

Mr. BAUMAN. But this continuing resolution will fund that committee?

Mr. DENT. No. As I understand, and I may be in error, and if I am, I would be glad to be corrected, the Select Committee on Assassinations was continued earlier in the session at its reduced rate, exactly the rate they were operating under at that time.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON. The distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, is correct, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland. Under the continuing resolution which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, has before him, the Select Committee on Assassinations will receive nothing else until it is heard by the Subcommittee on Accounts and is run through the Committee on House Administration and then to the floor of the House and will continue to operate under the approximate figure of 84,000 and some dollars per month, and no more.

I would hope the gentleman would not object to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAUMAN. In deference to the gentleman from New Jersey, I will certainly not cause any obstruction to this resolution, and that is strictly due to the best efforts of my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4800, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT OF 1977

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4800), the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 1977, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: The gentleman from Oregon, Mr. ULLMAN; the gentleman from California, Mr. CORMAN; the gentleman from New York, Mr. RANGEL; the gentleman from California, Mr. STARK; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. JACOBS; the gentlewoman from Kansas, Mrs. KEYS; the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. FISHER; the gentleman from New York, Mr. CONABLE; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. VANDER JAGT; and the gentleman from California, Mr. KETCHUM.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF U.S. DELEGATION OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 22 United States Code 276d, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group to be held in Vancouver, British Columbia, on May 27 to May 31, 1977, the following Members on the part of the House: The gentleman from Florida, Mr. FASCELL, Chairman; the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHNSON, Vice Chairman; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; the gentleman from Florida, Mr. GIBBONS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. HANLEY; the gentleman from Washington, Mr. MEEDS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. LAFALCE; the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. CAVANAUGH; the gentleman from New York, Mr. McEWEN; the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. WYNN; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODLING; and the gentleman from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS.

GEN. GEORGE BROWN OUGHT TO RESIGN OR BE FIRED

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. George Brown, ought to resign or be fired. His most recent remarks prove once again that he is unfit to continue as the Nation's highest military official.

General Brown's comments in the past have revealed an appalling lack of discretion, tolerance, or political and diplomatic sensitivity—qualities which are essential prerequisites to foreign and defense service. In 1974, he declared that Jews exert undue influence over Congress, the media, and banks. Last year, he characterized our defense commitment to Israel as a burden, Britain's Armed Forces as pathetic, and the Shah of Iran as having "visions of the Persian Empire." These statements were inaccurate then, and linger as continuing embarrassments today. But even his past excesses pale in comparison to the latest exposure into the thoughts of Chairman Brown. The mind processes of the Chairman make it clear that he ought to find another forum to spew his junk.

Congress is not, and should never be, immune from public criticism. Indeed, our republican system acknowledges, and even welcomes, the right of citizens to question, challenge, protest, and petition their Government. That function, however, cannot extend to the top military officials who are charged with insuring the national defense. As President Truman so appropriately noted when he was left with no other option than to relieve General MacArthur almost 26 years ago:

Full and vigorous debate on matters of national policy is a vital element in the constitutional system of our free democracy. It is fundamental, however, that military com-

manders must be governed by the policies and directives issued to them in the manner provided by our laws and Constitution.

One of the hallmarks of a free society is civilian control over the military. The military does not make policy; it executes it. Our generals do not select which policies to carry out; they act on whatever determination has already been made. Through their elected representatives in Congress and the executive, the people of the United States determine what their foreign policy will be and what defense posture should be taken. In giving the back of his hand to this process, General Brown has shown his insensitivity to the difficulty of holding on to a free parliamentary process. Were it up to him, we would have more efficient people in Congress who did not meddle in foreign affairs or military affairs. Maybe he would prefer the Members of Congress to clear their remarks and votes with him or the Joint Chiefs before we exercised our function.

General Brown's advocacy of privacy invasion and condemnation of congressional input in the decisionmaking process harken back to our recent past, when the American people were routinely denied the truth about their military operations and were bugged almost to death as a democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see General Brown free to criticize Congress and the Jews and the British and the newspapers to his heart's content. He can do that if he is restored to that civilian status which would suit him so much better than his present spot. Indeed, if he is not sent there soon, the rest of us will lose our right to criticize the General Browns that come into high military position every once in a while. Nowhere is the eternal vigilance that Jefferson urged on us more urgent than when we are dealing with the encroachment of the military on the civilian control of Government.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ASSASSINATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MOAKLEY). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. GONZALEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN).

