

Kennedy was killed, and I suspended judgment on the questions that arose then and shortly thereafter until Watergate, August 1973, revealed possibilities heretofore considered not possible.

I feel there is a congressional responsibility, and make no mistake about it, there is a great mass of American people and citizens in the world who are greatly concerned. And, I believe that since the national psyche has been traumatized by all of these shocking crimes there is a clear and impelling responsibility for the Congress to discharge.

Congress has never before studied the assassination of any President, but as the elected representatives of the people, I feel that it is clearly our responsibility to do so if there is any indication or reason to suspect that the truth of the circumstances resulting in the murder of a President have not been revealed, and any parties responsible and not previously known have not yet been brought to justice.

No similar period—the assassination of other nationally politically prominent people—has ever followed the deaths of the other assassinated American Presidents prior to John F. Kennedy, and there is a large body of knowledge done by committees and organizations involved in the study of the assassinations and independent researchers—scholars, journalists, pathologists, and others in forensic medicine—which warrants our attention and at least our attempt to verify.

During the past several months I have become increasingly sensitive to the need to conduct such an investigation because I have become a rallying point for people from throughout the country who are unsatisfied with the findings of the Warren Commission about the death of President Kennedy.

There has long been a need for further study of this death alone because, as the Gallup poll taken in January 1967 revealed, some 64 percent of the American public believed that more than one man was involved in the assassination.

Study of this assassination or any of the others is not something which I alone, or even one small select committee can do. It will take support of a majority of this legislative body, and I hereby call for that support.

We must settle for once and for all in the interest of the welfare of our country and the future of its people the truth of what happened at Dallas on November 22, 1963 and what Lee Harvey Oswald carried to his grave before he had his day in court, and perhaps what Oswald did not know.

We must find out if the President's death was in retaliation to the Bay of Pigs invasion against Cuba, and what connection did Oswald's murderer, Jack Ruby, also dead, have with all of this.

We must find out if there is any connection with the deaths of Senator Robert Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, and why there is any reason for cases of their two assassins to be back in the courts.

There is reason to subpoena E. Howard Hunt and Charles W. Colson, the Nixon

assistant, who, according to the Washington Post, called Hunt following the attempted assassination of Governor Wallace to order him immediately to Milwaukee and to break into the apartment of Wallace's suspected assailant.

There are many more disquieting questions to be resolved—so many as to boggle the mind—but they must be answered—with calmness, objectivity, dispassion, and fairness.

A NATIONAL HOLIDAY BILL IN HONOR OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in honor of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a man of humility whose life and work have had a profound impact on the conscience of America and the world. I take this opportunity with the hope that recalling his principles will stimulate us all to reflect them in our own lives and in the actions we take as servants of the people.

On January 23, 94 of our colleagues—both Democrats and Republicans—joined me in introducing legislation to make January 15, Dr. King's birthday, a national holiday. At that time, I expressed my belief that "establishing January 15 as a national holiday will insure that there will be at least 1 day each year when we collectively stop to consider how far we have progressed toward brotherhood and equality, and how much further we still have to go." I first introduced this legislation shortly after Dr. King's tragic assassination in April 1968. In each succeeding Congress, more Members have joined me in this effort; this year, I am confident we shall succeed.

No American more fully deserves such commemoration than Dr. King. No person ever dedicated his life so fully and tirelessly to the pursuit of equal rights for all Americans. Martin Luther King, Jr., gave his life for this struggle, and it remains for us to complete his work. Today, nearly 7 years after his death, "liberty and justice for all" have yet to become realities. In his best remembered speech, Dr. King eloquently described his dream for America's future. His vision remains as a guide for us today and as a measure of just how far we still have to go before we can rest.

By commemorating Dr. King's birthday, we would do more than honor a man; we would honor the spirit of love and hope which guided his life and which should inspire our efforts on behalf of the people we serve. I realize that 1 day cannot do justice to Dr. King's years of selfless dedication to the struggle for human rights. Yet, if on January 15 of each year, all Americans—in Dr. King's words, "sons of former slaves and sons of former slave owners on the red hills

of Georgia; farmers on the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire and the mighty mountains of New York"—stop to reflect upon Dr. King's life and efforts, we will preserve his great vision which is too often obscured by the daily demands of our own lives.

We must honor this great man of peace, and learn from the tragedy of his violent death. We must take Dr. King's boundless compassion as an example to be emulated in our own lives and give voice to his call: "Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill; let freedom ring from every mountain side."

Injustice, no matter where, no matter how, was intolerable to Martin Luther King as it should be to all of us. Black Americans, denied their inalienable right to register and vote in Alabama, were inextricably tied in his conscience to the people of Indochina, the helpless victims of American devastation.

Recognizing that injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere, Dr. King spoke out for freedom throughout the world, and the world loved him. In 1964, he received the Nobel Peace Prize—a recognition that his vision of man's potential transcended national boundaries and the differences of race, religion, and belief which divide us from our brothers. With characteristic humility, Dr. King accepted the coveted award, although he realized better than anyone else that his dream had yet to become reality. But his hopes were still aflame. The struggle would not be easy, but man's better instincts would prevail, not through death and destruction but through a nonviolent appeal to the sense of right which we may sometimes suppress but never fully forget.

In moving, measured cadence, Dr. King addressed his Stockholm audience, and his words deserve recalling today:

I am mindful that only yesterday in Birmingham, Alabama, our children, crying out for brotherhood, were answered with fire hoses, snarling dogs, and even death. I am mindful that only yesterday in Philadelphia, Mississippi, young people seeking to secure the right to vote were brutalized and murdered.

Therefore, I must ask why this prize is awarded to a movement which is beleaguered and committed to unrelenting struggle, to a movement which has not won the very peace and brotherhood which is the essence of the Nobel Prize. After contemplation, I conclude that this award which I receive on behalf of the movement is profound recognition that non-violence is the answer to the crucial political and moral question of our time—the need for man to overcome oppression and violence without resorting to violence and oppression.

I accept this award today with an abiding faith in America and an audacious faith in the future of mankind. I refuse to accept the idea that mankind is so tragically bound to the starless midnight of racism and war that the bright daylight of peace and brotherhood can never become a reality.

Dr. King rightly recognized that achieving freedom in America was incompatible with a foreign policy of oppression and war. He condemned the senseless, merciless slaughter in Vietnam, not because he calculated that the costs were too great, but because he recognized that the war was an immoral outrage which was corroding the soul of

refinance existing housing and a virtual ban on future construction. These factors hold true even in areas in which there is no history of flooding and in which the likelihood of future flooding is remote indeed.

Under the present law, after July 1, residential lending will be prohibited in communities which have failed to become eligible for flood insurance.

The reason is that the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Government National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and any federally supervised bank and savings and loan association will be prohibited from assisting in, making or approving loans secured by properties located in specially designated flood areas unless the community in which the property is located is participating in the national flood insurance program.

The spirit of this provision would seem most desirable, but let us consider the practical effects, which I believe we will see will bring severe injustice to property owners in communities which have not complied with the law, or for some reason cannot comply. I know that a recent court in just my area of Texas, showed that 44 communities are still not under the program.

Now let us look at what will happen in these communities after provisions of the Flood Disaster Protection Act go into effect on July 1:

Property values will fall sharply because construction financing will not be available. A homeowner, for example, gets transferred to another city by his employer. He tries to sell his home, where he has lived for 15 or 20 years. He finds that under the law we have written that there is no way he can get the house refinanced in order to sell the property. It does not matter that his home has never been flooded or that it will never be in danger of flooding. He is stuck from now on with that house unless he wants to virtually give it away.

Foreclosures will increase. As an example, say a homeowner is transferred after buying a house on VA financing 2 years earlier. He cannot sell the house, so he just defaults on his loan. He only loses the small downpayment. I fear such examples would become common.

Financing banks and savings and loan institutions would suffer because of the growing number of loan defaults.

The Federal Government will suffer because there will be a large number of FHA and VA loans involved. Those are the loans with the smallest down payments and thus the more likely to go into default. Then, under the law, the VA and FHA will pay off the mortgages and be stuck with the properties.

Property owners, the families who have worked and saved for years in order to own their homes, will suffer the most. Because no matter what they decide to do, the circumstances are beyond their control. Their lifetime investment can be completely wiped out.

We obviously went a little bit too strong in attempting to write this law and the need for corrective action should be obvious.

My bill would take that corrective action by:

Repealing the prohibition against federally assisted lending. The individual Government agency which underwrites a loan would make the determination of whether the property complies with flood insurance requirements that it deems necessary to protect the property. The application would be in the same manner as the FHA and the VA now set minimum property standards for each loan approved. Each piece of property would be judged on its own merits.

The law would apply only to housing built after the effective date of the flood insurance act. We should not penalize property owners who purchased homes in good faith years before we even considered flood insurance laws.

Regulation of federally assisted financing in areas where the elevation is above the 100-year flood plain would not include the prohibition against federally assisted financing, regardless of whether a flood insurance program was in effect in the community. The elevation of a piece of property could easily be established through maps already in existence and certified by an engineer's certificate. Thus a property owner in a nonparticipating community could still get flood insurance by certification of his property as being above the established 100-year flood plain.

Mr. Speaker, I hope all of my colleagues will study this law carefully. I can give full assurance that the problem that now exists is not one unique to my district or to my State. There have been numerous newspaper articles written throughout the Nation regarding the hardships that the flood insurance law as now written will bring.

If my colleagues have not yet heard from their constituents about the matter, I am sure they will as soon as the law goes into effect July 1. By that time, however, many of our citizens will have suffered needlessly.

There may be some who will argue that the only people who will be hurt are land developers. I wish that were the case, but the fact is that it will be the homeowner, not the developer who will be hurt.

My bill to make corrections in the Flood Disaster Act has been drafted after consultations with and recommendations from mortgage bankers, title company officials, local citizen groups, and with representatives from the Federal National Mortgage Association.

