*Resolved further,* That the Government of the United States should declare its intention to refrain from additional flight tests of multiple independently-targetable reentry vehicles so long as the Soviet Union does so.

COSPONSORS

Addabbo, Joseph P. (D., N.Y.).
Anderson, Glenn M. (D., Calif.).
Anderson, John (R., Ill.).
Ashley, Thomas L. (D., Ohio).
Beall, Glenn (R., Md.).
Biester, Edward (R., Pa.).
Blatnik, John A. (D., Minn.).
Boland, Edward P. (D., Mass.).
Bolling, Richard (D., Mo.).
Brademas, John (D., Ind.).
Brasco, Frank J. (D., N.Y.).
Broomfield, William (R., Mich.).
Brown, George (D., Calif.).
Burton, Phillip (D., Calif.).
Button, Dan (R., N.Y.).
Cahill, William T. (R., N.J.).
Carey, Hugh L. (D., N.Y.).
Chisholm, Shirley (D., N.Y.).
Cohelan, Jeffery (D., Calif.).
Collier, Harold R. (R., Ill.).
Conte, Silvio (R., Mass.).
Conyers, John (D., Mich.).
Dellenback, John (R., Ill.).
Dent, John H. (D., Pa.).
Diggs, Charles C. (D., Mich.).
Edwards, Don (D., Calif.).
Erlenborn, John N. (R., Ill.).
Esch, Marvin L. (R., Mich.).
Eshleman, Edwin D. (R., Pa.).
Farbstein, Leonard (D., N.Y.).
Fraser, Donald M. (D., Minn.).
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B. (R., N.J.).
Friedel, Samuel N. (D., Md.).
Gilbert, Jacob (D., N.Y.).
Halpern, Seymour (R., N.Y.).
Hamilton, Lee H. (D., Ind.).
Harvey, James (R., Mich.).
Hastings, James (R., N.Y.).
Hathaway, William D. (D., Maine).
Hawkins, Augustus F. (D., Calif.).
Hechler, Ken (D., W. Va.).
Helstoski, Henry (D., N.J.).
Horton, Frank (R., N.Y.).
Jacobs, Andrew (D., Ind.).
Joelson, Charles (D., N.J.).
Karth, Joseph E. (D., Minn.).
Kastenmeier, Robert W. (D., Wis.).
Keith, Hastings (R., Mass.).
Koch, Edward I. (D., N.Y.).
Lloyd, Sherman (R., Utah).
Lowenstein, Allard (D., N.Y.).
McCarthy, Richard D. (D., N.Y.).
McCloskey, Paul (R., Calif.).
McDade, Joseph (R., Pa.).
McDonald, Jack H. (R., Mich.).
McEwen, Robert C. (R., N.Y.).
Macdonald, Torbert H. (D., Mass.).
Matsunaga, Spark M. (D., Hawaii).
Meskill, Thomas J. (R., Conn.).
Michel, Robert H. (R., Ill.).
Mikva, Abner J. (D., Ill.).
Mink, Patsy T. (D., Hawaii).
Mize, Chester L. (R., Kans.).
Moorhead, William S. (D., Pa.).
Morse, F. Bradford (R., Mass.).
Mosher, Charles (R., Ohio).
Moss, John E. (D., Calif.).
Obey, David R. (D., Wis.).
Olsen, Arnold (D., Mont.).
O'Neill, Thomas P. (D., Mass.).
Ottinger, Richard L. (D., N.Y.).
Pike, Otis G. (D., N.Y.).
Podell, Bertram L. (D., N.Y.).
Powell, Adam C. (D., N.Y.).
Preyer, Richardson (D., N.C.).
Railsback, Tom (R., Ill.).
Rees, Thomas (D., Calif.).
Reid, Ogden R. (R., N.Y.).
Reuss, Henry S. (D., Wis.).
Rodino, Peter W. (D., N.J.).
Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (D., N.Y.).
Roybal, Edward (D., Calif.).
Ruppe, Philip E. (R., Mich.).
St Germain, Fernand J. (D., R.I.).
Scheuer, James (D., N.Y.).
Schneebeli, Herman T. (R., Pa.).
Schwengel, Fred (R., Iowa).
Stanton, J. William (R., Ohio).
Steiger, William C. (R., Wis.).
Stokes, Louis (D., Ohio).
Thompson, Frank (D., N.J.).
Tiernan, Robert O. (D., R.I.).
Tunney, John V. (D., Calif.).
Udall, Morris K. (D., Ariz.).
Van Deerlin, Lionel (D., Calif.).
Vanik, Charles A. (D., Ohio).
Whalen, Charles (R., Ohio).
Williams, Lawrence G. (R., Pa.).
Wilson, Charles H. (D., Calif.).
Yates, Sidney R. (D., Ill.).
Yatron, Gus (D., Pa.).
Zwach, John M. (R., Minn.).

