So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Baucus with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Ford of Tennessee.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Kindness.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Cochran.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hillis.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Levitas with Mr. Vander Jagt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A similar House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 252) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the two matters just under consideration, House Concurrent Resolution 252 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 35.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON CEMETERIES AND BURIAL BENEFITS OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING HOUSE SESSION ON JULY 28, 1975

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Cemeteries and Burial Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be allowed to meet on the afternoon of July 28, 1975, during general debate and under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6219, AMENDING THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 640 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H.R. 6219) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to extend certain provisions for an additional ten years, to make permanent the ban against certain prerequisites to voting, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) for debate only, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides that immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H.R. 6219) to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 with the Senate amendments, will be taken up for consideration.

The most important Senate amendment to this legislation provides for an extension of the Voting Rights Act for 7 years instead of the 10 years provided in the House bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for the great service their committee has rendered in bringing this legislation before the Congress. I urge the adoption of House Resolution 640 and H.R. 6219, with the Senate amendments, because the current Voting Rights Act expires on August 6.

There may not be time to have a conference on the bill before the recess. This extension is urgently needed. I ask that we accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, unless the House acts on this resolution this act will expire on August 6 of this year. The action taken by the Rules Committee is not unprecedented but when we adopt House Resolution 640 we will actually be voting to agree to the Senate amendments to H.R. 6219, the amendments to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

As has been explained by the gentleman from Indiana, there is one major amendment and some technical amendments added by the Senate to this bill. The major Senate amendment is a reduction of the 10-year extension as passed by the House, to 7 years in the Senate version.

I might point out that this legislation passed the House on June 4 by a vote of 341 to 70 and 2 voting "present."

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLORY).

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, while I did oppose a number of the provisions in this legislation, I think the Senate amendment is an improvement in that it does provide for a 7-year extension instead of the 10-year extension. I am sorry we have some of these other provisions in the bill with respect to voting rights of Eskimos and Indians as well as language minority groups that were not included in the original Voting Rights Act of 1965—nor in the extension of that act in 1970. However, I am going to support this resolution and vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker. I am fearful that some of these other provisions which will require ballots and voting materials to be provided in various languages—some of which do not exist in written form—will impose unconscionable and unnecessary inconvenience and expense in many States and counties of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the extension of this act for 7 years for the benefit of black Americans is justified. The problem with the other racial and ethnic groups should be taken care by education—and not in the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO).

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Rules Committee and the members of the Rules Committee for bringing this legislation to the floor at this time. It is urgently needed because, as the chairman has already expressed, the act will expire on August 6 unless we take this action.

As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which monitored this legislation, I would say it is a good piece of legislation and despite the fact that there has been a reduction in the time during which this act will actually be operative I believe this is an effective piece of legislation which the House should adopt.

I urge immediate adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we consider this morning is certainly as vital as any that will come before the 94th Congress.

We are dealing with the most important piece of civil rights legislation ever enacted by the Congress. That legislation is due to expire in a matter of days.

Last month, as you know, the House voted a 10-year extension and important expansions of the provisions of the voting rights act. The Senate has now passed the House bill with amendments that I urge the House to concur with this morning.

The Judiciary Committee has carefully monitored the proceedings in the Senate. Numerous cloture votes were required in light of an attempted filibuster by opponents of extension. What has emerged from the vigorous debate in the Senate is less than we would like, but it is nonetheless a very significant extension of the provisions of the Voting Rights Act.

The Senate amendments do not endanger the expanded scope of the act's special remedies. However, the Senate, by a vote of 52 to 42 simply agreed to reduce the extension from 10 years to 7. Ten years is of course preferable to 7, but even 7, remember, is a longer extension of the act than has ever been accomplished before.

Nonetheless, I opposed this amendment by the Senate. Together with the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. EDWARDS, I made my opposition to this amendment known at the time the Senate was considering it. I much prefer the 10-year extension voted by the House.

We are faced, however, by practical choices at this point, shaped by the exigencies of time and the necessary procedures of the Congress. It is my view that an effort to restore the 10-year extension through a conference would risk losing entirely the timely extension of the act.

