

H 10356

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

September 17, 1976

of this paragraph; shall make studies, develop information, and make recommendations toward remedying these differences and include these in the annual Employment and Training Report of the President; and, if deemed necessary, make recommendations to the Congress within ninety days related to the objectives of this paragraph.

## LABOR STANDARDS

SEC. 402. The policies and programs implemented and provided for by this Act, and funded in whole or in part through this Act, shall provide that persons employed pursuant to such policies and programs are paid equal wages for equal work, and that such policies and programs create a net increase in employment through work that would not otherwise be done. The President shall insure that any person employed in a reservoir project under section 206(d) or in any other job utilizing funds provided in whole or in part under this Act shall be paid not less than the pay received by others performing similar work for the same employer, and in no case less than the minimum wage under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as amended. No person employed under section 206(d) shall perform work of the type to which the Bacon-Davis Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5) applies. Any recommendation by the President for legislation to implement any program under this Act, requiring the use of funds under this Act, and submitted pursuant to the requirements of this Act, shall contain appropriate wage provisions based upon existing wage standard legislation.

## AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 403. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be needed to carry out the provisions of this Act. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, no provision shall be construed to require expenditures in excess of amounts appropriated pursuant to this Act.

## DEFINITIONS

SEC. 404. (a) "Fiscal drag" as used in section 106 means tax and expenditure rates which, in combination, substantially impede attainment (or maintenance) of full employment, production, and purchasing power.

(b) "Balanced growth" in the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Plan means projecting and achieving (1) the relationship between production or supply capability and demand, and (2) the relationships among the growth rates of private investment, private consumer expenditures, and public outlays, and also (3) the purchasing power, including important components of each element mentioned in (1), (2), and (3) above, required to achieve and then maintain full employment and production and appropriate servicing of national priorities, these to be promoted by the programs and policies set forth in this Act and by encouragement of voluntary cooperation within the private sector (for example, between labor and management) and between the Government and the private sector.

(c) "Frictional unemployment" means the lowest level of unemployment, determined on the basis of evolving experience, consistent with labor mobility, changing job patterns, freedom of job choice, and sufficient job search on a voluntary basis.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to establish and translate into practical reality the right of all adult Americans able, willing, and seeking to work to full opportunity for useful paid employment at fair rates of compensation; to combine full employment, production, and purchasing power goals with proper attention to balanced growth and national priorities; to mandate such national economic policies and programs as are necessary to achieve full employment, production, and purchasing power; to restrain inflation; and to provide explicit machinery for the development and implementation of such economic policies and programs."

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. 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. 747]

Abzug	Hébert	Railsback
Adams	Hecker, Mass.	Randall
Alexander	Helms	Rangel
Andrews, N.C.	Helstoski	Rees
Ashley	Hinsaw	Richmond
AuCoin	Holland	Riegle
Badillo	Howe	Rodino
Bell	Ichord	Roncalio
Boiling	Jacobs	Rose
Bonker	Jarman	Rosenthal
Bowen	Johnson, Pa.	Roussetot
Breaux	Jones, Ala.	Roybal
Burke, Calif.	Karh	Ruppe
Burton, John	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Byron	Kelly	Santini
Carney	Kemp	Sarbanes
Carter	Ketchum	Scheuer
Chappell	Keys	Schneebell
Chisholm	Kindness	Schroeder
Clancy	Krueger	Shipley
Cleveland	Lent	Shuster
Collins, Ill.	Lott	Skubitz
Conlan	McCloskey	Snyder
Conyers	McCollister	Stanton,
Cotter	McFall	James V.
Coughlin	Madigan	Stark
Derwinski	Mann	Steelman
Diggs	Matsunaga	Steiger, Ariz.
Dingell	Mazzoli	Stephens
Dodd	Meeds	Stuckey
Eckhardt	Meicher	Symington
Edwards, Calif.	Metcalf	Talcott
Emery	Meyner	Teague
Esch	Mikva	Thornton
Eshleman	Milford	Udall
Flynt	Mineta	Vander Jagt
Ford, Tenn.	Mink	Vander Veen
Fraser	Mitchell, Md.	Waxman
Fuqua	Mosher	Wilson, Tex.
Gialmo	Moss	Winn
Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.	Wirth
Green	O'Hara	Wolf
Hagedorn	Patterson,	Wright
Hansen	Calif.	Wyder
Harkin	Pepper	Yatron
Harsha	Pike	Young, Alaska
	Pressler	Young, Ga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. Jordan). On this rollcall 291 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

## CREATING SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY ASSASSINATIONS OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AND MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

Mr. MADDEN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 1540) creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the death of John F. Kennedy and the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., and of any others the select committee shall determine, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1540

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of twelve Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the select

committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The select committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the death of John F. Kennedy and the death of Martin Luther King, Junior, and of any others the select committee shall determine.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the select committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the select committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary; except that neither the select committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting under the five-minute rule unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. The chairman of the select committee may establish such subcommittees of the select committee as he considers appropriate. A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that the select committee may designate a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony. The select committee may employ and fix the compensation of such clerks, experts, consultants, technicians, attorneys, investigators, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it considers necessary to carry out the purpose of this resolution. The select committee may reimburse the members of its staff for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the select committee, other than expenses in connection with meetings of the select committee or any subcommittee thereof held in the District of Columbia. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the select committee or any member of the select committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The select committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 1540 provides for the establishment of a select committee to be composed of 12 members to be appointed by the Speaker. The select committee is directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the death of John F. Kennedy and the death of Martin Luther King, Jr., and of any others the select committee shall determine.

House Resolution 1540 provides that the select committee is authorized to sit and meet throughout the remainder of the 94th Congress whether or not the

is in session and also provides the select committee shall have no power.

Wednesday, September 15, the Committee reported this resolution by a vote of 9 to 4, with 1 abstention. Our committee feels that the time is right to begin an investigation of how these assassinations occurred.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. YATES, has received hundreds of letters and telegrams from all over the country on this issue. An overwhelming majority strongly urged approval of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I support House Resolution 1540, and I urge the adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman this question: What does the gentleman mean following the granting of authority for investigating the circumstances surrounding the death of John Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., to quote, "of any others the Select Committee shall determine"?

Will this committee investigate the assassination attempts on the life of John F. Kennedy, for example? Can it examine any assassination attempt it wishes to?

Mr. MADDEN. Madam Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) to answer that question.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I would like to advise my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES), that "any others" has no specific meaning.

Myself wish the words had never been included in the resolution, but it would lead to the determination of the committee as to what "any others" means. It could mean that if there was a post-assassination attempt on the life of the present President, the committee, I suppose, would have the discretion to go into that. However, it would be entirely up to the judgment of the committee.

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I share the gentleman's statement when he says he does not think this phrase was not in there.

I think it gives the committee enormous power to go into any possible kind of assassination attempt on any person throughout the world.

Madam Speaker, I wonder why this phrase should have been inserted. I wonder why the Committee on Rules included it.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Presumably it could mean what the gentleman says. However, I think we are going to trust the judgment of the committee to do what is right. This phrase pertains to American leaders, not to persons.

Mr. YATES. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me that the committee's investigation of

the assassinations of former President Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., would be enough of a charge upon the committee. I would hope that there would be no effort to go into any other.

I believe it gives the committee far too much power, power beyond the original intent of the resolution.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I have told the gentleman that I wish the words were not in there; but I can assure him that insofar as I have anything to do with it, I would not want the power to be too broad, and I hope the gentleman from Illinois votes for the resolution.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. MADDEN, for yielding to me.

Let me say that I raised the same question before the Committee on Rules. I would like to ask the gentleman why this language should not be stricken when this matter comes on for debate today?

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have no objection to striking those words.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MCKINNEY).

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

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to congratulate the Committee on Rules on this resolution. This is something I became involved in about 5 years ago. I do not know of any plots or any secrets, but I do know that I think the attitude of the American people is that there are questions that have not been put to rest. I think the questions that have not been put to rest about the Government have severely damaged the credibility of our Nation's Government and of our system.

I would hope that this committee quietly, very seriously and in a very hard working fashion can come out with the final answers that the American people have asked.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON).

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I too have some very real doubts as to some of the circumstances involved, particularly those surrounding the Kennedy assassination and perhaps we can get at some of the facts and questions that have been raised such as the unnatural deaths of certain of the people connected with the assassination, incidents that seem to be continuing right up to now as for in-

stance, the recent murder of Roselli a month or two ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, my most immediate interest is as to the funding of the committee and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) who will be the chairman of the committee.

