

PS  
ADDRESS

BY

HONORABLE HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

As Delivered

before the

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Tuesday, June 5, 1956

Thank you very much, Mr. President, we are proud to claim you as an alumnus of the Department of Justice. If you look around your dais you will see that not much work is being done over in the Department of Justice today. But everybody is allowed 15 minutes extra for lunch - that accounts for their being here. I am delighted to be back in the Press Club where I started out as a speaker 12 years ago. Knowing your penchant for non-controversial subjects so that you can digest your food after this lunch, I have chosen the subject of the Administration's civil rights program to talk about for a few minutes. I want to talk to you about it against the background of a governmental system that is called dual sovereignty. That's what the lawyers call it but in layman's language that means against the background of states' rights.

Now, you know our system of dual sovereignty has certain very overwhelming advantages. One of them is that we have respect for local self-government which is the keystone of our form of government and has the flexibility which has enabled our system, I believe, to continue uninterrupted since the founding of our country. And, secondly, it has an overwhelming advantage because it prevents tyranny by dividing the powers of government among 49 units throughout the country. But while this states' rights, federal-state dual jurisdiction has tremendous advantages for the average man and woman in this country, I must confess that in the field of law enforcement which is my particular responsibility at the present time, the system of dual sovereignty has very serious problems and complications. For example, oftentimes you hear and we hear demands that the federal government should step into and act in the field of law enforcement in some case which, under the law, is quite clearly outside the field of federal jurisdiction. And sometimes, even in the

international field, we have misunderstandings develop with other countries because of their failure to grasp the meaning and the significance of our federal system where, as I say, the powers are divided between the federal and state governments in the field of law enforcement.

And so to try and dramatize this, I am going to read a few lines from a letter that we wrote to a lady out in the Middle West recently who was naturally distressed because of the disappearance of her daughter and she wrote this letter in to the Department of Justice and asked "I am writing to find out just why the FBI, representing the federal government, has not entered this case." And we had to explain to her some of the technicalities and some of the lines of division that are inherent in our federal system. We said:

"As you know, very intensive investigation of your daughter's disappearance has been made to date by state and local investigative agencies.

"The FBI has done all that it could to assist them toward a solution of this crime and I do not believe that there is anything that the FBI has not done along this line that it could have done. But the FBI has not entered the case in the sense of assuming sole responsibility for the investigation to the exclusion of state and local investigative agencies. But this doesn't mean that the FBI has been indifferent to its solution or has failed to render every possible assistance within the limits of its jurisdiction.

"If the circumstances surrounding the crime require that it be prosecuted in the federal court, it is important that it be investigated by federal agencies. If the circumstances surrounding the crime require that it be prosecuted in the state court, it is equally important

that it be investigated by the appropriate state agencies. The FBI is limited to the investigations of certain federal laws and it does not have the jurisdiction to investigate crimes, however repulsive, that violate state law only. In other words, of necessity also, FBI investigations are always made with a view to eventual prosecution in the federal courts, and when the FBI assumes responsibility for investigation, it necessarily takes charge of the case to the exclusion of state and local investigative agencies.

"In other words, the Bureau never investigates a case for prosecution in a state court for this is the business of state and local investigative agencies. If the FBI were to do otherwise and were to take over any investigation which involved a violation of state law alone, it would not only be usurping jurisdiction without authority of law but would necessarily, and this is important too, impede the investigation by getting in the way of the proper law enforcement agencies."

Now the best example that comes to my mind of that particular situation where there is local law enforcement responsibility and no authority for a federal agency to go in is the case of Emmett Till, which, of course, you all know, caused international repercussions in the past year. Till was that teen-age negro boy, a resident of Chicago, who went down to Mississippi, and was taken from a home by two white men and his body was found three days later in the adjoining county. It was the so-called "wolf-whistle" case.

Although the FBI and the Department of Justice followed developments in this case closely, no formal federal jurisdiction was ever entered for the simple reason that, as I explained a few minutes ago, no federal jurisdiction existed. The civil rights laws were not

applicable because it was a type of crime committed by persons who did not hold public office. And, furthermore, no kidnaping, interstate, was involved because, as I said, the body was found in the adjoining county within three days so that the federal power to prosecute that case did not exist. As you know, the state authorities went in and they were acquitted of murder and the grand jury failed to indict as to intrastate kidnaping so no follow-up was taken after the commission of this crime.

