

understanding of what has transpired since March 8, the day that the Speaker of the House appointed me as chairman of this committee.

As the chairman of the committee, I found a situation which I am sure no other chairman of a congressional committee has ever found upon becoming chairman of a committee in this House. I found a situation where there were 73 staff employees, many of whom were investigators and attorneys, who could not make a single long-distance call. They had no authority whatsoever to make a long-distance call to anyone trying to communicate with a congressional committee.

I found a committee that had almost no stationary and no supplies with which to function. I found 73 people on a Federal payroll who had no authority whatsoever to travel anywhere to investigate anything in conjunction with these assassinations. I found a group of very dedicated and highly professional staff people, who in order to comply with the congressional mandate of \$84,000 per month for January, February, and March, had taken a 35-percent pay cut in order to comply with that mandate of the Congress.

I found an investigative staff that no longer had any access to FBI records or CIA records, and could not even communicate and get records from Senate investigatory committees because it was a committee without a chairman, and no one wanted to have any relationship with it whatsoever.

I found two Members of the Congress, respectively the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) and the gentleman from Washington, D.C. (Mr. FAUNTROY), both of whom had been subcommittee chairmen in the previous Congress, who in this Congress had not yet been appointed by the former chairman to be subcommittee chairmen. Consequently, neither one of these two Members of Congress and members of the committee could call any meeting of their respective subcommittees. It was a committee that had not yet adopted any rules, even though it had been in existence since the 94th Congress.

So immediately, then, I tried to restore some type or order to a very chaotic situation. This was 22 days ago. Since then we have been able to restore the long-distance telephone services. We have stationery supplies for these people. They can now travel into all parts of the country in order to investigate these assassinations, and they have now acquired access once again to FBI and CIA records and those of other committees.

In addition, I appointed both subcommittee chairmen, and they were able to once again function in their respective capacities. Since we had no rules, the day before I was appointed the chairman of this committee we had to invoke the rules of the House in order to appoint an acting committee chairman in order to be able to adopt some rules. We spent a day or a day and one-half on the adoption of those rules under the acting chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER). There were no committee rules at the time that this committee last went

before the Committee on Rules, under the former chairman. There was a great deal of concern about the fact that this committee was going to violate the civil and constitutional rights of those persons whom they were investigating or interviewing. Since the adoption of these rules, we have now received a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union, which says that they no longer oppose the investigation by this committee, that the rules we have adopted do in fact safeguard the civil and constitutional rights of persons who will come in contact with our committee, and they strongly endorse the continuation and reconstitution of this committee.

There have been some allegations made that during January, February and March the staff had spent the allowance by this Congress. I have here a letter, dated March 4, 1977, signed by William H. Cable, which says:

Based on a reduction in total payroll for February to a figure of approximately \$80,100, and assuming your estimates for expenses and salaries for March are as you indicated, \$81,600, the Committee would in my judgment stay within the amount authorized by House Resolution 11 of the 95th Congress which is \$84,337.12 per month.

I have with me in my hand at this time a recap of our expenses for January, February, and including up to March 31, 1977. Our total expenditure allocation was \$247,388.89. To date, we have spent \$246,955.93, with \$433.86 still remaining for the balance of March.

I might say that under the acting chairman we also spent a day and one-half ascertaining the fact that at no time had the staff exceeded the expenditure allocated by this House. And then, of course, we were in the position where the committee had never adopted and proposed to this Congress a budget which we could come to the floor on. Consequently, I appointed the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) as a task force chairman and appointed members of the task force, and asked them to study the budget as Members of Congress and to bring into this body a practical budget that we could live with.

The previous budget, as I recall, was proposed by our chief counsel, Mr. Sprague. He proposed a budget somewhere in the neighborhood of \$13 million for a 2-year period, at the rate of \$6.5 million per year.

The Members of Congress spent several days in their task force and then came in with the type of a budget which they felt would be acceptable to this House.

That budget is in the amount of approximately \$2.7 million for this year. That is for the 12-month period.