I am curious as I say, as to the nature of the funding. First, we are limited to this Congress and, of course, we have the proposed date of October 2 for adjournment although I do not know that we will get out at that time. I would ask the gentleman from Virginia if he has any idea as to how much it will cost? I assume they will come to our committee for the funds they need, or it is going to be a direct tap on the contingency fund? How much does the gentleman anticipate it will cost?

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Alabama is correct in his assumption in the first instance that we will appear before his committee and ask for funds. We will ask for, it is estimated, \$250,000. This will be for organizational purposes, setting up of the staff, and so forth, so the committee will be ready to go at the next session of the Congress.

Mr. DICKINSON. The gentleman says "at the next session of the Congress," so I assume the gentleman does not anticipate that this special subcommittee will make any substantial progress in investigating this year. Will the committee make any report during this present Congress even though the gentleman does not expect to conduct or finish any investigations until the following Congress? I ask that, Mr. Speaker, because the resolution says:

The Select Committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study . . .

From what the gentleman has told me, the gentleman does not even anticipate making a serious start until the next Congress. Could the gentleman explain that?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me?

Mr. DICKINSON. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Under the terms of the resolution the committee will have to file a report at the end of this Congress as to the progress of the committee during the interim period. It is not expected that there will be any formal hearings, certainly before election. It may be necessary to hold some hearings in order to preserve testimony. I just cannot assure the gentleman from Alabama that it will or will not hold hearings in that regard.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, much as I sympathize with the objectives of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING), we

must remember that the select committee expires with each Congress.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would mean the creation of this select committee, then, presumably, it would appear before the Committee on House Administration for funding purposes, then the organization of the committee, so that there would be relatively little time within which to do anything before the end of this Congress. Then the select committee would expire and there would be the reconstitution of the whole process all over again in the next Congress.

It just seems to me a meritorious idea—and I say this with all respect to my dear friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who will not be with us, unfortunately, next year—that this matter, if it does deserve the attention the gentleman is convinced that it does deserve, should really wait until the 95th Congress.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. If the gentleman would yield further, we have got to get started sometime, I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that this thing has been put off too long. The longer we wait, the more difficult it will be to obtain whatever evidence still remains out there. If we can get it organized, get our priorities, and get our directions set in the remaining days of this Congress, then the 95th Congress can start off right away with substantial hearings.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DICKINSON) would yield further, I wish to point out the factual situation as I see it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

(Mr. DOWNING of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, today marks the culmination for me—and others, too, I suppose—of 15 months of intensive work and efforts to try to persuade this body to reinvestigate the assassinations of President Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

I want to thank the Speaker; I want to thank the leadership on both sides of the aisle; I want to thank the Committee on Rules for giving the House this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1540, which is sponsored by Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FAUNTROY, and me, is the refinement of a number of similar resolutions sponsored by approximately 135 Members of this body.

Two or 3 years ago—perhaps even 1 year ago—only a small fraction of us would have looked with favor upon this establishment of a select committee to re-examine the assassinations of several of our national leaders. However, today, I believe that there is overwhelming support in this House and throughout the country for an in-depth study into these traumatic events, in order to ascertain the truth, or at the very least, dispell doubts concerning them.

Most of us have reached our conclusion as to the necessity of a select committee reluctantly. However, the revelations of the last year or two have been both shocking and sobering.

Committees of both the House and the Senate have proven that much vital information was withheld from the Warren Commission. The CIA and its former Director, Allen Dulles, pointedly withheld all information relating to the multiple plots, which the U.S. Government launched, in an effort to assassinate Fidel and Raul Castro. To underline the importance of this conscious effort to deceive, we have the recent violent and unexplained murders of Sam Giancana and John Rosselli, the two Mafia chiefs who were recruited by the CIA for the assassination plots against the Cuban leaders, which I think is deplorable.

A subcommittee of the House, chaired by our colleague from California, Mr. EDWARDS, has shown how a threatening note sent by Lee Harvey Oswald to an FBI agent, shortly before President Kennedy's murder, was torn up and flushed down a toilet rather than delivered to the Warren Commission.

We know that the original autopsy notes of the chief surgeon in President Kennedy's autopsy were burned in the doctor's recreation-room fireplace.

We know that Jack Ruby had many ties to both the Mafia and to Cuba, which were either unknown to the Warren Commission, or ignored by it.

The list of such items is almost endless.

In light of all of this, there is little wonder that very few people any longer have faith in the Warren Commission's conclusions that Oswald, and Oswald alone, was responsible for the death of President Kennedy, or that Ruby, likewise, was a "lone nut killer."

In a recent CBS poll, 65 percent of those polled said they did not believe the Warren Commission's conclusions. In a Detroit News poll, it was 87 percent. In addition, most of our leading newspapers and journals now have called for a reopening of the case.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution concerns only assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. King. If and when the select committee reaches a conclusion that other cases should be reexamined in depth, it will have authority to conduct such investigations.

However, for the present, the committee's efforts will be concentrated on the deaths of these two national leaders.

It is my hope and my expectation that this select committee shall be nonpartisan, and nonpolitical. It will be dealing with matters of grave concern to all Americans, regardless of their political party, race, or section of the country. I can foresee no partisan aspect to the work of the committee. And to the extent that I am privileged to participate in its work, I shall do everything in my power to see that it remains above politics.

This committee will engage in no witch hunts. Its purpose is to arrive at the truth, not to blame those who may have erred in the original investigations.

For my part, the only conclusion I have

reached concerning the murders of President Kennedy or Dr. King is that we do not know the complete truth. Certainly in the case of President Kennedy, I am convinced that there was a conspiracy involved. I do not, however, know the identity of the conspirators or their motives. It is this that we must prove in depth.

So that there will be no question about the nonpolitical nature of the proposed committee, it has been agreed that there will be no public hearings held prior to the election in November. Some hearings may be scheduled for later this year, but most of the time will be spent in organizing staff, setting priorities, and obtaining a mass of official records. This will set the stage for prompt and deliberate action by the select committee when, as I strongly urge and expect, it will be re-established in the 95th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that each of us remembers the manner in which we heard of the assassinations of President Kennedy and of Dr. King. We may forget many of the details of our lives, but each one of us will always remember where we were, what we were doing, how we heard about these assassinations, and our own personal reaction to them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go home and face my people unless I can assure them that I have done by utmost to provide them with the knowledge of what really happened to John F. Kennedy, their President. I want them to know what happened to Dr. King. I want to be able to tell them that no one has stood in their way of learning the truth. I want to help restore in them the credibility of their Government. That they need.

I want to leave this as my legacy to the Members of the 95th Congress, the pleasure of whose country I have chosen, with great reluctance, to deny myself.

#### INTERROGATION OF LEE HARVEY OSWALD

Lee Harvey Oswald was questioned by Dallas police and by seven FBI officials for approximately 12 hours. There are no stenographic transcripts of his interrogation. No tape recorded record of the questioning was made. Capt. Will Fritz, chief of homicide, "kept no notes." The sole source of information about the interrogations are reports, based in large part on memory, prepared by some of those present and covering some of the interrogation sessions. There are no reports for several of the interrogation sessions on Friday afternoon. No transcripts were made of Oswald's arraignments for either of the two homicides with which he was charged.

Oswald was taken into custody at approximately 2 p.m. on Friday and was murdered in the basement of the Dallas Police and Courts Building on Sunday shortly after 11 a.m. Throughout his detention, Oswald was without legal representation.

On Friday evening representatives from the Dallas Civil Liberties Union appeared at the police department to determine whether Oswald was being deprived of counsel and they were told by police officials that Oswald was informed of his rights and free to seek a lawyer. They sought permission to meet

with Oswald but were unable to meet with him.

The fact that the 12 hours of interrogation by FBI agents of Lee Harvey Oswald, perhaps the most important defendant and witness in the history of our country, are lost to us forever, raises the most serious questions. What did Oswald say? Why are we unable to learn his comments? Only a congressional committee that asks those questions of the seven FBI agents can provide answers for America.

#### BURNED AUTOPSY MATERIAL

There is general agreement that an analysis of the preliminary autopsy materials would shed further light on the possibilities of the Commission's "single bullet" theory, a theory which is crucial to the Commission's conclusion that Oswald was the lone assassin. However, chief autopsy surgeon, Comdr. James J. Humes, burned "preliminary draft notes" relating to the autopsy upon the body of President Kennedy. When Humes testified before the Warren Commission on March 16, 1964, he testified that:

In the privacy of my own home, early in the morning of Sunday, November 24, I made a draft of this report which I later revised, and of which this (handwritten report of autopsy report) represents the revision. That draft I personally burned in the fireplace of my recreation room.

