April 12, 1967

Dear :

The Administration has presented a civil rights proposal which is similar to the one introduced last year.

No hearings have been scheduled as yet by either House or Senate and it is difficult to predict at this time just when hearings will begin.

As you know, I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee which will handle this legislation and you may therefore be sure that this will have my most careful attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
September 28, 1967

Dear:

As you may know, a civil rights bill has passed the House after being amended to include some anti-crime provisions. The bill is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, and you can be sure it is having my best attention.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
November 14, 1967

Dear:

As you may know, a civil rights bill, H. R. 2516, passed the House after being amended to include some anti-crime provisions. This bill was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee which reported it out to the Senate on November 2, 1967.

This bill is pending presently on the Calendar of the Senate. When it is brought up on the Senate floor, you may be assured it will have my best attention.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
December 15, 1967

Dear:

H.R. 2516 is on the Senate Calendar, having been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on November 2, 1967. In view of the little time remaining in this Session it does not appear to me that this measure will be scheduled for consideration by the Senate until sometime next year. An effort to call this bill up at this time could result in prolonged debate and the leadership is attempting to avoid a situation of this kind at this time.

I appreciate your views on this measure and you may be sure that when it is considered next year, it will have my careful attention.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
Dear:

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee which is handling the current civil rights proposal, you can be sure that this is having my most careful attention and I will have your views in mind during the course of our deliberations.

In large part, Title IV, the so-called Fair Housing Proposal, is quite offensive and in my judgment does violate the Constitution in that it destroys the property right which is guaranteed and which cannot be taken away without due process of law.

Needless to say, there is a lively interest in this proposal and it will be carefully weighed and considered.

Sincerely,

Everett M. Dirksen

Everett McKinley Dirksen
Dear:

Thank you for your comments regarding the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966, with special emphasis on Title IV, the so-called Fair Housing Title.

Together with staff I have examined into this matter for months and to this good hour I am persuaded that it will aggravate rather than improve the situation in the housing field, that it will not be productive of any new housing, that it will have little or no impact on the so-called "metropolitan ghettos" and will be productive of an endless amount of litigation before we get through.

As to its constitutionality, I still believe that it is in contravention of the due process clause of the Constitution and does constitute a deprivation of property or a property right without due process of law.

Debate in the Senate will begin September 6th and what the outcome will be I cannot fully say at the moment but I have made clear my opposition to the housing section and also to other provisions in the bill. Be assured it will have good attention.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen
Dear:

Thank you for your comments regarding the pending Civil Rights Act of 1966, with special emphasis on Title IV, the so-called Fair Housing Title.

Together with staff I have examined into this matter for months and to this good hour I am persuaded that it will aggravate rather than improve the situation in the housing field, that it will not be productive of any new housing, that it will have little or no impact on the so-called "metropolitan ghettos" and will be productive of an endless amount of litigation before we get through.

As to its constitutionality, I still believe that it is in contravention of the due process clause of the Constitution and does constitute a deprivation of property or a property right without due process of law.

Debate in the Senate is now underway and what the outcome will be I cannot fully say at the moment but I have made clear my opposition to the housing section and also to other provisions in the bill. Be assured it will have good attention.

Sincerely,

Everett McKinley Dirksen