## HOUSE RESTAURANT WORKERS DESERVE FAIR TREATMENT

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), and to indicate my great concern about the dismissal of Wendell Quinn. The inadequacy of the wage level of those who work so hard in the restaurants of the Capitols buildings is an embarrassment to the Congress, and an unacceptable hardship to those who have endured it for so long.

As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS) pointed out, the people who work in the restaurants must also be able to eat. It is time we face up to our responsibilities for the conditions of employment of those who work in these buildings.

The sense that Mr. Quinn was dismissed because of his activities on behalf of cafeteria workers hovers over this episode and makes his abrupt dismissal profoundly unacceptable to many of us who are concerned about fairplay and about the rights of working people.

Beyond the immediate question of Mr. Quinn's employment it should be clear by now that Congress ought not to pockmark its processes by condoning demeaning and inadequate wages and working conditions for people who give dedicated service here, at the same time that we seek to legislate the end to such conditions in the rest of the country.

I am confident that the Speaker of the House, whose record of concern for the working conditions of his fellow men has made him one of the outstanding figures in the enactment of progressive legislation for more years than many of us have been alive—I am sure that the Speaker will share the concern of many Members of both parties about this situation.

I do not believe there is a public figure in American life who cares more about the right of American working people or who wants more earnestly to see that all Americans get paid a living wage. I cannot believe that the Architect of the Capitol will not see to it that Mr. Quinn is restored to his job. I cannot believe that it will be long before steps are taken to assure that the cafeteria employees are accorded treatment in the humane and wise tradition personified by the Speaker.

## TERMINATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT OF WENDELL QUINN

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join with our distinguished colleagues led by Congressman JACOBS of Indiana in decrying the action of the Architect in terminating the employment of Wendell Quinn on the grounds that he was leading the organization of an employees' association over in the Senate. As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, we have been charged with the responsibility of setting forth minimum working conditions and pay scales for working people throughout this Nation, and yet we find that within the very Halls of this Congress we are unable to maintain those very basic minimum standards for our own employees.

I would like to join my colleagues in calling upon the leadership of this House to make certain that these minimum guarantees are made available to all of our employees and, most appropriately, to the employees of our restaurants.

## THE 1965 VOTING RIGHTS ACT

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to insert in the RECORD the excellent testimony of Mr. Clarence Mitchell, who heads up the Washington bureau of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and who is also legislative chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee has been hearing testimony on the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I want to congratulate the many members of the Judiciary Committee on both sides of the aisle who have joined in opposing the administration version, which would distract the Nation from the central issue of extending the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I think it is urgent that this Congress make certain that this very simple, basic civil rights bill is continued for at least 5 more years.

I would like to include the following material: Clarence Mitchell's testimony before the subcommittee and three news articles relating to the current dialog on the extension of the Voting Rights Act.

The testimony of Clarence Mitchell and the other material is as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington Bureau of the NAACP. I appear here today on behalf of our organization and also as the legislative chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. We urge that the 1965 Voting Rights Act's ban against literacy tests be extended for an additional five year period as pro-

vided in bills introduced by Chairman Emanuel Celler and ranking committee member William M. McCulloch.

These bills would strike out the words "five years" in each place where they appear in the first and third paragraphs of Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973b(a)) and "inserting in lieu thereof 'ten years.'"

In order that there will be no mistake about what we support, we cite 42 USC 1973b subsection (b) in full:

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a state which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November, 1964.

"A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 1973d or 1973k of this title shall not be reviewable in any court and shall be effective upon publication in the Federal Register."

The wording of this subsection would remain unchanged. We have heard of several suggestions to change the date of November 1, 1964, in subsection (b) to a later date. Such a change would be a travesty in that it would reduce the coverage of the law—especially in those areas where diligent effort by citizens has increased the voter registration in the face of great odds.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of the effectiveness of the 1965 Voting Rights Act is the recent victory of Charles Evers in his race for Mayor of Fayette, Mississippi. For many years the State of Mississippi has been synonymous with terror, oppression and total deprivation of all of the Negro's constitutional rights. Mr. Evers' own brother, Medgar, was murdered by an assassin. There is a long, tragic and bloody history of how that state has tolerated and encouraged the consignment of colored Americans to a subhuman status.

Although the great and small cities of Mississippi were notorious for their mistreatment of colored people, the small towns justly earned the reputation of being worse than the large cities of that state. It is, therefore, especially gratifying that Mr. Evers won in a small community and that the entire campaign was conducted in a spirit of fairness.

I would like to state for the record that immediately after he won, Mr. Evers announced that he would work to make his community a place of fairness and prosperity for all people without regard to race or color. He has already embarked on a campaign to attract business and money to his town in order that it may be a credit to the state and to the Nation.