Commission Counsel Arlen Specter, author of the "single bullet" theory, did not ask Humes why he destroyed a crucial piece of Federal evidence in the case against Oswald.

#### JACK RUBY AND THE FBI

According to Commission Document 052 Jack Ruby worked for the FBI as an informant on organized crime in Dallas from March 11, 1959, to October 2, 1959. During that time he was contacted on nine separate occasions by Dallas FBI Special Agent Charles W. Flynn. J. Lee Rankin, general counsel for the Warren Commission received this information by courier service from J. Edgar Hoover on June 9, 1964.

Leon D. Hubert, Jr., and Bert W. Griffin, the two Commission lawyers in charge of investigating Ruby's background were not provided any information on his underworld or law enforcement affiliations. Thus the Warren Commission did not know and did not reveal the relationship between Jack Ruby and the FBI.

#### ROBERT R. McKEOWN AND JACK RUBY

In 1959, while Jack Ruby was an informant for the FBI, he went to Havana, Cuba, where he stayed at the Tropicana Hotel owned by Meyer Lansky, a king pin in organized crime. Before Ruby went to Cuba he attempted to secure a letter of introduction to Fidel Castro from Robert R. McKeown. According to the statement of McKeown, Ruby offered \$25,000 for the letter of introduction to Castro.

The year was 1959—the year organized crime entered into an alliance with the intelligence community to assassinate Fidel Castro. The two Warren Commission lawyers assigned to investigate Jack Ruby's background, Leon D. Hubert, Jr., the former district attorney of New Or-

leans, and Burt Griffin, now a judge in Cleveland, Ohio, insisted in four separate memorandums that the Commission call McKeown as a witness. The Commission did not call McKeown and did not ask Ruby any questions about the matter.

#### POSSIBLE OSWALD LINK TO CIA

Before Oswald went to Mexico in September of 1963, he had to get an entry permit from the Mexican Consulate in New Orleans. After the assassination, the FBI investigated everyone who had gotten permits in New Orleans on the same day as Oswald. To their horror, they discovered that the man immediately preceding Oswald was one William George Gaudet, a man who had worked for the CIA since its founding in 1947. After much discussion between the CIA, the FBI, and the Warren Commission, it was decided not to call Gaudet as a witness, nor even to let his identity be known until the year 2039. However, recently, and apparently by accident, Gaudet's name was made public, and he has affirmed the story of the entry permit and the coverup.

This coverup by itself is bad enough, but it becomes more sinister when one realizes that CIA-man Gaudet not only stood in line ahead of Oswald, he also had knowledge of Ruby's activities. In fact, Gaudet told the FBI on November 27, 1963—4 days after the murder—of Ruby's activities in New Orleans.

Yet to this day, Gaudet has never been subpoenaed, put under oath and questioned publicly about the links between himself, Oswald, and Ruby—and the CIA.

#### THE WARREN COMMISSION'S SECRET MEETING

Two documents recently declassified, the January 22, 1964, and the January 27, 1964, transcripts of the Warren Commission executive sessions, provide interesting reading.

The members of the Commission decided to destroy the minutes of the meetings so that the American people might not know what the Commission discussed. The minutes survived, and they reveal that the general counsel for the Warren Commission, J. Lee Rankin, reported that the two highest law enforcement officials in Texas, Waggoner Carr, the attorney general of Texas, and Henry Wade, the Dallas district attorney, both had proof that Lee Harvey Oswald was an employee of the FBI. Rankin suggested that an examination of the FBI records would reveal that Oswald worked for the FBI, but he added that Hoover would probably deny that Oswald was the agent referred to in the FBI files. Allan Dulles assured Chief Justice Warren that Hoover would not tell the Commission the truth, even under oath, if Oswald did work for the FBI. Dulles said that a good agent would lie under similar circumstances.

The Commission agreed to call the five relevant witnesses on the questioning of Oswald's employment by the FBI and to subpoena Oswald's FBI file as well. By the end of the second meeting, the Commission decided not to call the five relevant witnesses and not to subpoena the records of the FBI. Instead, the Warren Com-

mission relied exclusively upon the testimony of Mr. Hoover regarding Oswald's association with the FBI.

Yet for many Americans this question remains an open one. A question which must be resolved if we are to know how and why John Kennedy was assassinated.

#### TAPED CONVERSATION OF "OSWALD" IN MEXICO CITY

When Oswald visited Mexico City in September 1963, someone made several visits and phone calls to the Soviet and Cuban Embassies using the Oswald identity.

That there is some doubt that the person visiting and phoning the embassies was in fact Lee Harvey Oswald is evidenced by the fact that many photographs of "Oswald" were taken by CIA cameras outside both embassies. Each and every photograph which has been priored loose from the Government—and they are still withholding some—are of a man who is about 6 feet 2 inches, 175 pounds, 35 years old, and burly. "Our" Oswald was 5 feet 9 inches, 135 pounds, 24 years old, and slim. The pictures are obviously not of Oswald, though so identified by the CIA.

At the same time, the CIA—through some unknown means—tapped and taped the telephone calls of "Oswald" to the Soviet and/or Cuban Embassies. These recorded conversations were withheld from the Warren Commission. Had they been made available, or if they were made available today, voice prints of them could be made and compared with voice prints of known conversations of Lee Oswald. Then we would know for sure if there was someone else using Oswald's identity in Mexico City. And, if there are two Oswalds for sure, we can wager great odds that there was a conspiracy involved in the death of our President.

#### SECRET WIRETAPS

After the assassination, the Federal Government placed a number of wiretaps but withheld most of the "fruits" of these taps from the Warren Commission.

We are certain as to one crucial tap because of an FBI report declassified only weeks ago. This tap was either on the home phone of the Paine residence or the business phone of Michael Paine. It must be remembered that the Paines were the Oswald's closest friends in Dallas; in fact, Marina Oswald was living at the Paine residence at the time of the assassination. Oswald ostensibly stored his rifle in the Paine's garage.

On the day after the assassination, the FBI overheard Ruth and Michael Paine telling each other over the telephone that, although Oswald did the shooting, "We know who is responsible." Apparently the tapes from the conversation were withheld, because when the Paines were questioned at a later date, they denied the fact that the conversation had taken place. The FBI dropped the subject without ever facing them with a tape or an FBI agent who had monitored the conversation.

If the Oswalds' best friends, the Paines, know "who was responsible," is it not about time that the American people know?



A leading member of the Warren Commission was Allan Dulles. Mr. Dulles had been the Director of the CIA from 1953 until after the Bay of Pigs in 1961. During this time, Dulles, as the head of the CIA, must have been privy to the fact that the CIA had been actively engaged in many attempts to murder Fidel Castro in the years 1959-61.

The grimy details of the CIA excesses—especially the use made by the CIA of the Mafia in its murder plots—have been recently documented by the Church committee.

Yet, despite the Warren Commission's great interest in Oswald's many links to Cuba and to both pro-Fidel and anti-Fidel factions, Allan Dulles never said one word to the other members of the Commission about the attempts on the life of Castro. Had Allan Dulles been more forthcoming, the whole direction of the Warren investigation might have been radically different and its conclusions radically altered.

When we have a new investigation of the Dallas murder—and we will have one, whether it is this year, next year, or 10 years hence—the investigators can now realistically weigh the evidence withheld from Earl Warren by Allan Dulles to see if John Kennedy's death was directly or indirectly caused by his administration's attempts on the life of Fidel Castro.

#### THE MURDER WEAPON

A rifle was discovered on the sixth floor of the book depository building at 1:22 p.m. on November 22, 1963. The Dallas authorities told the press later that day that the weapon was a 7.65 German Mauser. Dallas District Attorney Wade repeated this information at a formal televised press conference and it was widely publicized. Deputy Constable Seymour Weitzman, on November 23, 1963, in a notarized affidavit, described the rifle he and Deputy Sheriff Boone found as "a 7.65 Mauser, bolt action equipped with a 4/18 scope, a thick leather brownish black sling on it." In a filmed interview in April 1974, Roger Craig, a deputy Sheriff also present when the rifle was found stated:

I was standing next to Weitzman, he was standing next to Fritz, and we weren't any more than six or eight inches from the rifle, and stamped right on the barrel of the rifle was 7.65 Mauser. And that's when Weitzman said, "It is a Mauser," and pointed to the 7.65 Mauser stamp on the barrel.