Mr. Speaker, part of the difficulty we had in adopting a budget was due to the fact that there were no previous criteria for such an investigation, because neither the House nor the Senate has ever undertaken the task of investigating two assassinations at the same time. Consequently, the figure that we have arrived at, we felt, is reasonable and practical. We are talking about a little over a million dollars per murder for a year.

In addition, the \$2.7 million that we propose for the fiscal year 1977 also in-

cludes approximately \$250,000, which amount we must repay to the contingency fund of the House at the rate of \$84,000 per month.

In regard to both matters, in the past 22 days we have now begun investigations. That is something that had been thwarted up until 22 days ago. In the King matter, for instance, we have now dispatched investigators to various parts of the country, and they are proceeding to investigate. We have issued subpoenas. We now have under our physical control for the first time in the 9 years since Dr. Martin Luther King's death all of the physical evidence in that case. We are now proceeding with the forensic scientific testing of some of that material and evidence that is now in our possession, and we are pursuing new leads concerning some previously unpursued facts. We have witnesses who have never previously been interviewed before, one of whom happens to be a constituent of a Member of this body. I am sure the Members have read recently about that.

In the case of James Earl Ray, who evidenced a desire and interest to talk to our committee, we dispatched investigators to Brushy Mount Penitentiary a week ago, and there they spent more than 2 hours interviewing him and taking his statement. This past Monday we sent them back down there again, and they have spent 6 additional hours talking to this man, who has never previously been willing to talk to any other investigatory body.

We have done the same in the matter of the Kennedy investigation. We have dispatched investigators throughout the country; we have issued subpoenas; we have taken statements. We have also had before this committee one witness, a very vital witness in this investigation, who upon being called before our committee, took the 1st, the 4th, the 5th, and the 14th amendments 14 times and refused absolutely to divulge any information to this congressional committee.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I just want to make reference to the fact that this morning at 10 a.m. our committee met and officially accepted the resignation of Mr. Richard Sprague. That was done reluctantly by the members of this committee, because 11 of us who worked with Dick Sprague, and then subsequently the 12 of us who worked with him, had very high regard for his professional ability.

Dick Sprague resigned this morning not as a result of the charges that have been leveled against him by any Member of this body nor as a result of the truthfulness of any of those charges. He has said continuously since October 8, the day I assumed the chair, that—

If at any time it is felt that I am an impediment to an investigation that I feel is necessary for the American people and in which I believe, I will step aside.

This morning his official resignation was tendered to us because he felt that the life of this committee depended upon his not being a member or a part of the staff assigned to this particular committee.

This morning the members of this

Test results?

Baird?

Truthful?

committee paid great tribute to this man for whom they have high personal and high professional regard, and in that spirit they reluctantly accepted his resignation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the past 22 days has meant for me the assumption of a rather onerous and awesome responsibility, but I did accept this responsibility out of a love and respect and an admiration for the Members of this body. I resented sitting on a congressional committee that was being caricatured in the American newsprint as being a group of buffoons.

I resented sitting on a congressional committee where we were being caricatured as standing in a backroom somewhere assailing and flailing and assassinating one another.

I have tried in the past 22 days to show that this congressional committee is composed of dedicated, highly professional Members of this House who have been united in their efforts in a way I have never seen before in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay special tribute to the gentlemen on the other side of this aisle, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. THONE), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY), men who have worked assiduously to try to complete a job to which they were dedicated and to which they were committed in order to try to bring credibility to this House in a responsible and professional manner.

On my own side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, I am indebted to each of the members of this committee.

I say to the Members, Mr. Speaker, that this is a committee which has undertaken the work of this Congress in an assiduous manner, in a dedicated manner, in a highly competent and professional manner; and I say that it would be a tragedy if this committee were not to be reconstituted.

Mr. Speaker, the American people should have the opportunity to have all of these unanswered questions answered for them and to have this committee enabled to bring in the type of highly professional report that would be a credit and reflect creditably upon this Congress, of which I am so proud to be a part.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman two questions.

First, there has been quite a bit of criticism of the previous counsel, Mr. Sprague, because of the fact that he was not, as I understand it, putting in full time on this job, but was putting in time on some other work.

Can the gentleman assure this House that his replacement as counsel to the committee would be a full-time employee who was doing no other outside work than his work as counsel to this committee?

