dakotans who believe like you. We've got to cut down the size and the interference and the power of the Federal Government. But still we lack effective political machinery for deciding the question in conformity with our convictions. If we decide that we want the Government bigger than it is, that's a permanent decision, because once you socialize an industry, it can be power or it could be banking—and it's likely to be banking's big sister, the insurance industry before it actually is banking—once you nationalize a big industry, it is very difficult to denationalize it, to get it back to private owners. So remember, we are playing for keeps. We are making a verdict for which there is not going to be a mistrial and a second chance, and in my opinion we are not

ready to make that verdict properly with our existing political alignments. That is why I prayerfully give thanks for Eisenhower, who is going to give us time, in my opinion, to get ready for this big important decision in 1960.

"Second question: 'How much should the Federal Government cost?' There are good people in this country, patriotic people, who say they can settle this question: 'Spend as much as you can. We only owe the money to ourselves. Why worry about balancing the budget? Spend for everything, spend for everybody, spend all the time, you can always get it from the people in taxes.' I don't question their patriotism. I question their economics. I deplore their judgment. I know they are preaching something which is anathema to the economic concepts which I studied in college; repugnant to the economic concepts which my people believe. I know my people don't like these spending sprees out in South Dakota. They think we are spending too much now. I think so too. I think you think so too, but if you do, there isn't any generally acceptable political machinery in this greatest country in the world today which will easily and effectively permit the people in South Carolina and the people in South Dakota in a national election to join forces to strike a blow for economy, or to team up in voting for a party or a President pledged to perform economically and who will be faithful to that pledge.

"Third big decision: 'How much should the Government own and operate?' I don't know what you believe. I know there is a big segment of the South that believes that the power business should be turned over to the Federal Government. Maybe so. I certainly believe the Federal Government should own some things. Most of us surely agree it should run the Army, and the Air Force, and our post offices, but I think, and I believe you think, and I know the people of South Dakota think that the Federal Government should cease expanding out as a giant competitor to private enterprises all over the country. I believe that you and I believe, and I know the people of South Dakota too, believe the Federal Government shouldn't get into the automobile business, or the insurance business, or the banking business, that we shouldn't have socialized medicine, that we shouldn't have Government radio, we shouldn't have Government railroads, we shouldn't have Government newspapers. Now there are good Americans who believe otherwise. Some of them are in Congress now. We are going to have to decide this basic issue pretty soon. I thought, perhaps, we were going to have to decide it in 1956. With Ike a candidate, we'll have additional time, but in 1960 when we go back to bidding for the bunches of votes where they are, and have to promise the bloc voters the things they want, it will be an issue. In fact, it could unhappily become a fact without ever having become an issue in the campaign, because if both parties start promising what your one party was promising in the forties, these things can become an actuality without your ever having a chance to vote upon them in the good American way.

"How much should the Government own and operate?"

"I introduced a year ago in the Senate of the United States an amendment which was a simple amendment, I thought. I thought it would go through almost unanimously. I never had been as discouraged in 18 years in Washington as the day my amendment was defeated on a rollcall vote. The President of the United States had sent up a request to Congress. It was a simple request. He said that we have discovered that there are over 2,500 different private enterprises in which the Federal Government is unnecessarily engaged. That your Gov-

ernment and mine was operating 50 coffee-roasting plants, a bunch of pop-bottling works, 2 or 3 barbed wire factories, some paint factories, some clothing factories, some furniture factories, all under the guise of supplying things for the armed services, or of making them more economical for our giveaway programs of foreign aid, whatever they were. I was aghast when I saw the President's report. He asked for permission to sell them back to you, the private citizens of America. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee so I introduced an amendment to the Appropriation Act implementing the President's request. Let's give the President the power to divest himself, and the Federal Government of all the socialistic enterprises not essential to our national defense or our national economy, I stated in support of my amendment. In a rollcall vote, the U.S. Senate, in the year of our Lord 1955, defeated that amendment. Why did they defeat it?

"Some good, sturdy, strong private enterprise Senators voted 'No' because it happened that one or more of those particular industries were located in their communities or in their States, and the realities of practical politics induced them to vote that way. I am happy to say that we finally got an amended version of my proposal through which said that unless the Appropriations Committee itself resisted by resolution any divestments of economic enterprises by the President, he could go forward with the program. So, through that hurdle and through that screen, he has been able to get rid of some 500 of the 2,500. Two thousand of them still are run by you and me as collective entrepreneurs under a system as completely socialistic as anything the 'B and K boys' of modern Russia could possibly conceive, because there isn't anything more totalitarian than the complete government ownership of an industry, whether you do it under the Stars and Stripes, or whether you do it under the hammer and the sickle. If the politicians run it, they run it, and it is in competition with the rest of the economy if competition is at all permitted. Anyhow, a decision on how much further America should move toward national socialism is one which we shall have to make in 1960.

"The fourth decision: How much authority should government exercise as a device for influencing our individual lives? How much authority do you want to give to us in Washington, to determine how you live, what you can and cannot do, into what businesses you can or cannot go, what hours your laborers can work and what you might pay them, what you can raise on your farms and plantations and what you cannot raise, the social mores of your community, who can and cannot attend church with you, or go to school with you, or work with you—these are the matters to be decided by voters in forthcoming national elections.

"Some very fine friends of mine in Congress believe that people like you and people like me cannot be trusted to be ethical or decent or chivalrous, or Christian or honest in our behavior, so that you have to give to politicians down in Washington custody over the collective goodness of the country and let them project it out from their angelic countenances by the political power of unimpeded centralized government. I do not believe that. I don't denounce them for their beliefs. I simply say that I, myself, dissent from their conclusions. I think the people who elect the politicians are certainly as good as the politicians they elect, and that the collective judgment of our people is always better than the individual judgment of anybody they elect. Consequently, if we retain for ourselves some of the rights of decision, we vest those determinations in a better spot than if we turn them all over to politicians and the Federal Government.

"This is an issue to be decided, if not in 1956, most certainly in 1960. You know what is going to happen in 1960 as well as I. You don't have to have spent 30 years studying the political behavior of the great parties of this country to know that in 1960 the great bid is going to be to the groups of voters in the big towns who want to do certain things in America, and who say if you agree to do them, 'our millions of people will vote your way.' So if one party promises it, as your Democratic or New Deal Party is most likely to promise it on the basis of historic record, the other party is going to be compelled to promise it or be defeated.

