

to be repaid as provided in section 5 of this Act, if not otherwise repaid. If no loan under this Act is made to the organization and no construction (whether or not financed under this Act) is performed as a result of such investigations or studies, such funds advanced may be nonreimbursable. Funds for this purpose shall not be advanced until the local organization has presented its program for these activities for approval by the Secretary. If a loan (or advance of funds) has been made by another Federal agency for planning with respect to a project theretofore or subsequently approved for a construction loan under this Act, the Secretary may provide from construction funds the full amount necessary to repay that loan or advance of funds and such amount shall be included as a part of the construction loan under this Act."

(i) Renumber existing sections "8", "9", "10", "11", and "12" as sections, "9", "10", "11", "12", and "13", respectively.

(j) Amend section 9 (formerly section 8) to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. To the extent not inconsistent with other provisions of this Act, the planning and construction of projects undertaken pursuant to this Act shall be subject to all procedural requirements and other provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act."

(k) Amend section 11, formerly section 10, to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, but not to exceed \$200,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act, this limit to be extended by the amounts of repayment of principal received from loans and the amount of nonreimbursable expenditures under this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall advise the Congress promptly on the receipt of each proposal referred to in section 3, and no contract, except as may be necessary under section 8, shall become effective until appropriated funds are available to initiate the specific proposal covered by each contract. All such appropriations shall remain available until expended and shall, insofar as they are used to finance loans made under this Act, be reimbursable in the manner hereinabove provided."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 602, and insert the provisions of the bill, H.R. 4851, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 4851, was laid on the table.

#### PROTECTION OF FORMER PRESIDENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2420).

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:  
S. 2420

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the second clause of title 18, United States Code, section 3056, is amended to read as follows: "protect the person of a former President and his wife during his lifetime and the person of a widow and minor children of a former President for a period of four years after he leaves or dies in office, unless such protection is declined;"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House was unanimously reported by the Judiciary Committee. It has bipartisan support.

Presently, the President and his immediate family are protected during the President's tenure. A former President, plus his wife, were given protection for only a reasonable period, unless he denied that protection. That protection was given by the U.S. Secret Service.

I was of the opinion—and I believe most people were of the opinion—that protection by the Secret Service continues throughout the lifetime of a former President. Such is not the case. It continues only for a reasonable period. Legislative history seems to indicate that a reasonable time might well be 6 months.

It now appears, unfortunately, that threats have been made on the life of our dear former President, President Eisenhower. President Eisenhower has been greatly annoyed by some of those threats. Not so long ago Members might have read in the public press that his automobile was invaded and ransacked by vandals.

Two years ago we passed a special statute providing for the protection of the widow of the late lamented President Kennedy and her infant children. That law expires this coming December 12. The bill which is before the House would offer protection to former Presidents and their wives during the lifetime of the President unless he declines that protection. Then protection would be given to the widow and the minor children of a former President for a period of 4 years after he dies or resigns from office.

That provision would take care of the usual situation with reference to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy.

Former Presidents and the wives of former Presidents are individuals who are sought after. They are in the limelight. They are singled out and often they are annoyed by the idle curious. Sometimes they are the targets of the mentally deranged. They are subject to threats by those who imagine grievances.

It strikes me, as it struck the members of the committee, that it would be small gratitude to show former Presidents and their dear ones to throw this cloak of protection around them for an appropriate period. We feel that in a case of the President himself and his wife, that period should be for his entire lifetime.

The case of Mrs. Kennedy involves some peculiar circumstances. This very gracious and lovely lady, who has suffered immeasurably, should be entitled to this cloak of protection beyond peradventure of a doubt. She is the wife of a legendary character, as it were. Wherever she appears, great crowds surge around her. She is frightened, not for herself, because she is a woman of

great fortitude and courage; but, I am informed, she is frightened for the sake of her children. I am sure the world will never forget her stamina and her self-abnegation during the funeral of her late lamented husband. She has endured suffering that very few women can and should endure. The entire Nation has risen to applaud her.

The least we can do is to extend this protection which, as I said, will expire in a few months.

