

reputation for credibility is equally in trouble.

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, let me say that there has been no comment at all in this debate today with respect to personalities. There have been no disparate remarks about any member of the select committee. We do not question the sincerity of the members or their dedication to their task. We have left out all name calling, and I think that is commendable on the part of this body.

My question is, do we continue it under the present setup or do we send it to the Department of Justice or continue it in some other way? We are not killing it, but trying to determine which direction to go.

Mr. MCKINNEY. In the privacy of my office or any other place in this building, I will be delighted to meet with the gentleman and counsel with him. I wish I could stand here in the middle of this whole House, in the middle of this difficult process, and tell the Members what I know, but the minute we do that, upstairs becomes the investigation, not the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

(On request of Mr. SISK and by unanimous consent Mr. MCKINNEY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from Connecticut, but as one of those who received, so far as I know, a secret briefing—at least, that was the point I understand, and I believe the gentleman was in the room at that time—

Mr. MCKINNEY. Not for that particular briefing, but I have been for many others.

Mr. SISK. Well, this was a special briefing for the Rules Committee. Let me say to my colleague that I had understood that, as he said, that there was some new evidence—and I am not here going to reveal any of the things that were said there in the presence of a group of Members, and Members exclusively, but I will say this: That I read rather carefully the material we were given plus listened very carefully, and I have great respect for the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), but the truth of the matter is that the only thing I heard was that you had information that X heard Y tell Z something.

I mean this sincerely: I had hoped to be able to support this effort. There has been a change in staff. But the truth of the matter is—and I say this in all kindness to my colleague from Connecticut—at that so-called secret meeting we absolutely were not given any new evidence or any justification for the continuation of this committee, as I heard it. Maybe I am not hearing as well as I should.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Of necessity, the

briefing the gentleman had was reduced. But far more important, there was a decision made by this committee, which has on it, for instance, an ex-Federal judge, and the decision was that we were never going to say, "Prima facie, this is proof," until we have validated every single aspect of any one of our informants' statements.

As the gentleman well knows, without a telephone for a long time, without any availability of transportation, this has been difficult.

Do we believe what we now know? Yes. But we will not tell you until it is proven.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the resolution.

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

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are getting rather impatient, and understandably so; and I had not intended, really, to take the well today to speak for or against the resolution. I have listened to all of the debate today. I missed the secret briefings. I had intended to attend them, but unfortunately my schedule did not permit. I did receive a private briefing, however, and I am privy to much of the information that is available to the committee. I have read the secret and confidential reports, and I want to say that every Member of this House should avail themselves of that opportunity.

A colleague of mine, just awhile ago, got up before us and indicated that he had a great deal of trial experience to draw on as he considered this issue. I do not doubt one bit that he experienced many of these things that I experienced in some 10 years of law enforcement. I know how difficult it is to try to pursue a cold trail. I know that the kooks will come out of the woodwork. They will come out, anyway. We do not have to have this kind of an investigation to bring them out.

I was not very happy, I am frank to admit, with the testimony of Santos Trafficante. I think if one of the committee members had asked him whether he agreed it was a nice day, he would have taken the fifth amendment.

I am also concerned about the \$2.7 million, funding level at a time when we are struggling to find sufficient moneys for all kinds of things. I do not really fault anyone on the side of the issue because I think it is an issue upon which reasonable men can differ. I had intended to vote against this resolution. That was the direction I learned. But I think it is essential that we vote to continue this committee. I am satisfied that we have a good chairman and that we have a good committee. I know each member of that committee personally, and I think they will do credit to this Congress. I am satisfied that the American people expect us at this time to do what is best for the country. I am not satisfied that we are going to really put to rest all of the issues that are raised. I do not think that will ever happen. I wish it were the case.

But I have seen enough in the confidential files to satisfy me that we must continue this committee to pursue the

new leads developed by the committee in its short history. We must put to rest as many of the issues and as much of the uncertainty as humanly possible.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in supporting House Resolution 433 reconstituting the Committee on Assassinations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the chairman of the committee a question or two, not in an embarrassing way, but certainly in a factual way.

Mr. Sprague resigned, and the committee accepted his resignation?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. QUILLEN. Is Mr. Sprague still on the payroll?