This description of the rifle is incompatible with the Warren Commission's case against Oswald. Although the FBI reported that Oswald owned a rifle it was not similar to the one reportedly found on the book depository sixth floor. According to the FBI, the rifle Oswald had purchased was a Mannlicher/Carcano, 6.5 Italian carbine. This rifle, which the Warren Commission identified as the murder weapon, is available for examination in the National Archives. Any individual, regardless of his experience in firearms, can clearly see it is an Italian rifle because stamped clearly on the rifle are the words, "Made Italy" and "Cal. 6.5." It is unlikely that two police officers upon close inspection

would have made such a case of mistaken identification.

Recently declassified CIA documents add further evidence that "Oswald rifle was not the rifle found in the book depository. A CIA report, dated November 25, 1963, states:

On November 22, 1963 Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy while the President was riding in an open automobile on a Dallas Texas street. The rifle used was a Mauser. . .

A second CIA report dated 5 days after the assassination states:

NOVEMBER 28, 1963.

INFORMATION ON THE WEAPON PRESUMABLY USED IN THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

1. As regards articles appearing recently in the Italian and foreign press concerning the presumed use of an Italian-made rifle in the slaying of President Kennedy, the following comments are made.

2. The weapon which appears to have been employed in this criminal attack is a model 91 rifle, 7.35 caliber, 1938 modification.

3. The description of a "Mannlicher Carcano" rifle in the Italian and foreign press is in error.

It should be clear that the initial identification of the rifle as a 7.65 Mauser clearly was not, as the Commission maintained, because Deputy Constable Weitzman "thought it looked like a Mauser." Since the Commission's case against Oswald as the lone assassin is built almost exclusively on his ownership of the 6.5 Mannlicher/Carcano, the identification of the murder weapon as 7.65 Mauser tends to discredit the entire case.

The report of the Warren Commission includes reference to a trip by Lee Harvey Oswald to Mexico City in late September of 1963, where on September 28 he visited both the Cuban and the Soviet Embassies. The report mentions that while he was in the Soviet Embassy he spoke with the Soviet Consul Kostikov, who also served as a KGB agent. Oswald referred to him as "Comrad Kostin." There is no further reference in the Warren Commission report as to the identity of Kostikov. We learned this in the recent release of some 1,500 CIA documents. I quote from one of the documents:

NOTE.—Valeriy Vladimirovich Kostikov, who has functioned overtly as a consul in the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City since September 1961, is also known to be a staff officer of the KGB. He is connected with the thirteenth, or Liquid Affairs Department, whose responsibilities include assassination and sabotage.

Upon reading this, my suspicions were very definitely aroused. Here we have the man who is considered to be the assassin of President Kennedy visiting a Soviet official whose responsibilities, according to the CIA, include assassination. I find the whole thing highly suspicious. I find it incredible. I would like to know more about Oswald's KGB contact. I would like to know why this is not mentioned in the Commission report.

#### THE HOSTY LETTER

Just as the FBI destroyed evidence in the Watergate case, equally did it do so in the Dallas case.

In one crucial instance we know that a few days before the assassination, Os-

wald hand-delivered to the FBI office in Dallas a threatening letter addressed to FBI Agent James Hosty. Two hours after Ruby shot Oswald, Hosty tore up the note and a memorandum about it, and flushed them down a toilet in the FBI office.

How can we be so sure of the details of this incident? Because a subcommittee of the House, chaired by the Honorable DON EDWARDS, held a full-fledged hearing under oath on this subject not more than a few months ago. Such facts as I have stated are perfectly clear.

What is not clear is: First, the nature of the threats in the letter; second, did J. Edgar Hoover know of the letter; third, who ordered the letter destroyed; and fourth, why was it so crucial to hide the whole incident from the Warren Commission?

At the Edwards hearing, the testimony of various FBI witnesses was radically contradictory. As they were under oath, at least some of the witnesses were perjuring themselves, 12 years after the fact.

The aim of the FBI appeared obvious from Hosty's answers to questions from Chairman EDWARDS. He said he did not tell the Commission about the Oswald letter because he was not asked. He did not volunteer the information because he had been instructed not to volunteer anything that would be of help to the Commission.

To the extent I am privileged to participate in its work I shall do everything in my power to see that the committee remains above politics.

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

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Missing Persons in Southeast Asia, I would like to pledge to the gentleman or others my cooperation and work with the staff on how to set up the committee. I also commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) for his initial leadership in this area. I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that you have a small staff and use other Government agencies to help gather information.

Also I would like to suggest that these select committees do not have to run on and on. Even though the Select Committee on Missing Persons was extended for 3 months over the 1 year of the life of the committee, which was needed, I think we can write a comprehensive report on the missing persons by January 3. I see no reason to extend the Select Committee on Missing Persons.

I know the gentleman will look into these matters.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I agree with him. The life of the committee will be determined by each succeeding Congress.

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

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING).

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this—

resolution and commend the gentleman in the well for his devotion to this cause. I think all America will applaud him for it.

The trouble is that we all felt in our bones that we did not have all the facts as to these terrible events, but only recently have we gotten some concrete evidence to confirm our misgivings. I was privileged to sit on the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Rights earlier this year when we had hearings with respect to the FBI incident where they had a report on Oswald which was suppressed and flushed down the drain.

Unfortunately, the new evidence has been developed piecemeal and as a sort of byproduct of other investigations and oversight hearings. Now for the first time we will have the satisfaction that at least one committee will have the jurisdiction to go into this whole matter and try to answer some of these awful questions that have been continuing concern to the people of our country.

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

This committee will engage in no witch hunts. Its purpose is to arrive at the truth and not to blame those who may have erred in the original investigation.

For my part the only conclusion I have reached concerning the murders of President Kennedy and Dr. King is that we do not know the complete truth. Certainly in the case of President Kennedy I am convinced that there was a conspiracy involved.

I do not, however, know the identity of the conspirators or their motives.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, so that there will be no question about the nonpolitical purposes of this proposed committee, it has been agreed there will be no public hearings held prior to the election in November. Some hearings may be scheduled for later this year, but none of the time will be spent in organizing staff, setting priorities or obtaining the mass of political records for setting the stage for broad and deliberate action by the Select Committee, when as I strongly urge and expect it will be reestablished in the 95th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we each remember the manner in which we heard of the assassination of President Kennedy and Dr. King. We may forget many of the details in our lives, but we will each remember where we were and what we were doing when we heard about it and our own personal reactions thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go home and face my people unless I can assure them that I have done my utmost to provide them with all the knowledge of what happened to John F. Kennedy, our former President. I want them to know what happened to Dr. King. I want them to know that no one stood in the way of learning the truth. I want to restore credibility in our Government. I want to leave this as my legacy to the 95th

Congress, whose pleasure I have chosen to leave at this time with great reluctance.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today—in this eleventh hour of the 94th Congress—the House has finally seen fit to attempt to discharge its responsibility in respect to some of the political assassinations of the last decade.

When I became the first Member of Congress since the Warren Commission report to ask for a congressional investigation of political assassinations on February 19, 1975—at the first available time after committees were organized for this Congress—I was ridiculed in some quarters and no one else was interested in joining in the effort. The U.S. press was, generally speaking, disinterested.

Much to my surprise, as well as everyone else's, the kind of reaction which I initially received quickly began to change as the result of revelations, especially about the John F. Kennedy assassination, which began to appear in print. The showing of the Zapruder film on national television also stimulated great interest.

As the interest began to mount, my good colleague, Congressman THOMAS DOWNING of Virginia, introduced the very same resolution which I had introduced, but left off all other assassinations—or attempted assassinations—except that of President Kennedy.

However, I had originally proposed and continued to propose that the House also undertake a review of the assassinations of U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, and the attempt on the life of Gov. George Wallace, so my good colleague and I began to gather cosponsors on our two different versions of my proposal.

In the discussions which I had with my good colleague he argued that all the names of the others, especially that of Dr. King, should be removed from the proposal I had introduced, if we were to get any congressional investigation underway on the John F. Kennedy assassination, or any assassination.

Therefore, it was heartening this last Monday that my good colleague, THOMAS DOWNING, agreed to join me and Congressman WALTER FAUNTROY in a compromise proposal, House Resolution 1540, which includes Dr. King's assassination, and possibly others, as well as that of President Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall, that I was the very first to appeal to you personally, on the floor of this House, for consideration of legislation creating a select committee on assassinations, as we have done today. This first appeal was many months ago when it appeared that there was no likelihood that we would ever get such a proposal out of the House Rules Committee.

