

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VETERANS' PENSION AMENDMENTS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension is considering two of my bills which are of great importance to veterans in the United States.

The first bill, H.R. 2793, would provide for a separate non-service-connected disability pension to be paid to veterans age 72 and over without regard to income. The second bill, H.R. 2794, would exclude recent increases in social security payments from the amount of earnings used to determine eligibility for veterans pension.

With regard to H.R. 2793, at the present time pensions are paid to all veterans based on a formula which decreases their pension as their income from other sources increases. This is similar to the formula in operation for recipients of social security benefits. What I am proposing is the elimination of this earnings limitation for veterans age 72 and over, just as we have eliminated the limitation for social security recipients.

The Veterans' Administration informs me that there are approximately 1.3 million veterans who would receive either an increase in their pensions or who would become eligible for pensions if this legislation is passed. This would cost approximately \$1.4 billion annually.

While I feel that this pension should be paid to our veterans—all of whom fought in the first two world wars—I realize that this cost could have a serious impact on the Federal budget at a time when we are trying to limit Federal expenditures. Therefore, I have proposed that the committee amend my bill to provide an increase in the limitation on earnings to \$10,000 for those veterans age 72 and over. This would lessen the cost considerably, yet help a great many more veterans.

This is a fair and equitable compromise and one that will still bring relief from the financial woes suffered by many of our older veterans. I urged the committee to accept the bill in its present form, but if that is difficult, at least in the modified form with the \$10,000 earnings limitation.

With regard to H.R. 2794, this is designed to allow for the increases in social security granted by the last Congress. Under present laws all veterans receive a decrease in their pensions equal to the amount of the increase in social security or other benefits they receive.

In the past, whenever a social security increase was granted, the committee had the wisdom to increase the amount of social security income excludable from the earnings limitation formula for veterans pensions. This bill would accomplish just that with respect to the latest social security increases.

Without this legislation, the social security benefits approved last year to aid the many older Americans who find it very difficult to live on their limited incomes would have no effect on the incomes of our veterans. The legislation is most worthwhile and I urged the committee to report it favorably.

Let us remember that the men and women who would be helped by these two bills are those who put their lives on the line in defense of this country. These are the people who fought our battles in the field and who helped keep America alive and free. We owe it to them now to let them know we still remember their valiant efforts on our behalf in wars past.

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS "FATHER OF THE YEAR"

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, recently, I had the pleasure of meeting H. Ridge Canaday, the National Multiple Sclerosis "Father of the Year."

Ridge Canaday, from Williamsport, Pa., was stricken with multiple sclerosis at age 24, while on active duty as a Navy jet pilot in 1966. He is married, father of a 3 1/2 year-old boy, and confined to a wheelchair.

Recently, he was honored at the White House by Mrs. Richard M. Nixon as National MS Father of the Year, and he accepted a plaque from the First Lady on behalf of hundreds of thousands of young Americans who are afflicted by this crippling, chronic neurological disease.

Today we know of no cure for MS. We know of no preventive. We do not even know of any very effective treatment for this disease, but we are getting there. Mr. Ralph I. Straus of New York recently put up a \$100,000 research award for the first scientist or team of scientists to come up with an effective control for MS. That prize, the largest in American medical history, is expected to provide a strong incentive for further research into multiple sclerosis. Looking into that research, and the directions it should take, is the nine-member National Advisory Commission on Multiple Sclerosis, which was established under the provision of a bill passed in the Senate last October and later signed into law by President Nixon. I strongly supported this measure as ranking Republican on the Senate Health Subcommittee, and was proud to participate in winning Senate passage.

I want to commend Ridge Canaday, and the members of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, for their outstanding efforts in helping to educate Americans about this disease, in aiding research to find a cure, and in providing

patient services to help the men and women afflicted with MS. We must do everything possible to aid national efforts to cure multiple sclerosis, to prevent the personal tragedies that have occurred to Ridge Canaday and many other young Americans.

TAX CREDIT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated repeatedly his goal of a post-secondary educational opportunity for all who wish to pursue it. The higher education budget request for fiscal 1974 reflects the administration's approach to this goal: A greater reliance on the basic opportunity grants and a strengthened guaranteed loan program for student financial assistance. The Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, where I serve, will soon report its recommendations regarding this approach.

However, congressional action on direct student assistance and guaranteed loans cannot fully meet the growing need caused by mushrooming college and vocational training costs. I have joined a bipartisan, cross-sectional group in the House in sponsoring tax credit legislation for higher education expenses. Our bill, H.R. 8328, provides an annual tax credit of up to \$675 on the first \$1500 paid by an individual or individuals for higher education. It will apply to the legitimate expenses for tuition, fees, books, supplies and required equipment for any student attending an institution of higher education, be it public or private college, vocational school, or business school.

The bill specifically states that the term "higher education" includes colleges, business or trade schools, or technical institutions. Thus, the bill allows an important choice for students in the kind of education they will pursue.

Another important choice is provided in that the tax credit applies for expenses at both public and private institutions. This is very important in view of the economic problems now facing our smaller, private educational institutions, most of which are more expensive than tax-supported public colleges.

I want to point out that this tax credit is available to anyone who pays the expenses of a student. It is available to the student, the student's family, or any other person who furnishes all or a portion of the student's expenses. The credit is prorated according to the portion of total expenses paid by each taxpayer.

In this way, we hope to stimulate an increase in private scholarships to deserving students from college alumni and others, thus to enlist a larger amount of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

private money to meet a national need. The bill provides a 100 percent tax credit on the first \$200 spent on the cost of higher education; 75 percent on the next \$300; and 25 percent on the next \$1,000. The tax credit would be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of a taxpayer's income over \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, the entire thrust of the administration's higher education proposals is on aid to institutions through aid to students. I do not quarrel with that as long as the aid to the colleges is sufficient. This tax credit legislation should be favorably considered as one important part of our student assistance package. Vital financial assistance can be provided to our institutions of higher education through this cooperative government-taxpayer effort. Prompt action by the House Ways and Means Committee is needed to allow this effort to begin in 1974.

SEVENTEEN AVIATION PIONEERS INDUCED INTO OX5 CLUB HALL OF FAME AT HAMMONDSPORT, N.Y.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Aviation Hall of Fame became a reality on May 15, 1971 under the sponsorship of the OX5 Club of America. And the Hall of Fame Tablet is housed in the Glenn H. Curtiss Museum at Hammondsport, N.Y.

The OX5 Club of America Aviation Hall of Fame is dedicated to honoring the men and women who risked life and fortune to establish the aviation industry. The aviation pioneers so honored were designated "beacons of light in the embryonic age of flight." The first two classes were inducted in 1971 and 1972.

On May 19, 1973, the third annual group of aviation pioneers selected for the Hall of Fame were inducted in ceremonies at Hammondsport. This year's class of inductees includes 13 living and 4 deceased aviation greats, as follows:

Talbert "Ted" Abrams of Lansing, Mich.—One of America's great aerial photographers; one of the first 10 pilots to fly airmail; and an aerial veteran Marine of World War I.

Alexander Graham Bell (deceased).—Coworker with Glenn Curtiss in early development of heavier than air; developed the first successful airplane independent of the Wright brothers.

Anthony A. Bitetti, Gardena, Calif.—More than 50 years in civil and military aviation; early organizer of flying clubs; participated in overseas flights; 30 years with American Airlines; specialized in aircraft repair and overhaul.

Clyde V. Cessna (deceased).—Built and flew his first airplane in 1911; one of America's best known aviation engineers; produced many record-breaking aircraft; organized and developed Cessna Aircraft Co.

Harry D. Copeland, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.—First flight in 1911 in pusher aircraft; early commercial pilot/operator;

made first commercial flight Maine to Florida; coorganized air traffic control system; colonel (ret.), USAF.

Parker D. Cramer (deceased).—Early military aviator; barnstormer and fixed base operator; made many long-distance flights, including the Antarctic expedition and Detroit-Copenhagen.

Dan Grecco, Portland, Oreg.—Made first flight in 1911 at Portland; distinguished barnstorming pilot/mechanic, latter for more than 50 years; serviced Lindbergh's *Spirit of St. Louis*; civilian instructor for Army in World War I.

Bennett H. "Bennie" Griffin, Washington, D.C.—Military and civilian pilot of note; early manager of Washington National Airport; drafted Air Inspection Systems for U.S.A.F.; established flight record America to Berlin in 1932; colonel (ret.) USAF; sponsored for induction by two original Hall of Famers, Blanche Noyes and John P. Morris. (I talked on yesterday with Colonel Griffin when he visited friends on Capitol Hill.)

Clifford W. Henderson, Palm Desert, Calif.—Founder of Cleveland National Air Races; creator of Thompson and Bendix Trophy Races; produced first International Aircraft Exposition; distinguished "Hump" pilot of World War II; colonel (ret.) USAF.

Beverly "Bevo" Howard (deceased).—One of America's greatest acrobatic pilots; supervised training of 6,000 pilots in World War II; flew for Eastern Airlines and operated Hawthorne Aviation, Charleston, S.C.

Howard R. Hughes, Houston, Tex.—One of America's aviation greats; established many land and sea flight records; winner of Harmon Trophy for flight around world; flew practically every type aircraft.

Edwin A. Link, Binghampton, N.Y.—Pilot, inventor, designer, manufacturer; designed and built Link instrument trainer; president, General Precision Equipment Co. and simulator production director, Singer Co.

Leslie C. Miller, Sarasota, Fla.—Inventor of Miller overhead valves; barnstormer of early vintage; distinguished aviation author; effective developer of early aviation.

Michael C. "Mike" Murphy, Findley, Ohio.—One of America's greatest acrobatic pilots; military combat pilot in World War II; winner of NBAA's Meritorious Award while aviation manager for Marathon Oil Co.

Leonard J. Povey, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.—Once commanded aviation for Cuban Government; distinguished acrobatic pilot; leading fixed base operator for executive aircraft; held executive posts with Fairchild Aircraft and Mackey Airlines.

Lloyd C. Stearman, Northridge, Calif.—Early builder of aircraft; designer, engineer, and pilot; built thousands of trainers for the military; was consultant to major aircraft manufacturers.

Noel Wien, Bellevue, Washington State.—Pioneered aviation in Alaska; conducted first "Bush" rescue service; made first flight, Alaska to Siberia; first to fly beyond the Arctic Circle; founder of Wien Airlines.

June 15, 1973

A SAD ANNIVERSARY FOR LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my colleagues that this is a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world.

On this day in 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly annexed Lithuania. Since then the proud people of that country have continuously struggled to reject the oppressive Communist system from their soil.

The postwar history of Lithuania bears grim testimony to this rejection of forcible incorporation. From 1944 to 1952, the anti-Soviet partisans struggled for freedom against the Soviet military occupation in protracted guerilla warfare at a cost of over 50,000 Lithuanian lives. During Stalin's era, more than one-sixth of the Lithuanian people were deported to Russia and Siberia in an effort to depopulate and subjugate the Lithuanian nation. To demonstrate the extent of this depopulation in comparison to the United States, it would mean the elimination of all the people from the 30 largest cities in this country.

To this very day, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of the right of self-determination, continued religious and political persecutions, and violation of human rights by the Soviet Union reached tragic heights on May 14, 1972, when a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, burned himself in Kaunas as a martyr in protest to Soviet oppression. This act triggered widespread demonstrations in the area and was culminated by two other self-immolations. Such dramatic events demonstrate that the Lithuanian people have not acquiesced to the Soviet occupation, but rather are still striving for freedom and independence.

The United States has never recognized the forceful annexation of Lithuania and other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. This steadfast policy of the United States gives succor to the Lithuanian people and reinforces their determination to await national independence while it also discourages the Soviet policies of Russification and effective absorption of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

The 89th U.S. Congress, during its 2d session, was explicit in its determination to forestall any Russification and absorption of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union when it adopted House Concurrent Resolution 416, which urges the President to bring up for discussion the question of the status of the Baltic States in the United Nations and other international forums. The European Security Conference is such an international forum. The Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc., asks your support in urging the U.S. delegates to openly state the U.S. policy of nonrecognition.

June 15, 1973

nition and raise the Baltic question directly as Congress has specified.

WATERGATE HEARINGS

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Watergate hearings continue on and on. And the more I see and read the more I become concerned that the Senate hearings are jeopardizing the chances for a successful prosecution of the guilty.

The names of those who may or may not have been involved are being dragged through the mud before the entire Nation, and when it comes time to select a jury and hear a case, a strong argument of prejudice can easily be claimed by the defendants.

In other words, it is going to be very difficult to find a jury that does not already have preconceived ideas as to guilt, because of all the publicity.

Also, many news reports have been dealing with unnamed third-party sources and have been scattered with innuendoes that are doing more harm than good.

The situation certainly provides the ground work for a long debate on fair trial versus free press, and fair trial versus separation of powers. We must be careful here to see that constitutional rights are not violated. Each is important and to sacrifice one for another will harm the entire system.

The tragedy of Watergate is that the entire political system has been given a black eye. There is a tendency to let other Government activity slip as we become preoccupied with Watergate. But this must not happen, and, in fact, it is not happening.

It is important that those responsible for Watergate be punished through due process of law but, in the meantime, the wheels of Government must continue to turn.

We must not allow Watergate to bog down the operation of Government and take our attention away from the many other important issues facing us today.

For example, one of the first jobs the President had to concern himself with was the rebuilding of the White House staff. I think he is off to a good start with the appointment of Melvin Laird as Director of the Domestic Affairs Council to replace John Erlichman. Gen. Alexander Haig should do an excellent job in replacing Bob Haldeman as the top Assistant to the President. With these two appointments the President's legislative program should move much more smoothly now.

I have known Mel Laird for 9 years, first as a Congressman from Wisconsin and then as Secretary of Defense. He is a man of great integrity and ability and is well respected in the Congress.

While I do not know General Haig except through occasional meetings, he has a fine reputation and is also highly re-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

spected by the Congress. Under his leadership, I see a new day coming and a much improved atmosphere in the White House.

With this new support in the White House and with the other appointments recently made by the President, considerable activity is now under way on many fronts. The Government is moving forward, and we must not let Watergate impede our progress.

THE LITHUANIAN NATION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union forcibly incorporated the nation of Lithuania into its domain, seeking by that action to stamp out one of the oldest nationalities in the world. Today we remember that day, and by so doing help to maintain the integrity of this freedom-loving people.

For more than a thousand years, Lithuania and its people made a distinct mark on the road to progress of the peoples of Europe. A strong ethnic culture and identity is perhaps the most remarkable hallmark of this people.

It was for that very reason that the Soviet regime long viewed these people as a menace to the homogenizing effect the Moscow government sought to impose on all its peoples. Because the Lithuanians strove to maintain their identity as a people, they incurred the wrath of the Kremlin.

Over the first few decades of Soviet rule, one effort after another was mounted to eliminate the identity of these people. All of them had significant state resources poured into them. All of them were pressed with vigor by cadres mobilized from across Russia. Many native people of the area were utilized to make these nationality-eroding campaigns a success, and in the end, all of them were relatively dismal failures.

Eventually, the Soviets tried to undo the lives and labor of a thousand years. By decree of the central government, Lithuania as such ceased to exist. The territory and people of that nation were physically incorporated into the Soviet Union, to become another province of that vast land.

That was 33 years ago. Yet in the end, this attempt has also failed, and just as dimly as the others.

Lithuanians across the globe have maintained the heritage, culture, and faith of their forebears. Here in the United States this has been particularly true. Our community here has been most vigorous in these efforts.

In what was once Lithuania itself, the work has been complemented by Lithuanian nationalism which has found a variety of expressions, especially in recent years.

More and more, overt assertions of identity have come to the fore in the major cities of that area, proving again that ethnicity and nationalism are per-

haps the most powerful forces at work in the world today.

The rulers of Russia would do well to note that truth, and accept it.

NATIVE COUPLE SHARES PAST WITH UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to share with my colleagues a bit of personal happiness that I derive from a well written article appearing on April 23 in the Hazard, Ky., Herald, which I insert in the RECORD. It regards the news that Mr. and Mrs. David Guilford Boleyn will celebrate their 58th wedding anniversary this coming Sunday, June 17, which incidentally is also Fathers Day.

I have known Mr. Boleyn for better than 50 years and recall with warmth and happiness my early boyhood associations with him. I can add little to the article except my own personal fondness for him and my best wishes for him and his wife's continuing success and happiness.

Mr. Boleyn, a prominent attorney for 52 years, and his wife, both of whom are now 80 years old, reside in Hazard, Ky., and are loved and admired throughout the region. Both are members of pioneer families. Mr. Boleyn is Hazard's first city prosecuting attorney and Mrs. Boleyn's father was twice county attorney of Perry County. She was a schoolteacher before the births of her four children.

As the article says, they recently shared their wisdom and richness of their folk heritage with the Folklore Archives of Western Kentucky University.

Both are intensely patriotic, vitally interested in the working of democracy.

Incidentally, Mr. Boleyn is still going strong and was in Louisville just this weekend taking depositions. The article follows:

[From the Hazard (Ky.) Herald, Apr. 23, 1973]

NATIVE COUPLE SHARES PAST WITH UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

"O good old way, how sweet thou art."

Bartering goose feathers for sugar, draining a carbuncle with a slippery elm probe, and getting clothes clean with a battlin' stick—these are only a few of the practices living in the memories of Mr. and Mrs. David Guilford Boleyn who recently relived their folk heritage and recorded it for the archives of Western Kentucky University. Both now eighty years old and living at 718 Davis Street, they have related experiences, tales, customs, and beliefs—all the warp and woof of their lives woven by this mountain region. Firm believers in the value of oral history, they have carefully related material they feel should be preserved. It is now taped, transcribed, and ready to be lodged in the university archives for use by future folklore students.

An interesting section of the material concerns old remedies. "Mullen tea" helped colds and the flu; a 'slippery elm probe' caused a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

carbuncle to drain; a hot oak bark "ooze" relieved the pain of sprains. More spectacular were the beliefs that a certain "mad stone" sucked out the poison of a rabid dogbite and that the seventh son in a succession of sons was endowed by special healing powers, one being to "stop the blood." His services were sought far and wide by ailing ones.

In pre-granulated-sugar days, Mr. Boleyn recalls three prime sources of sweetening—tapping maple trees, ginning sugarcane, and "growing" honey. Later, when sugar came to the stores, it could be bartered for goose feathers.

Various tools for breaking in and nurturing "new ground" were described. The coulter plow mentioned by Robert Burns, Mr. Boleyn's favorite poet, was one of these owned by early Kentuckians. Mr. Boleyn recounted the steps followed in making wash troughs for family washwater. He went again to the water mill, only usable in winter months, but which ground meal superior to that of the steam grist mills. He theorizes that "take your turn" originated from the old system of stacking sacks of corn in the old mill house.

Just as now, each district was taxed for building a school house, but the school term lasted only five months, beginning in July with two weeks' vacation in late September and early October for gathering in the fodder to winter-feed the stock. Slates made from local slate-rock cliffs provided writing material. No report cards or grades being used, each student progressed at his own speed, only "turning the leaf" when he had learned all on the page. His "thumb print" guided the teacher as to where he should begin in the new term.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Boleyn represent pioneer families who settled in this region long before the Civil War. Mrs. Boleyn's father, Charles Wooton of the family for whom the postoffice in Leslie County (formerly Perry County) served two terms as County Attorney, the first beginning near 1897 and the second in 1922. Mr. Boleyn's boyhood post-office on Rock Fork in Knott County was named for his family and was located on a farm never owned by any other, save the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Mrs. Boleyn, born on Big Creek in 1893, recalled the "public square" in Hazard and its two courthouses preceding the present one. Brick for both these were made at local brickyards located near Broadway. She remembers the first large school, a two-story plank house on High Street, just north of the Methodist Church. The lower grades were located downstairs, and the highest grades (there being no high school then) were housed on the top floor. She tells of a roof cupola that held a bell that sounded "all over everywhere." She later attended the Wilbur R. Smith Business College in Lexington where she met the young lawyer she was to marry in 1915. Four years she taught in Perry County schools—at Yerkes, on Grapevine, and on Second Creek.

Mr. Boleyn received his law license in 1915 after having attended Hindman Settlement School, Professor George Clark's Normal School, and the University of Kentucky. He settled permanently in Hazard in 1921 and has practiced law continuously since that time. He has been commended by the State Bar Association for his half-century of service. When Hazard received its third-class city rating, he became its first City Prosecuting Attorney. A staunch believer in justice and in individual rights, he donated to the Bar the scales of justice which now stand in the main courtroom of the new courthouse. Now consisting mainly of land title work, his career has contained a rich variety of both civil and criminal law suits, ranging from disputes over a bushel of beans to an air-crash claim.

About his legal career he says, "What I have enjoyed most is simply practicing my

profession." On the subject of retirement he says, "A lawyer's services are rendered to people. And as long as a lawyer is able to do anything to help other people, there's no reason for him to retire. And, too, the people he has practiced for over the years will keep coming back for as long as he lives . . ."

The Regular Baptist church to which Mrs. Boleyn has been a life-long member sings a song containing the line:

"O good old way, how sweet thou art!"

The meaning of these words is somehow enriched in the light of the experience, the wisdom, and the lives—so fully-lived, so unselfishly-shared—by Mr. and Mrs. Boleyn on Davis Street.

"WOLF! WOLF!" FROM DOOMSDAY ECOLOGISTS?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

MR. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as the pace of environmental debate accelerates, the following article should be useful in examining both sides of the question:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 11, 1973]

"WOLF! WOLF!" FROM DOOMSDAY ECOLOGISTS?

(By Melvin Maddocks)

During the last decade, the subject of Nature has become political, and, like all politics, prone to extremes. A cartoonist—a political cartoonist, naturally—might caricature the polarized parties thus:

Under a cone of sunlight in a pine forest the Good Guy stands, his face an idealized composite of Henry Thoreau and Albert Schweitzer. Caption him "Revererence of life." His palms are clasped behind him as if to symbolize: Hands off. Where Nature is concerned, he is the last of the laissez-faire men.

Stalking down the forest path (hiss, boo) comes the Bad Guy, his face ablaze with the greed of a dozen robber barons. In one hand he carries an ax, in the other a miner's pick. Caption him "Planet-plunderer."

In the nature-politics debates the Bad Guy has been getting just rewards—at least rhetorically—and in the process the by-standing citizen has been scared half to death. Various physicists and biologists have made a career out of promising the very worst if the Bad Guy wins, rather like Times Square prophets carrying sandwich boards reading, "The End of the World Is at Hand."

At first the environmental risk was nuclear bombing, and the threat of Apocalypse seemed more or less suitable. But then the varieties of predicted horrible-ends multiplied. Spaceship Earth, it was said, might self-destruct from Bad-Guy pesticides, Bad Guy detergents in the water, Bad-Guy smokes in the air, or simple Bad-Guy overpopulation.

The Club of Rome Study of 1972, which projected day-by-day 20th-century life as a "march toward ecological suicide," seemed to climax what John Maddox, theoretical physicist and editor of the British journal Nature, called the "doomsday syndrome."

In their zeal, have the Good Guys—the Nature-reverencers—been guilty of crying wolf? Maddox thinks so. He judges the alarmist "exaggerations" of the scenario writers to be "frighteningly irresponsible," to say nothing of unscientific. And he warns: "The 'doomsday syndrome' may be as much a hazard of human survival as any of the environmental conundrums society has created for itself."

Maddox signals perhaps the rehearsal of

June 15, 1973

a third posture toward Nature, which would say:

The Bad Guys—the "Planet-plunderers"—are not to be condoned. But the Good Guys must not become overreacting purists to the point of paralysis.

The new alternative might be stated: How can Nature be used without being exploited?

In the current issue of *Lifestyle!* ("Magazine of Alternatives"), the biologists of the New Alchemy Institute East in Woods Hole, Mass., join Maddox in assuming again a utilitarian standard. Calling the "back-to-the-land movement" a romantic "absurdity" and "organic farming" too "naive," the New Alchemists obviously find no contradiction between a love of Nature and efficiency. They are simultaneously idealists of the small farm and total technologists.

Ecology, the New Alchemists imply, will be served best not if men leave Nature alone, out of guilt or excessive reverence, but if they work with maximum effectiveness as "the Earth's stewards."

Nature's new Third Man—the Good Guy with the Bad Guy's tools—has discovered another spokesman in the microbiologist René Dubos, who has rebutted the "doomsday syndrome" with his own emphasis: "Environments upset by smogs, pesticides, or strip mining are not destroyed, they merely become different by evolving in directions determined by these challenges."

What appears to be destruction, he concludes, "always results in a different creation."

One of the Good Guys nominated Francis of Assisi as "patron saint for ecologists"—the hero who treated not only living things but inanimate objects as if they were his brothers and sisters. Speaking for the new minority, Dubos proposes Benedict of Nursia as the ecologist's saint: clearing forests, reclaiming swamps, building windmills for power with a task force of Benedictine pragmatists behind him.

The Nature-sophisticates are saying, in effect, that guilt over technology's past, fear over technology's future must not keep men from taking an activist stance toward Nature. If they have their way, we will get back our nerve without losing our scruples.

IN SUPPORT OF LITHUANIA

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 15, 1973

MR. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, today marks the 33d anniversary of the annexation of Lithuania. As with Lithuania Independence Day, which we commemorated earlier this year, on February 16, it is fitting that we pause today to take notice of the desire for freedom and self-determination of all Lithuanians. They are a courageous people, and I am proud to know and work closely with many Lithuanian-Americans in Pennsylvania, and to know of their strong loyalties for their native country. Events of recent years have not diminished the will of the Lithuanian people to live in political, cultural, and religious freedom, a cause to which men and women throughout the world are committed.

Today, I join with the Lithuanian-American communities to express our dedication to the Lithuanian people, and to people around the globe, who share the important goals of living daily lives with freedom and justice.

June 15, 1973

19903

FREEDOM FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Leonid Brezhnev, the leader of the Soviet Union, arrives in the United States for a meeting with President Nixon.