Mr. Kennedy would come in this picture because of the general legislation we adopt; namely, that widows and their dear ones should be protected for a period of 4 years after the death or resignation of a President. That would extend the protection to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy for an additional 2 years. That is deemed to be sufficient.

Members will find the cost of the protection shown on page 2 of the report. The U.S. Secret Service estimates the cost of protecting each former President at approximately \$160,000 annually; and the cost of protecting Mrs. Kennedy and her minor children at approximately \$210,000 annually.

I hope that this measure will be passed with a thumping majority.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. In all cases the cost figures set forth on page 2 would depend upon the travel by the individuals affected, would they not?

Mr. CELLER. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. It could be considerably more?

Mr. CELLER. It might be more and it might be less. It might go both ways.

Mr. GROSS. This would create permanent law. It would no longer be temporary?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is subject only to the declination of the individuals involved?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my able chairman, [Mr. CELLER], in support of this legislation. I should like to repeat what he said concerning the way the bill came from the committee.

The bill received a unanimous favorable report in the subcommittee which heard it. It received a unanimous favorable report in the full Judiciary Committee which has brought it to the floor of the House.

The chairman has accurately described the need for such legislation and he has told us accurately of the terms and provisions thereof.

I am sure that when the Congress passes this legislation by unanimous vote, it will be a great source of satisfaction to all the people involved. Particularly, the lovely and gracious Mrs. Kennedy will have a feeling of comfort and security for those two lovely children who have been threatened on at least one occasion. The generous people of our country will be happy that we took this timely legislative step.

Mr. GROSS. Would this involve the weapon used by Ruby in the slaying of Oswald?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What this bill provides is that the Attorney General shall within a 1-year period publish in the Federal Register the list of items that he believes should be preserved, which were considered by the Warren Commission. Many of these items considered by the Warren Commission are presently in the custody of the Federal Government.

We desire that they be retained here and if any individual claims that his property rights have been taken away from him the bill gives him a cause to action, so that he may go into court and assert his rights. The Government would retain the property and the claimant would get just compensation.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that a weapon used in a murder in the District of Columbia, confiscated by the police and used as evidence in court is returned to some member of his family?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I say to the gentleman that usually the question of what happens to a weapon that may have been used in the commission of a crime is something for State law. There is a specific procedure in the District of Columbia. Of course, the gentleman understands that the District of Columbia jurisdiction is not asserted in this matter. We are controlled by the law of the State of Texas. In this instance there was no conviction and no trial and the matter of trying to confiscate in such circumstances is not available to us.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, bearing upon that point, as I remember, the Assistant Attorney General who met with the committee and who is a distinguished Texas lawyer, stated that unlike most States, Texas law had no confiscation provision for weapons used in criminal cases.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct. Furthermore, in this instance there was no prosecution and hence we could not have proceeded in that manner as we would wish if a State law provided for forfeiture.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think the act which was passed by the Congress a short while ago would obviate this eventuality ever occurring again, because in the future this sort of conduct would constitute a Federal crime and the Federal law would be effective as to confiscation of weapons. So as I see it, this bill which we brought out of our subcommittee will take care of all the present cases, and in the future if such unfortunate happening should occur we will not need further legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think he has outlined correctly that since we have made the assassination of the President a Federal crime we probably would not need this type of legislation in the future.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder if the committee has considered the question of making this applicable to all future presidents, since it is going to be permanent legislation?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman's question is, should we cover all items in connection with future assassinations? We discussed the matter, and as pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] just recently the President signed a bill which would make the assassination of the President a Federal offense.

Heretofore this was not a Federal offense. At the time the late President Kennedy was assassinated in Texas the assassin, if he had been prosecuted, would have been prosecuted under the laws of the State of Texas.

Mr. HALL. We are simply catching up with our previously unfinished business?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question for the legislative record? Would, for example, the fragments of those ill-spent bullets that assassinated our late President, under this bill, necessarily be retrieved from the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology where I understand they now reside and have been the object of intensive ballistics research and study, which in turn is of some considerable scientific value?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If I understand the gentleman's question, the gentleman will recognize that the President's Commission recommended that most of these items be acquired and preserved by the Federal Government. All of the evidence and everything in connection with it is now in the Federal custody. I believe that any ballistic analysis made would be reflected in the testimony before the Commission and that it has been filed with the Archives at the present time.