Mr. STOKES. I would say in reply to the gentleman that it would be the in-

tent of this committee that any person assuming that responsibility for the committee would devote full time to it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDWARDS) that this is another unfortunate and unjust charge that has been leveled against Mr. Sprague because Mr. Sprague, while a member of a law firm in Philadelphia, had assured this committee in the full interrogation we made of him consisting of 1½ days in executive session, that each and every charge that has been leveled against him was not true and that while he was a member of the law firm he had not accepted or participated in any other case since assuming employment with our committee.

Furthermore, both former chairmen were apprised of the fact that he also was a law professor at Temple University, where he taught school 1 night a week; and at the time we were interrogating him about it, he had missed 4 of the last 5 weeks of teaching that course.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. May I say that I am not going back into that subject with respect to Mr. Sprague.

I am trying to get assurance that the committee does intend to get a full-time counsel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) has again expired.

Mr. BOLLING. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STOKES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. To continue, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the fact that there has been much discussion throughout the country about there possibly being a conspiracy behind the assassinations and so forth. There have been suggestions made that perhaps foreign governments were involved in some of these conspiracies.

Of course, this raises a question in my mind. We have this wonderful thing which we call détente, and we have all these other things going on. If the gentleman's committee does continue to exist and does find that, in fact, there was a conspiracy and that that conspiracy was international in nature, will the American people know the results or will it be hushed up?

Mr. STOKES. I can say to the gentleman unqualifiedly that this committee is dedicated to trying to, once and for all, allay and put to rest all of the rumors and rumors of rumors and theories that exist with reference to both of these assassinations. It would be our intention, when we have completed the report, to lay the facts out as we find them and let the American people be the judge.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Is it not

true that the gentleman cannot assure us that we will be able to find out the results?

Mr. STOKES. I have no way of knowing what the conclusions will be after we have been able to assess and analyze all of the evidence.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 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, and Members of the House, it is perfectly possible I think to serve in a body as large as is the House of Representatives for a fairly long period of time and yet not come to know the full measure of a man's capabilities. I believe that we now understand, in the very masterful presentation that we have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Assassinations, that in the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) we have a man who has undertaken to fulfill the mandate that we received from this House on the 2d of February. That is to go into the matter of the committee's budget and to draw up a set of rules that would satisfy the concerns of those who felt that somehow we were reaching too far in this investigation and possibly to involve and imperil the civil rights of American citizens. The gentleman from Ohio has had only 3 weeks to do that job because it was not until the 8th of March as a result of the unfortunate hiatus that developed upon the resignation of the former chairman, that this task was given to him to bring this committee together and to procure the kind of unity that has resulted in all 12 Members introducing House Resolution 433. All four Republican Members and all eight Democratic Members have joined in introducing the resolution that, when adopted today, as I am sure it will, will have the effect of reconstituting this committee.

So, Mr. Speaker, to stand up here and tell this House that we have before us a committee in disarray, one that is somehow going to place in ill repute the good name of the House of Representatives, is to ignore completely the character of the job that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), our new chairman, has done.

I do not want to turn this into a contest of personalities. I have great affection for my friend—and I am pleased to have him sitting over on the Republican side of the aisle this afternoon—great affection for the gentleman from Texas, Mr. HENRY B. GONZALEZ. The gentleman is not the issue in this debate nor is Mr. Sprague, the former chief counsel, who, just a little while ago submitted his resignation. The issue is, as the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), tried to point out, what we can do during the life of the select committee to try to answer the serious doubts that still exists in the minds of the American people concerning these matters. Was there a conspiracy connected with the murder of John Kennedy or Martin Luther King, Jr.? Maybe there was not. Maybe we will simply reaffirm the con-

clusions of the Warren Commission and the court that sentenced James Earl Ray.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we do nothing less but to put to rest the kinds of rumors and speculations that have led some 70 to 80 percent of the American people to express doubts that the full story has been told, then I think the money that we will have spent in the course of this investigation will be some of the best spent funds that this Congress has appropriated.