If we go to conference with the Senate, it is unlikely that we can get the full 10 years restored. We would likely come out with, at best, 8. Whatever the result, consideration of any conference report on the floor of the Senate will likely require at least two more cloture votes. Even assuming that the votes for cloture could be mustered twice more in the Senate, the debate would consume a minimum of 4 or 5 days. Then there is the question of whether we could win approval of additional years on the Senate floor. The act expires August 6, and the Congress is scheduled to recess August 1.

Mr. Speaker, desirable as I believe it would be to restore the extra 3 years, we must not expose this critical legislation to the parliamentary hazards of any additional time squeeze. We must also recognize what we do accomplish by accepting these amendments in the enactment of landmark legislation: extending, protecting, and expanding hard-earned triumphs in the struggle for equal rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is to be highly commended for bringing this resolution to the floor in such an expeditious manner. I urge the House to adopt the resolution.

I include the following:

Urgently request that voting rights bill passed by Senate be cleared for House approval. In the Senate opponents used so-called perfecting amendments to slow passage. Delays caused by these actions were clearly designed to make a House-Senate conference necessary. Any effort to send the Senate bill back to conference will cause more delay and increase the risk of getting no bill.

CLARENCE MITCHELL,
Director, Washington Bureau, NAACP.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that the Members of this body adopt a resolution to accede to the Senate amendments made to H.R. 6219, a bill to extend the Voting Rights Act of 1965. As passed by the House on June 4, H.R. 6219 extended the Voting Rights Act for 10 additional years and expanded the act's coverage to provide for the protection of the voting rights of language minorities.

During its recent deliberations on the House-passed measure, the Senate adopted three amendments to the bill. First, it shortened the extension period for currently-covered jurisdictions from 10 to 7 years. Second, it amended title III of the bill to make clear that in the case of language minorities where there has only been the recent development of written language forms, only bilingual oral assistance would be required for voting and registration, not a written ballot or other printed materials in the newly-written language. Third, the Senate adopted a perfecting amendment which amended the title of the bill to indicate that the extension would be for 7 rather than for 10 years.

The disappointment which I—and I am sure which most of us—experienced when the Senate agreed to the 7-year amendment was tremendous. We had passed our 10-year measure by a vote of 341 to 70; and having received such an overwhelming vote within our ranks, it now makes it very difficult for me to come before you to ask for adoption of a resolution that we agree to something less. Nevertheless, despite my regrets and disappointments, I feel that I must now ask that we agree to that something less.

After discussions with Senate proponents of the bill and the Senate leadership, I sincerely believe that the best course of action would be to agree to the 7-year extension amendment rather than push for a conference at this the eleventh hour. The 7-year amendment was adopted by a vote of 52 to 42 in the Senate, not an insignificant margin to overcome in terms of the adoption of a conference report recommending a 10-year extension. Furthermore, there were several "cliff-hanger" votes in the Senate, where amendments which would have "gutted" the act were only narrowly defeated. Under these circumstances, I do not feel it advisable to send the measure back for further Senate action.

The timing is too short. With an August 6 expiration date for the act and an August 1 recess sheduled, I do not feel that we can risk taking the time that would be involved in meeting in conference. Even then, assuming that a 10-year extension could be reported out of conference, the time that would be involved in obtaining a cloture vote in the Senate to actually get the conference report adopted on that side would be a minimum of 2 days. With only 5 more legislative days left before the August recess and with only 10 days before the act expires, I believe that the only sound and prudent course to take is to accept the 7 years.

Here and now, I would like to make very clear that our acceptance of 7 years does not in any way indicate withdrawal by either the Judiciary Committee or the House of Representatives from our commitment that there be fair redistricting and reapportionment in the covered States after the next decennial census. You will recall that the major thrust or purpose of the 10-year extension was to insure that the protections of the act's preclearance provisions were present during the redistricting and reapportionment which will necessarily take place after the 1980 decennial census. We felt that by insuring the presence of those protections through 1985, we would be insuring that the meeting of the "one-man/one-vote" standard did not result in the dilution of minority voting strength.