Creation of the select committee is long overdue. However, whether creation of such a committee at this time, under

the present circumstances, including the retirement from Congress of my colleague, Congressman DOWNING, is really appropriate, remains to be seen.

I have only one interest: the truth about why and how these assassinations occurred.

In organizing such an effort, as a select committee on assassinations, we should have only the objective of assessing the effects of these assassinations on the American people, trying to determine why they happened, and how we can prevent such a series of events from happening again.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman who has preceded me on this resolution was the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING). The gentleman certainly has no political motives whatever in espousing the cause of a reopening of the investigation into the death of Dr. King and John F. Kennedy, because as all of the Members of this committee know, the gentleman from Virginia is not seeking reelection to this body.

Mr. Speaker, very frankly, I was one of those who originally was highly skeptical—totally skeptical, I would say—of the utility of further pursuing this matter. Yet, after listening to the testimony of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) before the Committee on Rules way back in March of this year, I was so impressed with the very patient and persistent effort that the gentleman had made to gather together all of the facts and all of the evidence that certainly pointed to new areas that deserve investigation, that at that time I voted in favor of reporting out this resolution. This was on the 31st of March of this year.

Now, almost 6 months have gone by, 6 months, I might say, of very valuable time that could have been used to pursue this matter.

Fortunately, some of the members of the Committee on Rules, at least in my judgment, changed their position and so it was that I read this week 2 days ago that by a vote of 9 to 4 this resolution was favorably reported.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the time to go into the evidence that has been presented to the committee by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING). The gentleman has already made some reference to it in his statement a moment ago; but, for example, some of the people who have urged reconsideration of this matter include the staff attorney for the Commission, David Belin, who in November of last year called for a new investigation, because the Commission at the time it did its work had been totally unaware of CIA attempts on the life of Fidel Castro; yet I read, for example, in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) and heard the gentleman testify before the Committee on Rules, that Lee Harvey Oswald was questioned by seven FBI of-

ficials for approximately 12 hours and that there are no stenographic transcripts of his interrogation, no tape-recorded record of his questioning was made, that no notes were kept, even by the chief of homicide of the Dallas Police.

Mr. Speaker, those are things certainly that lead me to believe that in view of what we have learned in recent months of CIA involvement in attempted assassination efforts with respect to the Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, and also some of the revelations with respect to the activities of the FBI have lead me to believe that reasonable men have the right at this point in history to once again make an inquiry into these matters.

I have not spoken as extensively about the need for reinvestigation of the death of Dr. King, although I understand from one of the witnesses before our committee, Mr. FAUNTROY, that there is evidence in this case as well that is deserving of consideration. I think both of these matters are so important that I would urge Members to put aside their doubts and support the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that there is a considerable percentage of people in America who feel they haven't had the full truth about the assassination of former President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King. There are lingering doubts in the minds of many about the participants, motives, and causes of these tragedies.

In my opinion, sinister conspiratory aspects loom larger and larger.

Questions have also been raised about killings, or attempted murders, of other leading American political leaders in the past 10 to 15 years.

It is always worthwhile to seek the truth. It is always a wise course to try to replace doubts with certainty. It is always a course of wisdom to seek to find answers for important questions.

An investigation of these assassination attempts may help to guide America's conduct of international relations. An investigation may help to provide better protection for our political leaders. Most importantly, an investigation that is thorough, complete, and impartial will do much to ease American minds. The United States is a nation of free people. We require knowledge and information to keep our freedom. As Jesus said, "The truth will make you free."

In the search for truth, I urge adoption of this proposal.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the statements that have been made today by those advocating the resolution indicate

that the committee's attention will be devoted to the assassinations of former President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King. Yet, I am troubled by the phrase in the resolution which states, "and any others the select committee shall determine."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would respond to the gentleman from Illinois in this manner: Certainly, all of the testimony before the Committee on Rules—and which led me individually to support as long ago as March of this year the adoption of a resolution to set up a select committee—was based on a desire on the part of the witness to reopen the investigation into the deaths of two men, and two men only, Dr. Martin Luther King and former President John F. Kennedy.

Let me conclude my answer by saying that just as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) pointed out, there have been some very mysterious deaths occur in recent months, and he referred by name to two former members of the Mafia. It is generally believed that they may have had some connection with plots by the CIA on the life of Castro; so that, to me, indicates that this language is merely designed to give the select committee, if it is established, the latitude and the flexibility that it might need to look into the deaths of other individuals who are not really the prime focus of inquiry, but leads with respect to how that matter would in turn perhaps shed some light on the whole mystery surrounding the deaths of former President Kennedy and Dr. King. So, I think it is wholly ancillary to the principal thrust of the investigation, which is to look into the deaths of Dr. King and former President Kennedy.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman believe that the work of the committee should be fully devoted to the deaths of those two individuals? And further respecting the deaths, as the gentleman suggested, occurring recently if those deaths are related to the death of former President Kennedy, the authority given by the resolution would permit the committee to go into those deaths as well. I think the authority that is given by that gratuitous phrase, if you please, is so broad that the committee could go into the assassination of President Lincoln, for example, under this authority. It could go into the assassination of President McKinley.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Now, the gentleman is resorting to a familiar device. There is not a shred of evidence before the Committee on Rules to show that they intend to go back and exhume the bones of Abraham Lincoln or James Garfield.

Mr. YATES. Why put this phrase in here then?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I have tried to explain to the gentleman that the deaths of some of the other people in recent months have lead the authors of the resolution to think they might have some bearing on the deaths of President Kennedy and Dr. King.

Mr. YATES. If they have a bearing on the deaths, would not the authority of

this resolution give Congress the power to go into that investigation?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I suppose one could argue without the phrase "and of any others" that they could.

Mr. YATES. That is right. I thank the gentleman for his concession.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I frankly cannot see the basis for the fears expressed by the gentleman from Illinois that this committee is going to get off on a fishing expedition into every gangland slaying that has occurred over the past 10 years. I do not think that is their intention at all.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me urge my colleagues, for gosh sakes, if they have any respect, as I am sure they all do, for the dollars of our taxpayers, let us vote this resolution down. This, to me, is almost unbelievable, that we would be here, approaching October 1, even discussing the issue.

Maybe I should not use this title, because it certainly does not apply to any Member of this body, nor to most Americans, but there are unfortunately, a number of people running around this country who are plain witch hunters, and they have some kind of a melodramatic desire for the morbid. They want to try to create an incident.

If anyone can stand up and tell me one single good that anything that this committee may do would be of any benefit to the American people, to the American Government, to anyone, then for God's sake I wish they would do it.

I thought we put this thing to bed a long time ago, and we did have it stopped for a time.

But it seems to ever raise its head. And, finally, let me say we had an amendment yesterday proposed to eliminate the phrase which has been raised here which opens it up. For example, I understand there is new evidence in connection with the death of President Harding. I do not know whether or not the committee wants to go in and investigate the death of President Harding, and I do not really care. I just hope, as I said, that we vote this resolution down, and particularly at this stage of the year when there is no possibility even, with the admission of possible Members of the committee, that they are going to do anything this year and will depend on the 95th Congress for any achievements that may be developed.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that we have heard all kinds of rumors, and there will continue to be rumors. We had a very distinguished commission 13 years ago that I think did the very best possible job of investigating this. People talk about new facts. We read about new facts concerning a whole variety of things, some of them going back 100 years ago. Facts are facts to the individual stating them. They may or

may not be facts. They may be truths or half-truths.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that I would urge that this House on this occasion vote down this resolution, and then if the 95th Congress wants to take a look at some new evidence that apparently seems to be floating around, they can do so. Frankly, as a Member of the Committee on Rules, I still have not heard anything up there that would in any way change my strong conviction that it is a total waste of time. Are we going to go down and bring Mr. Castro up here if somebody comes up with some so-called facts that he was instrumental in the death of President Kennedy? To me, it is just unbelievable that we spend our time on this kind of situation.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING).

(Mr. DOWNING of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have resolved this question for myself. The Members all know that I do not go in for the sensational or the bizarre. That is not my lifestyle. I asked myself: "Why do you want to do this?" And the answer came back: "The truth."

The American people want to know the truth. I would hope and pray that the committee would resolve that the Warren Commission was right, but I know in my heart it will not.

