

H 1670

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

March 4, 1976

respect to Puerto Rico constitute major road-blocks to the formalization of relations between the United States and Cuba. It is important, however, that the United States let Latin America know that it stands ready, in return for an appropriate Cuban response, to move toward normalization of relations. Initial measures could include lifting the blockade on food and medicine.

Steps such as these will be helpful indications of our commitment, but basic problems will remain. We will have to understand that Latin American countries will continue to act in ways which they determine to be best for them—whether or not these will be helpful or harmful to the United States. We cannot assume an easy or permanent mutuality of interests. It is simply in our best interests to try to work cooperatively with the countries of Latin America.

By the same token, Latin America will have to recognize that in this changed world it will have to assume responsibility for its own future and that it must fulfill that responsibility with discipline and self-restraint. Kicking Uncle Sam around may be great fun, but it can also be costly in terms of investment, tourist travel, development of markets and in many other ways. The heart of the matter is that all of us—both in the United States and in Latin America—are playing for high stakes at a critical time. We can all win if we work together to shape the kind of hemisphere we seek—one free from war and free from want.

CONNECTICUT PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION

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

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago in February, 25 Connecticut pharmacists met in New Haven to organize the State's first professional pharmaceutical association.

According to its constitution, the association was created "to secure cooperation and concert of action in the advancement and diffusion of a knowledge of pharmacy and its collateral branches of science, and to promote the elevation of the professional character of, and facilitate an open and friendly intercourse between its members."

The association began its history with a campaign to regulate the practice of pharmacy in Connecticut. As a result of its efforts, the first such regulatory law was passed by the General Assembly in 1881.

In addition to its concern for legislation, the association also has been a force behind the quality of pharmaceutical education in Connecticut. In 1921, the Governor approved a charter for the State's first college of pharmacy. Unable to attach the school to an existing university, the association itself created and financed the school. The college is now part of the University of Connecticut and is recognized as one of the finest pharmaceutical institutions in the Nation.

The association naturally is concerned with the needs of its members, but it has been conspicuous in its efforts to meet the health needs of the people of Connecticut, especially in time of disaster. The association contributed emergency relief after the destructive flood that devastated large areas of our State in 1955, the urban riots of 1969 and other

crises. In 1944, its members sold almost \$1 million in war bonds, money that was used to purchase six ambulance planes.

The association began its life with 25 members. Today, more than 1,100 pharmacists belong. Twenty-eight local committees are active in the State.

It was appropriate that Gov. Ella Grasso of Connecticut designated February as Pharmacy Month in our State, for the 100th anniversary of the Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association should give all the people of Connecticut reason to remember the history of this group of dedicated professionals.

The Governor's declaration follows:

"To secure cooperation and concert of action in the advancement and diffusion of a knowledge of Pharmacy . . . and to promote the elevation of the professional character of, and facilities an open and fraternal intercourse between, its members" . . . these are the words of the Constitution adopted by the Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association when it was organized 100 years ago.

The Association included 25 members primarily from Hartford and New Haven in the year 1876. Seven years later, the Connecticut legislature enacted a bill that governed pharmacies throughout our state, and Governor Hobart Bigelow appointed Connecticut's first Pharmacy Commission.

In its first century, the Association has grown to more than 1,200 members. These concerned men and women have devoted long hours of their own time to community health programs that combat venereal disease, rheumatic fever, diabetes and cancer. They have raised funds for flood relief, war bonds, ambulance services, hospitals and many health organizations.

The Association offers several scholarships each year to encourage young people to enter this venerable and honored profession. Members have also worked diligently for legislation to improve the practice of pharmacy and upgrade the educational requirements for the profession.

I therefore designate the Month of February, 1976, as Pharmacy Month in Connecticut in tribute by the citizens of our state to the dedicated members of the profession which this year marks a century of service to the health and well being of the people of Connecticut.

ELLA GRASSO,
Governor

I know my colleagues will want to join me in recognizing the achievements of the Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association.

PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, when the privacy Act of 1974 went into effect on September 27, 1975, the capability of Members of Congress to perform services for their constituents was brought to a near halt. It is my view that some agencies deliberately interpreted the law to exclude access by Members to information on individuals.

Congress, its committees and subcommittees, the act says, have access to personally identifiable information if that information falls within the jurisdiction of the body. Members of Congress acting individually received no right under the act to see personal information from an

individual's record. Executive branch interpretation prevented congressional offices from representing the very constituents we are elected to serve by stopping our access to agency records without specific written authorization from the subject of the records.