We cannot take lightly the fact that the American public today is skeptical of Government and the processes of Government and the conclusions which we reach. And if we make the kind of dedicated effort I am convinced we will make then I believe that under the rules that even the American Civil Liberties Union endorses and says that they now want, and are asking that the committee go forward, that it is possible we can remove some of the doubts that have been expressed about these two assassinations.

I believe there is a terribly important job to be done. I have confidence in the chairman, I have confidence in the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER), and Mr. FAUNTROY, chairman of the King Subcommittee under Mr. PREYER's leadership of the budget task force on which I was privileged to serve we have drastically slashed both the proposed budget and the anticipated payroll.

I hope that the House today will unanimously support House Resolution 433.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker for recognizing me this morning on a point of order that a quorum was not present. I should have put it in the form of an inquiry or request. I thank the Speaker for his kindness.

I want to thank also the members of the Committee on Rules for allowing us to discuss this measure today openly and freely. I should have preferred an open rule with amendments under the regular 5-minute rule procedure, but the privileged rule they have adopted does give us a chance to have this discussion and to offer amendments or substitutes, and I think this sets better with the House, and I thank the Committee on Rules for doing it.

I also want to make it plain at the outset that I commend the 12 members of the select committee for their discreet approach in searching for some kind of answers. I want to assure them, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) did, that this is not a matter of personalities; this is a matter really of what we do now with this select committee. I think many of the Members know that originally I had planned and may offer some kind of a substitute or amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule. I think, however, that a more expeditious and forthright approach may be to have a yes-or-no vote on the resolution. I have

come to the conclusion that it is best to let this committee go out of existence. The Assassinations Committee, to begin with, was born in doubt. It was a question mark to begin with. It has continued in antagonizing controversy, with very few questions settled. The actual purpose of the investigation still hangs fluttering like an Irish pennant with nothing being settled at all.

Admittedly, at first the issue was the question of Mr. Sprague as against the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), however one wants to split and analyze it. There are many of us who would say—and I am sure every Member of this House would—that one of the most distinguished Members we have ever had in this body is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENRY GONZALEZ). I know for a fact that he is one of the most fearless men in public life that our State or this Congress has ever had. Make no mistake, he would not be this aroused and would not have taken this extreme action if he did not feel that he had been given a rebuff, that he had been repulsed and had not been supported. I do not propose at this time to discuss every step in his proceedings or every step by the leadership or the committee was right. That is for each Member to pass judgment on. I simply at this time will first pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), who has been really the sole voice, and at times almost the only voice, in trying to pursue the purpose of this committee.

Now the question is what do we do about it? It seems to me we are faced with very few options. We can continue the Assassinations Committee or we can put it to a peaceful rest. This option, at peaceful rest, is probably the best thing for the Congress and this House to do. The committee has given us no peace since its beginning with Mr. Sprague. Surely the Members have not been the problem, but the problems are real and the problems affect us all. Now the question is can there be any credibility for this committee; at least, can there be sufficient credibility for us to ever find out the answer to the questions that actually haunt us? I do not think we can find out these answers now under the select committee. I think that the committee, though they are well-meaning and though they are honorable members and have the best intentions, will not lay to rest the problem questions on the Kennedy and the King assassinations.

The better solution, in my opinion, would be to set up a special task force in the Department of Justice to handle this investigation. This would have credibility, just like the Watergate Prosecutor's Office had credibility. We could even give a 30-day extension for the staff members, if some felt that this would be in order.

In conclusion, I hope that the Members will vote "no" on the rule.

If this rule does not carry, I have here a bill which I will introduce that directs the Attorney General of the United States to establish a task force in the Justice Department to proceed with the full and further investigation of these

questions. It would seem to me we need a fresh start and this I think is the proper course for us today, and I ask for a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS).

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

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and I oppose the reconstitution of the committee. I want to focus only on one reason for my decision.

We can agree unanimously that the responsibility of this committee, if it is reconstituted, involves sensitive, delicate matters in which the rights of individuals affected are to be scrupulously protected. We were given assurance by the chairman and by the staff that the work of the committee will be conducted in a professional manner and will not bring discredit on the House of Representatives. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the brief history of this committee contradicts those assurances. In fact, there have been flagrant disregards of right already. Let me tell the Members how and where.