Mr. STOKES. We have not yet had an opportunity to sign the proper vouchers to terminate him from the payroll. This occurred at 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. QUILLEN. Will he be off the payroll as of today, or will he be given a 30-day notice or a 2-weeks notice, or will he remain on the payroll for a period of time?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, we had no discussion with Mr. Sprague relative to any time frame, and I assume that the resignation was effective at the time it was accepted by this committee.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Mr. Speaker, in line with the colloquy that was had with the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), I wish to say that I, too, attended a secret meeting with the committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), and other members of his committee, and I believe that if the Members of this House could have just one substantial new disclosure to hang their hats on, it would be helpful.

There were things I read in the documents at that time which have been revealed since in the press. One was about James Earl Ray's brother being involved in the conspiracy. The letter that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) read a moment ago was top secret. The things that were secret and that were divulged to the members of the Committee on Rules, I say to the gentleman from Ohio, have been made known in general terms.

Without divulging any secret information, does the gentleman have anything that he can give to this House at this time? I know that we hear about strip-teasers who have been converted. We hear this, and we hear that; we hear rumors of activities of members of the staff of the select committee. But does the gentleman have anything that he can tell us in the way of new information that we can hang our hats on?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I say to the gentleman that I certainly can, because the gentleman knows that in the briefing which we gave the gentleman concerning both cases, both the Kennedy case and the King case, we had sensitive materials that came out in that private briefing.

that executive briefing, and for the first time we revealed certain names of certain individuals who have never been interviewed in either of those investigations. We also had new and unpursued leads, and we asked, because of the sensitive nature of the material, that all that material be given back to us and not revealed publicly. The purpose of the executive briefing was so we would not be in the position of having to endanger the lives of certain persons by revealing that type of testimony openly relative to murder investigations.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I hold in my hand a news article that I referred to this morning in my colloquy, and that concerns the gentleman who killed himself. That name was revealed. Let me quote from the newspaper article:

The Oltmans interview developed into a national news story and sent investigators from the congressional committee scurrying to Dallas in search of De Mohrenschildt and his acquaintances. As of Friday, however, the probers had not inquired about his records with the Dallas County Mental Illness Department.

The name was revealed not under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), but by the committee at a prior time. The man has now killed himself.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask the gentleman to retract that statement. In no document that we have ever presented to the gentleman has that gentleman's name appeared.

Mr. QUINLEN. No. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. STOKES. I sincerely ask the gentleman to retract that statement.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, if I have misled the gentleman, I certainly do retract it. I did not say that. I said that I revealed the article which I quoted from this morning, and in the article there is allusion to the fact that staff members of the select committee went to Dallas, found that the man had had a mental health record, and know that he had a mental health record.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct any misunderstanding on the part of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), because he knows the high regard that I hold for him.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to say, as he had said earlier, that we have revealed this individual's name, because I know that we did not.

Mr. QUILLEN. No. That name was not revealed in the secret briefing.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker; I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explore the possibilities that we have before us. I do not intend to move the previous question at this time. However, there have not been any amendments offered for quite some time, and I know there could easily be any number of amendments offered.

However, I gather that the House is beginning to feel that it would like to

act on this matter; and I hope that Members will conduct themselves with that in mind.

I thank the Speaker.

Mr. STEERS. Mr. Speaker, I am in full support of House Resolution 433, which would reconstitute the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Passage of this resolution will result in a responsible and thorough investigation of the assassinations of President Kennedy and Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

It is of course unfortunate, that the former chairman and the former chief counsel got involved in such an unseemly dispute. It is also unfortunate that extravagant proposals were made to spend money which could better be allocated to more pressing needs.

However, the chairman has been replaced and the chief counsel's resignation has been accepted by the committee. The annual budget has been set at \$2.5 million instead of \$6.5 million.

I earlier voted against a proposal to continue the existence of this committee with totally inadequate funding. Subsequently, the bizarre occurrences relating to the Assassination Committee provided a deplorable and even disgraceful picture to the American public.

However, there is no reason, I feel, to believe the new chairman, Mr. STOKES, will experience the problems of his predecessor. There is no reason a new chief counsel cannot be found who will effectively perform the necessary duties of that position. We go forward with a clean slate and although there can be no guarantee of final answers to all the questions that have been raised, I believe the importance of these questions justifies making a serious effort which this resolution will initiate.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 433, the resolution reconstituting the Select Committee on Assassinations. I supported the original resolution creating the committee, and I was distressed by the subsequent events which have all but destroyed the original committee and its credibility. Frankly, many of my constituents were equally distraught and a majority of those who wrote to me felt the committee should be terminated.