The act does provide that agencies can release information to persons other than the subject of the record if such release is routinely made and the decision to routinely release such information is published in the Federal Register. On October 3, 1975, James Lynn, Director of OMB, issued the following guideline for agency consideration:

Disclosure may be made to a congressional office from the record of an individual in response to an inquiry from the congressional office made at the request of the individual.

Under this guideline, congressional offices need not write agencies for information or show the agencies proof that a request has been received by that office. At the same time, the Federal agencies are able to respond immediately to the congressional inquiries without obtaining the individual's consent and without the need to respond to the congressional office in writing. In substance, the OMB guideline, if observed by Federal agencies simply allows Congressmen to continue helping constituents as we had done before September 27, 1975.

Unfortunately, troubles developed in the implementation of this OMB guideline, either because employees of executive branch agencies had not gotten the word that such release should be made, or because agencies refused to comply with the OMB guideline.

As chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, I wrote to each Federal agency at the end of 1975 urging compliance with the OMB guidelines. If an agency felt it was impossible to be in conformity with the OMB guideline, I asked for an explanation as to why not.

A sample copy of the letter is appended.

I have received responses from 49 Federal agencies out of a total 150 letters sent. Notably, the only Cabinet-level department that failed to respond to my query is the Department of State. Others outstanding for their lack of response are the CIA, the SEC and the numerous boards, committees and commissions.

Of the agencies that responded to my inquiry, the Selective Service Administration is the only agency that has refused outright to comply with the guideline, based on its need to keep recruiting information in strictest confidence. The agency did state its desire to be responsive to all written congressional inquiries.

Four agencies hedged by saying they are studying the guideline, or that they would not refuse to deal with congressional inquiries. These were the Federal Power Commission, the Civil Rights Commission, the Federal Home Loan Board, and the Federal Maritime Commission.

The chairman of this last body has "directed the Commission staff to draft an appropriate 'routine use' provision to permit disclosures from the records

March 4, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 1669

and toward insuring its financial soundness.

The first section of the bill will stabilize replacement ratios by decoupling increases in the permanent benefit of retired persons. The decoupling concept has been recommended by virtually every individual and group that testified before our subcommittee.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Social Security called decoupling "by far the most important step to be taken to improve the system." Likewise the American Academy of Actuaries termed decoupling "an essential and practical step toward improvement in the financial soundness of the OASDI system."

The specific decoupling approach embodied in this bill was recommended by the Consultant Panel on Social Security employed jointly by the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to prepare constructive proposals on financing social security.

Under this decoupling proposal, benefits for future retirees will be computed using earnings that have been indexed in proportion to the change in price levels (CPI) during the retirees' working lifetime. This approach provides appropriate increases due to cost-of-living related inflation for future retirees, while simultaneously providing flexibility in the financing for Congress to adopt real dollar increases in the future, should that be desirable.

The second section of this bill liberalizes the limitation on outside earnings to \$4,000. The earnings limitation is a national insult to our older Americans, and it deprives this Nation of the continuing contribution of these citizens. Although I support complete repeal of this limitation, the \$4,000 figure is one that can be enacted.

It has never seemed right to impose a penalty on those older Americans who either want to, or need to, continue working. Perhaps this increase will provide some direct relief.

I have also included a new dimension to the earnings limitation. In addition to the \$4,000 level, an individual may also earn, without penalty, the difference between his actual received benefit, and the highest benefit paid in that particular category. This means that an individual receiving only the minimum monthly benefit would be able to earn an additional amount equal to the highest benefit allowed, for example, a single person aged 66.

This allows those individuals who are receiving less in monthly benefits, and who may actually need to work, the opportunity to do so without being penalized.

The third section of this bill directs the General Accounting Office to determine the shortfall in the social security trust fund attributable to low-interest investments made prior to 1960, when the law was changed. Any deficiency is to be replaced over a 5-year period out of general revenues.

This provision is designed to restore the trust fund to a "whole" status, and to put the Government on notice that the trust fund is not to be used for low-

interest loans to the Treasury Department.

My bill will not be a panacea for the problems of social security, but it does propose three concrete recommendations that are practical, and that will move us in the direction of stabilizing the trust fund and insuring the long-term viability of the trust fund.