Mr. KAZEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

During the debate on the assassinations resolution this afternoon I attempted on several occasions to get recognition from the Chair but before I could do so the motion on the previous question was ordered. I wanted to take the time of the Committee—which in my opinion was the proper thing to do at that time, but not having been able to, I do it now—to publicly thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for the work that he did in bringing

forth the resolution calling for the creation of an Assassinations Committee and later for the work that he did as chairman of the committee.

I want to state to the Members here today that had it not been for the work that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) did on that committee, had it not been for what he did in relation to the chief counsel on that committee, the committee today would not have accepted the resignation of Mr. Sprague. They had to accept his resignation because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) put it on the line and they could ill afford to keep that kind of person on the staff.

So when we come right down to it, Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the main reasons the resolution passed this afternoon was because of the magnificent work done by the gentleman from Texas, because we know now had they not fired Mr. Sprague that resolution would never have been adopted by the House. So I for one would like to thank the gentleman in the well for the tremendous job that he did, and I might say that the House vindicated his position. Even the committee vindicated his position and his actions.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I am deeply grateful for his words. He and I have served in the Texas State Senate. He had a very illustrious background of public service in Texas, going back since he returned as a combat veteran from World War II.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, I would like to echo and endorse the statement the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN) just made. I join him wholeheartedly. I think he has quite well pointed out that had it not been for the efforts of the gentleman in the well to relieve a very difficult situation, that is to remove Mr. Sprague from his position, it would have been impossible I believe for the resolution to have passed.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I wish to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT), who also has had a very distinguished record of service in Texas and of course he has served with great distinction in the House.

These words are heart warming, particularly in view of the rather unfair assaults I have received on the Washington level from some female harridan columnists in the Washington press corps without any opportunity to have justice in that respect, and so testimonials from men who do know me and have known me over a period of 24 years of publicly held elective office are most encouraging.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment on that point?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have known the gentleman in the well for many years. I was absolutely astounded at a statement that the gentleman is inclined to be emotional, to take an arbi-

trary or hard position. I have found the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) to be one of the most courteous member of any body in which the gentleman has served. But he is also a most dedicated and strong-minded man. I remember the gentleman in the well conducted for a longer period than any other member of any legislative body in the world a filibuster against nine bills that would have had the effect of impeding the Brown decision in Texas. It was one of the finest displays of a forceful and able defense of the Supreme Court's decision on the question of civil rights that I think ever occurred in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for that, and I hope the Nation remembers the gentleman's effort in that regard.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, once again I thank my very esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

The gentleman evokes memories of exactly 20 years ago, and it is with bitterness that I say this. The gentleman who spoke previously, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN), and I, were colleagues in arms in the Texas State Senate, the only legislative body of the 11 Confederate States where the so-called massive resistance kit that emanated from Virginia and finally worked itself over to the Texas Legislature were resisted. The Texas Senate was the only legislative body where these infamous laws, because they were an attempt to freeze into law the Jim Crow provisions of the Texas constitution and statutes and to undo the Brown decision of the Supreme Court, among others. In effect, there were a total of 14 bills before the year was out, because the Governor was compelled to cause two special sessions of the legislature. It was exactly 20 years ago and there was nobody else in Texas who fought. It was another world. It was weird. We were intimidated. We had pistoleros, gunmen come in from the white citizens' council, from another world. We would never recognize it today, thank God; but it is ironic that 20 years later there would be a solid black cabal in the select committee that would lead the fight to undo me in a most malicious way, because I cannot characterize the role of the Delegate from the District of Columbia with respect to my ethics, with respect to my situation as chairman after February 2, other than malicious, other than a calculated premeditated effort to first seek the Speaker to knock me out as chairman and then a calculated course to resist my serving as chairman, at least in any reasonable, harmonious way; so, of course, I am bitter because it seems not that I expect ever in politics any such thing as gratitude. I would take the same position again and I would have taken it if it had involved anybody else, because I looked upon it then as merely living up to the oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in my own district Americans of black or Negro descent constitute less than 8 percent. They did so then, but that made no difference. I just feel that in view of that fact it is ironic that exactly 20 years almost to the

month I would have received my thanks from the black cabal.