I mention this particular case because of the fact it did have international repercussions. As you know, the international communist propaganda machine ground out reams and reams about the failure of the United States Government to act in this matter. But it was a case of exclusive local jurisdiction and we tried to be meticulous in maintaining the dual sovereignty of which I spoke in the beginning.

Now, of course, in addition to those cases, and this you also run up against in your everyday reporting here in the Nation's Capital, sometimes a crime is committed over which both the federal and state governments have jurisdiction. Now ordinarily when this happens and the crime is serious enough, the same people are sometimes prosecuted in the federal and state courts.

Well, what happens in such a case. If I may now return to the answer we gave the lady in the Middle West, where a crime is committed under circumstances which make it perfectly plain from the beginning that the state law has been violated but at the same time the question of whether a federal law has been violated remains obscure. That's the tough one. And this was the case, we wrote to the mother, with respect to the crime committed against her daughter.

"Sufficient is known concerning the circumstances of your daughter's disappearance to leave no slightest doubt that the most important of state laws, with the severest sanctions and penalties, has been violated. It seems clear that your daughter could not have been kidnaped for ransom reward for no demand of any kind for payment has ever been made to you. Indeed the circumstantial evidence connected with her disappearance, some of which are mentioned in your letter to us, makes it very doubtful that she was kidnaped at all and it seems probable, as you have pointed out, that she was not alive when her body was taken from the house.

"The FBI must consider all these circumstances and probabilities before stepping in and taking over the sole responsibility for the case. So the wisest course would appear to be that which is being followed of leaving the major responsibility for investigation to the investigative agencies of the state whose courts in all probability will have exclusive jurisdiction to try the criminal or criminals while the FBI stands by to be prepared to render any assistance within its jurisdiction to help in the solution of the crime."

Well, now, I pointed out these two examples, as I said, in an endeavor to show you the meticulous care with which the Department of Justice tries to maintain the spirit of our constitutional system - the balance between the federal and state governments.

And as an aside I would like to say this: that I would like to thank the Washington correspondents for their almost unanimous acceptance and appreciation of these limitations under which we operate. Sometimes it is not clear to the layman but we've had wonderful cooperation from the men covering the cases here in Washington. And, of course, I need

not add that there are great frustrations, so far as we are concerned, in some of these heart-rending cases. But the overwhelming advantage to our national welfare of having this dual jurisdiction seems to us so important that it is necessary to be the central fact which we keep in mind in the investigation and prosecution of any case.

I know, continuing in my aside, that you realize that the functions of the Department of Justice usually do not lend themselves to public disclosure at the time that they would be the most newsworthy. That creates complications for you and it creates complications for us. For example, in this area of investigation that I was talking about, any premature disclosure of the facts which might lead to criminal prosecution might very well cause disappearance of the suspect, or the disappearance of key witnesses, or the destruction of important evidence.

These are the most obvious considerations, but there are others. Not all persons who were investigated were found to have committed a crime. Some of those, after investigation, are found to be entirely innocent, perhaps the victims of mistaken identity or of an accusation that was based entirely on malice, so that such persons, it is quite obvious, would suffer irreparable harm if there was publicity incident to the investigation at the very outset.

This is true not only so far as our work is concerned in the field of investigation of crimes, but it also is true in the prosecution area where we have certain limitations which cannot be overstepped by reason of the fact that lawyers are officers of the court. We must have a decent respect for the function and authority of our court system which demands that there should be objectivity and calm appraisal at the time leading up to the trial and during the course of the trial, so that

we have to pay respect to the opinion of the judge who is going to try the case and the canons of ethics of our own profession.

Right at this point I would say that there is a matter of extreme current interest to you and to us which is involved in the drawing of a line between the freedom of the courts from outside influences and the freedom of the press. And that is involved in the case where a man is arrested.

It has been thought up to this time that it was perfectly proper for the public authorities to issue a statement - a background statement - at the time of the arrest giving the facts surrounding the arrest and also giving the history of the persons who were involved. But recently, there has been a disposition on the part of certain federal judges to say that that is overstepping the line and interfering with the orderly conduct of the judicial system. So, in the months to come, I think you will hear quite a lot of debate as to just how far we may furnish information to the press about the circumstances and the history of the men who are under arrest without interfering with the orderly processes of the court.