LINOWITZ ON LATIN AMERICA

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished lawyer and former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, Sol M. Linowitz, authored an incisive article in the February 22, 1976, Los Angeles Times on the current state of the U.S. relations with our hemisphere neighbors. As Chairman of the Commission on United States-Latin American Relations, Sol Linowitz remains actively involved in pursuing his lifelong avocation of giving for our Latin and Caribbean neighbors the rightful priority they should have in our foreign policy. I commend Ambassador Linowitz' article to the attention of all Members:

DANGEROUS TIMES AHEAD UNLESS
WE CAN AGREE

(By Sol M. Linowitz)

To most Americans, Latin America is a homogeneous glob of countries and people, one indistinguishable from the other. Few Americans can name a Latin American president. Far fewer can name a Latin American artist, author or musician. Except for occasional attention to the shenanigans of Castro, the chilling tales of repression or torture in one Latin American country or another, or an explosion in the hemisphere, James Reston's dictum still stands: Americans will do anything for Latin America except read about it.

But a lot has been happening in Latin America while we were not reading and looking. And the Latin America Henry Kissinger sees today is far different from the one of a few years ago. For suddenly Latin America has changed; the relations between Latin America and the rest of the world have changed; and the relations between Latin America and the United States have changed.

We are in a new ball game with Latin America and old assumptions are no longer relevant. No longer can we treat Latin America patronizingly and take it for granted. No longer can we threaten to take our bat and ball and go home.

Today we need Latin America as much as Latin America needs us, for we are living in an interdependent world when security means more than military and political power. When we think of security we have to think of oil and copper and bauxite. We have to think of what we can do to improve the prospects for a peaceful and cooperative world. And these are problems we confront here in our own hemisphere.

In Latin America today, millions of people who have not yet become part of the economic system of their countries have through rapid urbanization and mass communication acquired political awareness. Faced with increasing demands to provide jobs and services, Latin American countries have pressed for freer access to the markets of the United States and other developed nations for their manufactured and semi-manufactured products.

At the same time we have been hearing

new voices from Latin America—voices of nationalism, voices of independence, voices of outrage at lingering dependency. Some have been asserting their independence stridently and provocatively. Others have done so more quietly, but also resentfully. To Latin Americans the United States remains a giant in a crowded room.

Two years ago, Secretary of State Kissinger called for a new dialogue between the nations of the hemisphere. Latin American expectations were again raised but once again remain unfulfilled. In recent months we have witnessed a continued erosion of mutual trust and respect as U.S.-Latin American relations have been clouded by revelations of covert intervention in Chile; by sharpening differences in the hemisphere over how to respond to major violations of fundamental human rights; by the failure to make real progress in the vital area of economic cooperation; and by continuing uncertainty as to the strength of the commitment by the United States to the solution of hemispheric problems.

If one thing is clear it is that we are headed for difficult and dangerous times if we continue to focus our attention and concern on other parts of the world and ignore our own hemisphere. Venezuela is a major exporter of oil to the United States. Other Latin American suppliers of important commodities—bauxite, copper, iron ore, sugar—speak of increasing prices or curtailing production without regard to the effect on the American economy. Argentina and Brazil have turned to other nations for technical assistance in the development of nuclear power plants. Panama is supported by virtually every other country in the hemisphere in its insistence that the outdated 1903 Panama Canal Treaty be revised.

What are the major areas of tension?

Trade and investments: Economic matters are a vital concern to the countries of Latin America today. As they continue to grow and develop it is likely that their economic interests will diverge from those of the United States. Such differences are inevitable. But confrontation can be avoided if the United States pursues policies that reflect a sensitivity to the problem. In an address to the United Nations, Secretary Kissinger launched new initiatives and a broad constructive approach to the economic problems affecting Latin America and the rest of the developing world. But in Latin America there is great concern that once again words will not be implemented by actions. We must make clear to Latin America that significant initiatives will be carried into practice this time.

A new Panama Canal Treaty: There is virtually unanimous support for a revision of the treaty throughout Latin America. It is one issue on which all the countries seem to have made common cause. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Administration's support for the new treaty negotiations be strongly reaffirmed. An unequivocal commitment must be made to assure necessary Congressional and public support.

A firm stand against violation of human rights in the hemisphere: Documented reports have continued to substantiate allegations of torture and repeated violations of basic human rights in some Latin American countries. But there has been no strong protest from the United States. The United States should make clear that it is ready to press for an international investigation—by the United Nations or by the Organization of American States—of alleged repressive practices and to cease providing aid and support to regimes which systematically violate human rights. No other position is consistent with the principles to which we have so long expressed our commitment.

Relations with Cuba: Clearly Cuban intervention in Angola and its position with

March 4, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 1671

of their constituents in response to a written request from Members of Congress made on behalf of such constituents."