One of his major reasons for coming here is to obtain economic help from the United States. Such help is to include U.S. Government credits and loan guarantees as well as most-favored-nation trade status.

The only difficulty which Mr. Brezhnev will face during his visit is the determination of the citizens of the United States to stand for the freedom of oppressed people anywhere in the world.

The policy of the Soviet Union regarding the basic human rights of Jews and other minorities within its territory is well-known. Freedom of religion is strictly limited. Jewish schools, books, newspapers, plays, films, and all other forms of cultural expression are forbidden. Russian anti-Semitism dates back to the czars.

Jews who declare their wish to return to their national homeland are immediately fired from their jobs and are subject to every conceivable form of harassment including imprisonment.

There can be no excuse for this pattern of systematic repression against tens of thousands of individuals who seek only to build a new life for themselves in Israel.

The Soviet Union has often proclaimed its strong adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which guarantees the right of free emigration to all.

We must make clear to Mr. Brezhnev that he may expect no commercial favors from the United States until his country lives up to its commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

No one has been fooled by the recent announcement that the notorious exit tax will no longer be enforced. The Soviet Union enforces and then ignores its own exit tax statutes whenever it hopes to win a particular favor from the freedom-loving nations in the West.

No one seriously believes that the Russians will not once again begin to enforce their "ransom" tax if they should receive trade concessions from the United States without the emigration guarantee of the Mills-Vanik bill.

I was proud to be one of the original cosponsors in this Congress of the Mills-Vanik bill to prohibit most-favored-nation trade concessions by the United States to any country which limits freedom of emigration.

This legislation now has the endorsement of 281 Members of the House and, in the form of the Jackson amendment, 77 cosponsors in the Senate.

The endorsement of this legislation by over 350 of the highest elected officials in the United States is striking evidence that America will stand firm in its sup-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

port of freedom of emigration for Soviet Jews and will not agree to bargain with human rights.

CHASE MANHATTAN: THE RIGHT DIRECTION

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the growing social responsibility and involvement of the Chase Manhattan Bank in the problems facing urban America.

An article from the National Urban Coalition's publication, Network, entitled "A 'friend at Chase Manhattan'" reported the current activity at the bank. I now submit the article for the collective interest of this body.

I hope that other American companies follow the excellent lead of Chase Manhattan in "giving a damn."

The article follows:

A "FRIEND AT CHASE MANHATTAN"

"Social responsibility is as important here as marketing, expansion, funding or corporate capacity," says John B. Davies, Jr., 31, vice-president for Urban External Affairs of the Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A.

Friendly, enthusiastic, and totally committed to his work, Davies punctuates every point with a vigorous gesture.

"Chase just isn't interested in an isolated, philanthropic, do-gooder operation," he goes on. "Social responsibility is built into every functional program this bank has—it's totally integrated with our business and economic activities. My office is simply a staff resource and consultant to ongoing urban activities in all our line divisions."

Davies outlined four principal program areas, unrelated except that each represents a corporate effort by Chase Manhattan (1971 assets: \$24 billion) to behave as a responsible, involved citizen of New York City.

Training programs: In the 60's, Chase started a Business Experience Training program for urban high school students and a Job Opportunities in Business program for dropouts. Hundreds of young New Yorkers, mostly nonwhite, are now employed by the bank as a result of those programs, and hundreds more have finished high school or have gone on to college.

More recently, Chase and another bank established a "satellite academy" in cooperation with the Board of Education and the city. There, at 2 New York Plaza, 150 teenage students (drawn voluntarily from public schools throughout the city) receive a combination of academic skills and actual job experience as part-time workers in the sponsoring banks.

Economic development: "The infusion of new business activity is essential if you're hoping to stem the tide of decay in any city neighborhood," says Davies. Economic development of minority business has been a policy of the Community Banking (branch-office) arm of Chase for several years, quite apart from the activities of the institution's separate Chase Investment Corp.

When the branch people needed help in evaluation loans that did not meet usual Chase credit standards but seemed reasonably prudent risks when weighed against a commitment to civic responsibility, Chase created a separate, skilled unit to package and evaluate such loans and to decide what

management skills might be needed by the borrower in addition to capital. Approximately \$17 million have been advanced by the bank in these loans.

In addition, a specified percentage of Chase's own immense annual purchases of paper, printing and other supplies must, by executive edict, go to small minority-owned suppliers.

Real estate: Mortgages in the city's disadvantaged areas are tough to arrange, and it's widely assumed throughout the housing industry that banks have simply "redlined" large parts of the city. What Chase has done is to allocate a specific pool of funds for loans to people wishing to buy or improve homes in three such communities—Fort Greene and Crown Heights, Brooklyn, and South Jamaica, Queens. The bank has also trained people in those communities to help their friends and neighbors fill out mortgage applications and provide guidance.

"We've concentrated on those three areas initially because it takes a long time to get to know a community," Davies says.

Volunteer program: There was, until a few years ago, a great untapped willingness on the part of bank employees to get involved beneficially in the lives of their fellow citizens. "People really wanted to get out and work tutoring youngsters, planning day trips, or helping non-profit groups with an accounting system or a filing system," Davies says. "The only problem was, they didn't know where to go."

The result has been a carefully planned program, Chase Volunteers for Community Action, involving more than 400 Chase employees. The bank acts primarily as a broker, putting groups with needs in touch with people who can meet the needs, and making sure that each side understands what's expected of it.

It all adds up to a busy, diversified series of urban programs, closely woven into the structure of the bank's other activities under the current Chase operating philosophy of "coordinated decentralization."

LITHUANIAN OCCUPATION—A FORCEFUL REMINDER TO US

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as Americans, we cherish highly our daily freedoms, yet sometimes forget that these rights are not shared by many of our fellow men in other countries. For Lithuanians everywhere, June 15 is a sad reminder that the right of all men to rule themselves should not be taken for granted. On this day in 1940, the independent Republic of Lithuania was occupied by forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and was subsequently stifled under Soviet rule.

Although rocked by a revolt in 1941, a guerrilla war from 1944 to 1953, and many demonstrations in the 1960's and 1970's which culminated in the self-immolation of Romas Kalanta on May 14 of last year, Lithuania has been unable to free herself from the bonds of foreign rule. To this day, Lithuania remains an occupied republic.

This glaring example of man's lack of respect for his fellow man can be neither understood nor condoned. The cornerstone of our American way of life, those

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

basic freedoms which we hold as inalienable rights, are being denied to the peoples of this Baltic state. For citizens of the United States, it is impossible to conceive of a life without free expression, religion, economy, and mobility. For Lithuanians today, it is a reality.

It remains for us in America to do everything possible to see that tragedies such as the domination of Lithuania do not reoccur and to hope that existing inequities can be rectified.

From one who has enjoyed the privilege of freedom, words seem an inadequate expression of sympathy for all people who cherish only a dream of independence. As we recall with Lithuanians the events of June 15, 1940, let us renew our determination to protect and preserve the right of all men to be free.

**LOWELL CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES
TO SUPPORT H.R. 49**

HON. PAUL W. CRONIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Speaker, increasing costs have assaulted every sector of our country and nonpublic education at primary and secondary levels provides no exception. In the city of Lowell, approximately 7,000 children attend nonpublic schools which are seriously threatened by economic difficulties and may be forced to close if relief is not forthcoming. One source of relief would be Federal income tax credit for tuition paid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools similar to that proposed in H.R. 49. The Lowell City Council has unanimously adopted the following resolution urging passage of tax credit legislation.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, there are about 7,000 Lowell youngsters attending non-public schools; and

Whereas, It is becoming increasingly more difficult for these schools to continue in existence; and

Whereas, Parents of youngsters attending these schools also support by their tax dollars the public schools of our City; and

Whereas, This City Council recognizes the financial burden that would be placed upon the City should non-public schools be forced to close; and

Whereas, Concerned Citizens and parents in all walks of life throughout this country are banding together in support of House Bill #HR 49, which will allow Federal Income Tax Credits for parents of non-public school children; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Lowell City Council go on record in support of HR 49 to help correct an historic injustice against parents who exercise their right to choose non-public education for their children and that this City Council communicate its feelings to Senators Brooke, and Kennedy and Congressman Cronin and ask all Lowell residents to do likewise in the form of letters, telegrams, and phone calls. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman Cronin and Senators Brooke and Kennedy with a request that it be included in the Congressional Record as evidence of our strong support of this measure vitally necessary to the future of education in our country.

**RALPH HUBBELL SPEAKS FOR
AMERICA**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, outstanding prose, that which contains eloquence as well as substance in the same essay, is a rare discovery. When it does appear, therefore, it should be shared.

Such prose flowed from the pen of my friend, Ralph Hubbell recently in his own column, "The Human Side," which appears in Buffalo's *Magnificat Catholic Weekly*. The Hubbell essay is a personal interpretation of "America, the Beautiful."

Its style, grace, and elegance make it compelling.

The essay follows:

WATERGATE

(By Ralph Hubbell)

O BEAUTIFUL FOR SPACIOUS SKIES

(Clear, blue skies to beckon our eyes and beseech us to look up with pride in this land of ours and beyond, with reverence and hope, to God Almighty who forgives us our troubled times in the knowledge that our ship is a proud ship and that our way is a proud and progressive way—and is not a lost way).

FOR AMBER WAVES OF GRAIN

(Showing the whole wide world of people how bountiful are our resources and how distant are our horizons. Farmlands that nourish and strengthen us and remind us of our God-given heritage and of our freedom which may be challenged but which, until the end of time, will rally from any attempt, from within or without, to bind our hands, seal our lips, blind our eyes or impair our progress).

FOR PURPLE MOUNTAIN MAJESTIES

(Mountains, they mean, for us to look up to and beyond, again, to the highest reaches where God lives and where God loves us all. Mountains, they mean, not for us to stand upon as busy-bodies seeking to solve the problems of the world and not as would-be conquerors of that world but as fortunate people seeing from on high the beauty of the world and willing to share our own bountiful treasures of peace and freedom with that world).

ABOVE THE FRUITED PLAIN

(Upon which plain we all stand shaken today in the knowledge that our chief causes for concern and unrest have festered from within. Yet upon which plain we promise as one that we will stay united as we seek our solutions with strong faces looking confidently to one another. We promise, as one, a unison of purpose and a self-belief that once our record has been cleaned of all taint and once we have put our own house in order in our own way we can walk, with pride, in the sun again).

AMERICA, AMERICA GOD SHED HIS GRACE ON THEE

(Yes, indeed, He shed His grace and His compassion upon all of us the while He knows that no matter how muddled the waters they will clear with hope and self-dedication to purpose; He knows that no matter how high the hurdle we will conquer it as we clear the air; He knows of troubles past and He watched, and was proud, when we set our house in order and continued the joyous road that is our beloved America).

AND CROWN THY GOOD WITH BROTHERHOOD

(That has been our key for our salvation from the very first step that was taken upon

our soil by the very first people who yearned to be free and to stay free. Brotherhood is just that. It is the acceptance of each other as a brother but not just within the circle of our own family. Brotherhood goes beyond our shores and insists that we accept all people as brothers for all people, one day, must be free. It is as brothers that we can re-unite to find our way back to the dignity and decency which we knew and accepted, perhaps too lightly, before the black cloud of doubt hovered over us and saddened us—so).

FROM SEA TO SHINING SEA

(It is as a shining family that we will one day continue as a self-believing family once the wisdom for realizing our shortcomings and for ferreting out and punishing our traitors is blended with the further knowledge that something must be done swiftly and with lasting strength and decisiveness. From the Atlantic to the Pacific we are America. Between those shores a pitiful and faithless few have been allowed to undermine, in some measure, all that we hold dear and all that we feel is our pride and our possession. It is when our freedom is challenged—from within as well as without—that we prove ourselves America at our integral best. Conquer we must and we will and let us lift our hearts to God in the certain belief that America is today, and will ever be, America, the beautiful.

LITHUANIAN FREEDOM

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago today the Lithuanian people were brought under the yoke of Soviet domination. The spirit of freedom that beats in the heart of every freedom-loving citizen beats sadly today; for freedom is a legend of the past in Lithuania. But the Soviet oppressors have found that the spirit of freedom does not perish easily. The post-World War II history of Lithuania bears grim testimony to this. In the years following the war, native Lithuanians took to the hills to fight the Soviet occupation army, at a cost of over 50,000 Lithuanian lives. Finally, the Soviets resorted to departing the native population to Siberian labor camps. Truly, a reign of terror had begun; a reign of terror that has not relented.

Yet, neither have the Lithuanians abandoned their struggle for freedom. In March of 1972 a petition bearing 17,054 signatures protesting the desperate plight of Lithuanian Roman Catholics was forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations with an urgent appeal that he relay the protest to the secretary general of the Russian Communist Party. Three previous collective letters had been ignored.

A more recent and more tragic protest against Soviet occupation and religious prosecution took place in May 1972. Romas Kalanta, a young Roman Catholic, burned himself to death in a public park in Kaunas to protest the subjection and prosecution of Lithuanians. The mass demonstrations that followed this act proved that the spirit of freedom still lives in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, it is this spirit that we honor today, but let us not forget that we are also mourning its captivity.

June 15, 1973

THE EXCELLENCE OF
VOLUNTEERISM

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, there are those who would say that social welfare and assistance programs weaken the spiritual strength of America by fostering strong dependence upon the Government in lieu of those things once prized as the products of hard work. Others claim that relief, work incentive, and social security programs do not damage but reinforce the confidence of every American citizen that he has a right to a decent standard of living. In the middle of this debate stand America's volunteer organizations, dedicated people who just want to help, with no strings attached. An example of one successful volunteer institution which I would like to share with my colleagues is the Catholic Family and Community Services of the Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Bridgeport, Conn.

For 56 years, this organization has been providing a wide variety of professional casework and group services to the people of the Bridgeport area, including counseling for individual adjustment, marital problems, parent-child relations, and services for unwed mothers. By operating programs that often surpass those of the Government in scope and organization, I think this agency demonstrates the effectiveness of American volunteerism and the advantages of a community's drawing together to solve problems through the use of its human resources.

Guided by a board of lay volunteers of all faiths, this agency boasts the largest professionally trained staff of social workers of any volunteer effort in Connecticut. Yet, each neighborhood center and project office has a voice in making policy decisions. In this way, the Bridgeport Catholic Family and Community Services provides the participation and cooperation necessary to confront personal problems individually and sensitively.

Programs on drug abuse, adolescent problems, the inner city, housing for the elderly, adoption services, and family service programs have provided invaluable help and good will to the people of Fairfield County.

A review of some of the programs this agency sponsors clearly demonstrates the dedication of the Bridgeport Catholic Family and Community Services and their ability to inspire all who wish to help our citizens help themselves.

To face the growing problem of drug abuse among the young, they operate two counseling, referral and treatment centers in conjunction with the regional narcotics rehabilitation program of the National Institute for Mental Health.

A short term residence and counseling shelter has also been operating to help sort out adolescent problems and bridge the mythical generation gap.

In the inner city, there is a wide range of volunteer projects, from day care cen-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

19905

ters to "College Students Involved," which attempts to break the hold of the ghetto by transporting children to a local university campus for a day of tutorial help and recreation.

This organization even provides a shopping center of services for inner city residents, a clearinghouse of service information which insures that no problem goes unsolved merely for lack of know-how in the face of the bureaucracy.

The Bridgeport Catholic Family and Community Services also sponsored the construction of 101 units of moderate-income housing for the elderly. This ambitious program was the first of its kind in the Eastern United States and was commended by the New York office of HUD.

Over half a century of selfless service certainly merits our respect and admiration. But more than that, the efforts of the Bridgeport Catholic Family and Community Services reminds us that poverty, mental illness, drug addiction, and old age are problems that people, not just dollars, must solve.

ANNUAL NEWSLETTER OF THE
HONORABLE JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently my colleague, the Honorable JAMES R. GROVER, JR., of the Second District of New York, released his annual newsletter and I believe Members will find the entire text of Mr. GROVER's article of interest, and I insert it for their consideration:

WEEKLY COLUMN OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

One of the long-prized strengths of the American system was the concept of equal justice. The high and the mighty are supposedly equal in the eyes of the law with the downtrodden and impoverished. All persons are, in American jurisprudence, considered innocent of wrongdoing until proven guilty.

Which brings us, once again, to the subject of the Watergate break-in. A number of my constituents, who are deeply distressed over Watergate and all its implications, have indicated to me that they are equally distressed over the daily repetition of unsupported accusations, hearsay and innuendo which swirl around the President. What justification is there for this media overkill? Is the anti-Nixon bias of such as the Washington Post a sufficient reason to scuttle hopes for a generation of peace so near our grasp? Is it so important that we should risk loss of confidence in our system and its institutions? And when will those journalists who pressed for a totally independent and powerful prosecutor support Archibald Cox in his efforts to set aside the banners of sensationalism and pick up the tools of swift justice.

Is today's media justice best exemplified in the lionization of draft evaders or those who destroyed draft records, the rioters and the looters who give social injustice as a reason for theft, vandalism and the cold-blooded assassination of police? The Berrigans and Angela Davis come readily to mind. I find particularly interesting the liberal mentality which can turn Jane Fonda into a heroine and Ramsey Clark into a sage, after they spouted the Hanoi line which denied that

our prisoners were in any way mistreated. These are headline-makers, every one, and, we are told, they are pure of heart.

The Watergate caper was a disastrous folly, which may well have been undertaken by men who had the goal of establishing link between the McGovern campaign, Castro's Cuba and other governments whose philosophies do not coincide with ours. President Nixon's involvement, separate from that of some staff members, has in no way been established. And yet, the President has undergone an unprincipled and unjust lathering which Daniel Ellsberg, the Berrigans and some of our mad anarchists have not experienced.

The media has a solemn responsibility to weigh its awesome powers lest it destroy that which it is pledged to defend.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CUT
MEDICAL CENTER GROWTH BY
ALMOST HALF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, someone once said that Washington is 100 square miles surrounded by reality. The on-going debate over the President's proposed fiscal year 1974 budget has certainly corroborated this definition of Washington.

Listening to the administration one would think that the massive cuts in the health and welfare areas will have little effect on the people of this Nation. Well, let me dispel that fairy tale right now.

Unless the Congress undertakes a mammoth reordering of the President's fiscal priorities, some of the most vital institutions in the Nation will be permanently damaged. Let me give a concrete example.

A recent article in the San Francisco Examiner has reported that as a result of Federal budget cutbacks, the University of California at San Francisco's medical center has slashed its growth plans by half. Instead of expanding to an enrollment of 7,500 by 1985, the famed research institute will have to make do with only 4,000 students. A lessening in the number of future doctors will not be the only result of the massive Federal cutbacks, however. The university has also scheduled reductions in a variety of research programs including pharmacy, nursing, dentistry, medicine, and human biology and veterinary medicine.

I fully realize the necessity of budgetary restraint, and do support the President's \$268 billion budget ceiling. But these cuts in Federal funds for health centers are simply imprudent.

Despite this country's great wealth, we have a very mediocre health record. Consider these facts:

On a per capita basis, the United States ranks fifth in the incidence of heart disease, eighth in the total number of accidents, and eighth in the incidence of diabetes.

In 1950 only 5 nations in the world had a lower per-capita percentage of infant mortality than the United States; today 14 nations have a better record in this area.

There are 24 nations in the world where the average male lives longer than he does in the United States, and 11 nations where the average female has a longer life expectancy than the average American female.

In 133 American counties there are no active physicians. These counties hold 3.8 percent of the total land area of the nation, and support a half-million people.

All of these disturbing figures serve to demonstrate the necessity for a larger, not a smaller health budget. The President, of course, says that we cannot afford higher expenditures in this area. I say we cannot afford not to increase the amount of Federal support for the health system in this country.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include for the benefit of my colleagues the article from the San Francisco Examiner entitled "UC Cuts Med Center Growth by Almost Half."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CUTS MED CENTER GROWTH BY ALMOST HALF

(By Carl Irving)

LOS ANGELES.—The University of California's San Francisco medical center, hit by Federal budget cutbacks, is slashing its growth plans nearly by half, Chancellor Francois Sooy revealed today.

The famed research and training center now is drawing up a new master plan for 4,000 students by 1985, down from the earlier target of 7,500. The reductions imply scaling down of faculty, students, researchers and facilities at Parnassus Heights.

Among the reductions are a new dental school on Fourth ave. between Parnassus and Kirkham avenues, the subject of drawn-out disputes with neighborhood organizations. The latter had protested against the added congestion a large new structure would bring to the neighborhood.

HEIGHT SLASHED

Sooy told the regents meeting here that his campus was now planning a structure set back from the street, which would be no higher than residences in the area. The structure's height has been reduced from 135 to 48 feet and square footage cut back from 168,000 to 85,000.

The Federal government is sharply reducing support for medical centers and the effect at UCSF will be leveling off in pharmacy, nursing, dentistry, medicine and human biology programs. Enrollment, now totaling 2,900, was to have grown rapidly in the next decade.

On campus enrollment now will go up from the present 1,500 to only 1,980 students by 1985, instead of 3,230 projected in the 1964 master plan, Sooy reported.

The new enrollment plans should be welcome news to neighborhood groups which had been objecting to the growth of traffic and population density in the area. Sooy said he was counting on use of U.S. Public Health Service and Veterans Administration hospitals away from the campus to provide space for the additional enrollments in future years.

Sooy also made the following points:

The UCSF campus provides 6300 full-time jobs and its employees pay state sales and income taxes totaling \$1.8 million annually.

It provides a 560 bed hospital, large outpatient facilities, dental clinic facilities and now a 90 bed neuropsychiatric hospital transferred from the State Dept. of Mental Hygiene.

Off-campus, UC is affiliated with the 800 bed San Francisco general hospital, a 350 bed VA hospital and more than 25 other private and community hospitals, mostly in the Bay Area.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cutting back on campus expansion will limit growth to 700 new jobs between now and 1985, a reduction of 500 positions. But a corresponding increase in staff will be spread around at off-campus hospitals.

The new campus plan will provide for demolition of not more than 25 houses in the area, instead of 130 originally planned for destruction. No additional property will be acquired; Moffitt Hospital will be limited to 560 beds instead of 760 originally planned.

Mount Sutro's forest will remain virtually intact. Of 74 acres of open land, a maximum of six acres will be reserved for development in the area.

\$1 MILLION

The Regents yesterday voted to make use of \$1 million promised by Governor Reagan at the urging of student lobbyists in Sacramento. The plan provides that at least half the sum be spent for evaluation of teaching and related programs.

Other uses will include grants for studying how to improve courses and seminars or other special courses for entering students.

"These are things we've been trying to do, but have been impeded by lack of resources," commented UC President Charles Hitch. "We hope the programs will be successful and that the governor will continue them."

Hitch reported that President Nixon's approval of student aid appropriations for next fall "substantially improved the outlook for the next academic year.

ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OPPRESSION IN LITHUANIA

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is an anniversary for Americans of Baltic descent—the anniversary of the day in 1940 that Lithuania lost her freedom to the Soviet Union.

In 1940, the Soviet Union invaded and annexed Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia—peaceful Baltic countries. Lithuania managed to reestablish a free government in June 1941 when the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union. That government lasted only 6 weeks until the Nazis took over the country.

The Baltic states have never again regained their freedom. They suffer religious and political persecution and denial of human rights. A total of one-quarter of the combined populations of the Baltic States have been forced into deportation and settlement programs by the Soviet Union.

The Balts have not given up on their freedom. Some 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in organized resistance between 1940 and 1952. More recently, a petition against Soviet repression bearing the signatures of 17,054 Lithuanians was forwarded to the United Nations in March 1972 with the request that it be given to Leonid Brezhnev, Secretary General of the Russian Communist Party, because three previous letters had gone unanswered by the Soviets.

Demonstrations were held in several Lithuanian cities in May 1972 to protest Soviet occupation and persecution of religious groups, especially Roman Catholics. There was rioting for several days after a young Roman Catholic, Romas

June 15, 1973

Kalanta, burned himself to death for political reasons.

The United States has refused to recognize the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union. The 89th Congress passed a resolution urging the President to bring up the matter of Baltic freedom in the U.N. and other international forums.

This year also marks the 722d anniversary of the formation of the Lithuanian State. Let us again urge the President to bring the Baltic question before the United Nations and request the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, in hope that June 15, now a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent can be forgotten in celebration of a 723d anniversary.

SOFT-HEADED JUSTICE

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as you know I have introduced legislation in the House to require reconfirmation of all Federal judges by the U.S. Senate every 8 years. I introduced this legislation, because I firmly believe that some irresponsible Federal judges in this Nation are turning back the clock on the cause of law and order by destroying the people's faith in the judicial process.

This certainly is not an attempt on my part to imply a blanket indictment of all judges, most of whom are responsible and reasonable, but it is an attempt to check those judges who are guilty of trying to remake the world according to their own moral and philosophical beliefs.

The Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter recently published an article about that kind of judge and his apparent dedication to what President Nixon has labeled "soft-headed justice." I would like to include that article in the RECORD:

"SOFT-HEADED JUSTICE"—JUDGES SHOW LITTLE CONCERN FOR VICTIMS

In Washington, D.C., the other day, a U.S. District Court Judge paroled a self-confessed killer who has served only one month of his 10-year sentence for shooting to death a university student during a holdup attempt. Even though the prosecutor had argued the killer should be sentenced as an adult, since he was 21, the judge sentenced him under the Federal Youth Corrections Act which provides for immediate consideration of parole. The man is now back on the streets.

This is among the examples of "soft-headed justice" which Newsletter readers are sending in from all over the country—examples which contain a pattern of judicial overconcern for the criminal and unconcern for the victim. Other examples:

In Colorado, a 23-year-old Black Hawk man was sentenced to two years in the county jail by a District Court Judge and fined \$2,000 for killing a 20-year-old girl. The judge ruled that the 253 days the man had already served in jail since his arrest would be applied to his two-year sentence.

