Department of Justice

NOTICE:

There should be no premature release of this statement nor should its contents be paraphrased, alluded to, nor hinted at in earlier stories. There is a total embargo on this statement until 10:30 A. M. EDT, June 26, 1963, which includes any and all references to any material in this statement.

STATEMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY REGARDING H. R. 7152, THE PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1963
JUNE 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am here today to testify in support of a bill that will go a long way toward redeeming the pledges upon which this Republic was founded -- pledges that all are created equal, that they are endowed equally with unalienable rights and are entitled to equal opportunity in the pursuit of their daily lives.

In this generation, we have seen an extraordinary change in America -- a new surge of idealism in our life -- a new and profound insistence on reality in our democratic order. Much has been done. But quite obviously much more must be done -- both because the American people are clearly demanding it and because, by any moral standard it is right.

The ten-and-a-half percent of Americans whose skin is not white are required to meet all the duties of citizenship. They must obey the same laws as white citizens, they must pay the same taxes, they must fight side by side with white men when the nation is at war.

Nothing is more contrary to the spirit of the Constitution -- and even to the spirit of common sense -- than to deny the full rights and privileges

of citizenship to people who are so obligated. And the Constitution provides the means for redressing this inequity. If we do not use those means, we compound the wrong.

On June 11, the President called for action by all Americans to assure Negroes the full rights of citizenship. He asked for the same action at all levels of government. And he asked in particular that Congress "make a commitment it has not fully made in this century to the proposition that race has no place in American life or law."

The bill before you today embodies that commitment.

Technically speaking, it is an omnibus bill, H. R. 7152, to carry out recommendations contained in the President's civil rights message of February 28, 1963, and his more recent message of June 19.

The bill contains seven titles dealing with problems of racial discrimination in our country. Two of the titles are virtually identical to bills already introduced by the Chairman of this Committee and which have the support of the Administration. Title I, with minor exceptions, is the same as H. R. 5455, concerning voting rights, and title V is the same as H. R. 5456, which would extend the life of the Commission on Civil Rights.

However, titles relating to discrimination in public accommodations, education, and federally assisted programs are new, as are titles providing a statutory basis for a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In his message to Congress of February 28 the President pointed out that more progress has been made to secure civil rights for all Americans

in the last two years than in any comparable period in our history. But he emphasized that harmful and wrongful racial discrimination still occurs in virtually every part of the country and in virtually every aspect of our national life -- in public accommodations, in employment, in education and in voting.

The events that have occurred since the President's first message -- in Birmingham, in Jackson, in nearby Cambridge, in Philadelphia and in many other cities -- make it clear that the attack upon these problems must be accelerated.

The demonstrations show not only that an ever-increasing number of our Negro citizens will no longer accept an inferior status. They have drawn sharp attention to the handicaps which so many Negro citizens experience simply because they are not white -- or because years of unjust deprivation have left them in poverty and without the means or hope of improving their condition.

Two titles of the bill--those relating to the Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity and to non-discrimination in federally assisted programs -- bear on the problem of poverty. However, much more will have to be accomplished in this regard, and the June 19 message details the President's proposals to stimulate economic growth, to provide employment opportunities and to equip individuals with the ability to take advantage of enlarged opportunities.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

Many of the demonstrations I have mentioned earlier, and the violence which has sometimes accompanied them, stem from attempts by Negro citizens to gain access to such facilities -- restaurants, lunch counters, places of amusement, stores, hotels, and the like.

These facilities are public in a very real sense. They are not at all like a private home or a private club, for example, to which the owner invites only the guests he selects.

Plainly, places of public accommodation cater to the public. Obviously when some members of the public are kept out solely because of the color of their skin, they resent it and their resentment is justified.

Arbitrary and unjust discrimination in places of public accommodation insults and inconveniences the individuals affected, inhibits the mobility of our citizens, and artificially burdens the free flow of commerce.

Consider, for instance, the plight of the Negro traveler in some areas of the United States.

For a white person, traveling for business or pleasure ordinarily involves no serious complications. He either secures a room in advance, or stops for food and lodging when and where he will.

