

Evans, Ga.	Lloyd, Tenn.	Ruppe
Fary	Lott	Russo
Findley	Lujan	Sarasin
Flippo	Luken	Satterfield
Florio	McClory	Sawyer
Flynt	McCormack	Schulze
Ford, Mich.	McDonald	Sebelius
Forsythe	McEwen	Sharp
Fountain	McKay	Shuster
Frenzel	Madigan	Sikes
Frey	Mahon	Simon
Gammage	Marriott	Sisk
Gilman	Martin	Skelton
Glickman	Mattox	Skubitz
Goldwater	Michel	Smith, Nebr.
Gonzalez	Mikva	Snyder
Gooding	Miller, Ohio	Solarz
Gradison	Minish	Spence
Grassley	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stangeland
Gudger	Mollohan	Stark
Guyser	Montgomery	Steed
Hagedorn	Moore	Steiger
Hall	Moorhead,	Stockman
Hammer-	Calif.	Stratton
schmidt	Mottl	Stump
Hanley	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor
Hansen	Murtha	Thompson
Harsha	Myers, Gary	Thorny
Hefner	Myers, Ind.	Traxler
Highower	Neal	Treen
Hollenbeck	Nedzi	Trible
Holt	Nichols	Ullman
Horton	O'Brien	Vander Jagt
Hubbard	Perkins	Waggonner
Huckabay	Pettis	Walcher
Hyde	Pickle	Walsh
Ichord	Pike	Wampler
Jeffords	Pressler	Watkins
Jones, N.C.	Quayle	Waxman
Jones, Okla.	Quie	Weiss
Kasten	Quillen	Whalen
Kazen	Regula	White
Kelly	Rhodes	Whitley
Kemp	Rinaldo	Whitten
Ketchum	Roberts	Wiggins
Kindness	Robinson	Wilson, Bob
Krueger	Rogers	Winn
Lagomarsino	Rooney	Wylder
Latta	Rosenthal	Young, Alaska
Le Pante	Rostenkowski	Young, Fla.
Leach	Roussetot	Young, Tex.
Leggett	Roybal	Zablocki
Lent	Rudd	Zeferetli
Levitas	Runnels	

NAYS—195

Addabbo	Diggs	Jones, Tenn.
Akaka	Dodd	Jordan
Alexander	Downey	Kastenmeter
Ammerman	Duncan, Oreg.	Keys
Anderson,	Early	Kildee
Calif.	Eckhardt	Koch
Anderson, Ill.	Edgar	Kostmayer
Annunzio	Edwards, Calif.	Krebs
Applegate	Eilberg	LaFalce
Aspin	Emery	Lederer
AuCoin	English	Lehman
Badillo	Evans, Colo.	Lloyd, Calif.
Barnard	Evans, Ind.	Loyd, La.
Baucus	Fascell	Long, Md.
Beard, R.I.	Fenwick	Lundine
Benjamin	Fish	McCloskey
Bevill	Fisher	McDade
Biaggi	Fithian	McFall
Bingham	Flood	McHugh
Blanchard	Flowers	McKinney
Blouin	Foley	Maguire
Boggs	Ford, Tenn.	Mann
Boland	Fraser	Markey
Bolling	Fuqua	Marks
Bonior	Gaydos	Mathis
Bowen	Gephardt	Mazzoli
Breaux	Glaime	Meeds
Brodhead	Gibbons	Metcalfe
Broomfield	Ginn	Misner
Burke, Calif.	Gore	Mikulski
Burke, Mass.	Hamilton	Miller, Calif.
Burlison, Mo.	Hannaford	Mineta
Burlon, John	Harkin	Mitchell, Md.
Burton, Phillip	Harrington	Moakley
Caputo	Harris	Moiffett
Carney	Hawkins	Moorhead, Pa.
Carr	Heckler	Moss
Chisholm	Heftel	Murphy, Ill.
Cohen	Hillis	Murphy, Pa.
Collins, Ill.	Holland	Myers, Michael
Conte	Holtzman	Natcher
Conyers	Howard	Nix
Corman	Hughes	Nolan
Cotter	Ireland	Nowak
D'Amours	Jacobs	Oakar
Danielson	Jenkins	Oberstar
Delaney	Jenrette	Obey
Devine	Johnson, Calif.	Ottinger
Dicks	Johnson, Colo.	Panetta