In Seattle, Washington, a Superior Court judge held that a man who beat a woman

to death with a frying pan was innocent by reason of insanity. His lawyer said a job in sales work is available and that as long as he takes medication he is not a danger to society. The prosecutor argued that there is no guarantee the man will remain on medication.

In Selma, Alabama, a circuit judge sentenced a man convicted of selling LSD to five years' probation, despite the fact that the man had several other drugs sales charges pending.

In Washington, D.C., the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed two attempted-rape convictions and freed a 17-year-old youth because it held he had been charged under the wrong part of the city's rape statutes. The court said the indictment was brought under a section relating to assaults on girls under 16 when, in fact, the two victims were 20 years old.

In Joliet, Illinois, a couple who allegedly sold their 12-year-old daughter for \$26,000 had charges of child abandonment reduced by a circuit court judge to failing to provide parental care, a misdemeanor.

In Columbus, Ohio, a university law professor announced formation of a union to get "decent wages" for convicts in the State prison.

A Cincinnati, Ohio, reader asks: "What can I do?"

For one thing, write letters to your newspaper editors and get your friends to do the same. Call your local radio stations that have talk shows. Make sure that the records of "soft-headed judges," as President Nixon calls them, are publicized.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, as we enter a period of stronger relations with the Soviet Union, it is important to pause a moment and remember that there are still many Eastern European countries under Soviet rule that do not know the meaning of the word "freedom." On June 15 we take time to honor one such country still in the bonds of tyranny—Lithuania.

Ever since this gallant Baltic nation was annexed by the Russians on June 15, 1940, the Lithuanians have struggled to throw off the yoke of their conquerors—even at the expense of thousands of lives. The daring and bravery of the Lithuanians have excited freedom-loving peoples everywhere and have served as a dramatic reminder to the world that freedom is destined to ultimately triumph over slavery.

The observance of this sad anniversary has a stronger meaning to all of us when we think of the hundreds of thousands of American citizens, who, through nativity or ancestry, share the heritage, culture, and industry of their homeland now under Soviet domination. These many friends and neighbors still have loved ones living in a country ruled by a Communist dictatorship rather than by representatives of the people.

With this in mind we must attempt to match the courage of Lithuania by reaffirming our Nation's devotion to the principle of self-determination for all men. We must offer the hope of a time

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

when every man can enjoy again the freedom to think as he pleases, to worship in his own way, to elect his own officials, and to make an honest living by a means of his own choosing.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in solemn commemoration of this great time of rededication to the ideal of freedom and justice for all.

HISTORIC HOWELL IRON WORKS 150TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 150th anniversary celebration of the Historic Howell Iron Works at Allaire State Park, I wish to commemorate this facility's important contribution to progressive American enterprise and initiative.

In 1823, the Monmouth Furnace was bought by James P. Allaire and renamed the Howell Furnace after Benjamin B. Howell, its previous owner. Fifty-seven years before, the Monmouth Furnace produced cannon shot for the guns of Gen. George Washington's army in the Revolutionary Battle of Monmouth, fought nearby.

James Allaire, born in New York in the waning years of the Articles of Confederation—1785—soon became a skilled craftsman. At the age of 20, he cast with his own hands the brass air chamber for Robert Fulton's first steamer, the *Clermont*. Five years later, in 1816, he established the James P. Allaire Works in New York City which continued operations in his possession until the late 1830's. During this period of American economic expansion, the need for reliable and more economical transportation systems was acute. James Allaire pioneered in several improvements on the steam engine which became well known in industrial circles throughout the world. The cylinders for the *Savannah*, the first American steamship to cross the Atlantic, were made at the Allaire Works in New York.

Learning of the availability of the Monmouth Furnace as a possible source of pig-iron for the Allaire Works, Mr. Allaire entered into negotiations with Benjamin Howell in the early 1820's for the purpose of purchasing the furnace. Mr. Howell appears to have allowed the Monmouth Furnace to be its own salesman. In a letter to Allaire, he described the property:

The furnace as you know is situated in a pleasant and good country—there is much good land immediately in the neighborhood and very valuable meadows, and I think this country wants only to be known to render it a place of much greater moment than it is generally estimated at. As a situation for a furnace it possesses many great advantages.

After a personal inspection of the grounds, James P. Allaire in 1823, bought the Monmouth Furnace and adjoining lands, renaming it the Howell Furnace.

Since the overland transportation system was extremely poor—there were no stage coaches in those days—previous owners probably had to ship their iron by floating it down the Manasquan River in scows. Despite these difficulties, Allaire made periodic visits to the Furnace, coming all the way from New York on horseback.

Under the ownership of James P. Allaire, the Howell Furnace grew from a dozen houses, a furnace, a saw mill and a few other buildings in 1821 to a substantial settlement less than a decade later. A village of nearly 70 brick buildings and 500 men had been founded. By 1831, in addition to the furnace itself, the Howell Works included a store, carpenter and smith shops, file and screw factories, saw and grist mills, dwellings, stables, a large public high school—maintained entirely at the expense of Mr. Allaire—and a church. A post office was established in 1832.

Since the previous owner had little pride in the appearance of the grounds, there were few trees or improvements in the land by cultivation. In 1825 Mr. Allaire began landscaping the ground and planting trees. He even employed young boys to plant chestnuts around the ponds and in the surrounding woods. He evidently believed that there was more to running a successful iron industry than hauling ore and paying wages; the quality of the workers' lives was acknowledged as being as essential to the community as the continuous procession of commerce.

Employees of the Howell Works Co., were of all nationalities and consisted of moulder, ware-cleaners, carpenters, patternmakers, wheelwrights, blacksmiths, millers, grinding mill and screw factory operatives, masons and builders, teamsters, ore raisers, charcoal burners, woodcutters, stage drivers, warehousemen, farm laborers, grooms, tailors, harness makers, bakers, gardeners, teachers, preachers, foremen, and ordinary laborers. This litany of occupations alone seems to tell the story of American expansion and development. A nucleus of trade or industry is first established and then quickly surrounded by the service trades which care for the needs of the workers. The Howell Works is a fine example of enlightened capitalism in that, although production was sustained at a profitable pace, the quality of the life of the workers was not forgotten.

Long before the days of trade unions, Mr. Allaire was an early champion of the working class. At a time when slave labor was available, he paid above-average wages to the workers and instituted a health and welfare program for his employees. This was unheard of in the early 19th century. A preacher was maintained—at Mr. Allaire's expense—whose duties included teaching school, in addition to his regular religious functions. Workmen's children were compelled to attend classes. By 1841, the school was flourishing and not only provided education for the Howell employees' children, but also attracted those of wealthier families who lived on the premises. Families from the surrounding countryside also sent their sons and daughters 3 or 4 miles to the Howell School. The de-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gree of excellence of the institution could be seen from the type of curriculum offered. Along with the higher branches of English, the classics, Greek, Latin, French, and German were taught. No charges were made for either books or tuition.

This thriving industrial community produced many of the early day mass-produced iron kitchen utensils, as well as cast iron stoves that were eventually carted across the country in wagon trains to warm the homes and cook the food of thousands of pioneers in the West.

James P. Allaire, after a career as inventor, industrialist, educator, and philanthropist, died at the Howell Works on Thursday, May 20, 1858. Twenty-three years earlier at a Fourth of July celebration at the Howell Works, a toast was offered which paid tribute to the industry that gave thousands their livelihood:

Howell Works—on inspection by friend or foe, may they exclaim, how well she works.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my friends from New Jersey in celebrating the 150th anniversary of the historic Howell Iron Works at Allaire State Park.

LITHUANIAN ANNIVERSARY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish today, June 15, to join with my colleagues in the observance of a sorrowful anniversary for the brave people of Lithuania. On this date, 33 years ago, Russia conquered the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Twelve months later mass deportation began and more than 150,000 Balts were sent to the deadly Siberian slave and labor camps. However, the Lithuanians were quick to retaliate. Several days before the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, these gallant people revolted and overthrew the Communist regime. A provisional government was established, and the fruits of freedom were enjoyed for a short but glorious 2 months before Hitler returned to terrorize the population.

My brief accounting of the Lithuanian freedom struggle is by no means a recent historical development. For centuries Baltic soil has been devastated by invaders from both the East and the West. All told, in the quick span of 8 years from 1942 to 1950, it has been estimated that 30,000 Lithuanians lost their lives in organized resistance movements against foreign domination.

The present situation remains unchanged as Russia has tightened her iron grip. The United States has never recognized this forceful annexation of Lithuania by the U.S.S.R., and deplores the fact that the Balts are denied the rights of assembly, free elections, and worship. In our observance today, let us renew our pledge to Lithuania in her fight for national independence, and hope that this Nation's determined ef-

forts to regain her inalienable rights will become an integral part of the overall plan toward world peace.

THE LEGACY OF LITHUANIA

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1973, is a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world. For, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union invaded Lithuania and these Baltic peoples have been suffering ever since. Regrettably, the Balts have had to suffer oppression for centuries due to the "accident of geography." From the West, they were invaded by Teutonic knights and, from the East, by the Russians. Accordingly, it has taken remarkable spiritual and ethnic strength to survive these pressures from both sides.

Just as Lithuanians have resisted invasions throughout the centuries, they have waged an intensive fight for freedom since the very beginning of Soviet occupation. During the period from 1944 to 1952 alone, approximately 50,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters lost their lives in an organized resistance movement. The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained new impetus.

To this very day, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of the right of national self-determination, continued religious and political persecutions, and the violation of human rights by the Soviet Union reached tragic heights on May 14, 1972, when a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, burned himself in Kaunas as a martyr in protest to Soviet oppression. This act triggered widespread demonstrations in the area and culminated in two other self-immolations. Such dramatic events demonstrate that the Lithuanian people have not acquiesced to the Soviet occupation, but rather are still striving for freedom and independence.

Such passive resistance has also been exhibited by the U.S. Government since we have refused to recognize the seizure and forced "incorporation" of Lithuania by the Communists into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Our Government continues to accredit only those diplomats whose credentials were received from the former free governments of the Baltic States and not the Soviet dominated puppet governments in existence today.

Since June of 1940, all U.S. Presidents have stated, restated and confirmed our policy of nonrecognition of the occupied Baltic States. Hopefully, the present generation of Americans will continue to recognize that the bonds which many U.S. citizens have with enslaved lands of their ancestry are a great asset to the struggle against communism.

June 15, 1973

The U.S. Congress has made a step in the right direction by unanimously adopting House Concurrent Resolution 416 which calls for freedom for the Baltic States. It is my hope that all freedom-loving Americans will urge the President to implement this very important legislation by bringing the issue of the liberation of the Baltic States to the United Nations to request that the Soviets withdraw from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Certainly, the time has come for everyone to demand that the principle of self-determination be respected and that the nations of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia be free to choose their own form of government. We should have a single standard for freedom. Its denial, in whole or in part, anywhere in the world, is intolerable.

LITHUANIA: A TRIBUTE TO A STRUGGLING NATION

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1940, the nation of Lithuania was forcibly annexed into the U.S.S.R. Today, I wish to join in paying tribute to this struggling nation and her people, who were denied the right of self-determination 33 years ago.

Lithuanian history has been one of domination and occupation for nearly two centuries. Russian domination over the Lithuanian nation began in 1795 and lasted until 1915. The First World War marked the beginning of occupation by the German Army, which lasted until 1919 when occupation by the Soviet Red Army began. On the verge of being driven out by the Polish Army and scores of Lithuanian fighting units, Russia signed a peace treaty with Lithuania on July 12, 1920. Recognizing Lithuania as an independent nation, the Russian Government pledged to renounce forever all rights of sovereignty. The treaty stated:

In conformity with the right declared by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic that all peoples have the right to free self-determination, including the right of full secession from the State of which they were a part, Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition, and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory. The fact that Lithuania was ever under Russian sovereignty does not place the Lithuanian people and their territory under any obligation to Russia.

Lithuania was admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921. During the next two decades Lithuania enjoyed a period of independence and national resurgence.

With the outbreak of the Second World War, Lithuania became one of the first countries to experience the brutal aggression of both Hitler and Stalin. Soviet occupation began in 1940, and Lithuania was forcibly annexed into the U.S.S.R. It is estimated that during this

June 15, 1973

19909

occupation, 45,000 Lithuanians lost their lives. Some 30,000 members of the Lithuanian intelligentsia were deported to Siberia. Hastily retreating under German attack, Soviet forces executed 5,000 political prisoners.

Soviet domination of Lithuania since 1940 has neither extinguished the desire for freedom nor has it been successful in erasing the Lithuanian ethnic spirit. In recent years, petitions, riots and self-immolations have challenged the Soviet regime, which is carrying out a relentless program of Russification. Furthermore, despite official harassment and repression by the Communist regime, traditional religious beliefs remain strong.

Mr. Speaker, despite the outward trappings of sovereignty of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, Lithuania today remains a captive nation.

Political change is accelerating throughout the world, however, and it may well be that future changes will again give the Lithuanian people the opportunity for self-determination. In addition to pressing the Soviet Union to observe the principle of self-determination and to continuing our efforts to promote political liberalization within the U.S.S.R. our objective should be to do all we can to encourage the Lithuanian people, through recognition, communication, and moral support, to maintain their national spirit, national identity and national will until that time arrives.

Mr. Speaker, I join millions of Americans in saluting the brave Lithuanian people, who continue to struggle for their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

LITHUANIA: FREEDOM UNDER SIEGE

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this great Nation of ours was founded on the ideals of freedom and the protection of human rights. To maintain this dignity which men deserve, we have struggled and sacrificed much, both at home and abroad. It is therefore with much regret that we witness today the anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

This Baltic State declared its independence on February 16, 1918, only to have its newly gained freedom destroyed by Soviet occupation during World War II. Under the aegis of communism, Lithuania has been denied the blessings of religious and political freedom. This freedom-loving people have been denied the right of national self-determination. Though this nation is tiny, the strength and the determination of its people are great. Past guerrilla warfare and the self-immolation of some of its youth have shown to the world that this nation will not succumb to Soviet suppression.

Lithuania struggles not to be colonialized. The United States, a country that fought to free itself of colonialization, has never recognized the Soviet incorpo-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ration of Lithuania. This policy of non-recognition, Mr. Speaker, must be reaffirmed and kept constant in our minds until theinalienable right of freedom is restored to Lithuania, and its independence is reestablished. May the day soon come when freedom for Lithuania will no longer be a fought-for dream, but rather a cherished reality.

FOREIGN AID AND THE LITTLE GUY

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing like a winner and Congress has one. It is section 240 of the Foreign Assistance Act and is entitled: "Agricultural Credit and Self-help Community Development Projects."

This is the program Congress created on its own initiative 4 years ago. It was admittedly an experiment. The program provided for a U.S. Government guaranty on loans by foreign private banks and other financial institutions to groups of peasants in five Latin American countries for worthwhile self-help community development projects.

Congressman Moss and I and many other cosponsors argued that we believed the peasant was a good credit risk. We also contended that the U.S. foreign aid program should concern itself more with the basic needs of "the little guy" in underdeveloped countries and, indeed, the American people would support such grassroots programs.

We predicted at the time that the default rate on these loans might run 5 percent, but, even so, this would still result in 20-to-1 cost benefit ratio in generating grass-roots development—a payoff higher than any other type of aid the United States was extending. Well, the default rate is zero. The only cost has been a pittance for administrative expenses.

More important, lives have been changed and the rising expectations of the people have been met in their own communities. The Congress has made it possible for working people to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. They have paid for it themselves, thus retaining their own pride and dignity. It has not been a handout or charity.

Now, Congressman Moss and I are asking you to expand this program to all of Latin America and, at the same time, give it a try in five countries in other parts of the world to see if it will also succeed there.

We also believe the operation itself, along with its present competent staff, should be transferred from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to the Agency for International Development.

This is a program where the peasants decide in a group action what the greatest need of their community is, then make a common commitment of labor and money to achieve their goal.

These untold stories of success are

deeply moving and the fact that Congress and the American people have made them possible is something that we can regard as truly a good deed for humanity.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) for his vision, his initiative and his faith in the integrity of the great mass of people in Latin America who have been ignored for so long. I am sure his efforts have changed many lives for the better and, in my mind, there could be no greater monument than that.

MEDICARE CHARGES KEEP RISING

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, senior citizens will be required to pay 50 cents a month more for their part B medicare premiums.

The Nixon administration has proposed additional increases in the cost of health services to be paid by individuals under medicare.

President Nixon would increase the part B deductible which must be paid by the medicare patient from \$60 to \$85. In addition, a patient would have to pay 25 percent of his physicians' fees and laboratory costs out of his own pocket, up from the present 20 percent.

To add even further to the burden on the individual, the President would increase the amount of the hospital room-and-board bill which would not be covered by medicare.

I have recently received a letter from a constituent which reflects the frustration of many of our citizens at rising health care costs which must be paid by the individual under medicare. The letter and the article in the Miami Herald to which it refers together explain how the enactment of the administration's proposals would be a serious mistake:

JUNE 9, 1973.

Congressman WILLIAM LEHMAN,
Cannon Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN LEHMAN: It was with a great deal of frustration that I read about the increase in Medicare payments as of July 1st. In the June 1st edition of the Miami Herald, was outlined the statement that the administration had proposed in its 1974 budget to increase Part B of Medicare a deductible of \$85.00. It was bad enough for the Senior Citizens to have the 1972 deductible of \$50.00, increased to \$60.00 for 1973, but just to think of raising this amount to \$85.00 is indeed frightening.

I am sure that you are familiar with the many injustices under the present administration we face, particularly with regards to the Health Program.

I wish my protest against these changes of increases be stated in the Congressional Record.

I and many other Senior Citizens hope that our faith in you will prove fruitful by your actions in working towards goals that will benefit us. So many things are being done to extend our lives, but what is it worth without dignity.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

Please do what you can to propose a bill to help curb the many spiral costs, especially the medical expense, which is way beyond most of our incomes.

If you can suggest any steps we as citizens can take, such as writing to sources that could help us, it would be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you for your kind cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL "LILLIAN" WEINER,
MIAMI, FLA.

[From the Miami Herald, June 1, 1973]

MEDICARE PAYMENTS TO GO UP JULY 1

WASHINGTON.—Medicare patients will be paying 50 cents a month more each for insurance premiums covering doctor bills and a wide range of other medical services beginning July 1.

Monthly Part B premiums go from \$5.80 to \$6.30 on July 1.

A \$10 increase in the annual deductible before Medicare benefits are paid went into effect in January, bringing the deductible to \$60.

The Nixon administration's proposal to add another \$700 million a year to Medicare recipients' medical and hospital bills has met stiff resistance in Congress, however.

Legislation designed to put the proposed increases into effect Jan. 1, 1974, reportedly still is bottled up in the Office of Management and Budget.

More than half the Senate has signed a statement opposing the plan, and Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D., Ark.) chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has vowed it will never pass.

Under Social Security Act amendments passed last year, about 1.7 million disabled persons under 65 and an estimated 10,000 to 15,000 persons suffering from chronic kidney disease will be covered by Medicare for the first time starting today.

Part A Medicare is hospital insurance for which eligibility is automatic when a person qualifies for Social Security. Part B is optional, covers physicians' bills and certain medical supplies, and requires a monthly premium payment.

In the new fiscal year, Part A is expected to reach 23.1 million persons at a cost of \$8.2 billion and Part B is expected to be selected by 22.5 million at a total annual cost of slightly more than \$3 billion.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare attributes the 50-cent monthly increases for Part B to greater use of physicians' services, more expensive services, and higher costs and increasing use of hospital outpatient services.

The increase will hold for two years, HEW said, unless Congress boosts benefits in the interim. Previous premium increases were 20 cents in 1972, 30 cents in 1971, \$1.30 and \$1 in 1968.

Last month the Social Security Administration sent cards to the newly covered disabled, telling them that they would be automatically enrolled for part B coverage unless they returned the card. In the past, Medicare beneficiaries were required to return cards only if they wanted to participate in the supplementary medical-insurance program.

Part B covers physicians' bills and the cost of prosthetic devices, medical supplies and equipment, and laboratory services in and out of the hospital. It does not include prescription drugs outside the hospital.

When Congress voted to increase the deductible from \$50 to \$60 each year, it expanded coverage to eliminate the home-health-agency copayment and include the services of speech pathologists and, in limited cases, chiropractors.

After the deductible has been met, the beneficiary pays 20 per cent of future bills

and the federal government pays the balance of what it considers reasonable charges.

Under Part A hospital coverage, the patient pays \$72 the first day and nothing more until the 61st day when he or she pays a daily charge of \$18.

The administration had proposed in its 1974 budget to increase the Part B deductible to \$85, and the beneficiary's share or subsequent bills from 20 to 25 per cent.

In addition, patients hospitalized under Part A would pay the first day's actual hospital room-and-board bill and 10 per cent of the bill daily thereafter through the 60th day.

HISTORIC MANASSAS

HON. STANFORD E. PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the town of Manassas, Va. Manassas, located in the southern portion of my congressional district, is as you know one of the most historic communities in the Nation. It shares with surrounding Prince William County a rich respect for the past and a progressive dedication to the future. As a tribute to this historic community and under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include now the following brief history of Manassas:

The Town of Manassas is the County Seat of Prince William, one of the oldest counties in the State of Virginia.

Manassas is located in the central portion of the county and the century old town boasts of rich historical heritage, irrespective of the Civil War battles which brought the name Manassas into national prominence.

It is believed that the railroad running through Manassas was constructed in the 1850's and that the railroad men were responsible for giving the name to Manassas Junction (sometimes called Manassas Junction). Records in the Frederick County courthouse mention Manassas Run and Manassas settlements as early as 1743-44. The point at which the Manassas's Gap Railroad diverged from Orange and Alexandria became known as Manassas Junction. The apostrophe was gradually dropped from the name, and at least by the time of the Civil War, the "Junction" part of the name was deleted. When the town was incorporated in 1873, it was simply the "Town of Manassas."

For a number of years prior to the Civil War, the Manassas area was generally known by its post office which was called Tudor Hall. This was a sparsely settled, quiet agricultural region primarily composed of large slaveholding estates. Many of these lovely old plantation homes still survive throughout the county, and town. Little did the peaceful farmers of 1860 dream that the recently constructed railroad junction would bring to them the horror of war and unsolicited national renown.

The railroad, to which the town accredits its existence, played a very significant role in this first major battle of the war (Civil War) the Battle of Bull Run or the First Battle of Manassas. General P. G. T. Beauregard who was in command, held his headquarters at Liberia, a beautiful brick home in the eastern part of the present town, from June 1861 to September, 1861.

During the Second Battle of Manassas or Bull Run with Stonewall Jackson in command, the railroads were destroyed or made impassable at many points, hence Manassas Junction again knew the ravages of war.

Although there were no buildings within the boundaries of the present Town of Manassas and few families living in the vicinity at the end of the Civil War, growth and progress were easily discernible within a few years.

The town's development really began when William S. Fewell, an enterprising and foresighted man who owned a great many acres in the area, laid out the town and began to sell lots.

The Eureka House was built by Sumner Fitts in 1865. The Cannon House was built in the same location around 1875. The Manassas Hotel was built on the east side of Main Street in 1865 or 1866. Later it was called the Goodwin House.

Besides these outstanding landmark hotels, there were three stores, a livery stable, a sumac factory, a grist mill for corn, a wagon shop and a blacksmith shop. Professional services were also provided in the 1860's. George C. Round opened a law office, along with several doctors who started their practice.

Churches began to establish in this growing community prior to the town's incorporation in 1873. By the time Manassas became the county seat in 1893, there were several buildings.

The first newspaper, the Manassas Gazette, began publication in April 1869 and 1896 sold to The Manassas Journal. Another important event of 1869, was the first public free school.

The growth and development soon led the citizens to desire incorporation. This was effected by an Act of The General Assembly of April 2, 1873. The Town of Manassas, as incorporated was about one-half mile square and lay on both sides of the railroad. The original charter, written by George C. Round, was designed to provide the simplest and least expensive form of town government and was used with only minor changes until 1926, when the town manager form of government was instituted.

Fire protection became a major concern and so wells were dug with this in mind as well as a public water supply. This was around 1890.

A second major concern was streets and sidewalks and by 1900 the streets of Manassas finally became free from the nuisance and danger of animals running at large.

By 1890, definite improvements were made as streets were graded, drained and gravelled and plank sidewalks were built. The only bonded debt incurred prior to this time was sidewalk construction. Beautification projects and ordinances were another concern to the council's time and the town's budget.

Although most of the Town Council's time during the first two decades were devoted to these routine tasks, considerable attention was given to education and to attempts to have Manassas become the county seat.

The county seat was moved from Brentsville to Manassas in 1892. The courthouse was constructed on the west side of town at the intersection of Grant Avenue and Lee Avenue. The names of these two new streets were chosen to represent the unity which had grown out of the tragic disunity which had devastated the area and the country for thirty years before. The courthouse was built of native brownstone and completed in 1894.

During the first decade after the courthouse was moved, telephone service was established in 1895. The National Bank of Manassas was established in 1896 and The Peoples National Bank, seven years later.

Manassas also expanded physically. In 1895 and 1896, West Street and Grant Avenue were extended northward and Portner Avenue was opened from the main gate of the Portner estate to Grant. Church Street was extended eastward to Zebedee in 1901. The

first extension of the town's boundaries was made in December, 1904, making the corporation approximately one mile square. A census held in 1905, showed 674 whites and 207 negroes.

On December 4, 1905, Manassas experienced the greatest disaster in its history, when a fire raged through the downtown. The fire was discovered by the night operator for the Southern Railway, in the rear of the Blossom building on the corner of Battle and Center Streets.

Hopkins candy factory completed in 1909 was an addition to the town. Bennett Agricultural High School was started and Eastern College came to town. The Industrial school laid its cornerstone and a Volunteer Fire Department was organized in 1909.

After many attempts by the Council, a bond issue of \$75,000 for water, sewerage and electric systems were accepted by the people.