Mr. Evers is one of approximately 400 men and women who have been elected to public office in the South. Most of these office holders won because of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In contrast to the turmoil and hostility that plagues some areas of the country, many of the men and women, white and black, who live in the states affected by the act are making quiet but determined efforts to move forward in a spirit of brotherhood and good will.

These elections have provided high drama in many communities. For example, while the mayor of Leesville, Louisiana, was personally leading his police force in arresting NAACP officials on May 17, a colored man, Rufus Mayfield, was being elected as the first of his race to serve in the city council of Lake Charles, Louisiana. It is important to note that the NAACP officials were being arrested because they had set up a tent for the purpose of receiving complaints of Negro servicemen stationed at Fort Polk in Louisiana.

The Evers victory and the action of the Leesville mayor should serve to remind us that while the 1965 Voting Rights Act opened the door for progress, the battle is by no means over. It is still possible to be jailed for exercising even the most obvious constitutional rights in many of the states of the so-called Old South. Vernon Dahmer, who died from injuries after his store was burned to the ground and peppered with a hail of bullets in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, was a leader of a registration and vote drive. Like many others before him he paid with his life for the right to vote.

Mr. Dahmer had announced on January 9, 1966, that he would receive poll tax payments at his grocery store from persons wishing to register to vote. On January 10 he was dead of wounds received in the firebombing of his store, his home and his car. Those who have been determined to deny the right to vote have not spared victims merely because they were white. Let us not forget that on August 20, 1965, Jonathan M. Daniels, a white man, was shot and killed just after he had been freed from jail in Lowndes County, Alabama. A Roman Catholic priest with him was also severely wounded but recovered. Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, who was also white, was shot and killed on the night of March 25, 1965, while ferrying marchers in her car from Montgomery, Alabama, to their homes in Selma, Alabama.

These crimes have been supplemented by official state action designed to prevent Negroes from voting. This subcommittee, and especially the senior members, know the long and shameful record of state sanctioned obstruction. Immediately after passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act the Mississippi Legislature, meeting in regular and special sessions, passed twelve bills and resolutions which substantially altered the state's election laws. Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina have all resorted to various devices to slow down or prevent registration, voting and election to public office. These devices include abolishing offices, switching to so-called "at large elections," consolidation of counties, "full slate voting," barring or intimidating poll watchers and giving misleading information to would-be voters.

The continuity of these attempts to defy the law is illustrated by a recent happening in Friar's Point, Mississippi. On May 17, 1969, the Department of Justice asked a federal court to block a June 3 town election in Friar's Point unless a slate of Negro candidates is placed on the ballot.

The Department of Justice charges that the Municipal Election Commission changed the qualification procedure for candidates and the city clerk failed to notify the Negroes of the change in time for them to be placed on the ballot, in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the 15th Amendment to the Constitution.

Prior to this year, candidates for city offices have qualified to be placed on the ballot by notifying the clerk and filing a statement that they were not subversives.

After a slate of six Negroes complied with this procedure to be placed on the ballots as candidates for mayor, town marshal, and four alderman posts, the defendants "without general notice to the public, altered the procedure for qualifying."

The new procedure required petitions to be filed by candidates and the clerk failed to notify the slate of Negro candidates and did not furnish them forms for the petitions as she did for the other candidates.

The change in procedure was made without the approval of the Attorney General, as required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and will "deny and abridge the right of Negroes to vote on account of their race by denying them the right to vote for the candidates of their choice."

Even without the sanction of law, slow downs, indifference and hostility have been used to keep down registration. Barnwell County, South Carolina, is a good illustration of how unofficial efforts to intimidate have been used to back up official action. In 1965, large numbers of would be colored registrants were kept waiting in a line and finally not permitted to register. Some of those who were not permitted to register began picketing and were arrested on a charge of parading without a permit. The Negroes then staged a register and vote rally in an open field. At the same time the Ku Klux Klan held a rally beside the main road that the Negroes had to use going to and coming from the rally.

The Virginia State Conference of NAACP branches made a statewide check on registration conditions in 1967, two years after the Voting Rights Act became law. Insufficient time to register and inconvenience of the place of registration were the most common complaints. In Lancaster County it was necessary to make an appointment in order to register. In Southampton County registration was on Thursdays only. In Halifax County the registration dates were set at the "convenience of the registrars." In one county a "registrar stopped registering to go play golf."

With so many risks of losing the progress that has been made since the 1965 Voting Rights Act became law, it is imperative that the ban against literacy tests be extended before the end of this session of the Congress. There are those who suggest that the law can be improved. This may be so, but let us extend the law that we know can and does work before seeking a change that may not get through Congress until after the present ban against literacy tests has expired.

