This was just Monday, March 28, in the afternoon; to which the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) says:

My impression was that the committee had gone into the charges and unanimously decided it was merely a conflict between the chairman and the committee.

STOKES says:

Absolutely. There was no proof to any of the charges.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) continues:

We have no problem with Sprague; only one person did.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MURPHY), a member of the Committee on Rules from Illinois, said:

Gonzalez made very disturbing charges against Sprague. What he, Sprague, has done to Henry he can do to you.

Well, the gentleman went on further and he said:

It's a funny way to have an investigation of the charges if just you and the committee and Sprague met and Gonzalez wasn't present.

Who pressed the charges to begin with? Well, let us go into the facts. I charge that Sprague had willfully, premeditatedly and with malice aforethought conspired to keep the nature and the extent of the hiring and anything to do with the staffing from any member of the committee from the chairman on down. Between December 15, 1976, and January 1, 1977, Sprague hired a total of 14 people with total annual salaries of $229,800.

On January 1, 1977, the committee was dying. All committees were dying. The 94th Congress was dying. We are not a continuing body.

Two days prior to the expiration of the committee and the Congress he hired 23 new staff members with total annual salaries of $474,600. He did not consult with or advise me or, to my knowledge, the members of the select committee of these actions.

Mr. STOKES told the Rules Committee on Monday that he knew about it. Well, he told me differently in January and February. I was sitting before the Rules Committee with RICHARDSON PREYER next day. He did not know about it. Now, Sprague explained later, when I demanded an explanation, that he took these actions because he contacted some member of the staff of the House Committee on Administration and was assured that $150,000 would be available under the continuing resolution. Now, how in the world could anybody assure that when we did not even have the new Congress assembled?

I told Mr. Sprague, "The trouble with that is that neither you nor that staffer have an election certificate, and you don't have a voting part in the Congress. Why did you go there? Why didn't you come to the committee to ask this information?"

Well, because somebody told him that this staffer, yet to be identified, in the House Administration Committee, told him it was all right. The truth and the fact is that he unilaterally hired and promoted staff employees at inflated salaries. He hired five employees of the staff of my predecessor, Chairman Downing, but the very fact that he hired these employees, and he did so without calling any member of the committee at any time, is a usurpation of the authority of the committee, and is an abject abdication of responsibility on the part of every member of that committee.

They still condone it. The effect of this hiring was to compel the 73-member staff to take a 35-percent reduction in salaries. On the other hand, as I pointed out yesterday and day before yesterday, Sprague was telling and counseling each member that as soon as his resolution passed—the one that passed today—they would have enough money soon thereafter when they got their $2,700,000 in order to pay back all of that difference of the cut they had taken, plus an increase—is the way he put it. That is another usurpation. He was allocating to himself the proper area of responsibility that only Members of the House can discharge.

Similarly, after the projected February salaries are to be paid, he says that there was to be a balance of $882. However, as I said, the letter from the House Administration Committee to me advised that they were exceeding the mandate of the House. As it now turns out, though, they do not call it that. They do not call it an over-expenditure—but that is what it is—of $200,000 that they owe the House Contingency Fund. What kind of numbers game is this? This is a shell game that I never thought I would see perpetrated on the Members of the House of the U.S. House of Representatives.

There is nobody at this point, including the present makeup of this committee and its chairman, who can tell this House with exactitude exactly how much that overexpenditure, as mandated by the House, of $84,333 is outstanding as of today or tomorrow or by the time the House Administration Committee decides to do something.

Now, there was another aspect that also motivated, and still bothers me very much, because I think the House is eventually going to be extremely embarassed. It will have to be defendant in litigation ultimately, just as sure as I am standing here.

I hope not. I hope it never comes to pass. But it is in the making right now. And some of the staffers and some of the members of the committee know it. At no time have they advised, that I know of, any of the general membership of the House, the reason being that under the ruling of a case styled McSurley against McClellan, decided just December 21, 1976, by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, it is very possible that the members of the staff, and maybe even Members of the House, can be personally liable. This is the reason why they were trying to sneak through that provision in the resolution today that, fortunately, was knocked out by the House adopting the Bauman amendment that would have made the House pay for their defense when and if it comes.

I can assure the Members that the chances are more likely than not that it is coming. That is the reason I was sensitive about signing vouchers. They talk about having no authority to fire, when they did not object when I hired. The moment I signed the pay vouchers for everyone of that staff at the reduced rate, and only after I compelled them to bring me, for the first time, the full list, having it chronologically fixed up there in column form, showing the base pay annually, the 35-percent reduction reflected, and the certificate from the Administration Committee, it was not until I got that that I signed the pay vouchers for January.