In 1915, the Council moved to a new Town Hall. A new brick structure housed the Fire Company on the first floor and the council chamber above. That building with various renovations, is still being used as the Town Hall.

One could not picture Manassas around the turn of the century without the awareness of the 2000 acre Portner Estate. Robert Portner built the beautiful mansion "Annaburg" as a summer home during the early 1890's.

Manassas had a dramatic association, an orchestra and a brass band. Nicol Hall provided theatrical productions. Conner's Hall provided quality shows.

The Peace Jubilee held during July, 1911, was to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Battle of First Manassas. George Round was one person most responsible for the Jubilee and the commemorate exhibit located on the courthouse lawn.

The town has continued to grow and expand to seven square miles and 13,000 to 14,000 inhabitants at the present time. (1973)

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tuted in international forums. The tragic position of Lithuania must be resolved.

FIRST EAGLE SCOUT RECOGNITION DINNER

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently the East Valley Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, which serves approximately 40 communities in southwestern Pennsylvania and more than 12,000 young Americans, held a recognition dinner to honor 124 young men who have attained the highest rank in scouting—Eagle Scout.

These future leaders were feted at the Edgewood Country Club and were the guests of their sponsors, men who have already achieved success in a chosen field of endeavor as well as having demonstrated a sincere interest in furthering the interest of Scouting.

I cannot begin to list all the names of individuals who have contributed their efforts in publicly recognizing the achievement of these Eagle Scouts. It is suffice to say they are men who serve without expecting such recognition for their part in molding and shaping the future of America's youth.

I would, however, like to insert into the RECORD names of the Eagle Scouts and their sponsors and also to extend my personal commendations to Council President James L. Pflasterer and his staff for all they have done to perpetuate the Scouting movement and to see that those who attain the rank of Eagle Scout are duly honored for their achievement.

The list of Eagles and their sponsors is as follows:

LIST OF EAGLE SCOUTS AND THEIR SPONSORS

Paul Andrews, Troop 78, pharmacist, (W. A. Hacker of McKeesport Hospital); Regis Andrews, Troop 78, dental technician, (Dr. Stanley J. Douglass, dentist); William L. Artz, Troop 16, architect, (Thomas C. Celli, architect); Gregory Babiak, Troop 44, journalism, (Russell Naylor, U.S. Steel Corp.); John Balog, Troop 308, medicine, (Dr. Jablonski, physician); Jeff Barbour, Troop 45, agriculture, (Charles G. Turner of Turner Dairies); Raymond G. Benney, Troop 310, contracting, (Steve Simko of U.S. Steel Corp.); Don Berquist, Troop 19, architect, (John M. Tarle of G. C. Murphy Co.).

Richard J. Bertoty, Troop 53, auto mechanic, (William Anderson, Chrysler dealer); Rand A. Brinkman, Troop 16, engineering, (C. Herbert Burkman of Champion Tool & Die Co.); John Bruchas, Troop 58, X-Ray technician, (Dr. P. C. Martineau of McKeesport Hospital); Edward Coll, Troop 115, biochemistry, (George Dankosik of Sinclair Kopper Co.); Gary DiFrank, Troop 21, teacher, (M. Eremick of Penn Hills School District); John C. Dinning, Troop 146, (Jerome Adams, attorney); Joseph C. Dombrosky, Troop 153, marine biology, (D. D. Skinner of Westinghouse Electric Corp.).

Harry C. Ellinsky, Jr., Troop 150, attorney, (Jan C. Swenson, attorney); Ronald Eng, Troop 267, nuclear engineer (W. H. Hamilton, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory); Howard Erickson, Troop 109, physician, (Dr. J. S. Anderson, physician); Kenneth R. Fabrizi, Troop 402, heating and refrigeration, (Wil-

liam Petrina of Refrigeration Service); Steven P. Faigen, Troop 70, medicine, (Dr. Frank Bondi, chief surgeon, McKeesport Hospital); Robert G. Ferer, Troop 4, electrical engineer, (Max Bills, Irvin Works, U.S. Steel Corp.).

Jeffrey Getkin, Troop 21, teacher, (Charles F. Ross, Christy Park Works, U.S. Steel Corp.); Charles B. Gilchrist, music, (John C. Fisher, director instrumental music, South Allegheny High School); James T. Gilda, Troop 19, funeral director, (William H. Craig, funeral director); Bruce E. Grinder, Troop 45, wildlife management, (James R. Smith, Pennsylvania Fish Commission); Richard Holmes, Troop 82, professional baseball, (William G. Turner of Pittsburgh Pirates); Thomas M. Halasynski, Troop 58, physician, (Dr. C. B. Bryce, physician).

Stephen A. Harbulak, Troop 302, law enforcement, (James B. Johnson, assistant city editor, The Daily News, McKeesport, Pa.); Clair W. Hartle III, Troop 211, electronic engineer, (Robert L. Howell, Westinghouse Electric Corp.); Elliott Haverlack, Troop 97, natural biologist, (Gus Vassilaros, teacher, Gateway High School); Richard Heckman, Troop 99, music teacher, (E. D. Rotilli, band director, Elizabeth-Forward High School); Robert L. Holman, Troop 184, law enforcement, (Don Little, attorney).

J. Scott Hughes, Troop 109, motor cycle mechanic, (Larry R. Sperling, Christy Park Works, U. S. Steel Corp.); David S. Hyland, Troop 70, architect, (Sylvester Damianos, architect); Douglas B. Jobes, Troop 45, computer science, (Paul Brodick, Westinghouse Tele-Computer Systems); William P. Jones, Troop 16, law enforcement, (Walter Backzowski, attorney); Paul Jumba, Troop 5, forestry, (Duane C. Conley, Koppers Corp.); William J. Kabbert, Troop 90, physician (Dr. Robert M. Priore, obstetrician); Robert W. Karow, Troop 97, architect, (Ted McConnell, architect); Barry M. Kerner, Troop 98, corporate lawyer, (F. H. Henson, general patent counsel, Westinghouse Electric Corp.); Stephen Kish, Troop 302, architectural engineer, (Boyd D. Vuinovich, U.S. Steel Corp.).

Raymond D. Krueger, Troop 26, professional hockey, (Terry Chambers of Pittsburgh Penguins); James M. Liberto, Troop 2277, solid waste management, (R. J. Liberto, solid waste management); Ronald Lyons, Troop 402, mechanical engineer, (Fritz Ottenheimer, Westinghouse Electric Corp.); Richard McAllister, Troop 53, commercial airplane pilot, (M. J. Tinstman, pilot, Alcoa); David E. McCarty, Troop 202, electronics, (John P. McCune, Pomco); William McVicker, Post 82, electronics, (G. W. Nagel, Westinghouse Electric Corp.); Charles G. Majetich, Troop 77, carpenter, (Patsy D. Brusco, Christy Park Works, U. S. Steel Corp.).

Raymond Mangano, Troop 73, construction, (R. C. Verona of Crawford Construction); Douglas F. Marsh, Troop 45, forestry, (Joseph B. C. White, manager of Boyce Park); Gregory S. Mazik, Troop 78, mechanical engineering, (J. W. Griffiths, Christy Park Works, U. S. Steel Corp.); Charles R. Morgan, Troop 16, politics, (Mayor A. E. O'Block of Plum Borough); Benjamin H. Mount, Troop 23, broadcast-journalism, (Edward T. Price, radio broadcaster); Harry C. Nagel, Troop 4, physics, (Robert Stark, Churchill Area Senior High School); David Nelson, Troop 109, engineering, (D. M. Nelson of Bacharach Instrument Co.); John D. Nogan, Troop 8, electronics technician, (E. F. Beckwith, Christy Park Works, U. S. Steel Corp.).

Delmar R. Olson, Troop 99, electronics, (R. W. Platt, Hauser & Carafas Engineering Co.); Paul J. Palsa, Troop 7, law enforcement, (S. Sylvan Little, attorney); David Paul, Troop 98, pilot, (George Kuebler, U.S. Steel Corp.); Mark F. Plaushin, Troop 15, officer in the U.S. Navy, (Robert Millich, U.S. Navy); Ronald J. Police, Troop 70, mechanical engineering (Lawrence Janci, U.S. Steel Corp.); Donald A. Privett, Troop 45, child psychology, (Rev. Lance Brown, minister).

THE SUBJUGATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. MARJORIE S. HOLT

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the 33d anniversary of the subjugation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. This is a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanian Americans, and Lithuanians throughout the world. A day when we pause to consider their forcible annexation into the Soviet Union, and their continuous struggles to reject this oppressive Communist system at a cost of 50,000 Lithuanian lives. One-sixth of their people were deported from their native land to Russia and Siberia in an effort to depopulate the Lithuanian nation. This is the equivalent of eliminating all the people from 30 of America's largest cities.

As the United States stands on the threshold of the most promising era of peace in a decade, we should remember that the Baltic peoples continue to sacrifice their lives in their struggle to attain freedom and the right of national self-determination. I would earnestly hope that the United States would continue steadfast in its refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation, and urge that, as the 89th Congress specified, discussion of the status of the Baltic States be insti-

Lawrence Ragan, Troop 308, ecologist, (Harry T. Dolan, Homestead Works, U.S. Steel Corp.).

Bart D. Reisdorf, Troop 26, data processing, (Richard J. Walko, Christy Park Works, U.S. Steel Corp.); Thomas Reutzel, Troop 3, music, (William Galvin, music director, Boyle High School); David Rogers, Troop 74, sales, (J. B. Frysinger, Pennsylvania Glass Sand); Ronald J. Rohall, Troop 86, forester, (John Daly, Koppers Co.); Louis J. Rubbo, Troop 24, chemical engineer, (H. L. Higgins, National-Duquesne Works, U.S. Steel Corp.); Mark J. Rutter, Troop 21, law enforcement, (Edward Arnold, Chief of Police, Penn Hills Borough).

Daniel C. Seitz, Troop 20, bank management, (Melvin C. Peterson, McKeesport Office, Union National Bank); Patrick M. Shriane, Troop 55, computer programmer, (Charles W. Israel, Price Waterhouse & Co.); James A. Shuback, Troop 70, air condition and refrigeration, (Glen H. Rojohn, Rojohn Co.); Stephen Siebert, Troop 19, mechanic, (John V. McElgin, Christy Park Works, U.S. Steel Corp.); Kenneth J. Smithhammer, Troop 23, chef, (Samuel Collura, Interstate United Caterer).

Ronald S. Snyder, Troop 40, electronics, (Stanley Bohn, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory); James Spellman, Troop 5, optometrist (Dr. Morton J. Keisler, optometrist); Timothy A. Spence, Troop 73, minister, (Rev. Lawrence Hauck, minister); Albert J. Sunday, Troop 24, accountant (Joseph Margolis, Margolis Jewelry Store); Robert Stocker, Troop 42, accountant, (Merle D. Chilcott, U.S. Steel Corp.); Leonard Tomko, Troop 8, electrical engineer, (D. E. Simpson, U.S. Steel Corp.); William D. Tritsch, Troop 78, mechanical engineer, (Dr. J. W. Cottman, Westinghouse Electric Corp.).

Kim V. Turnbull, Troop 45, engineer, (R. R. Ferguson, Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory); George Vurdela, Troop 116, law (James B. Richard, tax collector, Wilkinsburg); John Weigand, Troop 53, auto mechanic, (Michael Hirjicek, Devereaux Chevrolet); Steven Welsh, Troop 24, diesel mechanic, (P. M. Poole, Christy Park Works, U.S. Steel Corp.); James Wood, Troop 45, chemical engineering, (Dr. L. A. Wilson, Gulf Oil Corp.); Dale Worrell, Troop 68, law, (Mord Taylor, attorney); Jay B. Yarnel, Troop 184, law, (H. E. Evans, attorney).

Eagle Scouts unable to attend the dinner included David D. Art, Troop 97; Harry W. Austin, Troop 8; Brad S. Basic, Troop 19; Floyd R. Beech, Post 3; Christopher H. Bender, Troop 45; Joseph J. Burgan, Troop 78; Mark A. Chalfont, Troop 70; Michael R. Dzubinski, Troop 70; John A. Fickers, Troop 86; Michael L. Frangoulis, Post 490; Timothy R. Gaughan, Troop 99; Fareel B. Heifler, Troop 74; Gary C. Herbert, Troop 33; Robert C. Hornak, Troop 53; Robert M. Humphrey, Troop 73; Anthony B. Ives, Troop 111; Robert E. Jakubek, Troop 53.

Gary M. Kalansky, Troop 8; Kevin Kilburn, Troop 91; James Y. Lake, Troop 32; Winfield S. Lea, Troop 73; David W. Larontone, Troop 47; Edward D. Letchford, Troop 150; Robert C. Lopez, Troop 24; David Mathos, Troop 9; Daniel F. McNally, Troop 15; James F. Mycyk, Troop 146; Keith W. Snyder, Troop 97; James M. Smith, Troop 101; William K. Turner, Troop 184; Randall G. Tony, Troop 4; Terrence D. Tremont, Troop 99; Paul A. Village, Troop 308, and Scott M. Young, Troop 36.

TRIBUTE TO LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today is the 33d anniversary of the forcible

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Since that infamous day in 1940, freedom and independence have been no more than a dream and a fervent hope within the hearts of a determined people.

From the close of World War II until 1952, Lithuanian freedom fighters carried the banner of their country in armed combat with the Russian invaders. Their bravery and courage, documented by the thousands who lost their lives defending their homeland, was outmatched by a brutal, modernized, and well-financed totalitarian opposition.

Since 1940 the combined populations of the three Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been depleted by one-fourth. A policy of mass deportation succeeded in removing more than 150,000 Baltic people. Families were torn apart, separated, and consigned to the foreign and hostile labor camps of Siberia. Yet, the Communists failed to crack the spirit of the Lithuanian people, they failed to dilute the strong undercurrent of national identity and integrity that has been the strength of this small country throughout her long history.

This was never more true than in 1972; a year that witnessed several eruptions of the Lithuanian spirit. In March of that year 17,000 Lithuanians signed a petition protesting the religious discrimination of the U.S.S.R. In May, Romas Kalanta, the latest of a long line of Lithuanian patriots, burned himself to death in protest of his country's subjugation. The months that followed were marked by mass protests and arrests.

These events served notice not only upon the U.S.S.R. but upon the free world that Lithuania remains a nation of sorrow, a nation that hungers for self-determination.

America and the free world can do no less than to recognize their courage and to stand firm in our support for Lithuania and all the captive nations of eastern Europe. This, the 33d anniversary of the occupation of the Baltic countries, is a most appropriate time to reaffirm that support.

SPOKANE, THE HOME OF FATHER'S DAY

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Father's Day, which is celebrated in our country on the third Sunday of June, is close at hand. For this reason, I should like to point out that although the earliest recorded observance of this holiday occurred July 5, 1908, in Fairmont, W. Va., Spokane, Wash., was the first city to establish an official Father's Day in 1910, the difference being that the earlier observance was a Father's Day church service held at the request of Mrs. Charles Clayton.

Mrs. John Bruce Dodd of Spokane, Wash., may be credited as the most active and influential promoter of Father's Day. While listening to a Mother's Day sermon in 1909, remembering her own father, she was struck by the idea that

there should be a similar holiday for fathers.

With the support of her minister, Mrs. Dodd composed a letter to the president of the Spokane Ministerial Association setting forth her proposal for the observance of Father's Day.

The association approved the idea, and the event was publicized by the Spokane YMCA. Incidentally, the date chosen by Mrs. Dodd was that of her father's birthday, June 5. However, since it was believed that this would not allow enough time for preparations, the third Sunday in June was finally decided upon. The mayor of Spokane thus issued a Father's Day Proclamation and the Governor of the State of Washington, M. E. Hay, set the date aside for official observance throughout the State.

Spokane was the first city to establish a special day each year for honouring fathers, and as newspapers began carrying stories of the Spokane celebration, interest in Father's Day increased throughout the country.

In 1972 Richard Nixon permanently established Father's Day by signing a congressional resolution.

LITHUANIA

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago a courageous and proud nation fell under the cloak of communism. I would like to call on my fellow-Americans to take note that today marks the sad anniversary of the invasion and occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Army, June 15, 1940. It will be remembered as a dark day in the history of the Ukrainians and all peace-loving people the world over. Not only has the freedom of Lithuanians been suppressed but this brave Nation has been incorporated into the Soviet Union. While the United States refuses to recognize this forced incorporation of the Baltic States it is not enough. We must continue to press our delegates in the United Nations and elsewhere throughout the world to confront these aggressors and denounce the actions which have violated human rights. The Lithuanian people have proven many times over that they can withstand the forces of aggression. The United States must stand beside them in a joint spirit of determination and strength to pursue this fight for a place again in the free world. Our own freedom is only as good as that of our neighbors. Unless we are deeply involved in Lithuania's struggle for independence our own liberties will become meaningless. I am privileged to represent many Americans of Lithuanian descent in the 25th District of Pennsylvania and I am proud of their contributions to our community. To them I extend my warmest wishes, my prayers and my continued hope that their people in the Baltic States will be free men again. Let us salute a gallant nation and pledge our loyalty and continued support.

INNOVATION: WE NEED THE WILL

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress in its wisdom enacted into law, legislation which authorized the Office of Technological Assessment as an arm of the Congress. Civilian technology in this country knows no bounds, and until we can coordinate this innate capacity with the one branch of our Government which has direct contact with its people, we are in effect stifling development.

I believe the following article entitled "Innovation: We Need the Will" written by my good friend Mr. Michael Michaelis of the Arthur D. Little Co. covers this point well and I commend it to my colleagues.

INNOVATION: WE NEED THE WILL

(By Michael Michaelis)

Our domestic prosperity, the quality of our life, and our international strength are fashioned, in large measure, by our entrepreneurial and technical capabilities. But, to harness these more effectively in pursuit of national goals requires a new sense of purpose and urgency. America's ingenuity is being challenged by other countries, both intellectually and economically. Our performance must improve. The Congress is equipped to exercise leadership: its newly created Office of Technology Assessment can provide leverage for action. Congressional action should focus on creating those institutional arrangements and incentives that foster innovation while protecting the public interest.

Innovation means renewal. It means the improvement of the old and the development of new capabilities of people and their organizations. Innovation is a process which we choose to pursue, with a faith borne partly of hope and partly of experience, but also with a considerable sense of uncertainty. We are unsure of the outcome, but we believe in the process.

We believe in it because there is ample evidence that innovation spurs gains in productivity, and that such gains create resources needed for economic and social betterment. We are unsure of the outcome because the process is highly complex and subtle: it calls for both drastic and delicate changes in individual attitudes, in organizational behavior, and in the complex maze of public policies that impinge on both. As Schumpeter once said: "Innovation is a feat, not of intellect, but of will."

We need that will to innovate now to sustain our advances on two fronts: socio-economic progress at home and world leadership through competitiveness abroad. We must innovate so as to use to full advantage our vast pool of human, technical, social, and financial resources and knowledge. As we attempt innovation, we come to recognize that the causes for much of our hesitation are found in the imperfect processes for defining and balancing public policy objectives.

POLICY OBJECTIVES

Government policies, actions, and practices affecting technological innovation are now expressed in a diverse and diffused system of arrangements, and through a complex maze of statutory and administrative instrumentalities. Responsibility is similarly dispersed. It is unrealistic to expect constructive change to emerge from these arrangements.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Unlike the situation in countries that compete with us for our own and the world's markets, technological innovation in the United States has never risen to the stature of an explicit and integral component of the national policy. Instead, innovation tends to be variously stimulated or retarded only as a response to a wide array of public policy objectives designed primarily for other purposes—e.g., for economic stabilization, environmental health and safety, consumer protection, international trade, avoidance of monopoly, taxation, regulation, and other strategies for domestic progress and national security. While antitrust laws, for instance, were devised to overcome the effects of restraint of trade, they can, at the same time, inhibit pursuit of technological innovation that requires resource and policy commitments beyond the objectives and means of a single corporation.

Our public policies crisscross, one with another, creating uncertainties for innovation. By thus exacerbating the inherently uncertain process of innovation even further, they impede the entrepreneurial actions of industry, labor, and finance. We need to examine explicitly the impact on the innovation process of public policies and practices and, where necessary and possible, reformulate them in order to foster innovation while at the same time protecting the public interest.

Different industry sectors—e.g., automobiles, chemicals, housing—have different perceptions of the incentives for and the barriers to innovation that are posed by public policy. The differences between sectors in market characteristics, technology, industry structure, and institutional arrangements, make this inevitable. It follows that public policies, to be effective in stimulating innovation, should more often be honed to be sector-specific. The varying characteristics of our pluralist society limit the efficacy of uniformly applied measures.

MARKET DEMAND

There is no more effective stimulation for technological innovation than a market "pull" that is clearly perceived by industry. This "pull" is lacking particularly in those sectors—e.g., housing, education, transportation—where the taxpayer's money significantly structures the market and its characteristics. Yet, these areas are big users of resources and main triggers of consumer dissatisfaction. They are ripe for innovation.

Inasmuch as Federal, state, and local governments are principal determinants of such markets, they need to collaborate with the private sector so as to formulate performance requirements (technical, economic, and social), timetables, and cost parameters, if industry, labor, and finance are to respond with vigorous entrepreneurship to meet these public needs.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE SECTOR COLLABORATION

The dynamics of the market, and feedback control through profit, make the business community the most effective innovator and resource allocator that we have ever invented. The task of government, on the other hand, is to establish incentives and constraints in such a way that profit is made doing what society most needs done, in a manner that society finds acceptable.

For these two functions to be carried out effectively requires a degree and kind of interaction between business and government that we all too frequently deny ourselves by clinging to public policies and practices that reflect the needs of the past rather than those of today's world. We need to create the most open—and mutually trustful—communications between the public and private sectors, if public policies are to be so conceived, formulated, and executed that private industry can play its role as innovator to the fullest. Without such open communication and mutual trust, public poli-

cies may often be no more than cosmetic measures, or even counterproductive.

TECHNOLOGY IS NOT THE BARRIER TO INNOVATION

Many investigations in the last decade have indicated that present or prospective lack of scientific and technical knowledge is not a main barrier to innovation. Thus, merely increasing the volume of R&D is not the principal stimulus for innovation. Rather, barriers to innovation are mostly institutional ones, both internal to corporations, as well as external, e.g., uncertainties about government regulations, market characteristics and competition (often from foreign suppliers operating under different public policies), and return/risk considerations.

It is high time that we learned to manage innovation—the use of knowledge—as brilliantly as we have learned to accomplish R&D—the generation of knowledge.

WHERE IS THE WILL?

A year ago, in an historic message to Congress, the President said: "We must see to it that the environment for technologic innovation is a favorable one. In some cases, excessive regulation, inadequate incentives, and other barriers to innovation have worked to discourage and even to impede the entrepreneurial spirit. We need to do a better job of determining the extent to which such conditions exist, their underlying causes, and the best ways of dealing with them." Twelve months have passed and little has been done to turn this clarion call into action.

We must act faster. I urge that the Congress take new initiatives. The recent creation of the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) in the Congress can provide additional leverage for action.

OTA's first order of business should be to determine the extent to which entrepreneurship for pursuing innovation in the public interest is impeded by barriers that can be lessened through changes in public policy. Second, OTA should assist Congress in formulating those policy changes that require legislative actions and in identifying those that can be executed within the present legislative framework. With regard to the latter, Congress—through its oversight on executive agencies—can exercise such action-forcing influence as may be needed.

America has the human and financial resources to innovate purposefully, and it has the knowledge to do so wisely. We can sharpen the vision and energize the muscle of American enterprise. But we need new institutional arrangements to achieve our purpose. To Congress: Give us these tools and we will do the job.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago, on June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union occupied the independent state of Lithuania. Today is therefore a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanian-Americans, Lithuanians, and all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Tracing their national history back to 1251, the Lithuanians can lay claim to being one of the oldest distinct national groups in Europe. They yearn to follow their own cultural, social, and economic traditions.

History has not been kind to them. Yet even years of suffering cannot destroy

the Lithuanians' spirit and their desire for liberty.

I join today with more than 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent in looking forward to the day when Lithuanians and all peoples everywhere can share the blessings of freedom.

ARNA BONTEMPS

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a literary figure of deserved reputation and renown, Mr. Bontemps, died in Nashville recently at the age of 70.

Mr. Bontemps had a significant career in American letters and left a legacy of great value.

He was librarian emeritus at Fisk University at the time of his death, after having served as librarian there from 1943 to 1965. Born in Alexandria, La., in 1902, Mr. Bontemps early showed a talent for the literary arts. During the 1920's, he and other young black writers and artists settled in the Harlem section of New York City where their work was known as the "Harlem Renaissance." Among this group of writers was the late poet Langston Hughes.

In 1931, he wrote his first novel, "God Sends Sunday," which was dramatized on Broadway in 1946 as "St. Louis Woman." It starred Pearl Bailey.

In the depression years, Mr. Bontemps worked as a part of a group known as the "National Writers Project."

He was active until the time of his death, and at that time was working on a trilogy which was to be an interrelated interpretation of Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, and W. E. DuBois.

During his lifetime, Mr. Bontemps also served as curator at Yale University and as honorary consultant in American cultural history to the Library of Congress. Last January, he was named writer-in-residence at Fisk University in Nashville.

Among Mr. Bontemps other works are "Chariot in the Sky," "100 Years of Negro Freedom," and "Free at Last: The Life of Frederick Douglass."

During his lifetime, Mr. Bontemps contributed significantly to American literature and letters. In 1966, he complained of the "myths" that have plagued the Negro since his arrival to these shores. He went on to say:

The myth which I suspect has hurt us most in the present century was the allegation that the Negro had no history, no record, no background and no achievement.

Much of Mr. Bontemps' life and work was dedicated to the eradication of these myths and the establishment of the American Negro in his proper and rightful historic perspective.

His passing leaves a void in American literature which will be difficult to fill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I include editorials from the Nashville Tennessee en-

titled, "Mr. Bontemps, Author," and from the Nashville Banner, "Arna Bontemps." I commend them to the consideration of my colleagues:

ARNA BONTEMPS

Arna Bontemps served for 22 valuable years as librarian of Fisk University, and was nationally distinguished as a writer, poet and literary critic.