And, one other point within our jurisdiction in the Department of Justice and that is the area of legal advice. There are certain limitations there when we give advice to the President or to the heads of agencies in the Executive Branch on confidential matters. We cannot ourselves release that information to the press at the time, because we are acting in a professional capacity. It is up to the "client" to decide whether or not and when that news should be made public, and in what manner. But I just want to complete this aside by repeating that



I think on the whole, and almost unanimously, the correspondents here in Washington have recognized the professional limitations on our work and have cooperated 100 percent with the Department of Justice information officers in hewing to that line.

Now, if I can return to my main theme, and that is the proper federal and state area in the field of civil rights. For we believe that it is not only important to carefully respect the proper area of state law enforcement, of which I was talking a few minutes ago, but it is also just as important to see to it that the federal government has the proper legislative and prosecutive tools to enable it to vigorously protect those civil rights that are in the proper area and jurisdiction of the federal government. And, of course, as law enforcement officers we are required and we do follow the word of the Supreme Court as to the final word as to where to draw this line.

Now we believe that at the present time there are certain deficiencies and loopholes in the federal laws which make it impossible for the federal government adequately to protect the civil rights of our people under the present law. Therefore, we have advocated before the Congress a four-point program to change the federal civil rights laws to try and give us the proper tools to enforce these constitutional rights which from the beginning have been guaranteed to our citizens, ever since the adoption of the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments.

The first one of these four proposals would, as some of you are already familiar, create a Presidential Commission of six persons, three Republicans and three Democrats, to be appointed by the President, with subpoena powers to investigate allegations that have been increasingly made and with considerable force during the past few months, that in certain areas of our country the Negro citizens have, on a

wholesale basis, been denied the right to vote either through quirks in the registration laws or practices, or actual debarring physically from the polls on election day. So we have advocated and urged the Congress to set up this Commission to establish the facts not only to complete the public's education in this area but to find out whether new federal laws shall not be necessary in order to eliminate this practice which would seem clearly unconstitutional if proved.

Secondly, we have advocated the creation in the Department of Justice of a Civil Rights Division. And the reason for that will come to your mind quite quickly, I think, and that is that in the past couple of years we have had the Supreme Court decision in the school segregation cases, we have had the Supreme Court decisions in the golf club and bathing pool cases, and the hotel cases. We have had Interstate Commerce Commission decisions in the transportation field in interstate commerce.

Altogether there is drawing up a whole new area over which the Department of Justice will be called upon to study and perhaps take action. We are not set up for that sort of law enforcement job at the present time. Therefore, we are asking for Presidential appointees to be appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, who will take over all of the responsibility of the federal government in the civil rights area.

And then, third, strange as it may seem, over the years the only authority that the Department of Justice has had in this area of civil rights within the federal jurisdiction is to prosecute criminally. This, as you can well imagine from your own experience, has brought the federal government in direct clash and conflict with state and local public

officials. And it seems just about the most backward and the most foolish and nonsensical way of trying to establish a cooperative effort on the part of federal and state officials in the enforcement of civil rights.

So our third proposal to the Congress this session is that the Department of Justice shall be given authority to prosecute civilly, stay out of the criminal courts, bring injunction actions and try to prevent the violations of civil rights before they happen, which I am sure will appeal to you as an entirely sensible approach to the problem.

Finally, another loophole in the civil rights laws at the present time is that we can prosecute only where persons acting under color of law, in other words, which means public officials, and we cannot stop under our present powers the deprivation of one citizen by another private citizen of his civil rights. So we have asked that the law be changed to eliminate this loophole.

That is the four-point program which we believe is essential if the federal government is to carry out its part of the problem of assuring our citizens their constitutional rights.

And the point I would like to make now is that we think the critical time has come for action on these bills. I know that anyone who speaks about this subject in an election year is perhaps likely to raise an eyebrow or two as to his motives. But I want to say this:

As far as I am concerned and so far as the Administration is concerned, we are not inclined to fence about these matters. In other words, the purpose of the Administration this year and so long as we are authorized to act, is to be given the authority to bring about respect for law at the point where it can be quickly meaningful and at the time where the civil rights can be preserved. And if that is to be done

the processes of the past need to be changed in accordance with present needs.

We are now talking largely about members of the Negro race who need to be safeguarded from haters and opportunists, from those with sick minds, as well as those who have so long been exposed to the poisonous force of untruths that they would deny the inalienable rights of these citizens.

We also need to face up to the ugly fact that irresponsible action, if left uncurbed, tends to become a progressive, more violent, chain reaction that tends to get out of bounds; one that callously tramples on everything - life, liberty, and property - that may stand in the way of its force.

