

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Per Henry Bonnett

*1476
Sebel Committee
on Assassination*

Henry B. Gonzalez

M. C.

FEB 25 1977

Dr. Hector P. Garcia

1315 Bright

Corpus Christi, Texas

78405



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 95th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 123

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1977

No. 19

HOUSE FLOOR DEBATE ON PASSAGE OF H. RES. 222 - ESTABLISHING THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS FOR THE 95TH CONGRESS UNTIL MARCH 31

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 222, CREATING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 220 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 220

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the resolution (H. Res. 222), creating a Select Committee on Assassinations, in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a slightly unusual rule, but it has been used a number of times before. It in effect provides, when it is adopted—I think some of the Members may be interested in knowing how the matter is going to proceed—that the House will go into the House as in the Committee of the Whole to consider the matter contained in House Resolution 222, which would reconstitute the Select Committee on Assassinations for a limited period and, under the provisions of House Resolution 11, would provide for approximately \$84,000 a month, a few hundred dollars more than that, for the 3 months, one of which has already passed.

The House Select Committee on Assassinations would be reconstituted until the 31st of March.

The reason we chose this procedure, rather than providing for an open rule or dealing with a closed rule, is to try to be fair to Members who want to offer amendments in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. We proceed without general debate under the 5-minute rule. The Speaker continues to preside. He does the recognizing. The Members are recognized on either side for 5 minutes, pro forma, on all questions of amendments. Pro forma amendments are in order.

But this is the important difference: the manager of House Resolution 222—and I will be that manager—has control of the previous question.

I do not intend to use the previous question to shut off debate in a hurry. I intend to see to it that the Members have an opportunity to offer amendments. When I sense and the House feels that enough has been done on the matter, I have the opportunity to move the previous question either on the amendment that is pending or the amendments and all matters to a final action.

The reason that we chose this kind of a resolution is that at least the majority of us in the Committee on Rules felt that it was appropriate and proper and right to give the new committee an opportunity to go into the problems, the ones that have been raised on the developments that have been achieved by the committee that had a short life in the last Congress. A committee that had a limited time, approximately 2 months, in which to organize itself. There are safeguards in this resolution, that they must follow the rules of the House. They

must have written rules. There was a considerable amount of negotiation with a variety of Members who were concerned about certain civil liberties aspects.

The committee will have to come back, obviously, before the 31st of March and justify its future existence. And presumably it will not only have a set of rules, it will also have a proposed program, a method of operation.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is the only fair way in which the new

Congress, this Congress, could deal with the problem. The last Congress constituted a committee which functioned for a few months, most of the time with the Congress actually not in session.

There is now to be a new chairman and a committee composed largely, as I understand it, of members of the previous committee. This will give them an opportunity to adopt rules and to develop a program to justify to the House the continuation of the committee presumably for the rest of the Congress. At the same time it will give the American people an opportunity to see that we were purposeful in our original acceptance of a Select Committee, and that we are proceeding in a reasonable and orderly way to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule, and I oppose the resolution this rule makes in order.

We are here today to consider important issues, and we have been debating a natural gas crisis. That is really an important issue, and what we do should be for the benefit of all the people of this country.

But do the Members know that in the Committee on Rules we debated for 2 days whether or not this resolution to recreate the Select Committee on Assassinations should even come up on this floor.

I think it is time that this House sets its priorities. I cannot conceive of the Members of this House vetting this restructuring of the Select Committee on Assassinations as a top priority, as the first issue that this House should consider, instead of getting down to business and solving the problems of this country.

Just this morning, Mr. Speaker, one of the major wire-services reported that the Justice Department after months of investigation has concluded that James Earl Ray acted alone in assassinating Martin Luther King, Jr. This conclusion is contained in a 148-page report prepared by the Director of the Department's Office of Professional Responsibility at the direction of the former Attorney General.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman seen that report?

Mr. QUILLEN. I have not seen the report. I saw the news report, and I have it in front of me.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked that question because I would like to share with the Members an experience that I had today.

I have been trying to see that report. I have been advised that the material in that report is too sensitive. As a mem-

ber of the Committee on Appropriations and a member of the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce and the Judiciary, the committee that has jurisdiction over the Attorney General's office and the Justice Department, I find it very irregular that I have not been able to see that report.

I also find it irregular that the Justice Department had 12 to 15 deputies originally assigned to this investigation, that those deputies came back with a report to Assistant Attorney General Pottinger concluding that there should be an independent investigation, but that as a result there was another person appointed, Michael Sheehan, and that person has now come up with a report that was on the former Attorney General's desk at least 2 weeks ago, although the Attorney General has been gone for some weeks. This morning, the report was leaked.

The Justice Department told me this morning that they know nothing about the leak.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) if he will get a copy of the report so we can look at it and if he will give us some further information about the report.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman cannot get a copy of the report herself, I cannot furnish her with a copy. I have not asked for the report. I have in front of me a copy of a wire service story which moved this morning by a very responsible news-disseminating organization, the United Press International, and I understand the Associated Press had a story later in the day. The wire service story states that the report concludes that no one except James Earl Ray acted in the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. QUILLEN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I was advised by the Justice Department that they had nothing to do with this UPI report and they do not know where it came from.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have not talked with the Justice Department. I have not asked for a copy of the report.

In my remarks I read from excerpts from the wire story, and there is nothing on the wire denying the report.

Therefore, if, after months and months of investigation by the Department of Justice, a 148 page report is prepared, and if someone saw it and then prepared a news article as to its contents, I think that the Members of this House should take note of that. I do not know why the Members would think this is top priority and think we have to go back for another run around the mulberry bush.

Mr. Speaker, especially in view of the finding of the Department of Justice, I believe more harm than good will come from recreating this select committee. Further, I think it is irresponsible for the House to relaunch, as a high priority,

this apparently erratic investigation into these two tragic events of the past, at a time when the country is con-

continued on back.....

fronted with very real and pressing national problems which the Congress must address and solve.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

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

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that this subcommittee and a member of this subcommittee were denied the privilege of seeing this report. I am told that there are Members of this House who have seen the report, but the Justice Department denied it to the very subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the appropriation of Justice Department funds.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK) for his comment.

As I said, I have not seen the report. I have not asked for it, but an inquiry directed to the President could result in getting the full facts in the case. I would recommend, if the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE) would want to do that, that it would seem to me the report would be forthcoming. I think the gentlewoman should do that.

Mr. Speaker, let us not argue about 1963 and 1968. Rather, let us begin to act on the issues of 1977 and the issues coming up next year.

We have an opportunity now, in the early days of this Congress, to set the pace and establish the priorities for the next 2 years. It is essential that we start off in the right direction. We have the opportunity now to move, at last, toward establishing a national energy policy that will put America on the road to self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker, today unemployment is at a record level; and more and more and more people are being laid off due to the closing of factories. Electric power rates are skyrocketing because of our failure to come to grips with the energy problem. I suggest we do so now.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to enact permanent tax cuts for every American taxpayer and to recognize and reduce the size and cost of Government. The people demand it, and they should have it.

We have the opportunity now to put an end to the chaos and to the appalling waste of our welfare system, which is a national disgrace.

Other pressing problems and challenges lie at the door of this Congress. We have a full agenda of high national priorities, and I think it is time to get down to the serious responsibility we bear as Members of Congress to deal with this agenda and to solve these problems.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop beating around the mulberry bush with these proposals to drag out this dismal ghost of a tragic era that is now behind us. Let us get on with the serious national business of 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Assassinations was established without sufficient reflection and thought in the waning days of the 94th Congress. I opposed the creation of the Select Committee last September. I felt then that the procedures proposed would result in a misguided and loosely structured approach that would soon get out of control and cause us to regret the hasty action taken.

That is precisely what has happened. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members are anxious to get out tonight.

Now we are to decide whether or not the Select Committee should be established. I do not believe that an adequate case has been made that it should. The scope of the investigation is too broad. The question of funding, which has caused such an uproar, is unresolved. The control of the staff is unresolved.

So are the serious reservations that have been raised regarding the protection of civil liberties during the course of the investigations. Questions have been raised about committee staff traveling around the country and overseas, without a committee member being present, and taking testimony under oath. I have doubts about the wisdom or even the legal standing of such procedures. Grave doubts exist in regard to the unintended damage that may be done to an already weakened Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investiga-

tion because we really do not know what directions this Select Committee will wobble into.

It is said that since the resolution this rule makes in order merely extends the Select Committee until March 31st, that all of these questions and all of these problems will be solved. I do not believe so.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote down the rule and to kill this committee now.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 230 provides for the consideration of House Resolution 222 in the House, as in the Committee of the Whole. That means that if we adopt this rule after the 1 hour of debate allotted, we will proceed to consider amendments to the Assassination Committee resolution under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the unique position of being both a member of the Committee on Rules and the Select Committee on Assassinations, and perhaps not surprisingly, I support both the rule and the resolution it makes in order to reconstitute that select committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee held 2 days of hearings on this matter, and, as a result of some legitimate concerns raised during the first hearing, particularly with regard to the protection of individual rights, a new resolution was offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) and reported from the Rules Committee yesterday as House Resolution 232. I think this new resolution goes a long way toward meeting most, if not all of the concerns raised over the first resolution, House Resolution 9.

Specifically, House Resolution 222 limits the existence of the select committee to March 31 of this year, at which time it must issue a report; it holds the funding level of the committee down to last year's levels, which comes to about \$24,000 a month; it specifies that any deaths investigated other than those of Kennedy and King must be deaths which the select committee determines might be related to those two deaths; it adds to the legislative purpose of the committee the task of determining whether there was full disclosure and sharing of information on these two deaths among the various Federal agencies involved in the investigations, and if not, why not; the resolution retains the one-third quorum requirement for the transaction of business but adds the two-member quorum provision for taking testimony, consistent with the present House rule; the new resolution drops the blanket subpoena authority grant to the select committee chairman, though the select committee could still provide for this in its own rules; and there is an added requirement that the committee rules must be made public.

Mr. Speaker, three main objections remain to this resolution in terms of new language not contained in House Resolution 1540 adopted in the last Congress, originally creating the select committee. It is charged that all three of these changes broaden considerably the scope and authority of the select committee. The first objection is to the new language which gives the select committee a legislative purpose, which can be found at lines 3 through 24 on page 2 of House Resolution 222. This language says in effect that the select committee shall determine the adequacy of existing laws and agency enforcement efforts and cooperation with respect to the matters under investigation, and report back any proposals for change in present law or new legislation. This language is necessitated by numerous Supreme Court decisions that any congressional inquiry must be related to and in furtherance of a legitimate task of Congress. And I cite here, *Watkins v. United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957), and *Barenblatt v. United States*, 360 U.S. 109 (1959).

In short, without this language, the select committee's inquiry might be subject to a constitutional challenge. The prospective chairman of the select committee, Mr. GONZALEZ, assured us that this language was in no way intended as

a license for a fishing expedition and would not be used to "get" various Federal agencies involved.

The second objection is to the new language granting the authority to the select committee to sit and act and obtain statements in "any other country." The resolution adopted in the last Congress was confined to the United States and its territories. Since the adoption of the resolution in the last Congress, it has become apparent to our select committee that many potential witnesses are not

now residing in the United States and it will be necessary, if we are to thoroughly investigate these matters, to take testimony abroad. It is not the intention of the chairman of the select committee or its members to engage in any extensive foreign travels, and that is one of the reasons new language was included in House Resolution 222 to make clear that as few as two members may sit to take testimony and, in the alternative, that a designated counsel may obtain statements from witnesses placed under oath by proper authorities.

The third objection is to the language beginning on line 13 of page 3 permitting a designated counsel of the select committee to obtain statements from witnesses under oath. Contrary to statements which have been made, this is not unprecedented. Similar language was contained in House Resolution 803 in the 93d Congress authorizing the House impeachment inquiry. To quote from section 2 of that resolution:

For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

- (1) by subpoena or otherwise—
 - (A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and
 - (B) the production of such things; and
- (2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information as it deems necessary to such investigation.

Similarly, Senate Resolution 60 in the 93d Congress, authorizing the so-called Watergate inquiry, contained the following provision:

To have access through the agency of any members of the select committee, chief majority counsel, minority counsel, or any of its investigators, assistants jointly designated by the chairman and the ranking minority member to any data, evidence, information, report, analysis, or document or papers relating to any of the matters or questions which it is authorized and directed to investigate and study . . . etc.

While I can understand the concern of some Members about this designated counsel provision, I would simply stress the precedent of our own impeachment inquiry, and would add that if you are concerned about foreign travel by Members, this is one way to save money. Moreover, keep in mind that the committee is now severely limited as to funds by House Resolution 11 and that we have plenty of work to keep us close to home during this 3-month period of the select committee's existence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule and then of the resolution creating the select committee.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to use the full 5 minutes, so that the gentleman controlling the time will have greater flexibility.

Mr. Speaker, on January 25, 1977, I appeared before the House Rules Committee in support of House Resolution 9, which provided for the reestablishment of the Select Committee on Assassinations and providing interim funding under the provisions of House Resolution 11.

The Rules Committee has reported out House Resolution 222 which includes certain amendments which provides for great constraints, insure the greatest possible protection for the rights of witnesses and requires the select committee to adopt rules governing its procedures which rules shall be public. The resolution limits the life of the select committee to March 31, 1977.

continued on page 3

The limited reestablishment of the select committee will allow time to reorganize, to adopt rules of procedure and rules for the staff, to carefully reassess staff and budget requirements. It will allow a calm, quiet, and orderly consideration of how we are going to proceed to investigate these two tragic assassinations.