Patten	Santini	Udall
Patterson	Schauer	Van Deerlin
Pattison	Schroeder	Vanik
Pease	Seiberling	Vento
Preyer	Shiplay	Volkmmer
Price	Slack	Walgren
Pritchard	Smith, Iowa	Weaver
Pursell	Spellman	Whitehurst
Rahall	St Germain	Wirth
Railsback	Stanton	Wolf
Reuss	Steers	Wright
Richmond	Stokes	Wylie
Risenhoover	Studds	Yates
Rodino	Thone	Yatron
Roncalio	Thornton	Young, Mo.
Rose	Tsongas	
Ryan	Tucker	

NOT VOTING—14

Brown, Calif.	Pepper	Symms
Clay	Poage	Teague
Dellums	Rangel	Wilson, C. H.
Marlenee	Roe	Wilson, Tex.
Milford	Staggers	

On this vote:

Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Clay against.
Mr. Milford for, with Mr. Dellums against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Marlenee.
Mr. Roe with Mr. Symms.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Brown of California.

Messrs. TUCKER and APPEGATE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Messrs. SKELTON, ASHLEY, CONABLE, STEED, QUAYLE, JEFFORDS, BROOKS, SHARP, LUKEN, YOUNG of Texas, NEAL, WAXMAN, MCCORMACK, and STARK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let me preface my remarks by saying that I normally do not discuss my mail, whether constituent or otherwise, publicly or in the well of this House, and I would not today except that I met with the individual who has corresponded with me on March 12, and he at that time approved the public use of his letter in the form in which I have used it in times past and will use it today.

Let me say this, that I was not and am not an admirer of Martin Luther King's tactics or of his political philosophy, but that has nothing to do with the man's right to his philosophy or his right to live.

I opposed this resolution when it was up in February, and I speak today not to vouch for the truth or accuracy of the allegations to which I refer and which I will read, but rather to explain my own position in voting to continue the investigation of these allegations.

On February 28 I received a letter, and as I read it to the Members I will insert blanks. The original has the names there, but I believe it best not to read them until the allegations are investigated:

Congressman GENE SNYDER. Sir: I retired from (blank) police department in (blank) after serving (blank) years. While I was in the police dept. I was innocently involved in a conspiracy to assassinate Dr. Martin Luther King. Involved in this conspiracy were agents of the FBI; Agents (Blank), (Blank)

and (Blank) and others that I did not know. Members of the (Blank) Police Dept. Chief of Detectives (Blank), Capt. (Blank), Lt. (Blank), Officer (Blank), Lt. (Blank) of the Homicide Bureau and president of the F.O.B. (Blank).

They offered 500,000 dollars to me to assassinate Dr. King. The offer was made to me in my auto which was equipped with a tape recorder and I have a recording of this conversation.

At the same time this offer was made I was under an intense investigation by the (Blank) police dept. and F.B.I. I was suspected of being involved in a (Blank) ring operation in (Blank) where I was born and raised.

On three different occasions I was threatened by F.B.I. agents. In the month previous to the King assassination I was threatened seven or eight times by people I did not know.

When I retired from the police department I went to see (blank) of United Press International who stands me up everytime I make an appointment for him to hear the tapes. He did give me the names and address of James Earl Ray attorney, Bernard Finsterwald, suite 500, 910 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 223-1867. Area Code 202-555-1212. I contacted Bernard Finsterwald who referred me to James Lesar, 1231 4th Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20024 Area Code 202-484-6023.

I contacted these people both by phone and letter several times and they refuse to hear the tapes. I offered to bring them to Washington at my expense. They wanted me to mail them the tapes.