When I did that, I was in effect unilaterally hiring that staff. No one in effect suggested it. If they are right, I was exceeding my authority then. I think if we had an objective venue, we could find the precedents and rules to support me. By indirection, I certainly would have the power the other way around. Certainly the other rules of the House that are pertinent in the case of insubordination, in the case of irresponsibility, and willful refusal to be accountable for public funds, why, there is no chairman in this House who would have acted differently under the same circumstances, and where we had a confabulation, where we had a confederation, and where we had a conspiracy to willfully protect a rotten chief counsel and staff director.

I will at this point yield back the balance of my time and appeal to my next special order.

LOBBY REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon BOB KASTENMEIER and I are introducing a lobby reform bill similar to the measure which overwhelmingly passed the House in the closing days of the 94th Congress. Before discussing our legislation and the need to reform the existing lobby disclosure statute, I would like to take a moment to commend those who have worked so hard in this area.

First, BOB KASTENMEIER, my good friend and colleague, has been one of the main sponsors of the lobby bill for several years, and he provided the leadership and guidance which were largely responsible for our successes in the last Congress.

I would also like to express my special gratitude to the former chairman of the House Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, Walter Flowers, and the other Judiciary subcommittee members who labored long and hard to report a fair and even-handed disclosure measure last year. Thanks are also due to the members of the full Judiciary Committee and its distinguished chairman, Mr. RODINO, for important contributions to the bill, H.R. 15, as it was reported to the House floor.

I would also compliment the work of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct and its distinguished chairman, JOHN FLYNT, whose substitute proposal

presented the opportunity for full consideration of alternative disclosure policies. In addition, praise is due to the more than 150 House Members who have sponsored some form of lobby reform legislation; particularly, the freshmen in the 94th Congress who stood so solidly behind the concept of disclosure and accountability in the political arena. Last, I would like to extend my personal thanks to my colleagues in the other body, who introduced similar legislation, and to the many private individuals who have commented on my efforts. Their comments have been especially helpful to me as I have tried to redraft legislation in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago BOB KASTENMEIER and I introduced H.R. 15, to replace the ineffective 1946 Lobby Disclosure Act. Hearings were held by a Judiciary subcommittee, the full Judiciary Committee, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The bill was amended and reported to the House floor where it was debated along with the standards' substitute and numerous amendments. After lengthy debate, in the early hours of September 29, 1976, H.R. 15 passed the House by an overwhelming vote of 307 to 34. Unfortunately, largely due to the press of end-of-session business, H.R. 15 could not be resolved with the Senate's version before adjournment, and a law was not enacted. However, I am confident we will be successful this Congress.

If one theme dominated our deliberations, it was our determination that we not infringe on the citizen's constitutional right to petition his Government for redress of grievances, and must not overly burden any organization, large or small, having to comply with the requirements of the bill. Yet at the same time we sought to provide the public with another, equally important right—the right to know who is involved in seeking to influence legislative and executive decisions, what the issues are, and perhaps most importantly how much money and time are being spent for such efforts. We were not then, nor are we now, seeking to restrict lobbying—we only want to provide for accountability in an area that is too often closed to the public view. Such secrecy is inimicable to our system of government—it contributes greatly to the public notion that important decisions are made as a result of wining and dining and backroom deals. It also obscures the positive and informational role that the professional lobbyist plays, a role vital to the Government process, and which has often been helpful to me personally.

The bill I am introducing today differs in several respects from the original H.R. 15. Such differences are the result of a concerted effort to balance accountability with a fair, evenhanded approach to lobbying disclosure. For example, only organizations—not individuals—are covered. Further, a geographical exemption is provided when an organization is contacting its own Congressman and Senators. Such provisions, I believe, make clear my concern over any possible chilling effect and my intent not to create any device that would appear to discourage communications.

In addition, the bill sets new standards of applicability. An organization must file reports if it either retains an individual for $1,250 or more in a quarter or hires an individual who spends 30 hours or more for lobbying communications or solicitations.

The legislation also takes into account the burdensomeness of reporting requirements. In my opinion, we are requiring only the essential information, and even give the Comptroller General discretion in waiving some of the requirements in certain cases.

Finally, a contribution category instead of specific dollar figures is a much better requirement that addresses itself to the privacy question that was raised last year.

In sum, it is my hope that this legislation will provide the public with the information it should know, without burdening those organizations which engage in lobbying activities.

I am very pleased and encouraged that the subcommittee chaired by my distinguished colleague Mr. DANIELSON will begin hearings on lobby reform legislation next week. At that time, I hope to expand on my comments, and will urge that the bill BOB KASTENMEIER and I are now sponsoring will be taken into consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MORE EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE DEFERRAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a fairly lengthy statement reviewing my proposal that no increase in congressional salary should go into effect until the Congress following the one in which it is approved.