Once this period of reorganization has been accomplished the committee will be prepared to return to this House and justify every procedure for the conduct of the investigation, and every proposed expenditure.

It is important to point out that I have not yet served as the chairman of the select committee. Even though I was the originator of the legislation creating the select committee on assassinations, I was not named as chairman when it was first established. Thus, I have inherited problems which occurred when I was not the person in charge.

I have devoted myself and much of the time of my personal staff to meeting the challenge of these circumstances. It is my judgment after careful consideration that the problems which exist can be resolved and corrected. The work which has been done thus far by the legal and investigative staff has been outstanding. But the simple fact is that in the waning days of the 94th Congress, the committee did not adopt rules of procedure governing either itself or the investigative techniques to be employed. On September 23, 1976, I wrote to Chairman THOMAS DOWNING and specifically requested that the committee adopt rules, determine the nature and scope of the investigation as well as staffing requirements. I am submitting for the Record a copy of that letter as well as a copy of my testimony before the House Rules Committee.

I have long sought the enactment of legislation establishing a House study of political assassinations. I feel strongly about the need for assessing the impact of these assassinations on our citizens and the institutions of our democratic government.

The 1960's was a decade of political turmoil which began with the assassination of President Kennedy and included the assassination of the winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. These assassinations shook the foundations of our democracy and have had a lasting effect on our citizens.

The essence of our democratic process is the election of our national leaders. When the express will of the electorate is preempted by a bullet—it eliminates those who have been duly elected to serve and those who seek to serve.

We are a committee in search of the truth about these two assassinations. We seek not to condemn or discredit agencies or institutions of our Government—but to simply find the truth and in so doing we strengthen the confidence of the public in our democratic processes and in our institutions.

"In a free and democratic society the greatest infidelity of a government to its people is the suppression of the truth." I strongly believe that a professional, thorough and independent investigation will lead to the truth.

The material referred to follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1976.

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Assassinations, Rayburn House Office Buildings, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I was pleased to learn today that the House Administration Committee approved \$150,000 for the duration of this Congress for support of our new Select Committee on Assassinations.

As I indicated in my remarks at the preliminary meeting which you called yesterday afternoon, I believe the committee should operate as a committee. It should seek to develop and maintain a consensus on the work to be accomplished and methods to be followed. Staff should be selected, I believe, by the committee as a whole. I am enclosing with this letter a suggested list of staff positions and qualifications for these positions.

In consideration of the general philosophy of the committee, I believe the committee should eschew any statements that it believes in this or that theory. The requirement is to develop the facts and let the facts speak; it is self-defeating to proclaim at the outset that the committee believes there was a conspiracy, or that there was not.

I believe the committee should speak through announcements only. Leaks are inevitable, but the committee itself should assure that official information is given only in the name of the committee, preferably

through a staff representative, and in written form, insofar as possible. Announcements should be approved by the committee in advance.

The committee should organize itself in a way that allows all information to be received; but it should not allow itself to be bogged down by well-meaning individuals. The information specialist and staff could provide an effective filter whereby all information is received and catalogued, so that investigators have access, but are not besieged by offerors of information, theory, or fancy.

I am hopeful that we can think in terms of phasing of the work of the committee in these terms:

I. Organizational Meetings—rules, determination of scope of investigation, staffing pattern (tasks and qualifications of staff), phasing of investigation,

II. Information Collection and Collation,

III. Evaluation of Information,

IV. Hearings—evaluation of hearings and determination of whether to hold further hearings, and

V. Report Preparation.

With warmest regards, I remain

Sincerely Yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,

Member of Congress.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HENRY B. GONZALEZ IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 9, BEFORE THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE, JAN. 25, 1977.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I appreciate having an opportunity to appear in support of House Resolution 9, reestablishing the Select Committee on Assassinations and providing interim funding under the provisions of House Resolution 11.

I have come here today making this request for approval of H. Res. 9 fully realizing the impact of some of the controversy surrounding the use of various investigative techniques, the proposed budget and the activities of the Chief Counsel.

First, a proposal was made by the staff for the use of polygraphs and stress analyzers. These items have never been used. I am personally opposed to their use. Before they could be used they would have to be approved by the full committee after careful debate and deliberation. I am confident that once it is reestablished and the Members have an opportunity to meet, that the Committee for the 95th Congress will not sanction the use of such devices.

Furthermore, I have made it clear that each and every investigative technique proposed to be used will be carefully considered and decided by Members of the Committee.

Second, questions have been raised about the size of the proposed budget of \$6.5 million. Until we are reestablished as a Select Committee there cannot properly be a budget request. Once the Committee is reestablished, the Members will have to thoroughly review and evaluate the proposed budget. We will then be in a position to justify each and every expenditure. At this point, we do not know what the budget request will be. I can only state that whatever the amount of the request, the Committee will be prepared to justify it and I believe it will be acceptable to every Member of the House who wants to see a thorough, professional, independent investigation.

Third, various questions have been raised about the activities of the Chief Counsel, Richard A. Sprague. Some of the stories which have been published about him were dredged from the turbid and murky waters of big city politics. They are political and bear no credence. As to his frequent contact and visibility in the media, I have already prepared a draft of proposed rules for both the staff and the Members of the Committee. Once we are reconstituted the Members of the Committee will then be able to immediately consider and adopt such rules.

Fourth, while I propose to speak for no other Member, I am sure that I reflect their strong feelings that this investigation will be conducted under the highest professional and ethical standards. I can personally assure the Members of this Committee and of the House that this investigation will be carried out in the most professional manner so there will be no doubt as to our credibility or that of this House.

It is important to point out that I have not yet served as the Chairman of the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Even though I was the originator of legislation creating the Select Committee on Assassinations I was not named the Chairman of the Committee when it was first established last September. Therefore, it is important to understand that I have inherited the errors and misjudgments that have been made during a period when I was not the person in charge.

I have devoted myself, and much of the time of my personal staff, to meeting the challenge of these circumstances, and it is my judgment after very close consideration that there is nothing so dire that cannot be resolved or corrected. The work that has been done thus far by the legal and investigative efforts of the Select Committee's staff is commendable and outstanding.

At such time that this Committee is reconstituted and I am officially made the Chairman by House Speaker, Thomas O'Neill, it is certain that some staff adjustments will be made, and there is no doubt in my mind that after these adjustments are made we can work together in such a way that no further missteps are taken that could cause harm to this body or these investigations.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, I have long sought enactment of legislation establishing a House study of the political assassinations.

I feel strongly about the need for assessing the impact of these assassinations on our country, and getting to the truth of why they happened so that we can prevent such events from happening again.

There has never been a period of time in the history of our country like the decade of political assassinations which began with the murder of President Kennedy and included the death of Dr. King.

This decade of assassinations shook the foundations of our democracy and has had lasting effects on the people—too many of whom have very serious doubts and fears about their government and its ability to cope with forces both within it and loose throughout the land.

I sincerely did not seek the establishment of this Select Committee so that I could become the Chairman. The thought did not even cross my mind. Maybe it should have, because I certainly have other objectives and responsibilities which must be considered too.

All I have wanted from the beginning is the truth about these crimes against the people, and this is why I seek reestablishment of the Committee first established through legislation I originated.

I cannot think of anything more important for us to do here in the Congress, as elected representatives of the people, than to insure that the people have the option to choose their national leaders by ballot, rather than subjecting them to the possibility that bullets may eliminate those who could possibly serve, or who might continue to serve, in either a volunteer or elected position.

When I first introduced my proposal in the 94th Congress—on February 19, 1975—calling for a Select Committee to study the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President Kennedy, U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy, Dr. King, and the attempt on Governor George Wallace's life—I was serious, but since I was not taken too seriously at the time I had no reason to know much about the forces in this country that are dedicated to keeping the truth from being known.

Now that the Committee has been a reality and the investigations begun, I know full well that there are strong and organized forces dedicated to stopping these investigations in their tracks.

Nevertheless, I am willing to stand up to these forces, and I hope that you are willing to give me and my colleagues, who want to continue to serve on this Committee a chance to give the people a full accounting of why President Kennedy and Dr. King were slain.

Those of you who served on the House Rules Committee during the 94th Congress know that this Committee on September 15, 1976 favorably reported out House Resolution 1540, which authorized a Select Committee on Assassinations. On September 17, 1976, the House passed that resolution. Thus, four months ago, the House debated, deliberated and determined that there should be full and complete investigations into the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The initial reasons for the establishment of a Select Committee were thoroughly discussed and obviously dispositive to the overwhelming numbers of the Members of the House who voted in favor of that resolution.

First of all, the inadequacies of the investigations in both assassinations and the questions which have been raised, as well as independent findings of other Congressional Committees that in the case of the assassination of President Kennedy the Warren Commission was not provided with all the evidence, continue to be compelling reasons why the investigations must be carried out.

Similarly, Mr. Chairman, it was certainly the will of the American people that these investigations should once and for all solve these assassinations and determine the truth. To this end I would simply remind the Members of this Committee that both a CBS and a Detroit News poll indicated that 66% and 87% of those polled do not believe the conclusion of the Warren Commission. A poll by the Philadelphia Daily News indicated that 96% of those polled supported the need for investigations. Thus, the will of the American people to fully investigate these assassinations was carried out by the House last September by the passage of House Resolution 1540. A recent Gallup Poll indicated that only 11% of the people believe the conclusion of the Warren Commission.

continued on page 4

During the span of its short life in the 94th Congress, the Select Committee found previously undisclosed evidence, critical witnesses who had never been questioned, and revelations which lead to serious questions that must be resolved.

Can we, like an ostrich, now ~~hide~~ our heads in the sand and pretend this evidence does not exist? If we do, I submit we can be accused of the greatest Congressional cover-up in history. To do so would be tantamount to the Senate Watergate Committee discovering the existence of the tapes and not inquiring further, or the House Impeachment Committee drawing a Bill of Impeachment and not proceeding.

Further unwarranted delay would demonstrate vacillation and indecisiveness which ultimately damages our credibility as Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence is compelling—it will not be washed away—it cannot be ignored. As I said earlier, to stop now would be unthinkable. It would demonstrate to the American people that when faced with this challenge we turned our backs on the quest for the truth.

In closing, I would like to call your attention to a comparison of H. Res. 9 to H. Res. 1540 of the 94th Congress which I am submitting with this testimony, also copies of material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to the need for the reconstitution of the Select Committee, and to the exchange of correspondence I have had with Congressman Don Edwards in response to his initial letter to former Select Committee Chairman, Congressman Thomas Downing, who is now retired.

Again, I ask for your support of this effort to find the truth, and welcome any questions you might have.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a very difficult position today, being the ranking minority member on the now extinct but hopefully to be reestablished Select Committee on Assassinations. I am troubled by a number of aspects. I think it passing strange that the Justice Department has issued what has been reported today about Dr. King and the findings they have made. I think it passing strange that that happened to be issued today.

It is passing strange also I think that just last Monday the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia, Judge John Lewis Smith, issued an order that all known copies of tapes and recorded transcripts having to do with Dr. King be turned over to the court and placed in the National Archives under seal for 50 years. I do not know if this select committee if reconstituted would have access to or jurisdiction over those or not. But these things are troubling.

I happen to be one of the 85 Members that voted against the creation of the select committee when it was created in the last session. I was not sure a useful purpose would be served. I was afraid the tragic assassinations would be exploited by a number of persons. However, the committee was created and it was the will of this House by a substantial vote that it go forward, so when I was placed on the committee I felt we should not be hamstrung or handcuffed, but we should be provided sufficient funds to do a thorough and efficient job to settle the problems having to do with these assassinations. I think the Members all know about the starts and stops of the previous committee. I am not troubled by Mr. Sprague. I think he is a highly competent lawyer and investigator, so I am not troubled about that.

What troubles me is this resolution today, or at least the first two lines of it, which say:

... That effective January 3, 1977, and until March 31, 1977, there is hereby created a select committee . . .

Mr. Speaker, that is the day this Congress convened, and it says, "until March 31, 1977," which is just 60 days from now.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, we are pumping life into this for 60 days and I do not think Mr. Sprague or the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) can do justice to any investigation in this short period of time. I would be much more comfortable if this investigation said 1978, to at least give the staff time to do a good professional job; so that is what troubles me more about this resolution than anything else. I think we should examine closely what we are doing here today, whether we are really ham-

stringing the select committee for a period of 60 days and then have to reconstitute it or kill it again in 60 days. That is the problem today; so let us weigh what we are doing here very intelligently and do what we think is in the best interests of the country.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILFORD).

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

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule and I oppose the establishment of a House Select Committee on Assassinations.

While I know that several conscientious, sincere and dedicated Members have sponsored this resolution—including my distinguished colleague from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ)—I must respectfully disagree with their efforts.

Many of the Nation's wounds inflicted by the assassination of John F. Kennedy have healed. The anger and resentment directed at the city of Dallas—much of it very vicious and vindictive—has subsided. However, as a Representative of the city of Dallas, I can assure you that the memories of those feelings are still fresh in the minds of the people of Dallas.

At a time when we are answering calls for unity and healing, it seems ludicrous to me to relieve the pain, to revive the hurt and restore the bitterness. The deaths of President Kennedy and Dr. King produced painful traumas for the American people in general and the citizens of Dallas and Memphis in particular; this resolution would only add to that trauma.

State and Federal law enforcement agencies investigated these crimes with an intensity unequalled in our national history. If there are reasons to discredit these investigations they must be obvious and clearly spelled out for the American public. I contend no substantial evidence has been offered to discredit the Warren Commission or the findings of our judicial system.