In view of the recent disclosures and the resignation of Mr. Richard Sprague, committee counsel, however, I am willing to give it one more try, and would urge my colleagues to adopt a similar attitude. The committee has hinted that it may have some new leads, and I feel it's important that we give them a chance to follow up on those.

My support today, however, should not be construed as extending beyond that or of agreement to the funding request. Failing the development of new substantive evidence, or the presentation of a reasonable budget proposal, I will have no choice but to oppose the funding resolution due the end of May.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of House Resolution 433, which would reconstitute the Committee on Assassinations. I cannot justify pouring any more of our citizens' tax dollars into

the highly questionable activities of this committee.

The brief history of the Assassinations Committee has been a strange comedy of errors. Political pundits have called it the congressional version of "The Gong Show." And the committee has lived up to this reputation with one "gong" after another.

The surprises began when the committee's chief counsel Richard Sprague requested \$6.5 million in funding and a staff of 170 people. The \$6.5 million, moreover, would have covered only a 1-year span. To give some comparison, the House Judiciary Committee needed only \$1.5 million during a 1-year period to conduct its impeachment investigations and hearings. Under extreme pressure the budget of the assassinations panel was eventually slashed.

The next major highlight occurred when the committee chairman tried to fire Sprague, labeling him a "rattlesnake" who had to be "stomped" out of the committee's future. The full committee, however, decided to retain Mr. Sprague. Meanwhile the chairman of the committee quit in disgust. Now Mr. Sprague has also resigned. How is that for soap opera? If Mr. Sprague had stayed, I would have been inclined to reluctantly support this resolution.

Credibility is essential for a panel that is checking into the credibility of previous investigations. The Assassinations Committee, however, has so discredited itself in just a few short months as to render its work virtually meaningless. Will anyone really believe what the Assassinations Committee has to say after witnessing these antics?

It is time to bring this sad story to an end. Let us not throw away another \$2.3 million on the inept workings of the Assassinations Committee.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my fellow Members of Congress to support the reconstitution of the Select Committee on Assassinations. The myriad questions surrounding the assassinations of Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy are too important and persistent to go unanswered.

Public opinion surveys show that the majority of Americans have serious and continuing doubts regarding the sole guilt of James Earl Ray and Lee Harvey Oswald in the King and Kennedy slayings.

I believe that the select committee has carefully considered the criticism that has been leveled at it in recent months. This is reflected in its willingness to trim its budget request from \$6.5 million to a lean \$2.3 million. In addition, today's resolution requires that the committee report to the House as soon as possible on its findings and recommendations.

Of equal importance is the provision in this resolution that authorizes the committee to "bring, defend, and intervene in lawsuits and make applications to the courts." This power will enable the committee to conduct a comprehensive investigation.

For these reasons, I firmly believe that an already chastised and, hence, closely

watched committee will prove invaluable in getting to the bottom of the assassinations' controversy. I urge you to vote in favor of its reestablishment.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans who still ponder the questions: "Who killed President John F. Kennedy?" and "Who killed the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.?" Feelings of outrage and suspicion surround all previous investigations into the King and Kennedy assassinations. These feelings are further complicated by a growing sense of national concern about the adequacy and integrity of the original investigations."

Until a more acceptable study is conducted and completed, the cloud of suspicion will only grow denser. On September 17, 1976, a resolution of the House of Representatives was adopted. This resolution charged the House with a mandate to conduct a full and thorough investigation into the King and Kennedy assassinations.

This mandate—stified by a brief period of nit-picking and pettiness within the committee assigned to the task—has yet to be completed. Through a concerted effort of reorganization, sense of purpose and new factfindings, the committee has readdressed itself to the professional task of uncovering evidence and answers relevant to the basic questions which still remain unanswered.

According to a recent Gallup Poll—February 1977—81 percent of the American public question the conclusion delivered by the Warren Commission that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. Sixty-nine percent of all Americans polled and 84 percent of all nonwhite Americans polled believe James Earl Ray participated in a plot to kill King.