Now, as amended by the Senate, H.R. 6219 would provide for Federal preclearance of redistricting plans only through approximately August of 1982 in many of the currently-covered areas. We have been advised that the census data needed for redistricting should be available in early-to-mid-1981, which means that local governmental bodies should be moving to redistrict around that time. Of course, there is always the danger that those intent upon discriminating will attempt to stall and redistrict only after the expiration in 1982 of the Federal preclearance requirement, a requirement which would subject those redistricting plans to scrutiny for purposes of determining their discriminatory impact.

If such stalling attempts are made, I now give fair warning that the Congress will not stand idly by and allow the act to expire in the face of such attempts. The act, with its preclearance provisions, can be extended again in 1982 and in fact will be extended again, if redistricting has not taken place by then in covered areas who seek to stall until a time when they will be free to discriminate.

A 7-year extension is far from an ideal situation, but it can be lived with. And rather than endanger the life of the act itself, I believe that live with it, we must.

Although I have not been able to obtain a copy of the decision, I should like to note, somewhat as an aside, how pleased I was to hear that only a few days ago the District of Columbia Court of Appeals had upheld the lower court's decision in Harper against Kleindeinst. In that case the Justice Department had refrained from subjecting a South Carolina State Senate redistricting plan to section 5 or preclearance scrutiny because the local South Carolina District Court has approved the plan. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that the Attorney General had acted improperly and ordered him to make a "reasoned decision" on the Senate plans. It was that district court decision that was recently upheld and in so doing the court of appeals has again underscored the importance of having the system of section 5 review—whether it be carried out by the Attorney General or the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

As for the other Senate amendment to H.R. 6219, the amendment which requires only oral bilingual assistance for registration and voting where the language of the language minority groups is only recently set-down in writing or, in other words, where the language is historically unwritten, I believe that this amendment can be accepted without doing any damage to the protections to be afforded by the bill. This amendment was offered by Senator STEVENS of Alaska and simply codifies what both myself and Senator TUNNEY, the Senate floor manager of the bill, already viewed as the clear intent of the bill. Languages recently developed by anthropologists, which are obviously not used or widely used by citizens of voting age within the language group, have always been, for our purposes, "oral" or "unwritten" languages.

Therefore, the mandate imposed under such circumstances was not one for printed bilingual election materials but rather one for bilingual oral assistance in registration and voting. The Stevens amendment, as accepted by the Senate, simply codifies this understanding. Also, I would like to make clear that although the language of the Stevens amendment has been placed only in title III of the bill, as far as my understanding of the bill is concerned, this is in no way to imply that a contrary interpretation is to be given to the bilingual elections mandate as it appears in title II.

As I have stated before, it has always been my interpretation of both titles II

and III that where there is only a recently developed written form of the language, then only oral bilingual assistance is required for the 10-year coverage periods for titles II and III. The coverage periods for these titles in the bill were not shortened in the Senate. The Department of Justice, I have been informed, also has this same understanding as to the manner in which the bilingual elections mandates of both titles II and III are to work. A letter from the Justice Department to that effect is attached to my statement. Also, although the language of the Stevens amendment appears to carve out an exception solely for Alaskan Native languages which are historically unwritten, I do not believe that the intent of the language is to be so narrow in its application.

I believe that the Alaskan Native reference was added to the language solely because it was within the context of that group that debate was taking place at the time that the amendment was added. Clearly, if an American Indian language were also only recently developed in written form, then for that language too only oral assistance would be the form of the mandate, not printed election materials in the "new" written language.

I have been informed by the minority members of the Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights that there are several technical amendments which they had hoped would have been made to H.R. 6219 on the Senate side. I have now taken under advisement the possibility of sometime in the future dropping in a bill which would make those technical amendments. However, the matter is not one of extreme urgency since the amendments are few, only very minor in nature, and, in my opinion, are not required in order to effectuate a proper interpretation of the act.

