EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRESIDENT LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Lyndon Johnson, our 36th President, was a man uniquely endowed with the virtue of impatience. He was impatient with the racism which poisons our national spirit. He was impatient with all forms of intolerance. He was impatient with economic injustice which keeps millions in this country living in poverty. He was impatient with the prejudices which prevent some of our citizens from living with dignity and humanity. Above all, Lyndon Johnson was impatient with our national complacence. He could not understand how a country so rich could deny to some of its citizens a full measure of that richness.

He was a person impatient with the illness of American society. Only his ideal, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, exceeded his monumental program of social gains—the Civil Rights Act, medicare, the education programs, and Headstart.

But Lyndon Johnson's Great Society was not merely a conglomeration of legislative programs. Lyndon Johnson's dreams have become our dreams; his goals, our goals. In 1965, President Johnson addressed the commencement class at Howard University with these words:

> Our earth is the home of revolution. In every corner of the continent, men charged with hope contend in ancient ways in the pursuit of justice. They reach for the newest of weapons to realize the oldest of dreams, that each may walk in freedom and pride, stretching his talents, enjoying the fruits of the earth.

I was with President Lyndon Johnson at the signing of the medicare bill in the Truman Library in Independence, Mo., and I never saw a happier man. If it were not for the Vietnam war, he might have entirely succeeded in winning the war against poverty and intolerance.

As for now, even the tragedy of Vietnam cannot obscure the essential humanity of the man. Historians will debate for years his role in that conflict; but we should not allow this debate to detract from the contributions that Lyndon Johnson made to all Americans. Without the efforts of Lyndon Johnson, millions of aged would be without medical care; millions of blacks would remain in the political backwaters; millions of poor children would be deprived of the opportunity to overcome their disadvantage through a program of preschool education; and millions of other young citizens would be deprived of continuing their education beyond the secondary level.

In the end we should look at the life of Lyndon Johnson as an ideal to which we must continually rededicate ourselves. His words will serve as an inspiration to us in our time of doubt, our hour of despair. His call will be remembered by all men devoted to the elimination of human suffering.

GAS SHORTAGE HURTS INDEPENDENTS

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, during Monday's debate in the Senate over an amendment to strike from the Economic Stabilization Act a provision giving the President standby authority to allocate scarce petroleum products, a question was raised about the seriousness of the situation. It was suggested that perhaps the problem of gasoline shortages has been exaggerated.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Extensions of Remarks an article by John Fialka which appeared in the March 9, 1973, edition of the Washington Evening Star and Daily News. This article describes graphically the plight of thousands of small and independent oil dealers and suppliers who have been the first to feel the impact of gasoline and oil shortages. As the article notes, this independent segment of the petroleum industry is the consumers' principal bulwark against higher gasoline prices, and its survival is critically important in the effort to control inflation.

There being no objection, the article ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FUEL SHORTAGES—PINCH HITS GAS PUMPS

(By John Fialka)

Rufus P. Limpp of Marshall, Mo., has a problem that the nation may become thoroughly familiar with before the end of the summer.

Although rumors and signs of an impending gasoline shortage have surfaced in Washington in recent weeks, Limpp and thousands of "private brand" gasoline station owners like him have been struggling with the shortage for as much as six months.

The struggle has now evolved, for Limpp, into what may be the free enterprise system's strangest new marketing philosophy.

There have been days now when Limpp has to close all nine of his "Mars" gasoline stations so they will not run out of gasoline. He has discovered that it is dangerous to pump his underground fuel tanks empty.

When they are emptied, they become buoyant and, when the ground is wet, they have a tendency to pop out of the ground, breaking fuel pipes and causing damage.

Limpp has considered pumping them full of water to hold them down. "If I did that, though, then I'd really be out of business, wouldn't I?" he explained to a reporter.

Instead, Limpp has been experimenting with one of his Kansas City stations, pricing its gasoline 4 cents higher than the station across the street. He doesn't sell much gas, but he keeps his tanks in the ground.

