

BOTTOM

▶	UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
---	--------------	--------------	--------

**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP**

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DCI	7-19	HK WE
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			

<input type="checkbox"/>	ACTION	<input type="checkbox"/>	DIRECT REPLY	<input type="checkbox"/>	PREPARE REPLY
<input type="checkbox"/>	APPROVAL	<input type="checkbox"/>	DISPATCH	<input type="checkbox"/>	RECOMMENDATION
<input type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	FILE	<input type="checkbox"/>	RETURN
<input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE	<input type="checkbox"/>	INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/>	SIGNATURE

Remarks: Attached is an excerpt from the Congressional Record of 18 July containing floor debate in the House on a bill authorizing the Administrator of GSA to coordinate the activities of Federal departments and agencies in the field of automatic data processing. In offering an amendment to the bill concerning GSA control over the activities of other agencies, Representative Gary made a specific reference to the Agency. While Gary's amendment was adopted, we had already discussed with GSA part of the problem with which he was concerned. Mr. Houston's memo for the record on this is attached.

STAT

[Redacted]	NDER	
		DATE
Assistant Legislative Counsel, 7D01		19 July

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--------------	--------------	--------

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12255

ments problem. Toward the end of that message you will find this statement:

As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely.

Then we go back to October 31, 1960, when Candidate Kennedy made a speech in Philadelphia, Pa., on the balance-of-payments problem and I recommend it to you for your reading, with much of which I agree.

On page 825 of the report that carries these speeches of Candidate Kennedy, he says this:

The President himself echoes this alarm. Yet despite these warnings, and the clear trend of the preceding years, we failed to take prompt and vigorous action, and the balance of payments continued to go against us.

What then must we do, what would a new Democratic administration do to reverse the present downward trend in our balance of payments?

And he lists a few.

First, it says, and it is strangely missing from President Kennedy's message today.

Quoting Candidate Kennedy he asks:

What will a new Democratic administration's policy include?

First, we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession.

This fact is missing in today's speech. I respectfully suggest that President Kennedy read Candidate Kennedy's speech on balance of payments. I submit that the deficits of the administration contribute greatly to the balance-of-payments problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CODE OF ETHICS

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

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since the Congress approved the concurrent resolution which has become known as the code of ethics for Government employees. Since it was introduced by our distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, it has become a standard of conduct for public servants, elected and otherwise, in all three branches of our Government.

So often, however, Mr. Speaker, the public forgets the codes by which men serve, and for this reason, I consider it appropriate for the Members of this body to reemphasize and reaffirm their concurrence in the principles set forth by this resolution. Although the earlier resolution adopted by the Congress covered all Government employees, it was generally believed to apply chiefly to employees of the executive branch of the Government. I want to particularly stress in this new resolution the application of this code of ethics to members of the legislative branch as well.

I therefore am introducing legislation reaffirming that the code of ethics does apply to all Government employees.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate our beloved colleague for his insistence upon the maintenance of the highest possible standards in Government and that these principles apply in the Halls of Congress. He sets a good example in this himself.

The "Code of Ethics for Government Service," by its very terms applies to any person in Government service and to Members of the House and Senate. Its legislative history also shows this. It would, however, serve a very useful purpose to pass another resolution to emphasize this, as our colleague has proposed.

Although the code does have some teeth to it, because people can be hired and fired for ethical default and this code is considered in such and other disciplinary matters, it is my opinion that much ethical progress can be achieved in our Government if Congress passes a measure providing for a tribunal of some sort to hear and decide ethical questions and specific cases. I have been sponsoring legislation which would do this, House Joint Resolution 76. I have also introduced House Resolution 322 which provides a grievance committee in the House to handle specific problems which arise here. The public is impatient with Congress for its nonaction in this field and I hope that an increased sensitivity on the part of the Members of Congress may lead to early enactment of more progressive legislation in this field. It is long overdue.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 97 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye."

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Res. 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 432 provides for consideration of H.R. 5171, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The provisions of H.R. 5171 stem from a report of the Comptroller General and the continuing concern that a full dollars worth of efficient, responsive Government be obtained for every tax dollar. In a report submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, the Comptroller General emphasized the need for centralized management as a means of obtaining maximum utilization and economical acquisition of electronic data processing equipment, which is costly but highly useful.

Savings the Comptroller General authoritatively estimates as substantially in excess of \$100 million a year can be realized through effective and efficient centralized management of the automatic data processing equipment. H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 432.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us by unanimous vote of the Committee on Government Operations of the House and is for the purpose of authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill actually results in the saving of money, which is rather unusual in this day and age. This rule which passed by unanimous vote of the committee brings the bill before us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say that this morning I had the unusual privilege and one which I consider a very high honor, to be permitted to participate in bringing to the floor of this House a rule sponsored by a U.S. Federal judge, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERY], who has been named by the President to become a U.S. district judge. His nomination has been confined unanimously by action of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERY] has served with great distinction and great honor as a member of the Committee on Rules of the House. He is a man we do not like to lose from the Rules Committee of the House. We have found him to be always fair in his judgment. He is a man of great ability and of good nature. We have not always agreed across the table as to what should be done and what action should be taken in the Rules Committee on every matter that has come before it. But any disagreement that has come has been in an agreeable manner.

I am sure I speak for the minority members of the Rules Committee, and I am certain for all minority members of the House itself, when we pay our respects this morning and give honor to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERY], who is soon to leave us to become a U.S. district judge. We wish him well and many years of happiness on the bench, where I am sure he will render the same splendid service to his country that he has rendered to the House as a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. THORNBERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to one of the leaders in the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERY], who is going back to his first love, the field of law. Certainly I would feel that his going back to bar is a gain for that profession and a distinct loss to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin my remarks with an expression of deep gratitude to you personally for your splendid cooperation in making possible the project I am about to describe. And, in expressing that appreciation I am confident you will join me in thanking Dr. George W. Calver, the official physician to Congress and Mr. George Stewart, Architect for our Nation's Capitol, for their valuable assistance. Without such generous support the project would not be possible. And, without it, other and less effective means would have to be

sought to bring to the attention of legislators and the public a subject most important to the health of our Nation. My colleagues from Alabama have also given the effort every possible support. So, to all of them, Dr. Calver, Mr. Stewart, and you personally, Mr. Speaker, my sincerest thanks.

These remarks, of course, make it obvious, Mr. Speaker, that you are fully aware of the project of which I speak. And I appreciate this opportunity to inform the other Members of this distinguished body about it and urge them to lend it their fullest support and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, something new will make a temporary appearance on Capitol Hill next Monday, July 22. And, while it will remain here only a week, I trust it will help write a permanent chapter in the already proud history of the health of our people.

This something new is a mobile unit created to detect emphysema in human beings.

The unit was designed and developed jointly by the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, the public health service and welfare agencies, the Alabama Medical Center, and 31 county TB associations in Alabama.

Of course, as a native Alabamian, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety I have watched the development of this unit with exceptional interest and its trial use with excusable pride.

However, there are millions of people in this country—indeed, some of them may be in this very room—who are, by now, asking "What in the world is emphysema?" Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence and the indulgence of those who do know what emphysema is while I briefly describe it. For, believe me, ignorance about emphysema is not to be considered a sign of stupidity.

The word is almost as strange in today's vocabulary as was tuberculosis 75 years ago. This, in itself, is odd because emphysema was known to our forefathers. Not, however, as it affected them. Rather it was how it affected their chief source of transportation and power—the horse. A common vexation of the day was to apparently be cheated in the purchase of a seemingly healthy animal which proved to be wind broken. Upon the slightest exertion the horse became helpless and useless.

Only in our own time has it been realized that a similar condition is widespread among men. All over the world men in increasing numbers are falling into the most frightening of all disabilities—the inability to breathe. And that is emphysema. But, you may ask, is not there more to it than that? How do you explain it?

Well, "emphysema" is the Greek word for "elasticity." As a disease it may be defined as the enlargement of the whole or a part of the lung due to loss of the lung's inherent stretch—or elasticity. Normally the lungs are very much like elastic balloons inside the hollow cavity of the chest. An individual inhales simply by expanding his chest. The lungs

expand to fill up the extra space and thereby draw in air. Breathing out is accomplished by relaxing the muscles of the chest. The air is forced out of the lungs, not by the pressure of the chest wall but by the elastic recoil of every part of the lungs themselves. The patient with emphysema is still able to inhale normally, although perhaps with some effort. However, when he exhales, the air is not forced out as completely as it should be due to the loss of stretch. It must be pushed out by compressing the chest through muscular force. This is difficult and inefficient, as can be demonstrated by trying to squeeze the air out of a plastic bag with a small opening.

Emphysema usually begins in the middle or even early adult years. Its course is relentlessly progressive in the absence of treatment. And, there is no known treatment that will put the stretch back into the lungs once it is lost—any more, for instance, than can stretch be put back into a rubberband. One of the earliest symptoms of the disease is wheezing when exerting any effort. But, here is the insidious part of the ailment. This wheezing is sometimes interpreted as a sign of asthma—or heart trouble—and accepted treatment for either of these conditions meets with no success. As the disease progresses and more lung tissue becomes involved the symptoms become more severe and are brought on by less and less exertion. And, the final stage is the development of respiratory acidosis, right heart failure—and death.

Now, the logical questions at this point of my discussion are: "What is the cause of emphysema?" and "What are the possibilities for treatment?"

As for the cause, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that no one really knows. Many possibilities suggest themselves, of course, such as—air pollution, gasoline engine exhausts, smoking, allergies, and others.

With regard to possibilities for treatment I have the optimism to predict, Mr. Speaker, that these are unlimited. For, while treatment at the present time is very primitive by modern standards it is still possible to do much more for emphysema victims than could be done 75 years ago for tuberculosis victims when the campaign against that disease was begun.

These two answers, Mr. Speaker, because of their inconclusive nature, bring me to the main point of this discussion. It is vital to the future health of our Nation that further research be done into the causes, early detection, and treatment of emphysema. This will require the fullest cooperation and support of every citizen. And we, in the Congress, have it within our power to lead the way.

Starting next Monday morning and remaining all week the mobile unit designed to detect emphysema in its early stage will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. Going through it to determine whether one has emphysema takes only a few minutes of well spent time.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12257

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there will, no doubt, be some who say that a Congressman could not possibly have emphysema since he's so long-winded anyway.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues to visit the emphysema mobile unit some time next week—the earlier the better.

The device in itself is a milestone in medical research. From it strides of unknown length can be made, the least of which will be the adding of many fruitful and productive years to the lives of millions who now are not even aware that an insidious killer may slowly be sapping their strength. Even in its early stage emphysema can seriously impair the ability to work and take much of the joy out of living.

So, I urge every Member of Congress to visit the mobile unit next week. To repeat—it will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. It will require only a few minutes for the actual test and the few minutes each of us spend in it will be well worth our time personally and will set a fine example for everyone to follow in future years. I might add that the reports on the tests will be forwarded to Dr. Calver or whom-ever you designate to receive them. They will be personal records, not to be made a matter of public record.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 99]

Abernethy	Grabowski	Philbin
Ashtbrook	Gray	Pillion
Belcher	Hagen, Calif.	Pirnie
Blatnik	Hawkins	Powell
Bolton,	Healey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Frances P.	Hemphill	Riehlman
Bonner	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Celler	Jones, Ala.	St. Onge
Clancy	Keith	Schwengel
Clausen,	Kilburn	Scott
Don H.	Landrum	Senner
Clawson, Del.	Latta	Shelley
Conte	Leggett	Sheppard
Daddario	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dague	Long, La.	Staebler
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Stephens
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Taft
Donohue	Mathias	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, La.
Forrester	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Frelinghuysen	Moss	Trimble
Garmatz	Nelsen	Ullman
Gialmo	O'Brien, Ill.	Wharton
Gill	O'Brien, N.Y.	White
Goodell	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

No. 109—19

MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Government Operations for bringing out this measure which covers a very important part of our budget, a part which is going to become increasingly costly. We are talking about an item now that probably runs over \$500 million a year. A decade ago probably there was nothing in the budget in this area, or very little. This amount can mushroom under proper and efficient development to where the bill of the Federal Government is \$1 billion. If there is any way in which at this relatively early stage of the game we can produce some efficiencies in the method of procuring this automatic data processing equipment, it behooves us to do so. The big areas, of course, of utilization are Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy. Incidentally, the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve became aware of this problem coming in through the area of our concern for economic statistics, which is an important purpose of these data processing machines, but very definitely those agencies compiling these data are minor users in comparison with the other governmental agencies.

The only other point I would like to make on the rule itself, and again expressing my commendation to both of these committees for bringing this matter to the floor of the House is to call attention to a very important aspect: Whether or not we are going to have the money to buy or to lease the additional data processing equipment we need, because we are talking again, I want to point out, in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars. We certainly will have these funds if we will do what is being done in the private sector of our economy. This is something of a harsh thing. These are the kinds of machines that are removing thousands of jobs. The efficiency that one obtains in the private sector from the use of these machines is due to the fact that the

payrolls are reduced. I have seen little evidence of any understanding of this point on the part of the executive branch of the Government that the savings have to be reflected in cuts in personnel.

Fortunately I am able to end on a happy note. If we will only look at this business of automation we will realize it creates more jobs than it displaces, but the newly created jobs are frequently 100 or 1,000 miles away from where the jobs that have been made obsolete exist. They are frequently, and in fact usually, in different fields of endeavor and under different jurisdictions of the unions who have carved out in the past their particular areas of jurisdiction. Hence a very difficult human, political, and social problem arises in adjusting in this amazing era of automation. The Federal Government must start dealing in terms of economic efficiencies if we are going to be able to pay for these gains in efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the people handling the bill on the floor a question or two about the discretionary authority. I turn to page 2 of the bill under the proviso that begins on line 17 which reads as follows:

Provided, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from New Jersey this question: Who makes this decision as to whether or not an exception is warranted which is essential to defense or security? Who makes that decision under the legislation as reported?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who has done such an effective job in military matters in the great Committee on Appropriations? His question is, as I understand, who would make the decision when something is essential to defense or security that some other agency would lease, purchase, buy, or otherwise utilize a given data computer?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Under this legislation it would be the Administrator of the GSA, when sufficient evidence is presented to him that a delegation of authority is justified for security or defense or for efficiency or economy. It is expected that a decision would be forthcoming promptly from the Administrator. In the discussions with the GSA and the Comptroller General there was no question about the simple justification of a large number of scientific and technical data computers that would obviously be for unique defense and secu-

2
X
X
X

rity purposes, and which were really beyond the ken of the average computer expert and can justifiably be classified as specialized equipment. This is in keeping with the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. FORD. I can see considerable merit to the overall desire of those who want to achieve greater efficiency and economy in the utilization of this very expensive equipment. On the other hand, there are areas where automatic data processing systems are highly specialized for a specific program and which could not be adapted to broad utilization. Some such equipment is set up for intelligence evaluation, and for a number of other highly classified operations. I should certainly hope that the Administrator of General Services would understand such unique circumstances and would not preempt the utilization of this kind of equipment for various nonrelated jobs.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the expression of hope of the gentleman, but I remind him that the language of the bill, and even the answer of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], are unequivocally that the power and the control and the discretion are vested in the Administrator of GSA. And there is not any explanation that is going to obviate that plain intent and meaning of the law.