Just to illustrate one of the pitfalls that may lie ahead if we consider new legislation without first extending the present law, let us consider one proposal which is said to be under consideration. It provides that a sixth grade education would establish proof of literacy.

I invite the subcommittee's attention to the cover photograph on the Washington Post Magazine Potomac, for Sunday, May 25, 1969. It is the picture of a fine looking white man and his two children. Inside the story relates that "Ten years ago Brother Leonard Barton came out of the hills with a fifth grade education and a hungry family . . . he rose to a full time job as the $9,000 a year shop foreman for an engineering firm in College Park, Maryland." Mr. Barton is a relatively young man. There are thousands of Americans like him and many of them live in areas where they would be lucky if they could get a third grade education. What a travesty it would be to say to these people that although the Internal Revenue Service does not care whether you finished kindergarten—you must pay your taxes. But when it comes to electing the officials who impose the taxes on your property, on your necessities of life and on your income you have got to prove that you have finished the sixth grade.

It would serve no useful purpose to take up this subcommittee's time with other illustrations. However, I would like to close with a reference to a story that appeared in Jet Magazine on page 14 of the March 20, 1969, issue.

When President Johnson left office a number of persons decided to pay a tribute to him by presenting a replica of the first voting certificate issued under the provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It turned out that the certificate was issued to Mrs. Ardies Mauldin of Selma, Alabama. Mrs. Mauldin is a practical nurse in a Selma hospital and the mother of seven children. I offer her words

as a plea for prompt action in extending the present law. She said:

"It is hard for people in the North to know how we feel about voting. It's changed everything in the South and we'll not forget it. We in Selma have seen a lot of hard times but a lot of good has come from the struggle of our young people."

The voice and words of Mrs. Mauldin cannot always be heard above the cries of racists and demagogues who say that laws are worthless. Yet, she is one of an overwhelming majority of Americans who still rely upon the law for redress of wrongs. Let us vindicate her faith by extending the statute which made it possible for her to vote.

---

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]

NIXON RIGHTS BILL APPEARS DOOMED BY A GOP ATTACK—MITCHELL DEFENSE OF PLAN TO REVISE VOTING LAW MEETS HOUSE PANEL HOSTILITY—BOTH PARTIES CRITICAL—MCCULLOCH URGES FIGHT FOR COMPLIANCE WITH PRESENT ACT AND NOT REPEAL

WASHINGTON, July 1.—The Nixon Administration's five-day-old voting rights proposal ran into such uniform and intense opposition on Capitol Hill today that it was regarded as all but dead.

Completing the testimony he began last week before a House Judiciary subcommittee, Attorney General John N. Mitchell won a response that ranged from criticism through outright hostility to near abuse, with members of both parties chiming in.

As a result, any prospect that the Administration bill would be substituted for the extension of the present voting rights act favored by many Congressmen appeared to have dwindled to the vanishing point.

Asked after the hearing whether the Administration would fight an extension of the 1965 law on the House floor if its own bill lost in committee, Mr. Mitchell replied with his customary tartness: "I've made my pitch here."

When the Administration voting rights package was sent to Congress, there was speculation that President Nixon's strategists were aware that substantial numbers of Republicans would oppose it. This led some Capitol Hill observers to conclude that its purpose was largely political, aimed at increasing Republican popularity in the South.

M'CULLOCH LEADS ATTACK

Leading the attack on the Nixon proposal was the ranking Republican on the Judiciary Committee, Representative William M. McCulloch of Ohio, a courtly conservative with strong views on the importance of civil rights legislation.

The Administration proposal, Mr. McCulloch declared, "creates a remedy for which there is no wrong and leaves grievous wrongs without adequate remedy." "I ask you, what kind of civil rights bill is that?" he said.

Mr. Mitchell had recommended radically revising the section in the present law under which the Justice Department or a Washington-based Federal court must clear state or local changes in Southern election laws.

CALLS FOR HARDER FIGHT

"The bad jurisdictions have not obeyed it, he says," Mr. McCulloch continued. "But I would have hoped that the party of civil rights, the party of human rights, the party that voted 82 per cent in the Senate and 94 per cent in the House for the 1965 act, would not have thrown up its hands in surrender.

"There is an alternative to surrender, and that's to fight harder. Noncompliance does not justify repeal. That's not the way to promote law and order throughout the land."

A letter of protest against the Administration proposal from the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, who was named chairman of the Civil Rights Commission by President Nixon three months ago, was put in the record by Representative Emanuel Celler, Brooklyn Democrat who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Father Hesburgh, who is also president of the University of Notre Dame, called the Nixon proposal "a distinct retreat" that would "turn back the clock to 1957" in providing protection for the registration and voting rights of Southern Negroes.

"It is an open invitation to those states which denied the vote to minority citizens in the past to resume doing so in the future through insertion of disingenuous technicalities and changes in their election laws," he wrote.