Mr. Speaker, we do need a sound program to provide Federal flood disaster insurance and such a program will continue to have my full support. We need every community to participate in such a program. But we also must have a law that provides more help than harm.

The last thing I want to do is risk the public's money needlessly.

But in the process, we must not invoke a program that does severe economic harm to property owners throughout the Nation.

I would be glad to discuss my bill with any of my colleagues, or my staff will be glad to assist in providing further information about it. I will also welcome

any of my colleagues who desire as co-sponsors to my amendments, which I believe will allow the Flood Disaster Protection Act to be implemented in the manner in which we originally intended.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ASSASSINATIONS AND ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATIONS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a House resolution calling for you to name seven Members of the House to a select committee of seven Members of the House, one of whom you shall designate as chairman, to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, and the attempted assassination of George Wallace.

Under the terms of the resolution the committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of these men—a President of the United States, a U.S. Senator seeking the Presidency, a civil rights leader of international prominence, and the attempted murder of the Alabama Governor as he was seeking the Presidency.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the 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 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, at it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee, under the terms of this resolution, 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.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this resolution after much consideration. It has not been a decision I have made hastily.

It is time that we study all this in retrospect, and with calmness and dispassion.

There are questions to be resolved. I was at Dallas the day that President

America and its people. He appreciated the inestimable damage of wasting America's most valuable and precious resource—our youth—who were sent to kill or be killed in order to deny the people of Indochina the opportunity to design their own future.

Martin Luther King was rightly sensitive to the impact of the Indochina war on black America. Exactly 1 year before he died, he explained why he abhorred and opposed the war so intrinsically and why he denounced it so vehemently:

Perhaps the most tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and brothers and husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

He himself fell victim to violence before he could see an end to his country's involvement in Indochina. And, in a real sense, it has never ended. While American men are no longer dying needlessly, America's military presence remains in the form of hardware of destruction.

It has been more than 2 years since the Paris peace accords, yet President Ford now exhorts us to maintain the American war machine in Southeast Asia by feeding it an additional \$522 million.

If we agree to this request, especially at a time of spreading depression at home, we shall demonstrate that we have learned nothing from more than 10 years in Indochina. And we shall mock the ideals for which Martin Luther King, Jr., lived and died.

Dr. King's commitment to nonviolence was more than an effective strategy to achieve civil rights for the millions of blacks. It demonstrated an unshakable belief in the ultimate decency of men, and the possibility that they could come to understand that oppression exacts a greater spiritual toll from the oppressors than the oppressed. It meant to him that violence begets only violence and that men cannot be forced to love one another, but must freely come to recognize their common humanity.

Before his dream can be fulfilled, nonviolence must become the basis for relations among nations, as well as among individual men and women. So long as the spirit of violence pervades our foreign relations, it will inevitably corrupt our domestic affairs. Nonviolence provides the link between equality among Americans and eventual disarmament among nations, and offers the vision of an international society in which preci-

ous resources are no longer devoted to purposes which tear down, rather than build human lives.

By establishing Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday as a national holiday, we shall be providing all people, here and abroad, the opportunity to honor his memory and ideals in their own way. As Members of the Congress, we must accept the opportunity and responsibility to do what we can to embody his ideals in law. Surely this means a searching examination of the defense budget and a reallocation of our resources from military to human needs. This also means that we must protect and extend the fundamental political rights upon which the preservation of our liberties depend. This year, we shall be called upon to confirm the right of blacks and other minorities to vote, as provided by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Dr. King's efforts were based on the belief that people could change their own lives if they would join together in pursuit of their common goal. The right to vote, therefore, is basic to making his dream come alive.

Finally, and most critically today, is the need to extend our conception of fundamental rights to include the right of every man and woman to build constructive and self-fulfilling lives for themselves and their families. With unemployment among blacks at or near the national levels of unemployment during the depression of the 1930s, we must recognize the importance of the opportunity to work and the obligation of the Government to become the employer of last resort to all those willing but unable to find work in the private sector. Dr. King's vision of America was of a self-reliant nation whose people are strong and secure enough to love and not to hate. It is our obligation—to ourselves as well as to Dr. King's memory—to enable all the American people to provide for themselves and find the freedom to discover their brotherhood.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Miss JORDAN).

Miss JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I commend him for moving forward with the proposal to designate a national holiday in honor of Martin Luther King.

The Martin Luther Kings of this world are not duplicated in succeeding generations. A Martin Luther King is a once-in-a-lifetime experience, and we experienced him in the fullness of his impact on the lives of all of us.

There is little that we can do to honor his memory, but the little that we can do is to move ahead and see that the designation of a national holiday in his honor, in his memory, is accomplished. It is not much, but it is all we can do. We cannot resurrect him. We cannot duplicate him. We can only remember him fondly and try to incorporate into everything we say and everything we do the life he lived—the life of justice and peace and dignity and nonviolence and lack of agitation.

We can do that by approving the kind of legislation, which the gentleman has

introduced and which I have cosponsored, which designates his birthday as a national holiday.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Miss JORDAN), who herself comes from a family that has deep religious roots.

I want to say to her that I am asking for hearings before the appropriate subcommittee, and I think we have every assurance that, with the new groundswell of support that has accumulated as each session has gone by, we may be able to do that which the gentlewoman has so eloquently urged us on to do. I deeply appreciate her remarks.

I yield now to the gentleman from Florida, a former Senator and a Member of this body (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman, our distinguished friend from Michigan in the well (Mr. CONYERS), for yielding to me so that I might join him and my other distinguished colleagues in signifying my assent to and support for the legislation establishing a national holiday that bears the honorable name of Martin Luther King, Jr.

I am very much pleased to join in sponsorship of that legislation. I was born and raised about 40 miles from Montgomery, Ala., where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., first came into national prominence by leading a nonviolent crusade on the part of black people to protest against the discrimination of which they were the victims in that capital city of my native State.

From that point on, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., became a national figure, and a symbol of protest when we were treating Americans of our country—in an un-American way.

I shall never forget the first time I came to a vivid visualization of Dr. King, which was when he spoke at the Lincoln Memorial, and gave one of the most eloquent addresses I have ever heard, and in which he echoed again and again that theme for which he became so famous, and which came to be repeated throughout the country by his people, "We shall overcome."

Although dastardly assassins have taken the material life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., his spirit has overcome much of the discrimination against which he originally protested. He has opened up wider and better horizons of life to his fellow citizens which never should have been denied them. He has also, through his hopes and his aspirations, been able to give many people the ability to enjoy, in the fullest measure, the richness of the life of this great America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to take part in this special order today, and I hope that we will be able to let the name of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., symbolize the new spirit of America that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has brought into the beings and the hearts of our people.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) has chosen to

again associate himself with these kinds of causes which have distinguished his career in both the U.S. Senate and in this body, and I am indeed happy and privileged to be able to share his support for this measure.

I am now happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) of the bill to create a national holiday of Dr. King's birthday, and to appear with the gentleman from Michigan on his special order.

I feel this evening a strong sense of the continuity of the progress in the affairs of humankind. As my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER), referred to in his remarks, a few years ago in this Capital City occurred the scene of a remarkable phenomenon as hundreds of thousands of citizens of all ages, persuasions, and origins walked together through the streets of this city. These people came together, joining hands, hearts, and voices, in peaceful protest, petitioning long overdue redress of a sad and shameful imbalance in our society. My teenage son and daughter were a part of the crowd that gathered to hear the words of the unique person whose belief in ultimate justice and peaceful protest as a means to that end brought about the unforgettable march on Washington of August 28, 1963—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The words he said on that day have become immortal, not only because of their ringing persuasion and timeliness, but because of their truth and promise. "We shall overcome," he cried; and the cry was taken up by the thousands massed on the Mall, and millions more all over this land. And a movement became a crusade.

Martin Luther King, Jr., was joined in his great crusade by two Presidents of the United States—John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Proposals were made and bills were drawn; and in 1964, the historic 89th Congress acted upon the rightful demand of its black constituents for first-class citizenship.

I am proud to have been a Member of that body and to have supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as I sponsored and supported similar legislation in Oregon several years before.

Now all three of these memorable leaders are gone from us—President Kennedy and Dr. King in untimely and tragic fashion. But their common achievement, and that of all the other Americans who marched that day and other days, and who suffered and even died in that cause, as did Dr. King—this achievement, written into law as the civil rights legislation of 1964, lives on. Imperfectly, too slowly, but surely and inevitably these laws are working to effect deep and permanent change in our society.

Much still remains to be done before prejudice and discrimination are banished. Equality of education and opportunity do not yet exist to the extent we desire. Our black colleagues feel and know

this to a greater degree than can we of a lighter complexion. But men and women of good will of whatever race can here resolve to join together to insure that upward progress of our minority citizens continues, and is accelerated to the point where the statement of that great Scot poet, Bobby Burns, "A man's a man for a' that", becomes a reality and we need no longer worry about affirmative action, about black neighborhoods, busing, and similar devices, because such shall no longer be necessary.

There will be names engraved forever on the consciousness and conscience of America. Martin Luther King, Jr., is very near the top of the list. He is an authentic American hero of an age, supposedly, of antiheroes. It is time we recognized him as such.

Therefore, I am privileged to join in this special order to honor him and to advance the cause of brotherhood and good will toward all men and women of all races.

Mr. CONYERS. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Oregon, with whom I have not had the pleasure of working extremely closely on too many bills, and whom I have never heard make remarks about the nature of improved race relations and their importance before, that I am very deeply moved by the statement that he has just made, in which he has, in a very graphic way, shown how his family has brought him—and in some ways all of us—to an appreciation that we are not going through a sentimental exercise here today, speaking eulogistically of a great but deceased American.