There has been but one public hearing by the committee to my knowledge. That was, as Members will recall, a media event. The witness was a Mr. Trafficante, a person who I am told has been linked in the past with the underworld. He may be a very unworthy individual but it is in precisely that kind of case that rights should be scrupulously protected.

Mr. Trafficante's counsel informed counsel for the committee and the committee as a whole prior to the hearing that he would claim his Fifth amendment rights if questioned with respect to certain matters. Knowing that fact and before the full glare of television, committee counsel repeatedly asked Mr. Trafficante questions and forced him to the burden of claiming his fifth amendment rights.

Let me ask the attorneys in the Chamber: Is that professional conduct? The American Bar Association in its Standards of Conduct characterizes such questioning as unprofessional. In nearly every jurisdiction in America a prosecutor who questioned a witness under such circumstances would produce a mistrial. It is prejudicial and reversible error to do that. It is not sufficient to say that the act was the misconduct of Mr. Sprague alone. It was the act of the committee. The committee did it, and in doing so, disregarded important rights to which this perhaps unworthy person, Mr. Trafficante, was entitled.

In its first public hearing, under the threat of being disbanded, this committee demonstrated its insensitivity to legal rights. I am not convinced that it will gain that sensitivity in the future if reconstituted.

I offer the Members this important illustration as one more reason why this committee should not be reconstituted.

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

Mr. WIGGINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER).

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that on Mr. Trafficante first, we did not know he was going to take the fifth amendment until that morning. We offered to have an executive session. He did not want to go into executive session. I think he wanted to announce he was taking the fifth amendment before the world and the under-world.

Mr. WIGGINS. Did the committee know of Mr. Trafficante's intention to claim his fifth amendment rights before the questions were asked?

Mr. PREYER. Before the questions, yes.

Mr. WIGGINS. That is the issue in terms of professional conduct. I contend that it was grossly unprofessional for the committee to permit the questions to go forward under the circumstances.

Mr. PREYER. I would say to the gentleman these are not questions out of thin air. These are questions on which we have witnesses who would testify on the question asked Mr. Trafficante.

Also I would say to the gentleman it is the intention of the committee in every case to interview witnesses, to hear their initial testimony in executive session, to corroborate their testimony in every way we can before the witness would be put on in public.

Mr. WIGGINS. The gentleman's statement is not persuasive on the question of whether it was unprofessional conduct to ask the questions, knowing of an intention to claim a lawful privilege.

In conclusion, let me say that the spectacle which I have describe reminded me of another spectacle which occurred about 25 years ago in the other body, and which brought discredit to the Congress as a whole.

[Mr. KOCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE).

(Mrs. BURKE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted on September 17, 1976, to create the select committee to investigate the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the action was considered monumental. For in my view, it represented a great step forward in the effort to restore the faith of millions of Americans in this body. As Members know, governmental bodies at all levels, but particularly the Congress, have not been held in high esteem in recent years by the American people.

I make this point to illustrate the potential problems we may continue to face in this regard if we fail to pass House Resolution 433 continuing the operations of the Select Committee on Assassinations.

It has been 13 years since President Kennedy was slain in Dallas. Dr. King was murdered 9 years ago. Yet a recent

Gallup poll indicates that despite this passage of time, 80 percent of the American people still have lingering doubts about the extent to which all of the relevant facts have been disclosed in the assassination of these great men—two of the most traumatic events in American history.

As the committee stated in its report:

The passage of time has not healed the national trauma caused by these assassinations. In the ensuing years, old doubts have remained and new and disturbing questions have been raised as additional evidence has come to light . . .

In just 5 short days we will observe the ninth anniversary of Dr. King's assassination in Memphis. Nothing could be more fitting for this occasion than to have the American people know that the Congress is indeed determined to put to rest once and for all, all of the facts relating to his murder and that of President Kennedy.

Since its creation, the committee has endeavored to undertake a thorough and impartial inquiry into both murders. Unfortunately, and to the dismay of many of our citizens and Members of this body, the committee has been beset by many problems. The committee has experienced leadership changes on three occasions; objections have been raised about the size of the initial proposed budget and the rules of the committee were in need of revision. Many have complained that the inquiry, to date, has revealed nothing more than a rehash of information produced in previous investigations.