"Either eventuality would be almost equally calamitous insofar as resisting the expansion of political and economic power in Washington is concerned. Our political machinery isn't in order today so that those who resist these trends in the South can join their forces to those in the North resisting them. Divided as we are by antiquated and meaningless political labels and legends, we cannot win. This is another reason I am happy that things are happening as they are in 1956. We need at least until 1960 to develop some new political machinery.

"The fifth big decision that we have got to make: 'How far should the Government go to take us into the functions of the welfare state?' We all recognize our joint responsibility to people who are injured, disabled, too old, improvident, blind, diseased. How far do we want to go? How far is it necessary to turn over to Federal politicians in the Capital City the operation of our hospitals and our health-insurance programs; our clinics and our local relief activities? How far must the old cash and charity that used to permeate the heart of most Americans be collectivized in the office of a member of the Cabinet down in Washington? We are not going to go back. We are not going to abandon what has been started. I said earlier that it is difficult to desocialize. It's mighty hard to take away from somebody something he has been getting. Each Congress, though, each national convention, each presidential candidate is beleaguered by those who constantly say, 'We want more.' We are going to have to decide where we draw the line, or do we draw the line; do we follow the example of Great Britain? I like it like they put it down on paper that hot sticky summer down in Philadelphia's Independence Hall so long ago when our wise, far-sighted constitutional forefathers knew what was likely to happen if they brought forward on this continent a new Nation dedicated to the proposition that the men and women living there could rule themselves, when they wrote it in the preamble of our great Constitution.

"At Philadelphia they said the function of this new Government is going to be in part to provide the national defense. To be free, we must be secure. To be secure, we must have a common national defense. The function of the Federal Government is to provide it, to tax the people for the arms that they need, to conscript the soldiers if we need them for a war, to win a war if we get in, to protect ourselves, to maintain peace if we can do it. We must be strong. The function of the Federal Government is to provide that defense. Our constitutional forefathers made that clear.

"People were thinking about general welfare in those days also. The next clause in the preamble of our Constitution is an interesting one. Interesting because of the language that they used. They talked about general welfare. They had said that the purpose of the Federal Government is to provide the national defense. What about the general welfare? Note well the word that they used. To provide the national defense and to promote—and to promote—the general

welfare. What a difference. That's the difference, isn't it, between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America? It's the difference between Hitler's Germany and us. It's the difference between the welfare state and welfare assistance in this country. It could be the difference between two political parties. It could be an issue that we are going to decide in 1956 or 1960. Do you want to keep it that way? Does that make sense? Did it work out all right to have a great big Republic like this which provided the national defense and promoted the general welfare, made jobs available, made it easier for people to secure general welfare, did what it could to promote it without adopting a paternalistic government so that everybody was fastened to the Federal pact? We are going to make that decision in this country not later than 1960. In my opinion, we are not ready to do it today because of our political machinery. And, in my opinion also, our American experiment not only worked out all right, but it has provided living standards for all elements which are the goal and envy of the entire world.

"I have said all this on an assumption that may be false and wrong or right and proper; namely, that South Carolinians, along with South Dakotans, will be on the side of limited powers of Government on these five major decisions. If I'm wrong, you have nothing to worry about, except that you have had to listen to a speech of no particular interest to you; but if I'm right, and you want what we want, you have some mighty serious thinking to do on a plane so much higher than partisan politics that it isn't even in the same range of atmospherical statistics. We have got some political engineering to do if you agree with my assumption. Let me suggest five things that might be done now, or that we can start to do now, to save us from the great big controlling bloc of votes and the socialistic trends that I am going to mention soon.

"Five suggested remedies

"In the first place, we might develop the kind of political realignment that I was talking about when I spoke to you in Charleston some years ago. Getting the right thinking people of the country—let's not say that—let's be completely fair—getting the people who think alike in this country and who think conservatively and in terms of a modification and limitation of the powers of the Central Government, getting them into some kind of political party or political apparatus or political association or political instrumentalities so that they can vote alike for the same candidate on the same ticket regardless of what the party label is or where they live geographically.

"We have made some headway in that direction. We haven't made it very fast. That's why I shuddered when I thought we were going to make these five great lasting determinations for the rest of my life in 1956, and why I hoped we could defer them for another 4 years to get ready to write the verdict. If most of my fellow Americans, under a voting system which gives them a fair chance to vote in a national referendum, desire the towering size of the omnipotent state, I'm willing to accept it. I suppose I will be a candidate again from the State of South Dakota, although I'm not going to be happy with all of that power because I know that it isn't going to be good for you. I think that under that kind of system I could talk up a speech that would be persuasive enough to be elected for the rest of my natural life out in South Dakota. I would have authority, and I would have power, and where I couldn't talk them into voting my way, I could seduce them to come over with a dam, or a bounty, or a pension, or a new post office or something else that I could bring by way of loot from the Federal Government, which by that time would be dominating all their lives.

But I wouldn't like it. I would rather take a chance on trying to discuss with them the basic principles in which we jointly believe, and win or lose on that basis.

"I believe firmly in free choice by free voters. To get such free choice, however, and for freemen to reach sound political decisions, it is essential that we realine our partisan groupings in America. Southern Democrats and rural Republicans in this country have much in common. Their points of agreement on basic economic and political issues far outstrip their areas of disagreement. But we need to do some political engineering so we can work and vote together. So long as we cancel out each other's vote for President, we help the trend toward the total American state and defeat our ideals and our own best interests.

"A second device we tried, and may I say here that we tried this with the support of your two good South Carolina Senators in this session of Congress: OLIN JOHNSTON, whom I have known for a long time, and with whom I have served on the Senate Committee on Agriculture; and STROM THURMOND, that new gladiator from down South that you sent up there, who has cut probably the widest swath in the U.S. Senate ever cut by so young a Senator in so short a time. We proposed to do some political engineering, to get ready for 1960. We offered a constitutional amendment that wouldn't do any good under any circumstances for 1956, but once adopted it would take off from the neck of the Democratic Party of America and the Republican Party of America the big foot of the big cities of America, who now dominate in the main the thinking, the activities, and the trends of both political parties.