If a government of free people is to be worthy of its heritage and its obligation to this generation and future generations, important choices must now be made and they must be made pretty soon. We must decide, quite particularly and openly, whether to continue and encourage inhumanities and defiance of law. We must recognize once and for all that the inalienable right of a citizen of the United States consists in important part of being permitted the free and honest choice of those who will make the laws governing his life, and his liberty and his happiness.

I truly believe that we have come to a great moment in American history. There are infinite creative possibilities in this present enlarged view of human rights and privileges and once again this nation can demonstrate to the world its assumption of those large moral as well as legal responsibilities which make for more useful and prosperous living among all of us. Thank you very much.

Mr. Frank Holeman, President of the National Press Club:

Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney General, And now we come to the question and answer period. I would like to explain before we go into this, Sir, that I don't write these questions. I just ask them and we have got some real beauties here, I want to warn you. Just as a sample of the easy ones: Mr. Attorney General, if you had it to do over again, would you make that speech about Harry Dexter White and Harry S. Truman?

Mr. Brownell: Well, I have been asked that before a number of times so it doesn't exactly come in the category of news. But my answer to that is this: Among the jobs that I was assigned when this Administration came to Washington, and it was part of my official duties, was to try and to prevent a repetition of the tragic era in which our most secret government documents and atomic secrets were disclosed by government officials and by others to the enemy. The incalculable losses involved there are well known to you. And one of the ways, it seemed to me, one of the indispensable ways, of turning the tide in that matter and trying to set up a system under which, to the greatest extent possible, it could not repeat itself was to disclose the defects of the system that went before. And that was my purpose in showing what we called the blindness of the previous administration toward the handling of the communist problem here at home. So to accomplish that objective, to answer your question, I'd do it again.

Question: And another one, Sir, were instructions ever issued in your Department to go easy on Murray Chotiner?

Mr. Brownell: Well, the McClellan Committee has asked that same question. I will say this, that in due course we will -- that we have given some information to the McClellan Committee with respect to the Chotiner situation and that has been made public. The balance of the information for which we have been asked we are now giving consideration to and in a short time we will have some material ready for the McClellan Committee. I have told the men who are covering the Justice Department a couple of weeks ago that I personally did not ever issue any such instructions as to that. As to whether any further information along that line will develop we will, of course, know in connection with our preparation of our answers to the McClellan Committee.

Question: And now, Sir, what was the purpose of your recent visit to Governor Shivers? Was it social, or political?

Mr. Brownell: Well, it was social. I really had a good time. I'll tell you, I have been doing this Texas trip, you know, for some time. My wife is a Texan. Everytime we go down, we visit Mary Alice and Allen Shivers and when they come to Washington they visit us. I always get a little repercussions from my visits with the Shiverses. I remember two years ago when Shivers was running for re-election as Governor. As you know, he became the first person down south of importance and on a statewide basis who had ever bolted the Democratic ticket to be re-elected the next time. And he was running against a man named Yarborough. And Yarborough noted I went down with Mrs. Brownell and called on the Shiverses and so he devoted almost an entire speech to this problem, and he said: "Why, this man Shivers

is not fit to be Governor of the great State of Texas because he allowed the Attorney General of the United States to sleep in Sam Houston's bed for three consecutive nights."

Question: What is your opinion of the proposed legislation to require five years' service as a federal judge for appointment to the United States Supreme Court and the fact that only two present members meet that requirement?

Mr. Brownell: Well, that little zinger on there would seem to indicate that I would have to be careful not to bring any personalities into this situation. And so I'll try without respect to personalities either of the high court or the lower courts to express my view, which is this: That limitations of this kind very often bring results that cannot be foreseen. And I think that under our system the responsibility for appointment of federal judges rests primarily on the President and that he should have freedom of choice to pick the person and combination of persons whom he thinks will give this country the best judicial decisions. And, therefore, geographic, or age, or previous particular kinds of experience - limitations of that sort - would, I am inclined to believe, in the long run end up by doing more damage than good.

Question: What will you do if any state, including all its top officials, defies the Supreme Court order on segregation?