From his remarks, I just had the vivid recollection of my coming to Washington to participate in that march on that day in 1963. Somehow, the gentleman's articulation of this event in a personal way brought back these memories, and I am very, very pleased to hear him say what perhaps could be said best by him, better by him than perhaps even the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas or myself.

I think he adds a strength to our purpose. I think that he helped make most of us feel that in this 94th Congress we will finally do what we have said ought to have been done so much earlier, in earlier sessions.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon for these very obviously sincere remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SIMON).

Mr. SIMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the gentleman from Michigan has yielded to me. If I may join in personal reflection first of all, I recall very, very vividly the first time I met Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. A good friend of mine by the name of Robert Graetz was a Lutheran pastor in Montgomery, Ala., who stood up for the rights of all citizens in that community. Feelings in that day and age, unfortunately, were not what they should be, as too often they still are not today. Bob Graetz had his home bombed three times.

I was then a member of the Illinois House of Representatives, sponsoring some civil rights legislation. I was invited by Dr. King to go down to Montgomery

to speak on the second anniversary of the bus boycott in Montgomery. Dr. King happened to be in Chicago. I met him at the St. Louis Airport. We flew together down to Atlanta first, where we met his parents, Dr. and Mrs. King, Sr., and then on to Montgomery where I had a chance to spend 2 days visiting with Dr. King and his family in their small, white frame home, and to get a bit of the flavor and the breadth and the depth of the man. Through the years, we kept in touch.

I think the gentleman's resolution is important, not because of a personality but because of what he stood for and stands for. In a world of oppression he stood for justice; in a world of violence, he stood for nonviolence; in a world mired in discord, he gave us dreams and hope, and he was practical. Those are the things we need today. We still have oppression; we still have violence; we still are mired in discord.

Too often when we have dreams we do not know how to put legs on those dreams. No man who was not practical could have gotten a quarter million people in this city on that eventful day in 1963.

I commend the gentleman for his resolution. I am proud to join in it. I think it can be a significant thing for our Nation and literally for the world, too.

Mr. CONYERS. I am very pleased to hear the gentleman make these observations. He brings to this session of Congress a personal relationship on which he predicated his support of the national holiday legislation that is now moving forward, I think, at such a rapid rate. There is a continuing ground swell that to me is extremely significant—that even though the number of years increases since the time Dr. King walked among us, more and more people, on honest reflection and reevaluation, realize that this is indeed an appropriate man to be the first Black American to be so distinguished by having a national holiday established in his honor.

I deeply and sincerely appreciate the vigor and the perception which the gentleman brings in supporting and cosponsoring this legislation.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, there is a crying need in the country today for positive signs, for inspirational actions. In these times of economic hardship and moral aimlessness, we need to reflect and draw upon all possible sources of strength.

For many Americans, the spirit and work of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., provides a beacon in life's otherwise dark and uncertain pathway. For millions of us, Dr. King's memory keeps alive a resolve to work for the humanitarian principles that gave strength and direction to his efforts.

It would admirably serve our need for examples of greatness if we designated the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., a national holiday. This would but formalize a national pride and emotion that still stirs in those of us who rejoiced in his work to secure freedom and justice for all. Through H.R. 2265, the Congress of the United States has an appropriate vehicle to keep alive the val-

and ideals for which Dr. King lived and died.

It is well that the Congress accept a leadership role in this spiritual effort and give a collective concern for the heroes of America acknowledges and embraces. The choice is a fine one and I urge my colleagues to purposefully decide to adopt a commemorative resolution.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today to urge my distinguished colleagues on the Census and Population Committee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to give swift and favorable consideration to a bill which has for too long gone unattended. I refer to the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and cosponsored by myself and 93 Members of the House, to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday.

In his address at the Lincoln Memorial during the historic march on Washington 6 years ago, Dr. King said:

It is not an end but a beginning. Those who hope the Negro needed to blow off steam and now be content will have a rude awakening if the nation returns to business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, I say here today that Dr. King's assassination was not an end but a beginning. It sounded a call to each and every citizen of this country—black and white—to carry on the struggle for dignity to which he dedicated and ultimately sacrificed his life.

Black man, I have personally experienced the bigotry and hatred of discrimination. At an early age, I endured slurs and injuries caused by unfeeling and unfeeling people. But through the leadership of Dr. King, his writings and the example of his life, I refused to adopt an outlook of vengeance and loathing. As he said:

Do not seek to satisfy our thirst for revenge by drinking from the chalice of bitterness. . . . The marvelous new life which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to distrust all white men. They have come to realize that their fate is inextricably bound to our own. We cannot walk alone.

The consequence of Dr. King's guidance directed my time and energies to activities—activities designed to help the citizens of my community of the color of their skin. It is in large measure because of his philosophy and teachings that I am in this Chamber today as a Member of Congress representing the will of the good people of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee.

His tireless efforts and numerous accomplishments are known to all of us. He is the chief architect and executor of the plan to attain justice and equality in modern America through brotherhood. Indeed, he was instrumental in securing the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1968 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. In recognition of his devotion to the principles of unity, dignity and nonviolent action, he was awarded the Nobel Prize for

peace. However, the job he set out to do is by no means completed. Racial strife has again broken out over school desegregation, this time in the city of Boston. Unemployment among minorities is in excess of 30 percent and rising. Crime and violence still ravage innocent citizens in our streets.

We must again embrace his vision of equal justice for all men. A day commemorating these ideals and Dr. King's great life as well as providing all of us the opportunity to reexamine our commitment to these goals is what I am seeking today. A national observance of his birthday will serve as a reaffirmation of our intent to continue his unfinished work for peace and unity.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to close these remarks by leaving with my colleagues what was the very essence of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s life and his legacy to every man and woman of this country:

I have a dream . . . it is a dream deeply rooted in the American dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up, live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I join many of my colleagues today to support the resolution establishing the date of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birth as a national holiday.

The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience, but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy. Martin Luther King's life stood as a challenge to a country too long in the shadow of racial injustice, too dilatory in abandoning its prejudices, too late in fulfilling its constitutional legacy. The nature of his cause embroiled him in controversy.

On December 1, 1955, a tired Mrs. Rosa Parks refused to give up her bus seat to a white person in Montgomery, Ala. A young black minister was soon surprised to find himself elected to lead the bus boycott protesting the racial inequity in the city.

The boycott's success catapulted Martin Luther King to the front of the civil rights movement. He followed the boycott with an action to desegregate the lunch counters and restrooms of Birmingham and later went on to lead marches and protests in Washington, D.C., Selma, Chicago, and Memphis.

Throughout his short life, Martin Luther King was forced continually to test his capacity for self-restraint and for restraining others. He was arrested 15 times or more, harassed, beaten, stabbed, and finally killed by an assassin's bullet. Both sides criticized him—either as an "Uncle Tom" out of touch with the harsh realities of white racism or as a lawbreaker and agitator.

What motivated this man to leave a comfortable life? And in the face of the constant threat of violence and death, to press on from Birmingham to Selma to Memphis? How did he channel years of repressed aggression, bitterness, and hate in his followers into constructive, nonviolent action? How was Martin Luther King militant and yet nonviolent, revolutionary, but moderate?

The memory of Martin Luther King arouses these questions in my mind. I think it proper and necessary that all Americans be reminded on the date of this great man's birth to stop and ponder such questions and their answers.

Martin Luther King taught America great lessons. He did not fear her problems but, rather, preferred to face them and make others face them. He was known as the master of civil disobedience. But more than that, he knew the distinction between unjust and just laws, and he knew the highest respect for just laws, as well as the moral responsibility to disobey the unjust.

I support this resolution because I believe Martin Luther King is a model for all Americans. Like the great frontiersmen in our history, he was a revolutionary because he dared to tread on unknown territory and because his dreams were rooted in the American horizon.

In closing, I want to use once again Martin Luther King's own words when he said:

I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

Martin Luther King's children are grown today, but the American character still must work on perfecting this dream into a reality. The observance of Martin Luther King's birthday will serve as a steady reminder.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with our colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to a man who dedicated his life to correcting gross social, racial, and economic inequities among his fellow man, both here and overseas. Clergyman, teacher, husband, father, social activist, and Nobel laureate, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was a courageous and effective spokesman, not only for the Nation's black community but also for all other Americans who are disadvantaged, underprivileged, and relegated to a second-class status by the country's establishment.

Martin Luther King Jr. had a dream, a beautiful one in which he envisioned that all citizens would enjoy the same rights and privileges, that they would be judged not on the basis of their color but on the basis of their own inherent worth and capabilities. Dr. King, however, was no ordinary dreamer as he had a unique way of translating many of his dreams into living realities.

With unquestioned courage, dignity, a single-mindedness of purpose and deep faith, Dr. King struggled for his entire adult life to achieve justice and equality for all Americans—whether blacks in the South or urban ghettos, the Spanish-speaking in the Southwest or Northeast, or poor whites in Appalachia. He ignored his own safety and well-being. He was vilified, he was beaten, he spent many days in Southern jails and, finally, he was gunned down in cold blood.

As the leader of a great moral crusade, Martin Luther King Jr. devoted himself to removing all vestiges of racism, discrimination, and inequality wherever they may exist. He enlisted all elements of American society in a great effort to

redirect the country's distorted national priorities—most particularly our ill-conceived involvement in a military misadventure in Southeast Asia and the gross imbalance in terms of failing to meet urgent domestic needs.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with our colleague from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, in sponsoring legislation to designate Dr. King's birthday as a national public holiday. Action on such a proposal is long overdue. Not only would it serve as a fitting and well-deserved tribute to a great person and humanist, but it would also stand as a reminder of the continuing efforts which must be made to carry forward the important work initiated by Dr. King to fully achieve that dream of which he so eloquently spoke on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial over a decade ago.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, in April of 1968, an assassin's bullet stilled the voice of one of our country's most eloquent and diligent fighters for the cause of human rights—Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

From the beginning when he led the bus boycott in Birmingham to the end when he tried to negotiate dignity for the lowly sanitation workers in Memphis—Dr. King dedicated himself to the belief that injustice was not to be tolerated.