Mr. FORD. The only answer I can see, and I have read some of the testimony before the committee, is that the final authority would rest in the Executive Office of the President. In this case I suspect that would be the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the Administrator of FSA is appointed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget works with him on any such decision. I think without question anybody would understand that it would be, as the gentleman has explained, quite essential and obvious that certain of the installations in this country would be used on a part-time basis. This in itself should not indicate that they are not being utilized as fully as circumstances demand.

As the gentleman from Michigan has indicated, certainly nobody would attempt to say that this is a waste of money. It might be totally standby equipment vital to certain agencies.

Mr. FORD. On page 26 of the hearings there appears a statement that the Comptroller General suggests there ought to be a minimum of exemptions passed on by the Administrator. I do not want more exemptions than are necessary, but I do not want to hamstring the Department of Defense, the CIA, or any other agency that is involved with defense or security just because the head of the GSA wants to use an iron fist on this matter. So I hope from the comments of the gentleman from Texas and others some guidelines may be given to the head of the GSA so that he understands the needs and the

problems of these most important agencies.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

(Mr. KLUCZYNSKI asked and was given permission to proceed out of order.)

A RECORD OF GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENT AND
LOYALTY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express to you and to every Member of the House, sentiments which are particularly close to your heart, Mr. Speaker, and are shared by every Member of the House of Representatives.

I refer to and call attention to the fact that on July 18 of this year Eugene T. (Gene) Kinnaly will have completed 45 years of service as secretary and administrative assistant to two distinguished Members of this body, and particularly that he has served as the first assistant and good right hand to our beloved Speaker since 1928, when Speaker McCORMACK first arrived in Washington, as Congressman representing the 12th Massachusetts District.

Forty-five years of continuous and loyal service to his country, his Congressman, to all Members of this House and the citizens of the 12th Massachusetts District is an outstanding and unique record and contribution of which every man who greatly admires him, rejoice with us in spirit that Gene continues to serve. I am sure he will as long as he is physically able.

Today's testimonial merely marks the passage of time in a long life of great usefulness to his fellow man. We are happy to know it will continue indefinitely.

Those of us who have known Gene Kinnaly intimately, have always been impressed with his loyalty to his chief, the thoroughness and reliability he constantly demonstrates in every task he undertakes, and in striking manner the warm and friendly personality, which he shares with everyone who calls at the Speaker's office.

Every one from the most humble to the most prominent, is immediately struck by his sincerity, his desire to help everyone, and the easy, quiet and efficient manner in which he accomplishes every responsibility.

Gene Kinnaly probably knows more about how to get things done properly through Federal departments and agencies, has developed through the years probably more friends in these departments than any congressional staff member. He is undoubtedly better and more favorably known to Members of this body than any other person serving in a similar capacity.

I know I am speaking for hundreds of Members and former Members of this House when in their behalf I offer our warmest congratulations for the splendid service Gene has rendered to us all, our most sincere best wishes and hopes that he will continue in his present duties for the Speaker for many years to come, and how pleased we all are to count him as a valued friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following gentlemen may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point—the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Illinois in this word of tribute to a great American, my friend, Eugene Kinnaly. After 45 years on Capitol Hill, there is little about its operations, past or present, or its history, that is unknown to Eugene Kinnaly. He has served as our great Speaker's right-hand man for 35 years, and for 10 years before that he served as assistant to the late Honorable James Gallivan, of Massachusetts. The fund of knowledge he has acquired over more than four decades has made him an indispensable aid to the Speaker and a great servant of the House. Gene has a stupendous acquaintance with everything that has to do with the House of Representatives, ranging from parliamentary procedure to personnel. He is also a fine lawyer and a fine gentleman.

The House of Representatives has undergone some drastic changes during the momentous years Gene has been here. As its duties became heavier, its responsibilities more wide ranging and complex, Gene has continued to learn, to sharpen his talents, and to dispense his skilled services unstintingly to his own Members, to other Members of Congress, and to staff and committee employees.

Forty-five years is only the beginning in the career of a man of Gene's energy and ability.

He is one of the institutions of the House. I hope we may have the benefit of his talents for many years to come.

I wish him health and happiness and many more years of satisfaction in doing the work I know he loves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with this tribute that is being paid here today to a grand person, Gene Kinnaly. During the many years I have known him, no one could have been more accommodating and helpful to me than he has been. We all realize the importance of good staff work, especially in these days when the Congress is facing increasingly heavy responsibilities to the country.

Certainly Gene Kinnaly has proved his worth to the Speaker and to all of us who have occasion, from time to time, to call on him for information.

His long record of service represents a career of outstanding loyalty and dedication to the Congress. I congratulate him and wish him many more useful and happy years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join those of my

colleagues paying tribute to one of the most remarkable public servants in the history of this Congress, Eugene T. Kinnaly.

Gene completes 45 years of congressional service today, which makes him the dean of the present staff here on Capitol Hill and which must be very close to an all-time record of service to the House of Representatives.

My own administrative assistant, James N. Milne, recently completed 38 years of service with me, a long and wonderful association; but Speaker McCORMACK's assistant surpasses our record. Gene Kinnaly today completes 35 years with the Speaker, but he preceded the Speaker to Washington with his prior service to Congressman James Gallivan.

I wish for Gene and the Speaker many more years of good health and great service to the Congress and to the people of our country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I find it gratifying that the Members of this House are taking the time to give this public recognition to one of its most able and likable employees, Eugene T. Kinnaly. I am personally pleased to join with my colleagues in this unusual tribute.

His long service of 35 years with our beloved Speaker, after earlier service with the late Representative James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, has brought him to the favorable attention of almost every Member of the House and has gained for him their high respect. His gracious response to every request for assistance is a characteristic of his gentlemanly nature.

It has been my pleasure to have known Gene Kinnaly for many years. I fervently hope that, now having completed 45 years of honorable and effective service, he will choose to remain with us for years to come and that during those years he will have the blessing of good health and everything he desires. I heartily congratulate him today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to pay tribute to a devoted public servant and our good friend, Eugene T. Kinnaly. His tireless work in the House of Representatives has continued for 45 years. The citizens of Massachusetts are proud to call him a native son.

Gene Kinnaly has been a part of the Congress of the United States through the administrations of eight Presidents. He has served this House through 20-some Congresses. He arrived here to work as secretary to the late Congressman James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, with whom he was associated for 10 years. In the 35 years since then, he has been the confidant and administrative assistant to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, our present Speaker of the House.

We are reminded of the remarkable record of Gene Kinnaly in length of service, but we cannot forget the more remarkable part of that record, which embraces the enduring character of his accomplishments. He meets each day, each person, and each task with friendliness, unhurried assurance, and open

honesty. Few are endowed with his spirit of helpfulness.

Pressures do not bring a distraught atmosphere to Mr. Kinnaly's being. Many have praised him for his courteous disposition and the retentive memory that works best when under pressure.

His knowledge of the intricate network of government makes him a valued assistant. His diplomacy is exemplary. His calm disposition is a joy.

Gene has always been devoted to his job, but not in a narrow sense which excludes the bigness of the problems to be met. Members of Congress have sought his advice and always carry away a lasting impression of a warm and true friend. He understands the workings of a democracy.

It is with genuine pride that I extend to Eugene Kinnaly my congratulations and wish for him many years of continued success. We are glad to have him in our midst.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are few occasions, I think, that have given me greater pleasure or more satisfaction than this particular one. Mr. Eugene Kinnaly, the distinguished gentleman to whom I am about to pay tribute, has been with us in this great House for 45 years on this day. For 35 of those years, he has been the able and devoted right hand of the man who is now our Speaker, the honorable and distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK.

Gene Kinnaly, as he is so well known to most of us, has served our House and our Speaker for nearly half a century with a devotion and a vitality that have made him a credit to both. I am sure that my colleagues will take it as no slight when I say that I know of few in these chambers who are held in higher esteem by all than Gene Kinnaly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor of the highest order for me to join in the plaudits of my fellow Representatives today and pay tribute to a gentleman who has served this House so well for so long. With our recognition, I want him to know that he has gained the highest regard and respect of the Members of the House, and we all hope he will be with us at least 45 more years.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Capitol Hill, as a secretary, 23 years ago, I knew the employees much better than I know the Members of Congress. These were my first friends and my longest and the memories of them I deeply cherish. It was from the actions of these people that I recognized the truth and significance of that old phrase, "the power behind the throne."

There was John Andrews, of Salem, Mass., later to become the Clerk of the House of Representatives. John's desire to serve was too great for the stamina required and more than his body could endure.

There was Ivan Hedin, secretary to our former colleague, Dick Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, and who was rich in wit and service, and whom we sorely miss around these Halls.

There was Jimmy Milne, until recently secretary to our beloved former Speaker,

JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and who helped JOE in his long years as Republican leader.

Massachusetts has another son, for years a close friend of the triumvirate from Massachusetts referred to above. I refer, of course, to Gene Kinnaly, for 45 years a secretary on Capitol Hill and for many years assistant to our esteemed Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Gene is a quiet man but ever ready with a gentle smile and kind word. My association with him is something I always will treasure. He is a deeply religious man and oftentimes I note, at noon-time, that he and his friend, Jim Guinea of Congressman KLUCZYNSKI's staff, wind their way to St. Peter's Church near the Capitol for a few moments of meditation.

Gene has long been one of the most effective behind-the-scenes worker I have ever known. I am sure that his counsel, experience and judgment have been invaluable to our Speaker in the many trying problems of his office.

He is all of this and more but most important of all to me is that I am privileged to call him my friend.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join my colleagues in commending the longtime, invaluable aid of our distinguished Speaker, Eugene T. Kinnaly, who is completing 45 years of outstanding and devoted service on Capitol Hill.

Always friendly, helpful, considerate of others, he enjoys the high esteem and affection of Members of the House, his fellow staff members, and all who know him.

In expressing my great pride in the tremendous, memorable record which Gene Kinnaly has accomplished as a congressional secretary and administrative assistant, I take great pleasure in extending to him and his family my heartiest congratulations with my good wishes for many more happy anniversaries and choicest blessings for many more years of success, happiness, and accomplishment.

As secretary to the late, colorful, and highly esteemed Congressman James A. Gallivan, Gene Kinnaly came to Washington as a young man to carve out an enviable career of effective and devoted service to his district, State, and Nation.

Ten years quickly sped by and then began Gene Kinnaly's long, illustrious career as administrative aid to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK, taking on new and most important tasks and duties through all the vicissitudes and changing currents of national politics and world events.

As aid to the Speaker, he stands at the very top of his great profession, making invaluable contributions to the Congress and to the Nation. Capable, loyal, completely devoted to his job, Gene Kinnaly is a skilled professional who has gained tremendous knowledge of Federal affairs, a sure, competent grasp of affairs in his district and the country, a flair for getting things done easily and quickly that stamp him as one of the most outstanding in his field.

All of us in Congress who have come to know Gene Kinnaly are aware of the

great contributions he has made during the many years of his service on Capitol Hill. He has won a legion of friends in and out of public life and enjoys the respect and esteem of his associates, the constituency he serves, a wide range of public officials, employees of the House of every rank and station, and people in all walks of life who have come to know him and who cherish his friendship.

I rejoice with the many friends of this able, zealous, and dedicated worker on this happy occasion and join with very many officials, associates, and people in wishing for Gene Kinnaly all the blessings and graces of good health, success, and happiness that the good Lord may bestow.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in this special tribute to Mr. Eugene T. Kinnaly, administrative assistant to our beloved Speaker, who is today beginning his 46th year of congressional service.

"Gene," as he is affectionately known to all of us, personifies the highest tradition and ideal of an exemplary congressional assistant. He is supremely capable, intensely loyal, and devotedly patriotic in his service to the country in his congressional assistant capacity.

Despite the tremendous workload that we know is his responsibility, he always has time to guide the newer and lesser experienced secretaries in the discharge of their particular duties, and he has given counseling words of wisdom to untold Members here whenever called upon.

Gene's superior and developed talents shine through his modest personality, and his kindly nature and disposition are a byword on Capitol Hill.

Here is a man who has dedicated himself to patriotic service for his country for 45 years, and there are few indeed who can match his unique and inspiring record.

We are happy to salute you today, Gene, and join in our most earnest wishes that the good Lord will keep you with us, in continuing good health, for many more years of your fruitful work.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my few words to the many that are being paid in sincere tribute today to Gene Kinnaly on the 45th anniversary of his service to the Congress of the United States.

Gene has an unrivaled record, I believe, as a congressional secretary. Those of us from Massachusetts, of course, are proud that many of his years on the Hill have been spent as the chief aid to our esteemed Speaker of the House.

I know that I speak not only for myself, but for literally hundreds of Members of Congress and staff assistants when I say on this significant occasion "thanks, Gene," for the many times you have given freely of your good counsel and effective talents.

Men of such character and devotion to public service are rare and the Congress, indeed the Nation, is indebted to Eugene Kinnaly.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the service of Eugene T. Kinnaly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was consulted as to the advisability of this legislation and whether that agency was asked for its opinion.

Mr. BROOKS. The answer to the gentleman's question would be that they have not been. However, the Comptroller General of the United States who is the chief accounting officer of the Congress investigated this complex problem with reference to all of the Government agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. So, while it has not been directly consulted, the ADP utilization problems and practices of that agency were taken into consideration by the Comptroller General of the United States and were reflected in the recommendations contained in his March 6, 1963, report.

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. As I understand the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, he asked whether this matter went to the space agency?