I further submit that it is an exercise in futility to establish a small congressional committee with limited resources and honestly expect it to sort out the truth in 2 short months—especially when those who have called for this action have been arguing about it for 13 years.

The Select Committee on Assassinations in its report of December 31 indicates that one of the new issues which the committee should investigate is whether or not the Central Intelligence Agency deliberately withheld critical information or acted improperly. In fact, this seems to be one of the major issues discussed by the committee's chief counsel, Richard Sprague, in many news articles I have since read on the subject.

In this regard, I would like to point out that President Ford on January 4, 1975, established a Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States, which was chaired by Vice President Rockefeller. This Commission looked into the matter of the Kennedy assassination and reached the conclusion that, though many allegations had been made about possible CIA activity in this assassination, the Commission had to conclude that there was no evidence that the CIA had any improper involvement.

These same allegations were later investigated by the Select Committee on Intelligence, of which I was a member, and the committee reached the same conclusion. I am advised by my colleagues in the Senate that the Senate Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities also investigated the possibility of critical evidence being withheld by the FBI and also reached the conclusion that there had been no improprieties by the FBI in that area.

The resolution also declares that the express purpose of this select committee would be to assess whether or not statutes already on the books need to be changed or new legislation enacted to enhance the President.

I would like to bring the committee's attention to the fact that the Warren Commission during its investigation required the Secret Service to submit a detailed report regarding its policy and procedures for Presidential protection. The Commission's review of these procedures led them to make a series of recommendations to deal with the deficiencies they found—six involving internal

procedural changes and one which later became Public Law 89-141, making it a Federal crime to attempt to assault, assassinate, or kidnap the President or other Government officials in line for the Presidency and establishing penalties for conviction of such acts.

Also as a result of the Kennedy assassination, President Johnson ordered a broad assessment of Presidential protection to be undertaken—known as Project Star. This project incorporated reports, studies, and recommendations from numerous Federal agencies and private research institutions, and took 2 years.

There are a number of other important factors that must be recognized concerning the original investigations and the Warren Commission: First, all witnesses were then alive, with fresh memories and good recall of important facts; second, all physical evidence was then present for careful examination; and third, all possible theories and hypotheses could be evaluated against the then-present witnesses and physical evidence.

If there exists evidence or one credible eyewitness or one piece of definitive, scientific evidence to point to an alternate conclusion from that of the Warren Commission, I would be the first to sponsor a resolution to reopen the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that there is a great deal of difference between "evidence" and a "hypothesis" or "theory." Evidence requires that there must be a physical manifestation, a credible witness with sworn testimony, or a scientifically provable assumption.

On the other hand, "hypothesis" or "theory" simply means an "idea" or "proposition" that no one else can disprove. The hypothesis or theory is not evidence.

I have carefully read the theories presented by those who want to reopen the Kennedy assassination investigation. None contains evidence that can be directly tied to the assassination or admitted in a court of law. As of this day, no one seems to have either hard evidence to discredit the findings of the Warren Commission or evidence to indicate that a new investigative body could produce a new finding.

In the alternative, if—in the wisdom of this House—a Select Committee on Assassinations is established, then it must be provided with adequate resources to completely reinvestigate both the Kennedy assassination and the King murder. In other words, if we are to discredit the State police agencies, the FBI, the Secret Service, the CIA, our Federal court system, and the Warren Commission, then the House must be prepared to produce investigative funds and facilities to replace the work done by all of them. To do less would be to perpetrate a hoax on the American people and to revive cruel pains of the past.

If we are to take this alternative plan, I can assure you that the amount of funding originally requested by the proposed Select Committee on Assassinations would be woefully inadequate.

I plead with the House to vote down House Resolution 222. No one has come forward with a single shred of creditable evidence to show that a new investigation is needed. Existing standing committees already have the necessary jurisdiction to make any needed changes in our laws dealing with assassination.

The Kennedy and King murders were followed by another national trauma that tore our Nation apart—Watergate. Our people lost faith in our Government institutions. If there exists creditable and legally acceptable evidence to show that our State and Federal institutions have erred, then spell it out—in spades—so the American people can understand, and provide the select committee with the necessary funds and resources to do a creditable reinvestigation of the entire matter.

I thank the Members for their attention.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLELLY).

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILFORD) has just said. The gentleman and I served on the Select Committee on Intelligence in the last Congress. Let me tell this House, it was a real disaster. I supported the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) in the creation of that select committee. We had good intentions; but if some Members have any problems with the staff, let me attest to the fact that an uncontrolled staff can destroy the work of a good committee. We had that problem with some members of the Intelligence Committee staff. The staff was very ambitious. It did a great disservice to this body. We had to actually prohibit the publication of the report which the staff had prepared and which I described as a cheap paperback labeled as a committee report. Fortunately, the House never permitted the publication of that report.

I think we would face the same kind of dilemma with this kind of undertaking. I hope the rule and the resolution will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, with the creation again of a Select Committee on Assassinations, this House would wander far afield from its constitutional duties of lawmaking and oversight. Murder investigations are normally left to law enforcement agencies and the judicial branch, and I doubt that any previous Congress has undertaken criminal investigations of this type.

Apart from this very legitimate question of appropriateness, we might also ask ourselves if these proposed investigations will settle anything. As the distinguished commentator Eric Sevareid has rightly noted, a veritable "cottage industry" has developed concerning conspiracy theories. New hypotheses have proven very profitable, regardless of their relationship to known facts. Will another investigation, many years after the events—with many witnesses deceased and much evidence undoubtedly lost—put an end to such speculation? Commonsense suggests that it will not.

Given our marginal prospects for success, we might also consider the problem of quantifying the debt many of us obviously believe we owe to history. With so many other more pressing needs facing the country, do we owe history as much as \$13 million over 2 years—or any lesser figure that may be dreamed up to secure approval of this measure? The response must be in the negative.

Finally, we should ask ourselves to consider seriously the civil liberties issues so appropriately raised by our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. EDWARDS). Do we want a committee, without even a set of operating rules at this point, to be jeopardizing private citizens through secret recordings, what amount to secret lie detector tests, surveillance, and the untimely use of public hearings?

These possibilities, bizarre as they seem, were all raised recently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by authorized committee spokesmen. Assurances that secret lie detector tests would not be used came only after a press report to the contrary had been brought to our attention by Mr. EDWARDS.

Mr. Speaker, as presently proposed, these investigations have the potential of intensifying everything people already think is wrong with Congress. They are outrageously expensive, badly organized, and possibly destructive.

The 95th Congress needs to work hard to regain the respect its predecessor lost. This Select Committee on Assassinations is not the way to begin our task.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 222. I do so because, as one of three cosponsors of the resolution which was passed by the House in the 94th Congress by a 280-to-65 margin, I remain convinced of the need for a thorough investigation of these assassinations by this body. As a result of 3 months' service on the select committee that has conducted only a

threshold inquiry into the matter, I am even more convinced now of the necessity to continue these investigations.

Little attention has been given to the fact that threshold inquiries by a thoroughly professional staff assembled by the committee in the last 3 months have produced literally a thousand questions unanswered by the investigations of record into these assassinations. But as much as I would like to focus upon these matters, I realize that these things are not of primary concern to my colleagues who must vote on this resolution today.

You are concerned, I know, about whether the Congress should spend a

proposed \$6.5 million this year to conduct these two investigations. You want to be sure that the civil and constitutional rights of all who may be touched by these investigations are scrupulously protected. You want to be sure that illegal devices and tactics are not used in the conduct of this investigation, and that the rules and procedures of this House are meticulously followed by both members of the committee and the staff. And some of you fear that such a thorough investigation might be used to "destroy" the CIA and FBI in the eyes of the American people.

I support this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that these are legitimate concerns on the part of my colleagues and that the reconstitution of the committee until March 31 will give us the opportunity to address these concerns to the satisfaction of a substantial majority of the Members of this House.

If you are reluctant to support this resolution, because you have serious questions about the proposed budget, let me assure you that an aye vote today on this resolution will give the reconstituted committee not only time to carefully review the budget proposal, but also to adequately discuss it with Members. Thus, when you are asked to take a vote on reconstituting the committee for the life of the 95th Congress in March, you will have a much clearer picture of what you are voting for in terms of funds.

If you are reluctant to support the resolution, because you have concerns about whether the investigation will be conducted in a fashion that neither the constitutional rights of citizens are violated, nor the authority of the Congress exceeded, nor the integrity of the House compromised, let me assure you that both, the language of this resolution and the intent of this reconstituted committee to draft clear rules of procedure and conduct between now and the time you will be asked to extend the life of the committee insure that you will have adequate basis for making a judgment then.

For those of you who are concerned about the image of the FBI and the CIA, let me assure you that a thorough investigation of these assassinations will not destroy the confidence of the American people in these agencies; it will help restore confidence in them.

I submit that a measure of the confidence of the American people in our CIA was destroyed when its agency head, Richard Helms, had to testify before the Senate Committee To Study Government Operations that the CIA withheld information from the Warren Commission concerning CIA plots to kill foreign leaders, particularly a CIA plot to kill Fidel Castro. Now there may be a perfectly reasonable explanation for this that can help restore the confidence of us all in the Agency. If not, actions by the Congress to prevent such conduct in the future will certainly help restore the confidence of the American people in the integrity of this Agency.

I submit that a measure of the confidence of the American people in our FBI was destroyed when we learned through the Senate select committee of J. Edgar

Hoover's infamous CoIntelPro program which used, in the words of the committee report:

Dangerous and degrading tactics which are abhorrent in a free and decent society.

The committee went on to state that—

The sustained use of such tactics by the FBI in an attempt to destroy Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. violated the law and fundamental human decency.

I submit that a thorough investigation of the assassination of Dr. King by this House will restore confidence in the FBI either by proving that their investigation

of his death was thorough or by assuring that the passage of legislation by the Congress that will guard against abuses of authority and responsibility in these matters.

Once these and other questions about the investigations of these assassinations are answered, including why Lee Harvey Oswald was questioned by seven FBI agents for 12 hours and no transcript of what was said was provided the Warren Commission, why the American people were not told that Lee Harvey Oswald was at one time an FBI employee; answers to questions like these will not destroy these agencies, but restore the confidence of the American people in their present and future integrity.

It will also serve notice on any who would attempt to assassinate present or future leaders in our Nation that there will be no weaknesses in the intelligence agencies of our Government through which they may slip undetected.

For all these reasons, I urge today, your support of House Resolution 222.

IN RESPONSE TO MR. MILFORD'S STATEMENT

At the outset, it is important to note that Mr. MILFORD addresses himself to only one facet of the select committee's task. As he himself says:

(My purpose here is to examine realistically the proposition: "Should the House of Representatives appoint a committee to re-examine the Kennedy assassination?")

He pays scant attention to the select committee's other, and equally important purpose, to conduct a full, thorough, and comprehensive investigation of the assassination of the most renowned civil rights leader of our time, a Nobel Peace Prize laureate, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

In justifying his opposition to House Resolution 222, Mr. MILFORD displays an unfortunate tendency to put the evidentiary cart before the investigative horse. He demands "hard evidence" or "substantial evidence" or "credible evidence" to show, for example, that "the Warren Commission's conclusions were substantially in error." In other words, he wants the select committee to produce the fruits of a thorough and comprehensive investigation before it can undertake that investigation. In short, he has devised an impossible task for the select committee, placing on it a burden that no other standing or select committee of the House could carry, or should be expected to carry.

Thus, Mr. MILFORD wants the select committee to justify its existence by producing "a credible witness with sworn testimony." It is only stating the obvious to point out that, until it is reconstituted, the select committee does not even have the power to swear witnesses and, until it is funded, it lacks the resources to conduct the kind of investigation needed to determine whether a particular witness is in fact credible.

In his statement, Mr. MILFORD has clearly misunderstood the meaning and use of a hypothesis. He believes that it is a theory or proposition "that could neither be proved or disproved" or that "no one else could disapprove." Yet the primary dictionary definition of "hypothesis" is "a tentative assumption made in order to draw out and test its logical and empirical consequences." Thus, Mr. MILFORD to the contrary notwithstanding, a hypothesis is not a theory that can never be verified. Rather, it is a theory that exists precisely to be verified. The verification, the testing of the numerous hypotheses that have arisen in the Kennedy and King assassination cases can only be done by the kind of full, thorough and comprehensive investigation that the select committee proposes to undertake. In passing, it should be noted that most, if not all, technological and scientific progress is based on the development of a hypothesis by a particular physicist or chemist who then proceeds to test that hypothesis empirically. The select committee proposes to do no more, and no less, with the hypotheses that have arisen in the context of the Kennedy and King assassinations.

Moreover, Mr. MILFORD is clearly mistaken about the purpose of the select committee. It is not, as he seems to believe, to "discredit the State police agencies, the FBI, the Secret Service, the CIA, our Federal court system, and the Warren Commission." The select committee does not propose to discredit anyone. Its purpose, without preconceptions of any kind, is to conduct a full, thorough, and comprehensive investigation of the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King. At the conclusion of the select committee's investigation it will present the evidence it has gathered to the House and to the American people. Whether that evidence reflects credit or discredit to the agencies cited by Mr. MILFORD is a judgment that the House and the American people will have to make. One thing is clear: At the present time, before the select committee has been reconstituted, before it has been funded, and before its investigation has fairly begun, it is impossible for anyone to make that judgment.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY).

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

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my time is essentially short, so I would like to try to cover a few things in this statement that I have covered in much greater detail in today's RECORD.