This legislation would place all of it under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have read the Commission reports and this legislation, and I am glad to hear what the gentleman from Colorado says. It would be under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administrator, as designated by the Attorney General, as I understand it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I did not quite understand the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. My question is simply, could the Director of the General Services Administration, upon recommendation of the Attorney General, remove from the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, for example, and from further ballistic study the fragmented and extended missiles, or bullets, or projectiles?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will look at section 4 of the bill he will see that it provides that all items acquired by the United States, pursuant to section 2 of this act, shall be placed

under the jurisdiction of the Administrator of the General Services Administration for preservation under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe. Hence he is the custodian.

Mr. HALL. Would the gentleman agree with me that it would serve history well, as well as possibly even future scientific investigation of ballistics, if it were interpreted that such Director of the GSA could from time to time withdraw from the Archives and make available for such study as the Attorney General or the Director of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, or others, might request?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Certainly. There would be nothing to keep him from doing it and I am confident that if it would advance any information to the public, there would be no question but that under his rules and regulations he could so prescribe.

Mr. HALL. I believe this represents a valuable record and I believe the deceased would want it so.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, do I understand that the Court of Claims will eventually set the fee for the Federal Government's acquisition of the actual firearms mentioned?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The claimant whose property may be taken has an option as to whether to institute a suit in the district court of the United States in the district where in he resides or whether to file suit in the Court of Claims in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of this legislation and wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which considered this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman completely, that this legislation is necessary in the interest of history, and in the interest of any future calm and deliberate reevaluation of the events which surrounded the very tragic occurrence of the assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, some question has been raised here today about the possible cost to the Government. Of course, it is impossible to estimate what that cost might be. We are leaving it to the adjudication of the Court of Claims or an appropriate district court. In conformance with the Constitution, we are leaving it to a proper legal adjudication. But I would say whatever cost might be incurred would represent cost which must be met by the country and a cost which the country would want to meet. The items that will be paid for are somewhat grisly relics of a tragic moment in our national history. Nevertheless, they must be acquired without question.

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

I hope the measure will be unanimously passed today.

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 2420.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 10386) was laid to the table.

#### PRESERVING EVIDENCE PERTAINING TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9545) providing for the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, with committee amendments.

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 it is hereby declared that the national interest requires that the United States acquire all right, title, and interest, in and to, certain items of evidence, to be designated by the Attorney General pursuant to section 2 of this Act, which were considered by the President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy (hereinafter referred to as "items"), and requires that those items be preserved by the United States.*

SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General is authorized to determine, from time to time, which items should, in conformity with the declaration contained in the first section of this Act, be acquired and preserved by the United States. Each such determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

(b) Whenever the Attorney General determines that an item should be acquired and preserved by the United States, all right, title, and interest in and to, that item shall be vested in the United States upon the publication of that determination in the Federal Register.

(c) The authority conferred upon the Attorney General by subsection (a) of this section to make determinations shall expire one year from the date of enactment of this Act, and the vesting provisions of subsection (b) of this section shall be valid only with respect to items described in determinations published in the Federal Register within that one-year period.

SEC. 3. The United States Court of Claims or the United States district court for the judicial district wherein the claimant resides shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the amount in controversy, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon any claim for just compensation for any item or interest therein acquired by the United States pursuant to section 2 of this Act; and where such claim is filed in the district court the claimant may request a trial by jury: *Provided*, That the claim is filed within one year from the date of publication in the Federal Register of the determination by the Attorney General with respect to such item.

SEC. 4. All items acquired by the United States pursuant to section 2 of this Act shall be placed under the jurisdiction of the Ad-

ministrator of General Services for preservation under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe.

SEC. 5. All items acquired by the United States pursuant to section 2 of this Act shall be deemed to be personal property and records of the United States for the purposes of laws relating to the custody, administration, and protection of personal property and records of the United States, including, but not limited to, sections 2071 and 2112 of title 18 of the United States Code.