"The trouble is, we don't have any game plan for this kind of operation," he said.

According to statistics released by the American Petroleum Institute, the nation's "game plan" for fuel production is now seriously out of kilter. A fuel oil shortage, triggered in part by a natural gas shortage, necessitated a crash program by oil refiners to produce enough heating oil to last out the winter.

The emphasis on heating oil has now brought on the likelihood of a gasoline shortage. And diesel fuel, which is already in tight supply, may present a second shortage situation. Both shortages, if they are not prevented, are likely to cause consumers substantial amounts of money.

First, the gasoline shortage. There is a gap between this year's stocks of gasoline and the amount on hand last year at this time that amounts to around 20 million barrels. The gap now appears to be growing, although the demand for gasoline this spring and summer is expected to be up by at least 10 percent.

The first casualty of a major supply shortage will be the network of small oil companies which are not affiliated with major oil companies and, thus, have no crude or, usually, no refinery of their own. About 10 percent of the gasoline sold in the U.S. is believed to come from little stations such as Limpp's.

Limpp and other station owners have always depended on supplies of surplus gasoline, produced usually by major refiners in excess of their needs, supplies which are no longer there.

PRICE RISE SEEN

One authority on gasoline marketing, Dr. Fred C. Allvine, a professor at Georgia Institute of Technology, believes that the private brand stations, by underselling major, nationally advertised brands by 3 to 5 cents, now function as the main control on gasoline prices.

If the "supply squeeze" shuts down a large number of private brand stations, an event which Allvine believes is possible in the next few months, he expects major oil companies will raise the price of gasoline.

"Should this happen," he recently told the Cost of Living Council, "the public at large will pay a very high price."

It is difficult to tell how far the gasoline shortage has progressed since it was first noticed by private brand stations on the West Coast last fall.

A spokesman for the Society of Independent Gasoline Marketers of America (SIGMA), which has about 200 private brand members, said the group has been unable to come up with any firm numbers on the extent of the shortage. "It's a kind of fear thing. A lot of our members are still trying to deal with major suppliers. Some of them compete against each other. They are afraid to divulge competitive information."

"Let me put it this way," he added. "We don't have any members who aren't experiencing a shortage."

Hugh Lacy is vice president of Urich Oil Company, which owns 100 gas stations and wholesales gasoline to about 300 others on the West Coast.

Urich, the company that invented the self-service gas station shortly after World War II, has suffered from temporary spot shortages throughout the winter. Its main contract with a major gasoline supplier will end this month.

Urich will then have to "cut off" the 300 stations, Lacy believes, and begin to padlock some of its own.

"This whole damned industry is going down the drain," said Lacy. He believes the major oil companies are now waging a "two-pronged war" with the private branders. First, he explained, they cut off supply contracts; second, they have opened a number of new stations with strange-sounding names that are now competing at the same price level with the private branders. Some examples are Exxon's "Alert," Mobil's "Sello," and Phillips' "Red Ball."

R. J. Peterson is board chairman of Martin Oil Co., which, at 200 stations is the biggest of the little oil companies operating in the Midwest.

Last winter, he noted, Martin contacted 56 separate oil refining companies, including almost all of the major ones, and was able to locate only 2.1 million of the 7.6 million barrels of gasoline it needs this year.

Peterson believes that the federal government, by giving its primary attention to the needs of major, international oil companies, is to blame. "They're the ones who put us in this position."

When a private brand marketer runs out of gasoline, there is only one place he can go. It is called the Oil Import Appeals Board, an obscure Interior Department agency located near an Arlington shopping center.

MORE LICENSES SOUGHT

According to Lewis Flagg III, who was recently removed as chairman of the three-man board, its usual business is giving crude oil import licenses or "tickets" to oil refiners who have experienced supply problems.

