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.
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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 Capitol 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 dismissal, the congressional process could be cleared 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 progressive legislature 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 would do this in a manner 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 workers in the Washington, 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. 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. 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. 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 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-
vied in bills introduced by Chairman Emanuel Celler and ranking committee member William M. McCulloch. These bills would strike out the words "three times" which appeared in the first and third paragraphs of Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (2 U.S.C. 1973b(a)(1) and "inserting in lieu thereof"

In order that there will be no mistake about what we support, we cite 42 U.S.C. 1973b(a)(1) (g) 1964

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which 1) had a voting qualification or prerequisite to voting which was in effect on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the Director of the Census determines that less than one-half of the voting age population residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per cent 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 for the date of 1964 to be changed to 1974, 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 federal assistance is sought by citizens. The higher in the face of great odds.

Robert E. L. Lee's 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 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 in 1963. 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 Negroes, and the state had justly earned the reputation of being worse than the large cities of that state. It is, therefore, especially gratifying that Mr. Evers won in 1965. His Mayoral campaign was conducted in a spirit of fairness. Evers 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 regardless of the color of the people without regard to race or color. He has already embarked on a campaign to attract business and money to his town, and there is 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 since the death of the last of the old order. These men and women who won because of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. In contrast to the turmoil and hostility that plagued some areas of the country, Mr. Evers and Miss. Evers won with open and white, black, who live in the state affected by the act are making quiet but determined efforts to move forward in a spirit of brotherhood simple and wise.

These elections have provided high drama in many communities. For example, while the mayor of Leesville, Louisiana, was predominantly Negro, the NAACP officials on May 17, a colored man. Rufus Mayfield, was being elected as the first of 1965. In the city council of Lake Charles, Louisiana, it is important to note that the NAACP officials were being ar-


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 change everything in the South and we'll forget it. We in Selma have seen a lot of hard times but a lot of good has come from the struggle of our youth. The voice and words of Mrs. Mauldin cannot be heard above the cries of racist and demagogues who say that laws are worthless. Yet, it is only by voting that the 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 ON DEMOCRATS— TO BEAT 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 a dead letter.

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

As a result, a later official report that the Administration bill would be substituted for the extension of the present voting rights act favored by many Congressmen appeared to have dwindled.

 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, Attorney General Davis replied with his customary tartness: "I've made my pitch here."

When the Administration's voting rights package was presented 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.

McCULLOCH LEADS ATTACK

Leading the attack on the Nixon proposal was the Chairman of the House 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 with an inadequate remedy." "I ask you, what kind of civil rights bill is that?"

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 said. "McCulloch continued. "But I would like to say that the Nixon 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 is the vote," Deficiency does not justify repeal. The law is designed to promote law and order throughout the land."

A letter of protest against the Administration proposal from the Rev. Theodore M. Hebblethwait, 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 "the kind of law that would "turn back the clock to 1957" in providing protection for the registration and voting rights of Negroes." He said:

"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 and insert only those due to mechanical changes and in their election laws," he wrote.

In a letter to Chairman Celler, John W. Gardner, President of the MacArthur Foundation, strongly urged extending the present voting rights law before dealing with any of the "complicated issues" raised by the Mitchell report which had been regarded as likely.

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 problem of the Administration would be the "under-educated ghetto Negro" in the North, whose voting rights, he said, are obstructed. "We cannot test the Nixon program would ban."

"I suggest to this committee," the Attorney General said, "that it is the psychological and moral barrier that is 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 is "patently immoral". But he admitted that the most presumptuous 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."

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

Representative Clark MacGregor of Minnesota favored a one year extension of the Voting Rights Act but made clear he would vote for a renewal of the present law first.

Even Representative Edward Hutchinson of New York, who has been inclined 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 dazzling fact of Attorney General's McCulloch's statement on Thursday before a House Judiciary subcommittee is that it opposes the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That act expired in August. There is no doubt whatever that, with Administration support, the act could be extended for five years. But as a practical matter it could be an extension of the 1965 law. In the 1965 Voting Rights Act leaves the undereducated ghetto Negro as today's forgotten man in voting rights.

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 Negroes’ voting rights in the states. That construction may have been the justification for the 1965 act. But it is unrealistic today to ignore the ghettoes of Harlem, Watts, Roxbury, and the Watts-Harding and Portworth. Of all of which are located in states which have literacy tests.