For example, one proposed amendment is that in both titles II and III, where the mandate is for oral assistance where the language of the applicable group is unwritten, the word "bilingual" is sought to be added to insure that English assistance is not interpreted to be a fulfillment of the requirement. While the addition of the word "bilingual" would help make that clear, I believe that that is the only reasonable interpretation to be given the language, even in the absence of such a technical amendment. The thrust of the remedy is to provide for election procedures in the languages that can be understood by language minorities. It would be absurd to interpret the oral assistance requirement as having been fulfilled by the providing of oral assistance in English, a language not understood by the members of group.

Another possible technical amendment is one which states that a bailout suit under title III can be brought in "an appropriate" U.S. district court rather than "the" U.S. district court. Again, the absence of the amendment would have no effect on the interpretation of the statute. It could only be in the "appropriate" court, especially for purposes of jurisdiction and venue, that the case could be heard. It may be recalled that, as originally drafted, title III bailout actions were limited to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and the point is that in its current form, there is no such exclusive jurisdiction within the District of Columbia Court. Exclusive jurisdiction is retained in the District of Columbia Court for other bailout actions under the act.

I close now by simply again asking for your vote to agree to this resolution adopting the Senate amendments to H.R. 6219. The Voting Rights Act must survive, and I ask for your vote so that we can quickly get this measure to the President for his signature.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1975.

HON. DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN EDWARDS: This is in reply to your staff's inquiry concerning the proviso included in Titles II and III of H.R. 6219 which reads:

Provided, that where the language of the applicable minority group is oral or unwritten, the state or political subdivision is only required to furnish oral instructions, assistance, or other information relating to registration and voting. H.R. 6219, Sec. 203, (f)(4); Sec. 301(c).

It has been the understanding of the Department of Justice that this proviso, which was added to the Act on the floor of the House, should be read broadly to include languages of protected language minority groups which are not in fact written by the language minority group itself. Thus, it has been our interpretation of this proviso, together with the related portions of the Act, that if a written language has been developed linguistically, but has little or no relevance to the persons who speak the language, a jurisdiction would not be required to print election and registration materials in that language, but instead would be required to provide oral assistance to registrants and voters. This interpretation was confirmed by the floor manager of the bill in the Senate, Senator Tunney, when he said:

"There is no intent in this bill to require bilingual elections in a language that has historically never been written, except by a few anthropoligsts in a university somewhere." Cong. Rec., S13650-51, July 24, 1975.

Therefore, it is my judgment that Amendment No. 779 proposed by Senator Stevens and agreed to by the Senate on July 24, 1975, while it may clarify the meaning of this proviso, does not add or detract from it. I might add that because in my view H.R. 6219 does not require the printing of languages which are basically only of anthropological significance, Senator Stevens' Amendment should not be read as allowing oral assistance only to Alaskans with an historical language. Jurisdictions covered by Titles II and III would not be required, for example, to print American Indian languages which are not in fact written and read by those who speak the language, but could meet the bilingual requirements of the Act by providing oral assistance in the language of the language minority group.

In addition, because in my judgment it has been the intent of Congress that the proviso contained in Titles II and III be interpreted in this fashion, and since Senator Stevens' Amendment is only clarifying in nature, amending Title II to include Senator Stevens' Amendment similarly would not add to or detract from the meaning of the bill as now written.

I hope that this information is of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

J. STANLEY POTTINGER,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS) for yielding to me and commend him for his excellent leadership in extending the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

I feel compelled to express my displeasure in having to accept a 7-year rather than a 10-year extension of the Voting Rights Act. Unfortunately, the Senate version of the act has the House over a barrel: We either go along with the Byrd amendment with its 7-year extension or else we witness the expiration of the act's vital provisions in August. It is unconscionable that legislation that goes to the core of our constitutional principles of equal justice and the consent of the governed is to be diminished through apparent horsetrading in the Senate.