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

(Mr. ROGERS from Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### PURPOSE

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the acquisition and preservation by the United States of certain items of evidence pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

In the course of its investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy, the Warren Commission acquired a large number of physical items pertaining to the assassination and related events. The most important of these belonged to Lee Harvey Oswald and his wife. The Commission recommended that a substantial number of these items of evidence, particularly those relating to the actual assassination of the President and the murder of Patrolman Tippit, should remain in the possession of the Government. In furtherance of this objective the Attorney General requested the introduction of this measure.

These items include the assassination weapon, the revolver involved in the murder of Officer Tippit, among other exhibits. The working papers, investigation reports, and transcripts of the Commission have been transmitted to the National Archives. The items of physical evidence are presently being retained in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee is persuaded that the national interest requires that these critical exhibits be permanently retained by the United States. It concurs in the view of the Attorney General that in years ahead allegations and theories concerning President Kennedy's assassination may abound. To eliminate questions and doubts the physical evidence should be securely preserved. A failure to do so could lead to loss, destruction or alteration of such exhibits and in time may serve to encourage irresponsible rumors undermining the public confidence in the work of the Warren Commission.

The authority conferred by this legislation is vital and needed promptly. One private party has already filed suit against the Attorney General for possession of the assassination weapon and the .38 caliber revolver, claiming to have purchased all right and title from Mrs. Marina Oswald. The Government has not yet responded to the complaint.

The bill, H.R. 9545, would authorize the Attorney General to designate, by publication in the Federal Register, which items considered by the Warren Commission are required by the national interest to be acquired and preserved by the United States. All right and title to these items would vest in the United States upon the Attorney General's filing of the determination with the office of the Federal Register. This acquisition authority would expire 1 year after date of enactment. Under the bill, claims for just compensation must be filed within 1 year of the date of the filing of the Attorney General's designation. As originally drafted, the bill granted exclusive jurisdiction to the Court of Claims over claims for just compensation. The committee, however, amended the bill to provide concurrent jurisdiction in the Federal district court in the district wherein the claimant resides and also to permit the claimant in the district court to request a trial by jury.

As amended, the bill constitutes a measure essential in the national interest and the committee strongly urges its enactment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the Government pay for any of these items that were submitted in evidence?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Constitution of the United States provides that property may not be taken without just compensation. Under this bill these items which are private property, may be acquired by the United States. The bill also authorizes that just compensation be paid to the individual who may own the item, by a suit brought in the Federal district court in the district in which he resides or in the Court of Claims.

Mr. GROSS. It is reported that the weapon used in the assassination was purchased for \$10,000 by a collector. Are we to understand that with the passage of this bill the Federal Government would pay out \$10,000 for permanent possession?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. No. I may state that a man by the name of John J. King, who resides in Denver, Colo., claims that he has an arrangement with Mrs. Oswald in connection with the assassination weapon and the pistol. Now, whatever arrangement he may have made with Mrs. Oswald is not the question of what is just compensation. The bill leaves that issue for the courts. If we try to restrict, limit or specify the amount of just compensation, there is some question as to whether or not the legislation itself would be constitutional. Therefore, we say "just compensation."

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to commend the committee on reporting this bill, along with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]. I served on the Assassination Commission that he has described, a very sad and gruesome task. I saw these items not once, but many times, being discussed here this afternoon. As gruesome as it is, it would be very tragic, indeed, for these items—and that is the only word I know of to use in describing them—did not remain the property of the Government of the United States, so that for a great many reasons, the most compelling reason being that they were very vital in the evidence which the Commission used in its deliberations and in its determination.

I hope the House will pass this bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, for his observation, and for his personal experience. Certainly, our recollection of the Lincoln assassination, where there are certain missing links, would lead us to believe what we are doing today is important. Even more important is the principle mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado that we live in a government of law, that we deal with all citizens under the law with equal and impartial hand. Regardless of the circumstances, regardless of who may establish their ownership of the properties involved here, we are going to obey the supreme law of the land and pay just compensation.

