



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 95th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 123

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1977

No. 56

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We know that in everything God works for good with those who love Him.—Romans 8: 28.

Almighty and Eternal God, make us ready for the duties of this new day by bringing us closer to Thee. Renew our faith, restore our hope, replenish our love that we may do great things for our great people in this great Nation demonstrating the fact that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people is at work in this House of Representatives. Fill our minds with wisdom, our hearts with compassion that we may think clearly, choose wisely, and act nobly for the good of our Republic and the good of all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Chirton, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1977, and for other purposes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1977, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 5262

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs may

have until midnight, Thursday, March 31, 1977, to file a committee report on H.R. 5262, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Asian Development Bank, and the Asian Development Fund, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 95-114)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith a copy of the United States Civil Service Commission's Annual Report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1975. This Report was prepared and received prior to the beginning of my Administration.

JIMMY CARTER

The White House, March 30, 1977.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL OVERSIGHT AND RENEGOTIATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY AND TOMORROW DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Renegotiation of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs may be permitted to sit on today and tomorrow during the 5-minute rule.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4976 TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 95-140) on the resolution (H. Res. 448) providing for consideration of H.R. 4976 to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, title V of the Social Security Act, and the program of assistance for home health services to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for health services programs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4975 TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 95-141) on the resolution (H. Res. 449), providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4975) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for biomedical research and related programs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4974 TO AMEND THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 95-142) on the resolution (H. Res. 450), providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4974) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for health planning and related programs, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4895 TO AMEND THE STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCKPILING ACT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 95-143) on the resolution (H. Res. 451) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4895) to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 433, CONTINUATION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 445 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 445

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the resolution (H. Res. 433) to provide for the continuation of the Select Committee on Assassinations, in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is not in order at this particular time.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) to move a call of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 108]

Alexander	Florio	Pepper
Allen	Foley	Poage
Ambro	Fountain	Quie
Andrews, N.C.	Gibbons	Rangel
Archer	Harsha	Roe
Ashley	Heckler	Runnels-Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Horton	Sebelius
Burton, John	Leggett	Staggers
Cavanaugh	Long, La.	Stark
Chisholm	Luken	Stockman
Clay	Lundine	Symms
Conyers	Marlenee	Teague
Cornwell	Mathis	Thompson
Dellums	Mikulski	Udall
Diggs	Milford	Wilson, C. H.
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Tex.
Drinan	Moorhead, Pa.	
Evans, Del.	Murphy, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 379 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 433, CONTINUATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from

Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take a great deal of time myself on this resolution. I intend to yield a good block of time to the chairman of the Select Committee on Assassinations, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES); but this resolution is the same type of rule that we used the last time the matter was brought up.

When it is adopted, it provides for the consideration of the matter in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, which means, as the Members will remember, that the Speaker will remain in the chair and that the matter will be open for amendment. It also means that the manager of the resolution, and that is me, will have the opportunity to move the previous question at any point. However, I made it clear in the Committee on Rules, as I made clear during the previous consideration of this matter, I remember, on the House floor, that I do not intend to exercise that right to move the previous question until I feel that the House is in a mood to move ahead. In other words, I have no intention of preventing any amendments that Members wish to offer or anything broader than an amendment that a Member might wish to offer.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are proceeding as we proceeded before and that we have an opportunity to proceed from the rule to the consideration of the matter without too much difficulty.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. This is the point which I wanted to clarify: We have 1 hour on the rule itself; is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. Then we go ahead on the resolution; and of course, that runs its normal course?

Mr. BOLLING. We go ahead on the resolution under the 5-minute rule, and it runs its normal course.

Mr. KAZEN. There is no time limitation on the consideration of the resolution itself, is there?

Mr. BOLLING. There is no time limitation except when the House decides to order the previous question, which I may move.

Mr. KAZEN. And, as the gentleman already stated, every Member will have an opportunity to express his wishes?

Mr. BOLLING. That is exactly correct.

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

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

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the able

gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) has explained the provisions of the resolution.

I stood in the well of the floor of this House some time ago when the committee was restructured, opposing the restructuring of the committee; and I stand here today opposing the funding and the continuation of the Select Committee on Assassinations.