Let me tell the Members something else about these assassinations. We should take into consideration the political effects of this crime. Let us think of this for a minute: But for the fact that Kennedy was assassinated, Johnson probably would not have been President, and but for the fact that Robert F. Kennedy was assassinated, Richard M. Nixon probably would not have been President, and but for the fact that George Wallace was eliminated, Nixon probably would not have been reelected. No one can tell me that an assassination does not have an effect on politics and on our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to vote for this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY).

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

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the House Resolution 1540. There are at least three compelling reasons for the House to establish this Select Committee on Assassinations. The first is that the American people want it. The second is that a wealth of new information which was not available to the initial investigators of the Kennedy and King assassinations justifies it. And third, Mr. Speaker, the best vehicle for such an inquiry would be a duly constituted panel of distinguished Members of this House committed to conduct a responsible and searching investigation of these matters.

Let us take a look at the first compelling reason, namely that: The American people today want a thorough, im-

partial and reliable investigation of the rash of political assassinations that have rocked our Nation over the past 13 years. Both nationwide polls and more localized polls of the opinions of the American people indicate that an overwhelming majority of our people are not satisfied that we know the whole truth about several of these assassinations. In fact, a CBS nationwide poll as recently as November of last year found a whopping 46 percent of the American people believing that the shootings of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and even George Wallace were related. The polls found only that 15 percent of the American people believe that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone in the Kennedy assassination.

When one reflects upon the wealth of new information that has come to light since initial investigators completed their work, one can understand the low level of confidence which the American people have in these dated findings. Not only have a number of books published on the subject of the assassinations revealed new information and raised serious questions that ought to be answered, but the recent findings of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence have, in my view, confirmed the need for a reopening of these matters.

Our distinguished colleague from Virginia, Mr. DOWNING, has noted a number of facts that were not available to the Warren Commission in the Kennedy case. The King assassination has never been thoroughly investigated inasmuch as there has never been a trial, even though the confessed assassin has been seeking one for nearly 8 years. I have shared new information with respect to the King assassination with the leadership of the House with the result that they have concurred in our desire to establish the select committee.

Third, Mr. Speaker, a select committee of the House is clearly the best vehicle for investigating this investigation. What the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence has documented about the shameful conduct of the FBI with respect to Dr. King is certainly enough to convince all of us that the responsible thing for the Congress to do is to undertake this investigation, resolve any lingering doubts and help restore confidence in our Government.

The American people want it, new information demands it, and the conduct of our traditional investigate agencies require that we establish this select committee. Nothing more is needed; nothing less will suffice.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the gentleman, and I agree that these assassinations certainly needed investigation at the time, but I fail to realize how we can come up now 2 weeks before sine die adjournment with a resolution that provides for the appointment of 12 Members of this Chamber to make an investigation in 2 weeks and clear the air in a matter that the Warren Commission spent months in investigating. I just cannot see it.

I will ask one other question, if I may.

Mr. FAUNTROY. May I answer the first question and then answer the gentleman's second.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Certainly.

Mr. FAUNTROY. It is my considered judgment that the members of the Committee on Rules who voted for this, including the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DOWNING) whose record is very clear on questions of this nature, have not moved to do this at this time without serious understanding of the urgent need to preserve testimony. I am confident that when we are apprised of the specifics, of the new information, we will understand the wisdom of the leadership which is supporting this measure now.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. FAUNTROY) for the remarks he just made.

As I previously stated, Mr. Speaker, there have been thousands of letters and requests from organizations and people all over the country pressing for these investigations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has been one of the pioneers in bringing about this investigation resolution. His work has not only extended over months, but over years in trying to get this Select Assassination Committee created.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) for yielding.

I will not take all of that time because I was also going to point out to the House that one of the first voices in the Congress to raise questions was that of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. Speaker, I have doubts about what this committee will find; but I do know that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) has been pursuing this matter for the last several years and probably was the first one to initiate or to insist on further inquiring. I think the House ought to know that perhaps this resolution is before us today because of his persistence and because of his determination that certain testimony ought to be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, most of us are going to reserve our judgment, but I know that the able gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) felt very strongly about uncertainties, and I think that the Members should be reminded of that particular fact.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, once again we will establish a commission or a select committee, and I understand that these people who will serve



n this committee have already been designated, in the event this resolution passes today.

I wonder if this resolution would be here today if the 12 members who will serve on it were not Members of the House of Representatives. If we selected 12 persons from the population to make this investigation, would we still be voting on this bill today? Are we really concerned about this or is this an opportunity for somebody to be out in the daylight again?

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I must say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS) that I do not know whether the members have been selected. That is a matter for the Speaker, who will make that determination.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield further, at the time this came up I understand that the members had been selected already or designated, at least, even though they have not been appointed.

Again, I doubt that we would be here today taking up this resolution if Members of Congress were not to serve on this very select committee. Regardless of how worthy or meritorious this bill is, can we 12 members to be appointed fulfill all their other legislative responsibilities, or probably will be running for reelection and will be doing some politicking during this period, yet do any kind of job of investigation and make a report before we adjourn? To spend that much money in such a short time is just not reasonable.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. FITHIAN).

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

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

When I came to this body nearly 2 years ago, I came from a role of a history professor.

I was the person who had seen in the books repeatedly or every so often the statement that we wanted to go back and investigate some assassination.

Mr. Speaker, by training alone, I was opposed to this movement; but in the last 18 months, both from the evidence that has been amassed and the interest that has been exhibited, and from my own investigation and my own reading into this subject, I have been led to believe that this is worthy of our consideration. It is worthy of our consideration because there are too many unanswered questions.

Both of these assassinations and the evidence pertaining to them are now demonstrably incomplete, as has been stated ably by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), that being the case, it is time to try to lay this question to rest and to try to assure the American people, who are, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN), the chairman of the Committee on Rules mentioned, uneasy about this whole matter.

Therefore, I would urge the Members of this body to support this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

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

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is odd. Yesterday we had the Clean Air Act. Today we have this resolution.

Everybody in America loves moving pictures and they love to read mystery stories. It is the best way to sell a newspaper.

I work on the Appropriations Committee and there are no TV cameras or lights, no reporters. Let us get into the act even if it is a fake.

Mr. WON PAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 1540, which calls for the creation of a select committee to investigate the deaths of the late President John F. Kennedy, his brother Robert, Martin Luther King, and the attempted assassination of Gov. George Wallace.

The measure now before this body is similar to one I cosponsored; House Resolution 456, both of which were written by our esteemed colleague Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of Texas.

The need for Congress to undertake a new and thorough investigation of these matters, particularly the Kennedy assassinations, is very real. Recent events have revealed new information which shed light on some very gray areas of the Kennedy assassinations. Information which should give every American pause to question whether the Warren Commission did, in fact, uncover all the sordid facts surrounding these terrible events in our history. Did Cuban President Fidel Castro play a role in the killings as press reports now indicate may be the case? Did the Mafia know about the murders and are the gangland killings of the two Mafia heads related in any way to the Kennedy assassinations?

I, for one, have no idea if these or any of the numerous theories about the assassinations are valid. But the fact remains that many Americans continue to doubt that all the truth has been revealed.

I have great confidence that should the Congress approve of this legislation, the investigation will be conducted in a professional and responsible manner which will reflect credit on the U.S. Congress. What we are looking for is the truth, not a sideshow. But as long as a reasonable doubt remains, I believe that it is the duty of the Congress to investigate these issues and report to the American people its findings.

Congressman GONZALEZ deserves our support in this matter. He has approached this sensitive issue with dignity and appreciation for the complex issues involved. Should the select committee be authorized, I would heartedly recommend that Congressman GONZALEZ be chosen as its chairman. He is extremely familiar with the issues and has undoubtedly developed strong connections with many of the groups who have publicly expressed reservations about the assassinations. Congressman GONZALEZ's record in the House is an outstanding one, and I am confident that he would carry out the

duties of the chairman of the select committee to investigate the assassinations with his usual skill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 1540, a resolution that establishes a House select committee to complete a thorough investigation of the assassinations of President Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Lingering doubt about "what happened" remains with the American people. Uncertainty about the death of great leaders, or anyone cannot be.

Thus, last year I cosponsored a nearly identical resolution (H. Res. 574) introduced by my colleague from Virginia, Mr. DOWNING. Today, I urge every Member to join with me in passing a resolution that, hopefully, will close an old wound.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a speedy passage today of House Resolution 1540. As Members of the House of Representatives, we have the duty to investigate and prove or disprove to the best of our ability any allegations of impropriety or conspiracy in these assassinations. The American people have the right to know with the greatest certainty possible the circumstances surrounding deaths of President Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and the attempted assassination of Governor Wallace.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I am most hopeful that today the House will take a step toward ending the 13 years of doubt that have surrounded the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Public opinion polls have shown us repeatedly that the American people simply do not believe the conclusions of the Warren Commission report. And rather than subsiding, the questions, charges, and doubts grow in scope, magnitude, and intensity with the passage of time. The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence Activities concluded that there were serious omissions in the information and evidence provided to the Warren Commission and that another investigation is warranted. I concur with that conclusion and believe the House of Representatives should establish the vehicle to conduct that investigation.