In that statement I mentioned that the Congressional Pay Raise Deferral Act, H.R. 1365, has received considerable support from editorialists in the news media. Today, I wish to elaborate on that point.

At the conclusion of my remarks here, I would like to insert in the RECORD the text of three editorials. They are from the Minneapolis Tribune, the Akron Beacon Journal, and KSL–TV in Salt Lake City.

In previous statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have noted editorials supporting H.R. 1365 that were issued by news media outlets in Dayton, Ohio; Omaha, Nebr.; Roanoke, Va.; Seattle, Wash.; Albany, N.Y.; Toledo, Ohio; Richmond, Va.; and Bakersfield, Calif. Of course, there have been additional editorials that I have not cited.

The articles follow:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Feb. 28, 1977]

EDITORIAL

Members of Congress just got themselves a healthy pay raise by doing nothing. Now there is something they should do—see to it that their pay increases aren't handled that way in the future.

Raises through inaction are a product of a 1967 law setting up an advisory commission to recommend federal—including congressional—salary increases. Congress can accept, reject, raise or lower the recommendations. Or, if the president endorses the commission's proposal. Congress can do nothing—and the raises take effect in 30 days.

The last option has obvious advantages for members of Congress. They can get more money without having to take the political risks of voting raises for themselves. This year's performance was a typical result: Congressional leaders blocked efforts to bring the salary issue up for a vote; most members simply waited for the paychecks to go up.

There is a better way, one proposed by Rep. Charles Whalen, R-Ohio, and a bipartisan group of 73 other House members. Their plan would retain the advisory commission to make recommendations, but would require Congress to vote on them. And any raises would not take effect until after the next congressional election. That's like the system about 30 states, including Minnesota, use for setting legislative salaries; a raise voted one session doesn't take effect until the next.

The Whalen proposal would force members of Congress to make a public case for higher salaries, and to take a public stand on them. That's better than letting Congress get something by doing nothing.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal, Feb. 18, 1977]

CONGRESS SHOULD END ITS SNEAKY PAY RAISES

Whether or not congressmen deserve the fat pay raise they voted themselves by their silence is a subject that could be debated from now until the end of the century. But there should be quick agreement that the under-the-table way in which such raises are handled must be changed.

Beginning Sunday, congressmen will receive an increase of $1,075 in their monthly pay—simply because they didn't vote not to increase their salaries.

Legislators at all levels dislike having to vote on pay increases for themselves. They know the question in the minds of all their constituents is: Is he worth what he's getting now? Some legislators don't even like to ask that of themselves.

But only our federal legislators have shown such a complete lack of intestinal fortitude as to bypass the process altogether. A commission recommends salary increases every four years—and those increases take effect automatically after 30 days unless the Congress votes *not* to accept them.

So congressmen will receive their 29 percent increases at the start of next week because they sat on their hands.

Even if the raises are deserved—which they may well be—the method of granting them must become open and above board. "The thing that leaves a bad taste," said Rep. Ralph Regula (R-Navarre), "is the way it's being handled."

Rep. Donald Pease (D-Oberlin), points out that under Ohio law a state legislator cannot receive the benefits of a voted pay increase until after he has stood for re-election.

The same basic idea is contained in a bill offered by Rep. Charles Whalen (R-but-leaning-toward-D-Dayton). The bill, co-sponsored by Regula, Pease and J. William Stanton (R-Painesville), would delay raises from taking effect until after a general election.

That would allow voters the opportunity to decide whether a legislator who just voted himself a fat raise is going to receive it. Even more important than providing a potential campaign issue for challengers, though, is that a vote would put each indi-

tivities will benefit the public by enabling them to better understand the nature of special interest pressures, and they will be better equipped to hold public officials accountable for their response to these pressures. In addition, public officials also will gain by lobbying reform since they will, with public disclosure, find it easier to evaluate lobbying pressures and put them in a better perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that our colleague, Congressman GEORGE DANIELSON, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, has announced the start of subcommittee hearings on lobbying disclosure legislation beginning on April 4. Such expeditious consideration of the lobbying issue guarantees that this Congress will succeed in passing urgently needed lobbying reform legislation.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement regarding a recorded vote I missed on Tuesday, March 29, 1977, and an indication of how I would have voted had I been present. I was attending a concert in Detroit, Mich., in tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Senator Phillip A. Hart. The vote was on rollcall No. 107, a vote on final passage of H.R. 5045, the Reorganization Act of 1977. The bill passed 395 to 22. I was paired for this bill, and had I been present, would have voted in favor of it.