Mr. Brownell: Well, I have, as you perhaps know from a statement I made out in Arizona a couple days ago, been conferring with a majority of the Attorneys General of the southern and border states on some of the problems that grow out of the present situation

respecting segregation in the schools. I consulted with them as to the progress that's been made to date and the further progress which they expect to be made, beginning in September at the school term then, the status of litigation on civil rights in their areas, and as to whether or not they think that a formal conference of Governors or Attorneys General in this field would be a proper way to approach this problem. I'll make a report to the President on that in due course. But my impression is this: Over the past 12 months, 250,000 negro children have been successfully integrated in the public schools in this country. And, according to my view, progress is still being made so that I think it is unwise at this time to discuss the problem in the terms of this particular question. I believe that we may look forward to steady progress in this area. It is going to take good will on the part of everybody concerned. There will be a lot of heart-aches involved. There will be more litigation. But the big thing is to see to it that extremist statements are avoided; that we be sure that just because we disagree with one particular Supreme Court decision, we do not carry on to a point where we are attacking the system which has served us so well in the past 165 years, and, above all, that we keep our eye on the progress that is being made.

Question: Is it true, Sir, that the Justice Department is opposed to any large-scale admission of Russian visitors to this country, and why? And the second question in the same field, what is the Department's position on the fingerprinting requirement for Soviet visitors to the United States?



Mr. Brownell: The answer to the last part of the question, first. The Department has taken the position before the appropriate Congressional Committees that we believe that fingerprinting as a mandatory requirement for all immigrants should be eliminated, and that discretion should be given to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to decide in any particular case or group of cases whether or not fingerprints should be required. Now, "Is the Justice Department opposed to any large-scale admission of Russian visitors to this country, and why?" Well, I think it is obvious to all of you that the more of these visitors that come in from behind the Iron Curtain, the larger are the internal security problems that are created for the investigative and prosecutive units in the Department of Justice. It is our particular problem to present to the Administration that aspect of the matter. However, we do not take any position in opposition to this so far. If the Administration decides that that is a wise policy, if that policy should be adopted by the Administration, then our response would be one of complete cooperation, although we would undoubtedly have to ask for additional funds by reason of the enlargement of our internal security problems.

Question: What is the present Justice Department attitude toward return of vested enemy alien property?

Mr. Brownell: The attitude of the Department of Justice is that the property that has been vested should be processed through the administrative procedures and through the courts. And that the property which is found to be enemy-owned or enemy-tainted should be retained by the United States. As you know, the present laws provide that money

shall go primarily to reparations for persons who were mutilated or damaged in any way in person or property in Japanese prison camps or otherwise suffered damage during the war. A great deal of the money collected on these claims has already been turned over for that purpose. More money will have to be spent and we think that pursuant to the Executive Agreements entered into shortly after the war that this should continue to be the policy of the United States. Now this question does give me a chance to put in a plug for a piece of legislation which we and the State Department have before the Congress at the present time. There is one restriction on selling this property for the reparation of these persons on our side who suffered during the war. And that is that if there is litigation involved, such as there is in the General Aniline and Film case, then we cannot sell the property and get the Government out of business and use the proceeds appropriately under the Act. Further, in this \$100,000,000 corporation, General Aniline and Film, the Government has to continue to operate that, although we think it would be much wiser to have it in private hands. Because of the fact that litigation is pending and the law says that as long as the litigation is pending we cannot dispose of the assets and hold the proceeds. We are advocating that that restriction be removed so that we can get the Government out of these businesses and hold the proceeds for the benefit of the persons whom the courts decide are entitled to it.

Question: Now, Mr. Attorney General, here is an inquiry from a personal friend of yours out there, I gather, who wants to know something about your own future. He says, "What line are you going into, come January?"

Mr. Brownell: I wish I knew, and so does my family. But I have no plans beyond January. I've lasted longer than some of my predecessors and I think that is all I can say at the present time.

Question: Representative Jack Brooks accuses the Department of a cover-up in the Mansure case. Would you comment on it, Sir, please, and tell us when, if ever, the documents will be given to Congress?

Mr. Brownell: Well, that has been answered at press conferences by the President and I'll try to answer that myself. It all evolves on this particular policy which has been a policy uniformly of my predecessors over the years and which I propose to continue; and that is that when the Department of Justice gets into an investigation, an active investigation, such as is involved in this case, we retain the papers and the information which we have received until we have completed our investigation. And then we make proper disposal of them, depending upon the facts. As I tried to point out in my speech, sometimes these investigations turn out that no -- that there was no wrongdoing involved and we do not want to smear anybody that may turn out to have been innocent in the matter. On the other hand, if they are guilty, we will prosecute them and, of course, the information would come out at that time which is the proper time from the law enforcement aspect. So, to answer the question, in summary, so long as the active investigation is in process in the Department of Justice, we will hold the papers and information, to use them in our best judgment either for prosecution or dismissal of the charges.

