

broad outlines and many of its specific provisions, this year's administration bill is very similar to that which was debated, modified, and ultimately passed by the House last year.

There is, however, one significant exception. The administration, unfortunately, did not see fit to include in this year's draft legislation any form of preventive relief to preclude interference with freedom of speech, assembly, or petition in relation to civil rights. I am today introducing a bill fill this gap.

The bill which I am offering today is identical to title III of H.R. 14765, the civil rights bill of 1966, as reported on June 30, 1966, by the House Judiciary Committee. This title would provide an avenue of injunctive relief, through civil action, in two types of instances:

First. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deprive another of any right, privilege, or immunity granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws on account of such person's race, color, religion, or national origin; and

Second. Where there are reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage or continue to engage in any act or practice which would deny or hinder another in the exercise of his lawful right to speak, assemble, petition, or otherwise express himself for the purpose of securing recognition of or protection for equal enjoyment of guaranteed and protected rights free from discrimination.

In such instances, the bill would authorize a person, or the Attorney General for or in the name of the United States, to institute a civil action or other proceeding in the U.S. district courts for temporary or permanent preventive relief, including restraining orders or injunctions.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is in accord with a line of legislative proposals which have been discussed on both sides of the Capitol for a full decade. As part III, this approach was offered during the Eisenhower administration and was passed by the House in 1957. As title III, it was debated during our consideration of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As the Lindsay amendment, it was offered during floor debate on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Again as title III, this proposal was introduced early last year by approximately 20 Members of the House, accepted by Judiciary Committee as an addition to H.R. 14765, and passed by the House as an important part of that omnibus bill.

In advancing this proposal, the committee and the House have recognized its importance as a complement to the Federal criminal laws which punish violations of civil rights. Title III would give every American the assurance that he has a course of action to prevent such violations, and to guarantee that he may exercise his first amendment rights in advocating equal rights free from violence, intimidation, interference or the threat of interference. This bill would also give our law enforcement officers a new tool with which to prevent violence,

protect American citizens, and maintain civil order.

I trust that the House Judiciary Committee, in considering the administration's civil rights package of 1967, will continue the precedent set in 1966 and will again seek to improve our legislative guarantees of equal rights by reporting title III.

FATE OF POWELL TO BE DECIDED BY HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY

(Mr. RUPPE (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday we will be called upon to decide the fate of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. There is no question but what POWELL misused public funds and has acted in a grossly irresponsible manner. The facts of the Powell case have been carefully developed by a special House committee, and that committee has recommended severe punishment.

The American press has thrust the Powell case into the forefront of America's attention. Before POWELL came the strange case of Bobby Baker, and the allegations and investigation of U.S. Senator THOMAS DODD. All of this has culminated in a deep suspicion by the American people of their elected representatives.

I firmly believe that the great majority of Congressmen and Senators are honest and of the highest integrity. But the fact remains that the actions of a few have cast doubt on the entire legislative branch of our Government. If we punish ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—and go no further—we have done little to repair the sagging reputation of Congress. It is my sincere hope that the Powell investigation will culminate in the establishment of a Standing Committee on Standards and Conduct. This committee must have the power to investigate charges of official misconduct against any Member of the House of Representatives, and must have the authority to recommend corrective measures to the House concerning that Member. Only through such a committee can we begin to repair the reputation of the House of Representatives.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

(Mr. LUKENS (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the new Members who are proposing that a select committee be established on standards and conduct in the House of Representatives are not attempting to be presumptuous, nor are they suggesting that the Members who came here before them have been guilty of low standards and bad conduct. We know that, with a few possible exceptions, the integrity and honor of the Members of this body are beyond question.

But we are concerned with the public attitude toward the Congress generally.

Because of a few highly publicized departures from a standard the American people feel is required of their Representatives in Congress, a belief seems to have grown up that most Members of this honorable body indulge in practices of misconduct of one sort or another. It is at this belief that our resolution is aimed.

Our resolution is not complicated. It would ask for the establishment of a select committee of 12 members—six from each political party—to be named by the Speaker and empowered to investigate any violation of the law by any Member of this body. It would call upon Members to, first, make a full disclosure of the assets, liabilities, honorariums, and so forth held by them, their spouses or any staff members making more than \$15,000 annually; second, make a full disclosure of any interest, either financially or through kinship, with any firm practicing before any Federal agency; third, make a full disclosure of any interest, regardless of amount, in any business whose right to operate is regulated by the Federal Government; and fourth, make a full disclosure of any relatives—immediate family—carried on their congressional payrolls.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this kind of "gesture of honorability" is desperately required at this time in our history.

The "credibility gap"—with regard to the conduct of Congressmen, has not grown to such incredible size that it is more than a political issue—it is a menace to this Nation. Our people are confused, utterly, by conflicting statements from Government officials about the war in Vietnam, the need for a missile defense, the subsidizing of leftwing organizations by the CIA, the doubts cast on the Warren Commission's findings, the direction of the economy, the cause of inflation, the increase in crime in the streets—to name just a few examples.

I am convinced that this Congress has a great responsibility to resolve many of these doubts and I am confident that it will. But on the question of its own honor and integrity, we cannot wait. We must show the American people as quickly as possible that, in this time of widespread disregard for law and order, we intend to keep the U.S. House as far above suspicion as possible. In effect, our own right to act for the American people is at stake in this question of ethics. We must establish it beyond all question and quickly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT (at the request of Mr. GUDE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] is recognized for 20 minutes.