They referred me to their investigator Harold Weisberg, Route 12, Frederick, Maryland, Area Code 301-473-8186. I talked to Weisberg on the phone, who wanted to know what business it was of mine and where I was going to hide if I tried to do anything with the tapes. I have not tried to contact these people in the last year.

I have written to James Earl Ray but have been unable to contact him. I dont think his attorneys are on his side. I would like your help in contacting James Ray. Also refer this letter to the Committee investigating the assassination of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

Respectfully,

When I received that letter I sent it in a sealed envelope, hand-carried, to the then chairman of this committee and the ranking minority member, because I thought it should be up to them as to whose hands they would want this kind of content to fall into. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), the ranking minority member, a former member of the FBI, advised me that he checked this fellow out and that he checked out as a solid citizen.

As I indicated, I have talked to him face to face. I believe he is a solid citizen.

I recommend that this gentleman come to Washington. I understand he has been interrogated by the staff of this committee for several hours, and he has turned over to them this tape recording. I understand that they have verified that the age of the tape is approximately what the man says it is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SNYDER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I make no charges or allegations against anyone. I have always had

I met with check out

not possible

did not contact me

1/2 hr

and I still have confidence in the law enforcement agencies of this Nation. But nevertheless, I do believe that allegations such as these should be investigated. For that reason, today I shall vote to continue the committee.

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

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the Delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

Mr. FAUNTROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must commend the gentleman for bringing this information to the attention of the committee and the House of Representatives. I assure the gentleman that, as our report indicates, it is among several leads that we have which we are presently pursuing, leads that suggest that there was a plot or plots to assassinate Martin Luther King, Jr., prior to the fatal day of April 4, 1968.

I simply want to commend the gentleman for having brought this lead to our attention. By doing so, you have given the Nation an instructive example of the seriousness with which a majority of the Members of this House are prepared to pursue the facts in these very important investigations.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know, of course, the truth or veracity of these allegations; but I say if they are true, that needs to be found out, and if they are not true, the FBI and the rest need to be exonerated.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise somewhat reluctantly to oppose the continuation of the Select Committee on Assassinations. I do so reluctantly, because Dr. King was a great leader from my own State, and the late President John Kennedy was one of the most loved and best respected of all Presidents, who had the overwhelming support of the people of this Nation and of my own State.

Nevertheless, I am convinced by commonsense and, I hope, unbiased judgment that the continuation of this committee will not only serve no real useful purpose, but on the contrary, it will do the very opposite of what we are attempting to do and want to do.

As I look back through the pages of history, I realize that following the murder of any great leader the doubts and the guilt and the remorse and the confusion always lead to theories, hypotheses, and speculation that are never totally refuted. There is little hope of dispelling all of the possibilities—the possible conspiracies and the potential unlawful agreements—and this Congress will not be successful if that is the intent of this resolution.

The writers are still speculating today as to the people who were really involved in the Lincoln assassination. Contained within the 70 or 80 books of which I am aware relating to the Lincoln death

there are theories that Great Britain was involved, that France was the guilty country, that Jefferson Davis and the South were the real conspirators, that the Roman Catholic Church commissioned the deed, that Lincoln's Cabinet was involved, that Mary Surratt was totally innocent, that Vice President Andrew Johnson hired the assassin, that Canada was deeply involved, that John Surratt was an active participant, although never convicted—and the list goes on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, the hour of decision in this matter today is not upon this Congress and this House. There was a responsibility upon the Congress some 12 years ago to unearth the facts and to reveal its findings to the American people. How that duty was performed may be open to legitimate criticism and study today, but there is no possible way that this Congress can turn back the pages of history to reconstitute an investigation into events that occurred over a decade ago. That hour of decision is gone, and regardless of how much money we spend with this resolution today, that opportunity to perform a more thorough or a different style of investigation cannot be repurchased by whatever money we allocate.