I do so because I do not feel that the results of the investigation will justify the expense. Furthermore, I think that the pattern which this committee has followed since it was created and its stormy existence itself do not create a sufficient justification to continue its operations.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are Members of this body who disagree, since they feel that if anything can come out of the investigations to either agree with the Warren Commission report or the trials, including the trial and conviction of James Earl Ray, which would substantiate what has happened in the past, that will justify the existence and the restructuring of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not buy that. As a matter of fact, I have before me here a news article which appeared in the Washington Post Tuesday, March 22, 1977.

I beg the indulgence of this body, if the Members will please listen:

King, Sr.—Martin Luther King, Sr.—does not expect any results from inquiry.

And I quote:

"They are not going to get anywhere." King told an audience at Coffee High School in this North Alabama city. "They don't want to, they are just going to waste a bunch of the taxpayers' money," he said.

And that is a direct quote.

He goes on to say that there was obviously more than one man involved and there was a conspiracy. But even in saying that, Martin Luther King, Sr., said it was a waste of the taxpayers' money.

And I have not learned of any significant development in the investigation of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., nor have I learned of any significant development in the investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I will be happy to yield to the Delegate from the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to inform the gentleman of Dr. Martin Luther King, Sr.'s latest position on the continuation of this committee's work. I have, in fact, talked with him. And it is true that Dr. King, Sr., the father of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., does believe that there was a conspiracy to kill his son. In his own words he said that "there was more than one finger on the trigger." Dr. King, Sr., made the statement with respect to what he believed to be the reluctance of the Congress to do a thorough investigation. He said it on the basis of what information he received through the media about the procedure being followed by

the committee. He was laboring under the assumption that the committee was in disarray. And he interpreted that apparent disarray as an indication of an intention not to be serious about the investigation.

I shared with Dr. King, Sr., what now the committee has shared with the members of the Committee on Rules and the Members of the Congress in the report on the progress we have made in pursuit of these two investigations. I assure the gentleman that Dr. King, Sr., now has joined with the 12 members of the committee in urging the House on this date to reconstitute this committee to pursue the investigations and with the resources which the committee is now requesting of the Congress.

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

Yesterday I understood that Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr., was in town. I told a proponent of the legislation that I would be happy to talk with her. I have not received any call or communication. Since the article appeared on March 22 and there has been no contrary information in the paper, I join with Martin Luther King Sr., in saying it is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting that we now have the latest word from the father of the slain Dr. King, but that most recent word was brought to us by the committee's partisans in an atmosphere of desperation. They had to get him to reverse the statement he had made earlier.

I would suggest that the statement the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) has quoted is far more representative of the beliefs the senior Mr. King expressed in the published statement.

Mr. King, Sr., also was concerned about the disarray of the committee. While the committee remains in disarray up to this moment. They dropped their former chairman, and today they dropped the chief counsel for the committee. I hope the House will drop the committee and end the disarray.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I will yield shortly to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, the committee is in disarray. The chairman of the committee, the fine gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), came before our Committee on Rules Monday and in a briefing before the members of that committee, repeatedly said that if Sprague resigned or if Sprague were fired, more than half of the members of that committee would quit, would not stay on, because of their dedication to Sprague. It was obvious that Sprague was calling the shots.

Now that Sprague has resigned, I wonder what will happen this morning to the constitution of that committee?

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished gentleman in the well for yielding.

At 10 a.m. this morning the Assassinations Select Committee met and officially accepted the resignation of Mr. Richard Sprague. He is no longer counsel or in any manner associated with this select committee. Not one single person from that staff has taken any action to resign that staff. That staff is intact.

Mr. QUILLEN. Will the gentleman from Ohio be kind enough to answer this question.

Mr. STOKES. I certainly will.

Mr. QUILLEN. Did I quote the gentleman correctly when he made the statement that he thought that at least 50 percent of the committee would leave if Mr. Sprague were fired?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that I have never used the figure that at least 50 percent would have gone. What I think I said to the gentleman in response to his question was that at the time I assumed the chairmanship, there was no real sentiment for the dismissal of Mr. Sprague. Consequently, we were also faced with the problem that many of the persons who had been assembled around the country by Mr. Sprague felt a great deal of loyalty to him, and at that point in time, that is, on March 8 when I assumed the chair, I felt that we would have lost a large number of that staff.