In a letter to Chairman Celler, John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition Action Council, strongly urged extending the present voting rights law before dealing with any of the "complicated issues" raised by the Administration proposal.

One of the sharpest rejoinders to Mr. Mitchell came from Representative John J. Conyers Jr., Democrat of Michigan who is the unofficial leader of the House Negro delegation.

In supplementary testimony today. Mr. Mitchell had maintained that a major beneficiary of the Administration bill would be the "under-educated ghetto Negro" in the North, whose voting rights, he said, are obstructed by literacy tests that the Nixon program would ban.

"I suggest to this committee," the Attorney General said, "that it is the psychological barrier of the literacy test, long associated with the poll tax is a discriminatory tool to keep the Negro from the ballot box, that may be responsible for much of the low Negro voter registration in some of our major cities."

Mr. Conyers charged that "for this Administration to discuss psychological barriers to the Negro is the most presumptious act I've ever heard."

"Black people in the North are not being prevented from voting because of their education," Mr. Conyers continued. "But I can tell you that black people are losing faith in large numbers every day that this system had the promise of being what is says it is."

Following Representative McCulloch's lead, the Republicans on the subcommittee one by one registered their preference for a five-year extension of the present law or their objections to various aspects of the Administration bill, or both.

Representative Clark MacGregor of Minnesota spoke favorably of a national ban on literacy tests but made it clear he would vote for a renewal of the present law first.

Even Representative Edward Hutchinson of Michigan, who had been regarded as likely to back the Administration bill, objected because it included what he regarded an unrelated material on residency requirements for voting.

---

[From the Washington Post, June 29, 1969]

MONKEY WRENCH

The operative, conspicuous and altogether damning fact about the Attorney General's statement on Thursday before a House Judiciary subcommittee is that it opposes the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That act expires in August, 1970. There is no doubt whatever that, with Administration support, the act could be extended for five years. With Administration opposition, a simple extension bill may well be defeated. The extended hearings and bitter controversy to which Attorney General Mitchell's proposals will surely give rise may end by leaving the country without any Federal voting rights legislation at all.

There is much to be said for some of Mr. Mitchell's proposals. Unfortunately, there is also much to be said against them. For our part, we heartily agree with the Attorney General that "all adult citizens who are of sound mind and who have not been convicted of a felony should be free to and encouraged to participate in the electoral process." We would, therefore, support Federal legislation to ban literacy tests everywhere in the United States. But some states are going to resist such legislation.

We are no less heartily in favor of the ban suggested by Mr. Mitchell on state residency requirements for national elections. In this mobile Nation, such parochial and artificial restraints on the basic right of national citizenship should long ago have been abandoned. But the reform is likely to engender a lot of opposition. Similarly, there are substantial arguments to support the change recommended by the Attorney General in the mode of attacking state legislation which may operate to deprive minorities of voting opportunities. But the change is an extremely complex one calling for the most careful analysis and debate. Let Congress take up these proposed improvements at leisure and on their individual merits—and not when they can be used as devices for preventing the enactment of any voting rights legislation whatever.

The most cogent argument for continuance of the 1965 act was stated by Mr. Mitchell himself. "Since 1965," he testified, "more than 800,000 Negro voters have been registered in the seven states covered by the Act." And a few of them, he might have added, have been elected to public office. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 has given to black Americans the means to make themselves felt and heeded politically where they were previously ignored. And that, of course, is precisely why there is such bitter opposition to it among so many white Southerners.

The Attorney General can dress his proposals up as much as he likes in high-sounding phrases about putting voting rights on a national rather than a regional basis; but he is not going to fool any of the poeple who have fought the long hard battle to make voting a reality for Negroes in the South. He is not going to fool Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP who said with characteristic straightforwardness that the Justice Department bill is "a sophisticated but nonetheless deadly way of thwarting the progress we have made." He is not going to fool Joseph L. Rauh, the seasoned counsel of the Civil Rights Leadership Conference, who called the Administration measure "a monkey wrench." He is not going to fool Rep. William M. McCullough, ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee and a stalwart champion of civil rights who said he favors a simple extension of the present law.

These men have implored the Attorney General not to open the way now for prolonged, divisive debate and the ugly possibility of a Southern filibuster if the voting rights issue carries over into next year. The country is not going to be fooled, either. It knows that the Southern stratagem now embraced by the Administration poses two tragic dangers. One is the danger that if Negroes are deprived of a chance to advance their welfare through orderly political action, they will be pushed toward disorder and violence. The other is the danger that the country will find itself in default on a moral commitment it has undertaken in the name of democracy and justice.

---

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS BY MITCHELL AND MCCULLOCH ON THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Attorney General MITCHELL. The proposal for a simple five-year extension of the 1965 Voting Rights Act leaves the undereducated ghetto Negro as today's forgotten man in voting rights legislation.