Mr. HECHLER. That is correct. I am merely interested in whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was given the chance to express its views on the pending legislation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The witness for the space agency testified before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and he expressed his views in response to a direct question on this matter and was in total opposition to this type of approach.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. THORBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and other-

wise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5171, with Mr. ASHLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this measure which was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations on June 19, 1963, and reported to the House on the same day, has a direct and specific purpose. The enactment of this measure will provide the necessary organization and authority for effective, centralized and coordinated acquisition and utilization of costly automatic data processing equipment on a Government-wide basis.

Mr. Chairman, according to authoritative evaluations of the Comptroller General, the centralized management as provided for in H.R. 5171 will result in sound, accountable and direct savings substantially in excess of \$100 million a year. The Comptroller General in his report and in his testimony before the committee states that these savings can be realized through centralized, coordinated management which, in turn, will make possible, first, higher utilization of equipment now on hand and, second, more economical acquisition of equipment in the future.

Mr. Chairman, efficient and economic utilization of this costly equipment requires that it be used on a maximum round-the-clock, three-shift basis. Equipment now used by the Government is utilized only a little more than one shift a day, on an average.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of this bill will almost immediately result in an increase in utilization and, therefore, result almost immediately in substantial savings to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5171 will also make it possible to develop an economical Government-wide acquisition program. At this time, today about 85 percent of this equipment is leased. The Comptroller General has indicated in the most recent of a series of audit reports submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, and in testimony before the committee that there are significant benefits to the Government in the selective purchase of many automatic data processing systems and components.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12261

The Administrator of the General Services Administration would carry out this centralized management program which is comparable in many respects to other property management and centralized procurement responsibilities previously delegated to him by the Congress. Agencies would state their automatic data processing requirements to him and make payments to a revolving fund created under this bill. With the funds so deposited the Administrator would then either purchase or rent necessary equipment to fulfill individual agency needs.

Mr. Chairman, among the amendments adopted by the committee is one which would include automatic along with electronic equipment. Also the program was amended to cover equipment used for and at the expense of the Government in the execution of contracts and other agreements. These amendments were recommended by the Comptroller General.

The committee also added provisions for an annual report to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress relating to expenditures from the GSA-administered revolving fund created under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is without any doubt, based upon the extended reports made by the Comptroller General, who is the chief accounting officer of this legislative body, that hundreds of millions of dollars can and should be saved if we pass this bill. The Comptroller General stated without equivocation that we could save \$148 million in the first 5 years of this program and \$100 million each year thereafter. I asked him if this was a sound statement. He said without equivocation, that he thought it was a very conservative estimate of savings that could be achieved through the passage of this legislation.

The March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General is the latest comprehensive evaluation of Government automatic data processing utilization submitted to Congress. It is not the first, however. His recommendations for centralized management of automatic data processing equipment go back to 1958 when he originally made a general recommendation of this kind. Following 2 years of inaction by the executive branch, he reiterated his recommendations in stronger terms in 1960. Following 3 further years during which there was no significant improvement, he restated his recommendations in March of this year. This March 6, 1963, report is one of the strongest and most forceful reports the Comptroller General has ever issued concerning a problem so simply and obviously subject to solution. According to the authoritative figures contained in the Comptroller General's report, and his testimony, the taxpayers of this country are losing approximately \$10 million every month a centralized, coordinated program applicable to all Government agencies is delayed in implementation. It is essential that Congress act swiftly and decisively to provide the administrative machinery by which these significant sums can be saved.

Under provisions of H.R. 5171, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to provide central management of Government automatic data processing equipment. The General Services Administration, which is under the direction of the Administrator, is an operating agency of the executive branch especially created by Congress to perform centralized procurement and property management functions. H.R. 5171, which is an amendment to title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, therefore constitutes a logical extension of duties comparable to those which this Agency performs.

Under this centralized management program, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations can also be greatly improved. The Comptroller General has predicted an ever increasing rate of growth in the use of this equipment in Government. He has suggested:

We are discussing here a fixed charge on the Government. This is very much like the fixed charge on the debt. What we are seeing here is growing into what * * * will be a major fixed charge which cannot be reduced and which will probably grow and properly so if we are going to control what goes on in the Government.

Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963, and it is estimated that this figure will increase to 1,600 by the end of 1964. Furthermore, the Comptroller General testified that use of automatic data processing equipment in Government will increase more in geometric rather than arithmetic progression and that he does not expect that utilization will reach a plateau in the near future. At this time, budgetary appropriation requests for hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for such equipment are scattered throughout the Federal budget, making it difficult for Congress and the Executive Office of the President to maintain effective budgetary control. Following approval of H.R. 5171, comprehensive information from one source will be available to the Bureau of the Budget, to the substantive committees of Congress, to the Appropriations Committees, and to the Committees on Government Operations, as well as to the Comptroller General. The utilization of this information will assure both the executive and the legislative branches of proper policy and fiscal control over this ever increasing expenditure of taxpayers' funds.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. WALLHAUSER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5171, which has been explained to you, in general, by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks]. It seems to me that we have an obligation to the people we represent not only to refuse to appropriate money for projects that we do not con-

sider to be in the public interest but also to attempt to save some money. This bill gives us one grand opportunity to do just that.

The title of the bill really is the key to the whole program, and I would like to read it to you, because it sums up in one sentence the purpose and why we should all support it:

A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

This is not a new proposal. The General Accounting Office has been making studies and recommendations since 1958. On March 6, 1963, it made a very strong recommendation that a centralized purchasing and management agency should be set up. The General Services Administration is exactly this.

Under the act of 1949, on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and by act of Congress, it was designed to procure and manage real and personal property. It seems to me this falls within that category. We have the statement of the Administrator that no huge staff will be added. He claimed he had sufficient technicians in his own department and could utilize technicians from other agencies now employed by them and, with the help of representatives of private industry, he could come up with the answers required for the various agencies without adding a great deal to the staff. Individual studies would have to be made to determine if it would be financially advantageous to the Government to purchase or to continue to lease if no purchases were made. Even if we continued as we are the utilization of the equipment we now have on a 24-hour basis, or as nearly to that as possible, it would be a big step forward and, as the gentleman from Texas emphasized, studies made on about half of the present equipment indicated a substantial saving of \$140 million would be made in the first 5 years of its operation and more than \$100 million a year after that.

Most of the equipment used by the agencies is general-purpose equipment, something like a typewriter or adding machine. It should be set up in such a manner that any other agency can come in and utilize the equipment the same as any other recording apparatus.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this Bill has great merit.

I would like to say the Comptroller General in his studies has emphasized the need for it, but up until now no definite program has come out of these recommendations. He regarded them as essential.

If you will read the March 6, 1963, report by him, it would seem quite evident that we should pass this type of legislation.

I would like to close by reading one answer to a question. During the hearings the Comptroller General was asked the following question:

Mr. Campbell, in light of this, do you feel that these poor utilization conditions, including the question of lease versus purchase, could be improved by having the kind of central coordination that is provided in this bill, H.R. 5171?

Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, responded in this way:

We are convinced of it. We hope that this will be done. This is one of the most serious problems the Government is facing in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this measure will be supported and that this very worthy bill will be passed unanimously. I would hope that the Members give it careful consideration, because, as I said at the outset, we do have an obligation to attempt to save money in the operations of the Government as well as in not appropriating that for which there is no need.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I would like to rise in support of this bill and to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], and other members of this committee, for bringing this bill to the attention of the House. I think we should be very aware of any efforts that this House can exert to effect substantial savings in the operation of Government. This seems to me to be one of those areas in which we can be most effective. Therefore I rise in support of the bill and commend the committee for the work it has done in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 5171, now before us has my full support. I believe its passage will reflect the interest in this body of maintaining effective and efficient management over the utilization of automatic data processing equipment by the Federal Government. Further, a direct consequence of this improved managerial function will be a substantial saving of taxpayer funds.

This bill vests authority in the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The centralized management provided by this bill is authoritatively estimated by the Comptroller General of the United States as realizing a saving substantially in excess of \$100 million a year.

Just as private industry has made increasing use of automatic data processing systems in recent years, so has the Federal Government benefited from the advantages these systems possess. Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963. It is estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1964, approximately 1,600 systems will be in use.

The Comptroller General has reported that 85 percent of these systems are leased without comprehensive evaluation as to the benefits to the taxpayers

which might be gained through purchase. As no statutory requirement now exists to maintain effective budgetary control over the hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for the equipment, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations obviously suffers.

Another problem inherent in the present absence of centralized management is that Government agencies are not fully utilizing automatic data processing equipment at this time. An inventory report of the Bureau of the Budget made in August of 1962 reveals numerous examples of extremely low use of this equipment. Central coordination, as provided by the instant bill, can almost immediately begin to achieve savings by increasing the utilization of automatic data processing equipment the Government now has on hand.

It is noteworthy that the Administrator of General Services has testified the coordinated program provided by H.R. 5171 should not require a large increase in his agency's management staff. Additionally, implementation of this program is expected to result in a lessening of personnel requirements of user agencies.

For the economy and efficiency which would result from this measure, I urge its favorable consideration.

I also commend my colleagues on the Government Operations Committee for the excellence of their work in preparing this bill and reporting it to the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I thank the gentleman very much.

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I was just curious as to the definition of "data processing equipment." What does it constitute?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. It includes more than electronic equipment. It includes equipment other than electronic equipment.

Mr. SNYDER. It does not get into the office electric typewriters, and things of that nature, does it?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. No, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am one of those who served on the committee at the time the General Services Administration Act was enacted, which goes back to 1949. I followed with a great deal of interest during the years the progress of this agency. I would like to ask the gentleman if he in his opinion feels that the projected savings that this proposal will make are really genuine or not.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I firmly believe they are genuine, yes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 8 minutes.

(Mr. RIEHLMAN (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today offers us an opportunity to gain more effective control over an area of Federal expenditure that is already quite significant and becoming more so every day.

There are nearly 1,200 different automatic data processing systems in use in the Government this year and there will be 1,600 by the end of 1964. The annual cost to the Government of renting and purchasing this equipment runs well into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Decisions as to the type of equipment to be acquired, the manner of acquisition, the degree of utilization, and the time and nature of disposition are now made, for the most part, by the individual using agencies. There is a minimum of coordination among them.

The Comptroller General of the United States conducted a study of this growing problem, and, as a result, expressed the belief to the committee that substantial savings would be possible if these decisions were made, from the standpoint of the needs of the Government as a whole, by a centralized management agency, rather than by the individual using agencies.

The Comptroller General informed the committee that by purchasing more of this equipment rather than leasing it, for instance, the Government could effect potential savings in excess of \$148 million over the next 5 years, with possible savings of \$100 million a year after that. He also indicated that additional savings could be made by more effective utilization of this equipment within the Government once it has been acquired.

In other words, there is a pressing need for more effective Government-wide coordination of the acquisition and utilization of this equipment. The committee concurs in the belief that this can best be accomplished by centralized control of these functions, and that is precisely what this bill will accomplish.

There is one aspect of this proposal that will bear careful watching in the future. That is the impact of this bill on the tactical and classified operations of the Defense Establishment. The committee determined, and I think wisely so, that the fewer the exceptions to GSA's authority the better. But the committee does recognize the problem that could arise by removing control of equipment that is an integral part of a vital defense system from the Secretary of Defense and placing it in an outside agency. The bill does not except the Defense Department specifically, but it authorizes the Administrator of GSA to delegate his authority when such action would be essential to defense or security.

I think it is reasonable to assume that any irreconcilable conflict between Defense and GSA over the control of the former's use of automatic data processing equipment would be resolved adequately at higher levels. Nevertheless,

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12263

I do want to point this potential problem area out to my colleagues as one that will bear careful watching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Government Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], for his courtesy in extending me this time to speak in opposition to this bill. It is with regret I must take this position, for I have the highest regard for my dear friend from Texas.

I am against H.R. 5171 for the reason that though its intention is the best intention, it is too sweeping and would tend to retard the development of a growing and developing science. That is what computers are. This is not a case of adding machines, or typewriters, but this is a growing science that has not been standardized at all. To place a lid on it in the form of an agency that is not associated, let us say, with the specific duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is, in effect, taking the very duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and transferring them to the General Services Administration. That is how sweeping, I think, this legislation is.

This bill would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by or at the expense of the Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment. Some of the Members of Congress are very familiar with this legislation and some are not.

Therefore, I shall furnish a little background. We are talking about electronic data processing systems which frequently are referred to as giant brains, robots, monsters, or just plain computers. We are talking as well about conventional punched-card machines. The main emphasis, however, is on the larger gear; that is, on the electronic data processing systems. You may have heard them referred to as Univac's, Ramac's, Edvac's, Maniac's, Lark's, Stretch'es, 7090's, 301's, and a host of other names and numbers assigned by the manufacturers.

The Bureau of the Census was the first Federal Government agency to use one of these systems for a business-type application. That was in 1951. This has grown, however, to where in 1963 there were 1,248 such systems in use in the Federal Government with a total cost annually of \$704 million. The range of the rental cost of one of these systems per month is from \$1,000 to over \$100,000. The purchase price range is from \$25,000 to \$7 million and up.

At one time all of the systems could be purchased or rented except IBM. Presently and for the past several years

IBM systems also can be purchased or rented. The purchase-option method can be used in all cases.

The argument is and has been: Is it more economical to purchase or to rent these electronic data processing systems? This is what the Brooks bill is all about. In an effort to solve the purchase versus rental problem, it would centralize in GSA the control of the procurement and utilization of electronic data processing systems throughout Federal Government.

I am opposed to the bill and would like to take a few minutes to tell you why. I am hopeful that my remarks will adequately describe the shortcomings of the bill and that for these reasons you will join in opposing it. As you know, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, of which I am chairman and of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] was chairman in the 87th Congress, has some jurisdiction in the electronic data processing equipment field in the Federal Government. We have carried out our responsibilities diligently. We have had hearings on this subject for a total of 5 days. Consequently, I believe that we are in a fair position to know what should be done and what should not be done in regard to electronic data processing systems.

At the outset, I should like to point out to you that I do not object to the intention of the bill, but I do object to the basic elements of the bill and its sweeping misassignment of responsibilities. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration, in effect, to run the electronic data processing activities of the Federal Government, a job the General Services Administration cannot do. The bill simply overguns and overkills the electronic data processing problem and could easily make matters worse instead of better. There are problems enough with the experts throughout Government trying to manage electronic data processing, and I cannot see how one service agency could do it.

Let me get down to specifics. H.R. 5171 is intended to take action on the recommendations made in the March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress titled "Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government." The report indicated that the Federal Government potentially could save \$148 million over a 5-year period if it were to purchase rather than lease more of its electronic data processing equipment. The report estimated an additional annual savings of \$100 million if the machines were used more than 5 years.