Mr. Speaker, I believe awhile ago the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN) had sought recognition. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey at this time.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, what could make it more natural than the fashion in which a reputable lawyer had stated his respected views? I would like to join and also pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

As many know, I voted against the committee. In my experience, this is wasting the taxpayer's money; but insofar as the role of the gentleman goes to action, I want the gentleman to know from one Member that I am deeply appreciative to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the gentleman very much. I equally express a sincere and heartfelt sense of gratitude for those expressions from the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. He has indeed—and in fact, has always—been a friend, even when I came as a callow freshman. One does not forget those things.

Mr. PATTEN. Even when the gentleman was fighting Ed Foreman at that time.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Even during that time period, that is right, from the very beginning. I have not forgotten this, and I surely never will.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Of course, this Member is not prepared to say anything against any other Member of the House, but I certainly do support the proposition that what was done 20 years ago was not just a matter favorable to that minority generally called "Mexican Americans" in Texas.

I well remember traveling across that State at the time the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) was speaking, and reading the newspapers. I happened to be going from Dallas to Edinburgh, and over this sketch of Texas terrain there was a switch in position. In Dallas, newspapers favored the bills that would retard equal opportunities in the schools, and the further one went south, the more one found GONZALEZ's name spoken with reverence and praise. What HENRY GONZALEZ' effort did in Texas was to consolidate two groups who had been discriminated against for years in Texas. There was a time, as the gentleman in the well knows better than I, when there were three separate sets of schools in Texas, and the worst school facilities were found in the so-called Mexican-American schools. The reason for that was that people were not so afraid of a breakdown of segregation between so-called Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans as they were between blacks and whites. So they took the risk of even greater discrimination against the browns than against blacks.

But, the thing the gentleman in the well did in Texas that should never be

forgotten is that he consolidated the forces as between all who were being discriminated against at that time, and achieved more advance in Texas, more recognition of the equal rights of people, whether white, black, or brown, than any man I know of in Texas.

It was not too long after that, when to openly attack a politicians because he was fair to minorities became absolutely taboo in politics in our State.

Before the gentleman in the well took his stand and made his filibuster, it was the commonest thing in the world to attack everyone who stood for equal rights in Texas on the grounds that he was too friendly to minorities. They used a very ugly term for that. So, I do not think anybody in my State deserves more praise than the gentleman in the well for advancing equal rights of all persons without regard to race.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am particularly grateful for this, because although the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) has said that before, it has never been on the record. As I say, I think when we take an oath of office, once we are elected there is no black, white, brown; there is no economic minority or majority; there is no rich or poor. One has a duty to represent each and every one, even those who did not vote for us.

Well, President Benito Juarez it was who told my grandfather when they were fighting against the French and won, my grandfather was what was known as Jefe Politico, and alcalde of his area.

The group which fought so successfully against the French came to him and said, "Why did the President want to appoint this man over here? He is a Spaniard; he did not help us fight against the French."

So, my grandfather eventually got to Mexico City and brought the matter up with the President. The President said, "Don Joaquin, please tell our friends, is there anybody there that fought with us that we have not taken care of?"

My grandfather said, "No." The President said, "Well, will you please convey to our friends my message to please accept my judgment in this matter? It is true that this man is a Spaniard; it is true that he did not fight, but he did not fight us either, and I have a reason for appointing him to what I did."

Remember, when you win, when you triumph, justice, justice, always justice to those you defeated and your enemies. But for your friends, justice and everything else that you can.

And I think that that is a pretty good political lesson that came straight from President Benito Juarez to my grandfather.

I think in this case I have felt that very seriously since I was a city councilman, because once I was elected I would not be more eager to serve those constituents who helped me more than I would this one who has a legitimate cause but did not help me.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA).