Out of the thousands of applicants who had appeared before the board up to last year, only six had ever asked to import gasoline. In January, there were more than 60 petitions for gasoline on Flagg's desk, all of them from private branders.

After giving several substantial import license awards to private brand companies, Flagg was summarily removed from his job in February. The Interior Department gave no reason for his removal. Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre, D-N.H., has charged that it was because Flagg attempted to help the oil industry's smaller businessmen to compete.

The board, however, continues to award import licenses to small companies to import gasoline.

Paul Castenguay, who has now closed 15 private brand stations of a chain of 25 he has operated in Minneapolis, believes that the licenses are virtually worthless to smaller companies.

The awards are so small that it would be impossible, he maintains, for such a company to charter a tanker and then physically bring the oil inland. And major companies, according to Castenguay and others, have refused to trade their product for import tickets.

"I might as well burn the tickets," said Castenguay, referring to a recent award to him by the board.

What do major oil companies think of the situation? A marketing expert for one of them, who asked that his name not be used, put it this way.

"They (the private branders) have always been yelling. Perhaps this year they have something to yell about. We are all having problems and when we're short we have to take care of our own stations first.

"We used to carry these people by keeping our refineries full and selling the excess. Now there is no excess. The energy picnic is over," he added.

HARD TO IMPORT

Unlike crude oil, which has been brought into this country in huge quantities, gasoline may be difficult to import in substantial amounts. European refineries have traditionally concentrated on the heating oil market and the relatively small supplies of gasoline they do produce are frequently below the octane rating necessary to operate the high compression engine of the American car.

Short of gasoline rationing, a contingency which the White House is now studying, the most repeated solution to the problem is to build more refineries.

There are no new refineries being planned in the United States. Rawleigh Warner Jr., board chairman of Mobil, which opened the most recent new refinery at Joliet, Ill., in January, said that major companies are no longer willing to take on the repeated battles with environmentalists and mounting labor costs involved with refinery site location and construction.

Nevertheless, he told the Cost of Living Council, the U.S. will not catch up with its fuel problems unless it finds a way to build five medium-sized refineries each year "from now to the end of the decade."

Many government experts agree with Warner and believe that the federal government will soon have to provide some form of incentive for refinery construction.

REFINERY IDLED

However, to the residents of Cushing, Okla., (pop. 8,500) Warner's argument might sound strange. The town's major industry, a relatively modern refinery, capable of processing 19,000 barrels of petroleum a day, stands idle.

On Feb. 7, the refinery, owned by Midland Cooperatives Inc., a farm cooperative, shut down. It had run out of crude oil. According to Forrest S. Fuqua, its manager, Midland decided to stage a premature overhaul of equipment, rather than lay off the refinery's work force of 165 men.

Next week the overhaul will end. Neither the federal Office of Emergency Preparedness. (OEP), the state of Oklahoma, nor any other governmental agencies working on the problem apparatus has been able to persuade the major oil companies that control the crude oil in the fields near Cushing to part with any.

So far, to allow Midland to participate in the nation's Oil Import Program, the Interior Department has issued Midland import licenses for over 2½ million barrels of crude oil.

In the past, the licenses have been valuable. Midland, like many small interior refineries who do not have the capacity to import oil, has always traded its licenses to major oil companies for domestic crude.

"All of a sudden, bang, it doesn't work anymore and here we are sitting high and dry," said Fuqua.

Thus, at a time of acute fuel shortage in the upper Midwest, Midland, which supplies fuel to over 200,000 farm families, is out of business.

And Midland is not alone. The Interior Department recently studied a sample of eleven independent refineries in the Midwest and found eight of them running well below capacity. Five of them have had to cut sales of diesel oil.

The problem, according to an Interior memorandum, was that the "majors (are) not willing to exchange import tickets (licenses) because: a. they are busy utilizing their own tickets first; b. they have no more domestic crude to offer for tickets."

Whatever the reason, the problem is serious enough to draw Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz into the fuel shortage problem.