It is clear that the Warren Commission never questioned the guilt of Lee Harvey Oswald and never looked into any information that was not directly related to him. In this way they never examined any information that did not fit into this preconceived conclusion, and thus the scope of their investigation was narrow and incomplete.

I do not portend to know who did, or did not, kill President Kennedy. I do know that too many questions and doubts remain for us not to create a select committee to investigate that assassination. Further, information that has come to light over the last several months regarding the surveillance and harassment of Rev. Martin Luther King, and the inconsistencies surrounding his assassination warrant attention by the House of Representatives as well.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider the public's right to know the truth, and cast an affirmative vote on this resolution.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to indicate my full support for this resolution which will establish a new Select Committee on Assassinations. As a cosponsor of this resolution, I consider its passage vital if we are to address the clamorings of millions of Americans to reopen the investigations of the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Now, almost 13 years later, there are still many serious questions being raised on certain key facts associated with the murder of President Kennedy. The relentless efforts of such persons as Mark Lane in his book "Rush to Judgment" as well as other individuals and groups, have produced new evidence which questions the findings of the Warren Commission. It should be clearly understood that the efforts to create this select committee are in no way designed to be a total denunciation of the Warren Commission. Rather, in light of new and substantial evidence, it is imperative that a new inquiry be undertaken and we are seeking to allow Congress to investigate the assassination for the first time.

Similarly, serious questions have been raised about the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. New and very disturbing theories have surfaced which deserve close examination. This is exactly what the committee would do.

I am pleased that this resolution will vest the new committee with sufficient authority to insure that thorough inquiries are conducted. These two assassinations of major American leaders have had a profound effect on all Americans. We must write the final chapter on these two dark events in American history by permitting all relevant evidence to be aired and considered so that unimpeachable conclusions on these assassinations may be reached.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1540, to establish a Select Committee on Assassination. Many of us have been shocked in recent times to learn of the extent to which American intelligence and law enforcement agencies have engaged in illegal, improper, and unethical activities. Investigations by both Chambers of Congress have charted a long history of abuses by the CIA, FBI, and other agencies that have included illegal electronic surveillance, drug abuses, political spying, mail openings, efforts to disrupt and discredit citizen protest groups, and assassination plots against foreign leaders.

The recent disclosure of J. Edgar Hoover's now infamous COINTELPRO memos outlines a nationwide program to "expose, disrupt, misdirect, discredit, or otherwise neutralize the activities" of organizations and leaders who did not share Mr. Hoover's political philosophy. And yet, I would remind my colleagues, that the investigations of the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., were dependent upon information gathered under the direction of the very same J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress had done much to prevent the recurrence of the abuses of the past but to stop at this point is to leave our work half done.

Many Americans are demanding to be told the whole truth about the assassinations of some of our greatest leaders. The recent systematic violations of the Constitution, Federal, State, and local laws by the FBI, CIA, and other agencies, necessitates the direct intervention of this honorable body in order to determine if all facts have been brought to light. The American people will expect no less.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. The proponents of this resolution are asking the American taxpayers to pay \$250,000 to study the circumstances surrounding the assassinations of certain named individuals and other unnamed individuals. The proponents of this resolution call for the expenditure of these funds even though thousands of dollars have been previously spent by various local, State, and Federal entities—including adjudicatory bodies—in the investigation of assassinations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, assassinations are a terrible thing and if we could prevent them by writing \$250,000 reports that nobody will read, I would vote for this resolution. But the proponents of this resolution indicate that we just have to have this study. However, I have neither heard nor seen a great clamor from the people demanding this study. If the proponents truly down deep in their hearts want this great treatise called for by this resolution, I respectfully suggest that they reach down deep in their pockets and get out their checkbooks and personally contribute to this undertaking. I have it calculated. If each of the Members would write a check for \$575, that will cover the \$250,000 cost of this endeavor. Since the people do not want this resolution it is only fair that we pay the bill and save the taxpayers some funds. I suspect that there would be a lot less studies undertaken if we were required to pay for them out of our own pockets. And I also suspect, Mr. Speaker, that all of these study commissions would not linger on indefinitely if the Members were required to pay for them year after year.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the pending resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appear to have it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 280, nays 65, answered "present" 1, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 748]

YEAS—280

Abdnor	Frenzel	Morgan
Addabbo	Frey	Mottl
Allen	Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.
Ambro	Gilman	Myers, Pa.
Anderson,	Ginn	Natcher
Calif.	Gonzalez	Neal
Anderson, Ill.	Goodling	Nichols
Andrews, N.C.	Gradison	Nix
Andrews,	Grassley	Noian
N. Dak.	Gude	Nowak
Archer	Guyer	Oberstar
Armstrong	Haley	Obey
Ashbrook	Hall, Ill.	O'Brien
Aspin	Hamilton	O'Hara
AuCoin	Hammer-	O'Neill
Bafalis	schmidt	Ottlinger
Baldus	Hanley	Pattison, N.Y.
Baucus	Hannaford	Paul
Bauman	Harkin	Pepper
Beard, R.I.	Harrington	Perkins
Bedell	Harris	Pettis
Bennett	Hayes, Ind.	Peyser
Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle
Bevill	Heckler, Mass.	Pressler
Biaggi	Hefner	Preyer
Bingham	Henderson	Price
Blanchard	Hightower	Pritchard
Blouin	Hillis	Quie
Boggs	Holland	Railsback
Boland	Holtzman	Regula
Bolling	Horton	Reuss
Bonker	Howard	Rhodes
Brademas	Hubbard	Richmond
Breaux	Hughes	Rinaldo
Brinkley	Hungate	Roberts
Brodhead	Hyde	Rodino
Brooks	Ichord	Roe
Broomfield	Jacobs	Rogers
Brown, Calif.	Jeffords	Roncalio
Brown, Ohio	Jenrette	Rooney
Broyhill	Jones, Calif.	Rosenthal
Buchanan	Johnson, Colo.	Roush
Burgener	Jones, Ala.	Russo
Burke, Fla.	Jones, N.C.	St. Germain
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Tenn.	Stantini
Burton, Phillip	Jordan	Sarasin
Butler	Karth	Scheuer
Carr	Kasten	Schulze
Cederberg	Kastenmeier	Seiberling
Clausen,	Kazen	Sharp
Don H.	Kemp	Shriver
Clay	Keys	Sikes
Cohen	Koch	Slack
Conte	Krebs	Smith, Iowa
Conyers	Krueger	Smith, Neb.
Corman	LaFalce	Solarz
Cornell	Lagomarsino	Spellman
Crane	Landrum	Spence
D'Amours	Latta	Staggers
Daniel, Dan	Leggett	Stanton.
Daniel, R. W.	Lehman	James V.
Daniels, N.J.	Levitas	Stephens
Danielson	Lloyd, Calif.	Stokes
Davis	Lloyd, Tenn.	Stuckey
de la Garza	Long, La.	Studds
Delaney	Long, Md.	Symms
Dellums	Lundine	Taylor, Mo.
Derwinski	McCloskey	Taylor, N.C.
Diggs	McCollister	Thompson
Dodd	McDade	Thone
Downey, N.Y.	McDonald	Traxler
Downing, Va.	McFall	Treen
Drinan	McHugh	Thomas
du Pont	McKinney	Udall
Early	Madden	Ullman
Edgar	Madigan	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Calif.	Magnire	Vank
Ellberg	Mahon	Waggoner
Emery	Martin	Walters
Estimote	Mathis	Wicker
Evans, Colo.	Melcher	Wicker
Evans, Ind.	Menzinsky	Wicks
Evins, Tenn.	Mikva	White
Fascell	Miller, Calif.	Whitehurst
Fenwick	Mills	Whitcomb
Findley	Minish	Wilson, Eob
Fish	Mitchell, Md.	Wilson, C. H.
Fisher	Mitchell, N.Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Fithian	Moakley	Wyke
Flood	Moffett	Yates
Flores	Molloy	Young, Alaska
Flores	Montgomery	Young, Fla.
Foley	Moore	Zablocki
Forsythe	Moorhead,	Zelenitz
Fountain	Calif.	
Fraser	Moorhead, Pa.	