"We proposed by our amendment to break up the bloc system of electoral voting. We proposed to give both those who vote for the winning candidate and those voting against the winning candidate a chance to have their votes counted at the electoral college level. This proposed constitutional amendment would have driven a death nail into the domineering controls of the city machines and some of their associated pressure groups. It takes a two-thirds vote to get it through the Senate. We debated it for a week. We received a majority vote, but we lacked 6 votes of getting the essential two-thirds majority required to pass a constitutional amendment, so it's back in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary again. It's called the Mundt-Daniel-Thurmond amendment. I'm presently corresponding with STROM THURMOND, who's down in South Carolina enjoying a short vacation before resuming his activities in Washington, and we are soon going to come up with a new version of this amendment which we hope the Senate will approve early next year.

"I think it is tremendously important, for example, that we break up a system which means, as I put it during a Senate debate, that one sodden drunk can fall off of a park bench in Battery Park of New York City, and hitting the ground wake up and stagger and stumble into a voting booth on election day, not knowing where he is, and, in the heat of the election booth, to keep from falling on his face in his drunken stupor, reach for an election lever as a support and accidentally pull the election lever down, thereby determining the entire outcome of a national presidential election. Do you all fully realize this can actually happen? That one vote cast by Mr. Stumble Bum in New York City can put in action 45 electoral votes which mean more than all of the votes cast by intelligent people voting unanimously in 12 or 13 separate States of the United States. Break up that system of unit voting in the electoral college so that no one group, no one city, no one State, and no one collection of 12 metropolitan cities in this country can run the rest of us, and you are moving in the direction of modernizing and improv-

ing our political machinery. We would then begin giving like-minded people a chance to vote alike regardless of where they live politically or where they are registered geographically. We would be taking our elections out of the hands of pressure groups and big-city political machines and putting them back in the hands of the people where they belong.

"Our electoral college reform amendment would divide the electoral vote within each State in accordance with the way and manner in which it was cast. It would end the 'winner take all' system of counting all the electoral votes for the presidential candidate with one more popular vote than his opposition. It would destroy the dictatorial power of a few huge American cities and a handful of big so-called pivotal States to determine who is nominated and who is elected to the Presidency, and what is in our national political platforms. It would tend to relate the course of Government to the desires of the people rather than to the determinations of a few political machines and selfish pressure groups. It is a reform which in my opinion is long overdue and one which all freedom-loving Americans should enthusiastically and energetically support. We shall again advocate it in the Senate when Congress reconvenes in 1957.

"The third available remedy is revising your State election laws. We can do something in all of our States to make it easier for people to cross party lines and make it easier for a second party to get into operation, to make it easier for people who happen to be registered with one party and want to vote for another party for a certain cause to do so. That's a local responsibility which, in my opinion, can and should be locally met, and which was locally met courageously under the leadership of Gov. Allan Shivers over in Texas prior to the last election. I hope it can be met with equal success in a great many other States of the Union.

"Of course, other States may follow the example of South Carolina in the last election under the leadership of an old friend of mine and a great American, who, except for the political mechanics of our country during his prime, might well have been a candidate and President of the United States. I'm talking about Jimmy Byrnes of South Carolina. Jimmy Byrnes in 1952 demonstrated a courageous and patriotic leadership which other States, I hope, and other Governors will follow. His example in the last election, when, ignoring parties and concentrating on principles and confidence in personalities, he supported a candidate not of his own political party for the highest office in the land, deserves emulation by other courageous Democrats who are neither Fair Dealers or New Dealers. It is the medicine in the bottle that counts—not the label on the outside of the container. Governor Byrnes came pretty close to running up the score for South Carolina in support of Dwight D. Eisenhower. He came close enough to help write some new American history. He came close enough to cause even the city machines to wonder if somebody might be trying to get out of the bag in which they have been held so long and on which the party bosses in the big towns thought they had tied the knot.

"Senator HARRY BYRD, a great American in anybody's book, did the same thing in Virginia. Virginia voted for the man HARRY BYRD supported. Allan Shivers and Price Daniel did the same thing in Texas. Texas voted for the man they supported. I simply point out that there are times when principles prevail, when the perils of following the line of least resistance are so great, that men have courage like Jimmy Byrnes. Men take leadership to get results. They are history-makers. As long as southern political traditions continue, that is one way to break out of the trap.

"I have discussed this for many years in every State of the South as your chairman said, and I do it because of no partisan motive. I do it only because there isn't any other place that America can be saved from the consequences of the new controls which have been operating in this country as a result of what we all lost in the Democratic National Convention of 1936, and I use the word 'we' advisedly. In the evolution and the development of the competent forces which now control the country, there is no way to escape those consequences except by some of the devices that I am mentioning. Changing the two-thirds rule in 1956 is a fourth method by which conservatives at the Democratic Convention could do the job. I think it may be hard to do but it could be done. Even breaking up the unit rule, which was a part of the two-thirds rule, would help tremendously. It would once again have the same impact on my party as it has on yours, because parties emulate each other.

"A Florida legislator speaks out"

"It would move political controls in both our parties back to the hands of the people and out of the hands of political bosses and pressure groups. I was talking on this subject 2 months ago in Florida, and at a friend's home afterward, a man by the name of O'Neil Rogells—and may I say now that I use his name with his permission—came up to see me and introduced himself and said: 'I have been a member of the legislature down in Tallahassee; I'm a Democrat. No northerner has ever come down and talked to us like this before. I'm more interested in America than I am in my political party or my political career.' Mr. Rogells further said: 'If you could promise me, Senator MUNDT, that your party at the next convention would write a strong States rights platform, as strong as you did in your last convention in 1952, and nominate candidates who will support it and believe in it (Eisenhower will do if he is available), if you can promise me that you will get that kind of platform and perform on it in Congress, I'll register Republican in Florida despite the fact that I'm a member of the legislature of the Democratic Party in Florida.'

"I said, 'Mr. Rogells, that is a very interesting suggestion, and a very encouraging one, because what does a political party mean in a war? Did you ever hear anybody come back from the war in Korea—and that was a war—did you ever hear anybody say 'We lost a skirmish down there because I told the boys in the troops that half of them belonged to the other political party and I wouldn't work with them?' You never heard that, did you? You forget all about political registrations when you get into the uniform of Uncle Sam. When you have a common cause, who cares if your commanding officer is a Republican or a Democrat or a North Dakota Progressive or an Independent? You are concerned only about results.'