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I could not in good conscience pass up the opportunity to mention that the gentleman should not have to mention the things that he did in the State Senate of Texas. I was serving in the house at the time when his bills were introduced. And, like here, we could not filibuster in the house. We made every attempt possible, sidetracking one bill here, sidetracking another bill there, but the effort had to be made in the senate. And as the gentleman mentioned, in the wee hours of the morning, perhaps 1:30, 2:00 o'clock, we would come over there to give him encouragement. And right outside the gallery was an old black gentleman preacher, who came all the way from east Texas, and he told us, "God bless HENRY GONZALEZ, God bless him forever. May we always have friends like that."

The gentleman did what he thought was the right thing to do, regardless of the opposition. It took great courage in Texas at that time. It is easy now to look back, but it took great personal courage to stand up in the senate of the State of Texas and speak out, long before the world knew there was a Martin Luther King or Selma or Montgomery. And long before "We shall overcome" was sung, the gentleman in the well was doing it, because he thought it was the right thing to do, in the senate of the State of Texas.

And I remember him saying and pointing to some of his colleagues, "For whom the bells toll." He said, "They toll for you, because right"—I think the gentleman used the word—"shall overcome in the end."

And then when they had a constitutional amendment to bring the vote to the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman speaking handled it in the House. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. KAZEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) worked in the senate for Texas to confirm, against the objections of many of the same colleagues, that the District of Columbia should have the right to vote and then to have representation. The people of the District of Columbia and, I certainly would hope, those representatives, should have nothing but respect for HENRY GONZALEZ and those who were far away from here and those who were really not suffering the scourge of discrimination, of sitting in the back of the bus. It was people like Mr. GONZALEZ who began the fight, out of the battlefield of Selma and Montgomery. That is where it all began.

I might mention that in the senate of the State of Texas, as in the well of this House, the gentleman stood in the forefront.

Mr. GONZALEZ. I thank the very distinguished gentleman from Texas. Again, I am very grateful, because this is the first time on the record.

I will go further. Before I got to the State senate, in my own hometown I had the honor of fighting an attempt to pass segregative ordinances in 1954.

I stood alone. I lost that fight. The vote was 8 to 1.

The city council of San Antonio did what appeared to be about the same thing the House has been doing here with respect to the Select Committee on Assassinations, about the same thing that the members of the Select Committee on Assassinations have been doing. It is hard to explain. There is no logic, no reason for it. After 124 years of municipal life, since 1839, the city of San Antonio decided on June 19, 1954—which is a date we know as Juneteenth because that is Emancipation Day in Texas—to pass certain ordinances. The city council in San Antonio met and passed segregatory ordinances to prevent citizens of black or Negro descent from being allowed access to swimming pools paid for by tax moneys of the city of San Antonio and access to the Municipal Auditorium and all other public facilities except a golf course. The ordinance provided that the blacks could use that golf course on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays exclusively.

I stood up and fought that. I lost 8 to 1. But I was the only one who was reelected, for other reasons, to that city council.

When I came back, within 1 year's time, in 1956, I had the honor of introducing and having accepted unanimously the resolution that did away with discrimination on account of race, color, or creed in any tax-supported facility of the city of San Antonio.

Again I received threats. I had burning crosses thrown out on the front lawn of my house. My wife was phoned and threatened. It looked as if it was political suicide.

As it turned out, it was not that at all. The ordinance prevailed, and San Antonio became the first city south of the Mason-Dixon Line to pass that type of desegregatory ordinance, and that was on April 19, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, I bring that up only because we got into this theme and also because I think that it is obvious that certain members of the committee, under the leadership of the delegate from the District of Columbia and supported solidly by the three other black members of the select committee, picking up support from at least two other members of the select committee, had appealed to the Speaker to dismiss me as chairman. They had made up their minds to resist my appointment as the committee chairman.

They never had the guts, they never had the courage to confront me and say, "We don't accept you. We won't work with you. The Speaker may have felt committed to naming you, but we don't intend to work with you harmoniously."

If they had, I would have accepted that, I can assure the Members. I would have known exactly what to do, because I certainly am not enamored of the title of chairman. I was not elected chairman of the committee by the people of the 20th Congressional District of Texas; I was elected for what I am: The Representative to the U.S. House of Repre-

sentatives from the 20th District of Texas. That is all, and that is all I expected. I have yet to request any privileges. I have yet to conspire or to grasp for any kind of designation, because I feel that I came up here to work.

Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to place certain facts concerning my attendance record in this RECORD, since my absence last month might indicate that perhaps my attendance might have some deficiency. I would like to point out that for 12 consecutive years my attendance in this House was perfect in every detail, including quorum calls, yea and nay votes, and everything else. Then when my mother took seriously ill and I had other complications involving a member of the family 2 years ago, I lost a few days for the first time. However, up to the time that I left here on February 19, my average attendance and voting record for 15 years and 2 months was 98.6 percent. So when I did finally take the break that I had last month, it was in effect mandated by what I had to confront here, which is the reason I wanted to speak this afternoon.

The House has acted on this resolution anew, but it does not in any way help my situation in making sure that the record reflects the chronological sequence of events and what happened, because, as I have said in the last 2 days of the special orders, it was nowhere to be found.

The record revealed that when my resignation was presented to the House, the whole truth was not given the Members of the House. Under those circumstances, I felt impelled and compelled that as soon as I could, I would come back. What is it that I have? I have no power. I do not even have the support of the leadership. I do not even have the support of those who were expecting that they were expecting me to assert leadership. However, I did have the only thing, which is the forum of this House. That is all, ultimately, that a Member has; and therefore, I have resorted to it.

I made very serious allegations, specific allegations. They were not general. During the course of debate today, I felt constraint, first, because I had no real knowledge as to what treatment I would receive, particularly by the majority Members who were handling the time.

Before this, their treatment of me has been arrogant. It has been dictatorial, authoritarian. It has not been very democratic.

Therefore, I felt that any insistence on my part to get up would merely give reason and credence to those who were saying that all I am expressing is "sour grapes."

I will say, however, that there is a lot more involved in this. When we evoke the memory of the things in the State senate in which my stint began exactly 20 years ago, I was critical of the senate then. I found myself at cross-purposes at one point with the Governor, with the Lieutenant Governor, and with the leadership of the senate. I had a fight over the appointment of a judge. I asked the senate not to confirm that appointment, and the senate solidly backed me even though it caused me to be worse

treated than anything one might have read about here.

What happened? I was critical at that time. If anyone had asked me, I would have said that in all the English-speaking world the most undemocratic parliamentary body in this State senate. But now all I can say is that there was a residual virtue; there was an inherently sound core of integrity in the institutional life of that senate then, even with what I felt were arbitrary tactics, which is not present in this House.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the House and up to recently, a few years back, I could say, yes, there was an inherent core of health in the institutional vigor of this House, in its leadership, and in its procedures. I find that has eroded seriously; and the course of events reflected in the setting up and in the history, brief as it is, of the Select Committee on Assassinations clearly reveals that.

There were several things that happened with respect to actions that I took in my endeavor to state the record and to give the truth and the rational and logical reasons which motivated each action once I was named chairman, which I should refer to.

For instance, at no time did I have any indication from anybody in leadership position, the Speaker, majority leader, majority whip, or chairman of the Caucus, all whom intervened in this matter, or the chairman of the Committee on House Administration or the subcommittee chairmen thereof, that there was anything other than the strict mandate of the House of Representatives as reflected in House Resolution 222 that said that all the committee had was \$34,333 per month, period, for any purpose, for all purposes.

What do we find now? Lo and behold, the chairman of the committee now, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Stokes), now says, and he told the Committee on Rules on March 28 and repeated it today, with no questions from anybody, that the committee had at no time been guilty of overspending that amount or that stricture mandated under House Resolution 222.

In the record of February 16, in which I placed the statement I made at the time that I attempted to have a committee meeting to take up the matter of overexpenditure, I introduced a letter into the record that had been written by the chairman of the House Committee on Administration in which it clearly indicated that there were overexpenditures and overcommitments and that something would have to be done.

Well, now we find that, no, technically, they did not use that money to overspend but, all of a sudden, the chairman says they have had a lot of money to go traveling to interview witnesses for the investigators. They have had money to make long distance telephone calls. They have had money to do a lot of things.

And he now says, though he said it in a lower tone and in a less obvious way:

Oh, by the way, when this resolution is approved today and we go back to the House Committee on Administration, we are going to get \$2,768,000, of which \$200,000 will

pay back the contingency fund of the House of Representatives.