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman. I think some of the statements did reflect 50 percent. I am sure that what the gentleman says is correct as coming from him, but in the hearing before the Committee on Rules the 50-percent figure was used.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have been of two minds about this committee. I think the whole House has. I am persuaded to vote for the continuation of this committee because I think some of the finest Members of Congress sit on that committee, and we can have confidence in their judgment and in the way they will proceed. But further than that, I think we are beginning to understand that there are a great many things here that have not been properly investigated, for whatever reason I and the rest of the general public cannot seem to find out. I think they need to be aired. We know the quality and character of the Members who are charged with the responsibility of investigating. As Members of the House, they will convince me, because I know them. If they say "this is all there is to it," I will believe that. I believe that is what most of the people in this country would agree to, also.

Mr. QUILLEN. Let me continue my statement on the rule. I know there are those who favor the continuation of the committee, but we are going to have debate under the 5-minute rule later. My

position is to defeat the rule, to take up for the taxpayers, the people who pay the bill, the people who pay the high electric bills, the high prices and high taxes. I do not think we should go out on a witch hunt and spend \$2,700,000 in 1977 and then possibly more in 1978, all to no avail.

Yes, this morning it is reported in the press that a person who was connected with Oswald has killed himself, and that he has been interviewed or was expected to be interviewed by the counsel of this committee. But he no longer lives.

I do not know why the committee has had so many ill omens to begin with. This House took up for Mr. Sprague over a fine Member of this Congress, of this body, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ). They supported Mr. Sprague over this fine gentleman from Texas, and now Mr. Sprague has resigned. That is what the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) wanted when he fired him—to get rid of him—and now the same committee that backed Mr. Sprague met this morning and accepted his resignation.

How far can we go one way and then turn another way and say we are right both ways?

Mr. FITHIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. FITHIAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

Was the gentleman from Texas aware that in the initial altercation between the former chairman and the chief counsel, there were those of us who objected solely on the grounds that the rules of the House of Representatives, which my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, has been so stalwart in upholding, were being violated, that a general counsel had been elected by the committee and by the rules of the House, and that he could only be unelected or fired by the committee?

Mr. QUILLEN. I am familiar with that, but by the same token, the committee had a right to meet and uphold the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), as they did this morning when they accepted the resignation of the counsel.

Mr. FITHIAN. I am glad the gentleman raised the point that the committee had the right to meet. That was my argument too. However, the chairman did not call us to a meeting and then he became ill for some 2½ weeks and so we were unable to meet.

Mr. QUILLEN. The gentleman knows if he read the Record of yesterday and again today what the chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), has said, what he has done, and what he has tried to do, but the chief counsel got in touch with the members of the committee over and above the chairman's head. But we are not here this morning arguing Sprague. Sprague is no longer here.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Was the gentleman

aware of the fact that not only did the committee not have a chance to meet about the firing of the general counsel but that we were already on our way out of town when we were informed of this late in the evening and that we were not even consulted on the appointment of a new acting counsel 2 days later after we were all in unison in rejecting and disapproving of the previous action?

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUILLEN. Let me finish here. Rather than yield all my time, I would prefer that some of these statements be made under the 5-minute rule, but I will be very happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to concur in and support the gentleman's opposition to the rule. It seems to me that with the important business now pending before this House we are getting very, very far afield with the reinstatement of this select committee. I have had the opportunity, as other Members have had, to see movies and to listen to statements and to get certain promises that certain evidence could be or might be or would be made available, and so on. It seems to me we are invading the judicial and executive branches of Government by attempting to resurrect this select committee. The committee's proposed activities legitimately belong to the Department of Justice and to the judicial branch and to the prosecutorial agencies of Government. It seems to me this resolution takes us far afield from our legislative responsibilities, and gets us into activities where we do not belong, perhaps because of the natural attraction which the media might have in the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr., and John F. Kennedy.

It would seem to me a most unfortunate waste of time and of the taxpayers' money, and I hope indeed that the rule will be turned down.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

But if the Members have not done so, I plead with them today before the final vote if the rule is adopted—and I hope it will not be—to read the RECORD and the statements of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ). I think it will open the eyes of the Members.

