

I got from your statement that it would take another 100 years before it could be properly implemented.

Why do you think instantaneously it will do a lot of good?

Mr. MATHIAS. I think that, as I said, there is a paradox here. I think that the change, the actual practical change, will be very gradual. The laws of economics, whether we like it or not, are still superior to the laws of Congress. There will be change, but it will be gradual and not frightening.

But I do think that this will reaffirm the moral standard which our predecessors raised 102 years ago with the act of 1866. And that this will be, as the chairman referred to, the American heritage. I think this will be an important reaffirmation of the American heritage.

Mr. QUILLEN. One other question. In complimenting this committee for holding hearings and delaying the action originally——

Mr. MATHIAS. And in anticipating the action of the committee in bringing on a vote.

Mr. QUILLEN. You also said you thought quick action should be taken to bring it to the floor. You were not inferring that the instantaneous advantage of this measure would be the coming of Martin Luther King, who has threatened to march on Washington and threatened the Members of Congress?

Mr. MATHIAS. I can assure the distinguished gentleman that my interest in this subject has predated, and I hope will outlast, the events that are scheduled for April 22.

Mr. QUILLEN. In other words, having the measure on the floor of the House after Easter would serve just as useful a purpose as before his march?

Mr. MATHIAS. I said I think justice delayed is justice denied.

Mr. QUILLEN. I would like to look up the definition of "justice" in the dictionary and then apply that formula. I don't think it is right to take away a right of one person and give it to another. To me that is not justice.

Mr. MATHIAS. The question of the rights here was settled by the Congress in 1866. So when you talk about taking away something, the fundamental law on this subject has been settled for 102 years.

Mr. QUILLEN. Do you mean to say we could have operated this country without any succeeding Congresses? Doesn't this Congress have a right and duty and obligation?

Mr. MATHIAS. And I hope it will discharge it.

Mr. QUILLEN. I think it will. I think the Congress of 1866 had a duty and an obligation. But I do think that we also as Members of the Congress——

Mr. MATHIAS. When the gentleman talks about altering, changing, or adding or subtracting rights, I say on this particular subject the question of the fundamental rights was fixed by that act, and we are not changing anything this year. We may change some of the procedures by which the rights are enforced. But as for the rights, we are not altering them. Read the act of 1866. That is where the rights are spelled out. We are not doing anything novel or innovative in this bill. Or wouldn't be. As we didn't in the bill that the House passed 2 years ago.

There is nothing novel or innovative there.