Not so the Negro traveler. He must either make elaborate arrangements in advance, if he can, to find out where he will be accepted, or to subject himself and his family to repeated humiliation as one place after another refuses them food and shelter.

He cannot rely on the neon signs proclaiming "Vacancy," because too often such signs are meant only for white men's eyes. And the establishments which will accept him may well be of inferior quality and located far from his route of travel.

The effects of discrimination in public establishments are not limited to the embarrassment and frustration suffered by the individuals who are its most immediate victims. Our whole economy suffers. When large retail stores or places of amusement, whose goods have been obtained through interstate commerce, artificially restrict the market to which these goods are offered, the nation's business is impaired.

Business organizations in this country are increasingly mobile and interdependent, and they tend to expand beyond the areas of their origins. As they find it necessary or feasible to engage in regional or national operations, they establish plants and offices in various parts of the country. These installations benefit the localities in which they are established and affect the commerce of the country. Artificial restrictions on their employees limit this type of mobility and its benefits to the national economy.

Further, if we add together only a minor portion of all the discriminatory acts throughout the country in any one year which deny food and lodging to Negroes, it is not difficult at all to see how, in the aggregate, interstate travel and interstate movement of goods in commerce may be substantially affected.

No matter--in Mr. Justice Jackson's words--"how local the operation which applies the squeeze," commerce in these circumstances is discouraged, stifled and restrained among the states as to provide an appropriate basis for congressional action under the Commerce Clause.

Mr. Chairman, discrimination in public accommodations not only goes against our basic concepts of liberty and equality but such discrimination interferes with interstate commerce and the development of unobstructed national market.

We pride ourselves on being a people who are governed by laws. This pride is justified when we provide legal means for the settlement of human differences and the satisfaction of justified complaints. Mass demonstrations disrupt the community in which they occur; they also disrupt the country as a whole. But no one can in good faith deny that the grievances which these demonstrations protest against are real.

I believe the Federal government has a responsibility to help end the discrimination which causes these grievances. But at the present there are no existing laws which really enable the Federal government to do so.

So for the past two and a half years we have reopened and maintained communication with Negro and white leaders in the South and the North. As a result we have been able to use our good offices effectively to mediate a great number of disputes, permitting considerable progress toward ending discrimination.

For example, all railroad stations, bus terminals and air terminals have been desegregated. In a great number of cities, voluntary action has been taken to end discrimination in hotels, theaters and eating places.

But, obviously, this informal use of our "good offices" is not adequate to deal with the fundamental problem. That is why this legislation is needed, and that is why the President now urges legislation to provide an answer which will be truly effective and which will deal with the problem not in the streets, amid potential violence, but in the courts, under law. That legislation is embodied in title II of the President's proposal.

Title II would establish the right of citizens, without regard to race or color, to the full and equal enjoyment of the facilities of public establishments serving interstate travelers or affecting the interstate movement of goods in commerce.

Among the establishments covered by the title are hotels, motels, restaurants, theaters and other places of amusement, department stores, drug stores, gasoline stations and the like. Bona fide private clubs are not covered.

The title would prohibit any deprivation or interference with the right to use the public facilities within its coverage. This legislation would grant aggrieved persons the right to sue for an injunction. It also would authorize the Attorney General to bring suit whenever he is satisfied that the purposes of the bill would be materially furthered and when the aggrieved person has neither the funds nor the legal representation to do so himself.

Before bringing action, the Attorney General ordinarily would be required to permit state or local authorities to act if the state or locality has applicable public accommodation laws. In other cases he would first afford the Community Relations Service, to be established by title IV, an opportunity to secure voluntary compliance.

There are two constitutional provisions relevant to the validity of title II.

First, the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution (Art. I, section 8) grants extensive power to the Congress to deal with practices which burden the free flow of interstate commerce or otherwise affect national trade.

Under this clause of the Constitution, as you know, the Congress has enacted a wide variety of statutes in such fields as labor relations or trade regulation. There can be no real question about the authority of the Congress to deal with discriminatory practices by enterprises whose business affects interstate commerce or interstate travel.