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

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman. What he has said about the possible cost of the items of evidence to the Government is absolutely correct. I would point out to my colleagues that after we had studied the legislation proposed originally, it was the unanimous opinion, as I remember it, of the subcommittee that this determination as to cost should be left to a jury if the claimants desire to have a jury trial. We also felt that the original proposal that the Court of Claims have exclusive jurisdiction was not in keeping with what we thought was proper. For that reason we proposed that the claimant might bring action in the U.S. district court of his own district, where he could request a jury trial. I personally feel this gentleman from Colorado, Mr. King—whom I do not know—if he has paid \$10,000 in a bona fide transaction it would not comport with my idea of justice that he should not get his \$10,000 back. That is a matter for the courts to determine. We have our own theories as to what should be done on a monetary payment to the owner of the property. For that reason the committee very wisely left this to the constitutional test of just compensation, as that compensation is fixed by the court. The court may include a jury of plaintiff's peers, if he so desires. I do not know of any way we could proceed more considerately with any claimant, or any way we could do it

which would insure greater justice to the Government than this bill provides.

I believe we can all agree it is essential that prompt action be taken if we are to preserve these historical items of property.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

#### AUTHORIZING FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT'S CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) to authorize funds for the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the President by Executive Order 11236 on July 23, 1965, established the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice to study crime in the United States and to recommend ways to reduce and prevent it; and

Whereas the President by Executive Order 11234 on July 16, 1965, established the Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia to study the causes of crime and delinquency in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas there has been a steady increase in crime in the Nation as well as in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas there is a need to ascertain its causes and to develop methods which can be undertaken by Federal, State, and local governments to combat such crime: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$1,500,000 for the expenses of both the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes up by direction of the full House Committee on the Judiciary. It is an authorization bill coming within the jurisdiction of that committee, which has jurisdiction over matters relating to law enforcement and the prevention of crime.

The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$1,500,000 to defray the expenses of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice

and the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

The total amount involved is \$1,500,000. Of that sum, \$1,100,000 is authorized to defray the expenses of the Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and \$400,000 to carry out the objectives of the District of Columbia Commission on Crime and Law Enforcement.

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

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. BOW. Could the gentleman tell us something about the composition of this Commission and what the salaries are that are going to be paid?

Mr. WILLIS. These figures are set out on pages 7 and 8 of the committee report. They are broken down in this fashion.

For Commission members, travel and per diem and for meetings over an 18-month period—\$67,000.

For citizens advisory committees, consultants, witnesses, for staff salaries, printing, general expenses, administrative services, contracts, and so on—they are all broken down in the committee report and the total is \$1,100,000 for the National Commission.

On page 8 of the report, we have the breakdown of the District of Columbia Commission aggregating \$400,000.

Mr. BOW. If the District of Columbia is about to take over its own government, what is the justification for the Federal Government and the taxpayers of the country to pay the \$400,000 for the District of Columbia?

Mr. WILLIS. I would say, it is my hope if the bill the gentleman refers to comes to pass, that we should quickly pass this bill because it will not be repealed by that bill to come unless there is a move to repeal what we are doing today, and I doubt that it would prevail.

Mr. BOW. But as we do this and if there is this authorization, does the gentleman feel if the District of Columbia has its own government that the Federal Government will be called upon to make an appropriation for the expenses of this so-called home rule government?

Mr. WILLIS. Any way we look at it, this bill will become law before action is taken on the bill the gentleman refers to. Therefore, this bill will be part of the law of the land and any bill that may come hereafter within the next 2 or 3 weeks or 2 or 3 days cannot override this bill.

Mr. BOW. It would seem to me it might be a good idea to hold up this \$400,000 and to find out what is going to happen to that bill because if they want home rule and if they are going to have home rule, they ought to start paying their own bills.

Mr. WILLIS. If I had my way, I would think the situation should be reversed and this bill should be made a law first. In the second place, it would seem to me that even if the home rule bill is passed and becomes law, this bill that we are now considering could still be passed by the Congress.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

7 Sept. 1965

H.R. 9545 - House of Representatives

Boggs, Hale	Dem. Louisiana
Gross, H.R.	Rep. Iowa
Hall, Durward G.	Rep. Missouri
Mathias, Charles McC.	Rep. Maryland
Rogers, Byron G.	Dem. Colorado
Whitener, Basil L.	Dem. North Carolina

*spoke in support*  
*asked direction questions*  
*" " "*  
*demanded a record, later*  
*spoke in support.*  
*moved to pass*  
*supported*