He would be forgotten both in the 13 States outside the South which have literacy tests now and in the 30 other states which

have the ability, at any time, to impose them.

It is not enough to continue to protect Negro voters in seven states. That consideration may have been the justification for the 1965 act. But it is unrealistic today to ignore the ghettos of Harlem, Watts, Roxbury, Seattle, Hartford and Portland, Ore.—all of which are located in states which have literacy tests.

I believe the literacy test is an unreasonable physical obstruction to voting even if it is administered in an even-handed manner. It unrealistically denies the franchise to those who have no schooling. It unfairly denies the franchise to those who have been denied an equal educational opportunity because of inferior schooling in the North and the South.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIER

But perhaps most importantly, it is a psychological obstruction in the minds of many of our minority citizens. I don't have all the answers. But I suggest to this committee that it is the psychological barrier of the literacy test—long associated with the poll tax as a discriminatory tool to keep the Negro from the ballot box—that may be responsible for much of the low Negro voter registration in some of our major cities.

A higher percentage of Negroes voted in South Carolina and Mississippi, where literacy tests are suspended, than in Watts or Harlem, where literacy tests are enforced. A higher percentage of Negroes vote in Philadelphia and Chicago where there are no literacy tests, than in majority Negro neighborhoods in New York City and Los Angeles.

I want to encourage black people to vote. I want to encourage Mexican-American and Puerto Rican citizens to vote. I especially believe that minority citizens, who may feel alienated from our society, should be given every opportunity to participate in our electoral processes.

CALLS VOTE IMPORTANT

I want to encourage our Negro citizens to take out their alienations at the ballot box, and not elsewhere. I want them to know that their ballot is important and will be significant in determining the policies of the officials who govern.

It has also been suggested before this committee that our proposal to extend the coverage of the Voting Rights Act would result in weakening some of its provisions.

This criticism is untrue. Our proposal would broaden the act but would, in many ways, considerably strengthen it.

Our bill would maintain the authority of the 1965 Voting Rights Act for the Attorney General to send examiners and observers into the seven Southern states. But it would extend this authority to all states and counties where the Attorney General had received any complaints of possible violations of 15th Amendment rights.

Under the 1965 act, the Attorney General is required to go to court to request voting examiners and observers in non-Southern states. Under our bill, he has the authority to send the observers and examiners any place without first applying to the court. Our proposed bill would authorize the courts, on the application of the Attorney General, to temporarily enjoin discriminatory voting laws and to freeze any new voting laws passed by the state or county against whom the lawsuit is filed.

Representative MCCULLOUGH. I regret the necessity of opposing the Administration proposal as a substitute for the Voting Rights Act of 1965. As a Republican, I would like nothing more than to embrace and support a program sponsored by the present Administration. But in good conscience, I cannot support the one outlined last Thursday for two reasons:

The Administration bill is actually a weaker bill. It also jeopardizes the chances of passage of voting rights legislation.

As I understand the provisions of the Administration bill which pertain to the heart of this controversy, they sweep broadly into those areas where the need is the least and retreat from those areas where the need is greatest.

We are asked to extend the Section 4 ban on literacy tests or devices outside the South into 14 other states from which the Justice Department and the N.A.A.C.P. have never to this day received a complaint alleging the discriminatory use of literacy tests or devices.

We are asked to repeal the Section 5 requirement that the covered states must clear their new voting laws and practices with the Attorney General or the District Court of Columbia in the face of spellbinding evidence of unflagging Southern dedication to the cause of creating an ever more sophisticated legal machinery for discriminating against the black voter.

GRIEVOUS WRONGS

In short, the Administration creates a remedy for which there is no wrong and leaves grievous wrongs without adequate remedy. I ask you, what kind of civil rights bill is that?

That is not the kind of civil rights legislation that gives hope to black America. It is the kind of civil rights legislation that is favored by Attorney General Summer of Mississippi. It is the kind of civil rights legislation that is opposed by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and by the Civil Rights Commission. I repeat, what kind of civli rights legislation is that?

The Attorney General of Mississippi came all the way to Washington for only one reason. He well understood that Section 5 finally had to be obeyed. He wanted it scuttled. Discrimination will find it hard to survive under Section 5 if it is retained. But it will thrive again under the Administraton proposal.

The Attorney General testified that Section 5 cannot work. The bad jurisdictions have not obeyed it, he says. But I would have hoped that the party of civil rights—the party that voted 82 per cent in the House and 94 per cent in the Senate for the 1965 act—would not have thrown up its hands in surrender.

URGES FIGHTING HARDER

There is an alternative to surrender, and that's to fight harder.

Noncompliance does not justify repeal. That's not the way to promote law and order throughout the land.