Four agencies had similar provisions in their guidelines already. For instance, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission makes information "available to any Member of Congress who is acting in his capacity as a Member of Congress."

The Community Services Administration discloses information routinely "to a Member of Congress seeking information concerning the individual, but only when the individual is a constituent of the Member and had requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record."

The National Science Foundation and the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission also make information routinely available to Members of Congress.

Five agencies said the guideline is not necessary or applicable to their operation. The Appalachian Region Commission "does not make grants or provide other funds to individuals, therefore, we feel the regulations to which you refer do not apply to this agency."

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has concluded that the agency can respond fully to "infrequent congressional inquiries in these other areas within the rationale of the OMB recommendations without amending our existing regulation." The service will ask for a copy of the constituent's letter asking for aid or for assurance that the request from the constituent was in writing, presumably, all contained in a written inquiry from the congressional office. This is a particularly innovative evasion of the question and completely unresponsive to the OMB guideline, not even showing a need for written congressional inquiries.

The Indian Claims Commission simply stated that the only records it maintains pertaining to individuals are commission employee personnel records. No discussion was made of intention to comply with the OMB guidance.

Although the Smithsonian Institution has not seen fit to publish any Privacy Act guidelines in the Federal Register to date, I have been assured the OMB guideline has been circulated to several persons in the institute so no problems should arise regarding constituent case-work.

The National Mediation Board states that its policy since the establishment of the board is to respond fully to all congressional inquiries and it will continue to, so no specific regulation is needed.

All other responding agencies are in some stage of implementing the guideline. Fourteen of these are in the process of adopting the guideline as an agency regulation and 17 have already done so. This includes HEW and its component, the Social Security Administration, the entire Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration and the General Services Administration which controls the Military Personnel Records Facility and the National Personnel Records Center, both in St. Louis. NASA has agreed to implement the OMB guidance with the condition that the congressional

inquiry be made in writing. No mention was made by NASA that the constituent inquiry should be in writing also.

I am in hopes that those agencies delinquent in responding to my inquiry will realize the importance of establishing a uniform policy of responding to congressional inquiry.

In the meantime, any agency that does not think it can provide the congressional offices with personal information is at liberty to gather information requested through the congressional office and forward it directly to the individual who is the subject of the record and request.

Congressional offices report that they have had few problems attributable directly to the Privacy Act in obtaining information from agencies since the implementation of the routine use regulation. Problems with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of the Navy, and other agency components have been quickly solved by referring agency officials to their own privacy regulations, or by conferring with privacy policy-makers within the agencies.

I am referring copies of all agency responses to my survey to the OMB for support in asking all agencies to comply with the October 3 guideline. Further, the Department of Justice has declared its support of the guideline and its intention to ask all agencies to comply should there be any agency that seeks to exclude itself from the government-wide policy.

One purpose of the Privacy Act of 1974 is to insure that information collected by Federal agencies will be used only for the purposes for which it was collected. The routine use does not enable congressional offices to collect information that has not been solicited by the subject of the information. Should any congressional office knowingly and willfully obtain a record on an individual from an agency under false pretenses, the person responsible in the congressional office is guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of up to \$5,000.

In January, my staff conducted a survey of congressional offices to discover how many are collecting evidence that a request from the constituent has been received. Such evidence—a letter, signature form or other authorization—is valuable for the congressional office to have in its files should the subject of any records request later claim he never made the request. Of course, under the OMB guideline as implemented by 31 agencies, this written evidence need not be presented to the agency concerned.

Sixty-nine representatives' presented over 90 different forms to the subcommittee. Several others always ask constituents to write a letter describing their difficulty. Many Congressmen also make written requests to agencies about particular sensitive cases. Only one office reported it never asks for something with the constituents signature attached.

The forms used range from simple mimeographed consent forms asking only the constituents signature to detailed forms asking the constituent to present his problem, supporting data and

authorization to the congressional office in order to pursue his case with a particular agency. A few offices wisely note where the request was received, on what date and who handled the request.

I commend these offices for their desire to comply with the Privacy Act to the fullest and their initiative in determining that a requester is who he claims to be.

Facsimiles of several good forms will soon be available in the Congressional Handbook published by the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

The subcommittee will continue to monitor the constituent casework problem. Should any congressional office find an agency that is not complying with the OMB guideline, or its own regulation, I would appreciate having that information brought to my attention. Similarly, I hope Federal agencies will apprise me of problems they encounter in implementing the regulation. The referred to letter follows:

GOVERNMENT INFORMATION AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C., December 22, 1975.