Born in Louisiana, he had achieved much before he moved to Nashville in 1943. In New York, he was identified with the Harlem Renaissance of the 1920s, and his first novel became a Broadway play. Since becoming Fisk's librarian emeritus in 1965, he has served professorships at the University of Illinois and Yale University, among other things, and more recently has continued active as writer-in-residence at Fisk.

Nashville knew Mr. Bontemps as a substantial contributor to the betterment of education in general and of the English language in particular, with emphasis upon the expanding cultural achievement of the American Negro. His death is widely regretted.

MR. BONTEMPS, AUTHOR

Mr. Arna Bontemps, well-known American writer and literary critic, and writer-in-residence at Fisk University, died here Monday at age 70.

Mr. Bontemps, born in Alexandria, La., was librarian at Fisk from 1943-65 and after that was a professor at the University of Illinois in Chicago until 1969, when he became curator of the James Weldon Johnson collection and visiting professor of English literature at Yale University. He was named an honorary consultant in American cultural history at the Library of Congress last January.

During the 1920s, the author was among numerous young black writers and artists who settled in Harlem and reinvigorated Negro literature in America with a body of work called the Harlem Renaissance.

Mr. Bontemps produced a considerable body of work as novelist, poet and biographer. As a critic he directed much of his attention to the failure of white American authors to recognize the black contributions to the nation's creative life.

The thing that hurt blacks most in this century, he once said, was "the allegation that the Negro had no history, no record, no background, no achievement worth mentioning." When he started out as a youngster to find the origins of Negroes in the history books of the day, he said, he discovered that "the authors of the books treated me as if I didn't exist."

Mr. Bontemps did much to correct this in his lifetime. His death is a cause of sadness in the literary world. The author will be missed, but his works will long stand as a memorial to his contribution in helping all America realize the rightful role of blacks in the nation's literary history.

A SAD ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to recognize a sad, yet significant anniversary in the history of human rights. Today, June 15, 1973, marks the 33d anniversary of the forced annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

I wish to convey to the Lithuanian people—and to the partisans of individ-

ual freedom everywhere—my deeply felt sorrow at the tragic loss which continues to result from the bondage of this proud nation.

Lithuania has suffered the deportation of more than one-sixth of its population to Soviet Siberia. It lost 50,000 lives in the struggle against the Soviet annexation alone. It continues to suffer denial of self-determination, violation of the right of religious freedom, and the denial of the rights to dissent or to emigrate—all in violation of universal and fundamental principles of the dignity of man.

Let us hope for a day when such dreadful anniversaries need be marked only as a remembrance of times past.

FLAG DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 56th annual observance of Flag Day. Flag Day in America is an important occasion when each American should take time to reflect upon his heritage.

At a time when patriotism seems outmoded and irrelevant in the hearts of some of our citizens, let us be glad that there are still those of us who can celebrate Flag Day 1973 without reservation. Rather than deemphasizing the role of patriotism in our country, now is the time to renew it. In 1973 we need a new commitment to the ideals of patriotism; one that will lead all of us in the Congress to dedicate ourselves to the unfinished task of building a better America.

As we look up to the flag which is unfurled daily against the background of this historic Capitol Building, it seems hard to believe that there was in this past year a ruling by one of the highest courts in this country which stands to make a mockery of our great flag. The U.S. Court of Appeals recently said it was permissible for an individual to wear the flag on the seat of his pants. The Supreme Court has agreed to hear this case in their next session later this year. It is my profound hope that the Court will see to it to overrule this unfortunate decision. If we are ever to attain the great goals which our forefathers set for us, we must develop a greater respect for the institutions of our country than now seems evident.

These difficult times demand that we call forth the very best of our talents and abilities to meet this challenge.

Indeed, we must never succumb to the complacency that this life of liberty and prosperity can occasionally breed. We must constantly strive to actively exercise our freedoms. We must also maintain the necessary defenses to prevent all threats of tyranny, either from within or without.

Mr. Speaker, on this day let us not forget those gallant Americans who are still unaccounted for in Southeast Asia. We

must never forget that these men are examples of the type of Americans which exemplify the traditions and principles which we are called on to celebrate today.

FRANKLY SPEAKING

HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the Federal Government and the militant Indians of the American Indian Movement is now in a tenuous truce. Resolution problems pertaining to and arising from the long siege at Wounded Knee, S. Dak., in my congressional district, still remains.

Rev. B. Frank Belvin, an Indian who has spent his adult life as a missionary to the Creeks and the Seminoles for the Baptist Church, recently sent an open letter to President Nixon concerning the attitude of the Federal Government in relation to the Indian people and the need for the maintenance of law and order on the Indian reservations. His letter touches on the heart of the matter and deserves to be thoughtfully considered by all of those truly interested in the future of the Indian people.

This letter was included in the "American Indian Baptist Voice," and I hope my colleagues will seriously ponder its message:

FRANKLY SPEAKING—AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States of America,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NIXON: My personal admiration for you is exceeded only by my respect for the awesome office which you occupy. In light of that, and especially since I am such an insignificant individual, I am reluctant to say anything to one whose very position demands respect and deserves veneration. But in the face of recent developments, I feel compelled to speak my piece.

First, let me say that I am an American Indian. I have spent all my life working with and for the Indians in all stages of progress, on trust land, on reservations, and in urban communities, trying to reconcile man to God and man to man. So no one can justly question my dedication to my people.

But now some Indians have done some unfortunate things which have been inadvertently encouraged by government and exaggerated by the news media. If such is allowed to continue and the participants are permitted to go without penalty, this nation is in for a hard time, and every Indian council and individual in the country faces potential disruption and intimidation. Because you are who you are, the blame will be laid at your door.

I am aware that because of the multiplicity of your responsibilities you must, of necessity, rely on the advice of aides. But Mr. President, by now you ought to know that you are being ill-advised. Such bungling in the handling of the Bureau of Indian Affairs takeover by militant Indians last November, when over sixty thousand dollars were handed over to militants, according to reliable sources, without so much as a receipt to show for it, should have been enough for you to discern that your aides are simply contributing to blackmail.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

For your 'law and order' administration to dignify Wounded Knee by superceding tribal authorities without proper agreement and by "negotiation with unofficial tribal bodies about tribal affairs" is an affront to the "silent majority" of law abiding Indians, who saw a ray of hope in your message of July 8, 1970. Every tribe has a council, committee or organization that is recognized as the official body. Admittedly, some such councils are not always what they ought to be, but under our system of democracy the place to change them is at the polls, not in "negotiations" with self-appointed unofficial tribal "leaders" and by White House aides who do not know how the average Indian reasons.

In the past, some who have been high on the Totem Pole, in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, have helped to channel government funds into organizations that defy law and appear bent on rebellion. Some of your aides have deliberately bypassed constituted Tribal bodies. Thus, they have undermined Tribal organizations and fostered unrest. Such is now bearing fruit in incidents like Wounded Knee.

Therefore, with deepest respect, Mr. President, I suggest that you take a good look at your aides who deal with the Indians. Be sure they have patient human hearts, but at the same time are loyal Americans who will not let this nation be walked on or blackmailed by any minority group, race, or nation.

Mr. President, it is with sadness that I realize that what I have said may forever alienate me from you and your administration, but in my dedication to duty, I assume that I would speak the truth without favor. The old adage was never more true than in this instance, "I had rather be right than be president."

Believe me, for I am both humbly and Frankly speaking,

B. FRANK BELVIN,
General Missionary to Creeks and Seminoles.

neither participants nor outside reporters, acting as "observers," divulge the substance of the meetings or quote any statement made during the discussions and plenary session.

A report of the conference's findings is to be released later in the year.

NEW PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, I proposed that new Presidential elections called by Congress might offer the most constructive solution to situations like Watergate. An amendment to the Constitution would be required, of course, to give Congress the authority, and on May 9, I introduced House Joint Resolution 547. That resolution, if enacted, would submit to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment providing that Congress could call new Presidential elections whenever it might determine that a President had lost the ability to perform his responsibilities.

A variation of this proposal has now been put forward by historian Vincent Wilson, Jr., in a recent New York Times article. The main difference in the Wilson proposal is that it calls for a national referendum prior to the calling of new elections. Such referendum, Mr. Wilson argues, would reveal public sentiment on amending the Constitution and on whether such an amendment should apply to Watergate.

In view of the closeness and sensitivity of the Congress, and particularly the House of Representatives, to public opinion. I find it difficult to see the need for a referendum. But despite this aspect of the Wilson proposal, I certainly welcome it as added support for the basic idea of new Presidential elections called by Congress, and I am pleased to provide the article to which I have referred, entitled "A Show of Hands," from the June 13, 1973, issue of the New York Times:

A SHOW OF HANDS
(By Vincent Wilson, Jr.)

BROOKVILLE, Md.—It is possible that Administrations in the past have somehow used their power to keep incriminating information from the voters, but never has there been a case as patent as Watergate—where the voters learned just a few months after the election of criminal behavior engaged in by the party in power six months before the election.

If, under these circumstances, enough voters feel that they were deprived of important—and perhaps critical—information before the election, they can do something besides cry impeachment. They can, through Congress, take the action necessary to invalidate the 1972 Presidential election and call for a new one.

There are established mechanisms within our governmental system to ascertain if the voters, on a national scale, wish to take such action. One of these is the referendum, used generally to ratify state legislation. A member of Congress could introduce a bill calling for a national referendum on the matter of an amendment to Section 1, Article II of the Constitution, which deals with the election of the President. He could propose that a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

national referendum be held, say, the second Tuesday after the bill is passed, the referendum to determine if it is the will of the people to have an amendment that would provide that, under certain conditions, a Presidential election could be invalidated and rerun.

To be invoked, the amendment could require a Congressional vote, supported by a national referendum.

If the results of the referendum were affirmative, the regular process for amending the Constitution could then be performed with comparative speed, since each member of Congress would be reasonably sure that he had sufficient support from his constituents to give his support to the amendment. If the results were negative, action would, of course, stop there. No matter what the outcome, after this national referendum the Administration—and the nation—would know, with some accuracy, how American citizens feel about Watergate and all it implies.

If such an amendment were passed and proper action—such as a second referendum—taken to invoke it in this particular instance, the citizens would then have the opportunity to begin anew, with new conventions and fresh candidates.

As with many provisions of law, having such an amendment might, in itself, discourage attempts to thus subvert the democratic process.

What would happen immediately after a national referendum in which the vote was overwhelmingly for invalidating an election? Could the incumbent President carry on the business of Government, or would he lose too much authority to make that possible? Such a decision would rest with the Congress, as provided in Section 5, Article II of the Constitution, and with the Supreme Court, whose interpretation of that section might be required.

However, a convincing vote for invalidating the 1972 elections might not precipitate a crisis of confidence; the assurance of change implicit in such a vote might so direct people's thoughts toward the selection of candidates for a new election that the present Administration might be tolerated for its presumably limited remaining life much as many a lame-duck one has been in the past. Whatever the developments, such actions would give American citizens a chance to exercise some of the rights that the Bill of Rights so clearly states are "reserved to the people."

LITHUANIA REMAINS IN BONDAGE

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, the world is on the threshold of an era of peaceful coexistence, with armed conflict erupting but sporadically. Yet beneath this peaceful veneer lie irritants to true peace and freedom. The bondage by the Soviet Union of Lithuania and her sister Baltic nations of Estonia and Latvia serves as a reminder that quietude does not necessarily denote a content nation. The date of June 15 once again reminds us of the anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union in 1940.

I have had the opportunity to speak with Lithuanian-Americans living in my district concerning the future of the Baltic States. Each conversation serves

to reconfirm my belief in the cause of Lithuanian independence and to express my desire for liberty for Latvia and Estonia as well. I commend the efforts of the Lithuanian-Americans in Connecticut and throughout the United States to keep the spirit of freedom alive both here and in the Baltic States.

Our country aspires to freedom for all nations as it reaffirms in the Atlantic Charter "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." Since recognizing the Government of Lithuania on July 27, 1922, the United States continues to maintain diplomatic relations with the representative of that former government.

I join all Lithuanians and Americans of Lithuanian descent in striving to achieve freedom for the Baltic States before we commemorate another anniversary marking the loss of freedom. My wish is that the next anniversary will be one of jubilation for new-found independence for Lithuania and her sister states in the Baltic area.

A DECADE TO FARM PAYMENT REFORM—1963-73

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic day, for it signals the beginning of the end of big payments to big farmers. For over a decade I have been working to reform the system under which big farmers received huge payments for not growing crops, sometimes totaling several million dollars. This year, with the effective assistance of my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman SILVIO CONTE, the House has at last adopted a strong, leakproof payment limitation which if accepted by the Senate will bring an end to those unconscionably large farm payments.

In 1963, I first offered an amendment to an agricultural appropriations bill to limit big farm payments. The amendment was defeated, as it was in most years thereafter. Upon occasion, when the House accepted the amendment, the Senate would knock it out.

In recent years, Congressman CONTE has helped to lead the way to farm payment reform. Several times he has offered a farm payment limitation, sometimes with success—which the Senate reversed—sometimes without. But each time, support for the limitation has grown.

As support for the payment limit grew, opposition from the Department of Agriculture decreased. As recently as 1971, the Secretary of Agriculture took an uncompromising stance against the \$20,000 limitation. This year, for the first time, the administration did not actively oppose the amendment on the floor of the House. Instead, Dr. Carroll Bruntzhafer wrote me the following letter:

June 15, 1973

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. June 15, 1973.

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FINDLEY: This is in reply to your letter of June 13 in which you raised several questions about the possible effects of the \$20,000 payment limitation. Attached are tables giving our estimates under various assumptions.

At this time we have no good basis for estimating the proportion of any payment to wheat or corn growers that would be determined to be needed for resource adjustment. This determination would rest largely on an intensive review of prospective supply-demand conditions just prior to formulation and announcement of the annual programs. I would not agree, however, that most payments under the feed grain and wheat programs would be for resource adjustment, even at the target prices proposed by the Department. I can easily imagine a program for 1974 that requires no set-aside in which case the Secretary would probably determine that all payments for wheat and feed grains were for income supplement and, therefore, subject to the limitation. It is also easy to envisage a market situation for 1974 in which no payments would be required at the Department's proposed level of target prices. A situation in which no income supplements would be required if the Senate level of target prices were maintained would appear to be highly improbable, especially as these target prices escalate in future years.

In view of the 1972 and 1973 planting experience under the \$55,000 payment limitation, we would expect the \$20,000 payment limit to have a slight negative effect on acreage planted to cotton.

Sincerely,

CARROLL BRUNTZHAFER.

UPLAND COTTON: ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PRODUCERS AND ESTIMATED PRODUCTION ON FARMS THAT WOULD BE AFFECTED BY A \$20,000 PAYMENT LIMITATION¹

\$20,000 LIMITATION PER CROP

Payment rate (in cents)	Estimated number of producers affected	Estimated total production (million bales) ²
5	400	0.6
10	3,000	3.3
15	7,500	6.0

\$20,000 LIMITATION PER PRODUCER AS IN S. 1888

5	550	0.8
10	4,100	4.5
15	10,300	8.1

¹ Based on 1972 program data (without regard to any changes in farming arrangements that may occur), assuming all of the payment is income supplement. At this time we have no basis for estimating the proportion of the payment that would be determined to be resource adjustment.

² Production in excess of the limit would be approximately 40 percent of total production shown.

Much of the credit for today's strong vote of 195 to 157 in favor of the limitation must go to Congressman CONTE. As a member of the Appropriations Committee from which the bill came, he has worked diligently and resourcefully to see that an effective amendment was adopted. I salute him.

The House has acted in the wake of similar action by the Senate on the new farm bill. When the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 was being considered, Senator BAYH offered an

amendment to limit payments under the new farm program to \$20,000.

Although the action by the House and Senate were taken on different bills, the fact that they have come so close together in time makes me hopeful that each body will adopt finally a payment limitation similar to that already adopted in the other House.

When the agriculture appropriations bill reaches the Senate, I am hopeful that they will ratify their earlier decision on the farm bill and impose a strict \$20,000 limitation on total payments to any one farmer, just as the House of Representatives did today.

When the House of Representatives considers the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, which is currently being marked up in committee, I intend to offer an amendment similar to the one adopted by the Senate when they considered the bill.

Unfortunately, when I offered my amendment—reproduced below—in the full committee, it was entirely emasculated by amendments. As with the \$55,000 payment limit adopted in 1970, the new limitation of \$37,500 proposed by the Agriculture Committee is full of holes through which millions of tax dollars are sure to leak if it is not plugged up on the floor. In fact, the committee added a new hole which was not included in 1970.

This \$37,500 retread of the \$55,000 payment limit applies only to individual crops. Thus, under the committee bill a farmer could receive as much as \$112,500 in Government payments if he receives the maximum amount for planting all three crops—cotton, wheat, and corn.

Also, the committee bill permits subdivision of cotton allotments and farms. Through this loophole has flowed virtually the entire savings predicted for the \$55,000 limitation in 1970. If this loophole is left in the bill, farmers will once again sell or lease portions of their allotments to relatives and neighbors so that each receives the maximum of \$37,500 permitted by the law. The total cost to taxpayers will be the same, family farm units will continue to receive extraordinary sums of money, and taxpayers will be deluded into believing that Congress has acted to save their money.

The new loophole not included in 1970 is that under the new committee bill, resource adjustment payments—payments for set-aside—are not to be included in figuring total payments to farmers. Thus, a farmer could actually get far more than \$112,500 from Uncle Sam if he was entitled to the maximum payment under each of the three programs and if he set aside land under each program.

For this reason, when the full House considers the new farm bill in the coming days, I will offer a leak-proof amendment which will strictly limit total farm payments to any one farmer to \$20,000. No leasing or sale of allotments will be permitted, nor will any other subterfuge.

It is time for Congress, once and for all, to put an end to huge payments to a small number of farmers. The average man on the street opposes them. So does

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the average farmer in his field, who sees relatively little of the Federal charity, but receives the brunt of public reaction against big farm payments. Now it is time for Congress to vote for the average man and the average farmer and against big farm payments.

The following is a chronology of amendments to restrict big farm payments to farm producers which Congressman CONTE and I have offered over the years:

CHRONOLOGY

June 6, 1963: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agricultural Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1964. (Congressional Record, p. 10411):

"On page 33, after line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 607. None of the funds provided herein shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee who negotiates agreements or contracts or in any other way, directly or indirectly, performs duties or functions incidental to supporting the price of Upland Middling Inch cotton at a level in excess of 30 cents a pound."

The division vote was 105 in favor—136 against.

January 26, 1965: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation Act (Congressional Record, p. 1185):

"On page 2, line 3, strike the period at the end of the sentence and insert the following:

"Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program providing further payments during the fiscal year 1965 to any person, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, individual, or other legal entity, pursuant to the provisions of section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended."

The division vote was 45 in favor—105 against.

August 19, 1965: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965 (Congressional Record, p. 21061):

"On page 54, line 25, insert the following:

"SEC. 707. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the total amount of payments made by the Secretary to any producer or producers on any farm under the provisions of titles II, III, IV, V and VI of this act shall not exceed \$25,000 in calendar year 1966 or in any calendar year thereafter. In the case of any producer or producers owning, operating, or controlling more than one farm, the limitations set forth in the preceding sentences shall apply to such producer or producers. For the purpose of this section the term 'producer' shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof and the term 'payments' shall include price support payments, diversion payments, incentive payments, rental payments, and the value of both domestic and export wheat marketing certificates."

The division vote was 59 in favor—144 against.

April 26, 1966: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agricultural Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1967 (Congressional Record, p. 8962):

"On page 21, on line 23, strike the period, and insert a colon and the following:

"Provided, That none of these funds shall be used to make payments exceeding in the aggregate \$100,000 to any sugar producer."

The amendment was rejected on a voice vote.

June 6, 1967: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agricultural

Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1968 (Congressional Record, p. 14853):

"On page 34, line 18, after the word 'hereof' strike the period and insert the following:

"Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out price support or commodity programs during the period ended June 30, 1968, under which the total amount of payments in excess of \$25,000 would be made to any single recipient as (1) incentive payments, (2) diversion payments, (3) price support payments, (4) wheat marketing certificate payments, (5) cotton equalization payments, (6) cropland adjustment payments, and (7) compliance payments."

The division vote was 47 in favor—136 against.

May 1, 1968: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agricultural Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1969 (Congressional Record, p. 11281):

"On page 33, line 5, after the word 'hereof'.

"Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out price support or commodity programs during the period ending June 30, 1969, under which the total amount of payments in excess of \$10,000 would be made to any single recipient as (1) incentive payments, (2) diversion payments, (3) price support payments, (4) wheat marketing certificate payments, (5) cotton equalization payments, and (6) cropland adjustment payments."

A teller vote was taken with 79 in favor—129 against.

July 31, 1968: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the extension of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 (Congressional Record, p. 24402):

"SEC. 2. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 710. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, effective with the 1970 crop, annual payments made pursuant to provisions of Titles II, III, IV and V shall not exceed in the aggregate \$10,000 to any single recipient."

The division vote was 71 in favor—115 against.

March 12, 1969: H.R. 8773, a bill introduced by Representative Paul Findley to limit payments to farmers, increase the authorization for food stamps, and increase water-sewer grant authority for rural communities:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IX—LIMITATIONS ON PAYMENTS

"SEC. 901. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning with the 1970 program for wool, feed grains, cotton, wheat, cropland adjustments, and sugar, the total annual amount of any payments made to any farm under such programs shall not exceed \$20,000, nor shall any payment for any such single program exceed \$10,000."

"SEC. 2. Section 16a of the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, is amended by striking the figure '\$340,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$440,000,000' and by striking the figure '\$170,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$220,000,000'."

"SEC. 3. Section 306(a)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by striking the figure '\$50,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '\$150,000,000'."

May 26, 1969: Amendment offered by Representative SILVIO CONTE and supported by Representative PAUL FINDLEY to the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 13757):

"On page 22, line 17, strike the period and insert the following:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program (other than for sugar) under which payments aggregating more than \$20,000 under all such programs are made to any producer on any crops planted in the fiscal year 1970."

A teller vote was taken with 112 in favor, 100 against.

June 9, 1970: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for fiscal 1971 (Congressional Record, p. H 5289):

"On Page 23, line 8, after the word "regulations", strike the period, add a colon and the following:

"Provided further that none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used during the period ending June 30, 1971 to formulate or carry out a 1971 crop-year program under which the total amount of payments to a person would be in excess of \$20,000."

The amendment was rejected on a voice vote.

August 5, 1970: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley to the Agriculture Act of 1970 (Congressional Record, p. H 7761):

"Strike the Committee Amendment beginning on page 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATION

"SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) The total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive under each of the annual programs established by Titles III, IV, V, and VI of this Act for the 1971, 1972 or 1973 crop of the commodity shall not exceed \$20,000.

"(2) The term 'payments' as used in this section includes price-support payments, set-aside payments, diversion payments, public access payments, and marketing certificates, but does not include loans or purchases.

"(3) If the Secretary determines that the total amount of payments which will be earned by any person under the program in effect for any crop will be reduced under this section, the set-aside acreage for the farm or farms on which such person will be sharing in payments earned under such program shall be reduced to such extent in such manner as the Secretary determines will be fair and reasonable in relation to the amount of the payment reduction.

"(4) The Secretary shall issue regulations defining the term 'person' and prescribing such rules and further limitations as he determines necessary to assure a fair and reasonable application of such limitation and to prevent the circumvention or evasion of such limitation, whether the circumvention or evasion be attempted by means of the subdivision of farms, production allotments or bases thereof through sale or lease, or by other means: *Provided*, That the provisions of this Act which limit payments to any person shall be applicable to lands owned and operated by states, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof."

A teller vote was taken with 134 in favor—161 against.

June 23, 1971: Amendment offered by Representative Silvio Conte and supported by Representative Paul Findley to the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1972 (Congressional Record, p. H 5768):

"On page 17, line 2, strike the period and insert the following:

"And provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972 to formulate or carry out any single 1972 crop-year price support program (other than for sugar and wool) under which the total amount of payments to a person under any such program would be in excess of \$20,000."

A teller vote was taken with 214 in favor, 198 against.

June 29, 1972: Amendment offered by Representative Silvio Conte and supported by Representative Paul Findley to the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1973 (Congressional Record, p. H 6304):

"On page 19, line 21, strike the period and insert the following:

"And provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, to formulate or carry out any single 1973 crop-year price support program (other than for sugar and wool) under which the total amount of payments to a person under any such program would be in excess of \$20,000."

A teller vote was taken with 189 in favor, 192 against.

June 15, 1973: Amendment offered by Representative Paul Findley and supported by Representative Silvio Conte to the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1974:

"None of the funds provided by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who formulate or carry out:

"(1) programs for the 1974 crop year under which the aggregate payments for the wheat, feed grains and upland cotton programs for price support, set-aside, diversion and resource adjustment to one person exceed \$20,000, or

"(2) a program effective after December 31, 1973 which sanctions the sale or lease of cotton acreage allotments."

A teller vote was taken with 195 in favor, 157 against.

Text of amendment to be offered by Representative PAUL FINDLEY to the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives:

"Title I is amended to read as follows:

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATION

"SEC. 101. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) The total amount of payments which a person shall be entitled to receive under one or more of the annual programs established by titles IV, V, and VI of this Act for the 1974 through 1978 crops of the commodities shall not exceed \$20,000.

"(2) The term 'payments' as used in this section includes all price support payments, set-aside payments, diversion payments, and resource adjustment payments but does not include loans or purchases, or any part of any payment which is determined by the Secretary to represent compensation for public access for recreation.

"(3) If the Secretary determines that the total amount of payments which will be earned by any person under the program in effect for any crop will be reduced under this section, the set-aside acreage for the farm or farms on which such person will be sharing in payments earned under such program shall be reduced to such extent and in such manner as the Secretary determines will be fair and reasonable in relation to the amount of the payment reduction.