"So I said, 'Mr. Rogells, your suggestion is challenging and interesting. As the issues confront us now, we are having a tough fight to hold our party to an unflinching support of States rights. I happen to belong to what we call the "Thin White Line" of the Republican Party that's trying to keep our States rights position alive; that talks about it openly and votes for it consistently; and tries to pursue it; and encourages the White House and the executive agencies, and even the courts when we can, to remember and to sustain our States rights. But we lose almost as many battles as we win. We are going to have a hard time at our convention. Those opposing the rights of States have been fighting us consistently since 1932 and driving us further and further into a corner. We could lose our fight in 1956 or 1960. Why don't you join us now? We need your help.'

"Mr. Rogells said, 'I can't be sure that you are going to win it. I want to be sure.' I said, 'Look, my friend,' I noticed he had a service button in his lapel, 'You remind me of a situation where in a battle on a mountain slope, your side of the battle is up on the ridge with a thin and faltering line that is facing stupendous odds, and you send a runner back to a commanding officer who has a large platoon of troops about a half mile down the hill and tell him you need reinforcements quick or we'll lose the battle and the officer sends back the runner and says "Keep on fighting, boys, and if you can get the enemy on the retreat, we'll come on up and join you with the cheers." Mr. Rogells, we need you now, or we're apt to lose.'

"The conversation ended on that and then 2 weeks later I got a clipping from a newspaper down in Sarasota saying 'Rogells Breaks With Demos.' I read the article and Mr. Rogells tells how he is joining the Republican Party in Florida for the sole purpose of trying to be sure that they send to the convention Republican delegates who'll stand up and fight for a States rights platform in the Republican Party. He says, 'I know we can't get it in the Democratic Party, because we have tried it there and failed completely.'

"I wrote him a letter and told him I certainly appreciated that and that I was going to make a talk in South Carolina to the State Bankers' Association, and I would like to mention his courageous action as another possible device if I may, but I wouldn't think of discussing our conversation or his name unless he gave me his permission. Here is his wire: 'Senator MUNDT, appreciate your kind remarks. You have my permission to use statement in any way you see fit, O'Neil Rogells.'

"I mention this action as another way to solve our political problems. I'm not necessarily advocating it; I don't think perhaps that it is the most effective way in a completely one party State like South Carolina. I simply mention it as another remedy. If 500 of the most prominent Democratic families in South Carolina, for instance, were to register Republican within any given month and publicize it widely, you could go far toward rewriting the future pattern for America. Thousands of your fellow citizens would be glad to follow such an example. There are ways that free men can escape from the trap you're in. The formula followed by Mr. Rogells is a fifth such possibility.

"I have mentioned five possible remedies. Suppose we don't take any or them. May I make one final prediction, then before we close? Unless in some way or another this great section of the country becomes unpredictable, unchained, unless you can take the lead, the five biggest blocs of votes in this country are going to continue to dominate your party and perhaps mine. I'm perfectly frank to say that they have already influenced mine to a considerable degree. And to the greater degree to which they influence yours and the greater degree to which that brings victory to your Democratic standard, I'm frank to confess, to that greater degree we are going to go in the direction of total centralization of authority in Washington. Unless some of these things that I have talked about are done, and they can be done only in Dixie, and only by southerners in Dixie, and only by Democrats in Dixie, because most of the best people of the South are Democrats, then I know unless you do something different, socialism will soon again become a realistic menace in America.

"Five voter blocs who know what they want"

"The biggest voter bloc in this country today, that influences more political behavior in Washington than any other bloc. I suppose, including the Republican and Democrat National Committees combined, is this new organization known as the CIO-

AFL-PAC. Two great labor unions have merged and they have told the world, 'We are going to whip our enemies and elect our friends.' They have told the candidates in both parties, 'If you will move in the direction that we want you to move far enough, we will support you; or we'll support the one that yields to our demands the most, even though he is your opponent and of a different political party.'

"Add them up my good friends; there are tens of millions of them, these voters incorporated in the CIO-AFL merger. They are going to control a great many public decisions unless we find a political mechanism so those holding a different point of view can work together. I say that without criticism of the CIO-PAC. Why shouldn't they do that? They are Americans. They are loyal. They have a right to organize. They have their points of view, and while it happens they belong to a certain class and they unhappily seem to be trying to develop a class consciousness in this country, which in my opinion is unconscionable in America, still their patriotism is unquestioned and they have a right to function in the political system. So, if they are smart enough to do it and if those opposing their excesses are stupid enough not to react effectively, who can complain? If they should bring socialism to America under Mr. Reuther as President someday, that would be their right, if it is done by the ballot, and if we permit our political machinery to be controlled by their zealous leaders.

"The second biggest bloc is your city machines led by politicians who play politics for pelf, not for public service. These are bossed by men who discovered in the last quarter of a century that 'There is gold in them thar Potomac hills' and they are no longer going to fool around merely with electing sheriffs and police judges in big cities like Chicago and New York. They have learned they can drive people to the polls by multitudes, many of whom can neither read nor write the English language, who haven't studied American history, who don't know American traditions, and who come from countries which had paternalistic governments before they moved here. Yet, they can outvote all of the rest of us. You can forget about Dixie as you can forget about the Dakotas and Nebraska and Kansas, so long as you continue to give the bosses of the city political machines in the 12 major cities and the 8 big States of this country votes enough to bring about a determination in a national election because of our failure to change some of our political machinery, especially the method of unit voting in our electoral college. I don't complain about that. I simply point out that we should exceed them and excel them in their wisdom and in their determination. They have a right to do what they can to boss America. But we have a duty to make the reforms needed to prevent their successful domination.

"The third big group, and I say this completely without any suggestion of criticism of the colored voters of this country, is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. They have a right to their opinion. In my opinion they have a right to vote. They have a right to organize, and they have become a great organized voting bloc in this country seeking successes from their standpoint. There is nothing un-American about that, but it's a tremendous appeal to politicians on every side in every party to say, 'if that many votes are involved, from the third biggest voting bloc in America, why not get them? Why not solicit them?' They have become more important through their association than the collective vote of all of Dixie, and more important than the collective vote of the States of the Missouri and Mississippi Val-

ley, and we think that we are important people. We would like to get back into the Union, and we would like to find a way to join you in adopting basic fundamental principles which are not swayed by emotional suasion and are not based on prejudicial points of view. We want you in Dixie to get back into the Union, too, insofar as your voting importance is concerned.