Hon. RODERICK HILLS,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HILLS: It has recently come to my attention that many agencies have not yet implemented the Office of Management and Budget guideline for the Privacy Act of 1974 regarding congressional inquiries on behalf of constituents. These agencies are not releasing information in response to telephone calls from congressional offices which affirm that a constituent request has, in fact, been received. In some cases, agencies are refusing to respond to inquiries even when the constituent's letter requesting help, or a form signed by the constituent authorizing the congressman to help, has been forwarded to the appropriate division within the agency.

When the Privacy Act became effective on September 27 of this year, this Subcommittee was overwhelmed with complaints from Members of Congress because executive agencies were refusing to deal with congressional inquiries and were citing the Privacy Act as the reason.

As a result of over a week of meetings between myself, congressional representatives, the OMB, and agency representatives, OMB Director James Lynn issued the following directive on October 3:

"Disclosure may be made to a congressional office from the record of an individual in response to an inquiry from the congressional office made at the request of that individual."

The guideline, a copy of which is enclosed, appeared in the *Congressional Record* of October 6, 1975, and the *Federal Register* of December 4, 1975.

Representatives of the Defense Department, the Veterans Administration, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare quickly assured me that their departments would amend their regulations to permit release of a constituent's personal data to congressional offices upon telephonic assurance that the request for congressional help had been made by the constituent.

I am writing now to ask whether your agency is complying with the OMB guideline. As you may know, the guideline provides that if a constituent has asked for assistance, the Representative should inform the agency of that fact. The guideline does not require that the request be in writing, or that it be presented to the agency.

H 1672

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

March 4, 1976

Please supply the Subcommittee with a copy of your agency's regulation implementing the OMB guideline. If you have not yet implemented the OMB language, please inform the Subcommittee of your reasons for not having done so.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

BELLA S. ABZUG,
Chairwoman.

MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION CEREMONY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker it was my personal honor earlier this afternoon to be in attendance at the Medal of Honor presentation ceremony at the White House during which the President gave the following address:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT MEDAL OF HONOR PRESENTATION CEREMONY, THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1976

We are gathered here today to honor four Americans for exceptional military gallantry in the service of our Nation.

All four of these men distinguished themselves above and beyond the call of duty. I deeply regret that one of the awardees, to the late Captain Lance P. Sijan (Sigh-Jan) of the United States Air Force, is posthumous.

The other three—Rear Admiral James B. Stockdale, United States Navy; Colonel George E. Day, the United States Air Force; and Lieutenant Thomas R. Norris, United States Naval Reserve—are with us today.

We confer our highest decoration upon them for their inspiring and heroic conduct. We do this in realization of the simple truth that they have helped to preserve America's future peace by demonstrating through their courage the dedication of those entrusted with our defense.

Their bravery places them in the ranks of the finest of America's heroes from the present back to the year 1775—when we were forced, as a nation, to first take up arms to defend our liberty. These four men served in Vietnam. The war in Vietnam is now over.

But as we today confer the Medal of Honor on heroes who distinguished themselves in Vietnam, we have not forgotten others whose fate still remains unknown. We will continue, on humanitarian grounds, to press for a full accounting for those men to resolve questions that keep many American families living in endless anxiety and agony.

The United States today honors four men of uncommon courage with the Medal of Honor. But we can—and must—also honor these men by living up to their example of patriotism.

We can do this by fulfillment of our own duty as a nation, the highest trust that we bear—the preservation of the safety and security of the United States in a very dangerous world.

As we celebrate our Bicentennial year, we take satisfaction in our power to preserve peace through strength. We are today the strongest nation in the world.

As President, I intend to maintain our deterrent power.

While I will do everything in my power to reduce the danger of war by diplomatic means, my policy for America's security can be summarized in three simple words of the English language—peace through strength.

I am gratified that the United States is today at peace. No Americans are in battle anywhere. We have strengthened vital alliances that preserve peace and stability throughout the world.

By maintaining unquestioned strength and resolve, we can command respect and preserve the peace. We cannot win against the enemies of freedom, big or small, without the kind of vigilance and valor symbolized by the medal of honor, the highest of all this nation's decorations.

We will win by patient and persistent pursuit of a defense second to none in a world that knows that America says what it means and means what it says.

By so doing, we will pay America's debt to the men we honor today, and the many others who served with such courage.

A grateful nation thanks its defenders for their resolve in keeping the United States of America the world's best hope of peace with freedom.