"(4) (a) In any case in which the owner or operator of a farm leases any portion of the farm to one or more persons, the payment limitation applicable to such person as prescribed by this section, shall be reduced in the same proportion as the allotment remaining on the farm bears to the total allotment prior to such lease: *Provided*, That the payment limitation shall also be reduced on the leased portion of the farm in proportion to the allotment accredited to such portion if the lessee is a member of the lessor's family or is a corporation in which the lessor or member of his family is a stockholder, or a partnership in which the lessor or a member of his family is a partner.

"(b) In any case in which the owner or operator of a farm sells or leases any portion of the acreage allotment for the farm to one

or more persons, the payment limitation prescribed by this section shall apply in the same manner as if the lessor or seller had not leased or sold the acreage allotment.

"(5) The Secretary shall issue regulations defining the term 'person' and prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to assure an effective and economical application of such limitation: *Provided*, That the provisions of this Act which limit payments to any person shall not be applicable to lands owned by States, political subdivisions, or agencies thereof, so long as such lands are farmed primarily in the direct furtherance of a public function, as determined by the Secretary."

June 15, 1973

BALTIC NATIONS, THE UNRESOLVED LEGACIES

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is a day of sorrow and reflection for Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world. On June 14-16, 1941, the Soviet Union deported thousands of citizens of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in its endeavor to destroy the three Baltic nations which had become independent after World War I.

The item follows:

BALTIC NATIONS: THE UNRESOLVED LEGACIES

Today, the United States stands on the threshold of the most meaningful and potentially rewarding era in the history of mankind. For the first time in the last fifty years, global peace is attainable. However, global peace is only the first great objective of our nation, we must also seek the attainment of freedom and justice for all oppressed nations. For even if the countries of the world cease hostilities toward one another, the unresolved legacies of the Second World War must be confronted; the status of the Baltic Nations must be once and for all—equitably resolved. Furthermore, let us not be fooled that world peace can be attained by offering the inalienable rights of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations upon the altar of appeasement.

The Lithuanian people have continuously struggled to reject the oppressive communist system from Lithuanian soil ever since the forcible annexation into the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940.

The post-war history of Lithuania bears grim testimony to this rejection of forcible incorporation. From 1944 to 1952, anti-Soviet partisans struggled for freedom against the Soviet military occupation in protracted guerilla warfare at a cost of over fifty thousand Lithuanian lives. During Stalin's era over one-sixth of the Lithuanian people were deported to Russia and Siberia in an effort to depopulate and subjugate the Lithuanian Nation. To demonstrate the extent of this depopulation in comparison to the United States, it would mean the elimination of all the people from the thirty largest cities in this country.

To this very day, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of the right of national self-determination, continued religious and political persecutions, and the violation of human rights by the Soviet Union reached tragic heights on May 14, 1972, when a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, burned himself in Kaunas as a martyr in protest to Soviet oppression. This act trig-

gered wide-spread demonstrations in the area and was culminated by two other self-immolations. Such dramatic events demonstrate that the Lithuanian people have not acquiesced to the Soviet occupation, but rather are still striving for freedom and independence.

The United States has never recognized the forceful annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. This steadfast policy of the United States gives succor to the Lithuanian people and reinforces their determination to await national independence while it also discourages the Soviet policies of Russification and effective absorption of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

BALTIC STATES FREEDOM DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, to most Americans June is a quite beautiful month. It swells with sweet fresh fragrances and summer breezes. Yet in June while we sample from nature's cornucopia we should pause and for a moment remember the tragic plight of the Baltic peoples. For it is June 15 that marks the observance of the forcible annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union. Since that day these courageous people have consistently reaffirmed their determination to become independent.

"We shall overcome" is the resounding sentiment echoed by the brave men who refuse to let the spirit of independence and the dream of liberty die. Let it be known that America is listening to the anguished cries of those subjugated to persecution through foreign control. The United States has always recognized Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia as separate and sovereign nations. As we may recall, during the 89th Congress, the following concurrent resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right of self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic people of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people; be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

It is my hope that the principles embodied in House Concurrent Resolution 416 will soon be realized. It must not be forgotten that this is of grave concern to the Baltic peoples as it is to all free people. Not only must we become aware of the problem, we must create some means of implementing a solution.

Our hearts are with our Baltic friends. We sympathize with the hardship and suffering that has for too long been endured. We heartily support their efforts. It is our prayer that the intense courage and conviction exhibited by the Baltic peoples will result in a safe journey down freedom's road illuminated by the light of liberty and happiness.

HIRE A KID WEEK

HON. THOMAS S. FOLEY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the city of Spokane, Wash., has proclaimed the week of June 10 through June 16, 1973, as "Hire-a-Kid Week." A copy of the proclamation follows:

Whereas, Spokane's school year has drawn to a close; and

Whereas, a record number of young people between the ages of 14 and 21 will be seeking work this summer; and

Whereas, these young people constitute the future of the community and our nation:

Now, therefore, I, David H. Rodgers, Mayor of the City of Spokane in the State of Washington, do hereby proclaim June 10 through June 16, 1973, as "Hire-a-Kid Week" in Spokane, and commend this occasion to our citizens.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Spokane to be affixed this 10th day of June, 1973.

DAVID H. RODGERS,
Mayor.

I believe the city of Spokane and its mayor, the Honorable David H. Rodgers, are to be commended for their recognition of the need to insure as full employment as possible of the area's teenagers. The proclamation also recognizes the cooperation between the city and its teenage citizens, especially the Youth Employment Service and its youth volunteers who, together, are determined to seek practical answers to the very real and critical question of youth employment.

While it is, unfortunately, too late to complete the legislative and administrative steps required in order that the President may proclaim a national "Hire a Kid Week" in time to alleviate the particularly serious youth employment

problem which exists during the summer months, I, nevertheless, hope that the actions of the city of Spokane and the dedication of the Youth Employment Service of that city will serve as a model for other municipalities across the country and encourage them to take similar effective measures.

WHAT WAS THE INTENTION OF AMERICA'S FOUNDERS?

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, an incisive article appeared in the June 14 editions of the Washington Post titled "Watergate and Democracy," written by Robert C. Maynard.

Mr. Maynard's discussion was quite stimulating. He rightly points out that we and the press are so taken up by the daily events emanating from the Watergate Affair that insufficient attention is directed to the broader implications of the matter.

As a Member of Congress, I was particularly taken by one of Mr. Maynard's observations:

Given Indochina and the Watergate, it is time to take our obligation very seriously and begin explaining again to the American people what the founders intended by creating three branches of government.

Just what the Founders intended in this respect, it seems to me, either is not well understood, has been forgotten or, worst of all, is and has been ignored by too many in government and in our society.

A review of the *Federalist Papers*, I find, is very instructive in this regard.

James Madison, in the *Federalist No. 47*, dated January 30, 1788, assessed:

The particular structure of this government, and the distribution of this mass of power among its constituent parts.

Madison observed in the treatise:

The accumulation of all powers legislative, executive and judiciary in the same hands, whether of one, a few or many, and whether hereditary, self appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny. Were the federal constitution therefore really chargeable with this accumulation of power or with a mixture of powers having a dangerous tendency to such an accumulation, no further arguments would be necessary to inspire a universal reprobation of the system.

Madison later quoted the authority Montesquieu:

From these facts by which Montesquieu was guided it may clearly be inferred, that in saying "there can be no liberty where the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or body of magistrates," or "if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers," he did not mean that these departments ought to have no *partial agency* in, or no *control* over the acts of each other. His meaning, as his own words import, and still more conclusively as illustrated by the example in his eye, can amount to no more than this, that where the *whole* power of one department is exercised by the same

hands which possess the *whole* power of another department, the fundamental principles of a free constitution, are subverted. This would have been the case in the constitution examined by him, if the King who is the sole executive magistrate, had possessed also the compleat legislative power, or the supreme administration of justice; or if the entire legislative body, had possessed the supreme judiciary, or the supreme executive authority. The magistrate in whom the whole executive power resides cannot of himself make a law, though he can put a negative on every law, nor administer justice in person, though he has the appointment of those who do administer it. The judges can exercise no executive prerogative, though they are shoots from the executive stock, nor any legislative function, though they may be advised with by the legislative councils. The entire legislature, can perform no judiciary act, though by the joint act two of its branches, the judges may be removed from their offices; and though one of its branches is possessed of the judicial power in the last resort. The entire legislature again can exercise no executive prerogative, though one of its branches constitutes the supreme executive magistracy; and another, on the impeachment of a third, can try and condemn all the subordinate officers in the executive department."

Madison, in The Federalist No. 48, undertook "to show that unless these departments be so far connected and blended, as to give each a constitutional controul over the others, the degree of separation which the maxim requires as essential to a free government, can never in practice, be duly maintained."

In the Federalist No. 49, he observed:

As the people are the only legitimate fountain of power, and it is from them that the constitutional charter, under which the several branches of government hold their power, is derived; it seems strictly consonant to the republican theory, to recur to the same original authority, not only whenever it may be necessary to enlarge, diminish, or new-model the powers of government; but also whenever any one of the departments may commit encroachments on the chartered authorities of the others. The several departments being perfectly coordinate by the terms of their common commission, neither of them, it is evident, can pretend to an exclusive or superior right of settling the boundaries, between their respective powers; and how are the encroachments of the stronger to be prevented, or the wrongs of the weaker to be redressed, without an appeal to the people themselves; who, as the grantors of the commission, can alone declare its true meaning and enforce its observance?

In the Federalist No. 51, attributed to Madison, but possibly written by Alexander Hamilton, we find the familiar and eloquent:

But what is government itself but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controuls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to controul the governed; and in the next place, oblige it to controul itself.

And, a little further on:

It is of great importance in a republic, not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers; but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part.

These are some of the incisive thoughts expressed in the Federalist, which is regarded by many as one of the three most important documents in our history, ranking behind the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Mr. Maynard's article prompted me to look at the Federalist again and I recommend the same to my colleagues and the members of the press as an excellent reminder of what the founders intended. It is one thing to declare oneself a patriot but another to understand precisely what is entailed.

For the information of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Maynard's article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1973]

WATERGATE AND DEMOCRACY

(By Robert C. Maynard)

For all of the stunning revelations of indecency on high, something very important is missing from my daily diet of news and information.

As I hear that the President was willing to place spies in the mailbox and burglars in the bedroom, or that in the name of "national security" every citizen was a suspect, I keep looking for an explanation of the meaning of all this to the contours of what we have been pleased for nearly 200 years to call a democracy.

It almost seems as if we are all too stunned to consider it, but that, for me, is at least as timely as the next breathless revelation of hush money from the Philippines and perjury in the name of "the team."

It is remarkable simply to note that we have arrived at the anniversary of Watergate. It was just one year ago that five men in rubber gloves were found in the offices of the Democratic National Committee.

From that night to the present, the press has treated the affair largely as a police investigative story, which is properly how it began. Now, I wish to argue, it has become something very different. Now, it seems to me, the press and the nation are overdue for a deep and continuing inquiry into the implications of these revelations for the present and future of democracy as we have always perceived it.

Regardless of the extent of wrongdoing that is eventually proved, the press is under an obligation to go to the next and more difficult level of examining the question of what ought to be the proper relationship between government and the governed.

It was argued during the height of the war in Indochina that frequently the press was covering the wrong story. We were covering ground action and air support and many of our consumers were fairly thirsting for some persistent inquiry into the questions of what that war and the exercise of awesome power were doing to the foundations of American society. Eventually, we in the press came to see that the war abroad was raising large and ugly webs on the body politic at home. It is fair to say that we have not come to terms with all of them even now.

Watergate reporting can benefit from the press experience with the Indochina tragedy. All of our attention seems riveted on those hearings and the ancillary revelations, many of which have caused some commentators to wonder aloud at "how close we came" to a police state in the name of "national security."

Having uncovered the police aspects of the scandal, the press is now obliged, I believe, to open up for debate a number of questions about how we have been doing business "in the system." It is clear to me that dangerous misconceptions persist in the minds of many Americans.

I am not just speaking of the woman from Sisseton, S.D., who was quoted in this space last week, chiding the press for its "personal vendetta" against "the presidential choice of 49 states." I am also thinking of Patrick Buchanan of the President's staff. He wrote in The New York Times earlier this week chiding those who called for Mr. Nixon to enlarge his current stewardship of the White House into some sort of government of "national unity." Mr. Buchanan found such suggestions distasteful in the extreme:

"What they are urging," he suggested, "is that the President betray the mandate of 1972, that he unilaterally repeal, on their behalf, the democratic verdict of the ballot box . . ."

There, it seems to me, is where the press might begin its deeper inquiry. Irrespective of any possible guilt on the part of President Nixon, Watergate dramatizes in another form the same imbalance in this society as the Indochina tragedy: how powerful should the Chief Executive of this country be? The press has gravitated to the coverage of the presidency in a manner that has in times past approached awe. Much of the rest of the society concurs in this way of looking upon the President as larger than life.

We need a very clear understanding of what has become of the office when men have said that they lied, even committed crimes because someone in a credible position to do so could utter the seven simple words, "It is the wish of the President" that something or another be done.

Arguments abound as to how the presidency came to be an office of such power that its holder could feel justified in setting loose a secret police force on the citizenry or bomb Cambodia without a shred of authority having been granted by the other elected representatives of the people. But the press could help us understand some of the extent of that power so that we can debate in a wider arena than ever if that is what we in a democracy intend for the presidency to be.

The nation was shocked when an attorney general, Mr. Kleindienst, declared before Congress that executive privilege could be meant to extend down to the last file clerk. Given Indochina and Watergate, it is time to take our obligation very seriously and begin explaining again to the American people what the founders intended by creating three branches of government.

Another problem flows from the power of the presidency. The President defined the problem which led to his decision to illegally invade the privacy of citizens as one of "national security." It seems to me that it is time to take the question of "security," both internal and external, from the top.

The special investigation unit the White House created was concerned at least in part with Weatherman and the Black Panthers. It would be helpful to know how much of a threat to the security of this nation is posed by such groups or any other group using extralegal means to protest social conditions. The issue it seems to me that Americans need to understand among themselves is how we are to work out our relationships with each other.

The men in the White House chose the route of the wiretap and the mail cover. It remains a serious question in my mind, a question that puzzles me with each new revelation about this domestic spy operation, as to whether fear and suspicion ought to be the mode by which Americans come to understand their mutual problems and quell their various fears.

The same question applies to our external security. It would be helpful if we could gain some insight as to the level of the threat posed to Americans from other countries in this era of detente with the other nuclear powers.

The reason I miss all of these explanations

June 15, 1973

19921

in connection with my Watergate reading is that the issue of security looms large through all of this. The question must be posed and the issue balanced out: which was the graver threat to our security, the dangers being posed from within and without or the solutions devised within the White House to meet those dangers? If I could add that to my diet, I'd digest the remainder of the Watergate disclosures more intelligently.

THE GREENING OF BROADWAY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable thing is happening to the islands in the middle of Broadway, between 61st and 113th Streets in Manhattan. They are turning green.

Not long ago these malls were unsightly, barren patches of dirt. Today, with a combination of private and public generosity and a great deal of civic pride they are being transformed into islands of grass, plants, shrubs and trees.

What is most exciting, Mr. Speaker, is that the impetus for this project is truly citizen inspired. Block associations and the Broadway Mall Association, which consists of civic groups, foundations, and corporations, have raised funds to restore the islands. New York City has assisted with pavement renovations and bench repairs. The Wildcat Service Corp., which employs former narcotic addicts in a most successful public service work program, has donated the time of a crew to assist in planting and maintaining the islands.

The effort to restore the upper Broadway malls is pleasing to the eye and stimulating to the mind. Although some problems remain, the restorations can only have a positive effect on the surrounding communities and, hopefully on the rest of the city. Perhaps the idea will catch on.

I am including an article from the New York Times describing the greening of Broadway:

UPPER BROADWAY IS A GREENING

(By Barbara Campbell)

One of the largest block-association efforts to add splashes of greenery to New York is under way on the Upper West Side, where a federation of associations has replanted 13 Broadway malls between 61st Street and 113th Street and plans to replant and landscape 17 more.

The islands in the middle of Broadway—there are 43 between 61st and 113th Streets—were previously bleak and unkempt with scraggly patches of grass, broken iron fences and benches at each end. The renovated malls now have landscaping designed free of charge by Abel & Baininson, landscape architects, with geraniums and yews and other evergreens.

The federation of block associations, according to Olga Starka of the Parks Council, who is coordinating the project, must raise half of \$1,700 for each planting by buttonholing members and local merchants.

The other half is being raised by the Broadway Mall Association, an organization of civic groups, and through foundations, large corporations and banks.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs Administration is renovating 13 additional malls and two small parks in the area with a half-million-dollar budget.

STONE WORK PLANNED

The city agency's work is scheduled for completion this fall and will include the removal of existing curbs, sidewalks and asphalt pavement.

New curbs will be built along with hexagon blocks and new concrete settings. Benches will be repaired, and some will be replaced. The two small parks rehabilitated by the city are Dante at 63d Street and Lincoln Square Park at 66th Street.

The Wildcat Service Corporation, a manpower development agency that employs ex-narcotics addicts, has donated the time of a work crew to maintain the newly planted parks for four years. The crews, who can be seen digging and pruning every weekday along the strip, have also assisted the Parks Department in preparing the malls for the new plant beds.

The city, according to Mrs. Straka, has promised to mend the broken iron railings surrounding each mall but so far has neglected to do so. Yesterday many of the views bordering the new landscapes were brown, and workmen from the Wildcat service said the bushes had died because residents did not curb their dogs.

"Maybe it would help," Mrs. Straka said, "if the fences were mended."

TRIBUTE TO LESTER C. DAUTH

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, this month, Mr. Lester C. Dauth will retire as a member of the board of trustees for both the elementary and high school districts in my hometown of Paso Robles, Calif. His departure will punctuate one of the most progressive eras ever enjoyed by the Paso Robles school districts.

I greatly admire Mr. Dauth as an individual, as a dedicated citizen, and as a personal friend. Men of his stature and character do not come along every day.

Mr. Dauth has served on the district school boards for the past 18 years. During his tenure on the board, the quality of our educational program greatly improved. There was a marked increase in the construction of new buildings and the rehabilitation of existing schools. Many new programs were initiated which are responsible for enriching and improving the education of schoolchildren in Paso Robles.

A man of tireless energy and community spirit, Mr. Dauth was involved in numerous other organizations. He was president of the Paso Robles Rotary Club, a member of the Paso Robles Rotary Club for 22 years, president of the Paso Robles Trail Riders Association, member of the Paso Robles Parks and Recreation Commission, and a member of the Paso Robles Volunteer Fire Department for 25 years.

On June 30, 1973, the citizens of Paso Robles will honor Mr. Dauth at an appreciation night. I know I speak for everyone in our community in thanking Les

for his unparalleled devotion to the citizens and community of Paso Robles.

I know my colleagues join me in wishing Mr. Dauth and his wife, Della, best wishes on his retirement and our sincere appreciation for his dedication in the pursuit of quality education.

SHERIDAN STUDENTS HEAR U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES J. CARNEY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. CARNEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 30, 1973, I had the pleasure of speaking with about 150 youngsters in the third through sixth grades at Sheridan School in Youngstown. I was deeply impressed by the children's intelligence, honesty, and desire for knowledge. They asked me many difficult questions about problems facing the Mahoning Valley and our country.

Mr. Speaker, after talking with these youngsters I came away with the feeling that we need not fear for the future of America. When it becomes time for these youngsters to assume the leadership of our great Nation, they will be ready. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record at this time an article which appeared in the Youngstown Vindicator, along with the "thank you" letters I received from some of the Sheridan students.

The article and letters follow:

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, May 31, 1973]

SHERIDAN STUDENTS HEAR U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES CARNEY

Study hard and develop a strong interest in all levels of government because well-informed youngsters will make well-informed and responsible citizens, U.S. Rep. Charles J. Carney told 3rd to 6th grade students at Sheridan School Wednesday afternoon.

He pointed out that since boys and girls now can vote at 18 some of them will be exercising this privilege in about six years and urged them to start now preparing themselves intellectually for that great responsibility.

Carney told the children not to let physical handicaps stand in their way but to set their sights and work harder and they can attain their goals despite handicaps.

In answer to questions he said that inflation, price control, international trade and Watergate are among the biggest problems facing Congress today.

He also replied to question about pollution on the Mahoning River, Youngstown's interest in Milton Dam and Youngstown Municipal Airport and Watergate.

Robert Trucks, principal of Sheridan, welcomed Carney to the school. Tom Sheehan, a sixth grader, introduced the congressman.

JUNE 4, 1973.

DEAR CHARLES J. CARNEY: We deeply appreciate your visit to Sheridan School. We hope you like Sheridan School and we're glad Tom asked you to come. We could tell by the look on other students' faces that they enjoyed your visit too. Since we are studying government your advice came in handy. We think

19922

that even the students that aren't studying government learned a lot.

Thank you very much.

MICHELLE FORTUNATO,
(and students of Unit D.)

P.S. I have enclosed letters from other students.

DEAR REP. CARNEY, I thought your speech was good. I'm glad you could come and talk to us about government.

Thanks for coming.

ELANE CICCOTELLI.

DEAR MR. CARNEY, I want to thank you for coming to my school. I hope you will be a Congressman for as long as you live. You gave a good talk—that means you are a good man.

Sincerely,

FRANK VSIAH.

DEAR MR. CARNEY, Thank you for coming to our school. I enjoyed your talk about government. I understand government more since you came.

Sincerely yours,

SAM PROSSER.

SHEERDAN SCHOOL,
Youngstown, Ohio.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CARNEY: I wrote to say thank your four your good talk an government and thank you for making the effort for making a speech a for coming to our school.

Your truly,

MARCY MEIER.

MAY 30. 1973.

DEAR MR. CARNEY: Thank you for coming and talking to units C and D. You made a good speech and answered the questions beautifully. I hope the children were good and I hope that you can come again to talk to us at Sheridan School.

Thank you again.

CINDY DURKIN.

DEAR REP. CARNEY: We all thank you for coming and telling us some very interesting things and I hope you can come back in your busy schedule.

Thank you again.

JANET DEGENARO.

MAY 30, 1973.

DEAR MR. CARNEY: We the people of Unit D really enjoyed your speech. It wasn't boring like some of the speeches I hear.

I hope you didn't mind those people who were very rude.

I think that your speech will really help me in Social Studies.

Thanks again.

JUDY KANE.

DEAR MR. CARNEY: The many people at Sheridan school would like to thank you for coming. We thought that the way you answered each question was great. We enjoyed it very much.

Thank you again.

SHERRY KOEPPEN.

THE 33D ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET OCCUPATION OF LITHUANIA

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, today, June 15, marks the occasion of the 33d anniversary of the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. I wish to join

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

clients. He gets along with people, he is a gifted lawyer, he has been through the political meatgrinder and he is, most important of all, candid with the press.

It is something of a phenomenon to find a guy in public life who, over more than a quarter of a century, never has been accused by reporters of ducking, equivocating, telling lies to avoid embarrassment.

When Wales finds himself in a cul de sac, he is apt to say, "I blew that one because I was dumb, that's all."

The son of a state senator he scraped together borrowed money to go to college in the Depression of the 1930s (his father had died and the family was broke), Wales became a do-it-yourself guy to save money. As a result, if, on college construction contracts the electricians, say, find themselves being cross-examined on their work by Wales, it's because he wired his entire colonial-style brick home (most of which he built himself) with his own hands.

He is a killer on the squash courts, is politically independent (he shocked old-line Republicans by campaigning for his Democratic law partner, Donald Kramer, for mayor), and, to describe his judgment, married a girl named Alice Allaben who, while her husband is rewiring his living quarters, nails the shingles on their Cape Cod cottage at the top of a shaky ladder.

The board of trustees of the State University, with Governor Rockefeller's action, has a capable man. A colleague said of Wales yesterday, "He is the closest thing I know to Edgar Couper."

Couper, a retired member of the New York State Board of Regents, is one of the most respected men in Binghamton.

FLAG DAY—JUNE 14, 1973

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 14, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause for a moment to remember the resolution passed this day in 1777 by the Continental Congress:

Resolved, That the flag of the thirteen United States be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white: that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

As the number of stars has grown to 50, the flag has continued to stand for the fundamental principles of that new constellation, liberty, and justice for all people.

The flag is a symbol of the hard-fought battles for freedom, of protection under the Constitution of the rights and privileges of all Americans, of the duty of all citizens to speak out for what each considers right and to help correct under the law what each honestly believes to be wrong.

The Stars and Stripes have never been the symbol of the beliefs or actions of any particular group in our democracy. So it is today. The flag is the emblem of our Nation—our heritage, our principles, our goals. It represents the thoughts and ideals, the guarantees of freedom and the safeguards against tyranny, which are embodied in the Constitution.

my colleagues, the Lithuanian-American community and free peoples throughout the world in taking this opportunity to reaffirm our friendship and support for the people of Lithuania, who have never accepted the forcefully imposed Soviet rule of their country.

Annexation of Lithuania by the Soviets over the past few decades has meant continued religious, cultural and political repression. Yet the courageous people of Lithuania maintain a strong will and determination to regain their independence. As we continue our policy of refusal to recognize the forceful annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States, let us salute these freedom-loving people in their struggle for national self-determination.

HE LOOKED AT FARM AND SAW CAMPUS

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to note last week, that Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller has appointed one of my constituents, Darwin A. Wales, of Binghamton, N.Y., to the board of trustees, of the State University of New York. Darwin Wales is a man of great foresight and energy and will, I am sure, be a great addition to the State University operation. As further evidence of his outstanding qualifications for the job, I am pleased to include here in the RECORD an article by Tow Cawley, in the June 8 edition of the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, and I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

HE LOOKED AT FARM AND SAW CAMPUS

(By Tom Cawley)

In the 1950s, Darwin R. Wales would drive reporters in his car up Front Street out of Binghamton and wave his arm at a sweep of old hardscrabble farmland along the Chenango River and say, "That's where the campus is going."