During the history of our great country, we have seen fit to declare a national holiday for many good and noble reasons but what better reason could there be than to pay our lasting respect to the memory of so noble a countryman?

At a time when the poor, the elderly, and the other powerless citizens of our country are fighting to be heard—what better way to begin to answer than to honor the memory of their greatest spokesman?

For if we believe as he did that injustice is intolerable—that it is our duty "to feed the hungry," "clothe the naked," and "heal the sick" then I submit that we have a duty to declare Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Day a national holiday.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from Michigan in paying tribute to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and in urging that prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress of legislation which would make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday.

The murder of Dr. King in 1969 deprived mankind of one of its greatest leaders. Dr. King was a prophet who contributed immeasurably to efforts to unite all people, black, brown, yellow and white—to make the American dream a reality—to expose the cruel injustice of racism and inequality wherever it existed.

The greatness of Martin Luther King was his selflessness. From Montgomery to St. Augustine, to Chicago to Memphis he demonstrated his unyielding commitment to improve the lot of all Americans. Dr. King recognized that, so long as a single individual was a victim of inequality and injustice, so were all people deprived of their own dignity and self worth. For example, people realize that the financial gifts which accompanied

the Nobel Peace Prize were not kept for either himself or his family, they were distributed among civil rights groups.

Martin Luther King's life was taken from him as he gave to others. He was not being honored in these distinguished chambers. He was not consulting with the corporate leaders of this great Nation. He was not receiving the adulation of Americans. Instead, notwithstanding some Americans who questioned the long range effectiveness of his tactics, Dr. King was sharing the struggle of garbage men who in turn were seeking a decent wage.

Mr. Speaker, in previous years, I have been privileged to join my distinguished colleagues in cosponsoring legislation which would make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday. It was our hope that, by this time, favorable action would have been taken.

Now, however, this proposed legislation is before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which, in turn, has established a subcommittee whose concerns include national holiday. I am, therefore, hopeful that Dr. King's birthday will be memorialized for all Americans with the same prominence as that accorded to others who have made such enduring contributions to the development of America.

Passage of this legislation will make it resoundingly clear to all people that the future of all Americans, black, white, brown and yellow, is inextricably interrelated; that we cannot and will not be separated by such artificial barriers of race, class and personal belief; that such restrictions serve only to weaken the fabric of our Nation.

I call upon all Americans to hear the words and the spirit of Dr. King. Let us join together in reaffirming our commitment to truth and equality of opportunity for all Americans. Let us do so not because it is popular, easy or timely. Let us do so because it is the right thing to do.

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one who worked on civil rights cases in the South in the early 1960's, the cause of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has a special meaning to me. His tireless, well-organized, and inspiring campaigns to obtain equal rights for black Americans and to eliminate poverty and social injustice should serve as a model to all of us in our search for peace and harmony among ourselves and among people of all nations.

He brought concerned Americans together to work side by side for social reform, and was instrumental in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968.

Dr. King's life serves as a testimonial to the significant goals that can be achieved by peaceful and aggressive non-violent action in reforming political and social institutions.

I join wholeheartedly with my colleagues in supporting this resolution to pay tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., by making his birthday a national holiday. Such a commemorative day would serve as a reminder of his dream so that one day we truly can say not

that we shall overcome, but that we have overcome.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has graciously secured this time so that we might reflect upon the works of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who called for an America free of racial prejudice and economic injustice. As a cosponsor of Mr. CONYERS' resolution to make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday, I am pleased to speak of his enormous contribution to the further democratization of our society.

Reflecting upon the matter, I am constantly overwhelmed by the integrity and moral rectitude with which Dr. King led the civil rights movement. The greatness of his leadership lay in his unswerving commitment to nonviolent, civil disobedience as the vehicle for achieving legal and social change.

Dr. King firmly believed that social injustice and racial discrimination would only be eliminated by confronting the political and economic strength of the powerful with the moral and ethical strength of the powerless. In his "Letter from Birmingham Jail," he wrote:

We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed.

In placing the moral principle of equality above the legal premises of segregation, Dr. King reasserted the timeless doctrine which refuse to subjugate the individual to the state in matters of conscience. In the tradition of Antigone, Thoreau, and Gandhi, he chose to accept temporal punishment to remove the bonds of segregation, rather than remain chained to it.

During his lifetime, Martin Luther King was vilified as a "lawbreaker," a "common criminal," and a "felon." These accusations have always amazed me because they misperceive the nature of civil disobedience. Dr. King stated it well:

I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for law.

In addition many of the laws which made illegal the acts of Dr. King and his compatriots were later declared unconstitutional by the courts. That process by which Americans challenge invalid statutes is part of the great legal tradition of this Nation.

The Supreme Court reports are replete with instances of individuals who deliberately disobeyed a statutory command so that its constitutionality could be challenged in the enforcement proceedings which followed. Examples may be found in all areas of the law: antitrust, tax, and labor relations, to name a few.

That process is rightly a cornerstone of our constitutional foundation. If we were to ask our citizens to obey every law, government would be free to do as it pleases for its judgments would never be called into question. Such docile submission to authority is surely the path to oppression.

And so it is with great reverence that

speak of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Hopefully his legacy to America will be the constant recollection of the principles of civil disobedience, without which we would never have begun the long struggle to remove the ancient scourges of poverty and racism.

Our sorrow at the passing of Dr. King is assuaged only by the knowledge of the extraordinary things which his widow, Mrs. Coretta Scott King, continues to accomplish. The words of the Bible, so beloved by Dr. King, are applicable: One sows but another reaps.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., died fighting for justice and liberty. He represented the best this Nation had to offer. He fought for the high principles which he believed in, but he refused to fight with violence or hate. That is the legacy that Dr. King left us and while the battle is yet to be won, the dream is with us still.

Dr. King gave rise to a movement which exhibited the basic principles of freedom, justice and peace. When a man gives his life for the dreams, hopes and aspirations of a nation, his name should be inscribed upon the history of that nation. His birthday should be a symbol of rebirth for this Nation and its people should dedicate themselves to the ideals for which he lived and died.

Our children and grandchildren must remember that a man can strive for justice and liberty and can achieve these goals through peaceful means.

Dr. King was a symbol of these goals. Designating his birthday a national holiday is the least we can do to honor and remember a man who did so much to improve the lives of so many Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that the Congress act now to officially designate the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a national holiday.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of commemorating as a national holiday the birthday of the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He was born in Atlanta on January 15, 1929. After completing an outstanding academic career in Morehouse College and in universities in Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, he returned to the South to pastor the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Ala. It was from here that he first launched himself into national prominence. His mobilization of the Montgomery bus boycott, the formation of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the march on Birmingham and Washington, helped lift Dr. King into the forefront of the emerging civil rights movement.

For his efforts, Dr. King received numerous honorary degrees, Time Magazine's Man of the Year, and the Nobel Peace Prize, but he was not satisfied with personal rewards. He continued to press his movement onward, as he brought his nonviolent teachings northward. He found himself physically attacked and jailed in cities all across the Nation. Yet he clung to his undying conviction in the Gandhian ethic of passive resistance and civil disobedience.

He was finally called to Memphis in April 1968 to support a sanitation workers' strike. It was a call from which he

would never return. Struck by an assassin's bullet, he died almost immediately. It was cruelly ironic that such a man, dedicated to nonviolence would meet such an end, but despite his death his work and teachings pressed onward.

Not all men revered Dr. King. Some called him a cowardly Uncle Tom, others called him the Black Messiah, but whatever their opinion all men agreed that Dr. King ignited in the black man a consciousness that will burn forever. His strong belief in the unalienable rights coupled with his dedication to nonviolence awoke in the hearts and souls of his fellow black man a feeling of purpose, pride, and unextinguishable desire to fight for the rights that are lawfully theirs.

In America we commemorate our national heroes by declaring their birthday a national holiday. Such great Americans as Lincoln and Washington are honored in such a way. These two great men served their country well but by commemorating them we recognize them as more than just great statesmen; but as symbols of ideals that we hold dear. Dr. King was also a great statesman and yet he too was a symbol, a symbol of the emerging black consciousness and self-awareness. I therefore urge that his spirit be preserved by marking his date of birth as a national holiday.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 200th anniversary of the birth of this Nation. In these days we sometimes look at ourselves as if in a mirror to see if we have lost the vigor and commitments that have instilled in our history the quality of greatness. Many ask apprehensively if America has not lost its momentum, if there will be a full third century of American history.

Martin Luther King, Jr., gazed into that same mirror. He was aware, much more than most, of each blemish on our collective face. But Martin Luther King still saw the image of what America was yet to be. In that mirror, he perceived a dream, and he called on each of us to fulfill it, an America molded to the specifications of its own Constitution and its own ideals.

His vision was not limited to his hopes for the black people of America. The quality of universal compassion pressed him to speak for all Americans and for all people who suffered from injustice in any form. During the brief years which were ours to hear him, Dr. King became to us a national conscience, calling on America to become what was best in its very soul.

Every people needs heroes who become to it the embodiment of its own hopes for itself. Therefore, I am proud to join my colleagues in support of the bill, H.R. 1811, to declare the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a national holiday. Dr. King surely stands to the American people as a symbol of what a great American can do, even in a short lifetime.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of my esteemed colleague, Congressman CONYERS, in sponsoring legislation to honor the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. by declaring his birthday a national holiday.

Almost 7 years have passed since Martin Luther King was felled by an assassin's bullet. Since that time, how far have we come in realizing Dr. King's "dream" of an America where "people will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character"?