The Comptroller General recommended also the means of accomplishing the savings. I quote from the letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives which accompanied his report:

We believe that, to fully realize savings of such magnitude, basic changes in the Government's overall management system will be necessary. Decisions as to the financial advantages of purchasing will have to

be made from the standpoint of the Government as a whole, and not primarily from the standpoint of individual using agencies as has been the practice in the past. In addition, more attention needs to be given to obtaining more complete utilization of the equipment acquired. We believe that the only practicable way in which the kind of coordinated management can be practiced to achieve the possible financial savings cited is through the establishment of a small, highly placed central management office in the executive branch of the Government. Accordingly, we are recommending to the President of the United States that he establish such an office in his organization.

I supported the Comptroller General's recommendation in my remarks on the Floor of the House on March 18, 1963.

Now, on the other hand, the report of the House Committee on Government Operations—No. 428—states and I quote:

H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

I want to assure you that it does not.

Page 3 of the report goes on to say:

This authority would be exercised under the overall authority of the Executive Office of the President and, the Bureau of the Budget in the exercise of traditional budgetary and policy control.

In my opinion, this is a complete dilution of what the Comptroller General had in mind.

Still, strangely enough, General Campbell favors the Brooks bill, but he seems to consider it as assigning only house-keeping functions to GSA and still wants the policy guidance in an office in the President's organization. This is covered in General Campbell's testimony before our subcommittee. General Campbell, in his enthusiasm to save money, and each of us wants to do that, somehow overlooks the sweeping provisions of the bill which go far beyond house-keeping functions. This is the great danger in this bill. Some seem to think that it provides for a few essential functions, whereas in actuality the bill gives sweeping authority to the GSA.

For my part, based upon the facts, I submit to the Congress that the Comptroller General's recommendation of a central management office in the President's organization and Brooks bill which places the authority in GSA are two different things. Not only are they different per se, but they are different as a matter of practical application.

A central management office in the President's organization would be in a position to carry out the functions that the Comptroller General has in mind. The President's office is the place to make decisions which affect departments and agencies across the Federal Government. I think you will agree with me that it is to inconceivable to think of the Administrator of the General Services Administration telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science not presently capable of

standardization. Each executive agency has a different problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

It is quite likely that the proponents of the Brooks bill would tell you that the Administrator of GSA would not attempt to tell General Day, for example, about automating the Post Office Department, but I want to point out to you that such authority for the GSA Administrator is specified in the bill where it gives him the control of the utilization of electronic data processing systems.

Similarly, I am certain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], in his bill, does not intend that GSA take over the operation of all of the electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government. Still, H.R. 5171 states that the Administrator of GSA is authorized and directed, among other things, and I quote:

To operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, our Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics has held five hearings during the course of the last month on the subject of the use of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. You will recall also the hearings the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] held on the subject in October 1962. After listening to the testimony in these hearings, I can report to you that there is a lot more to the electronic data processing problem than the Brooks bill covers. Mind you, I am not saying that utilization and acquisition of electronic data processing systems are unimportant, but I am saying that the Brooks bill goes about the task in the wrong way and deals with only one of the many problems involved. This is what we have faced in the electronic data processing area time and again. Someone seizes upon a problem here and seizes upon a problem there and never considers the whole picture. The Brooks bill is a case in point. It deals only with the computer hardware. People in the industry are becoming more and more aware that we have been over-concentrating on computer hardware and that we should start paying some attention to the people who make it go. According to figures supplied by the Department of Defense, for example, we spend just as much money for the personal services in computer work as we do for the machinery.

So, when and if we legislate on the electronic data processing problem, we want to consider the human element, the standardization of this equipment, and improved management in general and not just selected areas.

Some of the other subjects that should be included in action taken on electronic data processing are: A study of pricing to find out why certain relationships exist between purchasing and leasing, improved progress in the use of automatic programming languages, attention to assignment of full responsibility for electronic data processing matters in departments and agencies, attention to the level at which the electronic data processing activity is placed in the

agency's organizational framework, the establishment of indexes for telling us what we are saving by using electronic data processing, and improvement in general of the reporting and statistics relating to electronic data processing equipment.

In opposing the Brooks bill and in asking you to join me in this opposition, I do not mean to ask you to oppose something with nothing. At the next meeting of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is to be held on August 1, as chairman of the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee, I will have a proposal to present for the committee's approval. I can tell you now that at this point in time we do not see the need for legislation. This does not mean that eventually some legislation will not be required, but at the present time we see the need for a high level Presidential appointed group—including Members of Congress, Federal executive agencies, industry, and general public—to place all of these matters under study and to report back to the President and to Congress with their findings. We have already been in touch with representatives of the Budget Bureau concerning this proposal, and I have been informed that Special Projects Funds of the President's office are available for this study. At our August 1 meeting I plan to present for full committee approval a draft of a letter which our chairman—and I hope—with the support of the full committee will send to President Kennedy. I can assure you that these electronic data processing problems require advice and counsel of unquestioned competence and authority—the very best brains that this country can bring to what is now called the electronic revolution.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree with me that it is unreasonable to think of the Administrator of General Services telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science, not presently capable of standardization. Each executive agency has a different problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

I submit that we should have a longer study of this problem before we impose any restrictions or limitations on the development of this wonderful new science.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] that the purpose of this bill is economy and efficiency and to save the American taxpayers some money. There is no intention in the bill to retard the growth of science in the particular field of data processing equipment.

The Federal Government is not involved to any great extent in the devel-

opment of data-processing equipment. The more sophisticated equipment that was referred to by the gentleman from Montana could be easily exempted under this bill, as provided on the bottom of page 2. So I do not think the advance of science in this field is going to be hampered in any respect if we enact this legislation. The end result is that we are going to save a large quantity of money. If there is a special instance involved, a particular piece of equipment can be provided for the agency concerned.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Would the gentleman be in favor of the General Services Administration operating the equipment for the Defense Department and the Space Agency?

Mr. STINSON. Did I understand correctly that the gentleman asked if the GSA should operate the equipment?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The bill says so. That is the objection I have to the bill. It says it shall control and operate the equipment. How about operating equipment designed for the Defense Department for specific purposes of defense?

Mr. STINSON. The legislative intent is not to accomplish that purpose but merely to coordinate the operations of the various pieces of equipment that are scattered throughout the Government and to get full utilization of the equipment.

Mr. GARY. If that is made plain in the bill, I would have no objection to it personally, but I would have to oppose it otherwise.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will say to the gentleman it is not plain in the bill. It cannot be made plain without rewriting the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to give to the membership of this committee the benefit of such special knowledge of this question as I have gained by virtue of my activity on the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

A few weeks ago the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, referred to me for my attention a certain report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General.

This report had been sent to the chairman of my committee by the Comptroller General by a letter of transmittal dated June 11, 1963, and went to considerable length to point out that in the opinion of the General Accounting Office, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had, during a period of over 2 years, made overpayments in excess of a million dollars for rentals on automatic data processing equipment.

In fulfillment of the request of my subcommittee chairman to look into this matter, I conferred for the better part of an afternoon with Mr. D. T. Spaulding, president of the Federal Systems Divi-

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12265

sion of the International Business Machines Corp., and another officer of his company, during which time he was kind enough to acquaint me with the nature of the problem and many of the difficulties involved in an accurate determination of the problem of automatic data processing rental charges.

A few days after our conference, I received a letter from Mr. Spaulding stating that although there were no adequate records in existence upon which to make an accurate assessment in the matter, the IBM Corp. had nevertheless agreed to adjust the matter by paying the sum of \$1,100,000 to the Government.

My discussion of the problem with Mr. Spaulding very soon led me to the conclusion that the matter was far more complex than it seems when it first meets the eye. In the first place, you heard the word "system" used during the discussion on the floor today in the talk about automatic data processing equipment. "System" is really the word for it. I do not have time to go into this fully, but I want to make a slight stab at drawing a parallel.

Let us say we have the mission of giving photographic coverage to a series of events here in Washington. We order movie cameras, flashbulbs, tripods, all sorts of film, miniature cameras, press cameras, many types of lenses, and accessory equipment of various kinds and description.

If we had a particular mission to fulfill, let us say to photograph a parade, we might decide we needed a movie camera but no floodlights and no flashbulbs, a tripod to hold the camera steady and a telephoto lens. We would put those things together and we would have brought into existence a particular camera system which would appropriately serve our mission of photographing a parade.

Every agency of the Government has its own particular mission to perform. To perform that mission they need not only many different kinds of automatic data processing equipment—they need to put together widely variant automatic data processing systems, composed of various combinations of the components that go to make up such systems.

Examples of such components are computers, memory units, power units, multiplexers, and tape drives, many of which are identical. Also there are card punches and card readers, not to mention such items as consoles and magnetic tape.

I serve on the Committee on Astronautics which has to do with NASA and that is why I have come in contact with this problem. But, NASA has no monopoly in this field and neither does any agency. An IBM official was quite frank to say that his company is constantly encountering new problems with reference to the leasing and selling of this equipment to private industry. It is virgin territory. There is much ground that has not been covered, and such difficulties are no reflection upon anyone. But there is a pressing and urgent need for some agency in Government to develop specialized knowl-

edge in this field, and to bring about economic use of these machines. Great waste is possible and I dare say great waste is going on in every department that uses this automatic data processing equipment. I think this bill will enable one agency to develop a competence that will enable it to decide what system may be necessary to perform a given job. The taxpayers stand to benefit greatly by such an arrangement.

I want to ask the chairman of this subcommittee one question. Is it your view that this bill, as now drawn, would enable the General Accounting Office to ride herd upon the mission of any agency in Government?

Mr. BROOKS. May I say in reply to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, that certainly the General Accounting Office as the accounting arm of this Congress has the authority to investigate any agency of Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Let me restate the question. I really did not mean the General Accounting Office, I meant the GSA, the General Services Administration. Is it the opinion of the chairman of this subcommittee that this bill would grant the General Services Administration the power to ride herd on NASA?

Mr. BROOKS. No, not in any way. Actually, to be quite candid about it, the bill would provide the authority to have the General Services Administration act as purchasing agent for the various agencies on the basis of the needs of those agencies and their requirements for these automatic data processing machines, and they would buy the equipment and supply the equipment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Abernethy	Grabowski	O'Brien, Ill.
Ashbrook	Gray	Philbin
Auchincloss	Griffin	Pillion
Bass	Hagen, Calif.	Powell
Belcher	Hansen	Rains
Bonner	Harding	Rooney
Broomfield	Harsha	Roosevelt
Buckley	Healey	Rostenkowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hemphill	Roybal
Clancy	Hoffman	St. Onge
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Schwengel
Clausen	Jones, Ala.	Scott
Don H.	Kilburn	Shelley
Clawson, Del.	Knox	Sheppard
Conte	Landrum	Shiple
Daddario	Latta	Smith, Calif.
Dague	Leggett	Stabler
Derwinski	Lesinski	Stephens
Diggs	Long, La.	Taft
Donohue	Mailliard	Teague, Calif.
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Teague, Tex.
Evins	Mathias	Thompson, La.
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Foreman	Morris	Trimble
Forrester	Morrison	Utt
Giaino	Mosher	Wharton
Gibbons	Moss	White
Gonzalez	Nelsen	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

(Mr. JOHANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

It is never my intention to be disrespectful of either the prerogatives or the performance of any other committee.

In this instant matter, however, I must be very blunt.

In terms of both legislative procedure and the content of this bill, we have a situation reminiscent on two counts of the patent medicine salesman at the carnival.

Procedurewise, we have his "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic.

One single day's hearing was held by the Government Operations Subcommittee on this bill. Two witnesses were heard—the Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of General Services Administration. I should point out that the latter was very much a party of interest, since his agency would acquire the enormous power delegated in this bill.

What is even more to the point and even more shocking in this "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic is that not a single one of the Government agencies nor any representative of private industry who are principal users and suppliers of automatic data processing equipment—including enormously complex and sophisticated automatic data processing systems—was called or heard.

Now the bill comes to the floor of the House under a 1-hour rule.

Furthermore, no real effort was made to correlate the Government Operations Subcommittee action with the very intensive and extensive hearings conducted by the Census and Statistics Subcommittee. While this latter subcommittee has been carrying on hearings and issuing reports on the broad subject of automatic data processing since the 86th Congress, in recent weeks, since the issuance of the Comptroller General's March 6, 1963, report, it has been focusing attention on questions of lease versus purchase and questions of strengthened Government-wide policy for acquisition and utilization of this equipment. This

12266

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

July 18

latter series of hearings was completed only Monday of this week, and the report now is in preparation. Yet, for all practical purposes, the Government Operations Subcommittee has acted as if this subcommittee and its labors had never existed. I know as a matter of fact that it has not even seen the transcripts of hearings in which these matters were fully discussed.

I think it goes considerably beyond any question of jurisdiction to suggest that the Census and Statistics Subcommittee may have some information and judgments in this matter worthy of the consideration of this House. I think it is obvious that this consideration cannot possibly be given under the limitation of time and the cavalier treatment of this complex and costly matter involved in these "Hurry, hurry, hurry" tactics.

I said at the outset that this was reminiscent of the carnival medicine man on two counts. I come now to the second point.

There is not the slightest evidence, either in the 1-day hearings or the committee report of the Government Operations Subcommittee, that the nostrum they are peddling will really cure the ailment.

On the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that it will aggravate rather than alleviate the condition.

Let us take a close look at the patent medicine we are being asked to buy on a "hurry, hurry, hurry" basis.

Let me point out first of all the enormous grant of power which this bill delegates to General Services Administration.

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

The committee report comments, apropos of written objections generously incorporated in the committee's printed hearings, from various agencies, but otherwise totally ignored:

Opposition to H.R. 5171 may center upon a misinterpretation as to the extent of the Administrator's authority.

I see no basis for misinterpretation of the language I read. It is a total grant of authority. Indeed the addition in committee of the words, "or at the expense of" means that GSA authority would extend to automatic data processing equipment in the hands of private contractors doing Government business.

Now let us consider this enormous grant of power in the light of two or three facts:

Under existing laws and regulations GSA already has authority to process Federal supply schedule contracts for lease of ADP equipment. This means it does the routine work necessary to implement equipment requirements of the respective agencies. What has been the GSA record on this score? I read from the June, 1962, report of the Comptroller General:

In the past, several months have elapsed between the expiration of 1 year's schedule

contracts for the rental of electronic automatic data processing equipment and award of the next year's contract. During these months, no contract terms were in effect. When the new contracts were awarded, the terms were made retroactive to the effective date. These time lapses have caused difficulties such as, (1) unnecessary administrative expense for GSA and the Agencies using the contracts and (2) problems in the areas of budgeting, purchasing, paying, and maintaining machine utilization records in the Agencies using the contracts.