In the past 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 Negroes who are illiterate and only 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 Negroes and the poor from voting—that is responsible for much of the low Negro voter registration in some of our major cities.

The situation of Negroes in South Carolina and Mississippi, where literacy tests are suspended, is in Watts or Harlem, where literacy tests are enforced. A black person in Watts or Harlem is as likely to vote as a Negro is 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 in the Negroes, who 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, 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 examination and observers in the seven southern states. Under our bill, he has the authority to send the observers and examiners anywhere.

Our proposal would authorize the courts, on the application of the Attorney General, to temporarily enjoin discriminatory voting laws in any county or any state.

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 better than to improve and finally pass 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 the national literacy law. I understand the provisions of the Administration bill which pertain to the heart of this controversy, they sweep broadly into certain jurisdictions which are not in need of the relief and retreat from those areas where the need is greatest.

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

I am 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 spelling evidence of unflagging Southern dedication to the cause of creating an ever more sophisticated legal machinery for discriminating against the black voter.

GRIEVING WRONGS

In short, the Administration creates a record 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 Southern law enforcement officers in 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 of the Department of Justice. What kind of civil rights legislation is that?

The Attorney General of Mississippi came all the way to Washington for one reason and one reason only—to have these laws that he had to obey. 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 Administration proposal.

The Attorney General testified that Section 5 cannot work. The bad jurisdictions have not obeyed it, he says. But I have had 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 put 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 a fair and a courteous way to begin the protection of the law and order throughout the land.

In considering the Administration proposal, it is equally important to note how its very nature is the principle for “no” votes. No matter how many protests are voiced, the issue under the Administration bill is whether literacy tests as a philosophical tool to keep the Negroes under the poll tax, to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 the issue is whether discrimination in voting is desirable.

The question of philosophical is there would be more divisive than a simple extension of the act would be.

Therefore, those who believe that only intelligent people should be allowed to vote, that we need either a strict or a moderate construction of the Constitution, and those who believe in economy in Government may be able to vote—vote against the Administration proposal.

I do not know what others may think, but as for me, I find the cause of civil rights too delicate 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?
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 the cost of a new and heavier truck would be.

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 of the studies ordered by the President to be 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 before 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 request for testifying on this 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 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:

Dear Mr. Secretary: As you may recall, a rather substantial effort was made last year in Congress to pass a bill to increase the size of tandem-trailers.

Doubtful 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 such an evaluation and review called for by the President, prior to any near-future, undoubted, efforts will be made again during this Congress, on behalf of the truck bill. The facts and attitude taken by the past 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 your kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRED SCHWENGEL, Member of Congress.

HINT WHITE HOUSE MAY BACK BIG TRUCK BILL

(By William Stelf)

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 step," he said.

Rep. Kluczynski's bill would permit states to increase truck weight 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 73,380 pounds, substituting in its place formulas.

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.

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 tri-axle trailer trucks such as would have been possible under last year's bill.

The effect permitting 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 to operate in the new program, which now bans them except on a few toll roads.

Mr. Turner pointed out that his agency last year recommended a 65-foot length limit on double trailer trucks. This bill sets a new formula designed to spread weight safely.

Mr. Turner also had recommended horsepower, braking and linkage standards, but 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 has 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 in the Washington Daily News indicate that 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 beginning the study. It is of great length 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

By Robert L. Chartrand

INTRODUCTION

The United States Congress, as it prepares to enter the 1979's, is confronted with growing problems of size, cost and complexity. Each of its Members must function effectively in three roles as a legislator, a policy-maker and a legislator of his State or district, and as an unofficial ombudsman accessible to every constituent. The ability of the Congressmen and Congresswomen to meet these responsibilities 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 "new technology." The chain of books, articles, analytical reports, and miscellaneous threats to overwhelm even the most sophisticated information handling center. In fulfilling 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 information do not suffice. This condition is causing the Congressmen to seek new devices in which automatic data processing (ADP) can assist him in the performance of his legislative and administrative tasks. Computer technology developed during the past quarter-century, now provides the potential support to 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 individual Member's work, it is also considering ways in which the Congress might work with the private sector to ensure that the Congress is furnished with the kind of information it needs to perform its duties.