Second, the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits the denial to any citizen of the equal protection of the laws. In the Civil Rights Cases, 109 U.S. 3 (1883), the Supreme Court held that the powers of the Congress under the Fourteenth Amendment did not extend to the elimination of discrimination per se in privately-owned places of public accommodation. Racial

discrimination is subject to the legislative powers of the Congress under that Amendment, the Court said, only where it is accomplished by action that is attributable to the government of a State.

Since the decision in that case, a vast change has occurred both in the character of business organization and in the concept of what constitutes state action. Today, business enterprises are regulated and licensed by the states to a much greater degree than in 1883.

The Supreme Court very recently indicated that racially discriminatory practices of business establishments may be attributable in many instances to action by the state or those acting on its behalf. In every case, discriminatory practices in business are supported or protected in some degree in government through police and other executive action and through the courts.

It is for these reasons that many believe the present vitality of the decision in the Civil Rights Cases is open to serious question. However, the decision has never been overruled.

In these circumstances, it seems to us to be the proper course for title II to rely primarily upon the commerce clause.

There are those who have challenged this public accommodations provision because they believe it would encroach on private property rights. A private businessman cannot be so regulated, they say; he is entitled to decide which customers he wants to do business with in his own store.

For one thing, private property rights long have been subject to reasonable federal and state regulation in a number of ways. We are all familiar with zoning laws or health regulations or rules affecting labor practices. Indeed, some 30 states now have public accommodations laws forbidding discrimination.

For another thing, some of those who complain most loudly about interference with private property rights, ironically are often those who most stoutly defend the laws, enforced by a number of states which forbid Negroes to be served.

Surely there is no difference -- in terms of private property rights -- between telling a businessman whom he may not do business with on the one hand, and telling him that if his business is open to those traveling in interstate commerce his doors should be open to one and all, on the other hand.

The difference is not one of property rights, but of the color of the customer's skin. That difference is called racial discrimination and it is racial discrimination, not private property rights, which the public accommodations title seeks to attack.

Mr. Chairman, in summary on this question of public accommodations, there are three points to consider:

1. Whether Congress has the authority to end discrimination in places of public accommodation. It is quite clear that Congress does. It is well established that a privately owned business is not exempt from Government regulation where it is engaged in interstate commerce. Many Federal laws regulate privately-owned businesses -- the Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Wagner Act, Taft-Hartley Act, Minimum Wage law, Food and Drug law, among others.

2. Has government ever entered this field of public accommodations before? Clearly, it has. As I pointed out earlier, thirty states now have laws preventing owners of private businesses from discriminating against customers because of race, and some states have laws requiring store owners not to sell to Negroes.

3. Is Federal intervention necessary? I believe it is. Discrimination in stores, restaurants and hotels is a daily insult to a large number of American citizens. I believe a proprietor might refuse to sell to a disorderly or improperly dressed customer, but no American should be

discriminated against because of his color, race or religion. The Federal government can and should play a part in ending such daily insults to a portion of our citizens.

SCHOOLS

I should like to turn next to title III of the bill, which deals with the problem of segregated public schools.

The Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education, which held that racially segregated public school systems were unconstitutional, is now more than nine years old. The second decision in that case, requiring that desegregation take place with "all deliberate speed," is now more than eight years old.

Yet in some areas of the nation no desegregation of elementary or secondary schools has occurred, in other areas, the rate of progress is barely discernible and falls far short of "deliberate speed."

Thousands upon thousands of Negro children who were in elementary school in the year of the first Brown decision will receive high school diplomas without ever having been afforded the rights established by that decision.

As the Supreme Court pointed out last month in Watson v. City of Memphis, these rights are "present rights; they are not merely hopes of some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise..... The decision in Brown v. Board of Education never contemplated that

the concept of 'deliberate speed' would countenance indefinite delay in elimination of racial barriers in schools."

Unquestionably, new measures are needed to prevent such delay and it is with these considerations in mind that the President has asked for legislation to accelerate desegregation.

Title III has two purposes. First, it would authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance to public school officials in preparing and carrying out desegregation plans and in dealing with problems incident to de facto segregation. The title would also authorize a program of grants and loans by the Commissioner to aid school officials in these activities.

Second, title III would grant authority to the Attorney General to institute civil suits in the federal courts in certain cases involving racial discrimination in public schools and colleges.

