

prevails in the country and in the Congress—it could very well bring about ill-advised legislation.

Insofar as the Congress is concerned, and this proposed legislation is concerned, it is difficult for me to understand how the Congress, made up of people certainly of average intelligence who are supposed to be statesmen, could have their judgment changed by either an unfortunate and cowardly assassin of a leader on one side or the rioting and murder and pilfering in defiance of the law on the other.

It would seem that this would be the time for a very full and ample consideration. Mr. Smith, do you have any questions?

Mr. SMITH. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Madden?

Mr. MADDEN. Well, the only thought I have on the matter is that our committee has had it here now for about 3 weeks and the bill passed the House last August.

Several days it was on the floor, then it went to the other body, and under all of the ordinary sensible processes of legislation the bill could have been legislated on over there last fall and brought back to the House.

But for some mysterious reason the bill was delayed and postponed. Even this year I think it was over there on the floor of the other body for about 3 weeks. And a handful of the Members tied the matter up under a rule they have over there that is so antiquated that it should have been abolished a long time ago to give the Members over there an opportunity to legislate.

And I think that the time has come when this Congress should legislate on some of their legislative processes and rules. Even some of the backward countries that are just trying to form a government, if they were called upon to have a legislative body where eight or 10 men could tie up 90 of their colleagues and not allow them to vote on a piece of legislation, why, even these inexperienced countries in democracy would laugh in a situation like that.

And here we have a piece of legislation that should have been passed last fall, in my mind. And now it has been watered down and some of the Members over there, the distinguished minority leader and others, who never carried any flags in the civil rights parade that I know of, voted for this bill in a watered-down situation. And this section pertaining to the Indian civil rights, we had the Congressman from South Dakota, a native Indian, testify before this committee on Thursday and, by the way, I placed his testimony in Friday morning's record, I think it is, and I hope all of the Members read it, where he thinks that that is the greatest piece of legislation for the Indian, American Indian, that has ever been passed.

So I don't see why we should relegate this bill back into the Judiciary or in conference and have the bill returned to the other body and have the same performance repeated over there. It has not only been repeated on this bill in that body, but on other pieces of legislation, like 14(b), that passed this House by a 19 majority, and went over there and eight or 10 men refused to have the rest of the body vote on 14(b).

Now, if that is legislation, why, we better go back into the days before the Constitution so that the people's representatives can vote