Certainly, the continuing magnificence of our country depends on maintenance of the individual's rights, liberties, and opportunities. And, in the sixty's and seventy's, our Nation has acted to mitigate the division and frustration of our society by moving toward equal employment, housing, and educational opportunities for all.

However, our declining economy is now hurting those minority groups who have just begun to feel assimilated into the mainstream of American life. Black men and women, who are often the last hired, are the first fired during an economic emergency. The overall employment figures are grim enough, but for blacks and other minorities they are devastating. Consequently, the proportion of middle-class black families is decreasing.

Another byproduct of these economically imperiled times is an increase in violence as an expression of frustration and anxiety. Since the blacks are most hard hit by the economic crisis—and could possibly feel that traditional methods are no longer viable in easing their plight—it is not improbable that we will see a rebirth of the turbulence that marked the 1960's.

So the time is certainly opportune for our Nation to remember the voice of reason and conciliation that was Martin Luther King's. I remember the words I spoke on the floor of the House in April of 1968:

We must resolve that Martin Luther King did not die a prophet without honor in his own country.

Now, if we vote to commemorate Martin Luther King's birthday as a national holiday, every January people will be reminded of the ideals embodied by this great man who, while he lived, was the single and most important bridge between the Negro and the white community.

His philosophy echoed that of his namesake, Martin Luther, who said, "Nothing good ever comes of violence." In this troubled time, it is ever more important to remember that we must solve our problems without senseless divisiveness and keep the vision of Martin Luther King ever before us.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for taking this special order to introduce legislation which I and others have cosponsored, which would commemorate the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Forty-six years ago a rare human being came into a world torn by violence, racism, and injustice. Eight years ago that same young man left our world, a victim of the very forces he sought to exorcise. The world he left will never see his like again. No life in modern history has had more meaning for black

America. No death has had more impact than the untimely one of Martin Luther King. To commemorate his noble life and to preserve his honored memory for the benefit of future generations, it is our duty to enact legislation to declare his birthday, January 15, a national, legal public holiday.

The lessons of his life and death will never cease to be relevant. The message will always be clear and applicable to men and women of all races, religions, and nationalities. But it is especially incumbent upon us to preserve that message. Dr. King came into our lives and changed them for all eternity. How can we fail then to remember him eternally for showing us the path to universal brotherhood, even if we never really achieve that goal, never climb the mountaintop without him?

My own friendship with Dr. Martin Luther King was without question the highest privilege of my life. I treasure the memory of his trip to Cleveland in 1967 as head of the largest voter registration drive ever to be conducted in our city. That was the year my brother, Carl Stokes won his election as mayor of Cleveland and thereby became the first black mayor of a major American city. The night of Carl's victory Dr. King and I sat together discussing what this meant to America. That was 8 years ago. Today the atmosphere is much different for black political progress. Today, largely due to the herculean efforts of Dr. Martin Luther King, there are 108 black mayors in America and over 3,000 black elected officials. Dr. King was assassinated in 1968 while I was running for Congress. At that time there were six black men serving in this body. Today there are 17 of us, including 4 black women.

Incidentally 2 of the 17 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, my distinguished colleagues WALTER FAUNTROY and ANDREW YOUNG, were two of Dr. Martin Luther King's top lieutenants in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. I am sure he would have been proud and happy to see two of his staunchest supporters serving our country in this body. These two, remarkable black leaders in their own right, will forever remember Dr. King's inspirational example. My respected colleague ANDREW YOUNG also bears the painful memory of the day Dr. King was taken from us, for he was present in Memphis on the tragic day of the assassination.

If we fail to honor Dr. King, how will future historians view us? We would surely appear to have abused the rare privilege of having him in our midst. This American hero was known and loved throughout the world. He received international acclaim in his own lifetime when he became the 12th American and the youngest man to ever win the Nobel Peace Prize. Yet today, 12 years after his brutal assassination we Americans have yet to pay even a posthumous debt of gratitude to one of our finest citizens.

Other groups in this country have been allowed the privilege of honoring leaders who were sources of inspiration to them. A recent publication of the Democratic National Committee entitled "1975 Guide

to Nationality Observances" lists 100 observances as follows:

1975 GUIDE TO NATIONALITY OBSERVANCES

JANUARY

- 1—New Year's Day.
- 6—Russian and Eastern Orthodox Christmas.
- 22—Ukrainian Independence Day.
- 22—Anniversary of 1863 Polish Insurrection.
- 26—Indian Republic Day.

FEBRUARY

- 11—Chinese New Year.
- 12—General Thadeus Kosciuszko Day.
- 12—Ash Wednesday.
- 12—Lincoln's Birthday.
- 15—American Sokol Founding.
- 16—Lithuanian Independence Day.
- 17—Washington's Birthday.
- 24—Estonian Independence Day.
- 25—Purim.

MARCH

- 1—St. David's Day.
- 3—Bulgarian Independence Day.
- 7—Birthday of Thomas G. Masaryk.
- 9—Taras Shevchenko Day.
- 15—Kossuth Day.
- 17—St. Patrick's Day.
- 22—Emancipation Day.
- 25—Greek Independence Day.
- 27—Passover.
- 28—Good Friday.
- 30—Easter Sunday.

APRIL

- 2—Birthday of Hans Christian Anderson.
- 13—Huguenot Day.
- 14—Pan American Day.
- 17—Verrazano Day.
- 19—Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.
- 29—Japanese National Holiday.

MAY

- 1—Law Day.
- 3—Anniversary of the Polish Constitution.
- 4—Greek and Eastern Orthodox Easter.
- 5—Cinco de Mayo.
- 7—Israel Independence Day.
- 8—V-E Day.
- 9—Rumanian Independence Day.
- 16—Shavuot.
- 17—Norwegian Independence Day.
- 20—Cuban Independence Day.
- 24—Sts. Cyril and Methodius Day.
- 26—Memorial Day.
- 28—Armenian Independence Day.

JUNE

- 5—Danish Constitution Day.
- 6—Swedish Flag Day.
- 15—Baltic States Freedom Day.
- 17—Anniversary of the East Berlin Workers Revolt.
- 24—Midsummer's Day.
- 28—Anniversary of Paznan Worker's Revolt.
- 28—Vidovan (St. Vitus Day)

JULY

- 1—Canadian Dominion Day.
- 4—American Independence Day.
- 4—Philippine-American Friendship Day.
- 6—Jan Hus Day.
- 14—Bastille Day.
- 21—National Holiday of Belgium.
- 25—Puerto Rico Constitution Day.

AUGUST

- 1—Swiss National Day.
- 1—Warsaw Uprising Day.
- 13—Thirteenth Anniversary of the Berlin Wall.
- 15—The Feast of the Assumption.
- 20—St. Stephen's Day.
- 28—Goethe Day.

SEPTEMBER

- 1—Anniversary of the Nazi Invasion of Poland.
- 6—Labor Day.
- 6—Jewish New Year's Day.
- 7—Brazilian Independence Day.

- 15—Yom Kippur.
- 16—Mexican Independence Day.
- 17—Von Steuben Day.
- 17—Citizenship Day.
- 23—Anniversary of the Execution of Nikola Petkov.
- 26—Succoth.
- 27—American Indian Day.

OCTOBER

- 6—Hungarian National Day of Mourning.
- 6—German-American Day.
- 6—Leif Ericson Day.
- 10—Chinese "Double Ten" Celebration.
- 11—Pulaski Day.
- 13—Columbus Day.
- 23—The Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolt.
- 24—United Nations Day.
- 27—Veterans Day.
- 28—Czechoslovak Independence Day.
- 30—Reformation Day.

NOVEMBER

- 4—General Election Day.
- 11—Polish Independence Day.
- 22—Lebanese Independence Day.
- 27—Thanksgiving Day.
- 28—Albanian Independence Day.
- 28—Hanukkah.
- 30—St. Andrew's Day.

DECEMBER

- 1—Portuguese Independence Day.
- 6—Finnish Independence Day.
- 12—Our Lady of Guadalupe Day.
- 25—Christmas.
- 26—St. Stephen's Day.

If all of these various nationalities are entitled to have special days to commemorate the lives of their heroes, black Americans are equally entitled to that right.

In his own country this prince of peace was arrested 30 times. His home in Montgomery was burned to the ground. A motel in Birmingham where he was staying was bombed. He was stabbed in a New York department store, struck by a hurled rock in Chicago, and finally killed in Memphis. No amount of legislation can undo the suffering of Dr. King and his family. But we can still redeem ourselves before future generations who will judge our treatment of Dr. King if we pass the legislation reintroduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) today.

If we are to rededicate ourselves to the goals of brotherhood and justice which he so courageously pursued, we must initiate an enduring public commemoration of his life and philosophy. We must do all we can to perpetuate his spirit and example. To declare January 15 a national holiday would be only the smallest recompense for his enormous contribution, but we are able to do this much, and conscience dictates that we must do at least this much.

It is especially incumbent on this body to honor Dr. King. His work paved the way for our own best work in this Chamber. Out of the intensity of his crusade sprang the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the civil rights bills of 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Dr. King played the most eloquent role in the effort to finally consolidate the black American's right to participate in the politics of the Nation. If this body wishes to take any credit for that accomplishment, it cannot fail to honor the real messiah of the civil rights movement.

I realize that no black has ever been

included in the small fraternity of patriots to receive this tribute. I also realize that legislation to make Dr. King's birthday a national holiday has been introduced and reintroduced since his death in 1963. But the 94th Congress has already shown some important differences from previous Congresses who considered this bill. This is a body committed to promoting the American ideals of equality and to combating the problems of poverty and discrimination. Martin Luther King's life is a monument to those same goals and principles. Nothing could be more fitting than for this to be the Congress to set aside a day to remember the reasons why Dr. Martin Luther King lived and died.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today we are honoring Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and renewing the call to make his birthday, January 15, an annual national holiday.