I think it is necessary for us in this Congress, though not controlled by the last, to think about the basic subject which reaches out to all the American people from the halls of this building: the credibility of the American system of government.

In the last Congress, whether you agreed or not, a vast majority of the Congressmen in this House representing a vast majority of the American people of this country said:

Yes, we should investigate the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King and President John F. Kennedy.

That was a decision we made far too late in time and it was a decision we made on a very poorly written resolution which left the committee with no direction and no startup time at the end of the last Congress.

Here we are. The press has titillated us with what they say we found, which is usually inaccurate. Our sense of purpose is at stake, as is our word.

I stand here, I hope, considered an honorable Member of this body, and say that we have found at least new avenues and some new facts. We must go on. Are we going to add to the total credibility factor of this Government that every time something difficult comes forward we turn and run? Are we, the Congress that wailed and screamed about Watergate, going to pull our own mini-Watergate, our own head in the sand act?

I think it is time we must look forward. Whether we are for the resolution or not, it was the will of the representative assembly of this country, and to run from it now simply says we do not have the will, we do not want the truth, we do not want to face the fact that 90 percent of the American people believe they were lied to.

I am convinced that under our new chairman's direction the committee will be properly run. Certainly I am not happy with this resolution. I am convinced that in 60 days we will come back with printed rules of order. We will come back with the printed, written rules for interrogation protecting the civil rights of Americans and others. We will come back with an explanation as to why we must go through the unique process of taking testimony under oath in foreign countries. We will come back to the Members, I believe, with a budget which is realistic, sensible, and explains itself. The Members then can in their wisdom reconstitute the committee to finish its job in this Congress and to answer the questions that the American people want to know.

And what if we do not find anything new? If we do not find anything new, I for one will say, "Hallelujah." But at least we have answered the questions, the people who are sent to Washington to run this country have not run away from an issue that they said they were interested in a mere few months ago.

I want to say something about the chief counsel of this committee. Certainly he does not know how Congress works. My wife has been married to a Congressman for 8 years and she does not know how we work. But he has had a hatchet job done on him, the likes of which I have never seen. I do not know why so many people would be so interested in such a hurry in doing a job on Mr. Sprague. Mr.

Sprague did not set up this committee. He did not ask for this job. We went to him, and our past chairman hired him. I wish I could have been consulted, but since then I have had the chief counsel in my office, I have read to him the allegations that have been made about him. I have received his answers. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BAYNE), that the gentleman will do a fine job. We do not have political friends on this committee.

Mr. Speaker, we have prosecutors, investigators, and police officers from some of the finest police divisions and prosecutorial offices in the United States of America. They have not been paid for a month, they are dedicated and hard working, and they deserve to be given a chance to show what they can do.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRAGER).

Mr. BRAGER. Mr. Speaker, I am not about to go into the merits or the demerits of the issue involved. We have constituted a committee, and I think it is incumbent upon us to continue with it.

But let me give the Members a perspective that has not been as yet introduced, and that is in relation to the assassinations of the late President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as they relate specifically to crime and criminal investigations.

As most of the Members know, I was a police officer for some 23 years. I retired as a squad commander of detectives in the city of New York.

Speaking from experience, I would tell the Members this: that if either one of these individuals had been just plain John Doe, we would not close those cases. There are too many questions that remain unanswered. We would carry both these cases as open cases.

So if we are dealing in terms of honest investigations carried on for the purpose of finding answers to questions that would have to trouble an investigator, we have no choice but to continue the investigation. The people have a right to know the truth.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FURMAN).

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize there has been a pronounced shift in opinion from enthusiasm for this investigation last fall to some skepticism about it today. I think there are a number of reasons for that.

There is one general reason, it seems to me, and that is that we have been going through a transition period in this country. We are looking toward new beginnings, and we want to put the nightmares of the past behind us; then here comes this committee raising these old ghosts of the past.

We wish that we could put all the evils of the past behind us, but nothing is settled finally until it is settled right, and this matter just has not been settled finally.

There are other specific reasons for this skepticism. One is the budget. Let me emphasize that we are not approving the budget here today. Our vote in favor of reconstituting this committee does not

indicate any sense of approval of the budget. We will come back to the Members with that on March 31.

Another problem is that there is a feeling that we have greatly expanded this resolution and have attempted to aggrandize our power as a committee. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) addressed himself to that point and I associate myself with his remarks.

Another element, I think, in this attack—I guess that is the right word—on the committee is the question of Mr. Sprague. Mr. Sprague has been made the issue by some people. There is a feeling that somehow he is running away with the committee, that he is speaking for the committee.

Well, from my experience with Mr. Sprague, I found that he has always handled himself in a thoroughly professional manner. He is dedicated. He will get the job done, and so will his staff.

I think there has been a wrong impression by some that he is always running to the press. For example, the committee told Mr. Sprague that he and Mr. Downing together should go on television when we would finish each of our sessions and answer the questions of the press so that all the rest of us would not be speaking in many voices. Since Mr. Sprague was the new man on the block, most of the attention was focused on Mr. Sprague and not on Mr. Downing. He was speaking with our agreement when he spoke.

Some of the questions that have been raised as to material being leaked from the committee indicate absolutely the reverse of that. For example, one network indicated that a published story contained the announcement that a staff member was going to Cuba to interview Castro. That was totally false. Mr. Sprague was outraged about it. He immediately called the network, and he prevented the story from going to other news media. Yet we were told that that represents an irresponsible leak from Mr. Sprague. That is a plant from somebody; that is not a leak.

The same is true with a network TV interview this morning. The interview with Mr. Sprague was filmed several weeks ago, and it was to depict the fact that staff morale was high and they were continuing to work even though the select committee had not been reauthorized. Unfortunately, that interview of several weeks ago was juxtaposed with an interview with the gentleman from California, Don Edwards, and it created an impression of a debate between Mr. Sprague and the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS).

It appeared that Mr. Sprague was taking the prerogative of speaking for the committee and answering the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), and that is absolutely not the case.

He is new in working with Congress. He has made some mistakes. He has indicated willingness to learn Congress ways.

Mr. Speaker, questions have been raised by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH) in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 11 and January 24 about the Applegate case and the Walter case as well as several other matters. My threshold inquiry into that case satisfies me that there is nothing seriously involved there which compromises Mr. Sprague, but that is a threshold inquiry and not exhaustive.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. WIRTH) that I talked with the chairman of the committee, and we have agreed that the committee will go into the charges made in the two issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I referred to and will give the gentleman from Colorado an answer as part of our first order of business.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me answer the charge that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILFORD) raises that somehow this will foster distrust in our system of government and that we will tear the Nation apart if we go into this matter again.

On the contrary, and I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY), this is a question of the credibility of our system, and in a democracy the system has to have credibility. That is not necessary in a monarchy or totalitarian form of government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this further time.

As I was about to say, if we were a monarchy, not a democracy, we would not have to have credibility to exist. However, a democratic system has to have it.

Mr. Speaker, the latest poll shows that only 10 percent of the American people believe Oswald was the lone assassin of President Kennedy. Only 10 percent, in other words, believe the Warren Commission report. That is a serious credibility gap.

Mr. Speaker, we are not out to tear the Nation apart. We are out to restore credibility, just as the Watergate hearings did not tear the Nation apart; they restored belief in our Government.

Mr. Speaker, this question is not just one of two murders of two men. It is a question of assassination, of regicide, in President Kennedy's case the killing of the representative of the State itself. Assassination is a peculiarly horrible crime. It arouses our deepest fears. It is going to continue to raise questions down the future unless we answer this matter once and for all.

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

Mr. PREYER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) for the presentation that he has made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) has expired.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

(Mr. COLLINS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I ask you to join me in opposing this rule on the Select Committee of Assassinations. With all of the important issues facing Congress we should not distract ourselves on some investigation that would serve no useful purpose.

From the time this issue was originally raised under H.R. 1540, we have seen the entire thrust changed under H.R. 9. It calls for smaller Member participation as only one-third of the Members shall constitute a quorum. It provides that only two members are necessary in order to take testimony. It establishes this select committee as a committee of the House for the apparent purpose of providing regulations providing immunity for witnesses. And therein we have a very serious issue, as they contended they are trying to find guilty people but one of their major concerns is to provide immunity for those they find guilty.

I was disturbed to see that under the authority of the act it did not merely cover the United States, but they have now added "any other country." So here we have a committee that is authorized to investigate the world.

My major objection to the broad resolution is the wide scope of its jurisdiction. H.R. 1540 is not only going to investigate the deaths of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King but "any other person the select committee shall determine in order to ascertain whether the existing laws of the United States . . . deprivation of civil rights, as well as the investigatory jurisdiction and capability of agencies and departments of the U.S. Government." It is apparent from the preliminary statements of this committee that one of their major concerns is to try to smear the FBI and CIA. With the press field day that we have had the past few years, it is time that we tried to establish and build a strong FBI and CIA for the security and law and order of America. There is no need today to create a new file with innuendoes, committee leaks, and wild statements.

After the last CIA hearings it reached a point where foreign nations were blaming the CIA for the earthquakes, floods, or any homicide that occurred in any country. Our friends abroad who were giving us intelligence information were apprehensive of reporting anything because we provided them no security and their own lives could be in jeopardy.

The FBI and CIA cannot make public all their operations. But we all know that politicians can make the front page with broad half true statements. The FBI is efficient, effective and absolutely essential to the security of America. We do not need a witch hunt committee.

We have talked about financial responsibility in this session of Congress yet once we create this committee we are

talking about pouring money into unlimited witch hunts with a \$13 million appropriation.

If there is one thing that America has learned in the past 2 years it is the right of privacy and protection of an individual's rights. And yet with the fiery spirit of the Klu Klux Klan and the electronic bugging of a special investigator this assassination committee desires to intimidate, shadow, and coerce citizens from one end of the world to the other.

President Kennedy's family did not ask for this resolution. There is no proved evidence that has come available that would justify Congress in creating the witch hunt committee. I call on my colleagues in the name of rationalized commonsense and dedication to a sound term of Congress that we repudiate this resolution and vote "no."

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution before us which makes in order a new authorization for the Select Committee on Assassinations, giving it a 60-day reprieve.

It has been said that during a period of calm and in a reflective atmosphere the committee will consider what their purpose is to be and what they are to do. However, they have already had 90 days to do precisely that, and they have failed. That is why we are here today debating this problem.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when the Washington Post and the gentleman from Maryland can agree on an issue, there has to be a broad spectrum of concern reflected, as there is in this particular case.

One investigative reporter from that publication said, basing his particular comment, I assume, on his observation of what the committee has done in the last 90 days, Mr. Walter Pincus calls it perhaps the worst example of congressional inquiry run amok.

He said that—

The present House investigation into the Kennedy and King assassinations, pushed by publicity and pressure from a narrow but vocal constituency, what amounts to a multimillion-dollar criminal investigation is going to be conducted in the name of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this investigation originally because I felt there were legitimate questions raised about the deaths of these two American leaders. I thought possibly a forum in the Congress of the United States could properly deal with the questions that were raised, fill in the gaps and provide answers.

I frankly now believe that the committee and its staff have shown that it is incapable of dealing with these sensitive matters. In fact, for us to permit the committee to go ahead will only raise more questions and defeat the very purpose it professes to hope to achieve.

The Kennedy family did not want this investigation and they have made that abundantly clear. We are informed that the Department of Justice has indeed investigated the King assassination. Both of these matters have been dealt with by official forums at great length.

I am aware that some of the American people do not believe many of the conclusions that have been reached, but I also suggest that if the American people were asked whether they wanted to spend \$13 million over 2 years, to hire 170 staff members to conduct an investigation of these matters by the Congress that their answer would be an emphatic "no." Indeed, it is a matter of credibility that we have here before us today.

I would suggest that the Members address themselves very carefully to the contents of the resolution that they find before them because it does expand the scope of the investigation, in my opinion. It does constitute a downpayment on a possible \$13 million or even more dollars expenditure. It will mean the creation of a committee that will be larger in funding and staff than the investigative group which dealt with Watergate. It will be larger than any committee in this House, larger than committees dealing with energy or any of the other serious problems we are facing.

I am well aware that this matter arouses certain passions. Last night the Speaker was subject to a public demonstration in Massachusetts warning that "They are watching Tip O'NEILL, what you do in this matter," a statement from Mark Lane who has been a champion of such an investigation.

I myself received a veiled threat of physical harm that I turned over to the FBI for investigation, because I had the temerity to stand up and ask, "What are you folks going to do with this investigation, and why are you doing it?"

I think we have a chance to restore credibility in the House. At the same time I think, a responsible job of answering these questions can be done through the proper channels. If there are new questions to be raised in the judicial or executive branches, then let it be done. Let existing congressional committees act. But this committee and its staff has proven that this is not the proper place where this kind of investigation should take place. I believe we would do well to put this committee to rest now.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the Members of the House again that I have a report from the Department of Justice and that copies of that report were delivered to the appropriate committee chairman. I say that if we pass this resolution, if we restructure this committee, then we are, in effect, obligating the American taxpayers for some \$13 million.

It is time we closed the gates on spending. It is time we get down to business and kill this resolution and stop it now dead in its tracks.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLLEN). Did I understand the gentleman to say that a copy of the report was delivered to the committee?

Mr. QUILLEN. If the gentleman will yield, I said to the appropriate committees. That is the information I have, that it was delivered to the appropriate committees.

I understand that the chairman of the committee in the Senate has the report. He has not read it, and also that the chairman of the committee in the House has been delivered the report.