On behalf of the American people, I salute the cherished memory of Captain Sijan (Sigh-Jan)—and the living example of Admiral Stockdale, Colonel Day, and Lieutenant Norris. You served your nation well and have given us all a clearer vision of a better world.

Mr. Speaker, it was a deep honor and privilege to witness this impressive, inspiring and dramatic presentation by the President of the United States of the Medal of Honor award to the following four distinguished Americans: Capt. Lance P. Sijan, Rear Adm. James B. Stockdale, Col. George D. Day, and Lt. Thomas R. Norris.

Mr. and Mrs. Sylvester Sijan, long-time friends and constituents of mine, received the posthumous Medal of Honor for their son, Capt. Lance P. Sijan. A deep sense of pride and indebtedness was shared by all as the President presented the award to Mr. and Mrs. Sijan, for it was my privilege to have met Lance Sijan for the first time at Christmas in 1960. A talented and able high school senior, Lance had applied for the fourth congressional appointment to the Air Force Academy. His obvious academic ability and personality—qualities of leadership—and numerous achievements—gained the approval of the reviewing board which evaluates the many competing candidates. Lance was their unanimous first choice. And I was most honored to name him as my principal appointee.

As periodic reports of his grades and other evidence of his outstanding performance and maturity were received over the years, I shared the joy of his parents, particularly when he graduated from the academy in June, 1965, when he became a pilot, and now most recently, this afternoon, when he most appropriately received the Medal of Honor award from the President of the United States.

It is at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to read the citation of the Medal of Honor posthumously given to Capt. Lance P. Sijan by the President of the United States.

CITATION

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded in the name of The Congress, the Medal of Honor posthumously to Captain Lance P. Sijan, United States Air Force, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty:

While on a flight over North Vietnam on 9 November 1967, Captain Sijan ejected from his disabled aircraft and successfully evaded capture for more than six weeks. During this

time, he was seriously injured and suffered from shock and extreme weight loss due to lack of food. After being captured by North Vietnamese soldiers, Captain Sijan was taken to a holding point for subsequent transfer to a Prisoner of War camp. In his emaciated and crippled condition, he overpowered one of his guards and crawled into the jungle, only to be recaptured after several hours. He was then transferred to another prison camp where he was kept in solitary confinement and interrogated at length. During interrogation, he was severely tortured; however, he did not divulge any information to his captors. Captain Sijan lapsed into delirium and was placed in the care of another prisoner. During his intermittent periods of consciousness until his death, he never complained of his physical condition and, on several occasions, spoke of future escape attempts. Captain Sijan's extraordinary heroism and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty at the cost of his life are in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States Air Force and reflect great credit upon himself and the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, among other Members of Congress, I was today privileged to be present at the White House for a Congressional Medal of Honor presentation to four gallant servicemen, one of whom being a long-time friend and constituent, Rear Adm. James B. Stockdale, USN.

Admiral Stockdale was the senior naval officer in the North Vietnamese prison camps. He set a courageous example of leadership in resisting efforts of his captors to propagandize the POW's.

His wife, Sybil, and their four sons, plus his cousin, George Bond, and other relatives were present to watch him receive his award from President Ford.

I insert his citation as a portion of my remarks:

CITATION

The President of the United States in the name of The Congress takes pleasure in presenting the Medal of Honor to Rear Admiral James B. Stockdale, United States Navy, for service as set forth in the following:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty on 4 September 1969 while senior naval officer in the Prisoner of War camps of North Vietnam. Recognized by his captors as the leader in the Prisoners' of War resistance to interrogation and in their refusal to participate in propaganda exploitation, Rear Admiral (then Captain) Stockdale was singled out for interrogation and attendant torture after he was detected in a covert communications attempt. Sensing the start of another purge, and aware that his earlier efforts at self-disfigurement to dissuade his captors from exploiting him for propaganda purposes had resulted in cruel and agonizing punishment, Rear Admiral Stockdale resolved to make himself a symbol of resistance regardless of personal sacrifice. He deliberately inflicted a near-mortal wound to his person in order to convince his captors of his willingness to give up his life rather than capitulate. He was subsequently discovered and revived by the North Vietnamese who, convinced of his indomitable spirit, abated in their employment of excessive harassment and torture toward all of the Prisoners of War. By his heroic action, at great peril to himself, he earned the everlasting gratitude of his fellow prisoners and of his country. Read Admiral Stockdale's valiant leadership and extraordinary courage in a hostile environment