"The fourth biggest bloc of votes in this country is what they call the ethnic groups, the hyphenated American organizations: people who come here and organize associations with the land of their ancestry and are attached to it. They read newspapers in the native language of their homeland, make frequent trips, write many letters back and forth, and maintain for many years greater attachments over there than over here. But, above everything else, they form voting blocs. This reminds me that a Democratic Congressman told me the other day in Chicago that all he needs to do to get elected is to see one Polish leader in Chicago and he's in. All of the Polish people, said he, in Chicago follow his suggestion. There is nothing wrong about that. It isn't illegal. I don't criticize it. I simply point out that we are living in a political era when blocs like that, which join at least in desiring more power for the Central Government, are going to control unless intelligent folks like you and me start living in the present and forget about the past and make at least as much of a study of political engineering as we have of mechanical, and electrical, and atomic engineering, in which fields we all have had to become educated.

"The fifth largest pressure group is Americans for Democratic Action, a little association of self-protecting liberals who actually preach a doctrine carrying you back to feudalism, when the king could do no wrong and the state was supreme. Americans for Democratic Action offer up their votes to the highest bidder. I'm happy to say that I belong to a political party which up to now has consistently refused to bid for the votes of that outfit and I hope that we Republicans continue to resist them even though we lose, because they are trying to push us as far toward socialism as is possible, as far as is favored by any sizable group in the United States of America today. They'll pack in a lot of people at their meeting a week from today in the city of Washington to write the ticket they are going to insist you Democrats adopt at your convention in Chicago this summer. I note a report in the papers of yesterday that they are inviting speakers including Elmer Davis, Kefauver, Stevenson, Walter Reuther, of the CIO-AFL, Governor Williams, of Michigan, Eleanor Roosevelt, Senator Lehman, Senator Humphrey, Senator Morse, and other like-minded and bewildered 'liberals.' I'm happy we Republicans have been excluded from the speakers' rostrum. I must point out that these people in the ADA are smart Americans and what they are doing is legal. I don't question their patriotism. They are just outsmarting the rest of the country. They point out that their main job in that convention in Washington next week is to further devitalize the influence of the South in the Democratic Party. That's why they are there.

"I emphasize that you have a bigger bloc of votes in Dixie than any of the five great groups that I have mentioned, provided you can develop a voting mechanism that will attach you some way or another to other right-thinking people in the North for specific purposes in specific campaigns. By doing that you can exercise the political influence which alone can save America.

"I have nothing against any of these organizations: the CIO-PAC, the city machines, the organized colored voters, the ethnic voting block, or the ADA. I accept them all into our fraternity of Americans as good citizens, but I simply point out that, in

my opinion, I wouldn't want any of those blocs, or all of them combined, to write the final political and economic ticket for America. I'd rather have it written by the people of the rural areas of this country, and by voters in our cities and on our farms who belong to no self-interested pressure groups. I'd rather have it written by the Republicans I know back home and the Democrats I know down here.

"Yes, my good Democratic friends of the South, all I suggest is that we develop our abilities in the science of political engineering so that no longer will an imaginary line created by the War Between the States continue to divide into rival political camps people who have an identity of convictions and such close similarities of concept. It would be tragic indeed if a generation that has split the atom and harnessed its great power would let a problem in semantics—an attachment to labels, traditions, and prejudice—cause us to continue to split people dedicated to identical high principles into rival camps under the comparatively meaningless names 'Republican' and 'Democrat,' so that we are impotent and powerless to harness our great vote power into a single effective voting machine.

"Our 10th amendment

"I feel that next to our great written Constitution itself, the greatest invention of Americans in the field of self-government was the concept of States rights as set forth in our Bill of Rights by the 10th amendment. Other civilizations and other lands have contributed much toward the evolution and maintenance of human freedom. But it was left to freemen on this continent and in the early formative days of our system of government to establish by the 10th amendment formal recognition of certain inalienable rights of both States and individual citizens which could be transferred to the Central Government only by the voluntary and specific delegation of those powers by those entrusted with them by our Constitution. This, then, is America's greatest contribution to the science of self-government and the endless contest of free citizens versus the Central Government. This, to a great degree, is the great genius of what we call the American system. This, then, we must preserve if our future is to be as resplendent as our past. And, finally, it is this great key to our success that we must support by proper changes in our elective machinery and our political procedures lest those who lack faith in this concept, or who find it a barrier to their ceaseless drives for power, succeed in developing too many powers for too strong a Central Government in Washington. It is this challenge which Dixie—and perhaps Dixie alone—can successfully meet by recognizing its dangers soon enough and by taking the indicated steps required to meet and defeat it.

"Good friends, I have suggested five possible remedial steps. Others may occur to you. I believe the challenge to all of us is crystal clear. I appreciate your close attention. You have been very kind. I have been very frank. These are days which call for blunt talk and unpleasant truths. I came here neither to try to please you nor to lure you away from your traditional political behavior. I came only to describe what I believe I know and to predict that which I know I fear.

"I came especially, however, because I am positive that the people of Dixie can determine America's destiny for the next half century. By so doing you will chart a course for all the world. No other group in America has the homogeneity, the good judgment, the high patriotism, combined with the tremendous vote power of our Southern States. You can have it as you want it. You will get it as you merit it. You can call the tune for Uncle Sam or you can become the victims

of inertia and remain docile and impotent while living through a future the nature of which you will have failed to help in fashioning.

"In conclusion, let me suggest to you as bankers that you always keep in mind that it is more important to you to help determine what takes place in the polling places of America than what takes place in the teller's cages of your banks. I beg of you to divert some of your great genius and your many talents to the problems I have discussed with you to the end that we can solve them in the best interests of all America and all Americans. In our country, we must all remember always that there is never anything wrong with America that a single good election will not cure. Likewise, there is no immortality for our freedoms and no security for our property that a single bad election cannot jeopardize and perhaps even terminate.

"I salute you as custodians of our country's future and I wish you well."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—KARL E. MUNDT, senior U.S. Senator from South Dakota, served in the House of Representatives 10 years before election to the Senate in 1948. He is a vigorous champion of electoral college reform and party realignment, as the quickest and most lasting way to give conservatives—a majority of the voters—the national voice their members warrant.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I express deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin for his graciousness in permitting me to discuss topics which may not be of a completely simpatico attitude toward him.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., of Illinois, to be Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Linton M. Collins, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Mavis Wyatt, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate in confirming these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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

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

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Dirksen-Mansfield amendment.