None of these concerns, however, are sufficient reasons for dismantling this important investigation. The House select committee is the only body which has the potential for disclosing all there is to know about these slayings, thus putting the matter to rest once and for all.

As Members know, many witnesses who were earlier available for purposes of corroboration of existing and new-found evidence are now deceased. Even today we are confronted with the mysterious and questionable death of yet another potential witness, George Mohienschildt. Mr. Mohienschildt is reported to have known Oswald and to have had advance knowledge of the plan to assassinate President Kennedy. Committee staff was in the process of contacting him to determine just how much he knew about individuals and circumstances related to the Kennedy case. If we wait another 4 or 5 years to generate a new inquiry, either by Congress or some other governmental body, other witnesses conceivably would not be available.

I suggest to my colleagues that the more time passes, the less likely it will become that we will ever be able to determine all the facts involved in these cases.

Under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), the problems of the committee have been resolved and the investigations are continuing in a methodical and thorough manner.

The proposed budget, previously an

area of much concern to a great many Members, has been reduced from \$6.5 to \$2.7 million.

On March 7, the committee adopted rules of procedure which insure that the inquiry will be conducted in a credible manner and with appropriate constitutional safeguards.

On March 11, physical evidence used in the investigation and court trial of James Earl Ray in the murder of Dr. King was introduced into evidence of the committee. Mr. Ray, the convicted assassin of Dr. King, has been interviewed twice by committee counsel. Although he pleaded guilty at his trial in 1969, Mr. Ray now claims that he was set up and in fact did not kill Dr. King.

The evidence accumulated to date suggests that Ray did kill Dr. King. A rifle of the same caliber as the one which killed Reverend King was found a short distance from the scene of the crime with his fingerprints on it. A thorough investigation supposedly was conducted by the FBI. The Justice Department followed with its own investigation of the murder concluding that Ray was the lone assassin of Dr. King.

Yet many important questions remain unanswered and much information suggest the possibility that the convicted assassin may have been assisted prior to and following the assassination.

The committee must investigate how Ray was able to escape from prison after allegedly failing on several occasions and how he remained at large for better than a year traveling throughout the United States and at least four foreign countries without being apprehended.

The committee is concerned with where Ray got the money for his travels since he reportedly had earned only \$664.34 from a dishwashing job at a restaurant in Illinois. Nevertheless, with no visible means of support he was able to raise nearly \$10,000, that he spent in three foreign countries prior to the assassination.

The Justice Department report acknowledged that "the sources for Ray's funds still remain a mystery" and implied that the FBI should have followed up more thoroughly. Needless to say, it did not.

The committee has uncovered other areas of possible assistance to Ray. At the time he was in Los Angeles, his safety deposit box in Birmingham was closed by someone from Baton Rouge, La. We need to know who the mysterious Raoul is? Does he exist? Is he related to Ray? Was he present at the time of the assassination?

The committee is also investigating information from reliable sources that the day of the assassination a black policeman, Edward Reddick, was mysteriously relieved of his assignment at a surveillance post in a firehouse overlooking the hotel in which Dr. King resided. Conflicting reports have been given for his removal. The day before, two black firemen were transferred from the station to other posts.

If a conspiracy to assassinate Dr. King did in fact exist, the committee needs to determine who were the participants in

test result
—> production

?

the conspiracy? How did it function? and, What was the motivating force?

With respect to the murder of President Kennedy, the committee is pursuing new leads which, if corroborated, would indicate connections between Lee Harvey Oswald, the FBI and the CIA.

The Warren Commission concluded that Jack Ruby never knew Oswald prior to the Kennedy assassination. The committee is attempting to substantiate information obtained from a witness, never previously interviewed, who has stated that he—or she—was introduced to Oswald by Ruby in November prior to the assassination.

The committee is pursuing leads which suggest that Ruby traveled to Cuba in 1959 to visit Santos Trafficante who was in jail. Trafficante was associated with Sam Giancana and John Roselli, who also visited him in jail. Both Giancana and Roselli were murdered allegedly in connection with the request for their appearance before the Church committee which was investigating the CIA and the Kennedy assassination.

