

with rational discourse, with mutual trust and, therefore, with joy and gratefulness for the gift of life.

Aug 15 63

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, never before in the history of the United States—indeed, not in the history of any free and civilized people—has such vicious legislation been proposed as that part of the administration's so-called civil rights bill which would enable the Federal Government to excommunicate sovereign States, to in effect, ban them from the Union.

I refer to title VI of the civil rights bill now pending before this body, S. 1731, which reads in part as follows:

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in any law of the United States providing or authorizing direct or indirect financial assistance for or in connection with any program or activity by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise, no such law shall be interpreted as requiring that such financial assistance shall be furnished in circumstances under which individuals participating in or benefiting from the program or activity are discriminated against on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin or are denied participation or benefits therein on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Under this provision, Mr. President, the executive branch of our Government would be given carte blanche authority to withhold Federal funds paid to the States in grants-in-aid programs or to cancel Federal financial participation in contracts, loans, insurance, and guarantees.

Without any notice, without any hearing, without a judicial proceeding of any kind, and without any appeal or other safeguard against abuse, entire States could be starved out of the Federal Treasury.

By alleging discrimination in connection with any Federal aid program, the Executive would have unrestrained control over the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for direct or indirect assistance to the States.

No court test to determine whether discrimination was actually being practiced would be required.

This proposal is so broad that whole States could be punished for voting wrong, if discrimination were alleged as an excuse.

Title VI is aimed of course at the States of the South, in a brazen attempt to legislate social reform and to blackmail law-abiding citizens to go against that which they believe to be in the best interests of everyone.

However, I would emphasize that no State in the Union would be secure against the wrath, whims or caprices of a Federal bureaucrat armed with the unlimited power of title VI.

A person of oriental or Mexican descent, for example, could apply for a bank loan in California or a highway job in Arizona, and be refused as a poor credit risk or as not competent for the job.

On the basis of a claim of discrimination, a Federal official could cause the cancellation of all FDIC insurance on all California banks or the loss of all Federal highway funds for the entire State of Arizona.

By the same token, the citizens of whole States receiving welfare benefits could be denied their old-age assistance or aid to the disabled.

Needy children could be deprived of food they now receive under the school lunch program.

Civil defense programs, so vital to the security of our country, could be halted in States which lost the favor of some Federal bureaucrat.

States could be denied Federal aid in hospital construction; funds for research in such critical areas as heart disease,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

cancer, and mental health could suddenly be cut off.

The ultimate effect of this iniquitous proposal would be to destroy our republican form of government.

Power to expend the funds it appropriated would be wrested from the Congress and handed over to the Executive.

Sovereign States would have to toe the administration line.

I submit, Mr. President, that title VI is totally unjustified and unwise, as the President himself said last April, when the Civil Rights Commission suggested that Federal funds be denied Mississippi. He said:

I don't have any power to cut off the aid in the way proposed by the Civil Rights Commission, and I would think that it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power.

I favor the full enjoyment of every American citizen of all rights guaranteed him by the Constitution. I know of no one who has claimed a deprivation of rights who has gone to court under existing statutes and has not had his rights granted him in full.

But I do not believe that a certain privileged group should be granted special rights and benefits to the extent that the rights of others are lost.

And, it is my opinion, Mr. President, that a majority of the citizens of the United States share this view.

GOVERNMENT LOSSES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—REFINED SALAD OIL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on July 16, 1963, I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that under Public Law 480 our Government had entered into a barter agreement with Austria for the disposal of 40 million bushels of feed grains but that out of this 40 million bushels only approximately 16 million bushels ever arrived in Austria, and the other 24 million bushels were diverted while en route, destination unknown.

Just how our Government could track of 24 million bushels of grain a 3-year period without someone knowing it, is as yet unexplained.

To determine who, if anyone, our Government officials or the executive may have been a part of the cover-up to arrange this illegal transaction, I introduced Senate Resolution 171, the purpose of which was to conduct a scale investigation of all transactions under Public Law 480.

The Government of Austria has already indicted seven individuals for their part in the diversion of 24 million bushels of grain. I did not see how this fraud could have been perpetrated without the cooperation of this side of the Atlantic. Thus far the Senate Agriculture Committee has not seen fit to conduct an investigation authorizing the release of information.

Today I wish to call attention to an example of a loose transaction in the disposal of agricultural commodities. This transaction like all others raises questions as to the propriety of the