Mr. Speaker, I can conceive of no real benefit that we will derive from this committee. I have the very highest regard for its members and their sincere desire to quiet the doubts of our people concerning these tragedies, but they have an impossible task. If we were commencing today with a new committee and a new staff, without acrimony or distrust and with a clean slate, the job would yet be impossible of satisfactory conclusion. But we cannot even give them that clean slate.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that whatever the finding of the committee might be, whatever its revelations, the American people will not accept those findings because, for whatever the reasons, this committee is tainted and suspect in the minds of the people. If no new revelations are forthcoming, I can see the new books coming off the presses now to indicate that a conspiracy was involved to remove the chairman or to remove the chief counsel or to limit the funding of the committee or to restrict the staff of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JENKINS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JENKINS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, let me complete my presentation.

Furthermore, if new hypotheses are developed, can we believe that the people will accept those conclusions that are derived from a committee that is plagued with such problems? I fear that we will accomplish nothing by this action today. The millions of dollars that we spend under this resolution could be better spent in other areas.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the resolution.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, one of the Members who spoke earlier in the well and addressed the Members of the House was the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RUDN), who is a former FBI agent and who is vitally concerned that it may be that this investigation is going the direction of being critical of our intelligence agencies. It is a real concern.

I, too, am a former FBI agent, and I am concerned about that.

But let me say this to the Members: During the short life of this start-and-stop and start-again committee we have had total and complete cooperation from the Bureau in seeking information, at least up until the time when our former chairman saw the Attorney General and shut off our water so we could not get any more information.

That source has now again been opened, and we are having total cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against this select committee when it originated last September, because I did not think any useful purpose could be served. I thought, by golly, here we have an election year. The Democrats want to crank this up so that they can get the emotions of the country aroused. Anyway, they did pretty well.

Then we came back after it expired in February. I again voted against it, because the resolution in February only gave us 60 days. No one could conduct any kind of investigation on anything in 60 days.

Mr. Speaker, I come before the Members today with a rather heavy heart. We, the Congress, have done a great injustice to a great American. I am speaking of Richard Sprague, and that might surprise the Members.

Here is a man who, I think, has integrity; he has efficiency; he has honesty, and he was doing a professional job, notwithstanding the scurrilous remarks that have circulated in this Chamber and elsewhere about him. He personally sacrificed his future by resigning last night. Why? Because we took a whip count in this House, and in counting noses, it looked as though there were enough Members of this House to say, "We will not vote for this committee unless you get rid of Sprague."

Mr. Speaker, he could have stood firm. We could have fired him, but he said:

This investigation is too important for one man or one man's career to stand in the way of this committee's having success on the House floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members that I have worked with the professional staff that Mr. Sprague got together. I have worked with the fine members of this committee; and under the chairmanship of our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), I am totally confident that this investigation can go forward in a meaningful manner. We may come up with the same conclusion as the Warren Commission and the Church committee did; but there are many unanswered questions like those

*Why not
use Mr.
Jim's
phone #?*

brought up by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) in the committee. We have a large number of unanswered questions in both cases. This is a two-pronged investigation into serious questions that must be answered.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker; I would say to the Members that there is enough information available for this House to exercise its will as it has done on two previous occasions.

What has happened in the interim period other than the lousing up of the staff and a personality problem? What is any different from what existed last September and last February as to the need to answer the unanswered questions in this matter?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues here in the House to vote favorably on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. KAZEN. I was interested in one statement the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) made about the former chairman of this committee shutting off any cooperation between the FBI and the committee.

What kind of action did the gentleman take in this respect?

Mr. DEVINE. The former chairman—and he is here and can verify this—personally went to the Attorney General of the United States and asked that all access to FBI files be terminated.

Mr. KAZEN. What was the background for that?

Mr. DEVINE. I think this was at the time that there was a dispute on whether or not Mr. Sprague and the rest of the committee should continue. This was a unilateral action, and I am sure that the gentleman will correct me if I say anything inaccurate.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say, as far as the gentleman's statement is concerned, that I, too, have sat and listened to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. SNYDER) read that letter.

It would seem to me that that might be investigated at least to find out whether it is or is not a true statement.

However, would it not be just as effective and just as easy to give that statement, for whatever it is worth, and the data, for whatever they are worth, to the Department of Justice and let them tell us if there is anything to it? Can they not do that? Do we have to have a \$5 million House of Representatives committee, which really only speaks for one body of Congress, do this entire type of investigation? We still have the Department of Justice. I have great confidence in it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see them do that kind of investigation. Why can they not do it?