The Attorney General would be able to bring suit upon his certification (1) that the students or parents involved in the suit are prevented from instituting litigation by lack of financial resources, by the unavailability of adequate counsel, or by intimidation, and (2) that his suit would materially further the orderly progress of desegregation in public education.

Although title III does not say so explicitly, it is expected that the Attorney General will call on the Commissioner of Education for information and advice in deciding which cases to file and preparing cases. The

expertise available in the Office of Education will obviously be of great service in this connection. And the Commissioner will obtain much useful information from the nation-wide investigation of discrimination in education which title III would direct him to make.

Title III would thus combine a program of aid to segregated school systems, which are attempting in good faith to meet the demands of the Constitution, with a program of effective legal action by the federal government. I believe that these programs would smooth the path upon which the Nation was set by the Brown decision.

VOTING

I should like now to discuss voting rights, which is the subject of title I of the bill.

We can, we must, and we will make strong and continuing efforts to guarantee all our citizens the right to vote without discrimination. In a democratic system such as ours the right to vote, and thus participate in the processes of self-government, is in the long run the most fundamental right of all. Obviously, if Negroes could participate fully in the electoral process in areas where racial discrimination is most prevalent, their grievances would secure attention and legitimate demands would be speedily met.

We have made significant progress in enforcing the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. Since September 1958, thirty cases have been brought under subsection (a) of section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1971) and nine under subsection (b). Demands for voting records

under title III of the 1960 Act have been made in 100 counties, and in 81 counties the records have been or are being analyzed. Thirty-eight court actions for voting records under title III have been brought to enforce these demands. Ten are pending, and the other twenty-eight have been brought to a successful conclusion.

As a result of this action, thousands of Negro citizens have been enabled to enjoy the franchise which is rightfully theirs. However, with the perspective we now have, five years after the filing of the first suit under the 1957 Act, we have become keenly aware of certain obstacles to fully effectively use the law.

First are lengthy delays in court proceedings. In a number of instances more than a year elapsed before cases were tried.

One suit was in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana, where 24,000 of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered, but only 725 of 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Although the suit was filed in July, 1961, it is still pending -- and so is the Negroe's right to vote. In another county, our suit has been pending since December, 1961.

There is no such thing as retroactive voting. Once an election date is past, the disfranchised citizen has suffered a loss which is irreparable. No amount of subsequent litigation can repair the damage done to such citizens or to the integrity of our democratic system.

Title I which follows the recommendations made by the President in his message of February 28, would hasten relief in two ways. First, the title would instruct the courts to give expedited treatment to voting rights cases by according them a preferential position on the docket. Election cases are given similar express preference in a number of States, and expedited treatment is accorded, under present statutes, to many other types of cases in the federal courts.

Second, title I would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended, which now authorizes the Attorney General to institute suits in connection with both federal and state elections.

The amendment would provide that, when the complaint alleges the existence of a pattern or practice of discrimination and fewer than 15% of the Negroes of voting age in the area involved are registered to vote, the court shall issue orders entitling qualified Negro applicants to vote.

Temporary voting referees may be appointed by the court to take applications for registration pursuant to its order.

This new procedure will provide meaningful interim relief. At the same time it will carefully safeguard the state voting process. No applicant would be registered pursuant to the court's order unless he were found qualified to vote under State law and unless he unsuccessfully applied to the proper local official for registration after the filing of the suit.

The findings of the temporary referee would be subject to challenge and would become effective only upon adoption by a court order. After final determination of the suit, if it were found that there was in fact no pattern of discrimination, an order of the court entitling an applicant to vote would no longer be effective.

A second major obstacle besides delay is the continued use of literacy tests and similar performance examinations as a device for discrimination.

Last year I appeared before this Committee in support of the

Administration's proposal, embodied in H. R. 10034, which would have established an objective standard to determine competency to vote in federal elections -- completion of six years of schooling. We are again proposing an objective standard for federal elections, but with some modifications.

The present proposal provides for a rebuttable rather than a conclusive presumption of literacy upon a showing that the applicant has completed six grades of schooling. This change was made because of the feeling expressed by some that in all fairness a registrar should have the opportunity to show that a particular person with a sixth grade education is not actually literate.