It is obvious that the American public cannot accept all the inconsistencies and suspicions surrounding these two assassinations. The American people simply want to know and deserve to know the answers, and we are in a good position to uncover them.

The obstacles to reconstitution are gone now: Richard Sprague is no longer chief counsel and the committee is completely unified. We have a fresh direction and a new sense of purpose. My colleagues, the committee has to act now. As we approach the eve of the assassination of Rev. Martin L. King, Jr., let us not lose sight of our mission. April 4, 1977, will mark 9 years of uncertainty around the death of Martin King.

It seems apparent, then, that we, as the highest elected officials of this great country, not only have an obligation, but we also have a duty to reconstitute the Select Committee on Assassinations. We furthermore have an obligation and duty to see to it that this reconstituted committee is charged with the mission of delivering to the curiously thirsty American public nothing less than a conclusive, credible, and reliable study.

I ask you, can we continue to deny the American people their right to hear a credible study, a study long overdue? Can we allow this long overdue study to become a longed-for-never-due? The answer is clearly "no" to me.

No, we cannot afford to drop the committee now for the price in time we would have to pay to get the answers tomorrow will simply be unaffordable.

I, therefore, challenge you, fellow Members, to join with me in voting, yes for reconstitution of the House Select Committee on Assassinations.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, my support for House Resolution 433, to continue the life of the Select Committee on Assassinations for the duration of the 95th Congress is based on my firm belief that a congressional investigation of these matters is essential in order to determine the facts and to discover any wrongdoing that may have occurred by any agency of the Federal Government.

The public's confidence in various Government organizations ranging from the FBI and the Justice Department to the Central Intelligence Agency has been eroded due to evidence and allegations of misconduct. For short spurts of time, the people of this country had been led to believe that the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. had been thoroughly investigated and leads pursued until the end. Our faith in some of the reports that have been presented to the people has been shortlived.

Mr. Speaker, my prime concern is that a full and fair search for the truth be conducted. I believe that the Congress is able to accomplish this and separate itself from the self interests that have characterized past efforts to answer our many questions on these tragedies of our lifetime.

It is also incumbent upon the Congress to conduct our own investigation with decorum and commanding the respect of the people so that we, ourselves, do not end up in the same quagmire.

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great many allegations at this point regarding unrevealed new evidence.

It was my impression, based on the record of this committee during its 7 months' life, that if indeed there were any new facts the committee had come across during any secret session, by now it would have leaked out because almost every other sensational statement has come out of the committee. If the Members will go back and read the select committee's report filed in December, it alleged that there were ex-CIA agents in Mexico who could testify about prior knowledge of the Kennedy assassination. We heard there was a Portuguese connection. There were statements on the part of members of the committee that the meetings with James Earl Ray would reveal new information and they did not. We heard that ballistics tests were going to be conducted. All of these things were going to provide us with new information which would support this committee's existence.

Mr. Speaker, if, indeed, there is such information, I think the House has the right to know exactly what it is before it votes to commit \$5 million and 2 years

and the prestige of the House of Representatives to this particular committee. The committee has thumped along like the Toonerville Trolley dropping rumors, hints, people, two chairmen and a general counsel, who was sacked this morning with all the aplomb of Kaiser Wilhelm dismissing Chancellor Bismarck.

All of these sad events have appeared, one after another, in the headlines, making the House of Representatives look ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, this committee has hit upon the truth, and they did so in the letter they sent to us today. They said the central issue of this entire investigation "is to resolve the many lingering questions about the assassinations and restore faith in our Government processes and institutions."

There is no way by which this committee, as presently constituted, with or without Mr. Sprague, can accomplish that objective. It has destroyed its own usefulness.

If, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the members of this committee have this information which they feel would warrant the continuation, they have the duty to reveal that to the House now.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move, under the terms of rule XXIX of the House of Representatives, that we resolve ourselves into a secret session, that we exclude the press and the people in the galleries, and that we be permitted, as Members of the House who have to vote on this, to know what this secret information is that they will not reveal to us here in public on the floor today.

If not, Mr. Speaker, we have no obligation to vote away our constituents' money for a continuation of what essentially has become the biggest legislative circus the House has engaged in for many years.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair appreciates the fact that the gentleman has offered a motion on which a vote may be required. However, before the House votes on a matter like this, the Chair thinks that we would want to have the opinion of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), with respect to whether a communication will be made on this matter.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I still have any time, the motion has been made and I believe it is in order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAUMAN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman's motion in writing?