Agriculture's problem is that the Nixon administration's massive attempt to reorient the nation's farmers to production, rather than subsidy, will hinge on increased supplies of gasoline and especially diesel fuel to operate tractors this spring.

Farmers are authorized this year to increase the number of acres they till by up to 40 million acres. Much of the new land, according to an Agriculture report on the subject, has been in the Soil Bank for years and will require extensive plowing.

In addition, because of the wet, cold weather last fall, farmers in the corn belt fell 30 percent behind on their plowing and will have to catch up this spring.

Meanwhile, farmers have been switching from gasoline to diesel tractors in large numbers, according to the report. "These large tractors are heavy consumers of fuel," it adds.

According to Agriculture sources the diesel shortage has already begun to slow plowing in Northern Florida, where farmers have discovered that they will be held to last year's level of fuel purchases by oil dealers.

"The phenomenon is likely to spread northward along with the plowing season," said one source.

As the Nixon administration grasps for a quick way to repair the nation's faltering fuel supply system, it will discover a savage process at work in the market place. The weaker, smaller companies are drying up, leaving increasing shares of the market to the major oil companies.

Perhaps the most poignant portrait of this approaching upheaval is seen by an elderly owner of a private brand gasoline station in a southern state.

Although he has been selling cut-rate gasoline since the Depression, his sources of supply have all disappeared in recent months.

Still, he gets by with a little help from his friends. One of them drives a gasoline truck for a major oil company. Often, after midnight, the truck arrives and smuggles part of its precious cargo into the owner's tank.

"I cut my teeth on a kerosene funnel," the owner told a reporter. "Ain't nobody going to drive me out of this business."

WOOD AND THE ENERGY CRISIS

HON. JOHN B. CONLAN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 19, 1973

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Speaker, energy supplies in the United States—natural gas, fuel oil, and coal—are dwindling. And as is the case with minerals, the supplies that are in the earth today are all there is left to serve mankind.

Although Americans make up only 6 percent of the world's population, we consume 35 percent of the world's energy. Thirty-two percent of the gas and 55 percent of the electricity used go into homes and commercial buildings—most of it for heating and cooling.

With these facts in mind, consider this: Statistics show that 1 inch of wood is 4 times as efficient an insulator as cinder block, 6 times as efficient as brick, 15 times as efficient as concrete or stone, 400 times as efficient as steel, and 1,770 times as efficient as aluminum.

Wood and air, either alone or in combination, are excellent insulators. Modern wood construction combines wood framing and airspaces in a structural assembly having high thermal efficiency. The National Bureau of Standards believes that with proper insulation and construction practices, in both residential and commercial structures, heating and cooling requirements can be reduced 40 to 50 percent. Just think of the fossil fuels that could be saved for the people and generations ahead.

But let us look at the other end of energy consumption too. A recent report reveals that about 430 kilowatthours of electricity are required to produce a ton of lumber. In contrast a ton of steel needs 2,700 kilowatthours and a ton of aluminum 17,000 kWh. These facts demonstrate that wood has exceptional environmental advantages and that we had better start intensively managing our only renewable resource.

GROCERIES TAKE BIGGER BITE OF PAY THAN BUTZ SAYS?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I recently inserted an article from the New York Times on the present low price and probable future increase in the cost of food. In that article the figure 16 percent was used as that part of the consumer's dollar going for food.

A more recent article in the Christian Science Monitor of March 15, 1973, indicates that 16 percent is a deceptively low figure except for the more well-to-do:

GROCERIES TAKE BIGGER BITE OF PAY THAN BUTZ SAYS?

(By Philip W. McKinsey)

WASHINGTON.—In seeking to turn aside the groundswell of complaints over rising food prices, Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz frequently says that Americans last year spent less than 16 percent of their spendable personal income for food.

Mr. Butz, an economist well versed in statistics, would be the first to acknowledge that that is an average figure that cannot be applied to everyone's food budget. In fact, it applies only to a relatively few families at the top of the income scale.