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the events of the death of Martin Luther King and the events of the death of Robert Kennedy and John F. Kennedy were terrible. They were great men, and all of us here present in this Chamber honored them.

The events occurred a long time ago. The evidence is cold. Witnesses have moved on. Memories have grown frail. Papers have disappeared. Investigations have been carried out to their end. Those found guilty have been sentenced. And to pursue a trail now that is so old would be enormously difficult and of doubtful productivity.

I do not want my colleagues to think I am some kind of reactionary or conservative, because throughout my career I opposed the Un-American Activities Committee which had less power than this committee seeks from the House today. It was a committee which was known for its excesses, its violations of the rights of Americans, of its behavior in a circus atmosphere, which brought shame and discredit upon the House of Representatives. Now we seek to reconstitute that kind of a circumstance here. This committee received a provisional grant of life from this body in January on the assumption that during that period of time they would come forward with some evidence as to the killings of the great Americans who are the subject of this supposed investigation, during which time nothing has happened except they have overspent their budget, they have wrangled in a most unseemly fashion over all circumstances. There has been continuous disharmony, disorganization and outrage within the bounds of the committee. Not one thing has been done.

The mandate of the House of Representatives was that on conclusion of that time period they would be back before us with some facts which would justify their continued existence, with some evidence of conspiracies, or some evidence of unpunished or uninvestigated wrongdoing or of failure of the law enforcement officials to properly investigate and carry out the investigations of the deaths of these three great men.

I have here, and all of the Members of the House have a copy of it, the report with regard to this matter. I challenge any Member of the House to find in this report one word, one sentence which indicates that this subcommittee, which seeks \$2.7 million of the taxpayers' money, and it is not our money, it is the taxpayers' money, should be granted this money to spend upon an investigation.

Now they have overspent their money so far, they have wrangled without end and they have presented no evidence.

How much longer must we wait for them to come forward with the smallest smidgen of the promised evidence to justify an expenditure of \$2.7 million?

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me.

I would ask the gentleman from Michi-

gan, in light of the fact that the gentleman has twice made the statement that we have overspent our budget, if the gentleman would give us some evidence of this, in light of the fact that in my earlier presentation today I presented to the House evidence of the fact that this committee has lived within the constraint of \$80,000 per month given them in January, February, and March.

In that respect I read into the record a letter from Mr. Cable relative to this matter. And I cite the fact that at the present time the total expenditure allocated to us being \$247,388.89 for the period of January 3, 1977, to March 31, and that as of today we have \$433 left over in that budget.

Mr. DINGELL. They are \$433 within the budget?

Mr. STOKES. That is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to debate with the gentleman from Ohio as to whether they have stayed within their budget, but there have been continuous charges emanating from the committee, including comments by the former chairman, that they have overspent their budget. The gentleman from Ohio has said that that is not right. The gentleman from Ohio has corrected me in my statement and I rejoice that that is not so.

But despite that fact, there is not one smidgen of evidence given of failures of the law enforcement officials in the investigation of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and of the deaths of either of the two Kennedys, John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, or that these investigations have in any fashion been inadequately carried out by the law enforcement officials. Nowhere in this report, which is supposedly a document upon which we bottom our judgment as to the merits of this committee, is there such information.

The resolution should be voted down and we should get on about the business of the House.

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

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not come in here with the intention of speaking to this subject, and I certainly would not speak to it based on any tenure or status I have here in the House. I do, however, feel I have some qualifications. I spent 31 years full time as an active trial lawyer. I had a 52-man law firm. I am a fellow of the American College of Trial Lawyers, a fellow and director of the International Academy. I spent the last 2 years as prosecuting attorney in a county of 425,000 people. I may be one of the few people who have both successfully defended five first-degree murder trials and successfully prosecuted five first-degree murder trials. My last experience was with a grand jury I constituted to investigate some old murder cases that had grown over a year old and up to 5 years old. We managed to break seven of them, one being a contract-conspiracy murder. So I have a little appreciation of the problem.