Mrs. BURKE of California. What is the source of the information that the report is being held in the committee?

Mr. QUILLEN. The Department of Justice has reported that copies have been sent to the appropriate committees.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Did the Justice Department also advise the gentleman that other committees that have jurisdiction also have received copies?

Mr. QUILLEN. I have not talked to the Justice Department. I feel that I have opened the door for the gentleman from California to find out who has the report so that she can have a copy of it if she so desires.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Let me say that I have asked the Justice Department all day and I have been asking the Attorney General. The chairman of my committee has been asking, and has been advised, we cannot have the report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Has the gentleman asked the chairman of the appropriate committee?

Mrs. BURKE of California. I have just talked to the chairman of the committee in this House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has the time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly must refuse to yield further.

I do not expect to take more than a minute, but I think that the issue before us has been somewhat twisted. What we are talking about is extending the life of the committee for a nominal 3 months—

continued on page 8

actually 2 months—so that the committee with a new chairman will have the opportunity to come back to the House and say that we are organized; this is the way we are going to function; and this is our program. It seems to me that it would be absolutely ridiculous to cut this committee off because of the reasons given. We are asking for an extension of 60 days so that a new committee of a new Congress will have an opportunity to prove to the House that it deserves to be extended for the life of the Congress. That is all the issue is. There is not any other issue. I hope very much that we will have an overwhelming vote in support of the revival of this select committee in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 265, nays 145, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—265

Addabbo	Flowers	Natcher
Akaka	Foley	Neal
Alexander	Ford, Tenn.	Nichols
Allen	Fountain	Nix
Ambro	Fraser	Nolan
Ammerman	Fraser	Oaker
Anderson	Fuqua	Oberstar
Anderson, Calif.	Gammage	Oboe
Anderson, Ill.	Gialmo	O'Brien
Andrews, N.C.	Gilman	Ottenger
Andrews	Glickman	Panetta
N. Dak.	Goldwater	Patterson
Annunzio	Gonzales	Pattison
Ashley	Gore	Pease
Aspin	Gradison	Perkins
AuCoin	Gudger	Pettis
Badillo	Guyer	Pickle
Baldus	Hagedorn	Freyer
Baucus	Hamilton	Price
Beard, R.I.	Hanley	Pritchard
Bedell	Hannaford	Quile
Bellenson	Harrington	Rahall
Benjamin	Harris	Rangel
Biaggi	Hawkins	Regula
Blanchard	Heckler	Reuss
Blouin	Hefner	Richmond
Boggs	Hefter	Rinaldo
Boland	Hollenbeck	Roberts
Bolling	Holtzman	Bodino
Bonior	Horton	Boe
Bonker	Howard	Rogers
Bowen	Hughes	Roncalio
Brademas	Ichord	Rooney
Breaux	Jacobs	Rose
Brinkley	Jenrette	Rosenthal
Brownhead	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Ruppe
Brown, Mich.	Jones, Tenn.	Russo
Broyhill	Jordan	St Germain
Buchanan	Kastenmeier	Santini
Burgener	Kazen	Sarasin
Burke, Calif.	Kemp	Sawyer
Burke, Fla.	Keys	Scheuer
Burke, Mass.	Kildee	Schulze
Burlison, Mo.	Koch	Seiberling
Burton, John	Kostmayer	Sharp
Burton, Phillip	Krebs	Slack
Byron	Krueger	Smith, Iowa
Caputo	LaFalce	Solarz
Carney	Lagomarsino	Spellman
Carr	Leach	Staggers
Carter	Lederer	Stanton
Cavanaugh	Le Fante	Stark
Cederberg	Leggett	Staers
Chisholm	Levitas	Stokes
Clausen,	Lloyd, Calif.	Studds
Don H.	Long, Md.	Stump
Clay	Lukens	Thompson
Cohen	Lundine	Thone
Collins, Ill.	McCloskey	Thornton
Conte	McDade	Tonry
Conyers	McFall	Traxler
Corman	McHugh	Tribble
Cornell	McKinney	Tsongas
Cotter	Madigan	Tucker
D'Amours	Maguire	Udall
Danielson	Mann	Ullman
de la Garza	Markey	Van Deerlin
Delaney	Marks	Vanik
Dellums	Mathis	Vento
Derwinski	Mattox	Volkmeyer
Dicks	Meeds	Walgren
Diggs	Metcalfe	Waxman
Dodd	Meyner	Weaver
Downey	Mikulski	Weiss
Drinan	Mikva	Whalen
Early	Miller, Calif.	White
Eckhardt	Mineta	Whitely
Edgar	Minish	Whitten
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson, O. H.
Eilberg	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Emery	Moakley	Wirth
Evans, Colo.	Moffett	Wolf
Evans, Ind.	Mollohan	Wright
Fary	Montgomery	Yates
Findley	Moorhead, Pa.	Yatron
Fish	Moss	Young, Mo.
Fisher	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Fithian	Myers, Gary	
Flood	Myers, Michael	

NAYS—145

Abdnor	Gephardt	Murtha
Applegate	Ginn	Myers, Ind.
Archer	Goodling	Nedel
Armstrong	Grassley	Patten
Ashbrook	Hall	Pike
Badham	Hammer-	Poage
Bafalis	schmidt	Pressler
Barnard	Hansen	Purcell
Bauman	Harsha	Quayle
Beard, Tenn.	Hightower	Quillen
Bennett	Hillis	Rosenboover
Bevill	Holland	Robinson
Breckinridge	Holt	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Hubbard	Roussot
Burleson, Tex.	Huckaby	Rudd
Butler	Hyde	Runnels
Clawson, Del.	Ireland	Ryan
Cleveland	Jeffords	Satterfield
Cochran	Jenkins	Schroeder
Coleman	Jones, N.C.	Sebelius
Collins, Tex.	Jones, Okla.	Shuster
Conable	Kasten	Sikes
Corcoran	Kelly	Simon
Cornwell	Ketchum	Slak
Crane	Kindness	Skelton
Daniel, Dan	Latta	Skubitz
Daniel, R. W.	Lehman	Smith, Nebr.
Davis	Lent	Snyder
Derrick	Lloyd, Tenn.	Spence
Devine	Lott	Steed
Dickinson	Lujan	Steiger
Dingell	McClary	Stockman
Dornan	McCormack	Stratton
Duncan, Oreg.	McDonald	Symms
Duncan, Tenn.	McKewen	Taylor
Edwards, Ala.	McKay	Treen
Edwards, Okla.	Mahon	Waggonner
English	Marlenee	Walker
Erlenborn	Marriott	Wampler
Ertel	Martin	Watkins
Evans, Del.	Mazzoli	Whitehurst
Evans, Ga.	Michael	Wiggins
Fascell	Milford	Wilson, Bob
Fenwick	Miller, Ohio	Winn
Filippo	Moore	Wylder
Flynt	Moorhead,	Wylie
Ford, Mich.	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Forsythe	Mottl	Young, Fla.
Gaydos	Murphy, Pa.	Zeretti

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Young Tex.

NOT VOTING—20

Bingham	Frey	Rallsback
Brown, Calif.	Gibbons	Rhodes
Brown, Ohio	Harkin	Shipley
Chappell	Long, La.	Teague
Coughlin	Murphy, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Dent	Nowak	Walsh
Florio	Pepper	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Walsh.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Chappell.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Florio with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Harkin with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Nowak.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATING A SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 230, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 232) creating a Select Committee on Assassinations, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER, pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I sought this time in order to say once again that this resolution, House Resolution 222, constitutes in this Congress a Select Committee on Assassinations and gives it until March 31, 1977, to come back to the House with rules and a plan to proceed.

This matter is being considered, of course, in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, which means we are operating under the 5-minute rule now. The Speaker will recognize Members for amendments. The manager of the resolution, myself, has the opportunity at any time to offer or propose that the previous question be ordered. I do not intend to cut off amendments by doing that until I sense that the House is ready to conclude the matter. But it is available, and it is available both in connection with an amendment or with a group of amendments and the resolution itself.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEL CLAWSON

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DEL CLAWSON: On page 2, line 3, strike all after the word "death" through the word "department" on line 21.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I offer is a very simple amendment in just what it does. It is not so simple in the substantive nature of the amendment, and yet it does no violence whatever to the resolution.

The amendment is intended to do just one thing, and that is to delay the full-scope definition of the select committee investigation until the time that the House acts at the expiration of this extension on whether or not there is going to be a full and complete investigation of these assassinations. And, of course, this could be done during the time of the extension of the committee to March 31, 1977.

Let me read to the Members exactly what the resolution now says and then read what my amendment would provide.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances of the assassinations to ascertain:

(1) whether the existing laws of the United States, including but not limited to laws relating to the safety and protection of the President of the United States, assassinations of the President of the United States, deprivation of civil rights, and conspiracies related thereto, as well as the investigatory jurisdiction and capability of agencies and departments of the United States Government, are adequate, either in their provisions or in the manner of their enforcement; and (2) whether there was full disclosure and sharing of information and evidence among agencies and departments of the United States Government during the course of all prior investigations into those deaths; and whether any evidence or information which was not in the possession of any agency or department of the United States Government in investigating either death would have been of assistance to that agency or department, and why such information was not provided to or collected by the appropriate agency or department.

The amendment strikes that language, but it leaves in this language:

The select committee or a subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the assassination and death of President John F. Kennedy and the assassination and death of Martin Luther King, Junior, and of any other persons the select committee shall determine might be related to either death...

And it also provides the legislative purpose. We leave that language in to meet the concerns and the constitutional question that some have raised. So this language is left in the resolution:

...and shall make recommendations to the House, if the select committee deems it appropriate, for the amendment of existing legislation or the enactment of new legislation.

During the discussion of the rule, my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), indicated if I understood him correctly, that this would give the committee an extension of time, time to adopt rules, determine the scope and nature of the investigation, develop a procedure, and design a program for the investigation.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment provides, that is exactly what they can and should do. During the course of the next 60 days they can adopt the rules, they can design a program of investigation, and they can decide at that point the scope of the investigation rather than leaving this language in the resolution as it is now drafted.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is just that simple. I think it is a very good amendment and one that certainly can accommodate the wishes of the House.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

My very able friend and colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), has as usual done an excellent job of presenting the best possible argument for his amendment.

The problem with the amendment is that if it were adopted, it might very well make the whole matter unconstitutional by eliminating the purposes and outlines necessary to make this a House matter. It might also cause a great many

continued on page 9

people who have agreed with this particular form of resolution, which is a modification of the original proposal, to turn against the resolution on grounds that have been raised by certain civil libertarians.

I do not question the intentions of my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON), because they are always good, as is his skill of presentation, but I feel that the adoption of this amendment would have a mischievous effect, no doubt not intended, and that it is very important that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the language which the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) seeks to strike out is in fact a blank check if indeed this committee or its members wish to divert this investigation into the deaths of these two American leaders into an investigation of the FBI, the CIA, and related agencies.

We have received a number of assurances in this debate that that is not the intent, but I am not assured. For instance, the remarks made by my colleague, the delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY), indicated that he had little faith in the conclusions of these agencies, and that, at least as I understood his remarks, he saw in the investigation the possibility of going into the activities of the FBI and CIA.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind the gentleman that I was not speaking in my own right. I was merely quoting statements from the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate with respect to the thoroughness of the investigations by these agencies into these assassinations.

For your consideration, I have noted the following statements from book V—Final report of the Select Committee To Study Governmental Operations With Respect to Intelligence Activities, U.S. Senate:

The Committee has, however, developed evidence which impeaches the process by which the intelligence agencies arrived at their own conclusions about the assassination, and by which they provided information to the Warren Commission. This evidence indicates that . . . the investigation of the assassination was deficient and that facts which might have substantially affected the course of the investigation were not provided the Warren Commission or those individuals within the FBI and the CIA, as well as other agencies of Government, who were charged with investigating the assassination.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I take the gentleman's statement to be a clarification, and I accept it as such.

Nevertheless, the language sought to be stricken is overly broad, so broad that it could be used for that purpose. I suggest to the Members that when this resolution was adopted last September, none of this verbiage was in there; and at some time during the last 3 or 4 months it has become necessary, for whatever reason, to broaden the scope well beyond the original jurisdiction.

If this amendment is adopted, read what language is remaining. It gives the committee full authority to investigate the two assassinations and to make legislative recommendations regarding their findings, and that surely answers the constitutional question which the gentleman from Missouri has raised.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when we vote on this amendment we are really voting on whether or not we want to investigate the deaths of these two persons, Reverend King and President Kennedy, or whether we want to go well beyond that into a rehash of what the FBI and the CIA did, going over the ground that has been plowed by the select committee in the House and the select committee in the Senate. This language is precisely the kind that offers the chance for publicity seeking and sensationalism.

Mr. Speaker, if we are really serious in wanting these two deaths investigated, instead of having a legislative circus, we ought to adopt this amendment.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. If, after the committee has met for the next 2 months and is able to consider all of these matters that are now included in this resolution, it would be possible at that point for the House to consider that broad scope of the committee's jurisdiction and the scope of the investigation itself and it could then be incorporated into a new resolution that could be adopted at that time. Is that not true?