The 16 percent figure does not reflect the proportion of its income the average U.S. family spends on food because not everyone has the same income. Past a point, people do not eat more or eat better even if they can afford to do so. Thus the incomes of the wealthy drag down the average figure.

Consider these three income levels: If you work 40 hours a week at the minimum wage of $1.60 an hour for a full year, you earn $3,328. The Labor Department estimates that an urban family of 4 needs at least $7,280 annually to lead a "subsistence level" existence. And in 1971, the latest figure available, the median family income in the U.S. was $10,285 Currently, the median undoubtedly is several hundred dollars higher.

But using the Agriculture Department's own estimates of what people spend for food, it is possible to conclude that the income of an average family of four must be above $20,000 before food expenditures fall to no more than 16 percent of spendable earnings.

The calculations are a bit confusing, primarily because of myriad variations in family composition, types of income, tax liabilities, and willingness to buy more expensive foods. However, making some reasonable assumptions, food expenditures can be related to income.

The Agricultural Research Service of USDA publishes quarterly estimates of the cost of food consumed at home under a "low-cost plan," a "moderate-cost" plan, and a "liberal plan." Estimates are given for individuals and for different size families. In December, a family of four, comprising a man and a woman, 20 to 35 years old, a child aged from 6 to 9 and a boy aged 9 to 12, would have spent the following amounts each week: low-cost, $33.50; moderate-cost $43; and liberal, $52.60.

Before relating these expenditures to income, however, a further adjustment needs to be made to take account of food bought away from home, restaurant meals and snacks, for example. In preparing the monthly Consumer Price Index (CPI), the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that food at home makes up 78 percent of the food sector of the CPI and food away from home 22 percent.

Just like that 16 percent figure used by Mr. Butz, this division does not fit everyone. It is estimated for families earning somewhat below the median income of about $10,000. People earning more tend to spend larger amounts on food outside the home; people earning less may eat out less often.

Last, total income must be adjusted for tax liabilities to get a figure for take-home pay. Here, for simplicity, assume the family of four has only one wage earner and that in paying his income tax he takes the standard deduction and files a joint return.

These various estimates and assumptions lead to the following table:

FOOD EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENT OF SPENDABLE EARNINGS

Annual gross income	Low-cost plan	Moderate plan	Liberal plan
$3,328	62	79	97
$5,000	42	54	66
$7,280	35	45	55
$10,000	26	33	41
$15,000	18	23	28
$20,000	14	18	22
$25,000	12	14	18

Obviously, some numbers in the table are absurd. No one working at the minimum wage could afford the moderate or liberal food plans. Also, in some locations the family would be getting food-stamp assistance or perhaps receiving free commodities from USDA programs.

On the other hand, it is not very likely that anyone with a $25,000 salary would be feeding his family according to the USDA low-cost plan.

Despite all these qualifications, some things are startlingly clear. An average American family with two children is spending a good deal more than 16 percent of its spendable earnings on food, perhaps far more.

The 16 percent figure used by Mr. Butz, and the gradual decline over the years in the proportion of spendable personal income going for food, are important factors. They say, in effect, that most Americans have a rising amount of discretionary income—income not required for the bare necessities of life including food.

But the 16 percent figure does not indicate that most families do not spend more than that proportion on food. Most do. In 1971 three-fourths of all U.S. families had incomes below $15,000 and few of them spent only 16 percent of their spendable earnings on food.

PROPOSED SOCIAL SERVICES REGULATIONS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the last day for interested citizens to comment on the new proposed rules of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding social service programs for families and children and for the aged, blind or disabled.

The proposed social services regulations would gut existing programs which provide many families with the help they need to get off the welfare rolls and become self-supporting. If we allow the new regulations to be adopted as proposed, we will be letting down the thousands of families who will be forced to go back on welfare if deprived of these services. And we will also be letting down the taxpayers, who will have to pay the price for the shortsightedness of their officials.