This was before the Broome Community College existed. Wales was about to make it a life's work.

"Great," the reporters would say, needling the young lawyer. "That's just the place to put a college. On the county pig farm."

Wales would wince, but he was game. "Okay," he'd say. "It's going to be by the county pig sties but it's the only land the county owns around here. But at least we don't have to spend any money for land. That's where it's going."

When Wales was appointed Wednesday to the board of trustees of the State University of New York by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller—joining one of the most prestigious high education policy-making groups in the United States—he had been picked because he is an outstanding authority on community colleges.

As chairman of the Broome Community College board of trustees for nearly two decades, he has fought for his school to improve it, to expand it, to give it high standing in what started out as a post-World War II experiment. He will join the state board of trustees as one of the best qualified experts on community colleges.

Wales' secret is a combination of ingre-

We should on this day rededicate ourselves to the preservation of those fundamental traditions, remembering that liberty is neither won nor preserved without great sacrifice. It is up to us to maintain the principles upon which our forbearers fought a war of independence and created the "new constellation" symbolized by our flag.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a bill House Resolution 439 which would create a standing Committee on Energy in the House of Representatives. The lessons of the past several months have taught us that the energy crisis is not just a passing difficulty. We know we are rapidly running out of fossil fuels. We know that an overwhelming dependence on foreign resources poses serious threats to our economy and national security. We know we are going to have to develop new types of energy that won't poison the environment. And we know that regardless of how we respond to the urgent need for energy conservation, Americans in future years will continue to require larger and larger amounts of energy. It seems obvious to me that we are going to have to meet these problems with a comprehensive and coordinated energy program, a program that can relate each problem and possible solution to the overall "energy picture".

As you know, at the present time energy legislation is scattered among several committees and subcommittees whose main concerns are not the energy policy of the United States. My bill would create a permanent legislative committee in the House, specializing in energy, that can take a comprehensive view of our situation and give a positive direction to our energy policy. The committee would review all energy legislation but would not deprive any existing committee of its jurisdiction. In case of an overlapping of jurisdictions, the Committee on Energy would have concurrent jurisdiction with any other standing, select or joint committee in the field of energy and power. I believe that such a standing committee is necessary in this area which will have a continuing importance as great as that of any other legislative area.

At this point I would like to enter the text of my bill into the RECORD:

H. RES. 439

Resolved, That (a) clause 1 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (g) through (u), inclusive, as paragraphs (h) through (v), respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately below paragraph (f) the following new paragraph:

"(g) Committee on Energy, to consist of twenty-five members."

(b) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(1) by redesignating clauses 7 through 33, inclusive, as clauses 8 through 34, respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately below clause 6 the following new clause:

"7. Committee on Energy.

"(a) All forms of energy and power, from whatever source or of whatever nature, expended or capable of being expended into work, including energy released in the course of nuclear fission or transformation.

(b) The Committee on Energy, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct investigations and studies of the development, application, use, and control of all forms of energy and power described in paragraph (a) of this clause in order to establish and maintain on a permanent basis a coordinated program for the development, application, use, and control, for and in the United States, of all forms of such energy and power. The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of each investigation and study, together with such recommendations as the committee considers advisable.

(c) The Committee on Energy, or any subcommittee thereof when authorized by the committee, may sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, hold such hearings, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it considers necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any member of the committee designated by the chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman or any member may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

(d) The preceding provisions of this clause shall not affect the jurisdiction of any other standing or select committee of the House or joint committee of Congress, but the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy as provided by this clause shall be for the purpose of establishing and maintaining on a permanent basis a coordinated program for the development, application, use, and control, for and in the United States, of all forms of energy and power described in paragraph (a) of this clause and, for such purpose, such jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy shall cover and be concurrent with the area of jurisdiction of any other such standing, select, or joint committee in the field of energy and power."

(c) Clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by inserting "the Committee on Energy," immediately after "the Committee on Appropriations."

SAD TIME FOR LITHUANIAN PEOPLE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania to the Soviet Union. It is a sad day in the lives of the Lithuanian people. One must recall the tragic history of this brave and noble people. Their freedoms were taken from them—they were forced to be governed by a state they did not want, many were deported to other countries. The list of abuses against the Lithuanian people grows longer each year, yet their courage and

open defiance does not lessen, rather it grows stronger and they become more determined.

Their tragic course, and their struggle is not theirs to bear alone. Every citizen of a free society should feel an akinship to the Lithuanian cause. We who are privileged to enjoy liberty, owe a great pledge to our oppressed brothers, wherever they are on the face of the globe.

They face possible death or threat of imprisonment for their defiant stand against their oppressors. They deserve our good faith and our promise of continued support.

In the past the United States has failed to recognize the forcible annexation of the Baltic States to the Soviet Union and this measure of our support for their struggle must be maintained, for it must be very heartening to them.

Today we remember a sad time in the lives and history of the Lithuanian people. Today we stand with our fellow citizens of the world—in spirit, if not in fact.

RED TAKEOVER OF LITHUANIA

Hon. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in remembering the takeover of Lithuania by the Red Army on June 15, 1940, and call attention to the way this relatively small, but united country was absorbed by the Soviet Union in 1940. The aggression of the Soviet Union against Lithuania and the illegal process of annexation has meant that the Lithuanians have been denied the right of self-determination, the right to practice the religion of their choice, and the right to dissent and to emigrate. As an independent nation for more than 20 years, the Lithuanian people developed their own political, economic, and cultural life, they were constantly being threatened by the Red Army during this period, and on July 12, 1920, a peace treaty between Lithuania and Soviet Russia was signed in which the Soviet Government "recognizes without reservation the sovereign rights of the Lithuanian state—and voluntarily and for all time abandons all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory." Again in 1922, Lithuania became a member of the League of Nations and thereby was recognized as an independent state by the world. Again the relations with the Soviet Union were normalized by the nonaggression treaty of 1926 and the convention between Lithuania and the Soviet Union for Definition of Aggression in 1933.

However, the ink on these documents was hardly dry when the Soviet Union began to plot again to subjugate the Lithuanian people.

Since the time of Soviet takeover, the Lithuanians have tried to maintain their own identity and cultural heritage. But these rights have been very hard to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

maintain. We who are concerned with human rights and individual dignity and freedom join with the brave people of Lithuania in objecting to the takeover by the Soviet Union some 33 years ago and proclaim our support for their self determination and the right to choose and practice the religion of their choice.

THE 1926 CIRCUS TRAIN WRECK

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, with the gradual decline of rail travel, railroad buffs throughout the Nation look back to the age when railroading was at its height for a wealth of nostalgia.

The romance associated with the railroad life has given rise to countless tributes to the rugged individualists who kept the trains running. In verse and song, the exploits of Casey Jones and John Henry are recorded for posterity.

Surely, each of us must harbor at least one fond memory of the golden days of rail transportation. It is my pleasure to share with my colleagues at this time the memories of the late Dr. J. B. Kinnaird as appeared in a 1926 volume of the L and N magazine, here reprinted in the April 21, 1973, edition of the Richmond Daily Register, Richmond, Ky.:

L & N MAGAZINE ARTICLE OF 1926 DESCRIBED
CIRCUS TRAIN WRECK AT PAINT LICK

(By J. B. Kinnaird, M.D.)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—W. H. Kinnaird, West Main Street, has received from L&N Magazine a 1926 article written by his father, the late Dr. J. B. Kinnaird. A surgeon at Lancaster, Dr. Kinnaird provided his services when a circus train wrecked on a rail branch line near Paint Lick. The surgeon's son offered the article to the Daily Register for publication with assurance that L&N Magazine be given credit.

(The article by Dr. Kinnaird is entitled "My First Experience with the L&N" and follows:)

Early in August, 1882, the Sells Brothers Circus gave a performance at Richmond, Ky., and was billed to appear at London on the following day. After the night entertainment the circus property was soon loaded on an L. & N. train and started on the trip via Lancaster and Rowland to London, for at that time the L. & N. had not been extended from Fort Estill to Livingston.

A hard pull had brought the train up a steep grade to Moran's Summit, the highest point on the Richmond Branch and the down grade to Paint Lick was being covered at a rapid rate when a coupling broke, dividing the train. In those days there were no patent couplers and no air brakes to control the speed. With increasing impetuosity the divided train tore down the steep grade towards Paint Lick at a terrific rate. Just before the locomotive reached the bridge that spans Paint Lick Creek the engineer discovered that the train was divided and for an unknown reason slackened his speed. The inevitable impact followed. The sleepers with two or three freight cars remained on the track, but the others carrying the greater portion of the property were smashed, derailed and rolled over a steep embankment to the edge of the creek in the bottom. The cars and

contents were demolished. A heap of dead and dying: the howls of wild animals that had been frightened; the confusion in the dark, with the cries of dazed men and women, made an everlasting impression upon those who witnessed the scene.

The locomotive was dispatched to Lancaster for physicians and surgeons. When William Bogle, the agent at Lancaster, (who is now in the L&N offices at New Orleans, received a message to secure doctors he sent Victor Wherritt, one of his clerks, for Dr. Huffman who was the nearest physician. The old doctor sent for me and together we soon started on the locomotive to the scene of the disaster. It was just before dawn when we backed out of the station. In the east ahead of us a beautiful comet was visible the tail of which seemed to reach down to the very tracks. The rising sun and fading comet made a gorgeous and impressive sight.

Just at daylight we reached the scene of the catastrophe and were greeted by a throng of sightseers from the surrounding country, some of whom in excited tones informed us that ferocious lions and tigers were roaming at large in the vicinity; that the wild beasts were licking up blood from the injured and that in all probability many of the victims were in danger of being devoured. Great excitement prevailed, and we were warned not to cross the railroad bridge but rather to go over the turnpike bridge, which we did without argument. In such a predicament persuasion was unnecessary. In a few minutes we reached the scene of the disaster in time to witness the corraling of the lions and tigers which were driven at the point of pitchforks into the shattered cages and covered with canvas.

Along the banks of the creek parallel with the track were stretched bodies of the dead and injured. We found three who had been killed instantly in the crash and about twenty more or less seriously injured. Of the dead two were employees whose names were unknown; one was a young man evidently from Laurel County upon whose body we found an affectionate note from his "best girl" urging him to come home to attend the circus to be shown at London.

As soon as we reached the scene I began to make a thorough and complete examination of each case in rotation, keeping a written history nature of the injury and treatment adopted. When I finished my work the report containing all necessary data for settlement was handed the officials, who had arrived. The injured who were able to travel were given passes to their various homes from all parts of the United States and the seriously injured were placed in comfortable homes.

During the day several accidents occurred. While switching at Paint Lick a man was run over and seriously injured. The crew was ordered to run back to Silver Creek about two miles and on the way the train collided with a special. The engineer being satisfied with his day's experience and wishing to avoid any further trouble left his locomotive, took to the woods and when next heard from had landed safely in Lexington. I have never learned what became of him.

The destruction of the circus was complete. The electric light plant, an innovation at that time, was so battered as to be wholly unfit for anything; the expensive gilded band wagon, ornamented with figures human and divine—gods and goddesses galore—dragons and gargoyles in profusion—was torn into splinters. Some of the many figures may be found in homes all over Garrard and Madison Counties used as parlor decorations.

My experience with the L. & N. began that fateful day. For over forty years I have been the Local Surgeon at Lancaster and have had many injuries to treat. Before the installation of the patent coupler and air brakes

injuries were common, but now exceedingly rare. By care and attention many accidents can be avoided.

My relations with the L. & N. have been pleasant and satisfactory and I hope I may live many years longer to serve the Old Reliable.

LEGAL AID FOR THE POOR—A
CONSERVATIVE PERSPECTIVE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities, Committee on Education and Labor, I have received numerous editorials in support of the legal services program. I should like to call my colleagues' attention to a recent item in the State of Columbia, S.C., which noted:

The corporation should be independent of the government, in part so that it can better handle grievances against government agencies.

The State, which strongly believes in responsible conservatism, endorses this legislation in the belief that a double standard of justice (one for the poor and another for those who can afford lawyers) is inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution and patently unfair as well.

I insert the editorial, and a resolution from the board of directors of the legal aid service agency of Columbia at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, May 29, 1973]

LEGAL AID FOR THE POOR ESSENTIAL FOR
JUSTICE

An elderly man is about to be evicted from his home. A woman is "in trouble," but her lover denies paternity. A widow is having trouble getting her social security checks. An uneducated person is being taken to the cleaners by a loan shark. Children are starving because an ex-husband fails to make support payments.

If these individuals are poor and unable to afford legal representation, it is highly likely that they will be taken advantage of. They will not get justice because they can't afford it.

It was to help people with problems like these that the Legal Services Program was created by Congress in 1965 under the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Every alert taxpayer knows that most OEO programs were some of the worst boondoggles of all time. The Legal Services Program, staffed in places by overly idealistic and aggressive young lawyers, has come in for its share of criticism, some of it richly deserved.

When President Nixon set out to dismantle OEO and disperse or kill its programs, there was concern that Legal Services would go, even though Mr. Nixon had given it lip-service support.

Now, however, the President has carried through with an earlier commitment to support the continuation of the program. On May 1, he recommended to Congress that an independent Legal Services Corporation be created to take over this work, the need for which is so apparent to anyone who truly believes in justice at all.

Here in Richland and Lexington counties, the OEO has been funding at fluctuating levels the Legal Aid Service Agency, a non-profit corporation whose objectives have been sup-

ported by the bar associations of the two counties.

The agency reports that there are over 50,000 people in the two counties making less than \$4,000—all potential clients of the agency. Since it began operations in 1967, the agency has handled legal matters, big and small, for 13,759 poor clients.

Ordinarily, only civil cases are accepted, particularly in counties, like Richland, which have public defenders. The agency does handle juvenile cases and some post-conviction cases when there is a question that the accused received due process.

The board of the local agency has passed a resolution, detailing the difficulties it has had keeping a staff due to the uncertainties of the OEO operation and urging Congress to promptly enact into law the President's Legal Services Corporation plan.

The corporation should be independent of the government, in part so that it can better handle grievances against government agencies.

The State, which strongly believes in responsible conservatism, endorses this legislation in the belief that a double standard of justice (one for the poor and another for those who can afford lawyers) is inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution and patently unfair as well.

As respected conservative columnist James J. Kilpatrick wrote recently an article backing legal services for the poor, ". . . if we truly believe in equal justice under law, we (conservatives) ought not be deterred from supporting an effort to make these words . . . something more than an empty phrase."

RESOLUTION

We, the Board of Directors of the Legal Aid Service Agency of Columbia, South Carolina, submit the following resolution:

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Legal Aid Service Agency is a not-for-profit Corporation established under South Carolina Law, governed by a Board of Directors whose membership consists of lawyers appointed by the Richland and Lexington County Bar Associations, elected representatives of the client community and appointed representatives of educational and social welfare institutions. The Agency began operation in April 1967 as a result of a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity's Legal Services Program. It has operated with the support of both Bar Associations since its inception.

The Agency serves the low income people of Richland and Lexington Counties. According to the 1970 U.S. Census more than 50,000 people in these two (2) counties lived in families with an income of \$3,999 or less. Since its inception the Agency has served over 13,759 people in providing complete range of legal services from simple advice to complicated litigation involving a debtor's right to notice and a hearing prior to any attempt to repossess property.

The Agency's ability to serve its clients has been seriously hampered by the fluctuating levels of federal funding and the uncertainty over the continued existence of OEO Legal Services Program. The Agency has at various times had from three (3) to ten (10) lawyers and supportive staff. The present funding permits a staff of three (3) lawyers and a clerk waiting to take the Bar. Turnover in experienced staff has occurred due to the uncertain future of the Legal Services Program; that is, the inability to give the staff any assurance that (1) there would be a Legal Services Program and (2) that it would be a program which respected the ethical requirements of Disciplinary Rule 2-103 (D) of the Code of Professional Responsibility.

The administrative and political disputes surrounding the dissolution of OEO and the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

future of the Legal Services Program have created an atmosphere which makes sound programming of the local level most difficult.

The inadequate and fluctuating levels of funding provided for legal services also make sound programming and high quality service to large numbers of low income people impossible.

RESOLUTION

Therefore, we, the Board of Directors of the Legal Aid Service Agency submit the following Resolution:

(1) That the Legal Services Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity be transferred to an independent national corporation as recommended by President Nixon.

(2) That the governing board of the corporation be composed of individuals who have a strong commitment to providing equal justice to the poor through furnishing lawyers.

(3) That neither Congress or the National Corporation impose any rule which deprives the poor of the right to bring before the courts through Legal Services lawyers any legitimate grievance that one or more of them may have against any government agency because of its failure to obey the constitution or laws of the United States or any State.

(4) That a level of funding be provided in accordance with the resolutions of the American Bar Association which permits adequate staffing to serve a large client population.

(5) That the President and the Congress adopt the above recommendations at the earliest possible date but no later than the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1973.

Respectfully submitted this 15th day of May, 1973.

HOOVER C. BLANTON, Esq.,
Chairman, Board of Directors, Legal Aid Service Agency.

ROY E. GARRIS, Jr., Esq.,
Secretary.

LITHUANIANS SEEK FREEDOM UNDER SOVIET SUBJUGATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 33 years ago today the Soviet Union launched a military assault against the sovereign state of Lithuania and forcefully incorporated the freedom-loving people of that country into the Communist bloc. This despicable action still stands as one of the most serious setbacks in the quest for worldwide peace and freedom and it is with great sorrow that we observe its anniversary.

After the Communist takeover in 1940 nearly one-sixth of the Lithuanian population was exiled from their homeland and transported to the harsh and cruel environment of Siberia. Still they could not be subjugated. They refused to give up the struggle against Soviet oppression. Just last year Lithuanian anti-Soviets conducted widespread demonstrations which were marked, quite tragically, by the self immolation of three of their most dedicated young countrymen.

The ardent love of freedom of the Lithuanian people should be an inspiration to all citizens of the free world. I urge my colleagues to join me in saluting them in their valiant struggle.

HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL HONORS AMERICAN LITHUANIANS AND LITHUANIANS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise and honor the anniversary, albeit a sad anniversary, of the date that the Lithuanian people were subjected to the forceable takeover and annexation by the Soviet Union of Lithuania which occurred on June 15, 1940.

I stand with American Lithuanians and Lithuanians throughout the world to commemorate the continued strong protest by Lithuanian peoples against the suppression by the Soviet Union of freedom and human rights in Lithuania.

Mr. Speaker, I include the attached resolution from the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, located in Southgate, Mich., in my remarks today and that the "Baltic Nations — The Unresolved Legacies" also be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the American people. This report was forwarded to me by the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc. of Philadelphia, Pa.:

RESOLUTION

We, the American Lithuanians of metropolitan Detroit, gathered on May 20, 1973 to commemorate a sad anniversary called by the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center. On May 14, 1972 Romas Kalanta burned himself to death in protest against the suppression of freedom and human rights by the Soviet forces in Lithuania. His death triggered mass riots and unrest in Kaunas and Vilnius. Special Russian riot troops cruelly put down these disturbances. A few hundred young people were imprisoned. Later two other Lithuanians, V. Stenis and K. Andriuskevicius, also burned themselves to death in an attempt to call the attention of the free world to the plight of the Lithuanian nation.

Now, therefore let it be resolved:

1. That we express our sincere gratitude to the Administration and Congress of the United States of America for the continued nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

2. That we request the President of the United States of America to instruct his delegation at the European Security Conference in Helsinki to demand the restoration of sovereignty and independence to Lithuania.

3. That we support the amendment proposed by Senator Henry M. Jackson that the Soviet Union not be granted a most favored nation status until all of her citizens are given the right to emigrate freely; and

4. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Senators and Congressmen of the State of Michigan.

BALTIC NATIONS—THE UNRESOLVED LEGACIES

Today, the United States stands on the threshold of the most meaningful and potentially rewarding era in the history of mankind. For the first time in the last fifty years, global peace is attainable. However, global peace is only the first great objective of our nation, we must also seek the attainment of freedom and justice for all oppressed na-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

tions. For even if the countries of the world cease hostilities toward one another, the unresolved legacies of the Second World War must be confronted; the status of the Baltic Nations must be once and for all—equitably resolved. Furthermore, let us not be fooled that world peace can be attained by offering the inalienable rights of the people of Lithuania and the other Baltic Nations upon the altar of appeasement.

The Lithuanian people have continuously struggled to reject the oppressive communist system from Lithuanian soil ever since the forcible annexation into the Soviet Union on June 15, 1940.

The post-war history of Lithuania bears grim testimony to this rejection of forcible incorporation. From 1944 to 1952, anti-Soviet partisans struggled for freedom against the Soviet military occupation in protracted guerrilla warfare at a cost of over fifty thousand Lithuanian lives. During Stalin's era, over one-sixth of the Lithuanian people were deported to Russia and Siberia in an effort to depopulate and subjugate the Lithuanian Nation. To demonstrate the extent of this depopulation in comparison to the United States, it would mean the elimination of all the people from the thirty largest cities in this country.

To this very day, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the communist regime. The protests of the Lithuanian people against the denial of the right of national self-determination, continued religious and political persecutions, and the violation of human rights by the Soviet Union reached tragic heights on May 14, 1972, when a Lithuanian youth, Romas Kalanta, burned himself in Kaunas as a martyr in protest to Soviet oppression. This act triggered wide-spread demonstrations in the area and was culminated by two other self-immolations. Such dramatic events demonstrate that the Lithuanian people have not acquiesced to the Soviet occupation, but rather are still striving for freedom and independence.

The United States has never recognized the forceful annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. This steadfast policy of the United States gives succor to the Lithuanian people and reinforces their determination to await national independence while it also discourages the Soviet policies of Russification and effective absorption of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

The 89th U.S. Congress during its second session was explicit in its determination to forestall any Russification and absorption of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union when it adopted House Concurring Resolution 416, which urges the President to bring up for discussion the question of the status of the Baltic States in the United Nations and other international forums. The European Security Conference is such an international forum. We ask your support in urging the United States delegates to openly state the U.S. policy of non-recognition and raise the Baltic question directly as Congress has specified.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing June 15, 1973, as a day of reflection upon and sorrow for the plight of millions of Lithuanians—in commemoration of the 7

million men, women, and children, who, 40 years ago, died resisting Soviet oppression.

The Soviet Union contends that their's is a federation of republics freely joined by a socialist constitution. In truth, the Soviet Government presides over a multitude of subjugated peoples. Winston Churchill's words can be used to describe these people. Under different circumstances, the war time Prime Minister of England referred to "shattered states and bludgeoned races." Lithuania is among these shattered states.

Lithuania once was an independent nation apart from the Soviet Union. Lithuanians are a people unto themselves who deserve to be recognized as such, by the Soviet Union and by the entire world.

The United has never formally recognized the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union nor have we acquiesced in the subjugation of these people. It is hoped that we will maintain that position.

However, beyond nonrecognition, beyond refusing to condone what the Soviet Union has done, let us join in an effort to help restore Lithuanian independence.

Accordingly I join in urging the U.S. delegates to the European Security Conference to raise the question of Lithuanian independence when they meet again.

LITHUANIA'S RIGHT TO FREEDOM

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, at this grave moment in our American democracy, we face perhaps the greatest crisis of national disunity that we have experienced since the cessation of the War Between the States, over 100 years ago. We find our friends and neighbors sharply criticizing our Government—its leaders and its policies. And most serious of all, our thoughts are filled with criticisms and complaints over the small irritants in our daily lives—lack of gasoline, high costs of food supplies, discrepancies in wages, and cutbacks in Government benefits.

In this national humor, I believe it would be fitting for all of us to think upon the peoples of Lithuania and the courage which they have displayed through the years; deprived, not only of simple comforts, but of their entire free nation. The patriotism and national unity which these people have displayed both under Communist rule and in exile should be an example to us all.

I wonder how we would remember our life in America if we were to be suddenly thrown into the hands of a hostile aggressor. The Lithuanian people have kept their culture alive not only under the threat of fierce attack on their native soil, but through several generations in this country where they have been welcomed into our communities.

The United States has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union, and we therefore champion such a display of patriotism, not as a lack of gratitude for our help, but as an attitude which we as Americans have always held in esteem. The Lithuanian people living throughout our country are not immigrants, they are exiles, and it is only fitting that we join them in honoring their anniversaries; even the ones of sorrow such as we commemorate today.

In an effort to give meaning to this magnificent struggle and our observance of it, we urge the delegates to the European Security Conference to speak out on our policy of nonrecognition and to carry out the wishes of Congress by speaking out directly with regard to the rights of the Lithuanian people. While we continue to enjoy the freedom of our own right to dissent, it is only suitable that we lend our aid to those who have a cause so just.

PRICE CONTROLS

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the reimposition of price controls for a period of 60 days is little better than a stopgap measure. Price controls should never have been removed in the first place and while I have supported the President on a number of issues, this time I think he is engaging in too little and too late.

The time has come to develop a set of economic controls that will protect the middle-income wage earner and taxpayer. Economic controls imposed up to now have protected welfare recipients through food stamps and built-in cost-of-living escalator clauses and have left the high-income people continued protection through tax writeoffs and other tax shelters. This has meant the middle-income wage earner has borne the burden of inflation along with the elderly and retired people on fixed incomes.

Within the past week I toured several supermarkets in the Washington area and was thoroughly appalled at what the basic necessities of life now cost, particularly food. While the price freeze will temporarily halt rising food costs, it will do so at an already too high level.

The administration now has 60 days to produce a workable economic control program. If what they develop is not designed to offer additional protection for middle-income people and those on fixed incomes specifically, I am prepared to offer substitute legislation or amendments to accomplish this goal.

I am particularly disturbed, Mr. Speaker, that people who have devoted 60 or 70 years of their life to make the United States the great economic machine that it is have been repaid with shrinking pension checks, rising prices and rents and evaporating savings.