What does this mean? Oh, where are the apostles of frugality over here like the gentleman from Illinois who sits on the committee, and also on the Committee on Rules, Mr. ANDERSON? I have always heard him get up and just get adamant about accountability.

Now, when did this happen? When did the committee get the right to dip into the contingency fund of the House? By whose authority?

The House said all the committee could have was \$84,333.

What happened here?

Lo and behold, when I was chairman, that was prohibited, that was absolutely off limits. What happened? Since when was this \$200,000 debt to the House contingency fund incurred? Who has accounted for it? Who gave the order? Who sanctioned it? The committee on its own?

Interesting.

Another question came up. The gentleman from Ohio said I shut off the records from the FBI, as if I were the Attorney General. Well, first let me say I did not shut off any records. That is a canard. It is a lie of whole cloth.

I did meet with the Attorney General the week of February 8, if I remember correctly it was on a Wednesday, or perhaps a Thursday, for another reason. I asked to meet with him not to discuss the committee. Oh, a few people like the delegate from the District of Columbia jumped to the conclusion I was going to ask him about the FBI report they were talking about at that time. But, like many other things he does, he jumped to the wrong conclusion. I wanted to talk to the Attorney General about a malodorous case that arose in an adjacent county concerning the murder of a Mexican young man while he was handcuffed by a municipal police officer and then his body had been taken in a truck by the police officer's wife all the way some 225 miles to another point in Texas. And in sort of a fouled-up west Texas sparsely settled court atmosphere that man had not even been tried for murder, he was tried for a lower felony and given probation.

There was loud indignation at this from the Mexican-American community, and from every other body, whether Mexican-American or not. Some of us had asked the outgoing Attorney General, the outgoing administration, to do something about it, and they refused. I wanted to talk to Attorney General Bell about the violations of the civil rights of this man Morales. Then in the course of conversing with him on that, he brought two of his assistants and informed me that they had gained permission, although none had ever been asked of the committee, much less the chairman, for certain staff members of the Assassinations Committee to go back into the files of the FBI. Mind you, we have all of these members of the Assassinations Committee saying that I had exceeded my authority. But in January, before there was any committee—there was no committee; there was no staff director—the late unlamented staff director took it on him-

self the first week in January to get into a very, very bitter dispute with then Attorney General Levi about third-dimensional evidentiary material that the Archives has in its possession in connection with the Kennedy assassination. It looked as though there were going to be an ugly confrontation. I did not see anybody protesting when I was asked to, please, come in and avoid this altercation. I was not chairman. There was no committee. But where were these others? Why did they not do something then? No, they were asking me to do it. The counsel himself called me and said:

I do not know what to do. This FBI is defying me.

I said:

It is not a foreign government. I am going to go over there and sit down and talk to them.

So when I went over, I could not meet with them, so we corresponded and talked on the telephone. The Attorney General then said:

We are willing to make this bulletin that was found down there in Dallas somewhere available to you, but you do not have a committee. In the meanwhile we are not going to allow you to come in and have access to our records until you are constituted again.

He was right. We had to accept it. We were reconstituted then on February 2. Without telling the Chairman or any members of the committee, the two lawyers—one of whom sat here this afternoon—took it on themselves and went to the FBI and demanded access to the files again, saying:

Last night the House reconstituted the committee.

I was not aware of it, but in the meanwhile I was aware that that same committee staff had either lost or misplaced four photographs of the Martin Luther King autopsy that they had taken from the Tennessee authorities, and Mr. Sprague, the counsel, had told me all along that the reason they had not taken physical possession of 99 percent of the evidence that had been subpoenaed in November and December was that we had no hold-safe facilities where we could guarantee the integrity of the preservation particularly of the three-dimension evidentiary material or artifacts.

I communicated this to the Attorney General, and I said:

Mr. Attorney General, I do not know who is over there. I am not aware of it, and I will ask you, please, to suspend any access to those files right now unless and until the staff requests the Chairman to make that request in turn.

They never did. Mr. Sprague refused. His staff refused. The Attorney General said:

We are going to honor the Chairman's request because we think it is reasonable and because we do not want to be guilty of finding that some of the evidentiary documentation that we have will get lost.