HENRY B. GONZALEZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KRUEGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has determined to establish a committee to pursue its investigation into the assassinations of John Kennedy and Martin Luther King, I rise to make some observations.

First, my friend and colleague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has emerged with his dignity and judgment confirmed. Those of us who have known HENRY GONZALEZ well, over some years, know that he is a man with a high sense of personal honor. He could not, in fairness to his respect for the House of Representatives, take lightly the arrogant and unbecoming behavior of a staff member who defied his authority as the duly-appointed chairman of the committee, and who sought to defy the proper processes of Government.

There is no question that if Mr. Sprague had continued to be the committee counsel, when today's vote came the House would not have extended the life of the committee. I regret that Mr. Sprague's departure did not come earlier for, if it had, HENRY GONZALEZ would probably not have resigned, and would be in his rightful place: chairman of a committee that he worked so hard to see established. He was in the forefront in his concern for this issue, and stood almost alone among Members of the House several years ago by his interest in establishing a committee to investigate the assassination of President Kennedy. Then, as so often, Mr. GONZALEZ showed himself to be a person of independent judgment and strong constitution. Few men in this House are as well loved by their constituents as HENRY GONZALEZ, and he has won the respect of the people whom he represents by his courage, his keen intelligence, and his independent bearing. If he has been assertive, as some have called him, he has been so in pursuit of matters close to the concerns of his constituents and his country. A pioneer in the civil rights movement, a man who has been consistently willing to champion unpopular causes when he thought they were right, he maintains, as before, his strong and courageous nature and his shrewd judgment. In assessing the character of the chief counsel of the Assassinations Committee, his judgment has, I believe, been confirmed by the House, for it voted to proceed with the Assassinations Committee only after Mr. Sprague's resignation.

Like many others, I could support the Assassinations Committee only after the resignation of Mr. Sprague. I commend my colleague from Texas, Mr. HIGHTOWER, for receiving confirmation from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) that all connection between the committee and Mr. Sprague has now ended. That is good news, and we must hope that the committee can now proceed in its investigation with judicious assessment of the evidence.

I have myself been at various times undecided about how to vote on whether or not to continue the committee. If Mr. Sprague had continued, I definitely would not have supported the committee's continuance. With his resignation, however, I could look again at the original question: whether or not anything is to be gained by the House of Representatives' investigating the assassinations of two of America's foremost leaders. And information given to me by members of the Special Committee on Assassinations convinces me that questions that are both important and answerable have not been answered because there was no forum for such an investigation. The Justice Department could not effectively undertake it because many of the questions surrounding earlier investigations of both assassinations concern whether or not agencies within the executive branch deserve the full confidence of the American people for their roles in those investigations. If charges, for example, that our intelligence agencies had information they did not reveal to the Warren Commission are ever to be removed, they cannot be removed by asking the Justice Department to investigate itself. Further, no grand jury is likely to have the funds and reach necessary to investigate all of these leads. Therefore, it is appropriate that the only body of Government to which all Members are elected, and none appointed, that is, the House of Representatives, should represent the people themselves in conducting this investigation.

I learned only today that one individual who had been asked to testify before the committee with regard to the Kennedy assassination has evidently committed suicide on being asked to testify. In addition, I learned from a member of the committee that James Earl Ray, convicted of the murder of Dr. King, indicated today that for the first time he is now prepared to take a lie detector test in responding to questions.

At one point, it seemed to me that further investigation by the committee could not come up with any leads and could not set old doubts to rest. I no longer believe that. I believe that there is both enough evidence of new information, and that there are enough serious questions about the past investigations conducted into the murders of President Kennedy and Dr. King to warrant the continuation of investigations for which, more than anyone else, HENRY B. GONZALEZ had the foresight to recognize the need. I intend no offense to those who are now charged with conducting the investigation when I say that I wish my colleague HENRY B. GONZALEZ were the person to chair the committee.

Because HENRY GONZALEZ is a man of great determination, and has presented to the House the story of his dealings with Mr. Sprague, we have now had Mr. Sprague's resignation, which is prerequisite to continuing an investigation which Mr. GONZALEZ first suggested should be undertaken. In this, as in the resignation of Mr. Sprague, HENRY B. GONZALEZ has been vindicated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. HOLTZMAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Ms. HOLTZMAN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

REMARKS OF TRADE SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN CHARLES A. VANIK ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today I had the pleasure of making a few brief remarks before the Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations, a group created by the Trade Act of 1974 and chaired by the special trade representative Ambassador Robert Strauss. Several committee members have asked for the opportunity to comment on my remarks; therefore, I would like to enter them in the RECORD at this point:

As the new chairman of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommitte, it is a pleasure to meet with you. There is a new trade team in town: new Subcommittees in the Congress and, of course, Ambasador Strauss is