Dr. King's leadership still addresses national and international issues, and I would like to recall some of his words on two very crucial issues: the national question of voting rights, and the international question of peace.

Ten years ago this month, the voting rights movement was building in Selma, Ala., toward the crisis which resulted in passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965—a monumental statute which must be renewed and strengthened this year.

Dr. King for years had been working for a guarantee of voting rights for all citizens. For example, on May 17, 1957, at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington he said:

All types of conniving methods are still being used to prevent Negroes from becoming registered voters. The denial of this sacred right is a tragic betrayal of the highest mandates of our democratic traditions. . . .

So our most urgent request to the President of the United States and every member of Congress is to give us the right to vote. Give us the ballot and we will no longer plead to the federal government for passage of an anti-lynching law. We will by the power of our vote write the law on the statute books of the Southern states and bring to an end the dastardly acts of hooded perpetrators of violence.

Give us the ballot and we will transform the salient misdeeds of bloodthirsty mobs into the calculated good deeds of orderly citizens. Give us the ballot and we will fill the legislative halls with men of good will and send to Congress men who will not sign a Southern Manifesto because their devotion is to the manifesto of justice.

Give us the ballot and we will place judges on the benches of the South who will do justly and love mercy and we will place at the head of the Southern states governors who have felt not only the pang of the human but also the glow of the divine. Give us the ballot and we will, quietly and non-violently, without rancor or bitterness, implement the Supreme Court's decision of May 17, 1954.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of foreign policy, Dr. King's warnings about the American involvement in Indochina are relevant today. We are asked to keep on pouring millions and millions of dollars of military aid into Southeast Asia. We hear talk of possible military intervention in the Middle East. We see points of tension with the potential for war

throughout the world. So let us remember some of the things Dr. King said on April 4, 1967, in an address sponsored by Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam at the Riverside Church in New York City:

Over the past two years, as I have moved to break the betrayal of my own silences and to speak from the burnings of my own heart, as I have called for radical departures from the destruction of Vietnam, many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path. At the heart of their concerns this query has often loomed large and loud: Why are you speaking about the war, Dr. King? Why are you joining the voices of dissent? Peace and civil rights don't mix, they say. Aren't you hurting the cause of your people, they ask? And when I hear them, though I often understand the sources of their concern, I am nevertheless greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment or my calling. Indeed, their questions suggest that they do not know the world in which they live.

In the light of such tragic misunderstanding, I deem it of signal importance to try to state clearly, and I trust concisely, why I believe that the path from Dexter Avenue Baptist Church—the church in Montgomery, Alabama where I began my pastorate—leads clearly to this sanctuary tonight.

I come to this platform tonight to make a passionate plea to my beloved nation. This speech is not addressed to Hanoi or to the National Liberation Front. It is not addressed to China or to Russia.

Nor is it an attempt to overlook the ambiguity of the total situation and the need for a collective solution to the tragedy of Vietnam. Neither is it an attempt to make North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front paragons of virtue, nor to overlook the role they can play in a successful resolution of the problem. While they both may have justifiable reason to be suspicious of the good faith of the United States, life and history give eloquent testimony to the fact that conflicts are never resolved without trustful give and take on both sides.

Tonight, however, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the NLF, but rather to my fellow Americans who, with me, bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

Since I am a preacher by trade, I suppose it is not surprising that I have several reasons for bringing Vietnam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Vietnam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor—both black and white—through the Poverty Program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the build-up in Vietnam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Vietnam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

Perhaps the more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles

away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, for it grows out of my experience in the ghettos of the north over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through non-violent action. But they asked—and rightly so—what about Vietnam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.

For those who ask the question, "Aren't you a Civil Rights leader?" and thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace, I have this further answer. In 1957 when a group of us formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, we chose as our motto: "To save the soul of America." We were convinced that we could not limit our vision to certain rights for black people, but instead affirmed the conviction that America would never be free or saved from itself unless the descendants of its slaves were loosed completely from the shackles they still wear. In a way we were agreeing with Langston Hughes, that black bard of Harlem, who had written earlier:

O, yes,
I say it plain,
America never was America to me.
And yet I swear this oath—
America will be!

Now, it should be incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war. If America's soul becomes totally poisoned, part of the autopsy must read Vietnam. It can never be saved so long as it destroys the deepest hopes of men the world over. So it is that those of us who are yet determined that America will be are led down the path of protest and dissent, working for the health of our land.

As if the weight of such a commitment to the life and health of America were not enough, another burden of responsibility was placed upon me in 1964; and I cannot forget that the Nobel Prize for Peace was also a commission—a commission to work harder than I had ever worked before for "the brotherhood of man."

Finally, as I try to delineate for you and for myself the road that leads from Montgomery to this place I would have offered all that was most valid if I simply said that I must be true to my conviction that I share with all men the calling to be a son of the Living God. Beyond the calling of race or nation or creed is this vocation of sonship and brotherhood, and because I believe that the Father is deeply concerned especially for his suffering and helpless and outcast children, I come tonight to speak for them.

This I believe to be the privilege and the burden of all of us who deem ourselves bound by allegiances and loyalties which are broader and deeper than nationalism and which go beyond our nation's self-defined goals and positions. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for victims of our nation and for those it calls enemy, for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Vietnam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them too because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries.

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing of the nation's only non-communist revolutionary political force—the unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men. What liberators!

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless on Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor.

In order to atone for our sins and errors in Vietnam, we should take the initiative in bringing a halt to this tragic war. I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do immediately to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict:

1. End all bombing in North and South Vietnam.
2. Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiation.
3. Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military build-up in Thailand and our interference in Laos.
4. Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and in any future Vietnam government.
5. Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

These are revolutionary times. All over the globe men are revolting against old systems of exploitation and oppression and out of the wombs of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born. The shirtless and barefoot people of the land are rising up as never before. "The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light." We in the West must support these revolutions. It is a sad fact that, because of comfort, complacency, a morbid fear of Communism, and our proneness to adjust to injustice, the Western nations that initiated so much of the revolutionary spirit of the modern world

have now become the arch anti-revolutionaries. This has driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Therefore, Communism is a judgment against our failure to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions that we initiated. Our only hope today lies in our ability to recapture the revolutionary spirit and go out into a sometimes hostile world declaring eternal hostility to poverty, racism, and militarism. With this powerful commitment we shall boldly challenge the status-quo and unjust mores and thereby speed the day when "every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain."

A genuine revolution of values means in the final analysis that our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional. Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies.

We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace in Vietnam and justice throughout the developing world—a world that borders on our doors. If we do not act we shall surely be dragged down the long dark and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight.

Now let us begin. Now let us re-dedicate ourselves to the long and bitter—but beautiful—struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the sons of God, and our brothers wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? Will our message be that the forces of American life militate against their arrival as full men, and we send our deepest regrets? Or will there be another message, of longing, of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we must choose in this crucial moment of human history.

Ms. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago the largest single demonstration in the history of these United States occurred in this city when over 200,000 Americans of all races, colors, and creeds gathered before the Lincoln Memorial, united and inspired by that hunger for justice which found its most eloquent expression in the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther King. Today, 8 years after Dr. King's tragic death, we as a Nation are confronted by the unfinished tasks for which Dr. King gave his very lifeblood. The theme of the 1963 march—probably the greatest peaceful demonstration in support of racial equality the world has ever witnessed—was the demand of the black community—and, indeed, of all Americans—for Jobs and Freedom. These are still the chief concerns of our people in this year of 1975, concerns to which the 94th Congress must address itself with vigor and despatch.

In 1957 Dr. King's first march on Washington dramatized the urgency of full, free, unimpeded access by blacks to participation in the democratic process. Today the Nation recognizes, however belatedly, the right of blacks to register and to vote. But this recognition has been won by struggle and suffering. The great decisions of the Supreme Court in the last two decades in behalf of an open, desegregated society were matched in the Congress by the Civil Rights Acts passed during those same

years and, above all, by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which did more than any other single development to invest the Federal Government with responsibility for aiding blacks whose voting rights had been denied or abridged.

Extended in 1970 for a 5-year period, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a historic step forward in the continuing movement by blacks toward full equality, now confronts this Congress with a decision for renewal, a decision crucial to the rights and interests of black Americans.

In 1963 Dr. King, speaking to America and to the world, described in unforgettable language his and our vision of this Nation as one society, the "beloved community" of the American dream. Ours is the task—and the privilege—of furthering that vision, of shaping American life in accord with the ideals of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and our Judaeo-Christian faith, ideals of justice, and brotherhood.

Moreover, in these troubled times, marked by grave economic strain and rising unemployment, whose burden falls with special severity upon the black community, the issues which Dr. King stated so clearly as "jobs and freedom" are unchanged. Full employment—a meaningful job at a living wage—is the right of every citizen able and willing to work, and it is our responsibility to do all in our power to make it possible.

During his long and eventful life, Dr. King assailed and aroused the conscience of the Nation, increasing the pace of action on civil rights and advancing a truly national commitment to social justice. The finest tribute we could render his memory would be a recommitment of ourselves to the goals of jobs and freedom, of economic security and political liberty. Dr. King spoke of a bill of rights for the disadvantaged, which would provide "an adequate education, income, home, and recreation" for all our people. Never was there greater need than today for the implementing of that vision as the tides of recession and inflation beat against our land. May we find continuing inspiration in Dr. King's legacy to this generation: "We will win," he wrote, "because the sacred heritage of our Nation and the eternal will of God are embodied in our echoing demands."

Let January 15 become a national day of remembrance and recommitment to his goals, to our goals for a better America.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in urging the House to proclaim the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King a national holiday.

Few of our national leaders have the long-range impact on the Nation's views, hopes and goals that Dr. King has had.

His energy, his dreams and his unselfish quest for peace and freedom have served as his legacy to all Americans. It is fitting that we who represent all Americans set aside one day each year to honor his memory, to honor his dreams.

Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we still are far from the goals Dr. King worked toward. But each new year, each new Congress offers cause for hope. Establishing Dr. King's birthday as a national holiday would not only pay tribute to this great man and greatly missed leader, but it

also would serve to remind us of the work he did and of the work that is left for us to do.

His tragic death cannot be erased from the pages of our history. But his compassionate life can be emblazoned into our national heritage by a simple act of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 200th birthday of America and prepare to pay tribute to the great men of our country, I urge this Congress to take that simple action and honor Dr. Martin Luther King.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with the Honorable JOHN CONYERS and my other distinguished colleagues in cosponsoring legislation to commemorate as a national holiday the birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dr. King will live forever in history as one of the great humanitarians of our time. He will be remembered as a superb tactician in the civil rights struggle. His ability to organize the downtrodden into effective cohorts against the forces of oppression and injustice will never be forgotten. His passionate concern for the working people of this Nation lives in the memory of that last trip to Memphis.

In paying tribute to this great man, however, I believe we would be doing a disservice to generations to come if we were to overlook Dr. King's contributions to this world as a philosopher, a theologian and a preacher. He was indeed spiritual leader to many thousands of people in this country and his teachings from the pulpit provided the bedrock foundation for the nonviolent civil rights movement which he led.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to quote briefly from a few of Dr. King's sermons, several of which were written while he was in jail:

THE NATURE OF GOD

I am thankful that we worship a God who is both toughminded and tenderhearted. If God were only toughminded, he would be a cold, passionless despot sitting in some far-off heaven "contemplating all," as Tennyson puts it in "The Palace of Art." He would be Aristotle's "unmoved mover," self-knowing, but not other-loving. But if God were only tenderhearted, he would be too soft and sentimental to function when things go wrong and incapable of controlling what he has made. He would be like J. G. Wells' lovable God in *God, the Invisible King*, who is strongly desirous of making a good world, but finds himself helpless before the surging powers of evil. God is neither hardhearted nor softminded. He is toughminded enough to live in it. He does not leave us to transcend the world; he is tenderhearted enough to live in it. He does not leave us alone in our agonies and struggles. He seeks us in dark places and suffers with us and for us in our tragic prodigality.

At times we need to know that the Lord is a God of justice. When slumbering giants of injustice emerge in the earth, we need to know that there is a God of power who can cut them down like the grass and leave them withering like the green herb. When our most tireless efforts fail to stop the surging sweep of oppression, we need to know that in this universe is a God whose matchless strength is a fit contrast to the sordid weakness of man. But there are also times when we need to know that God possesses love and mercy. When we are staggered by the chilly

winds of adversity and battered by the raging storms of disappointment and when through our folly and sin we stray into some destructive far country and are frustrated because of a strange feeling of homesickness, we need to know that there is Someone who lives us, cares for us, understands us, and will give us another chance. When days grow dark and nights grow dreary, we can be thankful that our God combines in his nature a creative synthesis of love and justice which will lead us through life's dark valleys and into sunlit pathways of hope and fulfillment.

ON BEING A GOOD NEIGHBOR

The real tragedy of . . . narrow provincialism is that we see people as entities or merely as things. Too seldom do we see people in their true humanness. A spiritual myopia limits our vision to external accidents. We see men as Jews or Gentiles, Catholics or Protestants, Chinese or American, Negroes or Whites. We fail to think of them as fellow human beings made from the same basic stuff as we, molded in the same divine image. The priest and the Levite saw only a bleeding body, not a human being like themselves. But the good Samaritan will always remind us to remove the cataracts of provincialism from our spiritual eyes and see men as men. If the Samaritan had considered the wounded man as a Jew first, he would not have stopped, for the Jews and the Samaritans had no dealings. He saw him as a human being first, who was a Jew only by accident. The good neighbor looks beyond the external accidents and discerns those inner qualities that make all men human and, therefore, brothers."

ON INTELLIGENCE

As the chief moral guardian of the community, the church must implore men to be good and well-intentioned and must extol the virtues of kindness and conscientiousness. But somewhere along the way the church must remind men the devoid of intelligence, goodness and conscientiousness will become brutal forces leading to shameful crucifixions. Never must the church tire of reminding men that they have a moral responsibility to be intelligent. If we are to call ourselves Christians, we had better avoid intellectual and moral blindness. Throughout the New Testament we are reminded of the need for enlightenment. We are commanded to love God, not only with our hearts and souls, but also with our minds. When the Apostle Paul noticed the blindness of many of his opponents, he said, "I bear them record that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge." Over and again the Bible reminds of the danger of zeal without knowledge and sincerity without intelligence."

ON LOVE

Love is the only force capable of transforming an enemy into a friend. We never get rid of an enemy by meeting hate with hate; we get rid of an enemy by getting rid of enmity. By its very nature, hate destroys and tears down; by its very nature, love creates and builds up. Love transforms with redemptive power.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with you Dr. King's words of hope for this world. Keep in mind, if you please, that this was the hope of a man who had been jailed a dozen times in his struggle for justice. Almost daily he and his courageous wife, Coretta, were subjected to threats against their lives and their children's lives. Twice their home was bombed. Dr. King was the victim of a near-fatal stabbing. Yet, of the future he had this to say:

In spite of the tensions and uncertainties of this period something profoundly meaningful is taking place. Old systems of ex-

ploitation and oppression are passing away; new systems of justice and equality are being born. In a real sense this is a great time to be alive. Therefore, I am not yet discouraged about the future. Granted that the easygoing optimism of yesterday is impossible. Granted that we face a world crisis which leaves us standing so often amid the surging murmur of life's restless sea. But every crisis has both its dangers and its opportunities. It can spell either salvation or doom. In a dark, confused world the Kingdom of God may yet reign in the hearts of men.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in proposing that January 15, the birthdate of Martin Luther King, Jr., be made a national holiday.

Today, in 1975, we are still far from the "promised land" of freedom and equality that Martin Luther King envisioned in the year of his assassination. Yet, the truths that Dr. King preached are more salient than ever. Martin Luther King's personal crusade was a crusade of justice and mercy. He sought to right the evils of discrimination by employing nonviolence as a method of protest. Influenced by religious and philosophical thinkers, and his mentor, Mahatma Gandhi, he said:

When evil men would seek to perpetuate an unjust status quo, good men must seek to bring into being a real order of justice.

During the numerous civil rights demonstrations he led throughout the South and across the country, he urged angry men and women to put away the weapons of violence.

Get the weapon of nonviolence, the breastplate of righteousness, the armor of truth, and just keep marching.

Martin Luther King did not have to place himself at the forefront of a movement which was both all-consuming and personally perilous to him. His father was the pastor of the prestigious Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta, Ga. His scholastic capacity won him recognition in the academic world from Morehouse College, which he entered at the age of 15, to his doctoral studies in philosophy at Boston University Theological School. His wife Coretta was anxious to pursue a musical career in the North where opportunity beckoned. Yet, after completing his doctoral studies he returned to the South, burdened with racial problems, to assume the pulpit of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Ala.

In 1955, a black seamstress named Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a crowded bus to a white person and was fined for violation of a Montgomery city ordinance. It was Martin Luther King who assumed the leadership of the Montgomery Improvement Association and masterminded a successful 11-month boycott of public transportation in response to this incident. Thus began the fight for human rights that was to continue until his death.

In Montgomery, Birmingham, Selma, and throughout the country, Dr. King preached and practiced physical restraint and the use of orderly peaceful resistance. Nevertheless, he was sensitive to on-paper promises and unenforceable laws. Most of all, he recognized "the capacity of society to remain

complacent in the midst of injustice." He urged negotiation between blacks and whites, forcing the confronting of an issue too easily overlooked by an apathetic government. His travels were far-flung, for he acknowledged "the inter-relatedness of all communities—injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

In the late 1950's Dr. King was elected the first president of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. It was he who requested, was denied, and was finally granted the first White House Conference on Civil Rights. In 1961 he was appointed chairman of the Freedom Ride Coordinating Committee. In 1963, during a convergence of 200,000 persons, white and black, on Washington, to dramatize a shameful condition, he delivered a speech acclaimed by all as a landmark in the civil rights crusade. In this speech, Dr. King spoke of "the urgency of now" for the attainment of his goal of equality for all races. He counseled:

Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline.

In 1964, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, becoming the third black and the youngest person, at age 35, to be so honored. Four years later, while in Memphis to participate in a strike of black sanitation workers, he was slain by an assassin.

By commemorating the date of his birth, we as a nation, may both memorialize and mourn Dr. Martin Luther King, a man martyred in the cause of freedom upon which this country was founded.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for reintroducing this legislation which I have co-sponsored.

These troublesome times breed much apathy and cynicism. The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had the rare ability to cogently penetrate the thoughts and emotions of so many with his carefully articulated ideals.

Dr. King's heroic energy and strength significantly contributed to the newest levels of social equality to which blacks, the poverty stricken, and other oppressed minorities have risen. He shocked our consciences into realizing that our Constitution and Bill of Rights lacked certain necessary provisions to eliminate the discrimination of two centuries.

Yet the steps taken have been few, when viewed in light of what must be done. Although 20 years have passed since the Supreme Court upheld the inherent inequality of segregation, the obstacles which eventually cost Dr. King his life remain. The devastating consequences of his death must be avoided by pursuing those very dreams which Dr. King so eloquently related to us. Instead of recognizing the mortality of the man, we must acknowledge the immortality of his dreams, for only then can we see a true renaissance of human rights in this country.