Question: Here's a question out of your political background, Mr. Attorney General. It says: "As a politician, do you believe that Vice President Nixon will lose votes for the GOP ticket in November?"

Mr. Brownell: Well, that is stepping out of my role a little bit today. But I'd say that the best possible ticket that the Republican Party can have in the campaign coming up is that one that we had in 1952. I think that it is a tremendously strong ticket and, unless something goes wrong, it will be a successful ticket.

Question: And if you would take just one more step in the political field, Sir, as a former national chairman, do you think that Senator Joe McCarthy should be used as a speaker for the Party in the Presidential campaign?

Mr. Brownell: If I were to get into that question I would be stepping on Chairman Len Hall's toes. I am going to let him answer that one.

Question: Well, about the business world, will the Department follow up on antitrust investigations started under Judge Barnes after he leaves?

Mr. Brownell: Yes, Judge Barnes and I have sung the same tune now for something over three years and we have never had a disagreement, a major disagreement, on any enforcement policy of the Department. He has participated actively in the selection of his successor and is just as enthusiastic as I am. To answer the question specifically: We believe that the prosecutions which Judge Barnes started are in the public interest and they will be prosecuted vigorously.

Question: Another one along the same lines, Sir, will the Department of Justice file its antitrust suit against the General Motors bus and coach division before Judge Barnes leaves?

Mr. Brownell: I guess I'd have to go into a huddle on that one. I would not, of course, seriously be able to make any announcement about what the Department will do or will not do in pending investigations. It is public knowledge that this matter is under investigation at the present time.

Question: Two questions on Judge Sobeloff. How do you feel about the delay of almost 11 months on getting a vote on the Sobeloff nomination? Second, is it true that Solicitor General Sobeloff may be shifted to a less controversial federal judgeship?

Mr. Brownell: I am very unhappy about the undue delay that has been involved in the consideration by the Senate Judiciary Committee on the nomination presented to them by President Eisenhower for Judge Sobeloff to go on the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. As the question indicates, the matter has been before the Committee now for nearly a year and no vote has been taken, although recently the subcommittee has acted favorably upon the nomination. This gives me an opportunity to say what I'd like to have said before -- and which I believe is in no way any interference with the work of the Committee -- that the charges that were, I think were rather recklessly brought against Judge Sobeloff in connection with his nomination have been disproved - disproved completely and 100 percent. And they have been disproved at the hearing out of the mouths of the persons who were involved in the particular transaction of the Baltimore Trust Company some 20 years ago. And, therefore, it seems to me,

that it is a disservice to the judicial system and to Judge Sobeloff to keep harping on these same charges which have been, according to the Chairman of the Subcommittee, Senator O'Mahoney, so completely disproved. I believe, in other words, that the time has come for a vote on the matter, and I sincerely hope that it will come soon. Now, I don't know where this other question came from, "Is it true that Solicitor General Sobeloff may be shifted to a less controversial federal judgeship from the one to which he has been named?" The only thing I can think of that may have been involved there was that at the time he was known as being considered for nomination by the President there was also a vacancy in the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. There was some public speculation at that time that he might be nominated for that Circuit rather than for the Fourth Circuit which is his home district, he coming from Maryland, which is part of the Fourth Circuit. But as you know another nomination was sent up on/or about the same time for the District of Columbia vacancy. So, to answer the question, briefly, it is not true that he may be shifted to a less controversial federal judgeship.

Question: Just got time for a couple more questions. Is Judge Vic Hansen of Los Angeles to be Judge Barnes' successor?

Mr. Brownell: Well, the nomination for a successor for Judge Barnes, of course, would be a Presidential nomination and, in accordance with long-standing custom, any announcement of a successor to him would come from Jim Hagerty's office.

Mr. Holeman: I want to thank you very much, Mr. Attorney General, for the address this afternoon and for handling these tough questions. I'd like to present to you our Certificate of Appreciation for your performance and ask a final question:

Is the present tight money situation later to be loosened for political purposes? That may have been left over from Humphrey, I must say.

Mr. Brownell: Well, I'll refer that one to my good friend, George Humphrey. But I do deeply appreciate this Certificate and I enjoyed very much being here with you today.