Mr. Speaker, the social services programs have been working. I respectfully urge my colleagues to take action to preserve them.

I insert for the RECORD a copy of the comments I submitted in opposition to the proposed regulations:

Mr. PHILIP RUTLEDGE,
Acting Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RUTLEDGE: In just two weeks I have received over one hundred letters from constituents who are deeply disturbed about the proposed new regulations for social services under Title IV–A of the Social Security Act of 1972. Not one supported these proposed changes.

These letter writers include many people who have worked very hard to provide child care services to poor Americans, allowing the mothers to earn a decent living and giving the children the help they need. They are disturbed that the new regulations restricting eligibility would exclude most working mothers and senior citizens, while state licensing could lead to the "warehousing" of children with little attention paid to their educational or other needs.

Mothers with handicapped children, who have benefitted under the special need category, have also written in support of the special care their children require. Equally concerned are many people who have worked hard to raise money for the United Fund and other private charitable organizations. They know from personal experience how the proposal to discontinue federal matching of private donations will stunt these private and local initiatives.

Of course, many of these people have also written to you as well. However, most of the working mothers who rely on the child care services provided under this Act, do not know of you, and do not know where to write other than to their Congressman. Therefore, I think you might be interested in part of one of these letters, since its viewpoint probably is under-represented in the mail you have received:

"Believe me, I don't know what I would have done without the (child care) service. At least my child is in good hands, and I don't know why I'd have to worry or doubt for one minute of the day.

"My greatest aim was to get off welfare and do for myself and my son. The day care service has given me back a bit of self respect, because without it, I'd still be sitting at home wishing I could support my own child.

"What you probably don't realize is that even by working it is difficult to make ends meet. For example, I clear $65 a week, pay $90 a month for rent for two rooms. Never could I afford to also pay someone capable to care for my child.

"Therefore, many of us would be forced to leave our jobs, and simply rely on funds from welfare."

It was the intent of Congress in passing Title IV–A to help such mothers get off and stay off the welfare rolls. Therefore, I urge you to withdraw these self-defeating new regulations.

Sincerely,

GERRY E. STUDDS.

COMMITTEE FUNDING RESOLUTIONS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering some 19 committee funding resolutions reported from the House Administration Committee. While we obviously could take the approach of urging defeat of the previous question on each of these so that we could offer our now notorious minority staffing amendment, I do not plan to do this, and, to the best of my knowledge, no one else will. I think the fact that we lost the previous question on this very issue on March 7 by only one vote indicates the strong sentiment which exists in this body, on both sides of the aisle, for providing the minority party with adequate committee investigative staff.

It seems to me that we must now concentrate on building on this sentiment and urge the Rules Committee, which has original jurisdiction in this area, to report out our bill. With this in mind, I will this week be circulating a "Dear Colleague" with other Members soliciting cosponsors for this bill from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out that this bill is not identical to that which was adopted as part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, but later deleted in the adoption of the rules of the 92d Congress. That amendment would have provided the minority party with "not less than one-third" of the committee investigative staff funds. On January 29 of this year Congressman CLEVELAND and I introduced House Resolution 167 which would provide the minority party with "up to one-third" of these funds upon request of a majority of the minority.

Furthermore, as a result of the colloquy we had with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) during the debate on the Banking and Currency investigation-travel authority resolution, we have again revised our bill to meet the objections which he raised at that time, namely that the bill contained no safeguards against the minority abusing this privilege by appointing staffers who may not be qualified for the job or of proper character. Consequently, our revised bill now contains language on minority investigative staff employees which is identical to language now contained in clause 29(a) (2) of rule XI with respect to professional minority staff employees, namely that the selection of such staff must be subject to the approval of a majority of the committee, and lack of qualifications or proper character will be grounds for rejection. If a minority staff selection is rejected, the minority party would then make another selection, again subject to the approval of a majority of the committee.