I am informed that such delay cost one important supplier \$500,000.

This is the record of GSA in handling the paperwork. I submit that it does not recommend transfer of vastly broader, substantive authority to GSA.

Consider another aspect of the matter. During the one day hearing conducted by the Government Operations Subcommittee, Mr. Boutin, the GSA Administrator, was asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], this pertinent question:

Do you have in GSA at the present time personnel who are capable of analyzing these tremendously difficult machines and these difficult processes and the varying needs of this department or that department?

Mr. Boutin replied:

We do have substantial in-house capability right now * * * how many additional people would be required, I could not tell you. It would be minimal.

The facts are that Mr. Boutin further testified that GSA now has 481 persons in the agency for its own automatic data processing operations. Let me say right now that this agency which is going to save the Government millions of dollars by purchasing these computers has never purchased one itself. In fact, the 10 computers it has on hand at the present time are all leased. To suggest that the vast functions involved in exercise of the Government-wide control of automatic data processing called for in this bill would involve only a minimal increase in GSA personnel is too preposterous to even argue. Either this bill means nothing, or Mr. Boutin fails to comprehend the responsibility he would acquire, or he was something less than frank with the committee.

One further point. The Comptroller General, in recommending "overall policy guidance and direction" of automatic data processing, proposed that it be directed from the Office of the President.

This led to the following colloquy between Mr. Boutin and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], as follows:

MR. BOUTIN. We have a close and everyday liaison with the President and his Office.

MR. BROOKS. You do not think he would be reluctant to call you and say, "Bernie, we have got to get together on this now." You would be there.

MR. BOUTIN. It is not unusual to have the telephone ring and have the voice come on and say, "This is the President" and go right into what he has in mind. He is not bashful.

Time does not permit further comment on this exchange.

The heart of this issue goes to the distinction between overall policy guidance—which I may say, under the prod-

dings of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, the Comptroller General, and the Bureau of the Budget, is presently being provided and constantly improved—and actual planning, acquisition, and operation of this equipment by a central agency.

Remember we are talking not just about simple punchcard machines. We are talking about complex automatic data processing systems used by the Atomic Energy Commission, by the Department of Defense for defense against nuclear attack, and also by NASA.

With this fact in mind, it seems to me obvious that the views of departments and agencies responsible for scientific and technical use of this equipment are not only highly relevant but absolutely essential. It seems to me that their views need to be explored in depth and not handled in the perfunctory fashion of routine letters introduced into the appendix of the hearings record. Evidently, the Government Operations Subcommittee does not share this view.

The Census' Subcommittee does hold this view, however, and I include a few excerpts of testimony which have been given before the subcommittee.

One statement was made on June 24 by Mr. John P. Abbadessa, the Controller of the Atomic Energy Commission:

Implementation of a program should rest with the agency that has responsibility for the program. In the AEC, a large percentage of our computer work is done in the scientific area. These are very complicated machines and complex applications. We cannot conceive that a central group elsewhere in the Government could discharge this responsibility efficiently.

As to control of contractors by such a central group he added that he felt it would result in administrative costs that could outweigh any economies that would be gained.

On July 15 in response to my questioning on the proposal incorporated in this bill, Mr. John D. Young, the Director of Administration for NASA, voiced his emphatic opposition. He said that he believed the effect would be to diffuse responsibility and accountability. He urged further clarification of guidelines by the Budget Bureau, and continuation of the work that GAO is doing.

And then Mr. Young added this significant comment:

I think that if tight control were given to the GSA or to the Bureau of the Budget in terms of our use of computers, there is a real question, in fact there would be no question that we could not meet flight schedules at the rate that we are trying to meet flight schedules today.

Here are just a few more comments taken from testimony by department and agency representatives before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee.

Mr. Harold Seidman, Acting Assistant Director, Office of Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget:

I would strongly object to any arrangement whereby the control of automatic data processing equipment was put in some agency other than the one responsible for its operations.

Mr. A. T. Bishop, staff director, Data Systems Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense:

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12267

We are aware of certain proposals which would greatly centralize control over the acquisition, management, utilization, maintenance and operation of all automatic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. Performance of these responsibilities is a prerequisite to effective control over operating Defense programs. The Department opposes such proposals which would vest these responsibilities in another agency and interfere with vital command relationships.

Mr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Programs and Standards, Civil Service Commission:

In view of the very size and complexity of Government operations, I personally would tend to shy away from any heavy emphasis on centralization of such processes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe my record in this House will justify any suspicion that I am hostile to economy or that I favor bureaucratic proliferation, expansionism, or empire building.

We are getting a fast sell on this bill on the alleged grounds that it will prevent waste and improve efficiency of automatic data processing operations.

I think we had better take a second look. I think we need to remember we are dealing with something a little more complex than procurement of paper clips.

Otherwise, we may find to our sorrow that we are compounding instead of curing the evils which concern us all.

There is an old warning about rushing in where angels fear to tread.

I think that warning is appropriate this afternoon. Again, I urge defeat of H.R. 5171.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I agree completely with the position taken by the gentleman. And, is it not a fact that the General Services Administration will have complete control over the operation of these machines and the purchase of these machines, whatever department is involved?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is precisely what the bill says, and there cannot be anything else under this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. And further than that, the General Services Administration charges 10 percent commission on everything they purchase for any other agency. They then take that money, put it into their own fund and spend it at will without asking Congress. So, to that degree you have back-door spending in this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. There is a great deal involved from the financing angle in this bill that needs to see the light of day before we vote on it.

Mr. JENSEN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, to my memory every time in the past any agency asks to reorganize and buy such machinery, they say it will save personnel. However, the record shows that the very next year they ask for more people.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman tell us how many departments of Government are opposed to the bill? I have found some here, but I am wondering if the gentleman would list them for us.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I can tell the gentleman from Texas from my own knowledge that these include the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA, among others. I know about that many.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and also to commend its author, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has a nose like a bloodhound for searching out waste and inefficiency in Government. And when he finds waste he expresses himself in a salty way which does not always endear him to the bureaucrats who are more interested in preserving their particular petty empires than they are in rendering service to the taxpayers at the least cost.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] is a member of a subcommittee, the members of which, on both sides of the aisle, are dedicated to the proposition that it is sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of service for each dollar of tax he pays. You or I might disagree about whether the Federal Government should embark upon a particular new program, but we can all agree that any program which the Government does carry on should be carried out as efficiently as humanely possible. We can all agree to support a savings of dollars which does not reduce any essential Government service. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economy vote. But it does not involve any philosophical concept other than the concept of efficiency in Government. This bill represents a \$100 million a year savings. As soon as this program becomes fully effective it will mean a savings of \$100 million per year.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I thought it was sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of Government service for every dollar's worth of tax he pays. If this expensive equipment is not used on a three-shift basis, the taxpayer does not receive 100 cents on his dollar. But what are the facts? Twenty-four percent of this equipment is used only on a two-shift basis. The taxpayer is getting only 67 cents worth of Government out of each dollar of taxes. But even worse than that, 70 percent of this equipment is only used on a one-shift basis, one-third of the time which it should economically be used. Therefore the taxpayer is getting only 33 cents worth of services out of his tax dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sinful waste of the taxpayer's money, and I be-

lieve that H.R. 5171 should be enacted in order to eliminate this sin.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a few moments ago that this was a hurry, hurry, hurry bill. The investigation in regard to electronic data processing equipment in executive agencies was begun back in 1958 and a report was delivered to the Congress in 1960. I carry here to the well of the House with me four reports that we have received on the Government Operations Committee from the General Accounting Office with respect to the use of this equipment by executive agencies for the purposes of effecting savings. I would not be standing here, you can believe me, Mr. Chairman, if I did not firmly believe that this would effect savings of not less than \$100 million.

Are we going to concede that private industry can have electronic data processing centers and utilize these machines full time, but the Federal Government is not capable of that action? That is essentially what we are deciding here today. Certainly, the individual agencies do not want to surrender the control they have over this equipment, the spending of the money which goes into automatic data processing equipment and the employees who operate it. But is that efficiency? Efficiency means for us to provide the maximum for the dollar paid by the taxpayers, and the maximum use of this equipment by the fewest number of employees.

GAO made one investigation in the Chicago area with regard to the distribution of VA checks. When they put in the electronic data processing equipment they consolidated six regional offices. Now they have one office instead of six. What else happened? They lost 76 employees. That is too bad. But this example shows how coordinating use of automatic data processing equipment can result in an efficient operation, and that is what we are trying to accomplish here today.

I do not know how long we must study these problems in order to come up with an answer, but it seems to me that 3, 4, or 5 years ought to be enough. We have received reports from the General Accounting Office which we have had an opportunity to study and read. Thereafter, the General Accounting Office recommendations have been put in the form of a bill which we have here today and which we should be able to act on and we should act favorably on this bill.

Another objection has been made to certain language in this bill with regard to delegating authority. That is an essential part of the bill and should remain. If the GSA were not permitted to delegate authority to the Department of Defense with respect to its own specific automatic data processing equipment, we would be shortchanging the Department of Defense. Also, we have provided that GSA may operate such equipment just as all the other agencies can operate it. The GSA may operate such equip-

12268

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18

ment for itself or for other agencies. These are the essential parts of the bill.

Now, these are essentially the objections that have been cited. The committee has considered all of these objections, and we adopted this bill as a full committee. We are now recommending the bill to the Congress for enactment for the purpose of saving not less than \$100 million.

We should be interested in that.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not aware that GSA is already operating some 10 units of its own and this allocation of authority to operate is on a Government-wide basis, not with respect only to GSA?

Mr. McCLORY. This is in a proviso which applies to GSA. There would not be any harm in GSA operating the equipment, if it could do it, for other agencies of the Government.

The Space Agency uses electronic data processing equipment. The use of ADP equipment by all Federal agencies was investigated and reported to the Congress in 1960.

According to that report the Department of Defense had most of these machines or systems. They had 626 out of 1,006. Now that total has gone up to 1,200 systems, as they say. But there is no reason why the Department of Defense cannot keep theirs. That is why the authority is given in the bill to delegate to the Department of Defense and all other agencies to lease, purchase, maintain, and operate automatic data processing equipment. This is essential under a clear interpretation of the bill.

This is a good bill, and it should be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this saving of \$100 million presuppose the use of this equipment by the various centers working on a round-the-clock basis?

Mr. McCLORY. On a much fuller basis. That is the recommendation of GAO. If we are not going to accept the recommendation of GAO to effect savings, then we better find some other agency to look to. This amount of \$100 million is the figure given us by GAO.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not come close to answering my question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am intensely interested in anything that affects the Post Office Department. It appears to me that this bill, giving authority to the Administrator of the General Services Administration over automatic data processing equipment, places authority outside of the Post Office Department to make decisions about and to generally interfere with postal opera-

tions. I could not possibly agree with such an arrangement.

I should like to read a letter dated May 9, 1963, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget from Frederick C. Belen, Acting Postmaster General, in which Mr. Belen comments on H.R. 5171.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1963.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: This is in reply to the request of the Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, for the views of this Department with respect to H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

The use of electronic data processing the establishment of a central control organization for the procurement or management of electronic data processing equipment for all Federal agencies.

The use of electronic data processing equipment is vital to the day-to-day conduct of the Post Office Department business and is considered to be an essential administrative sanction of the Department.

While the bill would permit the Administrator of General Services Administration, in his discretion, to delegate the control of electronic data processing equipment in certain cases, we believe that because an exceptionally high degree of responsiveness to the data processing needs of the Department is required, it is imperative that all phases of administrative management of the equipment, personnel, job schedules, and contact with vendors remain under the direct control of the Postmaster General or his designated representative.

This Department is currently participating in the experimental regional sharing plan for electronic computers sponsored by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department intends to continue in this effort in order to help secure maximum utilization of data processing equipment. However, it is not considered advisable to relinquish authority over the management of this function since data processing services are fundamental responsibilities of the Postmaster General.

This Department would not be opposed to the establishment of an electronic data processing fund provided such fund is available for the purchase of electronic data processing equipment if an economic evaluation of the relative costs of lease against purchase indicates that it is to the best advantages of the Government to purchase equipment and further, that the fund is available to support extraordinary one-time expenses for data processing services which may from time to time occur.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. BELEN,
Acting Postmaster General.

I fully support Mr. Belen's remarks and I daresay this bill would have a similar unfavorable effect on most of the executive departments and independent agencies. Letters of the type of Mr. Belen's from the various departments and agencies bear me out on this.

Mr. Chairman, we would do great damage to the automatic data processing program of the Federal Government by passing this bill. H.R. 5171 certainly should not pass the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield

4 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this bill. As most of you probably know, the Treasury Department has been a leader in the use of electronic data processing equipment. As chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriations for the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department, I have been working on the problem of data processing equipment for a long, long time.

By the use of data processing equipment in the Treasury Department we have saved millions of dollars; and I mean literally millions of dollars. Without the use of electronic equipment in the Post Office Department the vastly increased volume of mail could not be handled today. About 2 years ago we gave to the Bureau of the Budget, whose appropriations are also handled by our subcommittee, \$50,000 to study the very questions covered by this bill.

Frankly, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but I think it goes too far. I think we need a central agency to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of this equipment, because as it is now, with each department making its own contracts with the manufacturers, they cannot secure as favorable contracts as a central agency could negotiate.

But this bill says, and I read:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate—

That is all right—

and control—

What?—

the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, to give the General Services Administration the right to use and operate this equipment in the Department of Defense, in the Atomic Energy Commission, in NASA, in the Treasury Department, in my judgment is absolutely all wrong. What do they know about operating this machinery in the Defense Department? Instead of saving money they would have to have technicians who are familiar with the technical aspects of every department of the Government.

This machinery is scattered all over the United States. We are not dealing with just a few machines here in the city of Washington. They are broadly scattered. Right now the Internal Revenue Service is establishing data processing machinery in their seven regional centers for processing income tax returns. They requested nine but our subcommittee recommended reducing the number to seven, which will save several million dollars. This equipment will be set up in each of those seven regions. Now, is the General Services Administration going to have people in each of those regions to control the operation of that machinery? If so, they will have to employ numerous,

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12269

technicians. If the words "control" and "use" and "operate" are stricken from the bill I will vote for it. I think we need some central agency to coordinate the purchase, leasing, and maintenance. But unless some amendment is adopted to strike out the control, use, and operation by the General Service Administration I shall be compelled to vote against it. I think it is fantastic to talk about giving the General Services Administration control over the use of this machinery in the Department of Defense or in the Central Intelligence Agency, and other sensitive agencies of the Government.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished colleague who just preceded me made an eloquent case for the legislation. There is very little I can add to that case except to say this: that the question of central purchasing and the question of standardization has been a problem which has plagued all levels of the government starting with the municipality, to the Federal Government.