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman would be glad to reduce it to writing.

The SPEAKER. In the meantime the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Maryland still have time?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BAUMAN. That being the case, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Speaker, would like to say—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BAUMAN. Does the gentleman from Maryland still have time remaining in his 5 minutes?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asked the Chair whether he had time to write out his motion.

Mr. BAUMAN. I asked whether I had time remaining to speak.

The SPEAKER. The answer is in the affirmative. The gentleman has time in which to write out his motion.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I asked whether I had time to speak.

The SPEAKER. The Chair begs the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman has time remaining.

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman is going to use his time, Mr. Speaker, with the sufferance of the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland has made a motion. The Speaker has required that it be reduced to writing.

The gentleman from Maryland is going to pursue that motion because he believes that under the rules of the House, we have a right to that information.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may be asked to rule on that and asked the gentleman from Maryland whether he will yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BAUMAN. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

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

In reply to the Speaker's question, this committee did consider undertaking a secret, private briefing of the House.

After a great deal of deliberation as to the unwieldy aspects of being able to contain highly sensitive materials and communications, this committee decided that it would be too unwieldy a procedure and would, in all probability rebound against the committee, and we decided against such action at that time.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say that this Member was not invited to any secret briefing. There was a secret meeting held with the select committee and the Committee on Rules with no notice at all given in an effort to get them to get this resolution to the floor. But if there are secrets, we all should be told.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BAUMAN. I renew my motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears the gentleman from Maryland and the Clerk will read the motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves under rule XXIX that the House resolve itself into secret session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make the following statement:

There has been a motion made by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN). If the motion would prevail, in view of the fact that the Chair has said at an earlier date yesterday that we

would be through at 5:30 this afternoon, and in view of the precautions that must be taken, the clearing of the galleries, the clearing of the Press Galleries, the proper placement of officers and employees that are necessary in order to protect the House of Representatives, that should the motion prevail that then a motion would be entertained to adjourn the House until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAUMAN) there were—ayes 76, noes 97.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will reread the motion so that the Members know what they are voting upon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BAUMAN moves under rule XXIX that the House resolve itself into secret session.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, nays 226, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—185

- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abdnor | Flowers | Mitchell, N.Y. |
| Ambro | Ford, Mich. | Montgomery |
| Andrews, N.C. | Forsythe | Moore |
| Archer | Fountain | Moorhead, |
| Armstrong | Frenzel | Calif. |
| Ashbrook | Frey | Myers, Gary |
| Aspin | Gluman | Myers, Ind. |
| Badham | Glickman | Nedzi |
| Bafalis | Goldwater | Nichols |
| Bauman | Gonzalez | O'Brien |
| Beard, R.I. | Gooding | Pettis |
| Beard, Tenn. | Gradison | Pressler |
| Bennett | Grassley | Pritchard |
| Biaggi | Guyer | Quie |
| Breaux | Hagedorn | Quillen |
| Brown, Mich. | Hall | Rahall |
| Brown, Ohio | Hammer- | Railsback |
| Broyhill | schmidt | Regula |
| Burgener | Hanley | Rinaldo |
| Burke, Fla. | Hansen | Risenhoover |
| Burke, Mass. | Harsha | Rousselot |
| Burleson, Tex. | Heckler | Roybal |
| Burton, John | Hefner | Rudd |
| Burton, Phillip | Hightower | Runnels |
| Butler | Holland | Ruppe |
| Carter | Hollenbeck | Russo |
| Chappell | Huckaby | Sarasin |
| Clausen, | Hughes | Satterfield |
| Don H. | Hyde | Sawyer |
| Clawson, Del. | Ichord | Scheuer |
| Cleveland | Jenkins | Schroeder |
| Cochran | Johnson, Colo. | Schulze |
| Cohen | Jones, N.C. | Sebelius |
| Coleman | Jones, Okla. | Shuster |
| Collins, Tex. | Kasten | Sikes |
| Corcoran | Kazen | Sisk |
| Cornell | Kelly | Skubitz |
| Cornwell | Kemp | Smith, Nebr. |
| Cotter | Ketchum | Snyder |
| Coughlin | Kindness | Solarz |
| Crane | Koch | Spence |
| Daniel, Dan | Krueger | St Germain |
| Daniel, R. W. | Lagomarsino | Stangeland |
| Davis | Latta | Stanton |
| de la Garza | Leggett | Steed |
| Dent | Lent | Steiger |
| Derrick | Lloyd, Tenn. | Stockman |
| Derwinski | Lott | Taylor |
| Dickinson | Lujan | Treen |
| Dingell | McClory | Vander Jagt |
| Dornan | McCloskey | Vanik |
| Duncan, Tenn. | McCormack | Waggonner |
| Eckhardt | McDonald | Walker |
| Emery | McEwen | Walsh |
| English | Madigan | Watkins |
| Erlenborn | Mahon | Whalen |
| Ertel | Mann | Wiggins |
| Evans, Del. | Marlenee | Winn |
| Evans, Ind. | Mariott | Wydler |
| Fish | Martin | Young, Alaska |
| Fisher | Mathis | Young, Fla. |
| Flippo | Mattox | Zerferetti |
| Florio | Miller, Ohio | |

- | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Addabbo | Foley | Nolan |
| Akaka | Ford, Tenn. | Nowak |
| Alexander | Fraser | Oaker |
| Allen | Gaydos | Oberstar |
| Ammerman | Gephardt | Obey |
| Anderson | Gialmo | Ottinger |
| Calif. | Gibbons | Panetta |
| Anderson, Ill. | Ginn | Patten |
| Andrews, | Gore | Patterson |
| N. Dak. | Gudger | Pattison |
| Annunzio | Hamilton | Pease |
| Applegate | Hannaford | Pepper |
| Ashley | Harkin | Perkins |
| AuCoin | Harrington | Pickle |
| Badillo | Harris | Pike |
| Baldus | Hawkins | Freyer |
| Barnard | Hillis | Pursell |
| Baucus | Holt | Quayle |
| Bedell | Holtzman | Reuss |
| Beilenson | Horton | Richmond |
| Benjamin | Howard | Roberts |
| Bevill | Ireland | Robinson |
| Bingham | Jacobs | Rodino |
| Blanchard | Jeffords | Rogers |
| Blouin | Jenrette | Roncalio |
| Boggs | Johnson, Calif. | Rooney |
| Boiland | Jones, Tenn. | Rose |
| Bolling | Jordan | Rosenthal |
| Bonior | Kastenmeier | Rostenkowski |
| Bonker | Keys | Ryan |
| Bowen | Kildee | Santini |
| Brademas | Kostmayer | Seiberling |
| Breckinridge | Krebs | Sharp |
| Brinkley | LaFalce | Shipley |
| Brodhead | Le Pante | Simon |
| Brooks | Leach | Skelton |
| Brown, Calif. | Lederer | Slack |
| Buchanan | Lehman | Smith, Iowa |
| Burke, Calif. | Levitas | Spellman |
| Burlison, Mo. | Lloyd, Calif. | Stark |
| Byron | Long, La. | Steers |
| Caputo | Long, Md. | Stokes |
| Carney | Luken | Stratton |
| Carr | Lundine | Studds |
| Cavanaugh | McDade | Stump |
| Chisholm | McFall | Thompson |
| Collins, Ill. | McHugh | Thone |
| Conable | McKay | Thornton |
| Conte | McKinney | Tonry |
| Conyers | Maguire | Traxler |
| Corman | Markey | Tribe |
| D'Amours | Marks | Tsongas |
| Danielson | Mazzoli | Tucker |
| Deaney | Meeds | Udall |
| DeLums | Metcalfe | Ullman |
| Devine | Meyner | Van Deerlin |
| Dicks | Mikulski | Vento |
| Diggs | Mikva | Volkmer |
| Dodd | Miller, Calif. | Walgren |
| Downey | Mineta | Wampler |
| Drinan | Minish | Waxman |
| Duncan, Oreg. | Mitchell, Md. | Weaver |
| Early | Moakley | Weiss |
| Edgar | Moffett | White |
| Edwards, Ala. | Mollohan | Whitehurst |
| Edwards, Calif. | Moorhead, Pa. | Whitley |
| Edwards, Okla. | Moss | Whitten |
| Ellberg | Mottl | Wilson, C. H. |
| Evans, Colo. | Murphy, Ill. | Wirth |
| Evans, Ga. | Murphy, N.Y. | Wolff |
| Fary | Murphy, Pa. | Wright |
| Fascell | Murtha | Wylie |
| Fenwick | Myers, Michael | Yates |
| Fithian | Natcher | Yatron |
| Flood | Neal | Young, Mo. |
| Flynt | Nix | Young, Tex. |