Mr. BAUMAN. I agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON). I do not think the removal of this language will in any way affect the limited 60-day role that this committee is being assigned. Mr. Speaker, we will pre-judge this matter if we do not adopt the amendment.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 165, nays 237, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—165

Abdnor	Cleveland	Goodling
Allen	Cochran	Gradison
Andrews	Coleman	Grassley
N. Dak.	Collins, Tex.	Guyer
Annunzio	Conable	Hagedorn
Archer	Corcoran	Hammer-
Armstrong	Crane	schmidt
Ashbrook	Daniel, Dan	Hannaford
Badham	Daniel, R. W.	Hansen
Bafalis	Davis	Harsha
Bauman	Derwinski	Hefner
Beard, Tenn.	Devine	Hillis
Bennett	Dickinson	Holt
Bevill	Dingell	Hubbard
Blaggi	Dornan	Huckaby
Bonker	Duncan, Tenn.	Hyde
Brinkley	Edwards, Ala.	Ichord
Broomfield	Edwards, Okla.	Jeffords
Brown, Mich.	Erlenborn	Jones, N.O.
Brown, Ohio	Ertel	Jones, Okla.
Buchanan	Evans, Del.	Jones, Tenn.
Burgess	Fenwick	Kasten
Burke, Fla.	Findley	Kelly
Burleson, Tex.	Florio	Kethum
Butler	Fountain	Kindness
Byron	France	Lagomarsine
Carter	Gaydos	Latta
Clausen	Glan	Leach
Don H.	Goldwater	Lederer
Clawson, Del.	Nichols	Lenz
Lent	O'Brien	Spence
Levitass	Pettis	Stanton
Lloyd, Calif.	Pike	Steed
Lloyd, Tenn.	Poage	Steers
Lott	Preacher	Steiger
Lujan	Pritchard	Stockman
Lukens	Purcell	Stratton
McClary	Quayle	Symms
McDonald	Quillen	Taylor
McEwen	Regula	Treen
McKay	Rinaldo	Trible
Madigan	Robinson	Vander Jagt
Marks	Rostenkowski	Waggoner
Marlenee	Rousselot	Walker
Mariotti	Rudd	Wampler
Martin	Ruppers	Whitehurst
Michel	Satterfield	Wiggins
Millford	Schulze	Wilson, Bob
Miller, Ohio	Sebelius	Winn
Mitchell, N.Y.	Shuster	Wyder
Moore	Sikes	Wyllie
Moorhead,	Skubbits	Young, Fla.
Calif.	Smith, Nebr.	Young, Tex.
Mottl	Snyder	Zablocki
Myers, Michael		Zerfretti
Myers, Ind.		
Nedzi		

NAYS—237

Addabbo	Fithian	Murphy, N.Y.
Akaka	Fippo	Murphy, Pa.
Alexander	Flood	Murtha
Ambro	Flowers	Myers, Gary
Ammerman	Foley	Natcher
Anderson	Ford, Mich.	Neal
Calif.	Ford, Tenn.	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Oaker
Andrews, N.O.	Fuqua	Oberstar
Ashley	Gammage	Oboe
Aspin	Gephardt	Ottinger
AuCoin	Gladma	Panetta
Badillo	Gilman	Patten
Baldus	Glickman	Patterson
Barnard	Gonzalez	Pattison
Baucus	Gore	Pease
Bedell	Gudger	Perkins
Beilenson	Hall	Pickle
Benjamin	Hamilton	Preyer
Blanchard	Hanley	Price
Bleuin	Harrington	Rahall
Boggs	Harris	Rangel
Boland	Hawkins	Reuss
Bolling	Heckler	Richmond
Bonior	Hefner	Rosenbloom
Bowen	Hightower	Roberts

page 9

Brademas	Hollenbeck	Rodino
Breaux	Holtzman	Roe
Brickridge	Horton	Rogers
Brodhead	Howard	Roncalio
Brooks	Hughes	Rooney
Broyhill	Ireland	Rose
Burke, Calif.	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Burke, Mass.	Jenkins	Roybal
Burlison, Mo.	Jenrette	Ruppe
Burton, John	Johnson, Calif.	Russo
Burton, Phillip	Johnson, Colo.	Ryan
Caputo	Jordan	St Germain
Carney	Kastenmeier	Santini
Carr	Kazen	Sarasin
Chisholm	Kemp	Sawyer
Clay	Keys	Scheuer
Cohen	Kildee	Schroeder
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Selberling
Conte	Kostmayer	Sharp
Conyers	Krebs	Shiley
Corman	Krueger	Simon
Cornell	Le Fante	Skelton
Cornwell	Lehman	Slack
Cotter	Long, Md.	Smith, Iowa
D'Amours	Lundine	Solarz
Danielson	McCloskey	Spellman
de la Garza	McCormack	Staggers
Delaney	McDade	Stark
Dellums	McFall	Stokes
Derrick	McHugh	Studds
Dicks	McKinney	Stump
Diggs	Mahon	Thompson
Dodd	Mann	Thone
Downey	Markey	Thornton
Drinan	Mathis	Tonry
Duncan, Oreg.	Mattox	Traxler
Early	Massoli	Tsongas
Eckhardt	Meade	Tucker
Edgar	Metcalfe	Udall
Edwards, Calif.	Mikulski	Ullman
Ellberg	Mikva	Van Deelen
Emery	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
English	Mineta	Vento
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Volkmer
Evans, Ga.	Mitchell, Md.	Walgren
Evans, Ind.	Moffett	Watkins
Fary	Molloham	Waxman
Fasell	Montgomery	Weaver
Fish	Moorhead, Pa.	Weiss
Fisher	Murphy, Ill.	Whalen
White	Wirth	Yatron
Whitley	Wolf	Young, Mo.
Whitten	Wright	
Wilson, Tex.	Yates	

NOT VOTING—29

Applegate	Frey	Nolan
Beard, R.I.	Gibbons	Nowak
Bingham	Harkin	Pepper
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Rallsback
Cavanaugh	LaFalce	Rhodes
Oederberg	Long, La.	Teague
Chappell	Maguire	Walsh
Coughlin	Meyner	Wilson, C. H.
Dent	Moakley	Young, Alaska
Forsythe	Moss	

Mr. BALDUS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. LUKEN and LEVITAS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LOTT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LOTT: On page 3, strike all after line 13 through the word "State" on line 18.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would strike the language allowing the committee to designate a counsel to take statements from witnesses.

House Resolution 222 contains a provision on page 3 which permits the select committee to designate counsel to obtain statements from any witness who is placed under oath by an authority who is authorized to administer oaths in accordance with the applicable laws of the United States or of any State. This means that the select committee could designate a staff member of its professional staff to interview a witness who has been placed under oath by any person authorized to administer oaths either by Federal or State law. The interview could be recorded, transcribed, and made a part of the official record of the select committee. All of this, it should be pointed out, could be done without even one member of the select committee being present at the time.

It is claimed that there is a precedent for a designated counsel. It is said that House Resolution 803, which authorized the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment investigation, granted that committee very similar authority.

What the impeachment investigation resolution did was to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of any person, and this power was extended to include the attendance and testimony by a witness at the taking of

continued on page 10

a deposition by counsel for the committee. Translating this provision in House Resolution 803 into practice, I am advised that the Judiciary Committee sent its counsel, both majority and minority, to interview potential witnesses. Statements were taken and brought back to the committee. Based on the information revealed in these statements, or deposition if you prefer, the Judiciary Committee would make a decision as to whether or not to call a particular witness to testify before the full committee.

What kind of a precedent is this for allowing a designated counsel to take the sworn testimony of a witness without even one member of the select committee being present and having this testimony made a part of the official select committee record?

I submit that the provision cited as a precedent is not one, that there is no precedent for such conduct by a select committee of the House of Representatives, and that there is no compelling reason to allow this loose method of investigation to begin today with the passage of this resolution as it now reads.

I wonder how many of you have been satisfied with the actions of the Select Committee on Assassinations we established last year?

How many of you approved of the press statements of select committee counsel Richard Sprague?

How many of you were shocked when Sprague asserted that his committee had to have \$6.5 million this year alone to do its job? The House Judiciary Committee only spent \$1.5 million over a 1-year period with its impeachment investigation and hearings.

How many of you feel select committee counsel Sprague should be allowed to hire 170 people for this investigation?

Did you know that the select committee placed 23 people on its payroll on January 1 with full knowledge that its authority would expire January 3? The prospective chairman of the select committee GONZALEZ has testified that he did not know about this.

And now the Sprague committee has demanded this unusual, if not unprecedented, designated counsel.

Should we not at least preserve this one small last vestige of control over the select committee? Let us wait and see what they do for this 90 days. Let us look at the rules they adopt.

We can change our position then if we feel it is justified. Let us witness their actions and judge their sincerity.

Therefore, I urge the adoption of my amendment to knock out the designated counsel provision. If we must conduct this investigation, let us, the elected representatives of the people, do it and not farm out to others a responsibility that we have created for ourselves in the first place.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is neither new, nor novel authority which the committee is being given. It simply will help make this a better investigation. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) argues that there is no precedent for it. The House Impeachment Committee was authorized to use this procedure, and actually its authorization was not as restricted as the one that is being used here.

Second, I think that it may not be understood that the fact that designated counsel may take a statement does not give them subpoena power. What it in fact does, is allow a willing witness who wishes to make a statement do so under oath. The oath is not given by counsel, it is given by a notary public. Once he is placed under oath, the witness can refuse to answer the question, but it will help keep a witness from giving false information. If a witness knows that his testimony is under oath and that possible risk of perjury can ensue from it, it is going to focus his attention wonderfully on being more truthful.

Third, the purpose of this is to avoid the expense of either bringing witnesses to Washington or requiring committee members to travel to take the testimony of those witnesses whose statements may be relatively inconsequential and would not justify that sort of trip.

Again, I want to emphasize that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has said that the committee will establish strict guidelines covering the rights of witnesses and making sure that they are protected. This procedure is implicit

in rule XXVIII of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. It is like taking a deposition in a normal civil or criminal case, and it does not seem to me that there is any sweeping authority we are giving. It is neither too new, nor too novel. It is very helpful to those conducting the investigation, and I urge defeat of the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Two hundred fifty-one Members are present, a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON: On page 4, line 25, after the word "witness," insert the following: "except that the select committee shall not be considered a standing committee of the House of Representatives for the purpose of Clause 5(a) and Clause 5(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives."

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which has been read is proposed to clear up what I perceive as an ambiguity in the resolution that we are considering.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) if it is his intention that the language in question would authorize the select committee to employ the standing committee staff members authorized under clause 5 of rule XI of the House.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the Committee on Rules nor of the members of the select committee from the last Congress that that be the case. There is an intention that the select committee have the right to the staff provided under the section of the House rules the gentleman cited.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. THOMPSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Bauman).

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that unless this amendment is adopted, the possibility exists that the committee could make claims to well in excess of \$100,000 a month and 80 staff members, as every standing committee might have?

Mr. THOMPSON. The gentleman is quite correct. Under clause 5 of rule XI of the House Rules, committees having the status of a standing committee are entitled to 30 statutory employees. Currently, the annual cost for them would be \$1,192,400 or, as the gentleman has stated, approximately \$100,000 per month in addition to that which is authorized in the resolution.

Mr. BAUMAN. I thank the gentleman, and I support the amendment.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House, I rise in opposition to the resolution.

I would like to make clear that I do not for a moment defend the action of the Justice Department in releasing the report it did today, which the gentleman from California referred to ear-

lier, nor in their denial of access to that report. I think that both actions are not defensible.

There are questions on both assassinations. But we should remember that last year a new book came out, the latest of a series of books, on the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. A hundred years from now there will be books published on the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. I think we are best advised to let historians look at these matters.

A few weeks ago I received a letter from a gentleman in Saginaw, Mich., a Dr. Mudd, who knew of my interest in history. His grandfather set the leg of Mr. Booth, who killed Abraham Lincoln, and Dr. Mudd says his grandfather was wrongly imprisoned, and that Congress should act on the matter to clear his grandfather's name.

I am interested in history, and I hope that historians will delve into these matters very, very carefully, but I see nothing productive happening by our doing it.

This afternoon I called the distinguished John J. McClellan. Many of us here know him. He served on the Warren Commission. I asked him, "How would you vote if you were voting today?" He said:

Frankly, I do not know the details of the King assassination, but nothing is to be gained in the area of the Kennedy assassination.

I think we in Congress do the right thing and honor these two men by fighting for the things they stood for, such as getting jobs for people who are unemployed. Let us concentrate our efforts in this session of Congress and the attention of the people of this Nation not on what might have been but on what should be.

Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution should be defeated.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 722 to recreate a House Select Committee on Assassinations to continue studying the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

This resolution would allow the committee to operate on a limited budget for the next 2 months. This would give the committee the opportunity to re-evaluate and justify its proposed, overall budget and to prove through its investigation that it should be allowed to continue with its inquiries after that date.

I urge all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to cast their ballots for this measure, and to defeat any possible amendments aimed at hampering this Select Committee in its future efforts to carry out a much-needed re-investigation into these terrible crimes.

During the last 3 months of the 94th Congress and the first month of the new, 95th Congress, the Select Committee and its recreation have been the source of many questions and much controversy.

Some of these questions have been based on legitimate concerns, Mr. Speaker, but the controversy itself has, I believe, been unwarranted and has diverted attention from what should be the central concern of all of us in this matter.

That concern should be whether the deaths of a President and the foremost civil rights leader of our time should be reinvestigated—whether ample reasons exist for having the House of Representatives spend its time and the taxpayers money on such a study.

I believe such reasons do exist, Mr. Speaker, and that a properly directed, prudently administered investigation—conducted by a dedicated select committee staff and controlled by the Members of Congress on the committee—will justify the time and reasonable expense of such an investigation.