When you get to a budget the size of the one which we must consider here, the problem of central purchasing and standardization is so gigantic as to shake your imagination.

In our Committee on Government Operations we have been dealing with this problem, as have other committees of this body, for a considerable time. I forget the exact number of items used by the Federal Government, but as I recall it is over 3 million. The problem of standardization is so complex that by the time you standardize you have so many new items of inflow into the pipeline that you cannot keep up with the standardization.

In an effort to save money everyone is in agreement on the desirability and necessity of central purchasing. True, these machines are not of the same category as screwdrivers, yet it has been admitted here that you can within the limit of a single agency make more efficient and more economical use of these machines by proper programming and otherwise. It makes good business sense to adopt these practices within the agency itself. Why is it not good business, good sense, and good logic to do so on a Government-wide basis where applicable, where necessary, and where feasible? That is what we seek to do with this legislation.

Certainly the equipment suppliers would love to have the competition that exists now among all the agencies of Government. Certainly every agency of Government would like to have the best and the newest of equipment, whatever it is, no matter how little they utilize it in space or time. But this is not economic.

I do not mean by that that we ought to eliminate the right of the agency to have its own requirements. The bill specifically provides that they submit their requirements and the purchasing will be done to meet those requirements. But that does not mean that where practicable and possible, if there is a common use or machines can be put to a common use, the General Services Ad-

ministration should not have the authority at least to try to make this kind of common-use purchase, this kind of common-use leasing, and this kind of common-use management.

No one anticipates that in cases of special military requirements men are going to be taken out of uniform and civilians from the General Services Administration will be sent down to the various stations and posts to operate the machines. That is not the intent of the legislation.

Therefore, I would submit that the theory of central purchasing which the Hoover Commission tried so hard for so many years to get into Government, and that our own committee has fought for so diligently, should be put into effect. Here is a brand new area, expanding like a mushroom, where the bureaus and agencies themselves, the General Accounting Office and others, have recognized that we must do something now before it gets out of hand, before all of these new systems get into the agencies and are fixed to the point where you will never have the opportunity to achieve standardization or common use. The time is now to get some action on this problem. That is all we seek to do.

I have cosponsored this legislation by my bill H.R. 7559 and I urge the passage of it by this House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, in considering the various proposals contained in H.R. 5171, it is important that we recognize the significance of placing the coordination and control of all federal electronic data processing equipment under the General Services Administration. In addition we must recognize the far-ranging effects of this bill on the executive agencies and private industry as well as the projected saving indicated by the General Accounting Office.

The General Services Administration has a difficult time controlling and administering its own internal data processing system now. Should we burden it further with the task of coordinating the programs of other agencies? It is beyond estimation at this time how large a staff will be required by GSA to administer the program proposed here. Furthermore, the agencies using the equipment would completely lose their prerogative to select the equipment which will best perform a particular job. This is particularly important when the Nation's security is involved as it is in the defense and space efforts.

This bill will also have a detrimental effect on the competitive spirit which is only now developing in the computer industry. Contrary to the point of view of the Comptroller General in the hearings on this bill, it is not always to the best advantage of the Government to purchase automatic data processing equipment, nor is it always wise to use the equipment 24 hours a day. There are many situations in which it will be to our advantage to reexamine the competitive equipment available and select new computer hardware instead of purchasing existing equipment. The Government must examine the feasibility of purchase in each individual case.

The enactment of this legislation would bring about a huge windfall to

the company which presently is the largest supplier of systems. This would discourage competition in the industry and lock that company in for an indefinite period of time.

Finally, the legislation would, I think, discourage technological advancements. The purchase of existing equipment would prevent for some time Federal Government participation in the fruits of the imaginative and productive research now carried on by all companies in the computer field.

I must therefore, Mr. Chairman, oppose this measure. It will not bring about in the long run the savings claimed for it and it may instead set back the cause of progress in this vital contemporary industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment. Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the Administrator through purchase, lease, transfer of equipment from other Federal agencies, or otherwise and the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the maintenance and repair of such equipment. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section the Administrator is authorized to transfer electronic data processing equipment between Federal agencies, to require joint utilization of such equipment by two or more Federal agencies, and to establish equipment pools and data processing centers for such joint use when necessary for its most efficient and effective utilization: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate (1) general classes of equipment, (2) equipment of special design needed to fulfill some unique requirement or special purpose of a particular Federal agency, and (3) equipment necessary for national defense and security.

"There is hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury, an electronic data processing fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for expenses, including personal services, other costs, and the procurement by lease, purchase, transfer, or otherwise of equipment, maintenance and repair of such equipment by contract or otherwise, necessary for the efficient coordination, operation, utilization of such equipment by and for Federal agencies.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to said fund such sums as may be required which, together with the value, as determined by the Administrator, of supplies and equipment from time to time transferred to the Administrator, less any liabilities assumed, shall constitute the capital of the fund: *Provided*, That said fund shall be credited with (1) advances and reimbursements from available appropriations and funds of any agency (including the General Services Administration), organization, or

12270

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18

persons utilizing such equipment and services rendered them, at rates determined by the Administrator to approximate the costs thereof met by the fund (including depreciation of equipment, provision for accrued leave, and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges and for amortization of installation costs, but excluding, in the determination of rates prior to the fiscal year 1966, such direct operating expenses as may be directly appropriated for, which expenses may be charged to the fund and covered by advances or reimbursements from such direct appropriations) and (2) refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of or damage to property: *Provided further*, That following the close of each fiscal year any net income, after making provisions for prior year losses, if any, shall be transferred to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Sec. 111." insert "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misunderstanding about these committee amendments, I should like to explain what they are, and then I intend to ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

Other than changing subsection designations and other minor typographical changes, the basic changes made by the committee are these.

We changed the word "electronic" to "automatic" to include punchcard and other nonelectronic equipment as well as electronic data processing components in the coverage.

Second, it is made specifically clear in the bill that reports on the funding, with reference to those matters involving the revolving fund, would go to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress and any excess of funds that is not used would be returned to the Treasury.

The other basic change in the legislation which was included at the suggestion of the Comptroller General is that coverage under the bill would include that equipment which the U.S. Government buys and pays for incident to execution of contracts and agreements.

Mr. Chairman, basically that is what the committee amendments do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and, following that, I would say to the membership I hope to see an amendment offered, possibly by my distin-

guished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, to remove the word "control" and the word "use" from page 1 of the bill because that has apparently upset many of the people who otherwise are as dedicated as I am to save that \$100 million a year and thereby increase the efficiency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then is my understanding correct that the amendment relating to the deletion of the word "control" and the word "use" is to come later on?

Mr. BROOKS. I understand that such an amendment will be offered and I would be delighted to discuss the amendment at that time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas in regard to his explanation of these amendments.

Do I understand that the individual agencies will have to justify their request under the terms of these amendments on a yearly basis for new equipment? Let us take, for example, the Social Security Administration where we have had a large outlay each year from the social security trust fund for data processing equipment. I think the gentleman from Texas is familiar with the operation we have in Baltimore and the additions at the Baltimore center for the Social Security Administration. This is equipment that has been worked many, many hours and the Bureau of the Budget in their reports and the Comptroller General has found this to be one of the best Government equipment operations in the country. Presently, the Social Security Administration has to come in and justify on a yearly basis any new additions to this equipment complex. Does the amendment that you ask to be considered en bloc with the other committee amendments provide that the Social Security Administration will have to come in on a yearly basis and justify in their appropriation requests any additions to this computer equipment?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank the gentleman for that question because the answer is, of course, "Yes." Under this bill a given agency if they wanted an additional computer capacity would have to get authorization and appropriations through the appropriate committees of the Congress to cover the cost of the additional ADP capacity required during the fiscal year. With an authorization and an appropriation from the Congress the agency would then put in a request to the GSA for the automatic data computing equipment which would give them the required capacity to meet their needs. So the answer to the gentleman's question is, "Yes, every dollar would be approved by the appropriations committee."

I might add with reference to this revolving fund in the General Services Administration, reports would be made to the Committee on Appropriations. Also, any excess of funds resulting from savings from the operation within the

agencies would revert back to the Treasury of the United States on an annual basis.

Mr. LAIRD. The GSA cannot tap the revolving fund unless the individual agency has saved the money in their annual appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They would be operating under the Committee on Appropriations as they are now.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. On the bottom of page 2, the committee amendment in italics, do I understand that this is based on the premise and the presupposition that under this bill the authority to delegate authority will be vested in GSA; is that correct?

Is that the premise of this amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; on the basis of the justification which is laid out in the succeeding line. Let me see if I can be of some further assistance to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Line 23 goes on to explain that they could eliminate from the performance of this bill, in the discretion of GSA authority, any individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or for the security or defense of this country.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman a further question: If it is proposed and if it should be voted by this House—and I will oppose the amendment when it is offered to strike out the words "control" and "use"—how can you then preserve to GSA power and authority which has been delegated?

Mr. BROOKS. We would only be changing slightly the delegation—the authority and power—that is authorized in the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, what will this power and authority amount to if you are going to eliminate the key words "use" and "control"?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman understands that we are trying in this legislation—this is the concept of it—to have the different agencies and the Government to work together in an effort to achieve both efficiency and economy. I think this is a mutual purpose that we all feel. I think the agencies do. I give the people in the bureaus that credit, as I hope they give to me. Even without the words "control" and "use" this bill would give this one agency of the Government, the GSA, the responsibility for coordinating and otherwise providing for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by the Federal departments and agencies. It is not a very complex matter to describe. It means that there will be one agency to buy and lease this equipment at the best possible deal in

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12271

order to see if the equipment can be made available to all agencies to meet their needs on a reasonable and more economic basis.

This is a recommendation that I did not dream up, but is a recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States. He, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, is a distinguished Republican appointed some years ago as Comptroller General to a 15-year term, and he has worked on this for some years. This has not been a hasty recommendation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Do I understand that there is now before the committee a unanimous consent request to consider the amendments en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "by" add a comma and the following: "or at the expense of."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct some questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the meaning and import of the words in this amendment "or at the expense of."

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, it means "or at the expense of the U.S. Government."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me be more specific. I want to be very clear as to what I am driving at. Does not this amendment specifically mean that the powers that are granted in this bill to the GSA will be extended to all contractors in private industry operating on Government contracts?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, I do not believe that would follow, sir.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think it is very clear, and I think it was brought out in the hearings, that it was for the specific purpose, and I will ask any of the gentlemen of the committee who are here from the Committee on Census and Statistics if it was not the understanding that it was specifically for the purpose of expanding this authority to cover Government contracts?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Do I understand by the gentleman's line of questioning that he is opposed to the contractors who use this equipment paying for the use of it?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course not. My point is I want to know just what the outer reaches of authority that we are granting to GSA are. I want to know how prodigious a job GSA is going to be doing without any addition or at least with a minimum of addition of personnel. It is my clear recollection in reading the committee report that the purpose of this was to include controls of the acquisition and the use and operation of this type of equipment by non-Government agencies operating under Government contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and", and immediately after line 3 insert the following:

"(b) Automatic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, beginning in line 17, strike out "(1)" and what follows thereafter down through page 2, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment, when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1966, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate automatic data processing equipment to the various Federal agencies to the extent necessary and desirable to allow for the orderly implementation of this utilization program."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say if we do not grant the kind of total power, czar authority, to the agency that is written into section 111(a), it will not be necessary to start adopting amendments to give part of it back. I directly and particularly emphasize the fact that this amendment does not in any way alter the fact that the discretion rests with the GSA Administrator.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the quotation mark at the beginning of the line, insert "(c)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike "Treasury," and insert in lieu thereof "Treasury".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike the word "agencies," and insert the following: "agencies: Provided, That a report of receipts, disbursements, and transfers to miscellaneous receipts, under this authorization shall be made annually in connection with the budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after the quotation marks at the beginning of line 6, insert "(d)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike out "less any liabilities assumed,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "persons" and insert in lieu thereof "contractor".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "receipts," and insert "receipts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 7 add the following new subsection:

"(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) (63 Stat. 383), the provisions of section 602(d) (63 Stat. 401), and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377), or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes

12272

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18

and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, in line 20, strike the period, insert a comma, and the following: "and the inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions regulating the operation of the automatic data processing fund, or limiting the expenditures therefrom, is hereby authorized".

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would permit limitations in appropriation acts against the use of the funds in the revolving fund. As this bill is now drawn there is a revolving fund set up and the General Services Administration has authority to make purchases whether authorized by the committees or not. It takes the control away from the Congress and they can go ahead. Under the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], there is a provision that they must report the receipts, disbursements, and transfers to "Miscellaneous receipts." Under this authorization the report shall be made annually in connection with budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. All they have to do is report to the Congress what they spend. If they go ahead and spend beyond what the Congress might think is necessary, there is no limitation. All this amendment I am offering does is permit, in the inclusion of appropriation acts, a provision regulating the operation of the automatic data processing funds. It puts a regulation upon this fund and also permits limiting expenditures so that there can be a limitation if they have gone too far. You see, actually, what this section (c) on page 3 does, and I am sure it was not the intent of the committee to do so, but what it actually does is to give to the General Services Administration the opportunity to go out and buy without any opportunity for the Congress to look it over.

In the subcommittee of which I am a member we have the Weather Bureau coming up before us, and every year we have a question of automatic data processing machines. This would mean they would no longer come to us but the General Services Administration could go out and buy and make a report to us. Then if we did not like it there is not much we could do about it, but if this amendment is adopted it gives the Congress an opportunity to do something about it and to exercise control. I think if we could save \$100 million this is fine, but I think this amendment locks the door in a way and keeps within the Congress control of expenditures rather than delegating to the head of the General Services Administration the opportunity of going out and making the expenditures and only reporting to us and giving us an opportunity of saying, "You should not have

done it," but that is all. This will give us the opportunity to make a decision and give control to the Congress and I think we should maintain this control.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me say to my distinguished and able friend from Ohio, an important member of the Appropriations Committee which has dealt with this matter for many years, that I appreciate the motive behind his amendment. If the gentleman would yield a little further to me, I would just like to explain that there is no intention that any given agency would not have to get clearance from the legislative committee and from the appropriate subcommittee of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations with full authority over any requests. These funds would go then to the General Services Administration's automatic data processing revolving fund. When funds were taken from the revolving fund GSA would justify it. I do not believe there is any conflict between our ultimate aim of seeing that the Congress has a check on what is done. The Appropriations Committee will have one check, and this amendment as I see it would give them another check.