NAYS—65

Fury  
Ford, Mich.  
Gaydos  
Hall, Tex.  
Harsha  
Hicks  
Hoit  
Hutchinson  
Jarnan  
Jones, Okla.  
Kindness  
Lujan  
McClary  
McCormack  
McEwen  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio  
Mosher  
Murtha  
Myers, Ind.  
Nedzi  
Passman  
Patten, N.J.  
Pike  
Poage  
Quillen  
Risenhoover  
Robinson  
Rostenkowski  
Runnels  
Satterfield  
Sebelius  
Shuster  
Simon  
Sisk  
Stanton  
J. William  
Steid  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stratton  
Van Deertin  
Waggonner  
Wampler  
Wiggins

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Young, Tex.

NOT VOTING—84

Hawkins  
Hébert  
Heinz  
Helstoski  
Hinshaw  
Howe  
Johnson, Pa.  
Kelly  
Ketchum  
Lent  
Lott  
McKay  
Mann  
Matsunaga  
Mazzoli  
Meeds  
Metcalfe  
Meyner  
Milford  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moss  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Patterson,  
Calif.  
Randall  
Rangel  
Rees  
Riegle  
Rose  
Rousselot  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Ryan  
Sarbanes  
Schneebeli  
Schroeder  
Shipley  
Skubitz  
Snyder  
Stark  
Steelman  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Talcott  
Teague  
Thornton  
Vander Veen  
Winn  
Wirth  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyder  
Yatron  
Young, Ga.

Clerk announced the following

men with Mr. Hébert.  
ppell with Mr. Talcott.  
gue with Mr. Heinz.  
Esunaga with Mr. Bell.  
nt with Mr. Esch.  
an Burton with Mr. Goldwater.  
play with Mr. Wyder.  
ff with Mr. Lott.  
ron with Mr. Carter.  
eta with Mr. Hansen.  
yner with Mr. McKay.  
n with Mr. Schneebeli.  
er with Mr. Howe.  
rphy of New York with Mr. Lent.  
rk with Mr. Snyder.  
e with Mr. Clancy.  
bal with Mr. Ruppe.  
vkins with Mr. Kelly.  
ams with Mr. Hagedorn.  
ug with Mr. Steelman.  
on with Mr. Metcalfe.  
ney with Mrs. Collins of Illinois.  
isholm with Mr. Winn.  
hardt with Mr. Skubitz.  
qua with Mr. Johnson of Pennsyl-

almo with Mr. Riegle.  
een with Mr. Symington.  
stoski with Mr. Alexander.  
eds with Mr. Cleveland.  
angel with Mr. Rousselot.  
th with Mr. Mazzoli.  
ight with Mrs. Sullivan.  
illo with Mr. Milford.  
iley with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.  
rd of Tennessee with Mr. Conlan.  
ompton with Mrs. Burke of Calif.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Rees.  
Mrs. Mink with Mr. Sarbanes.  
Mr. Patterson of California with Mr. Young  
of Georgia.  
Mr. Ryan with Mrs. Schroeder.  
Mr. Vander Veen with Mr. Randall.

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the  
table.

NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT  
ACT OF 1976

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that  
the House resolve itself into the Com-  
mittee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union for the further considera-  
tion of the bill (H.R. 15069) to amend  
the Forest and Rangeland Renewal Re-  
sources Planning Act of 1974, and for  
other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BO-  
LAND). The question is on the motion of-  
fered by the gentleman from Washing-  
ton.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself  
into the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union for the fur-  
ther consideration of the bill, H.R. 15069,  
with Mr. DANIELSON (chairman pro tem-  
pore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr.  
DANIELSON). When the Committee rose  
on Wednesday, September 15, 1976, the  
gentleman from Washington (Mr.  
FOLEY) had 14 minutes of general de-  
bate remaining and the gentleman from  
Idaho (Mr. Symms) had 16 minutes of  
general debate remaining.

The Chair now recognizes the gentle-  
man from Washington (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3  
minutes to the gentleman from Oregon  
(Mr. WEAVER).

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

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the  
timber industry and the men and women  
who work in it have contributed greatly  
to this Nation, providing the wood prod-  
ucts with which we have built our homes  
and the furnishings within our homes  
and buildings.

It is a hardworking industry, a proud  
people, fallers and buckers, choker set-  
ters, all who work in the woods, in log-  
ging shows, in mud and snow; those who  
pull on the green chain, the sawyers,  
those who lay out veneer and make ply-  
wood, the log truckdrivers who work  
from early dawn to late at night, all  
bring to America one of its most pre-  
cious, warm, and useful resources to be  
constructed by craftsmen into that  
which, with the food we eat, is the im-  
portant quality in our lives—our homes.

Oregon is proud to be the State which  
provides the most softwood timber to  
this Nation. We do our part, and want  
always to do our part. We want to con-  
tinue our ability to provide timber, and  
at the same time show strong and rea-  
soned concern for the care of our forests

For, Mr. Chairman, the woods are  
many things. They are the growing place  
of magnificent trees, the growing place  
of plants of rare beauty, and they are  
the source of our water, the fresh moun-  
tain water that is our blessing and our  
trust. They are the habitat of countless  
wildlife, the spawning grounds of bright  
fish, whose natural streams are sensitive  
to environmental change. We in Oregon  
are fishermen and women, hunters and  
hikers, and we love our forests with our  
streams coursing through the moun-  
tains. We know the soils must be care-  
fully preserved to protect all that is in  
our woods.

We invite you to Oregon to see our  
natural wonders. Join us if you wish; it  
is a free country. We only ask one thing:  
that you help us to keep Oregon, its for-  
ests and rivers, a special place to live.

And, we ask this Congress to approve  
sound, balanced legislation which will  
keep us at work providing wood to this  
Nation, and at the same time keep a  
forest environment that preserves those  
other vital values of nature; and legis-  
lation that will assure that the trees,  
young and old, growing and harvested,  
will be with us forever. For, what would  
Oregon be without trees; the Nation  
without forests?

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield  
such time as she may consume to the  
gentlewoman from Nebraska (Mrs.  
SMITH).

(Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska asked and  
was given permission to revise and extend  
her remarks.)

Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chair-  
man, I rise in support of H.R. 15069, the  
National Forest Management Act of  
1976.

As reported by the House Agriculture  
Committee, this legislation would amend  
the 1897 Organic Act—enacted at a time  
when our timber resources appeared vir-  
tually unlimited—to permit the increased  
use of the timber produced in our na-  
tional forests.

As Members know, a recent court deci-  
sion based on the Organic Act has re-  
sulted in an outright ban on all clear  
cutting in the Monogahela National For-  
est. If extended to all national forests,  
the Forest Service estimates, timber har-  
vests in the East would be reduced by  
about 10 percent, with a 50-percent re-  
duction in western forests.

The bill presented today would allow  
limited clearcutting in national forests  
under the supervision of the Agriculture  
Department. This will allow the use of  
modern timber harvesting methods,  
while at the same time assuring ade-  
quate protection for the environment.

In addition, today's bill will establish  
an 8-year reforestation program de-  
signed to increase future timber yield.

Mr. Chairman, this represents a sound  
balance between increasing timber pro-  
duction and protecting the environment.  
As is evident in the debate last night  
and today, this is an extremely sensitive  
issue, and I want to commend the Agri-  
culture Committee for a constructive  
solution to a difficult problem.

can confide  
ation will  
to increa  
an in  
SYMM  
ther po  
FOLEY  
to the  
KREB  
to r  
KREB  
the Com  
ates.  
oted in  
it eme  
I suppor  
the su  
not repres  
areas in the  
is substantia  
have two n  
privileged to  
think it is i  
legislation of  
sion of the c  
I also ha  
strike a b  
needs of th  
vironmenta  
from conce  
emotions t  
mind, I wil  
ments that  
I feel that  
fore us c  
emerged fr  
which I fe  
balance I  
So I ur  
mittee to  
amendme  
mittee lat  
Mr. FO  
minutes t  
(Mr. S  
(Mr. S  
mission  
marks.)  
Mr. ST  
H.R. 150  
manag  
that the  
delay. I  
it provi  
crisis, t  
permit  
about t  
forests  
and els  
safegua  
strong  
prefer  
mistak  
the M  
the Co  
job of  
portin  
the H  
Sev  
posed  
dang  
legisl  
the F  
tions  
meas  
be le  
exer  
prop