I will not dwell on the many reasons for this new inquiry other than to say significant unanswered questions exist about the deaths and about the past investigations into those assassinations. These questions are documented in many official sources, including the report issued by the Select Committee at the end of the last Congress and in testimony before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, which has oversight responsibilities for the Federal Bureau of Investigation—FBI.

As a member of both the select committee and the Judiciary Subcommittee last Congress, I can assure my colleagues that these questions are compelling. I also believe they should be answered once and for all, and that this House Select Committee on Assassinations represents the best opportunity for this to happen.

What I would like to concentrate on in my remarks, today, Mr. Speaker, are the questions of controversy which have surrounded the select committee recently. I think I can provide some useful information to my colleagues, which should serve to answer their questions and to still their doubts.

I further believe that the answers to these questions demonstrate that the members and staff of the select committee have been aware of these concerns, and that they are committed to dealing with them in a manner which can only bring credit and increased credibility to this House and the Government of the United States.

These questions are primarily focused in four areas:

First, a proposed overall budget for the select committee; second, constitutional and civil rights concerns about committee investigative techniques; third, whether members of the committee, or its staff, will be in charge of the investigation; and fourth, what will be the committee's attitudes toward the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency—CIA?

As a member of the House Rules Committee, I asked these very questions 2 weeks ago to our colleague from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), who is expected to become the chairman of the select committee.

His responses, which I shall place in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, establish the following:

First, That the proposed \$6.5 million budget for the select committee already is being reevaluated with the view toward decreasing it to the "irreducible minimum" necessary to carry out the independent, thorough investigation the House would want.

To exercise strict control over any committee expenditures, and insure that control is placed in the hands of the members of the committee, our distinguished colleague (Mr. GONZALEZ) also stated he would be willing to have written in the committee's rules language to the effect that all major expenditures, including travel, should be approved by the appropriate subcommittee or committee chairman.

My own feelings are that the proposed budget can and should be reduced, and that strict spending controls can be built into the committee's rules, so that any expenditure is carefully considered and determined to be necessary before it is actually made.

Second, That the committee rules will contain language aimed at protecting the constitutional and civil rights of witnesses; that any investigative techniques will be discussed and voted on by the committee before they are used; and that the committee is committed to carrying out an investigation of the highest professional and ethical standards.

Third, That language will be considered for the committee rules to exercise strict control over all members of the committee staff and to insure that only the chairman and subcommittee chairmen will issue policy statements to the press and report on the progress of any investigations. I might add that leaks should be strictly prohibited.

Fourth, That the select committee is not out to "get" the FBI or the CIA, but rather intends that its investigation deal objectively with the actions of these agencies as they relate to these assassinations.

It would be my personal hope that whatever legislative recommendations

which stem from the select committee's investigations will result in these agencies being better able to fulfill the responsibilities they were established to handle.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the questions raised about recreation of this committee have been addressed, and that the answers should satisfy those concerned about protecting constitutional rights, reducing the committee budget, controlling the committee staff, and avoiding attacks on the FBI and CIA.

I think this select committee should now be allowed to get down to business—to continue the work the last Congress in its wisdom thought should be done, and which I believe the American people support—reinvestigation of the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King.

I am confident the select committee will more than prove its worth in this time and demonstrate without question that it should be allowed to continue to complete these needed inquiries.

I call my colleagues attention to the following testimony by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) before the House Rules Committee, on January 25, regarding the House Select Committee on Assassinations:

Mr. DONN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment you on your statement and your response to these questions that have been brought forth by the members of this committee. I feel, as Mrs. Chisholm does, and others on this committee, that the main thrust, the main purpose for which we are here today has been somehow sidetracked as a result of several questions which have been raised since the committee was constituted in the last Congress, and I would like, if I could, to try and synthesize, being the last person on this committee to have an opportunity to question you, to try to bring together some of these questions and ask you some direct questions in regard to these three or four areas that I think have really, in a sense, sidetracked our efforts to have this committee constituted.

I can't help but feel this is reminiscent of other committees that have been charged with similar responsibilities, who have seen their efforts sidetracked because of ancillary issues that have surfaced.

I feel, as I listened to my colleagues on this committee and in the House, that there is strong support for the constitution of this committee, albeit some problems may exist in the three or four areas I would like to ask you about.

One is the budget; the second is the techniques, certain techniques that have been raised; the third is staff; and the fourth I suppose would be the focus of the committee's attention with regard to certain agencies, specifically the FBI and the CIA.

With regard to the budget, would you instruct your budget officer to begin a complete reevaluation of the entire budget with the view toward reductions in that budget? Are we wedded to any particular figure, the \$6.5 million, or is there going to be an entirely new reevaluation process of our budget needs and demands?

Mr. GONZALEZ. There never has been a thought in my own individual mind that we were wedded to any figure and, as a matter of fact, as a suggestion, because really I know nothing; I have precisely asked for a reevaluation on the part of the professional staff, what really is the irreducible minimum without in any attempt trying to make that the main order of business now, but looking forward in case the committee is reestablished, to bring up for discussion with the committee and get a consensus of the committee.

I believe in traveling on consensus, where I have had the honor of being chairman of subcommittees and so forth; it is the only legal, moral and ethical precedents, methods way I have of going, and I wouldn't want it in carrying out the investigation any other way. So I would say that that would be an absolute need to reevaluate, re-estimate, and to re-organize.

Mr. DONN. In conjunction with that, would you be willing to have written into the rules of the committee language to the effect that all major expenditures, particularly in the area of travel, purchases, and so forth, should be approved by the appropriate subcommittee or chairman of that committee so that we would have, or the committee would have, some sort of control over the budgetary process as we move through the investigation?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes, sir; I would favor that. Mr. DONN. I wonder if in light of that, and been brought out in the past, and are you I don't want to take up too much more of the committee's time with it, but I think it might be helpful for the members of this committee to have some idea if you could describe in broad detail the magnitude of the task we are undertaking in terms of documents, the possible number of people—just in broad figures—you may be wanting to talk to, so the committee might have some idea of how large this undertaking will be.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I don't have as precise a figure as I would like to have, and I would like to ask your indulgence to recognize the chairman of the subcommittee on Kennedy, who has been briefed on this, and is on top of the matter, and if he is present, the chairman of the subcommittee on the Martin Luther King assassination, Congressman Fauntroy, because I think they can give you a better grasp of what we are talking about in the number of witnesses and the range of the investigation than even I could at this time.

Even though I have been briefed, I think they have been there from the beginning and have had a chance to follow it more closely than I have, and I think briefly they could better fill in than I could at this point, if you think it is all right.

Mr. PREYER. To try to put that one in some sort of manageable compass, I would say in the Kennedy assassination subcommittee the staff has drawn up a list of almost three hundred questions which they consider as basic questions to which they are committed to finding answers, and they have drawn up a list of witnesses which run over a hundred, as I recall right now, so I think that gives you some idea of the scope of the investigation.

Mr. DONN. That is an initial list. Presumably these questions will raise additional questions and witnesses will raise questions about potential other witnesses?

Mr. PREYER. Yes, as you go into the investigation of this sort, it creates a sort of bandwagon effect that people begin to volunteer information, apparently feeling that the committee is going to get them and they are going to get in first with their information, or again maybe it is a sort of bandwagon effect from other volunteering, so new leads come in every day.

One of the reasons I think it is important that the committee go forward with a substantial investigation and not some preliminary study investigation is that you would dry up these leads and this sort of bandwagon effect.

Mr. GONZALEZ. May I emphasize one point? As vice chairman, I was not consulted on hiring. I was just as much informed as some of you were on the number of twenty-three on January 1, so the briefings I received were briefings in conjunction with other members of the committee, and about a week or so ago, Congressman Preyer had the courtesy of having some of the staffers of his subcommittee brief us on their developments, and this is the reason I don't know how to grasp the magnitude because I don't know what consultation there had been at the time between the staff director and the then chairman, and this is why I favor your suggestion that before you have any substantial hiring or appreciable hiring, that this be cleared through the subcommittee first.

Mr. DONN. That will be a practice that you will follow as chairman of that committee?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would hope to.

Mr. DONN. With regard to some investigative techniques, and I will try to move along. I am going to read some statements and I ask you to either respond yes or no, and expound if you want.

To increase the assurance that all constitutional, legal and ethical requirements will be preserved, are you willing to spell out in the committee rules the following: one, that before being employed, all investigative techniques will be discussed and voted on by the full committee?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. DONN. Would you be willing to consult with the appropriate committees of Congress, for instance, the Subcommittee on Constitution and Civil Rights of the Judiciary Committee, with regard to some of these techniques as to their possible concerns or questions they may have?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would consider that indispensable.

Mr. DONN. That the committee is committed to the following highest constitutional, legal, moral and ethical precedents, methods in carrying out the investigation?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes, sir; I have committed myself to that before, and I wish to reiterate that position.

Mr. DONN. That the rights of witnesses will be scrupulously protected to the extent of the committee language to the effect that all major expenditures, particularly in the area of travel, purchases, and so forth, should be approved by the appropriate subcommittee or chairman of that committee so that we would have, or the committee would have, some sort of control over the budgetary process as we move through the investigation?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Absolutely; Yes, sir.

Mr. DONN. On what basis, Henry, will the committee use polygraphs and stress analysis? This has raised questions that have been brought out in the past, and are you willing to stipulate strict controls over these techniques in committee rules?

Mr. GONZALEZ. In my opinion, none whatever. If such were to be desired, it would have

to be on the request of some individual who would want to prove a point himself and volunteer to do so, but under no circumstances where it would involve the purchase on our part of that type of equipment, or even the use of it without all of the constitutional safeguards.

Mr. DODD. With regard to the staff, the problems that have been raised in this area, some suggestions have been made, and I think members of the committee particularly were reassured by your response to Mrs. Chisholm's question regarding the status of staff people jeopardizing the existence of the committee, but I would like to know whether or not you, as chairman of the committee, would be willing to draft in the committee rules specific language along the lines of those drafted for the House Impeachment Committee, stipulating no statements by staff to the press, and that leaks will be absolutely prohibited?

Mr. GONZALEZ. Yes, sir. May I point out I requested such rules and received some written that had no reference to that but then it was communicated to me by a member of the staff that the counsel on the committee said they had unwritten but verbal understandings as to the rules they would follow along this line. I would prefer to have some written guidelines, pinning this down as you suggest.

Mr. DODD. In light of that, with that, are you willing to state in the committee rules that only the chairman or subcommittee chairman articulate policy statements and speak for the committee as to the progress and nature of the investigations?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I would, and I would add that that be done only after a consensus has been attempted to be obtained from the committee.

Mr. DODD. The last point, Henry, I would like to address is the question of our focus with regard to the Federal investigatory agencies. It has been the feeling of some Members of Congress that part of the investigation, just by the very nature of the investigation, would have to address the role that the C.I.A. and the F.B.I. and other possible agencies had with regard to these two assassinations, but that, in itself, has raised some questions as to whether or not we would, in effect, be bringing down or bringing to their knees these agencies.

I wonder if you might address what you see as the focus of the committee's attention with regard to those agencies? Is my statement basically correct, or do you see a broader role for this committee to play?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I think you are essentially correct. As a matter of fact, what has happened up to now clearly indicates that we have had—I don't think we can truthfully say we have not received the cooperation of the F.B.I. The committee, even though it has issued subpoenas, has not acquired any physical control of evidence because there has been no ability to safeguard it, so if the staff is searching documents that have been described in a subpoena, they have done so on the premises of the F.B.I. or C.I.A., so I can't visualize coming in with a frontal attack and making that the main basis of the committee's work on these agencies.

Mr. DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no other amendments to be offered, and I propose to take 1 minute to reiterate my view.

I have great sympathy with my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON), and I have great respect for him.

I happen to believe that there is a strong possibility that there is real evidence, new evidence, particularly in the Martin Luther King matter. I respect the gentleman's view and perhaps agree with it in part, but I think it would be a disaster if this House did not reconstitute this committee and did not take the opportunity to see if there is not real new evidence in the King matter and in this case satisfy the American people and also the members of the King family who are now living.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the resolution be agreed to overwhelmingly.

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose recreation of the Select Committee on Assassinations to conduct an unnecessarily expensive exhaustive investigation of the assassinations of our President John F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King.

Such an effort is wasteful duplication of work that has been satisfactorily done before.

To my knowledge, absolutely no new evidence has turned up since the original investigations to question earlier conclusions in the reports on the two respective assassinations.

Neither has any new evidence turned up to indicate that assassins other than Lee Harvey Oswald or James Earl Ray were responsible for and committed the two crimes involved.

Quite frankly, I think this has been a headline-hunting operation. How could it be anything else?

The fact that the House is now being asked to extend the life of this committee for only 2 additional months, just so its staff can try once again to produce any hard evidence of new information to justify a further 2-year investigation, demonstrates that this entire assassination probe is a frantic exercise in futility, rather than a serious and needed effort in the public interest.

If such hard evidence of new information does not exist now—after the committee has worked for 4½ months with access to all the voluminous material that is available—then the committee deserves to go out of existence immediately.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 13 years since the death of our President Kennedy, and more than 8 years since the death of Dr. King. Since the original exhaustive investigations of their deaths, and the public disclosure of all known facts about these assassinations, original physical evidence has been repeatedly examined, resulting in the same conclusions.

Memories have faded, principal witnesses have died or moved away—even to foreign lands.

The trail is stone cold, and even a trained professional investigative arm such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation would have difficulty conducting a proper investigation now.