Under the order of yesterday, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

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

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on the important subject now being debated by the Senate, I received, a few minutes ago, a very cogent letter from Hon. Maynard E. Sensenbrenner, mayor of Columbus, the capital city of my State

of Ohio. I desire to read it into the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

CITY OF COLUMBUS, OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
September 9, 1964.

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: At this time, we understand that the U.S. Senate is considering a number of proposals to delay the implementation of court decisions in the matter of the apportionment of State legislatures; and when it comes time to vote upon the question please give consideration to the fact that in a true democracy, the principle of determination in equating rights is based upon the individual as a unit in society.

We also know that the only reason that the Federal Constitution provided for two Senators from each State, was because of the fact that the smaller States would not have ratified the Constitution, had not this concession been made.

To determine representation in the legislative branch on the basis of geography or land is giving more consideration to the land owners and to property than to individuals.

We must recognize that our country is becoming more urbanized each day; and if the people in the cities are not permitted to have fair and equal representation in both branches of the legislature, then we are denying to them their rights to which they are entitled in a true democracy.

I hope that you will give every consideration to these factors when you deliberate and vote on these issues relating to apportionment.

Sincerely,
MAYNARD E. SENSENBRENNER,
Mayor.

Mr. President, I am glad to place in the RECORD this scholarly letter, sent to me by Hon. Maynard E. Sensenbrenner, mayor of Columbus, Ohio.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGING MUST BE SOLVED NOW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak without regard to the rule of germaneness.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, we have created a society in which most people now survive well beyond retirement and are contributing to their communities and to the Nation. The retirement age of 65 fixed by Von Bismarck around 1866, when the life expectancy of an individual was far different from what it is today, makes the present retirement system in many industries unrealistic. Today, many men and women who retire at the age of 65 have 20 or 30 years more of useful life before them. The arbitrary retirement age of 65 is unfortunate. However, because of that practice, our country now has 18 million so-called elderly citizens, and many of them are unemployed, retired, and in need.

As the achievements of medical science progress, the life expectancy of Americans will grow even longer. This is one of the greatest achievements of American civilization.

Of all the revolutions generated in this space age of change and challenge, this is one of the most profound. It brings

to us a new frontier in the history of man's development, but it has also created problems which we must face today. The bell of aging tolls for all men and women. We must take action to meet the changing conditions of older citizens in this second half of the 20th century.

A quiet revolution has taken place in the age structure of our society. More than 18 million Americans are now over the age of 65, and it is estimated that in 1980 there will be more than 23 million. Almost 9 million will be over the age of 75. Every day witnesses a net increase of 1,000 in the number of citizens over 65 years of age.

In my State of Ohio, approximately a million people are now 65 years of age and over, amounting to 9.2 percent of the total population—almost 1 in every 10 persons. From 1950 to 1960 alone the number of people 65 and over in Ohio increased about 190,000, representing a rise of 26.5 percent.

More than 300,000 Ohioans are now over the age of 75, and approximately 53,000 are over the age of 85. The number of those 75 to 84 increased 32.5 percent and the number over 85 rose 54.6 percent. Comparable statistics apply to all States in the Union.

We are seeing the emergence of not one but two generations of older citizens. Today 1 of every 3 persons reaching the age of 60 has a parent or a close relative over the age of 80 to be concerned about. Within 35 years this ratio will soar to 2 out of 3. This means that most men of 25 today have to prepare not only for their own retirement but also for that of a parent or a relative who will be alive and also in retirement.

Far far too many Americans retirement means the end of status, dignity, and a comfortable standard of living. It too often means the beginning of poverty, substandard housing, lack of medical care, and days filled with nothingness. Our problem lies in the fact that to date the planning necessary to meet the economic, social, and medical needs of the aged has been inadequate. As a result, too many of our elderly citizens feel unwanted, unneeded, isolated—and neglected.

These are the very people who have contributed for so long to the amazing growth of the American economy. They deserve more. During the 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, some major steps forward have been taken to raise the dignity and status of our elderly citizens. These accomplishments are in sharp contrast to the previous 8 years. Here are some of the major advances made in this past 4 years:

The social security law was improved in 1961; as a result benefits were raised \$900 million a year, and more than 3,300,000 people received increased benefits for the first time. This year benefits are again being increased, and the number of people who will be covered has been expanded by more than 750,000.

Congress passed a Community Services and Health Facilities Act to authorize new programs for health care outside of hospitals, and communities in

Ohio and all other States are benefiting from this act.

We expanded the Federal programs of housing for the elderly. The direct loan program has risen from \$50 million to \$350 million as a result of legislation passed during this administration. Commitments for housing for the elderly through the Office of Housing for senior citizens have more than quadrupled since the end of 1960. The State of Ohio is one of the leading States in this area.

We have passed legislation to help the elderly homeowner when he no longer is able to take care of a large home and wishes to sell it. He now has the possibility open to him of selling the home without having to pay a capital gains tax on sales up to \$20,000.

We have taken action to decrease discrimination in employment because of age. The President has issued an Executive order requiring Federal contractors and subcontractors to remove all elements of age discrimination in their personnel policies.

We have passed legislation to increase funds available for construction of safe and restorative skilled nursing homes. Authorized funds were increased in 1964 from \$40 million to \$70 million a year for chronic disease hospitals and nursing homes. We are also extending the availability of FHA mortgage insurance for nursing homes to nonprofit groups.

We have established a new Institute of Child Health and Human Development to conduct basic health research on the aging process and to train people to work in the field of aging.

We have created a gerontology branch in the U.S. Public Health Service to deal exclusively with the health needs of older citizens and to put into effect today's health knowledge today. We hope thereby to reduce or eliminate the disabling diseases of stroke, arthritis, and heart disease.

We have passed legislation under both the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Training Act of 1962 to give special attention to older workers whose skills may no longer be useful and who can profit by training to acquire new skills and productive employment.

We have established programs of housing for the elderly in the Department of Agriculture through legislation passed in 1962 and 1964 to help the many elderly citizens in rural areas.

We are utilizing surplus commodities and school lunch programs to help provide hot, nourishing meals to elderly people in public housing and in senior centers.