March 30, 1977

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 2747

For those Members who might not have had this appreciation, let me tell them that when we get involved in these investigations of old cases, we have everything come out of the woodwork. If the matter is getting any publicity, we are deluged with people who are attracted by the glare of the spotlight and who then come forward with all kinds of rumors—some having enough semblance of truth that we have to spend time to run them down. Everybody who is spending time in prison who has any connection, remote or otherwise, with these killings comes forward to try to buy time off, to buy a reduction of sentence, to do all kinds of bargaining. This is a tough professional job, and it is tough enough to do when one is in the cloister of a grand jury. But when we start then to do this kind of highly professional, extremely difficult job under the glare of the media—and the national media which attracts kooks like flies, and where everything is there—this just is not the forum within which to tackle this kind of case.

The House of Representatives might do very well to constitute such a committee to investigate the Korean money situation because that involves them. This is clearly not the mission for a legislative committee, other than perhaps to attract a lot of publicity. It is not the place for the job, and I urge the Members to vote against it and save the taxpayers \$5 million.

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

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to join the gentleman from Michigan in that sentiment. I think this is the greatest body for legislation that exists in the civilized world. I think we are pretty good investigators, and I think we are awfully poor inquisitors.

I join the gentleman entirely in his views.

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

Mr. SAWYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to engage the distinguished Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) in colloquy, if I may. I would ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) the question that bothers me in considering this resolution, and I would hope that he can answer it for me to my satisfaction. In that way would the continuation of this committee or its investigation serve the Congress in its consideration of any legislation now pending or contemplated?

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

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

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the original resolution constituting this select committee, a part of the mandate of the Congress is for the committee to propose legislative proposals to

the Congress based upon their findings in both the assassinations.

Mr. ALLEN. Just what kind of legislation could possibly be recommended based on any findings of this committee and its investigation?

Mr. STOKES. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman it is difficult for me at this point in time to be able to say what type of legislative proposal would be based upon conclusions of investigations that would take some time. We are in the initial stages of the investigative process. Obviously, I was unable to say to the gentleman today what conclusions this committee will come to after sorting out, evaluating, and analyzing all the evidence.

But hopefully we will be able to restore the confidence of the American people in their governmental agencies, and that is the problem or the purpose for which we were originally established.

Mr. ALLEN. One more question of the chairman and I will terminate my questioning.

In just what respect does the gentleman think that this investigation is any different from what normally would be handled by the regularly constituted law enforcement agencies and the grand jury? And certainly the Congress does not pretend to be a grand jury or law enforcement agency but rather a legislative body.

Mr. STOKES. I think I need only make reference to the Warren Commission report which we now know the FBI and other agencies of the Government participated in and we know now certain evidence was withheld from that Commission. We know that certain false information was given to that Commission and we know that governmental law enforcement agencies were involved in that process. So I say to the gentleman that an independent body such as the United States Congress needs to investigate and analyze in both of these matters.

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman does not feel that the present Department of Justice under its new leaders can conduct that investigation impartially and thoroughly and in depth?

Mr. STOKES. If we are assigned the responsibility of investigating these matters and a part of the investigation is for us to ascertain whether or not those Government agencies did in fact what they were supposed to do in those types of investigations, whether they talked to all the witnesses they should have, whether they withheld information, whether they covered up information, obviously we cannot use those agencies to police themselves.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the chairman.

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

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it took a very long time to get the select committee appointed. I remember that I was a co-sponsor of that resolution. It took literally years until the House voted in favor of appointing the committee. The reason that this House ultimately appointed the

committee was, that when we went back to our districts people said, and I think almost everyone in this House agrees, that they were not satisfied with the results of the two investigations that are the subject matter of this resolution. I doubt that there is anyone who would get up and defend those investigations by law enforcement authorities as absolutely thorough and complete.