But here we are today. We plowed this ground over and over when the committee was constituted late last year, when the Congress knew that we were going to adjourn and the committee was going to be a lameduck committee with a lameduck chairman and with a committee staff that was oversized. The general counsel said that he needed \$6.5 million in order to do the work for 1 year, and it would be a 2-year investigation, for a total of \$13 million.

Many things took place, it is rumored, and it was in the newspaper columnist's article in the Dallas paper that the chief

counsel sent some people down there to make an investigation and found where they were supposed to go, the building had been torn down and what they had been sent to investigate was absolutely past history; nothing current, up to date.

I realize that the gentleman from Ohio said Monday in the Committee on Rules that CBS had said that was an error; but I find that the newspaper columnist in Dallas has not reported that it was an error.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a statement.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again say to the gentleman that when the question was posed to me in the Rules Committee, that I did respond to the gentleman that CBS has completely refuted that particular account and has reported that that account was in error.

Mr. QUILLEN. Is the gentleman familiar with the newspaper article to which I refer?

Mr. STOKES. I am not familiar with the newspaper article, just the report we had that was put out by CBS, which I assume is the same identical information that appeared in the newspaper article which has now been refuted.

Mr. QUILLEN. I have personally not seen the article—I must level with the gentleman, but I am told that the columnist has not retracted his statement; but I would like the chairman, if the committee is extended, to find out, in fact, if that did occur, and if it did, to take the necessary action, and if it did not, of course, there is no action to be taken.

Mr. STOKES. I am sure the gentleman will do that.

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

Mr. QUILLEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EDGAR. The gentleman in the well has correctly suggested that we review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the last 2 days. I have taken the time to read carefully each of the documented charges against Mr. Sprague. I am curious that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 2696 of yesterday the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) said:

The fact reflected in those vouchers was that the biggest single expense in the \$9,900-plus—just for expenses; that was not salaries—was in long distance calls, and in those long distance calls enumerated, his long distance calls to Philadelphia were the biggest item.

I would just suggest to the gentleman that in doing some further research I found that the vouchers total \$11,488.40. Of that figure, only \$826.85 were telephone calls, and of that figure only \$114.28 were calls made to the city of Philadelphia, and of that figure the gentleman, Mr. Sprague, had given a check to cover the cost of this \$114.28 expenditure.

It seems to me it reflects on the quality of the accusations if, in fact, the research that I have been able to do with the Committee on Rules indicates that, in

fact, the voucher was not for telephone expenses entirely and, in fact, the item mentioned was only for \$114.

I just have a great deal of difficulty with a number of these charges that seem to me, as a naive, young Congressman, to be unfounded.

Mr. QUILLEN. Does the gentleman support the restructuring of the committee?

Mr. EDGAR. What is that?

Mr. QUILLEN. Does the gentleman support the restructuring of the committee?

Mr. EDGAR. I support the restructuring of the committee, because I have taken the time to read the charges and accusations.

Mr. QUILLEN. If the rule is not defeated, and I hope it will be defeated, I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is entitled to reply to what the gentleman has said.

Mr. EDGAR. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would do that.

Mr. QUILLEN. If we take a paragraph or a statement out of context, and work it any way that we want to, the meaning can be twisted. I, for one, supported Mr. GONZALEZ, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, over Mr. Sprague. I will not ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania what the gentleman did, but I am not going to get into an argument.

Let me go to this mental illness of George de Mohrenschildt, the man who killed himself. The committee well knew that he had mental illness; that the pursuit of the charges against this man could lead to his death. When the investigators went down to Dallas, they were told that he had a mental health record.

Now, it said in this morning's paper that the man has killed himself. Oh, yes, the committee can go out and get the mental incompetent; it can get the rumors; it can go on a witch hunt and spend the money, but in the end, what do we have? President Kennedy is dead. Martin Luther King, Jr., is dead.

I understand they have been down interviewing Earl Ray in prison, but I am sure that under the confidentiality requirements of this committee, we cannot reveal on the floor of the House what has been said. But, what about this? On Earl Ray, the Department of Justice says that there is no new evidence.

But I say, let us not spend the taxpayers' money. Let us put an end to the committee. Let us do it now. Vote down the rule.

Mr. Speaker, the entire texts of the newspaper articles from which I have previously quoted are as follows:

KING, SR., DOESN'T EXPECT ANY RESULTS FROM INQUIRY

FLORENCE, ALA., March 21.—The Rev. Martin Luther King Sr., father of the slain civil rights leader, said Sunday he does not expect any results from an investigation into his son's death by a congressional subcommittee studying assassinations.