Trafficante appeared before the committee on March 16 concerning his knowledge of the Kennedy assassination, Ruby, Giancana, Roselli, Oswald, the CIA and the FBI. He refused to testify claiming rights under the first, fourth, fifth, and 14th amendments of the Constitution.

Oswald and an unidentified FBI agent were reportedly seen together on several occasions in bars in New Orleans.

Other pertinent information or leads have also surfaced.

If we are to resolve the many doubts and suspicions which still exist in the minds of millions of Americans, we will vote to adopt this resolution before us today. To do less is to simply perpetuate indefinitely the many suspicions which have surrounded the murders of President Kennedy and Dr. King for a decade or more.

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I will take the 5 minutes.

I think the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) made it very clear that the committee is functioning, that it has rules.

I think the fact that the committee membership has held together through thick and thin is one of the most remarkable things that I have seen in this House in all the time that I have been here. Really, the membership of the committee is a cross section of the whole institution and they are unanimous in their efforts. Their current effort is a phenomenon.

Mr. Speaker, I think the notion that this matter should be referred to the Justice Department, while all surely sincere, is really not very meaningful. This House took upon itself the responsibility of examining into these two murders. If it now decides not to do so when its committee is in order, the conclusion and the only conclusion that will be drawn by many of the American people, perhaps unfortunately, is that the House

does not want to proceed and is, in effect, covering up.

I do not suggest for a moment that anybody who opposes this rule or opposes the resolution has that in mind. I suggest that that will be the reaction of the American people. They are uneasy, to put it very mildly, about the Warren Commission report. They are very uneasy about the King murder. They deserve from their servants the best possible efforts to mitigate and, if possible, dispel that unease.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for the rule. I urge that we pass the resolution which the rule will bring up.

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

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKLE), there were—yeas 70, noes 54.

Mr. PICKLE. 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 285, nays 124, answered "present" 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]
YEAS—285

Addabbo	Collins, Ill.	Harrington
Akaka	Conable	Harris
Alexander	Conte	Hawkins
Ammerman	Conyers	Heckler
Anderson,	Corman	Hefner
Calif.	Cotter	Hillis
Anderson, Ill.	Coughlin	Holland
Andrews, N.C.	Crane	Holtzman
Andrews,	D'Amours	Horton
N. Dak.	Daniel, Dan	Howard
Annunzio	Daniel, R. W.	Hubbard
Applegate	Danielson	Hughes
Ashley	Davis	Ichord
Aspin	Delaney	Ireland
AuCoin	Dent	Jacobs
Badillo	Derwinski	Jeffords
Baldus	Devine	Jenrette
Barnard	Dickinson	Johnson, Calif.
Baucus	Dicks	Johnson, Colo.
Bedell	Diggs	Jones, Tenn.
Bellenson	Dodd	Jordan
Benjamin	Dorman	Kasten
Bevill	Downey	Kastenmeier
Biaggi	Drinan	Kelly
Bingham	Early	Kemp
Blanchard	Edgar	Keys
Blouin	Edwards, Ala.	Kildee
Boggs	Edwards, Calif.	Koch
Boland	Eilberg	Kostmayer
Bolling	Emery	Krebs
Bonior	Evans, Colo.	Krueger
Bonker	Evans, Ind.	Lagomarsino
Bowen	Fascell	Latta
Brademas	Fenwick	Le Pante
Breaux	Findley	Lederer
Breckinridge	Fish	Leggett
Brinkley	Fithian	Lehman
Brodhead	Flood	Levitak
Brooks	Florio	Lloyd, Calif.
Broomfield	Flowers	Lloyd, Tenn.
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Long, La.
Buchanan	Ford, Tenn.	Long, Md.
Burke, Calif.	Fraser	Luken
Burke, Mass.	Frenzel	Lundine
Burlison, Mo.	Frey	McCloskey
Burton, John	Fuqua	McDade
Burton, Phillip	Gammage	McEwen
Byron	Gephardt	McFall
Caputo	Giaino	McHugh
Carney	Gibbons	McKay
Carr	Gilman	McKinney
Carter	Ginn	Madigan
Cavanaugh	Goldwater	Maguire
Cederberg	Gore	Mann
Chappell	Gradison	Markey
Chisholm	Gudger	Marks
Clausen,	Hagedorn	Mathis
Don H.	Hamilton	Mattox
Cohen	Hanley	Meeds
Coleman	Hannaford	Metcalfe