The 4½-month existence of this committee has already fanned the flames of rumor, distortion, and unwarranted distrust of law enforcement agencies. Widespread publicity and the dissemination of unprovable theories and allegations have created further unnecessary emotional trauma and public confusion.

But the committee has not contributed one iota of new information for the public record. It has not benefited the public in any way, or been a credit to the Congress.

I urge a "no" vote on re-creation of the Select Committee on Assassinations. The Congress needs to turn away from media events, and get down to the real business of helping to solve some of our Nation's pressing economic problems.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the underlying questions before us today is what will be accomplished if the Select Committee on Assassinations is established as provided by House Resolution 222. Thirteen years ago the tragic death of President Kennedy shocked the Nation. Extensive investigations were held and the Kennedy family has not indicated its dissatisfaction or requested the case be reopened. Martin Luther King was murdered 8 years ago.

I sincerely believe that after 13 years nothing will be accomplished other than a needless expenditure of taxpayers' dollars, a possible international incident or two caused directly by the Select Committee, and perhaps the publication of a book or two by enterprising staffers based on materials gathered at public expense.

Should the Select Committee be re-established, there will still be questions left unanswered about the deaths of President Kennedy and the Reverend King. It may well be that some years later another Select Committee will be established but the purpose of this committee will be to investigate the methods and findings of the Select Committee on Assassinations established by House Resolution 222.

Nobody wants to put truth on the back burner. But there is simply little the select committee could do which is not now within the authority of the Judiciary and Government Operations Committees and the other standing committees of the House.

Nothing the Select Committee can do will bring back the lives of President Kennedy and Reverend King. And there is nothing a Select Committee can do to lift these two men to higher levels of esteem by our Nation's people.

There are very significant legal problems with this resolution.

As you will recall the original resolution establishing the Select Committee last year provided that the committee would have the authority to conduct its investigation only within the United States and our territories.

The language of House Resolution 222, however, would provide that the Select Committee could hold hearings in "any other country." And authorizes the select committee—

To hold hearings . . . in any other country . . . and to require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents as it deems necessary; to take testimony and oath anywhere within the United States or in any other country . . .

Under the doctrine of United States against Cuesta, a committee must be authorized to conduct investigations in geographic areas, and without such an authorization a committee would have no jurisdiction to act. In this particular case an indictment for contempt of Congress for failure to appear in response to a subcommittee subpoena was discussed because no authority had been adopted to empower the subcommittee to hold hearings in Puerto Rico.

In House Resolution 222 not only is the select committee authorized to hold hearings and issue subpoenas within the United States, including any commonwealth and possession, but also in any other country.

The addition of the last phrase "in any other country" is not an authorization such as could have provided jurisdiction to the committee in the Cuesta case to act in Puerto Rico.

It is not the kind of authority such as was possessed by U.S. courts as an aspect of international good will to empower the taking of depositions from courts of foreign jurisdictions, a power now granted by statute, and covered by an international convention.

As it was stated in 1887 California Federal Circuit Court Pacific Railroad Commission case, no act of any kind, for the securing of information abroad, could be invoked by an investigation committee appointed by Congress. To my knowledge the situation is no different now than it was then. If a congressional committee is to carry on hearings in other countries to subpoena witnesses, its ability to do so will depend entirely upon the consent of the sovereign foreign nation. No convention exists nor does any concept of international treaty exist upon which such an exercise of authority by a congressional committee can be made.

Disagreeable or unsatisfactory situations might arise unless the House is certain in advance, that another nation would be cooperative to a request from a select committee.

Before the House grants the proposed select committee any such authority, I believe that we should be informed of the countries where investigations are planned, whether cooperation can be expected, and what guarantees exist for their cooperation. If the sponsors of the resolution cannot now provide this information, surely the wisest course would be to defeat this proposal before it votes a possible international incident into being.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 164, answered "present" 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]
YEAS—237

Addabbo	Ashley	Blanchard
Akaka	AuCoin	Blouin
Alexander	Badillo	Boggs
Ambro	Baldus	Boland
Ammerman	Baukus	Bolling
Anderson,	Beard, R.I.	Bonior
Calif.	Bedell	Bowen
Anderson, Ill.	Bellenson	Brademas
Andrews, N.C.	Benjamin	Breaux
Annunzio	Biaggi	Brodhead
Brooks	Hefelf	Freyer
Brown, Ohio	Hollenbeck	Price
Broyhill	Holtzman	Pritchard
Buchanan	Horton	Rahall
Burke, Calif.	Howard	Rangel
Burke, Mass.	Hughes	Reuss
Burleson, Mo.	Ichord	Richmond
Burton, John	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Burton, Phillip	Jenrette	Roberts

continued on page 13

Byron
Caputo
Carney
Carr
Cavanaugh
Chisholm
Clay
Cohen
Coleman
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cornell
Cotter
Crane
D'Amours
Danielson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Dicks
Diggs
Dodd
Downey
Drinan
Early
Eckhardt
Edgar
Edwards, Calif.
Emery
Evans, Colo.
Evans, Ind.
Fary
Fenwick
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Flood
Florio
Flowers
Foley
Ford, Tenn.
Fountain
Fraser
Frenzel
Gammage
Gialmo
Gilman
Goldwater
Gonzales
Gore
Gradison
Gudger
Hamilton
Hanley
Harrington
Harris
Heckler
Hefner

Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Jordan
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Kildee
Koch
Koestmayer
Krebs
Krueger
Le Fante
Leach
Lederer
Leggett
Levitas
Lloyd, Calif.
Long, Md.
Luken
Lundine
McCloskey
McDade
McFall
McHugh
McKinney
Marks
Mathis
Meeds
Metcalfe
Mikulski
Miller, Calif.
Mineta
Minish
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Murphy, Ill.
Myers, Gary
Myers, Michael
Natcher
Neal
Nix
Nolan
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ottinger
Panetta
Patten
Patterson
Pattison
Pease
Perkins
Pettis
Pickle

NATS—164

Abdnor
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Applegate
Archer
Armstrong
Ashbrook
Baldwin
Balfas
Barnard
Bassman
Beard, Tenn.
Bennett
Bevill
Bonker
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Mich.
Burgener
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Butler
Carter
Clausen
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Cochran
Collins, Tex.
Conable
Corcoran

Cornwell
Daniel, Dan
Daniel, R. W.
Davis
Derrick
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dorman
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Okla.
English
Erlenborn
Ertel
Evans, Del.
Evans, Ga.
Fascell
Filippo
Flynt
Ford, Mich.
Fugate
Gaydos
Gephardt
Ginn
Glickman
Goodling
Grassley
Guyer
Hagedorn

Hall
Hammer-
schmidt
Hannaford
Hansen
Harsha
Hightower
Hillis
Holt
Hubbard
Hutchaby
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jenkins
Jones, W.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Kelly
Ketchum
Keys
Kindness
Lagomastino
Latta
Lehman
Leah
Lloyd, Tenn.
Loft
Lujan
McClary
McConack
McDonald

McEwen
McKay
Madigan
Mahon
Mann
Marienae
Marriott
Martin
Mattox
Mazzoli
Michel
Mikva
Milford
Miller, Ohio
Mollohan
Moorhead,
Calif.
Mottl
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Nedzi
Nichols
O'Brien
Pike

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—29

Allen
Aspin
Bingham
Brown, Calif.
Cederberg
Chappell
Coughlin
Dent
Ellberg
Forsythe

Murphy, N.Y.
Murphy, Pa.
Nowak
Pepper
Rallsback
Rhodes
Teague
Walsh
Young, Alaska

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:
Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Walsh against.
Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Young of Alaska against.
Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Forsythe against.

Until further notice.

Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Coughlin.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Rallsback.
Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Murphy of Pennsyl-
vania.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Brown
of California.
Mr. Novak with Mr. Aspin.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mrs. Meyer with Mr. Maguire.
Mr. Harkin with Mr. Chappell.
Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Holland.

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the
table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSAS- SINATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provi-
sions of House Resolution 223, 94th Con-
gress, the Chair appoints as members of
the Select Committee on Assassinations
the following Members and delegates of
the House: Mr. GONZALES, Texas, chair-
man; Mr. PREYER, North Carolina; Mr.
STOKES, Ohio; Mr. FAVRETT, District of
Columbia; Ms. BYRNE, California; Mr.
DODD, Connecticut; Mr. FOX, Tennessee;
Mr. FITHIAN, Indiana; Mr. DEVINE, Ohio;
Mr. ANDERSON, Illinois; Mr. McKINNEY,
Connecticut, and Mr. THOMAS, Nebraska.

COMMENTS ON SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

HON. GEORGE M. O'BRIEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1977

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, taken to-
gether the report of the Rules Committee
is a fair and decent approach to estab-
lishing the Select Committee on Assas-
sinations.

Removal of authority to dabble with
wire taps, bugs, lie detectors and stress
analysts is certainly necessary to a fair
and just investigation.

There is, however, another area equal-
ly important to the credibility of the se-
lect committee's work that has not been
dealt with in the Rules Committee's re-
port, namely the matter of what consti-
tutes a quorum for the select committee
and its subcommittees.

The Warren commission has been fre-
quently and fairly criticized because
more than half the members never heard
more than half the witnesses. One War-
ren commission member heard only 6
of the 94 witnesses. Fairly, then, it has
been written:

"They were part-time investigators of the
(Kennedy) assassination thus leaving them-
selves open to charges that they were serving
as 'front men'."

To prevent this devastating criticism
from being used to undermine the efforts
of the select committee, Mr. Speaker, it
is clear that the requirements that only
two members need to be present to hear
testimony needs to be strengthened.

It is absolutely essential that these in-
vestigations be carried out by one House,
not by Philadelphia lawyers in the em-
ploy of the House.

I therefore support the requirement
that at least one-half the members of
the select committee or the subcommit-
tees must be present to take testimony.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSI- NATIONS SHOULD CONTINUE INVESTIGATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous
order of the House, the gentleman from
Connecticut (Mr. McKinney) is recog-
nized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise
in support of the resolution to reconsti-
tute the Select Committee on Assassina-
tions. Having participated in the pro-
ceedings of the committee to date, I have
no doubt as to the necessity for continu-
ing this investigation. I regret, Mr.
Speaker, that every Member could not
have witnessed the progress of the in-
vestigation firsthand. Had that been
possible, I am certain we would not be
debating a mere temporary reprieve for
the committee; but we would be granting
a unanimous mandate to continue this

probe to its ultimate conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, 6 months ago the 94th
Congress approved the creation of the
Select Committee on Assassinations by
a wide margin. At that time, I can only
assume that it was the weight of the
facts which convinced an overwhelming
majority of this body to authorize an
investigation into the deaths of President
Kennedy and Dr. King. Since that time,
the facts have not changed. Rather, the
committee's work to date has provided
further substantiation for completion of
an independent, dispassionate investiga-
tion.

What then, Mr. Speaker, could be the
basis for the sudden change of heart on
the part of so many Members? Have we
found new evidence to sufficiently an-
swer the serious questions which have
plagued the American people for so long?
Not according to a recent Gallup poll
which shows a vast 80 percent of the
American public is uneasy with the con-
clusions of prior investigations into these
tragedies. Does the passing of election-
time pressures reflect insecurity in the
original vote of a strong majority of this
House? Free of the watchful eye of the
electorate, are we now too timid to com-
plete that which we voted to undertake?
I think not. However, I am truly at a loss
to explain how the desire of so many to
ascertain the facts involved in these two
murders has been mitigated.

In its original approval of House Reso-
lution 1549, the 94th Congress placed its
reputation on the line. In the 6 months
since its inception, the committee has un-
covered sufficient evidence, pertinent to
both crimes, to protect the integrity of
that decision and to justify continuing
the committee's task. Working with the
limited resources available, the commit-
tee has become privy to previously un-
disclosed information, located and inter-
viewed new witnesses whose testimony
may ultimately challenge the findings of
prior investigations, and has confronted
the questions of possible complicity on
the part of various individuals or groups
in the commission of these crimes.

However, in carrying out this assign-
ment, the committee has been subject to
severe criticism. Perhaps the greatest
controversy concerns the alleged over-
zealous desire of the committee to review
the work of our Federal investigatory
agencies in connection with these two
assassinations. Mr. Speaker, these
charges are without foundation. In my
view, the personal histories of those em-
ployed by the select committee should
alone be enough to allay these fears. The
chief counsel and director of the investi-
gations, who has himself been recognized
as one of the country's best criminal
prosecutors, has been able to secure the
services of the best legal and investiga-
tory talent in the Nation. These people
have for years enhanced the image of
law enforcement through their work. I
believe they now have neither the inten-
tion nor disposition to discredit any Fed-
eral law enforcement agency. Nor do I
expect them to endanger their own pro-
fessional integrity through the use of in-
vestigative techniques or devices which
will compromise the civil rights of others.
In this respect, Mr. Speaker, critics of
the committee are misguided. Those with
doubts as well as those, like myself, with
no preconceptions about the ultimate
findings of this committee, can view the
assembled investigatory know-how of the
select committee staff as an asset rather
than a threat.

This is not a battle between the select
committee and the rest of the House. The
entire Congress has already accepted re-
sponsibility for a new investigation into
these deaths, and rightfully so. To shirk
that responsibility now on the basis of
procedural differences or budget disputes
without adequately addressing the
troubling questions which still remain
unanswered would be an injustice. We
cannot feign disinterest now, Mr. Speak-
er, without badly discrediting this body
and intensifying the charges of coverup
and conspiracy. I urge all my colleagues
to support the committee now and in the
future and thereby grant the American
people their right to know.