"They are not going to get anywhere," King told an audience at Coffee High School in this north Alabama city. "They don't want to. They are just going to waste a bunch of the taxpayers' money" he added.

But King said he was convinced there was a conspiracy to kill his son. "There was obviously more than one man involved. There were many fingers on the trigger of that gun," he said.

[From the Washington Star]

FIGURE IN JFK PROBE FOUND DEAD, A "SUICIDE"

PALM BEACH, Fla.—A Russian-born petroleum geologist and language professor, described as "intimately involved" with Lee Harvey Oswald and a "crucial witness" in the congressional investigation of the Kennedy assassination, was found dead yesterday in an apparent suicide.

Palm Beach County Sheriff Richard Wille identified the victim as George de Mohrenschildt, 65, a professor of French at Dallas' Bishop College.

Wille said de Mohrenschildt, a guest at the historic oceanfront mansion in suburban Manalapan, Fla., of Mrs. Charles Tilton III, apparently placed the muzzle of a 20 gauge shotgun to his mouth and pulled the trigger.

The sheriff said de Mohrenschildt had vanished from Dallas shortly after a Dutch newspaper report about three weeks ago claimed he had prior knowledge of the assassination.

De Mohrenschildt was traced by a House Assassinations Committee investigator to the Florida address, the sheriff said, and he returned to the Tilton home about 2:45 p.m. yesterday to learn that the investigator, believed to be Gaston J. Fonzi, had been trying to reach him.

The dramatic development yesterday, together with sudden support of a continued investigation by Dr. Martin Luther King Sr., may serve to win the committee a new lease on life. Under continuous attack, the assassinations panel will go out of business at midnight tonight unless the full House votes an extension.

Informed late last night of the death, Rep. Richardson Preyer, D-N.C., a key member of the committee, said, "He was a crucial witness for us, based on the new information he had. He was intimately involved with Oswald."

When the Warren Commission issued its report in 1964, concluding that President Kennedy was killed by Oswald acting alone, it said it had conducted an extensive investigation into de Mohrenschildt and his wife, Jeanne, because they had known the Oswalds through mutual Russian-speaking friends in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. The commission concluded that there was no evidence linking them to the tragic event in Dallas.

In his account quoting de Mohrenschildt as saying he had prior knowledge of the Kennedy assassination, Dutch journalist William Oltmans reported, "He (de Mohrenschildt) asked me 'How do you think the media would react if I came out and said I feel responsible for Oswald's behavior?'"

After vanishing from Dallas, De Mohrenschildt showed up in Oltmans' office in Holland. Then he disappeared again and was traced by government investigators from Brussels to Florida.

Sheriff Wille said only a maid and the Tilton family chauffeur were at home at the time and the shooting went undiscovered until the body was found by de Mohrenschildt's daughter in a second floor drawing room. Both had been guests at the Tilton home for about a week.

The sheriff said the call to the home was believed to have been placed from Miami by House investigator Fonzi.

About an hour later, Wille said, de Mohrenschildt apparently shot himself. "We're 99 percent certain he killed himself," the sheriff said.

Wille and Palm Beach State Atty. David

Bludworth questioned witnesses about the shooting until shortly before midnight.

Among the witnesses quizzed was freelance writer Ed Epstein, who had told the West Palm Beach Post Monday night that he had been interviewing de Mohrenschildt in connection with a book he was doing about Lee Harvey Oswald.

After his questioning last night, Epstein said, "I don't mean to be evasive but the police told me not to talk about de Mohrenschildt's death to anybody."

The Tilton home remained sealed off by sheriff's deputies last night.

According to the Warren Commission report, de Mohrenschildt was born in the Ukraine in 1911 and fled Russia in 1921 following the civil disorders that broke out after the Bolshevik revolution.

He became an American citizen in 1949, having earlier received a graduate degree from the University of Texas in petroleum geology and petroleum engineering.

In 1960, the report states, he traveled for eight months through Mexico and Panama over primitive jungle trails, and by happenstance he and his wife were in Guatemala City when the Bay of Pigs invasion was launched. He prepared a lengthy film clip and a complete written log on the trip and a report was made to the U.S. government, the commission reported.