During the past 4 years under the present Voting Rights Act a number of States covered by the act have used various means to circumvent its intent and purpose. Adoption of at-large elections, changes in polling places, redistricting, annexations, and switches from elective to appointive offices have been undertaken to dilute, if not irreparably weaken, the voting strength of those for whom the act was intended to assist. There is the distinct danger that the covered States will delay redistricting necessitated by the results of the 1980 census, which would give greater representation to all of our citizens, until the expiration of the act in 1982, thus once again allowing them to stymie the realization of full voting rights for all Americans.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was before the House a few weeks ago, I voted against it. I did not and do not disagree with the objectives of the legislation. The case has been more than adequately made that many of the States have permitted voter registration discrimination to occur. The record is equally clear that many States having once been made aware of the illegality of the practice have rejected corrective measures and allowed them to continue. I voted against the bill because of my deep misgivings over the fairness and wisdom of some of the provisions.

First, both the Constitution and traditional American practice leave election law to the control of the States. The Voting Rights Act extension interjects the direct presence of the Federal Government in that area of State jurisdiction. The bill would have continued that situation for another 10 years—for certain States—when there is substantial evidence that voter registration discrimination has been reversed and almost eliminated in some areas.

Second, the intervention of the Federal Government would be activated by a mechanism that does not distinguish between voter apathy and registration discrimination. American citizens are entitled not to vote if they so choose. I felt that the Government should not be permitted to intervene except where there was legitimate showing of registration discrimination.

Third, the bill's provisions did not apply equally to all the 50 States. Since

1965, when the Voting Rights Act was first passed, the distribution of racial and ethnic minorities has greatly changed. Further, some States have eliminated registration problems. To continue the coverage of the law to selected areas ignores the changes that have occurred and may even encourage new abuses. Out of my concern for these problems and the failure of the House to correct them, and out of my belief that my "no" vote in combination with others in the House would encourage the Senate to make some of the changes, I voted no.

Well, as you all know, the Senate made only one substantive change. It reduced the life of the extension from 10 to 7 years. While this definitely improved the legislation, it did not correct the other provisions that concern me. The report accompanying the bill clearly shows that voter registration discrimination still exists. In spite of the law citizens are still being denied their rights—their right under the Constitution—to vote.

Without this legislation, there is no guarantee that those situations will be corrected. Furthermore, in spite of the existence of this law and of numerous court decisions upholding it and striking down discriminatory practices, too many States have failed to pass corrective legislation of their own. I am always one of the first to rise in support of States and localities having as much original power and authority as they can exercise. But, in the case of ending voter registration discrimination, we can see that too many jurisdictions have failed to act and act responsibly.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the weaknesses I see in this bill, I will vote for the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The States have failed to come up with reasonable, viable alternatives. Consequently, the Congress and the Federal Government must act to preserve a basic right of our citizens.

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report on the bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I voted for final passage of this bill when it was before the House after supporting a number of amendments to improve it, which unfortunately failed.

I voted for final passage because I believed then, and I still believe, that every effort must be made to encourage every citizen to vote, and to make it as easy as possible for every citizen to vote.

Since that vote, I have had numerous lengthy conversations about the legislation with officials of the State of Texas and a number of legal experts. The intervening period has also given me time to make a much more thorough study of my own of this legislation than was possible before the bill was originally presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has a fine title, and I do not believe anyone in this Chamber is opposed to the right to vote in principle.

But this particular bill is bad legislation, no matter how high sounding its title may be. I do not believe we Texans, or the people in any of the other States affected, need someone looking over our shoulders when we draw our precinct boundaries, for example. This bill is simply too restrictive, and superimposed restrictions are something the voting process does not need.

This bill's application in Texas and the other selected States would create a chaotic situation which I believe would, in fact, discourage participation in the election process, rather than encourage it.

Texas, which is included in this bill, is in the vanguard among States striving to make it easy for every citizen to vote. Texas has postcard registration, for example. You do not need to take a test to register to vote. You do not even have to go to some special place to register to vote. All you have to do is fill out a postcard and mail it in. In those areas of Texas where there are sufficient numbers of Spanish-speaking citizens to justify the expense, ballots in Spanish are available. And I might add, this includes a large part of the State.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this conference report is rejected overwhelmingly, and that we can go back to work on an extension of the Voting Rights Act which will, in fact, guarantee the right to vote and encourage our citizens to vote in all of the 50 States, not just a select few.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House, by its overwhelming passage of House Resolution 640, assured a 7-year extension of the Voting Rights Act.