I believe that the practical result will be the same, for I have little doubt that practically all persons who have completed the sixth grade are fully capable of meaningful participation in the democratic process.

Title I would further require that if a literacy test is used as a qualification for voting in federal elections, it shall be written and the applicant shall be furnished, upon request, with a certified copy of the test and the answers he has given.

The questions asked of white applicants frequently do not compare even remotely in degree of difficulty with those asked of Negroes. Excellent answers supplied by Negroes are sometimes rejected out of hand as insufficient or faulty.

The requirement that the test be in writing would facilitate challenges to capricious decisions on the part of voting registrars.

Title I would deal with another practice of discrimination which is both widespread and effective. It would specifically forbid denial of the right to vote because of immaterial errors or omissions on applications for registration.

Very frequently, voting registrars have rejected Negro applicants for the most trivial errors, such as miscalculations of age figured in days, months, and years, entering correct information in the wrong space on a confusing form, and the like.

You may recall that in my testimony to this committee last year, I described a number of instances of such discrimination. We have encountered many more since.

In one county, Negroes have been required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of the state constitution--and then have been rejected for omissions of punctuation. Whites, meanwhile, have been asked to copy such simple provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt."

One white gentleman interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be fore voting Becouse he dont under Stand."

He was registered.

In other instances, college professors, school teachers, ministers and Negro graduate students have been declared illiterate. Meanwhile, white applicants in the same districts who completed only the second or third grade have been declared literate and permitted to vote.

Title I would eliminate such abuses.

Although significant progress has been made under existing law, much remains to be done. We must make the right to vote a reality for all our citizens regardless of race, creed or color. Title I will help us do so.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Title V, which I should like to discuss next, is concerned with the Commission on Civil Rights. In his message of February 28 the President recommended that the life of the Commission be extended for an additional four years and that the Commission be authorized to serve as a national clearing house to provide information, advice, and technical assistance to private and public agencies.

Title V embodies both of these recommendations and I strongly urge their adoption. I emphasize that the Commission's services under the new clearing house provision would be available only upon request and would not be forced on anyone. We believe that the Commission can perform a very valuable function in this area.

Title V would also make minor changes in the provisions of the Civil Rights Acts dealing with the Commission and its procedures. These changes relate to such subjects as the reception of summaries of evidence, service of subpoenas, fees and allowances for witnesses, and compensation and allowances for Commission personnel. In addition the Commission would be authorized to issue rules and regulations.

These amendments to the present statute have been requested by the Commission as the result of its experience in carrying out its duties, and we believe they should be adopted.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

At the beginning of my statement I touched briefly upon the economic handicaps to which our Negro citizens are subjected and pointed out that measures to deal with this problem are contained in bills not before this Committee. However, two titles of H. R. 7152 have an important bearing upon this problem.

By executive order issued shortly after the President took office, he established the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity which has opened large areas of employment to Negroes by preventing racial discrimination by Government contractors and subcontractors.

Although it contains some public members, the Committee is financed as an interdepartmental group, and therefore must rely for its operating funds upon contributions by various departments and agencies.

Under the leadership of the Vice President, the Committee has made outstanding progress toward the elimination of discriminatory employment practices in business and industry. It has won the confidence and obtained the cooperation of the leading firms and labor organizations of the country.

Title VII of H. R. 7152 would provide the Committee with a statutory base and would establish it as a permanent body. No change in its composition or manner of operations is intended, and it would

remain under the direction of the Vice President.

In short, the new organization will have the same leadership and use the same personnel as the Committee now has and will have the same powers and functions as the President has conferred upon it to date. But it will have, in addition, the prestige of congressional authorization and direct access to appropriated funds to meet its needs.

USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Title VI deals with a related problem. Many programs and activities carried on by state and local governmental authorities and by private enterprises receive financial assistance or backing from the Federal Government. The benefits of such programs and activities unquestionably should be available to eligible recipients without regard to race or color. Likewise, the employment practices of the public or private organizations involved should be free of racial discrimination.