We have enacted a bold program in the field of mental health with the sound concept of treating older persons who are depressed, or have mental problems, right in their home communities rather than sending them off to mental hospitals. Nothing is more tragic than the commitment of older persons to isolated mental hospitals when they could be assisted and treated right in their home communities, near families and friends. This is one of the great contributions made by the late, great President Kennedy and it will mean an immense amount to the Nation's elderly citizens.

These advances are outstanding when contrasted with the passive indifference to the needs of our elderly citizens during the 8 years preceding the administration.

However, for every step we are able to take forward, the urgency and dynamism of the problems causes us to fall two steps backward.

The aged still have problems. Using my State of Ohio as an example, the following conditions exist:

Most are unemployed. Seventy percent of Ohio's elderly—more than 680,000—are completely unemployed and out of the labor force.

They are the largest single poverty group. Three out of five of the aged in Ohio have less than \$2,000 a year income. The median income of older persons in my State is less than \$100 a month.

The aged have health problems. Most of the Nation's elderly are mobile, but 8 out of 10 have one or more chronic illnesses. Older people spend twice as many days in the hospital as those under 65.

Too many elderly are lonely. Almost half of America's elderly citizens are in a single status, that is widowed, divorced, separated, or unmarried. There are almost 6 million widowed persons among the elderly with especially severe problems of social isolation and personal adjustment.

Too many aged are ill housed. One out of every three homes occupied by the elderly is deficient in that it is dilapidated, deteriorating, or sound but lacking important facilities like a bathroom.

The elderly are the ones most tragically hit by relocation. Most of the aged live in our urban areas, and the heaviest proportion is in the central part of our cities. They are, therefore, just in those locations which are hardest hit by highway projects, urban renewal and other public developments.

Mr. President, I could cite many more statistics and examples but they will only serve to emphasize the fact that the aged of the Nation, despite our recent progress, are still a deprived group. Their economic and social status is an underserved one. They merit greater respect for their contributions to our country.

It is time now—indeed it is past time—to set forth for the elderly citizens of the Nation a bill of rights which is their heritage.

First. The right to the best possible physical and mental health. The most urgent problem of the elderly is how to meet the problem of health care at the time when income is lowest and disability is at its highest.

The elderly of this Nation must have a program of health care through the social security system, whereby during the course of their working lives, they pay a small premium for health insurance—approximately a dollar a month—and have a paid up medical insurance policy upon retirement. This would be an earned right—not a morale-shattering charity handout. The promises of President Kennedy and President Johnson will be won despite the fantastic, and even fanatic, opposition of the American Medical Association.

It is my fervent hope and that of millions of Americans that the medicare proposal recently passed by the Senate will be approved by the House of Representatives and enacted into law before this Congress adjourns.

Second. The right to an adequate income. One fact stands out clearly. The incomes of the aged as a whole are well below what is considered an adequate income for an American standard of living in this second half of the 20th century. A Nation such as ours not only can afford but must insure that its retired citizens enjoy a life which permits dignity and well-being in the years of retirement.

I propose, therefore, to fight for legislation to secure substantial increases in social security for all beneficiaries. It is time to achieve retirement incomes which are much closer to previous earnings than is now the case.

I intend to press for an expansion in the amount which retired persons can earn without being penalized by deductions from social security benefits. The retirement test should be raised to at least \$2,400.

I intend to work for a social security program which will have automatic adjustment in benefits as changes occur in the cost of living. The elderly should not suffer because prices go up for reasons beyond their control.

Third. The right to adequate housing. The provision of safe, sanitary, and congenial housing at a rental which older persons can afford is a major unmet need of elderly citizens. I intend to press for a program of legislation which will widen the area of choice that older persons have in seeking the kinds of living arrangements they desire in their retirement years.

First, I intend to seek legislation through which elderly homeowners with low or moderate incomes can improve and rehabilitate their homes. Many of Ohio's aged live in houses which are dilapidated or deteriorating and cannot afford the added expense of borrowing to repair these deficiencies. I shall therefore introduce a program of low interest loans of up to \$2,500 to rehabilitate homes owned and occupied by elderly citizens in order to make them safe and healthy for the elderly themselves and also for the community. This is a program that is already underway in rural areas and certainly deserves to be introduced in urban communities.

Second, I shall propose legislation to authorize the construction of senior centers and health units in connection with housing for the elderly. These facilities should be available to the community as well, and the cost should be shared through grants made by the Housing and Home Finance Agency for these important, related facilities.

Third, I intend to find a more effective and humanitarian use for properties acquired by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration through foreclosure. Those dwellings which are suitable for housing elderly citizens should be made available to responsible, nonprofit groups at

substantially written-down cost to provide low-rental housing for low and moderate income elderly persons.

Fourth. The right to equal opportunity in employment. The No. 1 problem of those between the ages of 40 and 60 is assurance of equal opportunity for employment. There is ample evidence of serious discrimination in employment because of age. We cannot wait for the longrun economic processes to take care of those who are laid off and whose skills have become obsolete. They must eat and raise a family today, not in the long run. Further legislation must be enacted to help retrain those in this age group whose skills have become obsolete, and to utilize the skill, knowledge and know-how of retired citizens who still have much to contribute to this Nation.

Fifth. A right to restorative health services. All of us in Ohio are keenly and even tragically aware of the great need for safe and rehabilitative medical services in nursing homes. We cannot and must not tolerate the firetraps and custodial warehouses in which some of our sick aged reside.

I call for the establishment of minimum Federal standards for construction, health services, and care for all nursing homes financed through Federal funds or which have elderly patients supported through Federal old-age assistance payments.

Second, I propose the authorization of special funds to universities and college medical centers for training and research programs for physicians and allied professions in the care and treatment of the aged chronically ill and disabled.

Sixth. The right of access to community resources. Too many older persons are unable to obtain effective access to the community health, recreation, and social services so essential to meaningful living in retirement. In many cases, this is due to lack of ability to pay for the services; in other instances, the elderly are unaware of the existence of these services; in still other cases, older persons hesitate to pay for the cost of public transportation to the facility.

To every extent possible, services such as counseling, health, recreational, and volunteer work should be made available and publicized to the elderly citizens in the community.

I propose that we take one very important step in this direction right now. We can make it easier for older persons to use public transportation to get to senior centers, meetings, places of part-time employment or volunteer work.