Meyner	Pursell	Steers
Mikva	Rahall	Stokes
Miller, Calif.	Railsback	Studds
Mineta	Regula	Taylor
Minish	Reuss	Thompson
Mitchell, Md.	Rhodes	Thone
Mitchell, N.Y.	Richmond	Thornton
Moakley	Rinaldo	Tonry
Moffett	Rodino	Traxler
Moorhead, Pa.	Rogers	Treen
Moss	Rooney	Tsongas
Mottl	Rose	Tucker
Murphy, Ill.	Rosenthal	Udall
Murphy, N.Y.	Rousselot	Ullman
Murphy, Pa.	Ruppe	Van Deerin
Myers, Gary	Ryan	Vander Jagt
Myers, Michael	Santini	Vanik
Natcher	Sarasin	Vento
Neal	Scheuer	Volkmer
Nichols	Schroeder	Walgren
Nix	Schulze	Walsh
Nolan	Seiberling	Waxman
Nowak	Sharp	Weaver
Oakar	Shipley	Weiss
Oberstar	Shuster	Whalen
Obey	Simon	Whitehurst
Ottinger	Skelton	Whitley
Panetta	Skubitz	Whitten
Patten	Slack	Wilson, C. H.
Patterson	Smith, Iowa	Wirth
Pattison	Snyder	Wolf
Perkins	Solarz	Wright
Pettis	Spellman	Yates
Preyer	Spence	Yatron
Price	Stanton	Young, Mo.
Pritchard	Stark	Zablocki

NAYS—124

Abdnor	Grassley	Pickle
Armstrong	Guyser	Pike
Ashbrook	Hall	Pressler
Badham	Hammer-	Quayle
Bafalis	schmidt	Quile
Bauman	Hansen	Quillen
Beard, R.I.	Harsha	Risenhoover
Beard, Tenn.	Heftel	Roberts
Bennett	Hightower	Robinson
Brown, Mich.	Hollenbeck	Roncalio
Brown, Ohio	Holt	Rostenkowski
Broyhill	Huckaby	Roybal
Burgeer	Hyde	Rudd
Burke, Fla.	Jenkins	Runnels
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Russo
Butler	Jones, Okla.	Satterfield
Clawson, Del.	Kazen	Sawyer
Cleveland	Ketchum	Sebelius
Cochran	Kindness	Sikes
Collins, Tex.	LaFalce	Sisk
Corcoran	Leach	Smith, Nebr.
Cornell	Lent	St Germain
Cornwell	Lott	Stangeland
de la Garza	Lujan	Steed
Derrick	McClory	Steiger
Dingell	McDonald	Stockman
Duncan, Oreg.	Mahon	Stratton
Duncan, Tenn.	Marriott	Stump
Edwards, Okla.	Martin	Trible
English	Mazzoli	Waggonner
Erlenborn	Michel	Walker
Ertel	Miller, Ohio	Wampler
Evans, Ga.	Mollohan	Watkins
Fary	Montgomery	White
Flippo	Moore	Wiggins
Flynt	Moorhead,	Wilson, Bob
Ford, Mich.	Calif.	Winn
Forsythe	Murtha	Wylder
Gaydos	Myers, Ind.	Wylie
Glickman	Nedzi	Young, Alaska
Gonzalez	O'Brien	Young, Fla.
Goodling	Pease	Zerferetti

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—22

Allen	Fountain	Rangel
Ambro	Harkin	Roe
Archer	McCormack	Staggers
Clay	Marlenee	Symms
Dellums	Mikulski	Teague
Eckhardt	Milford	Wilson, Tex.
Evans, Del.	Pepper	
Fisher	Page	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Pepper for, with Mr. Teague against.
Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Milford against.

Until further notice:
Mr. Clay with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Ambro with Mr. Fountain.