De Mohrenschildt death was third involving witnesses or potential witness before congressional panels investigating assassinations.

Underworld figure Sam Giancana was murdered before, and John Rosselli was killed after, testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee investigating allegations that the assassination of Kennedy was in retaliation for CIA efforts to assassinate Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 20, 1977]

MENTAL ILLS OF OSWALD CONFIDENT TOLD

(By Earl Goiz)

George de Mohrenschildt was having mental problems shortly before he told a Dutch journalist last month he knew in advance Lee Harvey Oswald was going to assassinate President John F. Kennedy, The Dallas News has learned.

The 65-year-old Bishop College French professor agreed to commit himself to the psychiatric unit of Parkland Memorial Hospital last Nov. 9 after his wife filed court papers to force commitment, Dallas County Mental Illness Departmental records show.

The hospital said De Mohrenschildt was released from the psychiatric unit about eight weeks later on Dec. 30, but declined to give information about his examination.

The hospital did not refer De Mohrenschildt to the County Evaluation Center for further examination, which indicated he was not considered harmful to himself or others.

The House Assassinations Committee last Tuesday quizzed a Dutch journalist and longtime De Mohrenschildt friend, Willems Oltmans, who said he had interviewed De Mohrenschildt last month at Bishop College. Oltmans did not say whether he had known of De Mohrenschildt's previous mental problems.

Oltmans quoted De Mohrenschildt as saying he knew in advance what Oswald was going to do before the assassination in Dallas Nov. 22, 1963.

"He said to me, 'How do you think the media would react if I came out and said that I feel responsible for Oswald's behavior,'" Oltmans said.

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.

In response to a request from The Dallas News, which asked that court records regarding De Mohrenschildt's mental illness proceedings be made accessible because such action is "in the public interest," Probate Judge Joseph E. Ashmore Jr. did so.

Congressional committee investigators have been working on the De Mohrenschildt case under the impression he disappeared after he left Bishop College March 1. Oltmans told the probers he accompanied De Mohrenschildt to Europe after he left the college on a leave of absence of several days, and then lost contact with him.

Bishop College officials said while De Mohrenschildt had not been heard from, they still expect him to return after the school's spring vacation ends Monday.

De Mohrenschildt, who was born in Russia, was questioned at length before the Warren Commission in April, 1964, because of his friendship with Oswald months before the assassination. Then a petroleum engineer, he had befriended Oswald and his wife when they arrived in the Dallas-Fort Worth area in 1962 from Russia.

Mr. and Mrs. De Mohrenschildt had left for Haiti in connection with the oil business seven months before the assassination and were living there when it happened.

One of the fascinating aspects of De Mohrenschildt to the Warren Commission, was his personal acquaintance with both Oswald and the mother of President Kennedy's widow, Jacqueline. During his 10 hours of testimony, he acknowledged he had written a letter to Mrs. Hugh D. Auchincloss, Dec. 12, 1963, expressing his sympathies after the assassination.

De Mohrenschildt told the commission he had met and become friends with Mrs. Auchincloss at Belport, Long Island, in 1939, within a year after he arrived in this country from Russia. He said he also met Jacqueline at the same time when she was a little girl.

In his letter to Mrs. Auchincloss, De Mohrenschildt stated he still had "a lingering doubt, notwithstanding all the evidence, of Oswald's guilt."

De Mohrenschildt told the commission he "will have the lingering doubt for the rest of my life . . . mainly because he (Oswald) did not have any permanent animosity for President Kennedy."

Mrs. Auchincloss later wrote back to De Mohrenschildt saying, "It seems extraordinary to me that you knew Oswald and that you knew Jackie as a child. It is certainly a very strange world." She added, "I hope, too, that Mrs. Oswald will not suffer."

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), the chairman of the Select Committee on Assassinations.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this particular select committee, as the Members know, was constituted originally in the 94th Congress. Unfortunately, it was constituted under a Member of this body who was in a lame-duck status; consequently, very little was done between the time of constitution and the end of the last Congress. We were reconstituted once again on February 2, 1977, and then of course I need not recite to any of the Members the events which transpired after that time. I do not want to use my time to make reference to that. I would like to utilize my time to give the Members some