I shall, therefore, introduce legislation authorizing the housing and home finance agency to make grants to metropolitan and other transportation systems which will carry on demonstration projects providing low fares for elderly citizens during the nonpeak hours of the day. As a minimum, the elderly should be able to ride on public transportation at one-half fare during the hours in which buses and street cars are least used. This will add income to public transportation systems and benefit older people at the same time.

Seventh. The right to freedom, independence and an exercise of individual

initiative. America's elderly citizens want and deserve the right to determine their own destinies like all other Americans. They do not seek charity; they abhor dependence. They ask only for the opportunity to spend their retirement years in dignity, in self-respect, and in contributing to their neighbors and their community.

President Johnson has accepted this goal as his own and is providing the leadership to stride across this social frontier with real accomplishments. This administration today has an appreciation of the aged not as a problem but as a positive gain of American civilization.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] for that purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield for that purpose.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 575 Leg.]

Bartlett	Kuchel	Pearson
Bayh	Long, La.	Proxmire
Carlson	McClellan	Randolph
Hart	McNamara	Smith
Inouye	Mourenoy	Sparkman
Johnston	Morton	Stennis
Jordan, N.C.	Mundt	Walters
Jordan, Idaho	Nelson	Young, N. Dak.

Mr. INOUE. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr.

MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. FONG, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. SMATHERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I withhold my motion until the distinguished minority leader has had an opportunity to confer.

Mr. President, I renew my motion.

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

The motion was agreed to and (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 18, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 1964:

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Linton M. Collins of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the U.S. Court of Claims.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Mrs. Mavis Wyatt, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate September 17, 1964:

BOARD OF PAROLE

Charles E. Casey, of California, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1970, which was sent to the Senate on September 9, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. George R. Davis, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, how frail we are, how inadequate, even the strongest, the keenest, the most clever of us. And yet Thou hast invited us to be coworkers with Thee. Stab us wide awake then, that all of life is sacred, all decent work magnificent, all honorable occupations and professions sublime. Make known to us then once again, clearly and sharply, Lord of all the earth, that in the marketplace, in the courts of justice, in the halls of legislation, as well as in cathedrals and before altars, we may do, we are doing God's true work. We reject, O God our Father, the ultimate betrayal of our true humanity, that man in our time has finally and forever lost his way. We reject, O God our Father, the degrading fatalism, that in this hour of peril we are left only with sterile choices. We reject, O God our Father, the contemptuous presumption that our leaders are bereft of ethics, and are driven by the hunger to cynically manipulate power. We know, righteous God, the times are strange and hard, that men may have to stumble and grope, fall and rise again.

But so did our fathers, O Lord God, in other times and in other places. Save us then, from despair, in a time when there are no easy answers, and when we cannot expect to come suddenly upon the end of the rainbow. Remind us of the ultimate decency of things. Give us grace to light even small candles, and to refrain from the easy way of cursing the darkness. Let this spirit, O Father God, be in those whose essential ministry is here in this House of Representatives, and in all of us as citizens of this Nation and of the world. And unto Thee be the glory, the majesty, the dominion, and the power, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CONSTITUTION WEEK AND CITIZENSHIP DAY

Mr. ROONEY of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is most appropriate that we all remind ourselves that this week has been proclaimed by the President as Constitution Week. In his proclamation of April 14, President Johnson designated September 17 as Citizenship Day and the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 as Constitution Week.

Citizenship Day dates back to a law enacted on May 19, 1940, which authorized the President to designate the third Sunday of May as I am an American Day. Twelve years later in legislation adopted on February 29, 1952, for good and valid reasons the date and name were changed to Citizenship Day and Constitution Week to be celebrated on September 17 each year to commemorate the signing of the Constitution of the United States on that day in 1787.

One hundred and seventy-seven years have passed since that historic event. Our Nation has grown from a brash and self-determined infant in swaddling clothes to the acknowledged leader among the nations of the world. Little could our Founding Fathers dream that this country struggling to shed the restrictive garments of colonial dependency and to step forth in the rich toga of sovereignty could ever extend its boundaries to the Pacific and even beyond to include the State of Hawaii. Little could they dream that the borders of the Thirteen States would push northward to the Arctic Circle.

It would have been sheer fantasy to think that the population of the first States to adopt that Constitution then numbering in the tens of thousands would reach the fantastic figure of 190 million. No, Mr. Speaker, our great leaders who conceived our Constitution could never dream the heights to which their Nation

would rise nor could they dream the extent to which it would expand. But yet they drew up a document which so skillfully set forth our privileges and responsibilities that it has well weathered the ravages of time. It has stood up for seven generations under revolution and evolution. It has stood firm in times of prosperity even as it has met the pressures of adversity. So brilliant and comprehensive was the concept of those drafters of the Constitution that its basic structure has required but little change over the years to meet the needs of a growing and expanding Nation.

Within a few weeks we as Americans are about to enjoy exercising a sacred right assured us by the Constitution. As each of us measures the quality and caliber of those who seek our vote we should remind ourselves of the value of this constitutional right. We have only to realize how many people in other countries are denied the right to vote in free elections for the persons of their choice.

We should reflect with satisfaction, too, that the legislation which the majority of this Congress fashioned a short while ago assures even more of our fellow countrymen the opportunity to register and cast their ballot.

Mr. Speaker, as Americans we should all give thanks for the blessings we receive daily under our Constitution. We should apply ourselves anew to the preservation of our liberties and the safeguarding of our rights.

As we dedicate ourselves during this special week to do our utmost to carry out the responsibilities which the Constitution imposes upon us, we should not forget our friends: the fathers and mothers, the sons and daughters of our foreign-born Americans—who still must live under the domination of atheistic Red dictators and be continuously denied any form of self-determination.

As citizens of these great United States, we are grateful for the blessing of our revered Constitution. Such gratitude can best be demonstrated by our unstinting efforts to obtain kindred rights and benefits for all mankind whether free or presently enslaved.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S MESSAGE ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLDEST AMERICAN RADIO PROGRAM IN THE ITALIAN LANGUAGE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, September 12, 1964, an event took place which is deserving of not only the attention of this body but of the American public as well. That day marked the 30th anniversary of the oldest American radio program in the Italian language—the program known in the areas covered by the eastern radio network as the "Voice of Local 89."