I defy the present committee, the leadership, the outgoing konked out chief counsel to assure this House that the rifle that they have in their possession, that is supposed to be the rifle that James Earl Ray used, is safe and

sound and preserved in a manner that will not embarrass the House at some future time.

I demand to know if they ever located the four missing autopsy photographs of Martin Luther King. They were certainly lost as of a month ago and misplaced. That is the reason for that.

And if the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DEVINE) had bothered to ask and be present at the meetings called for he might have gotten the truth in case he is interested in that.

Oh, there is another thing. A Member of the House who I think now is on the committee and is pretty new talked about how I was wrong when I said that there were \$9,900 plus in terms of expense vouchers that were presented to me that same week that I met with the Attorney General and which included as the biggest single item in that list long-distance telephone call expenses. And in turn those attributed to Sprague formed the biggest single item in that list of long-distance telephone calls. I reiterate that statement. That is exactly the way it was.

But the gentleman who spoke today was nowhere near the committee at that time. At best he could not have come on to the committee until after my resignation, and then had access to vouchers. He said it was not \$9,900 for December 1976, over which we had no authority and I had no authority then and the books had closed on the 94th Congress. Where was the money coming from for that? He said:

Oh, no, it was not \$9,000. It was \$11,000.

The truth is that the dollar amount of nonsalary expenses for the month of December for the committee exceeded \$22,000, but the only vouchers I was ever given and asked to sign blindly were for \$9,000 plus, and I repeat that statement and I stand behind every bit of it.

Now this man said Sprague gave his check for \$124. If he did, he did it recently, and if the rest of the committee is honest and accountable, why do they not search the records for November and October and find out how much Sprague owes for those long-distance calls? I do not see anybody talking about that.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), the chairman of the committee, said that they reluctantly accepted the resignation of this erstwhile chief counsel and staff director, that they had all faith in him, that at all times he was a great guy. Well, the best I can say in the most charitable sense is that Mr. Stokes has a very facile memory because on December 6 right here where we were assembling for the preorganizational Democratic Caucus, the delegate from District of Columbia, the vizier from Washington, says:

I am ready to bust this thing up. I picked up the paper yesterday and read where Sprague hired two guys from New York and they are both white and one of them is going to be the deputy counsel for Martin Luther King and that is where I come in and I am ready to denounce him and fire him.

I said:

Oh, whoa, just a minute.

Mr. STOKES was at the counter in the cloak room. I summoned him. I said:

Mr. Stokes, at the last meeting we had in November, which was November 15 and 16, you were ready to demand the resignation of Mr. Sprague because you said he had hired only 4 blacks and he had hired a total of 37 people by then. Do you remember that?

He said:

Yes.

I said:

Well, have you been satisfied?

He said:

Well, I do not know, I just wash my hands. I do not trust him.

So I then took it on myself to call on the other members of the committee and I said:

Hold off. Let us get together and let us get the staff counsel because we have got to get the chairman.

At that time, remember, the chairman was the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Downing).

Well, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Downing) was in Virginia, but the gentleman was on his way back to the district. The gentleman advised that he would not get in until 6 o'clock, so I arranged a breakfast the next morning at 8 a.m. and all but two members of the committee showed up. I said:

This is what has come up, gentlemen. What is the best way to handle it?

They all agreed. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Downing) showed up for the breakfast and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Downing) said:

I will arrange a meeting at 1:30 with Mr. Sprague and Mr. Fauntroy and Mr. Stokes or anyone else that wants to. Will I miss out?

They must have ironed it out, because when I talked to the delegate from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) about 4 p.m. that afternoon, they said:

Yes, sir; it's okay. We think he is going to be okay.

But I do not know whether he hired any more blacks or whether he did not. I think they had a good point. Why should not there be a black deputy counsel in charge of the Martin Luther King assassination? Why is not one now? I thought they had a good point, but apparently they were satisfied. All of a sudden they say, he has always been okay, but they wanted to fire him as of December 6. The Delegate told me right then and there that he was about to call a press conference. I dissuaded him from it.

In the presentation before the Committee on Rules on Monday, March 28, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES) told the chairman and the rajah of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), he said:

Gonzalez acted without consulting the rest of the committee. I do not want to deal now with the staff problems. The staff would have walked out if Sprague had been fired. The staff feels that the charges against Sprague are unjust and untrue.