These fine words of praise which we give today, however, will never adequately commemorate this selfless man who stood for and accomplished so much. We must, at long last, show our most sincere gratitude. A national holiday marking the birth of Dr. King, will at least assure, for ourselves and our posterity, that his vision of a peaceful and content society will never be forgotten. Surely it must never be forgotten.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be counted among those many dozens of Members of this House of Representatives who have been officially listed as cosponsors of legislation to designate January 15 each year as a national holiday in tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The civil rights movement and the dramatic progress which it has meant to this country will be much on our minds during this first session of the 94th Congress as we are asked to extend provisions of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Certainly our deliberations will recall the great agonies through which the country moved in the 1960's in pursuit of genuine equality for all our citizens. Many of those here in this Chamber were present in Washington nearly a dozen years ago when thousands upon thousands of Americans gathered at the Lincoln Memorial to hear Dr. King speak of his dream for our people and our Nation—his dream that one day we would put aside the bitterness and hatred, that one day we would live up to the highest principles of our democracy and reaffirm the dignity of the individual.

Looking ahead to the 200th anniversary of our declaration of those principles, honoring the memory of those great patriots who dedicated their lives to the pursuit of their dreams for America will also be much on our minds. How fitting it would be for us to be able to count among those patriots the late Dr. King. We have the opportunity to honor this immensely important figure in our recent history by designating the anniversary of his birth as a day of re-dedication to the principles for which he worked.

I do not need to remind you that Dr. King's work remains unfinished. Minority peoples in this country still suffer abuses simply because they are minority peoples. The strife of the sixties is behind us, and a degree of complacency has crept upon us. I find this disturbing. We cannot allow abuses to continue simply because there is no dynamic Dr. King pricking our consciences as he did so persistently and effectively not so many years ago.

We need this day of reflection, this day of re-dedication, and I urge my colleagues to take the necessary action to pass this legislation now to honor a great American.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for taking this special order today. Our purpose is to urge congressional action on legislation designating the birthday of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., a legal public holiday. Support for this effort continues to grow

and I share the hope that we can achieve our goal in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, many great Americans have made their mark in our Nation's history. Very few indeed have been afforded the highest tribute which we as a people can bestow, that of setting aside a day each year to honor their individual accomplishments. I believe Dr. Martin Luther King is worthy of this high honor. His life was devoted to the quest for freedom, equality and social justice, principles on which our country was founded. By establishing Dr. King's birthday as a national holiday, we as a Nation will say that we are still committed to these goals and we will remind ourselves that we must continue to work for them.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King's unrelenting efforts had many positive results, including the enactment of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965. This Congress must turn its attention to a renewal of that statute and I hope that effort will coincide with the designation of Dr. King's birthday as a national observance.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, January 15 is the birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who epitomizes the values of nonviolence, peace, and racial equality. Dr. King is the man who had a dream "that one day little children will live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." He is the man who believed that the dream was not unrealistic. He is the man who dedicated his life toward the goal of brotherhood among all people.

His successes during the late 1950's and 1960's through peaceful, nonviolent marches and sit-ins are well known. Selma, Montgomery, and Little Rock are clear visions in the minds of those who were part of the massive civil rights movement and helped to pave the way for a Nation which has hopefully learned from the long battle for racial justice. It was Dr. King who led all people, white and black, in a style of struggle that required nerve and discipline—actions which should constantly remind us that nonviolent tactics do work if executed with the same dedication, discipline, and courage which he employed.

It was Dr. King who rekindled a new pride of culture and heritage in all Americans, particularly blacks, who adopted a new appreciation of their roots and values. A new respect and understanding for all people was the cornerstone of his activity, his style and his actions.

What Dr. King did for human rights cannot be overly emphasized. His efforts to encourage others to pursue the battle for racial equality and world peace are well known. As a recipient of the coveted Nobel Peace Prize, Dr. King gained the respect of a world audience. We in this country have yet to officially recognize his long range contributions to this Nation.

In a personal sense, I feel very honored and privileged to have known Dr. King, to have worked with him. He was sensitive, direct, resourceful, and persevered in circumstances which would have de-

ferred many, many others. He continues to be a great source of pride to us all.

Dr. King once said:

In the final analysis all humanity is involved in a single process, and all men are brothers.

As brothers, we in this body should unite in thought and spirit and create January 15 as a national holiday to commemorate the work and memory of this great American. We should not ignore the importance of this annual tribute to a man who gave so much to all of us.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMPACT OF MEDICAL MALPRACTICE ON HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on February 4, I announced I was sponsoring a National Conference on Medical Malpractice, in cooperation with the American Group Practice Association to be held on March 20-21 in Arlington, Va. As I stated at that time, I consider this conference an essential step in developing a rational approach to the problem of medical malpractice. I also announced that I planned to insert background papers on medical malpractice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the conference, with the hope that they will be of some assistance to my colleagues in the House in achieving a fuller understanding of the problem.

Between now and the end of the second week in March I plan to insert five background papers into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning medical malpractice as it relates to health service providers, patients, trial lawyers, and insurers, and to discuss both existing and proposed approaches to dealing with the problem of medical malpractice. The first background paper, which I am inserting today, is concerned with the impact of medical malpractice on health care professionals and institutions.

BRIEF STATEMENT OF PRINCIPAL MEDICAL MALPRACTICE PROBLEMS

In 1969, the Secretary's Medical Malpractice Commission estimated the cost of professional liability coverage at \$60 million. In 1970, the figure was approximately \$300 million. We do not know precisely what the figure is today, but some estimates are as high as a billion dollars or more.

Between 1960 and 1970, malpractice insurance premiums for dentists rose 115 percent; for hospitals, 262 percent; for physicians other than surgeons, 540.8

percent; and for surgeons, 949.2 percent. Available evidence since 1970 shows malpractice insurance rates continuing to climb. In early 1974, physicians in New York State had to pay 93.5 percent more for their malpractice insurance than for the previous rating period. The insurer in that State recently proposed an additional increase of almost 200 percent, raising the rates for some specialists as high as \$45,000. In Maryland, St. Paul Cos., which insures 85 percent of the State's doctors, had requested a rate increase of 48 percent, after receiving an increase of 46 percent only a few months before their new request. The company is currently insuring the State's doctors under a court ruling requiring them to continue insurance. They are appealing the ruling. The California Medical Association claims their medical malpractice insurance rates have increased 400 percent since 1971.

Hospitals are also experiencing extraordinary increases with rates doubling, tripling, and sometimes increasing as much as 700 percent. Argonaut Insurance Co., the major hospital malpractice insurer, has recently announced it will no longer cover hospitals in at least 14 States.

According to an article in the November 4, 1974, issue of the American Medical News, the number of malpractice claims filed has increased 8 to 9 percent per year. The Insurance Services Office, an independent rating organization, reported in 1966 that 1.7 physicians per 100 were sued; by 1972, 3 physicians per 100 were sued. In 1970, the average settlement of malpractice claims was \$5,000; by 1973, the figure had increased to \$8,000. Prior to 1971, there were three settlements for over \$1 million in California; since 1971, there have been nine.

Only a small portion of these medical malpractice premiums actually goes to the injured patient or his legal representative. The amount of each premium dollar actually awarded to the patient or his legal representative may range from 16 to 38 cents, depending upon which estimate is accepted. The remainder goes to lawyers for the plaintiff and the defendant, and for costs and profits of insurers. Settlements are seldom prompt; the average time for cases heard by a jury is 5 years. It takes over 10 years to settle all medical malpractice claims made in any one year.

A major problem from several standpoints is the contingent fee system for paying the claimant's lawyer; the most common charge is one-third of the recovery amount, with rates as high as 50 percent. In a very large settlement, the injured patient or his legal representative may have to pay the attorney hundreds of thousands of dollars. Contingent fees can also result in cases being rejected by lawyers because the potential return is too small to justify their investment of time. A study for the Secretary's Commission on Medical Malpractice, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reported that 23 percent of the claims rejected by lawyers specializing in medical malpractice were rejected because the potential dollar settlements were too small. For lawyers

surveyed who had ever closed a medical malpractice case, there was a 10-percent rejection rate.

An unanswered question is the extent of medical injuries caused by the negligence of health care providers which do not result in malpractice claims. One study, again commissioned by the Secretary's Commission on Medical Malpractice, found that of 23,750 discharges from two hospitals studied, 517 patients had received medical injuries during treatment which were caused by negligence. The investigators found that only 31 malpractice claims would be filed during the year in which the study was made. Since there were only 12,600 claims asserted in 1970 throughout the Nation, and over 30 million hospital admissions a year—according to the National Center for Health Statistics—it appears that malpractice claims are instituted in only a small fraction of cases where medical injuries through negligence have occurred.

Medical malpractice, and claims that result from alleged malpractice can create additional problems regarding the delivery of medical services. Physicians, because of their great concern for avoiding malpractice suits, frequently practice defensive medicine. Defensive medicine is defined as medical practices undertaken to avoid a malpractice claim or to provide protection in the event a claim is instituted. There is some evidence that defensive medicine is practiced, and that it results in higher health service costs and overutilization of scarce medical resources. The fear of charges of medical malpractice may also jeopardize the relationship between the physician and his patient, because each patient is viewed as a potential adversary in a medical malpractice lawsuit.

Perhaps the overriding concern of health care providers is the real threat that they will be unable to purchase medical malpractice insurance because insurers will no longer be willing to offer it. The number of insurers who offer malpractice insurance appears to be decreasing. According to Gene Cudworth, secretary of Hartford Insurance:

The current malpractice situation represents probably the most serious problem faced by the insurance industry at any time in its history. Almost every carrier in the business is either restricting its business or getting out altogether.

The number of companies involved in malpractice has always been small compared to the total number of insurance companies, but today there are only a half a dozen who handle the majority of malpractice business.

Congress must look carefully at this problem not only because of the cost of professional liability insurance and the threat that doctors and hospitals may not be able to obtain coverage but because of our need to determine the extent of medical injuries and their impact on patients who receive them. We need to examine the impact this problem of medical malpractice has on the way medical care is delivered, and conversely, the impact of the way medical care is delivered on the medical malpractice problem.