The legislation just approved by Congress retains amendments I have introduced in the Judiciary Committee to protect the rights of language minorities. As a consequence, the measure shortly to be sent to the White House contains triggering mechanism which will assure that jurisdictions in which, first there are large concentrations of persons of Spanish heritage, Asian Americans, American Indians, and Alaskan Natives, second, certain election and registration materials were printed only on English in 1972, and third, less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age voted in the Presidential elections of November 1972 will be covered by the Voting Rights Act.

In addition, this law also broadens the Attorney General's discretionary authority under section 3 by allowing him to bring suit and seek to have certain provisions of the act apply to any State or political subdivision when in his judgment substantial evidence exists that such State or subdivision is denying or abridging the voting rights of any citizen.

It would have been better, of course, to have a 10-year extension. But August 6, the date of expiration, is staring us in the face. Protracted conferences may have resulted in a lapsing of the law. By agreeing to the Senate-stipulated 7-year extension the House assured that the vital protection of our most momentous civil rights legislation will remain intact.

I hope that enactment of this legislation will be recognized by the language minorities—particularly the Spanish speaking who numerically are the largest group affected—as an indication of the desire of Congress to safeguard their rights and increase their participation in the political process. The provisions just enacted will afford them protection identical to that afforded black minorities in the South by the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1965. I trust that they will take advantage of the law and utilize it to assure increased registration and increased representation in the years to come.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 346, nays 56, answered "present" 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—346

Abdnor	Daniel, Dan	Harkin
Abzug	Daniels, N.J.	Harris
Adams	Danielson	Harsha
Addabbo	Davis	Hawkins
Alexander	de la Garza	Hayes, Ind.
Ambro	Delaney	Hays, Ohio
Anderson, Ill.	Dellums	Hechler, W. Va.
Andrews, N.C.	Dent	Heckler, Mass.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Derrick	Hefner
	Derwinski	Helstoski
Annunzio	Devine	Henderson
Ashley	Diggs	Hicks
Aspin	Dingell	Hightower
AuCoin	Dodd	Hillis
Bafalis	Downey, N.Y.	Hinshaw
Baldus	Drinan	Holland
Barrett	Duncan, Oreg.	Holt
Beard, R.I.	Duncan, Tenn.	Holtzman
Bedell	du Pont	Horton
Bennett	Early	Howard
Bergland	Eckhardt	Howe
Biaggi	Edgar	Hubbard
Biester	Edwards, Calif.	Hughes
Bingham	Eilberg	Hungate
Blanchard	Emery	Hutchinson
Blouin	English	Hyde
Boggs	Erlenborn	Ichord
Boland	Eshleman	Jeffords
Bolling	Evans, Colo.	Jenrette
Bonker	Evans, Ind.	Johnson, Calif.
Brademas	Evins, Tenn.	Johnson, Pa.
Breaux	Fary	Jones, Ala.
Breckinridge	Fascell	Jones, N.C.
Brinkley	Fenwick	Jones, Okla.
Brodhead	Findley	Jones, Tenn.
Brooks	Fish	Jordan
Brown, Calif.	Fisher	Karth
Brown, Mich.	Fithian	Kasten
Brown, Ohio	Florio	Kastenmeier
Broyhill	Flowers	Kemp
Buchanan	Foley	Keys
Burke, Calif.	Ford, Mich.	Koch
Burke, Fla.	Forsythe	Krebs
Burke, Mass.	Fountain	Krueger
Burlison, Mo.	Fraser	LaFalce
Burton, John	Frenzel	Latta
Burton, Phillip	Frey	Leggett
Byron	Fuqua	Lehman
Carney	Gaydos	Lent
Carr	Giaimo	Levitas
Carter	Gibbons	Litton
Cederberg	Gilman	Lloyd, Calif.
Chisholm	Ginn	Lloyd, Tenn.
Clausen, Don H.	Goldwater	Long, La.
	Goodling	Lujan
Clay	Gradison	McClory
Cleveland	Grassley	McCloskey
Cohen	Green	McCollister
Collins, Ill.	Gude	McCormack
Conable	Guyer	McDade
Conte	Hagedorn	McFall
Conyers	Hall	McHugh
Corman	Hamilton	McKay
Cornell	Hammer-schmidt	McKinney
Cotter		Madden
Coughlin	Hanley	Madigan
D'Amours	Hannaford	Maguire