NOT VOTING—21

- | | | |
|------------|---------|--------------|
| Broomfield | Hubbard | Roe |
| Cederberg | Michel | Staggers |
| Clay | Milford | Symms |
| Findley | Poage | Teague |
| Fuqua | Price | Wilson, Bob |
| Gammage | Rangel | Wilson, Tex. |
| Heftl | Rhodes | Zablocki |

Mr. PHILLIP BURTON and Mr. SATTERFIELD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I know of no amendments pending.

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 the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 230, nays 181, answered "present" 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—230

Addabbo	Fithian	Murphy, Pa.
Akaka	Flood	Myers, Gary
Allen	Florio	Myers, Michael
Ambro	Foley	Natcher
Ammerman	Ford, Tenn.	Neal
Anderson, Calif.	Fraser	Nix
Anderson, Ill.	Gaiamo	Nolan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gibbons	Nowak
Annunzio	Gilman	O'Brien
Applegate	Ginn	Oakar
Ashley	Goldwater	Oberstar
Aspin	Gore	Obey
AuCoin	Gradison	Ottinger
Badillo	Hamilton	Panetta
Baldus	Hannaford	Patten
Baucus	Harkin	Patterson
Bedell	Harrington	Pattison
Beilenson	Harris	Pepper
Benjamin	Hawkins	Perkins
Biaggi	Heckler	Preyer
Bingham	Hefner	Pritchard
Blanchard	Holland	Purcell
Blouin	Holtzman	Quayle
Boggs	Horton	Railsback
Boland	Howard	Reuss
Bolling	Hughes	Richmond
Bonior	Jeffords	Rinaldo
Bonker	Jenrette	Rodino
Bowen	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers
Brademas	Johnson, Colo.	Rooney
Breaux	Jones, Tenn.	Rose
Brinkley	Jordan	Rosenthal
Brodhead	Kasten	Rousselot
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Ruppe
Buchanan	Kemp	Santini
Burke, Calif.	Kildee	Sarasin
Burke, Mass.	Koch	Scheuer
Burlison, Mo.	Kostumayer	Schroeder
Burton, John	Krebs	Seiberling
Burton, Phillip	Krueger	Sharp
Byron	Lagomarsino	Shipley
Caputo	Le Fante	Slack
Carney	Lederer	Smith, Iowa
Carr	Leggett	Snyder
Carter	Lehman	Solarz
Cavanaugh	Levitas	Spellman
Chisholm	Lloyd, Calif.	Spence
Cohen	Lloyd, Tenn.	Stark
Coleman	Long, La.	Steers
Collins, Ill.	Long, Md.	Stokes
Conable	Luken	Studds
Conte	Lundine	Thompson
Conyers	McCloskey	Thone
Corman	McDade	Tonry
Cotter	McEwen	Treen
Crane	McFall	Tsongas
D'Amours	McHugh	Tucker
Danielson	McKinney	Udall
Davis	Maguire	Van Deerlin
Delaney	Mann	Vanik
Dellums	Markay	Vento
Dent	Marks	Volkmer
Devine	Mathis	Walgren
Dickinson	Meads	Waxman
Diggs	Metcalfe	Weaver
Dodd	Meyner	Weiss
Dornan	Mikulski	Whalen
Downey	Miller, Calif.	Whitehurst
Early	Mineta	Whitten
Edgar	Minish	Wilson, C. H.
Edwards, Calif.	Mitchell, Md.	Wirth
Eilberg	Moakley	Wolf
Emery	Moffett	Wright
Evans, Colo.	Moore	Yates
Fenwick	Moorhead, Pa.	Yatron
Fish	Moss	Young, Mo.
	Murphy, Ill.	
	Murphy, N.Y.	