However, it is arguable that some of the statutes providing federal assistance leave the President no discretion to direct the withholding of the assistance on the ground of racial discrimination.

Numerous proposals related to this problem have been made in Congress in recent years. In general they have provided that federal backing be withdrawn automatically and without exception from any program when discriminatory practices occur. The principle that these programs be non-discriminatory is sound, but I think that a mandatory requirement that financial assistance be withdrawn is too sweeping.

Title VI would specifically provide authority to the Executive branch to withhold financial support in any program when discrimination is found, regardless of the provisions of existing law.

However, the exercise of the authority would not be mandatory. This approach, I believe, is directed to the heart of the problem, yet will not force the Government into inappropriate action in the exceptional situation which may arise--for example, a disaster situation or one compelling the emergency grant of a defense contract.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Finally, I come to the subject of persuasion and voluntary procedures. It is our hope that the recognition of the rights of miniority groups can be achieved more and more frequently outside the arenas of litigation and public demonstrations. The Administration has made strenuous efforts to help resolve racial conflicts by discussion and mediation in many communities where serious conflicts have arisen.

The President and other members of the Administration have met with substantial numbers of white and Negro leaders, clergymen, business executives and public officials to enlist their aid to achieve solutions consistent with the basic principles of democracy.

The efforts of Assistant Attorney General Burke Marshall and others have contributed to the achievement of at least precarious peace in a number of cities.

The Administration's efforts will continue. But they cannot adequately substitute for the work of a regularly constituted organization which could devote its full energies to mediation in seriously troubled areas.

In every racially troubled community there are leading citizens of both races who would like to confer with each other, who desire to prevent tensions and antagonism and, above all, violence. But often the pressures on these leaders make it difficult for them to approach each other--much less admit that there is a basis for amicable settlement of the problems in their communities.

In situations like these, it is virtually indispensable that some organization be available to bring together the people of influence in both races. Where a local organization exists--a by-racial commission or the like--it is in a position to play the primary role.

But even a local group frequently needs the help of reasonable and dispassionate men who are not members of the community and not emotionally involved in the particular situation.

I do not believe there is reason to fear that mediation will block or slow down the vindication of constitutional rights. Grievances may cover the whole gamut of the economic and cultural organization of any given community and may not relate solely to constitutional rights.

Some of the problems will be resolved in the courts, but others must be disposed of by voluntary action. And even those which are susceptible of judicial resolution can frequently be handled more effectively by agreement.

In all, it seems to the Administration that there is a real need for a federal service with a congressional mandate to provide mediation assistance to communities where racial tensions are rising or have erupted. Title IV of H. R. 7152 would create such an organization under the name of the Community Relations Service, to be headed by a Director appointed by the President.

The Service would be able to provide assistance to a troubled community, either upon request or upon its own motion, whenever it concluded that peaceful relations in the community were being threatened. It would seek the cooperation of nonpublic agencies, as well as appropriate State or local bodies.

The work of the Service would be conducted without publicity and in order to encourage interested persons to give it complete information, it would be required to treat as confidential any information it received as such.

CONCLUSION

With respect to the bill in its entirety, it must be emphasized that racial discrimination is far too complex a problem to be solved overnight. It has been with us since long before the United States became a nation, and we cannot expect it to vanish through the enactment of laws alone.

But we must launch as broad an attack on the problem as possible, in order to achieve a solution as soon as possible.

The demonstrations of the past few months have only served to point up what thinking Americans have known for years: that this country can no longer abide the moral outrage of racial discrimination.

If we fail to act promptly and wisely at this crucial point in our history, the ugly forces of disorder and violence will surely rise and multiply throughout the land--and grave doubts will be thrown on the very premise of American democracy.

If we enact a program that presents a reasonable opportunity for the Negroes to resolve their legitimate grievances--only then will this nation be living up to its ideals.

The courts have already played an important role. This Administration has taken significant and far-reaching action by the exercise of executive power. Now it is clearly up to Congress to bring it strength to bear.

The call to Congress is not merely for a law, nor does it come only from the President.

This bill springs from the people's desire to correct a wrong that has been allowed to exist too long in our society. It comes from the basic sense of justice in the hearts of all Americans.