Mahon	Pepper	Solarz
Mann	Perkins	Spellman
Martin	Pickle	Staggers
Mathis	Pike	Stanton,
Matsunaga	Pressler	J. William
Mazzoli	Preyer	Stanton,
Meeds	Price	James V.
Melcher	Pritchard	Stark
Metcalfe	Quie	Steed
Meyner	Railsback	Steelman
Mezvinsky	Randall	Steiger, Wis.
Michel	Rangel	Stephens
Mikva	Rees	Stokes
Miller, Calif.	Regula	Stratton
Miller, Ohio	Reuss	Stuckey
Mineta	Rhodes	Studds
Minish	Richmond	Sullivan
Mink	Riegle	Symington
Mitchell, Md.	Rinaldo	Taylor, Mo.
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rodino	Taylor, N.C.
Moakley	Roe	Thompson
Moffett	Rogers	Thone
Mollohan	Roncalio	Thornton
Moorhead, Pa.	Rooney	Traxler
Morgan	Rose	Tsongas
Mosher	Rostenkowski	Ullman
Moss	Roush	Van Deerlin
Mottl	Roybal	Vander Veen
Murphy, Ill.	Russo	Vanik
Murphy, N.Y.	Ryan	Walsh
Murtha	St Germain	Waxman
Myers, Ind.	Santini	Weaver
Myers, Pa.	Sarasin	Whalen
Natcher	Sarbanes	White
Neal	Scheuer	Wilson, Bob
Nedzi	Schneebeli	Wilson, C. H.
Nichols	Schroeder	Wilson, Tex.
Nix	Schulze	Winn
Nolan	Sebelius	Wirth
Nowak	Seiberling	Wolff
Oberstar	Sharp	Wright
Obey	Shipley	Wydler
O'Brien	Shriver	Wylie
O'Hara	Sikes	Yates
O'Neill	Simon	Yatron
Ottinger	Sisk	Young, Fla.
Patman, Tex.	Skubitz	Young, Ga.
Patten, N.J.	Slack	Young, Tex.
Patterson, Calif.	Smith, Iowa	Zablocki
Pattison, N.Y.	Smith, Nebr.	
	Snyder	

NAYS—56

Archer	Downing, Va.	Pettis
Armstrong	Edwards, Ala.	Poage
Ashbrook	Flynt	Quillen
Bauman	Haley	Roberts
Beard, Tenn.	Hansen	Robinson
Bevill	Hébert	Rousselot
Bowen	Kazen	Runnels
Burgener	Kelly	Satterfield
Burleson, Tex.	Ketchum	Shuster
Butler	Lagomarsino	Spence
Casey	Lott	Steiger, Ariz.
Chappell	McDonald	Symms
Clawson, Del	McEwen	Talcott
Cochran	Milford	Treen
Collins, Tex.	Montgomery	Waggonner
Conlan	Moore	Wampler
Crane	Moorhead,	Whitehurst
Daniel, R. W.	Calif.	Whitten
Dickinson	Passman	Wiggins

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gonzalez

NOT VOTING—31

Anderson, Calif.	Harrington	Peyser
Badillo	Hastings	Risenhoover
Baucus	Heinz	Rosenthal
Bell	Jacobs	Ruppe
Broomfield	Jarman	Teague
Clancy	Johnson, Colo.	Udall
Esch	Kindness	Vander Jagt
Flood	Landrum	Vigorito
Ford, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Young, Alaska
Fulton	Macdonald	Zeferetti
	Mills	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Landrum.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Baucus with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Risenhoover with Mr. Heinz.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Kindness.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Fulton with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Ford of Tennessee with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Hastings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE MAJORITY LEADER RELATIVE TO VOTE ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 54

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the Speaker will lay before the House Senate Concurrent Resolution 54, providing for an adjournment of the two Houses from Friday, August 1, 1975, until Wednesday, September 3, 1975.

