for the enactment of a minimum wage law covering the District of Columbia. He was indeed the District Committee's principal adviser, trusted by Senators on both sides of the aisle, and in particular by his own Indiana counterpart in the District Committee's discussions of this legislation. It could be rightly said that the minimum wage law today for the District of Columbia is a monument to Joe Goldberg. I know that Joe Goldberg's death will be a loss to the Department of Labor and the American people, and I hope that the American people will agree that the America of tomorrow will be the further hope that while dissent is not likely to halt a war it serves to point up its futility and to make us wonder if we are to avoid another such ill-advised venture in the future. To the man who writes "Why don't you speak out, Senator?" my answer is, "We have, and we can only pray that it has served some useful purpose." 
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DEATH OF JOSEPH GOLDBERG,
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Sunday, March 12, Joseph Goldberg, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, died at the age of 53 from a heart attack.

Joseph Goldberg's death is a real loss to the people of the United States and the citizens of the District of Columbia, and it is a loss to me personally. Joe was born in Poland, and his rise to the high position of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor is a symbol of the opportunities that America, regardless of its past, offers to the hard-working and brave. Joe has left a family, a community, and a nation to honor his memory.

As almost any member of Congress will agree, the Fair Labor Standards Act, governing minimum wages and working conditions for millions of American workers, is one of the most intricate and complex fields of the law. Joe, who served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, brought a passion for the poor and underprivileged who were unprotected under the law, a passion for the poor and underprivileged who were unprotected under the law, to his work.

It was not until 1961 that the Fair Labor Standards Act, covering the minimum wage up to $1.25, were adopted. Joe continued to provide valuable help to Members of Congress that year. He was in constant attendance at markup sessions of the committee and helped us with many constituent complaints.

Starting in 1963 and culminating in 1966, Joe provided expert technical ad-
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tasks to which he devotes great attention—outer space and undersea exploration. The President has added to his list of special duties and missions. He has dealt with all of them competently and quietly. History will have to disclose how valuable he has been to our nation's administration but there is reason to believe he has been very useful there.

The most important legacy that he will leave the country is the concept of the Vice Presidency that fits both its subordinate position in the Executive Branch and the necessities of modern administration. Not for an instant has he prepared himself or a staff that would indicate any confusion about the place where there resides the constitutional power and duty to speak for the Government of the United States. He has rightly said, and repeatedly said, that there can be only one authoritative voice—and that is the voice of the President. He has been the President's echo on every public policy discussion of the Administration. And whenever the Vice President, under our system, tries to be anything other than that, "the trumpet maketh an uncertain sound."

No wonder the President admires his public service. The thoughtful citizens of this country also admire it and understand it. He is, to the very model of a model Vice President.

**SELECTION OF JURORS IN FEDERAL COURTS**

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the administration's current civil rights bill, like its predecessor which was defeated in the Senate last year, contains in title I extremely important proposals for a revolutionary reform of the jury selection procedures in the Federal courts. One of my major objections to this proposal has been that its merits have never been adequately analyzed—either in Congress or the community. The administration's jury selection proposals have been shielded from meaningful debate by the decision to make them a civil rights issue.

To some extent this unfortunate situation has improved in recent days. I was pleased that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] chose to introduce a series of six alternative proposals for jury selection reform and that he has scheduled these bills for hearings in his Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary. I hope that in this way jury reform can be evaluated on its own merits.

Appropriately, the editors of the American Bar Association Journal have also appreciated the fact that the 1966 debate on civil rights failed to produce much enlightenment about the controversial features of jury selection reform. They recently asked the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] and me to present in essay form a summary of the arguments for and against title I. The provocative article by Senator Hart is really the first thoughtful statement by the proponents of what the courts are calling the "blue ribbon jury" or "keyman system.

In the interest of widening this discussion still further, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Case for Federal Jury Reform," written by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, and my article entitled "Jury Reform Needs More Thought," published in the February 1967 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, be printed in the Record. There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

**THE CASE OF THE FEDERAL JURY REFORM**

(By Philip A. Hart, U.S. Senator from Michigan)

The basic responsibilities of jury officials, federal and state, are imposed by the Constitution. "The American tradition of trial by jury, considered in connection with either our federal or state judicial systems, exemplifies an idealization of the democratic spirit PURSUED by the idea that the truth will be the victory of the side which is able to present the best evidence."

The Supreme Court has recognized that it is impossible to select completely representative juries. "Neither the jury roll nor the venire need be a perfect mirror of the community. "

No wonder the President admires his public service. The thoughtful citizens of this country also admire it and understand it. He is, to the very model of a model Vice President.
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