

Mr. FORRESTER. I was sure that was what the gentleman's answer would be.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the article which appeared in the New York Times on February 4, 1960, about a meeting that was held up there concerning your civil rights proposal by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Americans for Democratic Action, the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, and some labor union. The statement was made that they had a private strategy meeting, and at that private strategy meeting they were joined by a staff member of the Civil Rights Commission.

Is the gentleman familiar with it?

Mr. WALSH. I am familiar with that article, written by a very able reporter, known for his accuracy.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me ask the gentleman his opinion in representing the Justice Department: Is it cricket, is it fair, or was it supposed to be assumed that a member of the staff of the Civil Rights Commission would be participating in a strategy meeting with the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Forrester, I do not think it is for me to pass upon the conduct of any other agency. I would assume that whatever was done was done in an honest, earnest, and sincere interest to advocate measures which they thought should be brought to the attention of Congress in as comprehensive a manner as possible.

Mr. FORRESTER. As I understand, although you are familiar with that, you do not think that is any part of your business, and you would not make a recommendation that that man be fired?

Mr. WALSH. No, sir, I have got enough trouble with our own Department.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we should allow Judge Walsh to continue his statement. After you have finished your general statement, then you can be interrogated.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the statement I had prepared, because we are under the pressure of time, and I think I can summarize it fairly quickly.

Coming back, then, to the overall objection we have to the registrar proposal, we think it raises the constitutional question on which Congressman Walter has commented.

You might say all we have to do is amend the Civil Rights Commission procedures, and we take care of that problem. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if that is done, you might just as well create a new agency, because the purpose for which the Civil Rights Commission was created and the functions it was to perform will be lost and submerged in this new function.

An administrative agency which goes around from county to county, passing upon the conduction of the registrar of that community and determining whether he should be supplanted by a Federal registrar or not has a different type of function than the Commission, which is surveying the operation of the election law throughout the country to find facts for Congress which would justify congressional legislation. They are two different functions, and as the proposal for a review of discrimination, county by county, is much more time-consuming, I do not think the Commission as now set up could function that way.