The Senate adopted this concurrent resolution on July 22 and under section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, both Houses must vote by rollcall to adjourn for this period. Since under the precedents an adjournment reslution of this sort is not debatable, I have taken this time for the convenience of the Members to notify them of the forthcoming vote.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I support the Senate concurrent resolution.

I do want to make sure, however, that the program for the rest of the week provides for further consideration of H.R. 7014, and it is my hope that this bill will have been passed by the time the recess occurs.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we were hoping, of course, that we would be able to complete the consideration of the bill. The program is the same as was scheduled; it is the same as that which I reported to the House on Friday last. There are no changes up to this present time. If there are changes, we will be happy to notify the Members.

Mr. Speaker, we do expect, in answer to the question that was asked, to go ahead with consideration of H.R. 7014.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, does the distinguished majority leader not feel that it might be better to vote on this issue later this week after the House has resolved the energy impasse so that our constituents are not faced with the possible situation in which prices of oil and gas will increase drastically?

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the answer is that this Senate concurrent resolution is going to be laid before the House at this particular time. If that is the feeling of the gentleman, he may vote either way he wishes to at this time.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES FROM AUGUST 1, 1975, UNTIL SEPTEMBER 3, 1975

The SPEAKER laid before the House the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 54) providing for a conditional adjournment of the Congress from August 1, 1975, until September 3, 1975.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 54

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, August 1, 1975, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, September 3, 1975, or until 12 o'clock noon on the second day after their respective Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 2 of this resolution, whichever event first occurs.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion the public interest shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the House and the majority leader of the Senate, acting jointly, or the minority leader of the House and the minority leader of the Senate, acting jointly, file a written request with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

SEC. 3. During the adjournment of both Houses of Congress as provided in section 1, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, respectively, be, and they hereby are, authorized to receive messages, including veto messages, from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Under the law, the vote on this Senate concurrent resolution must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays 109, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 441]

YEAS—293

Abdnor	Carney	Fary
Abzug	Carter	Fenwick
Adams	Casey	Findley
Addabbo	Cederberg	Fish
Alexander	Chisholm	Fisher
Anderson, Ill.	Clawson, Del	Florio
Annunzio	Clay	Flowers
Archer	Cleveland	Foley
Armstrong	Cochran	Ford, Mich.
Ashley	Collins, Ill.	Forsythe
Aspin	Collins, Tex.	Fraser
Baldus	Conlan	Fuqua
Barrett	Conyers	Giaimo
Beard, R.I.	Corman	Gibbons
Bergland	Cornell	Ginn
Bevill	Crane	Gonzalez
Biaggi	Daniel, Dan	Goodling
Bingham	Daniels, N.J.	Gradison
Blouin	Danielson	Hagedorn
Boggs	Davis	Hall
Boland	de la Garza	Hamilton
Bolling	Delaney	Hanley
Bonker	Dellums	Hannaford
Bowen	Dent	Hansen
Brademas	Derwinski	Hawkins
Breaux	Dickinson	Hayes, Ind.
Breckinridge	Diggs	Hays, Ohio
Brodhead	Dingell	Hébert
Brooks	Downey, N.Y.	Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Calif.	Downing, Va.	Helstoski
Brown, Mich.	Duncan, Oreg.	Hicks
Brown, Ohio	du Pont	Hightower
Broyhill	Early	Hillis
Burgener	Eckhardt	Hinshaw
Burke, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Holt
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Calif.	Holtzman
Burleson, Tex.	Eilberg	Horton
Burlison, Mo.	Erlenborn	Howard
Burton, Phillip	Eshleman	Howe
Butler	Evans, Colo.	Hungate
Byron	Evins, Tenn.	Hutchinson