The charge is made that the investigations will never be complete, that they will never be thorough. That really is not an adequate excuse in my view. It may very well be that this House select committee will not be able to do a thorough, complete job. It may be. But I think that the committee will do a thorough and complete job and satisfy the American people that all that could be done was in fact done.

Some aspersions, if you will, not intentional, have been cast upon the ability of the members of the select committee to do the kind of job that would make this House proud, and the fear is that in some way the investigation would become a circus. I remember when we had the impeachment proceedings, and the single group of men and women that brought this House to its highest point in public esteem was the Judiciary Committee because it conducted itself in a way that made not only everybody in this House, but everybody in this country, proud.

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's sentiments regarding the Committee on the Judiciary, that it should have the authority to handle this matter. Would the gentleman support a motion to recommit this entire matter to the Committee on the Judiciary for further evaluation as to whether it should continue at all?

Mr. KOCH. The answer is no.

Mr. BAUMAN. I am sorry that the gentleman would not.

Mr. KOCH. Let me tell the gentleman why. Every Member of this House, just like the gentleman who just rose, was very proud of the way the members of the Committee on the Judiciary conducted themselves. I say that in the same way we will be proud of the people on this select committee. Their names are known to us, but let me read them:

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER).

The delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BURKE).

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. FITHIAN).

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EDGAR).

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE).

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY).

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. THONE).

There is not a single member of that select committee of which I am not proud. I believe that they will conduct themselves in a way that will make this House feel very proud. Furthermore, I believe that if we vote this resolution down that the American public will say that there has been another effort to prevent the truth from being known. Whether it is intended that way or not is not of importance. The credibility that the House has with the American public is at stake and that is why it is essential that we pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I would like to read the following letter into the record from 33 individuals who have sent their letter to President Carter and the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Without passing judgment on any of the charges therein I would like to share its content with this House:

MARCH 24, 1977.

DEAR PRESIDENT CARTER: One is tempted to speculate on the recent troubles of the House Select Committee on Assassinations. Would it be, one can wonder, in the interests of high officials in the CIA and the FBI to cooperate with such a committee when such questions as Oswald's links to the CIA or the FBI's alleged malfeasance in the investigation of the slaying of Martin Luther King could be patiently, even authoritatively explored while new evidence further damning the FBI and CIA could also be discovered? (Indeed, who in these organizations would be certain there was no such damning evidence?) Under these circumstances, how could the CIA and the FBI live with the Select Committee on Assassinations? How could they not be ready to apply pressure and sabotage against its workings?

It is, however, in the interest of the American public to have the Committee in existence. The Select Committee on Assassinations may be imperfect, impractical, and a demon for poor publicity. For all we know, it may be riddled with undercover men. But it is the only investigating body we have in the House of Representatives with the obligation to subpoena recalcitrant witnesses on these matters and the duty to listen to witnesses who have studied the flaws in the Warren Commission report for years. By its existence, therefore, the Committee represents a threat to anybody who would hope to maintain public apathy about the assassinations.

Such public apathy exists for good reason. So long as we believe that it is impossible to learn the truths of Dallas or the truths of the murders of Martin Luther King and of Bobby Kennedy, then such deaths are too depressing to contemplate. Yet we pay an incalculable price for living with these unsolved crimes. A clear idea of the character of the events of the recent past is essential to a democracy: without knowledge of what actually happened in an event, how can one debate its meaning? If we do not know whether Jack Kennedy was killed by the demented act of an isolated man, or whether by the concerted acts of a group of conspirators who employed Oswald as the set-up; if we do not know whether the murder of Oswald by Jack Ruby was an attempt to spare the First Lady all the discomfort of appearing at a trial, or an order that came to Jack Ruby out of the chain of communication that ran between the CIA and the Mafia, then we do not know which history we can act upon.