In considering the Administration proposal, it is equally important to note how its various provisions increase the number of "no" votes. No matter how many protests are voiced, the issue under the Administration bill is whether literacy tests as a philosophical question are desirable, whereas under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 the issue is whether discrimination in voting is desirable. The broad philosophical question would be far more divisive than a simple extension of the act would be.

Therefore, those who believe that only intelligent people should be allowed to vote, those who believe in either a strict or a moderate construction of the Constitution, and those who believe in economy in Government may—even if they favor civil rights—vote against the Administration package.

I do not know what others may think, but as for me, I find the cause of civil rights too dear to jeopardize the chances of success. And if the risk were taken, what is the prize? A weaker civil rights law.

What kind of civil rights legislation is that?

## HEARINGS ON BILL TO INCREASE THE SIZE AND WEIGHT OF TRUCKS ON INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 8 the House Public Works Committee will begin hearings on H.R. 11870, a bill to increase the size and weight of trucks on Interstate Highways.

As was the case last year, I am strongly opposed to the enactment of this legislation. Since I will be going into more detail on this legislation during the hearings, I will briefly outline the reasons for my opposition.

During the election campaign last fall President Nixon said about the truck bill:

> This proposal raises serious issues, including the safety and convenience of the motoring public.

There is no doubt that this is true, and is the key issue. In addition, President Nixon stated during the campaign:

> I would direct the Secretary of Transportation to take a hard look to make certain that the interest of the traveling public and also the life of our highways are fully protected as we facilitate the vital movement of goods in the Nation's commerce.

Up to now I have not been able to find any evidence that the "hard look" called for by the President has taken place. There have been no new studies or research projects undertaken. I have talked to officials in the Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety, and the National Highway Safety Bureau at great length. None of those to whom I have talked has any knowledge of any restudy or review of the situation. They have not been able to produce any reliable data.

In fact, Dr. Robert Brenner, Acting Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, stated before the Public Works Committee recently that—

> As to the specific of what extra width does or does not do in the safety picture, I am unaware of any work specifically in that area.

Therefore, it is incredible to me that there have been published reports recently indicating that the Department of Transportation is going to support the big truck bill. This is an irresponsible position to take for two obvious and compelling reasons. First, President Nixon's own directive for a complete restudy of the bill and its effects has not been undertaken, and second, the administration's own top safety people say there is no credible research on what effect this will have on highway safety.

It seems to me the Department of Transportation has given absolutely no consideration to the important issue of the "safety and convenience of the traveling public" to use President Nixon's own words.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of this unreasonable position of the Department of

Transportation, I will continue to fight this special interest legislation, I find it difficult to understand how this legislation can be considered at all until we know what effect a wider and heavier truck will have on safety.

It is my hope that the rumors and press reports are in error and that the Department of Transportation will instead call for postponement of consideration until the studies ordered by the President are started and completed. To do anything else would violate President Nixon's campaign statement and pledge.

Now Mr. Speaker the House should know that at 6:30 p.m. last night, after I had prepared the statement I just made and after I had notified the Department of Transportation as a matter of courtesy indicating the contents of the statement, I received a phone call from the Department of Transportation that the study mandated by President Nixon supposedly began on Monday.

It is my understanding that the Department of Transportation has requested a 30-day extension from the House Public Works Committee on its date for testifying on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is utterly unrealistic to think that the kind of credible research data, needed to be reliable, can be gathered in 30 days and be used as a basis for making a recommendation on this big truck bill.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I include a letter I wrote to Secretary John Volpe last February 5 in the RECORD, along with a newspaper article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on June 21:

FEBRUARY 5, 1969.

Hon. JOHN VOLPE,
*Secretary, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you may recall, a rather substantial effort was made last year in the Congress to pass a bill to increase the size and weight of trucks.

Dubious about the merits of the bill and completely at odds with the tactics used by its supporters, I led the opposition to the legislation. Standing alone at first, my efforts gained support and the bill never reached the floor of the House.

During the campaign, President Nixon was asked about his position on the legislation. His response was heartening. In it he called for a thorough review by the Department of Transportation of the entire matter of truck size and weight and related issues such as user tax and safety.

It seems to me that it would be appropriate to begin the re-evaluation and review called for by the President in the very near future.

Undoubtedly, efforts will be made again during this Congress on behalf of the truck bill. The position and attitude taken by the last Administration was less than friendly. They exhibited a closed mind attitude. Therefore, a fresh study and evaluation would be of great value.

The opportunity to discuss the entire matter with you or one of your staff certainly would be appreciated.

With warmest regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRED SCHWENGEL,
*Member of Congress.*

---

HINT WHITE HOUSE MAY BACK BIG TRUCK BILL

(By William Steif)

Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner strongly hinted today that the Nixon Administration will endorse a new bill permitting larger, heavier trucks on the Interstate Highway System.