So I think it is evident, Mr. Speaker, that with these two changes we have made considerable accommodations to those who have objected to these earlier versions for one reason or another. We do not view this as a partisan issue but rather as a congressional reform issue which is in the best interests of strengthening the Congress as an independent and coequal branch of Government, and therefore we have not adopted an uncompromising stance of insistence upon the restoration of the language of the original version, even though it had broad bipartisan support at that time. Our primary interest is in a more effective Congress, and an improved committee system is at the very heart of achieving the goal.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of our revised bill which we intend to introduce on Wednesday, March 28:

H. RES. —

Resolved, That clause 32(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The minority party on any such standing committee is entitled, upon request of a majority of such minority, to up to one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff pursuant to each primary or additional expense resolution. The committee shall appoint any persons so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of any person so selected are unacceptable to the committee, a majority of the minority party members may select other persons for appointment by the committee to the staff until such appointment is made. Each staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 20, 1973

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, Margaret J. Morris, judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, county of San Bernardino, will receive the Citizen of the Year award from Leonard Armstrong Post 1744 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

News of the VFW's choice of Judge Morris appeared in the March edition of the Dented Helmet, official bulletin of Post 1744. This laudatory article contains some very well deserved commendations for Judge Morris. I heartily applaud the VFW's choice and would like to share with you the following information on Margaret J. Morris, Citizen of the Year:

It is once again the time of year when Leonard Armstrong Post 1744, Veterans of Foreign Wars, presents its Citizen of the Year Award. This year we are proud to honor Margaret J. Morris, Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Bernardino.

Judge Morris was born in Kentucky on Oct. 8, 1922. She completed elementary school at Marion, Ky., as Valedictorian of her class and winner of the American Legion Citizenship Award. After graduation from Evansville, Ind., High School, she won a merit scholarship at Indiana University where her activities included:

Major in speech and drama, Varsity Debate Team—it was the first year women participated in the Big Ten Conference debates—university theater productions, including a lead in the premiere production of William Saroyan's play, "Jim Dandy" for the National Drama Association.

Judge Morris' employment—beginning at age 12 while she attended school—included waiting on tables, sales clerking, modeling, and keeping books for an aircraft plant to fund her education.

After graduating from Indiana University with a B.A. degree, she taught speech and drama for 2 years at Molene Junior High School before receiving a scholarship to Northwestern University School of Law.

Biographical highlights of the honoree include:

Education: Indiana University, bachelor of arts; Northwestern University School of Law, 1949 juris doctor; Editorial Board, Illinois Law Review and Illinois Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology and Order of the Coif, legal honor society.

Before moving to California in December 1952, Judge Morris practiced law for 3 years in Chicago from 1949 to 1952. She was a staff attorney for Chicago Land Clearance Commission, a member of the Board of Women Lawyers of Illinois and was the Illinois State delegate to the National Association of Women Lawyers.

In 1955, she became deputy county counsel for San Bernardino County, Calif., and she served as chief assistant county counsel in 1961.

She became judge of the municipal court in San Bernardino in 1963 and was elected presiding judge in that court for 1964. On January 21, 1966, she was appointed to the superior court and she was elected presiding judge in that court for 1969.

Her activities in San Bernardino include memberships in the Lutheran Church and Zonta Club. She served on the board of directors of the Legal Aid Society and as a member of the citizens advisory committee to the intergroup relations specialist of San Bernardino City School District from 1967 to 1970.

She was a member of the board of directors of the San Bernardino Community Scholarship Association from 1968 to 1970. She is an honorary member of Delta Kappa Gamma Society's Epsilon Tau Chapter. Judge Morris is a member of the Conference on California Judges. She served as a member of the juvenile courts committee. Conference of California Judges, in 1971. In 1972, she became a member of the board of directors of the Crafton Hills College Foundation and the San Bernardino County Heart Association.

Her husband, Robert S. Morris, is a San Bernardino lawyer. The Morrises have two children, Stephen, 19, and David, 17.