Now we have a new administration seeking

to take America out of the historical dependency of the last decade. How promising if this new administration and Congress will recognize that the assassinations of the sixties are not old scars to be covered but unseen bruises that still deaden the confidence of America. For the shadow of the assassinations keeps us thinking we do not have a history that can bear exposure. That is a deadening suspicion. Basic to good feeling about our country is our ability to believe that our representatives are brave enough to undertake thoroughgoing investigations of the role of government itself, no matter where that may lead! Such a need will obviously not be satisfied by stopping the work of the House Select Committee on Assassinations and we, the undersigned, send this letter to President Carter and to the House of Representatives in the hope it will serve the idea that the continuing life of the Select Committee and the voting of an appropriation adequate to its needs are matters of significance to the psychic well-being of this Republic.

Respectfully signed,

Norman Mailer, Edward Albee, Robert Bly, Malcolm Cowley, Will Durant, E. L. Doctorow, Allen Ginsburg, Doris Kearns Goodwin, Richard Goodwin, Francine du Plessix Gray,

John Hawkes, Shirley Hazzard, Joseph Heller, Larry King, Stanley Kunitz, Joyce Carol Oates, Denise Levertov, William Phillips, Richard Poirer, James Purdy, Dotson Rader, Muriel Rukeyser.

Mark Schorer, Meyer Shapiro, Wilfred Sheed, Francis Steegmuller, Wallace Stegner, William Styron, Hunter Thompson, Kurt Vonnegut, Jr., Richard Wilbur, Irving Howe, and John Aldredge.

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

Mr. KOCH. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Louisiana.

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just as the gentleman from New York is proud of the members of the committee, I also am very proud of the patriots of excellence who were members of the Warren Commission, my husband among them.

I would like to say to the House that I was told on many occasions by the chairman of that Commission, Chief Justice Warren, that Hale perfected the language that made it possible for all those members, those excellent members of that Commission, to be able to sign the Commission report unanimously. That language was:

In accordance to the evidence that has been presented to this Commission we find no evidence of a conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, I have voted for the resolution before. I intend to vote for it today, because I think that it is not a reflection on the members of the Warren Commission. It is their feeling that if new evidence, indeed, could be brought forth, then it should be.

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TREEN) and I had lunch today with 60-odd young people from our area. We asked for a show of hands among the young people on whether or not they approved of continuing this investigation and this committee. Overwhelmingly, they were in favor of it. Whatever the cost, however cold the trail may be, we owe it to the young people of this country

to see that this body has done everything in its power to regain their confidence in the Government.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman has presented the position in a way that no one else could improve upon.

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

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak today, because as a member of the committee I felt that perhaps my words would not be given any real weight of judgment. There seems to be, however, a misconception of what this committee is about doing. I think that the gentlewoman from Louisiana said it far more succinctly than I could have, but I want to add to it. Eleven members, now twelve, four very disparate Republicans, eight very different Democrats, have tried to tell any of us who would give the time in secret session, "Yes, we know a great deal new, and it bothers us."

Some of you have taken the time and the effort in our busy schedules to come and accept that opportunity. We think we have changed some minds with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard today the most outrageous statements about how this committee is out to slander the organizations of our Government. It is not. I have heard that this committee has not found new information. It has. I have heard that this committee has been in turmoil. It has not been. The press has made it appear to be in turmoil. I have never, in my entire legislative history, worked under a man—in fact, two men—that I could better go before this House for commendation: RICHARDSON PREYER and LOUIS STOKES. They are the hardest working, fairest, most honest individuals I have ever been associated with in a leadership position.

I could have come before the press of this Nation and this House and torn the majority party's handling of this situation apart. I have not done so. I believe in this. I am not going to stand here and say that you have to endorse STU MCKINNEY or anything else, but I am going to tell the Members something: I am an honest man. I believe in this country. I believe in what it stands for, and I believe that if this investigation is cut off in the last possible council it will ever have, the people's House of this country, that if this investigation is cut off I will personally feel that this body, to which I am proud to belong, has done the intelligence, and I think the morality of the American people, one of the greatest disservices it could have ever done.

I am not going to be dramatic or anything else, but, Members of the House, I am going to tell you something: I came on this committee with no preconceived notions. I believe my colleague from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE), who voted against this committee twice, had the same feelings. Both of us, I think, have put before the Members our reputations and our belief that if this does not go ahead, this country is in very serious trouble, and our