In an interview, Mr. Turner said "we haven't endorsed any bill yet," but noted that the revised measure introduced two weeks ago by Rep. John C. Kluczynski, D-Ill., was "close" to what he recommended last year.

"That's a pretty good tipoff," he said.

Rep. Kluczynski's bill would permit states to increase truck width limits on the interstate system from 96 to 102 inches, increase maximum single-axle weight from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds, and increase maximum tandem-axle weight from 32,000 to 34,000 pounds.

It would eliminate the Federal weight limit of 73,280 pounds, substituting in its place a formula based on axle spacing.

The new feature, which last year's defeated bill did not have, is a 70-foot length limit on trucks, thus limiting a vehicle's greatest possible weight to about 92,000 pounds. Previously, there was no Federal length limit.

The proposed new bill would permit double trailers to be operated in tandem on the interstate system in states which go along with the 70-foot length limit. But it would bar triple-trailer truck trains such as would have been possible under last year's bill.

The effect probably would be to permit double trailer trucks to continue to operate in Western states, but leave it to the state legislatures to determine whether they would be permitted in most Eastern states which now ban them except on a few toll roads.

Mr. Turner pointed out that his agency last year recommended a 65-foot length limit under the axle-spacing formula. The formula is designed to spread weight safely.

Mr. Turner also had recommended horsepower, braking and linkage standards, but now feels his National Highway Safety Bureau has sufficient power to set these standards without legislative authority. There are indications the bureau will set such standards soon, just as it recently set new fitness standards for truck and bus drivers.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the unreasonable and undue delay of DOT in beginning the study ordered by the President and the newspaper article indicating support by DOT of the present truck bill indicates some hesitancy, to say the least, by DOT to seriously attack this problem.

I am apprehensive about the sincerity of the Department of Transportation in dealing with this whole issue, especially in light of the 30-day wonder or quickie study evidently underway. It does not appear to me that this kind of procedure carries out either the spirit or the letter of President Nixon's directive.

---

## COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the importance of modernizing the Congress is a matter of continuing concern to all of us. We must avail ourselves of every possible tool and technique if we are to function effectively. One powerful asset which has not been adapted to any appreciable extent in the congressional struggle for survival is the computer. In my chapter of the book "We Propose: A Modern Congress," I stressed the fact that "knowledge is power." Every Member of both Chambers is aware of this, but all too often we fail to take those steps which will lead to an upgrading of our inadequate resources. Knowledge is based on information—information that is timely, accurate, and relevant—and the computer can be instrumental in providing the information which we need in our decisionmaking, committee work, and constituent support.

The House Subcommittee on Electrical and Mechanical Office Equipment, chaired by the gentleman from Louisiana, Hon. JOE D. WAGGONNER, has been assigned the responsibility for charting a course which will allow the Congress to utilize fully the power of the computer. As a member of that group, I believe it is imperative that all Members of the Congress be cognizant of the legislative applications where automatic data processing can help. To this end, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent study prepared by Robert L. Chartrand, the specialist in information sciences of the Legislative Reference Service. This report, entitled "Computers for Congress," is a succinct, factual discussion of the information needs of the Congress, legislation which has been introduced to create a computer support for the Federal Legislature, private sector studies of the information problems facing us, and commentary on those legislative tasks which might be carried out better with computer support and those already being implemented through the efforts of the Clerk of the House, the Senate Sergeant at Arms Office, and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I include this excellent study in the RECORD:

COMPUTERS FOR CONGRESS

(By Robert L. Chartrand)

INTRODUCTION

The United States Congress, as it prepares to enter the 1970's, is confronted with governing problems of unprecedented severity and complexity. Each of its Members must function effectively in three roles: as a legislator rendering decisions on national and international issues, as the prime representative of his State or district, and as an unofficial ombudsman accessible to every constituent. The ability of the Congressmen and their committees to perform responsively often is impeded by the sheer volume of routine tasks to be performed, the almost infinite variety of information to be acquired, and the diverse issues to be considered.

The stresses upon the Members and their staffs have been augmented by the effects of the "information explosion." The profusion of books, articles, analytical reports, and miscellany threatens to overwhelm even the most sophisticated information handling centers. The Federal legislator, in discharging his many duties, must be able to obtain information relevant to a variety of topics in a timely fashion. All too often, traditional procedures for acquiring, indexing, abstracting, storing, processing, retrieving, and disseminating priority information do not suffice. This condition is causing the Congressman to seek out new techniques and tools which can assist him in the performance of his legislative and administrative tasks. Computer technology, developed only during the past quarter-century, now possesses the proven potential to support the Congress in a number of application areas.

Not only is Congress considering the ways in which automatic data processing (ADP) can enhance chamber, committee, and indi-