

owner is not given freedom of choice in the selection of waiters, chefs, and cashiers? Although a restaurant serves, and advertises as its specialty, genuine southern dishes, under this bill the owner could not hire only Negro chefs if covered by sections 601, 602 or title VII. (See Labor Standard, p. 12.) He could not, even though the success of his business depended on such chefs; even though his patronage was built upon the belief the food was being prepared by Negro chefs whose culinary art with "southern" specialties is world renowned. He could be forced instead to hire in a "racially balanced" manner—so long as the potential employee had a modicum of skill—else be in violation of law. And a modicum of skill, it need not be added, is insufficient to attract clientele to a restaurant whose reputation is built upon the culinary art of southern Negro chefs.

THE PRESS

Race, as the first criterion of employment for newspapers, periodicals, radio and television, applies under this bill, as well as for other elements of our commerce. If a job applicant can write and there is an opening and if he is of the race called for to balance the makeup of the staff, that person must be employed in preference to someone of another race.

What such employment practices would do to the character of the newspaper or program is immediately apparent to those who earn their living in the world of mass media. Yet that is the sense of this bill. The bill grants the power to make it mandatory that the staff of a newspaper be thoroughly integrated, racially and religiously, else the owners are in violation of Federal law.

If the owners of a television station prefer an announcer of a certain race to enunciate its commercials, it is denied that choice. Announcers, as well as commentators, actors, and supporting staff, must be racially balanced, despite the fact the use of members of a certain race may, demonstrably, cause diminished sales to both station and sponsor.

Even so, this destruction of the right of free choice, serious as it is, is not the most fearsome feature of this bill as it applies to the press.

Title II, section 203, says: "No person shall * * * incite or aid or abet any person to do any of the fore-

going," i.e., deny or attempt to deny any person any right or privilege described in the title.

Read that language as you will, if this becomes the law it means that no editor could with impunity editorialize in opposition to its provisions.

If a citizen takes a position in direct opposition to some provision of this title and a newspaper writes an editorial in support of that position, indeed, urges others to take similar stands, is that newspaper inciting, or aiding, or abetting? It would seem so (sec. 203 (a) (e)).

The fact of the matter is this: If a person stands in a public square or before a civic club and advocates that segregation is best for either race and urges that it be maintained—and his stand is editorially supported by a newspaper—*both* would be in violation of Federal law and *both would be subject to fine and imprisonment* (sec. 202, 203 (a) (e)), if they continue to exercise freedom of speech and of the press. Under such a circumstance, what becomes of the right of free speech? Or freedom of the press? Of course, this violates all constitutional concepts.

TEACHERS AND SCHOOLS—PUBLIC AND PRIVATE

The proposed legislation ultimately would result in total Federal control of the education processes in the United States.

Under provisions of this bill, the President and appointees in Federal agencies would have the right to dictate pupil assignments in local schools and to approve the faculties (secs. 601, 602, 711 (b), title IV). The alternative would be the loss of all Federal aid (sec. 602). The child who is given lunch through Federal grant must also study under a federally approved faculty. This applies to every school, public or private, benefiting from programs involving Federal aid.

The power contained in this bill to cut off Federal funds is not merely a negative power. Those who have already accepted Federal funds can be compelled, in various instances, by foreclosure, injunction and black-listing, to meet the current Federal standards (secs. 601, 602, Executive Order 11063).

The bill gives the Attorney General the power to institute school integration suits, not only against in-