I want to thank the gentleman for what I think would be a constructive contribution to this legislation. It will give Congress a determined and clear check on every dollar that is spent by this agency or any other for automatic data processing equipment, as it should be.

Mr. BOW. I understand the gentleman is accepting the amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Does the language the gentleman offers authorize language in the appropriation act which would not be otherwise authorized?

Mr. BOW. No, I think not; it would have to be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone can find fault with the objectives of this bill but I believe that the bill was introduced rather hastily, that certain agencies of the Government were not given an opportunity to present their views to the committee as is evidenced by the report, wherein the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Treasury Department, and many others who are the biggest users of these kinds of machines were not given an opportunity to appear before the committee and whose adverse views, including those of the Bureau of the Budget, are expressed in that report.

The National Aeronautics and Space

Administration does not have here a letter in the report opposing this bill because it did not have an opportunity to get one in. It was only yesterday that I got a letter from Mr. Webb opposing the legislation or opposing the passage of the legislation in its present form.

Many of my colleagues in the House do not need to be reminded that these agencies use scientific computers and more sophisticated machines. They are not bookkeeping machines for payroll or inventory purposes. There is a great deal of difference between them. These machines are sophisticated. They must be under the control of the people who are using them and they cannot be turned over for other purposes successfully.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true of the warning system devices, is not that so?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is true; and the Post Office Department and many others. The Weather Bureau has been mentioned here. These are some of the specialized machines that are used. The Department of Defense is in opposition to it for that reason, not that they do not want to see this done, but I think the best thing that could happen to this bill is to have it returned to the committee with instructions to go into the matter more thoroughly and give these important scientific agencies of Government a chance to plead their case before the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am alone in this, but I find that I am not. There are quite a few who are not experts in this field and who do not understand all of the ramifications of it. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he and others here who are concerned with the national security feel that this would not be to the best interests of the country; is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. If that be true, and the objective gained of trying to save some money, in which all of us are interested—and I am just seeking advice because, as I say, I do not know a great deal about this—why would it not be a good idea to amend this bill to exempt the Department of Defense, as suggested by the gentlemen interested in this subject, such as the distinguished gentleman from California who is now addressing the House? I just throw that out for what it is worth.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think this would be good, but who is going to say what agencies should be exempted from the bill? I can name a dozen. Maybe some of them should not be in; maybe some should be out. We just have not had time to study the matter properly. It is a complicated bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12273

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made and the position he has taken. I ask him again if under the circumstances he does not agree it is a matter of futility to try to rewrite this bill dealing with so complex a matter on the floor of the House? Would not the reasonable, logical solution be to send it back to the committee and have the full and exhaustive exploration the subject deserves?

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman. You cannot write the bill on the floor of the House, and in its present form it is not a good bill.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C. July 17, 1963.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astro-
nautics, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This replies to your request for the views of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the bill, H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies." The bill is on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives, and this report is directed to the form of the bill in which it appears on that calendar. We understand that it is scheduled for debate tomorrow, July 18, 1963. Due to the urgency of your request, time has not permitted the submission of this report to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President.

H.R. 5171 would, through the addition of a new section 111 to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, provide for the assumption by the Administrator of General Services of responsibility for the acquisition, maintenance, and use of most, if not all, automatic data processing equipment required by agencies of the Federal Government for both in-house and contracted automatic data processing activity.

Among the more important aspects of the legislation are provisions under which:

1. The General Services Administration would be made responsible for providing automatic data processing equipment "suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies"; to carry out this responsibility the General Services Administration could not only buy or lease equipment, but could transfer equipment between agencies, require its joint utilization, and establish pools and data processing centers.

2. The General Services Administration could delegate its authority to acquire and utilize "individual automatic data processing systems or specific units" when necessary "for the economy and efficiency of operations" or where "essential to defense or security."

3. The program would be financed by a revolving fund into which agencies using automatic data processing equipment would make advances and reimbursements to pay for services rendered.

4. Provisions of law inconsistent with the purposes of H.R. 5171 would be made inapplicable.

5. Under Section 111(a), the Administrator of the General Services Administration would be authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equip-

ment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies. The wording of this passage is so broad that not only "in-house" automatic data processing and automatic data processing work contracted out as such, but also apparently any contract or procurement, the performance of which entails any automatic data processing, could be scrutinized by the General Services Administration for "economy and efficiency" of equipment utilization.

6. Section 111(b) would direct that ADP equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the General Services Administration. It is not clear whether the General Services Administration would merely act as an administrative intermediary in providing all types of ADP equipment requested by an agency or whether the provision would effectively lodge in the General Services Administration the authority to review agency requests for equipment and to approve, modify, or deny them by determining that the equipment requested is, or is not, "suitable for efficient and effective use." If the latter situation should develop, the provision might seriously impede, rather than aid, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in discharging operative responsibilities set forth in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended. Section 203 of the Space Act requires, for example, that NASA arrange for participation by the scientific community in planning specialized scientific measurements and observations, and authorizes the Administration to enter into those "contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of its work and on such terms as it may deem appropriate." For those projects requiring ADP the statutory grant set forth in the Space Act would be severely circumscribed were the General Services Administration assigned a share in deciding whether the ADP equipment requested for a given project was "suitable for efficient and effective use" or whether the "joint utilization" of the equipment with other Federal agencies was necessary and proper under the circumstances.

As of June 30, 1963, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had an inventory of 118 general-purpose digital computer systems ranging from 25 very large systems to small "desk" computers available for the direct use of individual scientists and engineers in their daily activities. Only 7 of the 118 computer systems are used full time for administrative applications. The remainder are used on substantive scientific and engineering tasks required by NASA programs. The latter can be classified into five broad areas: (1) theoretical and analytical investigations; (2) engineering studies; (3) simulation; (4) space flight operations; and (5) processing scientific and engineering experimental data. Several days ago, Mr. Edmond C. Buckley, Director of NASA's Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition, submitted to the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a statement on the scientific and technical uses of computers in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides a rather complete report on this subject which you might find helpful. I am enclosing a copy for your use.

From the foregoing and the attachment, it appears that the scientific and technical use and management of computers cannot be separated from the responsibility for conducting the national space program. The bill would necessarily have the effect of fragmenting and watering down that responsibility. Accordingly, I see no alternative but to recommend that NASA be exempted from the terms of the bill.

In this connection, reference is made to the exemption in section of the Federal

Property and Administrative Services Act, section 602(d) (40 U.S.C., sec. 474). This section provides that "Nothing in this Act shall impair or affect any authority of * * * (3) any executive agency named in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, and the head thereof, with respect to the administration of said Act." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is such an agency. Section 111(e) of H.R. 5171 would make this exemption unavailable since it declares that—

"(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) * * * the provisions of section 602(d) and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

Accordingly, we suggest and recommend that section 111(e) of the bill be modified to read:

"(e) Any provision of law inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable; *Provided*, however, that section 111 shall have no application for any purpose to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government enumerated in section 2304 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, 10 U.S.C. 2303."

Sincerely yours,
JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARY

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gary: Page 1, line 7, after "coordinate and" strike out "control the" and insert "provide for the economic and efficient".

Page 1, line 7, after "lease," insert "and".

Page 1, line 8, strike out the comma and the words "and use".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "operate or".

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely takes care of the suggestions I made during my remarks on the bill. It strikes out the control, use, and operation of this equipment by the General Services Administration. With the amendment the section would read:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have talked with the gentleman from Virginia. I think everybody agrees that if there is a coordination program no one is trying to force anyone to do things. We would like to encourage them to save this \$100 million instead of building their little empires. But I do not think there is anything devastating about this amendment. I think there might be difficulty in this word "operate." I believe we would be very wise not to try to strike the word "operate" on page 2. If you strike the words "control" and "use" you will give the Administrator authority to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic

12274

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18

data processing equipment by or at the expense of Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

I think they sometimes may need to operate this equipment. I think to strike it from the language of the bill would be inappropriate. I would offer a substitute which would only strike the words "control the" and strike the word "use."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman and to the chairman, I do not think striking the word "operate" has much effect except that I am afraid if you give them general authority to operate this machinery that that would mean all of the machinery. I leave in the language of the bill the words "to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment," which I take it would mean to operate their own equipment. I think they ought to have the authority to operate their own equipment and to delegate that to somebody else if they are fit to do so.

Mr. BROOKS. I would say it may well be that that is true. I have not had an opportunity to study this particular language of the amendment at great length so I believe I will not offer the substitute amendment to which I referred. I thank my colleague for his consideration and I appreciate his support on this legislation. We would both like to save some money as my colleague pointed out.

Mr. GARY. I am all for saving the money, and moreover I think it can be saved by coordination of the purchasing, leasing, and maintenance of this equipment. We have already saved a great deal by the action of our committee but I do not want to leave any doubt in anybody's mind that we are giving the GSA the right to use and operate this equipment that is already under control of the various agencies.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to direct a question or two to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. Will the gentleman clarify the word that is being stricken in his amendment?

Mr. GARY. The word "operate."

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is the word that would be stricken?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not we are in danger here of getting into quite a word game and a semantic operation? I wonder if, with the uncertainty as to what the effect might or might not be, of deleting one word or adding another, this is the best way of handling the matter. I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the committee is a much better area in which to work out these problems and then to come back with something after an exploration of the practicalities of the matter rather

than attempting to do this on the floor of the House?

Mr. GARY. Well, of course, the committee could do a more thorough job, but I am particularly anxious to have it absolutely understood, and I think with the explanation of my amendment here on the floor of the House, it will be plain that what we are trying to do by striking out the word "operate" is to insure the fact that the GSA will not attempt to operate the machinery that is under control of the Defense Department or under the control of NASA or of any other agency of Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman for his purpose. But I entertain serious doubts, I will say to the gentleman, as to whether with the retention of the word "control" or the retention of the word "use" that purpose is made clear.

Mr. GARY. They have both been stricken by my amendment. It deletes the word "use" and also the word "control."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then I will say to the gentleman, while I subscribe to his purpose and commend him for it, I think it is a sorry bit of legislating to come in here with a bill in which the key word is "control" and in which the committee commits itself to building up this kind of power, and then here in the matter of an hour or an hour and one-half of debate it completely backtracks.

And then they ask us to try to doctor up the bill with some namby-pamby euphemisms and kindlier words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated, not because I disagree with my friend's purpose, but I do not want us to kid ourselves that we are improving this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking someone the question as to where I can find a definition of "Federal agency." This bill is predicated upon "Federal agency." I would like an official definition of the words "Federal agency."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe that definition is contained in the basic act. This bill seeks to amend the basic act, and I am sure that that term is defined in that act. If the gentleman will give us a minute or two, I think we can locate the definition of it. Most of them, I am sure, the gentleman from Iowa is familiar with. There are a large number of agencies. We are interested in those, however, who use automatic data processing equipment.

The gentleman could probably in his own mind write down a list of the number of them.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I have some idea of what constitutes a Federal agency, but I do not know whether, for instance, the Department of Defense is legally a Federal agency, or the Department of the Treasury is legally a Federal agency.

Mr. BROOKS. I believe in the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, revised Decem-

ber 1, 1958, on page 4, we have the definition of the words that we use. Section 3 as used in titles 1 through 6 of this act, part B, the term "Federal agency" means any executive agency or any establishment in the legislative or the judicial branches of the Government—except the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, and any activities under his direction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but I would add that the definition just given was apparently written by the committee.

Mr. Chairman I am as much interested in saving money as any Member of the House, but up to this point no one has convinced me that centralization as proposed in this bill will provide any part of the claimed savings. Earlier this afternoon I asked the question as to the basis for the claimed savings and I am still awaiting an answer.

I would point out that in the past 2 years the Government has purchased millions of dollars worth of equipment to provide automation and yet in the same period some 150,000 persons have been added to the Federal payroll.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am very reluctant to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. Brooks]. But at the appropriate time I expect to offer a motion to recommit this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably the best example of poor coordination within the Congress that has been on the floor of the House in a long time. The moment I saw this bill on the calendar I contacted the two agencies with which I have very close relationships, NASA, and the Veterans' Administration. I find that both of them are opposed to the bill. If you read further in the report you find the Post Office Department, the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, also are opposed to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have just completed months of hearings on the NASA authorization. During these hearings we asked representatives of NASA questions about this equipment. This is a question which has a tremendous effect on every agency. We asked whether or not there is not some executive policy on this whole question, and we were told that it was being worked on, but it was not.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is premature. I think it should be given much more consideration among the other committees of Congress and among the other agencies of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill at the proper time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. It does pain me to have a difference with my old and dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12275

TEAGUE]. But I would say that I am glad that all of the members of the committee have asked questions of the agencies with which they are so directly concerned, those in particular.

I would say that the Comptroller General, who works for us as Members of Congress, sent in a letter—not an old letter, but I believe it is dated June 11, 1963—a copy of a letter which he sent to the Speaker of this great body, in which he said:

Our review disclosed that, during fiscal years 1961 and 1962 and part of fiscal year 1963, Goddard Space Flight Center made rental overpayments for automatic data-processing machines because it failed to determine and consolidate operational use time in accordance with provisions of the Federal supply schedule contracts. We estimate that the overpayments amount to about \$1.2 million.

Now, I do not say that everyone does not make mistakes. But I think that this bill, in fairness to my colleague—

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will not take all of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], in fairness, should be given every opportunity to continue to question these agencies, as I think you have full authority to do, and I think you should exercise it as you do. But this legislation would take no authority away from your great committee or any other congressional committee, and no authority away from the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. You understand why some of the agencies that would be restricted would sort of be chastised in overpaying \$1,231,000, to be exact. You can understand why they are not very enthusiastic about anybody taking a look at their operations.