NAYS—181

Abdnor	Baumgardner	Broyhill
Alexander	Beard, R.I.	Burgener
Andrews, N.C.	Beard, Tenn.	Burke, Fla.
Arch	Bennett	Burlison, Tex.
Armstrong	Bevill	Butler
Ashbrook	Breckinridge	Chappell
Badham	Brooks	Clausen
Bafalis	Brown, Mich.	Don H.
Barnard	Brown, Ohio	Clawson, Del

Cleveland	Hightower	Rahall
Cochran	Hillis	Regula
Collins, Tex.	Hollenbeck	Risenhoover
Corcoran	Holt	Roberts
Cornell	Huckaby	Robinson
Cornwell	Hyde	Roncalio
Coughlin	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Daniel, Dan	Ireland	Roybal
Daniel, E. W.	Jacobs	Rudd
de la Garza	Jenkins	Runnels
Derrick	Jones, N.C.	Russo
Derwinski	Jones, Okla.	Ryan
Dicks	Kazen	Satterfield
Dingell	Kelly	Sawyer
Drinan	Ketchum	Schulze
Duncan, Oreg.	Keys	Sebelius
Duncan, Tenn.	Kindness	Shuster
Eckhardt	LaFalce	Sikes
Edwards, Ala.	Latta	Simon
Edwards, Okla.	Leach	Sisk
English	Lent	Skelton
Erlenborn	Lott	Skubitz
Ertel	Lujan	Smith, Nebr.
Evans, Del.	McClory	St Germain
Evans, Ga.	McCormack	Stangeland
Evans, Ind.	McDonald	Stanton
Fary	McKay	Steed
Fascell	Madigan	Steiger
Fisher	Mahon	Stockman
Flippo	Marienee	Stratton
Flowers	Marriott	Stump
Flynt	Martin	Taylor
Ford, Mich.	Mattox	Thornton
Forsythe	Mazzoli	Traxler
Fountain	Mikva	Tribie
Frenzel	Miller, Ohio	Ullman
Frey	Mitchell, N.Y.	Vander Jagt
Gammage	Mollohan	Waggonner
Gaydos	Montgomery	Walker
Gephardt	Moorhead, Calif.	Walsh
Glickman	Mottl	Wampler
Gonzalez	Murtha	Watkins
Goodling	Myers, Ind.	White
Grassley	Nichols	Whitley
Gudger	Pease	Wiggins
Guyer	Pettis	Winn
Hagedorn	Pickle	Wyder
Hall	Pike	Wylie
Hammer-	Pressler	Young, Alaska
schmidt	Quie	Young, Fla.
Hanley	Quillen	Zefereetti
Hansen		
Harsha		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—20

Broomfield	Michel	Staggers
Cederberg	Milford	Symms
Clay	Poage	Teague
Findley	Price	Wilson, Bob
Fuqua	Rangel	Wilson, Tex.
Hefelt	Rhodes	Zablocki
Hubbard	Roe	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Teague against.
 Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Milford against.
 Mr. Rangel for, with Mr. Hefelt against.
 Mr. Price for, with Mr. Michel against.
 Mr. Findley for, with Mr. Symms against.
 Mr. Roe for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Staggers.
 Mr. Hubbard with Mr. Charles Wilson of Texas.

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

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4800) entitled "An act to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1974 for an additional year, to revise the trigger provisions in such act, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. DOLE, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. LAXALT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

TO EXTEND PERIOD DURING WHICH PAYMENTS FROM CONTINGENT FUND MAY BE MADE UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 11, 95TH CONGRESS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 435) and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of this resolution, let me say to the Members that it extends the period to May 31, 1977, during which interim payments for committee expenses from the contingent fund of the House may be made under House Resolution 11 of the 95th Congress. It will maintain the present level of spending until the funding resolutions for the particular committees involved are reported.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 435

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 11, Ninety-fifth Congress, adopted January 4, 1977, the period during which payments may be made from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in accordance with such resolution, to any standing committee or select committee referred to in the first section or section 2 of such resolution, is hereby extended to the close of May 31, 1977.

Mr. DENT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell us the committees that will be funded by this resolution?

Mr. DENT. The committees that will be funded are the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Select Committee on Ethics.

Mr. BAUMAN. What about the Select Committee on Assassinations?

Mr. DENT. The resolution for the Select Committee on Assassinations has not as yet reached the committee.