You can understand why they are not very enthusiastic about anybody taking a look at their operations. They did not offer a criticism. My obligation is not to the individual agencies, but, as yours is, I think you will agree, to the people who pay the taxes and expect efficiency from every agency whether we work with them or not.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to say to the gentleman that I requested the General Accounting Office to furnish me the report he made on NASA. I have seen the report. I know the gentleman has it, and I will sooner or later find out why I did not get a copy of it. Our committee was not furnished a copy of it, neither was I furnished a copy. I have seen the gentleman's report and I know it. But why did not the General Accounting Office send us this report? The amount is tremendous and it is going to get bigger and bigger as time goes on, particularly in NASA. The amount there is fantastic. We did ask the question, and we were told that there is a policy being formulated by the Government that would control it.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. OLSEN of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I think a statement has to be made

in fairness to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with regard to the overpayment that was spoken of by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. It is exactly true, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] has said. The report of the General Accounting Office showed \$1.2 million as an overpayment. In fairness now to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I think the Members should know that the discovery of the overpayment was, as a matter of fact, a discovery made by NASA. NASA learned that they were making some kind of an overpayment and because they learned this fact, they put a kind of counting device, time device, on the computers. Then with the use of these timing devices on the computers NASA learned how much the overpayment was and at what rate this was going. It was the General Accounting Office that revealed the overpayment to the Congress and to the public in general, but it was NASA itself that found the fact of overpayment, indeed that made it possible to find the overpayment. Then they went ahead and negotiated for a refund of the overpayment, and I understand the amount of the refund as agreed upon is \$1.1 million.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Was the committee advised by the agency over which it has jurisdiction?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The committee on which I serve was advised by the General Accounting Office first. I want to give them credit for having first revealed this fact, but it was not because NASA was concealing it. NASA had actually been responsible for finding the overpayment or the effect of it in computing the overpayment. NASA, by the way, appeared before our committee and revealed it as well and gave full credit to GAO and as well to justify their activity and exonerate themselves for having found an error and took credit by correcting the error.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to correct some of the statements that have been made. I am quite sure they were made in good faith, but, nevertheless, they are in error.

The Comptroller General did write a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics in which he did say that in his opinion there had been an overpayment by NASA to the International Business Machines Corp. and that in his judgment the amount of the overpayment was \$1.1 million.

That report was referred to the Subcommittee on Tracking and Data Acquisition, of which my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], is chairman.

The subcommittee referred that report to me, perhaps for the reason that I had had quite a bit to say in our subcommittee hearings on the question of computers. I was requested to look into the matter and see what I could make of

this reported overcharge. I did do that and I spent the better part of an afternoon in conference with officials of the International Business Machines Corp. During that discussion it became apparent, as I have said earlier on the floor today, that the matter was far more complex than the Comptroller General himself had realized. However, it was not disputed by the International Business Machines Corp. that there might very well have been an overpayment. It came to light that the computer system, the automatic data processing system, can be linked up in an extremely wide variety of ways. In some hookups, or in some linkages, you might use three tape drives and one computer and one memory circuit, whereas in another system you might use a different set of components. Each component did not have a separate meter upon it. Furthermore, the machines are energized not only while they are in use, but they are energized while they are being overhauled, and when preventive maintenance was being performed upon them or when they were broken down and being repaired. None of these things have been metered or have been subjected to precise measurements.

Following my conference with the officials of the International Business Machines Corp. an agreement was reached based not upon anybody's measurement, but based simply upon an educated guess as to what the overpayment might have been. The actual refund made by the International Business Machines to NASA was over \$1.2 million, although the Comptroller General's estimate was that it was \$1.1 million. The whole point of the matter is that it suddenly came to light that a great deal more accuracy was needed in the computation of time. I might add at this point that the International Business Machines Corp. does not meter the time. It was strictly up to NASA to do it. NASA had not done it with the degree of specific accuracy as to each component which would have been necessary to make possible an accurate billing by International Business Machines to NASA.

I am for this bill and I think we need some agency of the Government to develop that degree of specialized knowledge which will enable them to go into any agency of the Government and find out whether a sensible, economical, and thrifty use is being made of automatic data processing equipment. We do not have such an agency at this point.

As to the particular language of the amendment I do not see why we cannot afford to strike the word "operate." We do not want the General Services Administration operating this equipment, but we certainly need an agency and I think the General Services Administration is the best one to do it, to go in and see whether they have the right equipment and whether the right methods are being used to determine how they use the equipment and what type and kind of equipment they ought to have, as well as should the equipment be leased, or whether it ought to be bought outright by the Government.

12276

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

July 18

For the reasons I have stated I urge the membership of this Committee to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pool: Page 5, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, or any other provision of law, no punched card machine shall be purchased or leased under authority of this section by negotiation. Each punched card machine which is purchased or leased under this section shall be so purchased or leased after public advertisement in accordance with subsection (a) of section 303 of this Act, and the award for such purchase or lease shall be made to the lowest responsible bidder notwithstanding any provision of subsection (b) of section 303."

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, JACK BROOKS, has sponsored this bill and made a speech here earlier, as did my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER]. They pointed out that the main purpose of this bill is to save approximately \$100 million a year. I want to help this bill a little bit, so I have offered an amendment to give the contract to the lowest bidder.

First I want to point out that from the work I have done on this matter, I found that none of these machines is presently bought on a low-bid basis, either by custom or under the terminology of the statutes. Many of the contracts are negotiated. So I offered this amendment in view of the fact that one of the purposes stated in this bill is to save the Government money. Let us save some money by giving the contract to the lowest bidder. This amendment will save the Government a great deal more money by requiring that when punched card machines are purchased or leased, the lowest responsible bidder will get the contract. That is all it does.

Mr. Chairman, I have limited the amendment to punched card machines because upon investigation I found that these are about the only machines on which you can get three or four bidders. The electronic computers are so complex that it would prove virtually impossible to spell out the specifications which would allow enough bidders a chance to offer competitive bids on them. But, on punchcard machines, I have been told that the industry has been developed to the point where it is possible to get a low bid. That is all my amendment does, I think the lowest responsible bidder should get the contract. The same thing is done in many other fields of Government.

There is no reason why we should not do it here, if possible. And it is possible with respect to punched card machines.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POOL. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We have studied this particular problem for a considerable period of time. I want to associate myself with his amendment and would like to ask him just a question or two to help develop this a little bit further.

Did not the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, appear before our committee and discuss this particular matter of competitive bidding as distinguished from negotiated contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct.

Mr. WATSON. And did he not at that time say that the Government had lost millions of dollars because of negotiated contracts on automatic data processing machines, instead of going into competitive bid contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct. I think he went further than that and said that with respect to punched card machines it would be entirely possible to set up specifications so that the awarding of the contract could be made to the lowest bidder.

Mr. WATSON. Does not the gentleman also recall further that although he did not testify before our committee, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, recently made a public statement, which we all applaud, that he had saved some \$100 million, or perhaps in excess of that, over the past year through competitive bid contracts instead of negotiated contracts? And he cited as one particular example, I believe, of a radio or some electronic device for which originally the Department of Defense had been paying something like \$2,000 but which under competitive bidding they got down to about \$800?

Mr. POOL. That is right. And this is a very similar situation. When they first came out the punched card machines were all different and it was difficult for a department to specify what they needed. It was difficult for the industry to bid on specifications that were so general. So they had to negotiate. But we are now in the position where, instead of 3 or 4 companies being in a position to bid maybe 10 or 15 of them could get in a bidding position if we pass an amendment such as this one. It would save the Government thousands of dollars.

Mr. WATSON. Under the gentleman's position, this would not apply to other equipment?

Mr. POOL. No. That is why we limit it specifically to punched card machines, because we can do it in this field.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment basically provides for no negotiated sales in the limited field of punchcards. I believe this is not trying to legislate on purchase

practices. I believe there is some merit to the suggestion. I would be delighted and pleased to cooperate with the distinguished Member-at-Large from Texas in pursuance of this, but I feel that it is more arbitrary than we in this Congress would want to establish as a precedent. The statement that you would never buy anything by negotiation has not proved to be good business for the country. As an example, we Senators do negotiate sales but they ought to be submitted to the Congress for approval. I think this is good policy. Where there is only one supplier or where there is one producer of a given commodity, you might well negotiate a purchase price with that individual, if you bought for the Government or for yourself or for private business. If you bought for the Government on a negotiated contract, I think it would be wise to provide for Congressional approval or renegotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WATSON) there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5171, to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

12277

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 258, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]
YEAS—96

Abele	Fuqua	Mosher
Ayres	Gavin	Norblad
Becker	Gross	Olsen, Mont.
Beermann	Grover	Olsen, Minn.
Bell	Gubser	Pike
Bray	Gurney	Pirnie
Bromwell	Haley	Poage
Bruce	Hall	Pool
Burkhalter	Harvey, Mich.	Quillen
Burton	Hemphill	Rivers, S.C.
Cameron	Henderson	Roberts, Tex.
Casey	Herlong	Saylor
Cederberg	Hoeven	Schadeberg
Chamberlain	Jensen	Secrest
Chelf	Johansen	Senner
Coghlan	Karth	Short
Collier	King, N.Y.	Stikes
Colmer	Knox	Staggers
Corbett	Kyl	Stratton
Cunningham	MacGregor	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Mahon	Tuten
Derounian	Martin, Calif.	Udall
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Utt
Dole	May	Van Pelt
Dulski	Meader	Vinson
Edwards	Michel	Watson
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Everett	Milliken	Westland
Feighan	Montoya	Whitener
Frelinghuysen	Moore	Whitten
Fulton, Pa.	Morris	Wickersham
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	Winstead

NAYS—258

Abbott	Derwinski	Kee
Addabbo	Diggs	Keith
Albert	Dingell	Keogh
Alger	Dorn	Kilgore
Anderson	Dowdy	King, Calif.
Andrews	Downing	Kirwan
Arends	Dupcan	Kluczynski
Ashley	Dwyer	Kornegay
Ashmore	Elliott	Kunkel
Aspinall	Fallon	Laird
Auchincloss	Fascell	Langen
Avery	Findley	Lankford
Baker	Finnegan	Lennon
Baldwin	Fisher	Libonati
Baring	Flood	Lindsay
Barry	Flynt	Lipscomb
Bass	Fogarty	Lloyd
Bates	Ford	Long, Md.
Battin	Foreman	McClary
Beckworth	Fountain	McCulloch
Bennett, Fla.	Fraser	McDade
Berry	Friedel	McDowell
Betts	Gallagher	McFall
Blatnik	Gary	Macdonald
Boggs	Gathings	Madden
Boland	Gibbons	Maillard
Bolling	Gilbert	Marsh
Bolton	Glenn	Matsunaga
Frances P.	Gonzalez	Matthews
Bolton,	Goodell	Mills
Oliver P.	Grant	Minish
Bow	Gray	Monagan
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead
Brock	Griffiths	Morgan
Brooks	Hagan, Ga.	Morton
Brotzman	Halpern	Multer
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Murphy, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hansen	Murphy, N.Y.
Broyhill, N.C.	Harding	Murray
Burke	Hardy	Natcher
Burleson	Harris	Nedzi
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison	Nix
Byrnes, Wis.	Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Cahill	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Cannon	Healey	O'Hara, Mich.
Carey	Hébert	O'Konski
Celler	Hechler	O'Neill
Chenoweth	Hollifield	Osme's
Clark	Holland	Ostertag
Cleveland	Horton	Passman
Cooley	Hosmer	Patman
Corman	Huddleston	Patton
Cramer	Hull	Pelly
Curtis	Hutchinson	Pepper
Daniels	Ichord	Perkins
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Pilcher
Davis, Tenn.	Jennings	Poff
Dawson	Joelson	Powell
Delaney	Johnson, Wis.	Price
Dent	Jones, Mo.	Pucinski
Denton	Karsten	Quie

Rains	Schneebeli	Thompson, Tex.
Randall	Schweiker	Thomson, Wis.
Reid, Ill.	Schwengel	Thornberry
Reid, N.Y.	Selden	Toll
Reifel	Shipley	Tollefson
Reuss	Shriver	Tuck
Rhodes, Ariz.	Sibal	Tupper
Rhodes, Pa.	Sickles	Ullman
Rich	Siler	Van Deerlin
Riehlman	Sisk	Vanik
Rivers, Alaska	Skubitz	Waggoner
Roberts, Ala.	Smith, Calif.	Wallhauser
Robison	Smith, Iowa	Watts
Rodino	Smith, Va.	Weltner
Rogers, Colo.	Snyder	Whalley
Rogers, Fla.	Springer	Widnall
Rogers, Tex.	Staebler	Williams
Rosenthal	Stafford	Willis
Roudebush	Stinson	Wilson
Roush	Stubblefield	Charles H.
Rumsfeld	Sullivan	Wilson, Ind.
Ryan, Mich.	Talcott	Wright
Ryan, N.Y.	Taylor	Wyman
St. George	Teague, Calif.	Young
St. Germain	Thomas	Younger
Schenck	Thompson, N.J.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—79

Abernethy	Grabowski	Morrison
Adair	Green, Pa.	Moss
Ashbrook	Griffin	Nelsen
Barrett	Hagen, Calif.	Nygaard
Belcher	Halleck	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Harsha	Phillbin
Bonner	Hawkins	Phillon
Broomfield	Hoffman	Purcell
Broyhill, Va.	Horan	Rooney
Buckley	Johnson, Calif.	Roosevelt
Clancy	Jonas	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Don H.	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Clawson, Del	Kelly	Scott
Conte	Kilburn	Shelley
Daddario	Landrum	Sheppard
Dague	Latta	Slack
Donohue	Leggett	Steed
Edmondson	Lesinski	Stephens
Evins	Long, La.	Taft
Farbstein	McIntire	Thompson, La.
Fino	McLoskey	Trimble
Forrester	McMillan	Wharton
Garmatz	Martin, Mass.	White
Glaimo	Mathias	Wilson, Bob
Gill	Miller, N.Y.	Wylder
Goodling	Minshall	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Trimble against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Horan for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Nygaard for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Glaimo with Mr. Fillion.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodling.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wylder.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.

Mr. White with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Phillbin with Mr. Jonas.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. McLoskey.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Gill.

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. BATES, and Mr. BARRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1963, several members of the Georgia delegation, myself included, were in Georgia to confer with the Governor on a matter of public importance. Accordingly, I am recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 95, taken on a motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 4897, to amend the Wartime Sedition Act. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit, and "aye" on final passage of the bill.

PARTICIPATION BY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

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

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Defense Department appropriations bill, I made mention of a report released by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. I stated that this report indicated a real threat to our military bases as it presupposed that unless an area adjacent to a military base was integrated, the people in the area would be punished by removal of the base. It also called upon military commanders to take the lead in the communities in the desegregation movement. At that time, I stated that such action as contemplated by the report was not con-