I specifically intend to urge the development of an effective rent control and a most thorough examination of the causes for soaring food costs.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer in the free enterprise-supply and demand system, but it is time to stand up and be counted against the gouging of the middle-income people in my district and the Nation.

FIVE IN ORANGE HOLD AGRICULTURE SERVICE AWARDS

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the good fortune of the people of Orange County, Fla., many of whom are in my congressional district. We have five men who have received awards for their outstanding contributions to agriculture. I would like to submit for the RECORD the following article from the Orlando Sentinel of Monday, June 4, 1973, which explains the contribution these men have made:

FIVE IN ORANGE HOLD AGRICULTURE SERVICE AWARDS

Out of all the counties in the United States, Orange has the distinction of having five members of the United States Department of Agriculture Superior Service Award—probably a record for one county.

Henry F. Swanson, County Extension Director for the Florida Cooperative Extension Service, said only 700 or so of the medals are given out each year nationwide. The award is the second highest the USDA gives.

The five award winners, four of whom are still active in the USDA, include:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Paul Harding, developer of a maturity standard for citrus fruit.

Dr. Bill Cooper, who developed a chemical for loosening fruit so it can be mechanically harvested.

Fred Merrill for his application of soil and water conservation standards to urban situations.

Henry Swanson for overall leadership in the extension program for 25 years.

Robert A. McGregor, who developed a monitoring system for California agricultural production.

Swanson won his award in 1970 for overall leadership in extension programs after 25 years of service to the USDA. He is now working on the problem of urbanization as it affects agriculture. As Orange County grows, he is trying to assess the impact on agriculture, the water supply, pollution, and taxes.

Swanson now works in cooperative extension work in agriculture, home economics, and with youth groups and was winner of the County Agricultural Agents Award in 1960.

Cooper received the award in 1969 for his work with a chemical that loosens citrus fruit so it can be harvested mechanically.

Cooper, working with William Henery and Dr. Gordon Rasmussen, developed the chemical Cycloheximide which is now in semi-commercial use in Florida. Cooper said the USDA now holds a public service patent for the method, which is the first of its kind to be used in commercial production.

Cooper holds a doctorate in plant physiology, and has worked in Orange County 13 years. Before that, he spent 28 years in California. All of his work has been in the citrus industry, he said.

The chemical is mixed 10 parts per million of water, and is effective on early and middle season citrus. It is not effective on late season citrus such as Valencias, which are harvested in April and May.

McGregor said he received the award in 1966 for developing a monitoring system for production after California revised its labor laws. Labor problems were resulting in less output, and the problem was solved after

farmers and growers turned to mechanized harvesting.

McGregor now works for the Florida Crop and Livestock Reporting Service which forecasts amount other things the citrus production in Florida.

Dr. Paul Harding was honored for developing a maturity standard for citrus fruit. Harding, who is retired, developed a standard based on the sugar and acid ratio in citrus fruit to determine the fruit's maturity. The system is now used throughout the state.

The fifth member of the elite group, Fred Merrill, is a district soil conservationist with the Orange Soil and Water Conservation District.

Merrill received the award in Ohio in 1969 for his application of soil and water conservation techniques to urban situations stopping erosion in subdivisions instead of farm land.

Cooper said he believes there is only one other research worker in Florida who has received the award, and Swanson said only four Florida USDA agents have been recipients.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES G. MARTIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. MARTIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the month of April of this year, I solicited the opinions of my constituency in the form of a questionnaire. The results of the responses to that questionnaire have today been sent to all my constituents in a special report. I would like to share with my colleague this special report and do therefore request that the text of this message to my district be printed in the RECORD.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

	Yes		No		No answer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
(A) Amnesty: Should those men who fled the country or took other illegal action to avoid their military service during the Vietnam conflict be given amnesty	3,604	17.5	16,606	80.4	434	2.1
(B) Busing: Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would prohibit the busing of school children to achieve a racial balance	16,106	78.0	4,299	20.8	239	1.2
(C) Crime: Do you favor mandatory prison term without probation for conviction of a crime committed with a gun or other lethal weapon	16,957	82.1	3,318	16.1	369	1.8
(D) Drug pushers: Would you favor a Federal law imposing 5 year mandatory sentences without parole for first offense drug pushers and life sentences for second convictions	16,889	81.8	3,330	16.1	425	2.1
(E) Energy crisis: Do you think the "energy crisis" is serious enough that the Federal Government should help in finding new energy sources	14,137	68.5	5,534	26.8	973	4.7
(F) Federal Government: Do you support the President's efforts to reduce and decentralize the federal government	16,490	79.9	3,099	15.0	1,055	5.1
(G) Gun control: Do you favor stricter gun controls at the federal level	10,957	53.1	9,345	45.3	342	1.6
(H) Highway taxes: Would you favor the states and cities spending some of the money earmarked for highway construction in the Highway Trust Fund (gasoline taxes) on urban mass transit (bus, train, subway)	13,490	65.3	6,372	30.9	782	3.8
(I) Impoundment: The President said he will withhold spending of funds Congress has authorized if they would result in tax increases. Do you favor forcing the President to spend the money as Congress directs	6,059	29.4	13,856	67.1	729	3.5
(J) News sources: Is it your opinion that under all circumstances news reporters should be permitted to keep their sources of information confidential	9,394	45.5	10,324	50.0	926	4.5

Please list the national problems which most concern you:

(1) Inflation/economy	9,456
(2) Crime	8,475
(3) Drugs/drug abuse	4,436
(4) Taxes	1,633
(5) Busing	1,498

This special report presents the results of the opinion questionnaire which I sent in April to all constituents in the 9th District. 20,644 questionnaires were returned. This exceptionally high rate of return for this Congressional District is second only to the 21,479 responses received by former Congressman Charles R. Jonas in 1970.

A questionnaire is one particularly valid way for a Member of Congress to gauge the opinions of constituents for it affords everyone a chance to register his or her attitudes

without having to be represented by a small random sample.

The Amnesty question was strongly worded to single out illegal draft evasion. While this might have been expected to stimulate response on both sides, the actual result was heavily against amnesty, more so than in several national surveys. Pollsters Harris and Gallup have found that nationally 67% oppose amnesty, with the figure being higher, 72% in the South. The busing question was intentionally aimed at sounding out support for an amendment to the Constitution which I have introduced. In response to the above-mentioned 1970 questionnaire, 90% of our District had already opposed "compulsory busing if that is required in order to achieve

approximate racial balance in the public schools".

The very high percentages favoring mandatory, harsh prison sentences for drug pushers and crimes committed with lethal weapons indicate a deep public concern in these areas. Some respondents differentiated between organized hard drug pushers and those who are sustaining their habit. The intensity of feeling regarding gun crimes may be a factor contributing to the 53% majority favoring generally stricter gun controls.

Support for federal research on new energy sources is a very timely finding, particularly considering that most responses were received prior to the summer impact of the gasoline shortage. This is the legislative area

where I am devoting most of my time. The somewhat related question of permitting highway taxes to be spent for mass transit produced almost as high a percentage of those in favor, more than two to one. This item also incorporated an element of decentralization of government, which received a better than five to one endorsement in question (F), on reduction of the Federal Government.

The need to economize in federal spending was indicated in another question (I), contrasting the impoundment issue of Congressional prerogatives *versus* the threat of a tax increase. Less than one out of three would compel spending, given that choice. Partially this reflects a concern for the economy and inflation which ranked highest in the "open-ended" question. The closest score of the questionnaire came on the question of permitting reporters to keep their news sources confidential under all circumstances.

On the open-ended final question asking for three greatest national concerns, our things stand out: (1) In the aftermath of the Vietnam settlement, foreign policy questions were no longer dominant; they had nearly disappeared; (2) Primary concern by far was focused on "pocketbook" issues, and on crime and drug abuse; (3) Concern over housing registered a high level of emotion; (4) The "Energy Crisis" was just beginning to be perceived, with 745 responses (3.6%). Environmental concerns were noted in 986 responses (4.8%).

VOLUNTEER ARMY VERSUS THE DRAFT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I had the opportunity to visit at some length, the U.S.S.R. One of the many observations I made was the fact that there were a great many men in uniform, all of whom impressed me as being topnotch individuals. There appeared to be a great esprit de corps and a pride in uniform. When you compare this to what we are experiencing to some extent in this country today it gives cause for alarm.

The other day I received a letter from the State director of Selective Service in the State of Texas which further increases my concern for what is happening in our country so far as our military is concerned. The experience in Texas is probably not unique and I would urge that every Member give some consideration to the contents of this letter and query his own State director for the facts:

MAY 31, 1973.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: Draft calls were suspended at the end of last January and the authority to induct will expire completely on June 30th. At the present time I am being required to carry out a major reduction-in-force and dismantling of the vital elements of the draft machinery in Texas. (Reference my letter dated March 14, 1973.) This is being carried out before the success of the all-volunteer army is assured.

There have been all kinds of optimistic comments and forecasts made from the Pen-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tagon during the past year regarding the success of achieving an all-volunteer army. Evidence that this staggeringly expensive venture is failing is rapidly piling up.

The failure of the recruiters to meet their monthly quota of non-prior service volunteers has become more dramatic each successive month since last January. For the month of April the army made only 40% of the minimum quota set for its recruiters. As of the 21st of May, they had succeeded in enlisting only 1900 while their goal for that date during the month of May was 4200.

The advocates of the all-volunteer army have claimed a much better quality soldier would be attracted by the new methods. I have suspected for a long time that the opposite would be true, and evidence of this is now emerging here in Texas which confirms my suspicions to a disturbing degree. For months my local board personnel have reported to me that many men, already found unfit for service during a pre-induction physical examination, were being enlisted as volunteers. It should be pointed out that these men were disqualified at the same examining stations used for volunteers and under the same uniform standards established for all by the armed forces for acceptability for service. I recently had a survey made of all the boards in Texas to determine how many there were of such cases and directed that the files of such men be sent to my headquarters for examination. To date we have uncovered 868 cases of men enlisted since last October who had been previously disqualified for physical, mental or moral reasons (4-F). There are signs this is happening all over the country.

The Department of Defense announces that standards will have to be reduced to achieve an all-volunteer force, while at the same time announces the intentions to hire civilians to handle some of the sophisticated jobs manned in the past by the Military. On the other hand, civilians are also hired to perform such time-honored Military tasks as KP because these jobs are too menial for the volunteer soldiers. What a paradox. Just what kind of people are we becoming when we are willing to attempt to buy the services of the unfit and disadvantaged of this nation to man its defenses? I say it is not only morally wrong but it is downright dangerous.

The draft has never been popular—and it never will be. It is, however, the most practical and equitable way to raise manpower when large Military forces are maintained in a nation of people not oriented to seek Military service. Contrary to what the opponents of the draft say, it is one of the best examples of democracy in action meeting a most difficult responsibility by assuring that our Military forces are representative of our society as a whole.

The draft does not prevent a single volunteer from enlisting. For more than twenty years draft calls have been levied to fill the difference between the needs of the armed forces and the success of recruiters to find volunteers. During this entire period there was always a remarkable correlation between the size of draft calls and the success of recruiters.

The proposed Selective Service budget for FY 74 is fifty-five million dollars—a cut of twenty-three million. This is less than 2% of the costs associated with efforts to achieve an all-volunteer force. Congress should pause before it permits the emasculation of the agency which has proved to be so successful in helping meet the manpower requirements of both the active and reserve components of the armed forces.

This is an earnest plea to use your considerable influence in behalf of extending the induction authority, unpopular though it may be. It will not cost anything to keep it on the books, nor will one man have to be inducted if the all-volunteer effort should

June 15, 1973

unexpectedly bear fruit. There will be time-consuming difficulties in reestablishing the draft once it has lapsed—plus the difficulty of maintaining the viability of Selective Service without induction authority.

Sincerely,

MELVIN N. GLANTZ,
Colonel, AGC, State Director.

DEATH OF TED COTT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to speak to the House briefly about a great gentleman, great professional, and a wonderful friend, Ted Cott, who passed away suddenly on Wednesday evening in New York. I was privileged to know Ted for many years, and I can only say that he was as creative an individual as one could ever hope to know. He served as president of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences, but that was only one of the many ways he contributed to our national life.

Many of my colleagues will be familiar with Ted directly, but others would know him through his activities. As an originator of the David Susskind show, with its unique television format, he gained tremendous respect throughout the communications field. He was an innovator and an explorer in all areas of television and radio communications. Many of the Members of this House appeared on "Ask Congress," a television program for which Ted Cott and I helped to create. This TV show, which we tape here in the House of Representatives, brought the views and ideas of many Members of Congress to viewers in 22 cities.

I was privileged to know Ted Cott well, and I know that the communications industry has lost one of its brighter lights. His was a directness and honesty that enriched the lives of millions of people who never knew him.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert the obituary that appeared in the New York Times:

TED COTT IS DEAD—TV PRODUCER, 55—EXECUTIVE GENERAL MANAGER WAS A RADIO INNOVATOR

Ted Cott, who was responsible for many innovations in radio and television in his years as a broadcaster and producer, died Tuesday at St. Clare's Hospital, apparently of a heart attack. He was 55 years old and lived at 70 East 77th Street.

At his death, Mr. Cott was a media consultant to several companies and was active as a television producer.

In 1950, he was named general manager of the National Broadcasting Company's local radio and television stations here.

Two years later he became vice president of National Telefilm Associates, which operates WNTA-TV in New Jersey. One of his accomplishments there, in 1960, was the production of Eugene O'Neill's "The Iceman Cometh."

There had been some fear that viewers would protest O'Neill's salty language in his portrayal of down-and-outers in a water-

June 15, 1973

19929

front bar, but of 93 calls by viewers, only three were complaints.

Mr. Cott began as a radio announcer at the age of 16 in 1934, and his first job of consequence was at WNYC, the city's station. He had the title of dramatic director.

JOINED WNEW IN 1943

The city's salary scale for radio announcers was \$1,800 a year, and Mr. Cott left for WNEW in 1943, after nine years with the city, when the Municipal Civil Service Commission pronounced him unqualified for the job.

The city had spent \$10,000 and two years on its examination of qualifications. It also discharged the announcer Tony Marvin. Mr. Cott's new job meant an increase of \$140 a week. Mr. Marvin went on to the "Major Bowes Amateur Hour" at \$18,000 a year, 10 times his WNYC pay.

One of his innovations, as program director of WNEW, was a discussion of radio entitled "Report to the Listeners." Mr. Cott who had been a radio critic for The New Republic, not only "reported to the listeners" on how a station prepares programs and how it selects its material but also gave the listeners a voice, by having their letters read on the air.

Another innovation, in 1950—he was then manager of WNEW—was the presentation of Leopold Stokowski as host of a four-week series on the music of Bach.

The formula was essentially similar to today's, except that William B. Williams has replaced Mr. Stokowski as the disk jockey, and the musical fare is lighter.

Mr. Cott also put on a series with Carl Sandburg, the poet and biographer of Lincoln. The program featured folk music, with Mr. Sandburg playing a guitar, singing and commenting in his own way on the American musical heritage.

OPPORTUNITY FOR SUSSKIND

Mr. Cott also gave David Susskind, his cousin and a producer in his own right, a chance to expound on the air instead of at a women's club.

Here again there was an innovation: The program did not have a fixed termination point. The programs kept on going so long as they stayed interesting.

Mr. Cott had served as vice president and general manager of WABD, Channel 5, the DuMont station here.

He had been president of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

His books included "The Victor Book of Musical Fun"; "Isn't It a Crime?", a quiz book, written with David and William Manners: "A Treasury of the Spoken Word," an anthology that came out of a series of WNEW programs on poetry, and "How to Audition for Radio," a handbook for actors.

Mr. Cott leaves his wife, the former Suzanne Oakland; five sons, Jonathan, Jeremy, James, Thomas and Patrick, and a half-sister, Frances.

A funeral service will be held today at 1 P.M. at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue at 81st Street.

A TRIBUTE TO LITHUANIANS

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the United States-Soviet summit meeting this month will not dim the significance of June 15 as a sad anniversary for all who value freedom and dignity for people everywhere. I refer of course to the date, 33 years ago, when Soviet forces invaded

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

peace-loving Lithuania. Lithuania lies in Moscow's grip to this day.

I pay tribute to the courageous Lithuanian people who have opposed the oppressive Communist system ever since their forcible annexation into the Soviet Union. History tells of the long struggle of patriots against Kremlin subjugation. The spirit of Lithuanian independence and nationhood lives on.

The United States has never recognized the forceful incorporation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. Our steadfastness in this policy amidst improvement in other American relationships with the Soviet Union has been a measure of our devotion to the cause of freedom.

SPEEDY TRIALS

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in a landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court has handed down a ruling that criminal defendants who are denied speedy trials must have the charge against them dismissed.

During the 93d Congress, several bills have been introduced in both the House and Senate to provide for speedier trials. My own bill, which was introduced on January 3 of this year with 12 cosponsors, would provide both State and Federal judicial systems with the means necessary to assure prompt disposition of criminal cases.

The need for adoption of this legislation is now greater than ever, in order to guarantee that pretrial delays do not result in countless dismissals against criminal defendants whose guilt or innocence has not been determined in accordance with the law.

The Supreme Court decision on this matter, which arose in the case of Strunk against United States, involved the conviction of one Mr. Strunk for a Federal offense. Strunk was sentenced by the U.S. district court for a term of 5 years, although prior to the trial the court had denied his motion to dismiss the charge on the ground that he had been denied a speedy trial.

The court of appeals reversed this decision, holding that Strunk had been denied a speedy trial, but that the "extreme" remedy of dismissal of the charges was not warranted.

The case was then sent back to the district court, with instructions to reduce Strunk's sentence by 10 months to compensate for the unnecessary delay that had occurred between the time of the indictment and Strunk's arraignment.

The Supreme Court then heard the case, with a view toward ruling on the question of whether the remedy provided by the court of appeals was the appropriate one: that of reduction in sentence for the time of the pretrial delay.

Writing the opinion for a unanimous Court, Chief Justice Burger stated that dismissal of the charge must remain "the

only possible remedy" for denial of the constitutional right to a speedy trial.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to give its prompt attention to passage of the speedy trial legislation which I introduced earlier this year, H.R. 4807.

BOB PHINNEY ENDS DISTINGUISHED CAREER OF PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, in the annals of public service, few names ever will be more synonymous with dedication, honesty and hard-working integrity than Robert L. Phinney.

Bob Phinney retires this month after serving 21 years as district director of the Austin, Tex., Internal Revenue Service district.

In over two decades his name elicited only the highest praise and respect from all who knew and worked with him. Seldom has a man been more honest, more fair, day after day.

The area of Austin, the State of Texas, and this Nation become the losers when he steps down this month.

His reputation was not built in a day nor solely during his stay at the IRS. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to make a personal observation.

It was my privilege to become associated with Bob Phinney just after World War II, when we both volunteered our time to help then Congressman Lyndon Johnson in a campaign for reelection. Bob Phinney was selected to head the entire Travis County organization, and this was a wise choice. People believe in the integrity and honor of Bob Phinney then as now.

Later I was associated with Bob in private enterprise when a group of ten veterans gathered to form radio station KVET in Austin. The station became known as "Kay-Vet," and I believe it was one of the first stations in America to coin a phonetic name. Bob Phinney served as business manager, and he got a new and risky enterprise set off in a healthy direction.

Both Bob and I later sold our interests in the station, and I imagine we both regret that action, as the station remains a most successful enterprise today.

Bob Phinney then served as postmaster in Austin for over 4 years, and he carried to that organization the same high standards of service and performance which have characterized his whole life.

I have visited many times in the Phinney home with Bob, his lovely wife Helen, and his gracious and talented daughter, Mrs. Susan Conrad.

Bob had married the former Helen Avery, whose father, Col. C. N. Avery, was easily one of the most loved men in all of central Texas. Wonderful, warm, and colorful stories still float about concerning Colonel Avery, his son Buck, and his wonderful son-in-law Bob.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

June 15, 1973

Bob's distinguished career began before I knew him. Bob and his brother, Gen. Carl Phinney, were both cited for leadership and valor in the European theater of World War II. They were members of the famed and honored 36th Division which saw action in Italy.

In both his personal and professional life, Bob Phinney has always displayed the very highest sense of honesty and integrity. In dealing with the public, he always made his decisions in an equal and nonpartisan manner.

Truly, Bob Phinney has exemplified the very finest of public service. Texas and America can point with pride to his unselfish life of dedication.

A recent article in the Austin American-Statesman details Bob's life history, and I would like to include it in the RECORD at this point:

FROM WPA TO TOP ADDRESS IN IRS: BILLIONS HAVE FLOWED THROUGH HIS FINGERS—TAX CHIEF PHINNEY TO RETIRE

(By Nat Henderson)

It's a long way from the WPA to a top address in the IRS.

But some of the same people from whom Bob Phinney collected almost \$52 billion in taxes during the last two decades were drawing "Relief" from him a seemingly short 40 years ago.

R. L. Phinney, director of the huge district of the Internal Revenue Service in the southern half of Texas, will retire at the end of this month after working over 38 years for the federal government.

In addition to the \$51,849,159,000 Phinney collected from taxpayers since becoming district director of IRS in 1952, most of his federal service has involved the handling of large sums of money.

The late President Harry Truman appointed him postmaster in Austin on Nov. 25, 1947. He supervised the work of more than 500 employees who handled about \$2.2 million annually in postal receipts. At the same time, Phinney also was central accounting postmaster. Almost \$133 million was remitted to Phinney in that post in 1951 alone.

Lt. Col. Phinney was finance officer for the 36th Division of the Texas National Guard in Texas, Africa and Italy during World War II. He supervised a \$32 million payroll for the T-Patchers to spend and send back home.

Even back in the Depression when "Phinney was skinny" along with a lot of other people, quite a few greenbacks flowed across his desk. In spite of all those millions he oversaw in the latter part of his career, Phinney really was "on relief" and was "buying everything from needles and pins to mules."

He became assistant purchasing agent for the Texas Relief Commission in Austin in January of 1933, when "soup kitchens" were commonplace and a favorite song was "Eleven-cent cotton, 40-cent meat. How in the hell can a poor man eat. Back's all broken; fingers all sore; cotton's going down to never rise no more."

As it went on down, along came the NRA, CCC, Triple A, NYA and the big one of the Depression alphabet known as the WPA. Phinney became director of employment at the Work Projects Administration district headquarters in Austin when that agency absorbed the Texas Relief Commission on July 1, 1935.

In 1936, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt sent Lyndon Baines Johnson from Washington back to Austin to organize the National Youth Administration in Texas. Phinney aided Johnson in setting up the NYA procedures at their offices in the Littlefield Building, and they became lasting friends.

"One of the two most brilliant men I've ever known was President Johnson," Phinney says.

The admiration was mutual; for the late President Johnson once said of Phinney, "That Bob is big enough to walk with any man and humble enough to walk with every man."

The other man Phinney admired most was the late Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, the father of oil conservation and a member and chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission for 34 years.

A photograph of Gen. Thompson hanging in Phinney's office bears the inscription, "To my devoted companion in war and peace."

The two went to war together in the 36th Texas Division. Phinney, who had been in the Texas National Guard since 1927 and commissioned a second lieutenant in 1933, was called to active duty with the "T-Patchers" on Nov. 25, 1940. He was regimental adjutant under Thompson, then a colonel.

Phinney became finance officer of the division in 1941. He served with the 36th through its overseas tour in North Africa and Italy. He landed with it at Salerno on Sept. 9, 1942, the anniversary of his marriage to the former Miss Helen Avery of Austin in 1939. He won the Bronze Star for meritorious service in combat.

After returning to the States in August of 1944, Phinney became fiscal director at huge Camp Swift near Bastrop. He was promoted to colonel in 1946 and released from active duty that September. He retired as a colonel in 1960.

Phinney and a group of friends, including John Connally, J. C. Kellam, Jake Pickle, Ed Clark, Sherman Birdwell, Willard Deason and Ed Syers, organized Austin Broadcasting Company and began operating Radio Station KVET on Oct. 1, 1946. Phinney was secretary-treasurer until his appointment as Austin postmaster in 1947.

He remained with the postoffice until transferring to the IRS as acting collector on April 22, 1952. He became district director on Nov. 19 that year.

The 1972 business was five times greater than the \$1,146,073,000 collected in 1952 during Phinney's first year with IRS. Last year the total was \$5,870,914,000.

The Austin district now has 1,100 employees in 25 offices serving 111 counties in the lower half of Texas. Last year a total of 3,443,079 returns were filed. Austin and the Jacksonville, Fla., district are about equal as the largest in the nation.

As IRS district director, Phinney has been chided on many occasions. Former State Sen. Charles Herring once asked how much taxes the citizens of the district paid during the year.

When Phinney gave him the total tax collections, Herring replied, "No, that must be their total income."

Phinney assured him that was the taxes and not the income, and Herring quipped, "Well, there's not a lot of difference anyway."

Nevertheless, Phinney says, "I've had more fun than I ever had in my life in the last 21 years. I like to deal with people—the actual millions of customers we have in the southern half of the state and the many tax practitioners themselves. I've thoroughly enjoyed working with the employees."

As far as taxpayers are concerned, Phinney says, "We have in our district the greatest percentage of voluntary compliance anywhere in the country. There's no question, as high as taxes are, that they are burdensome, but the huge majority realizes it's a necessity."

In regard to higher taxes now than during the Depression years, Phinney says, "In the old days it was just as difficult to pay the proper tax as it is in today's affluent society. The truth is it was harder. We now want to spend more on ourselves for luxuries."

Speaking about taxpayers in the district, Phinney smiles, "Their attitude is just great. They're all great Americans and great Texans, and they like to gripe and brag at the same time about just how much taxes they pay."

Phinney, youngest of four children of Lillie and Charles DeWolfe Phinney, was born in Marble Falls on April 5, 1910. The family moved to Austin in 1916, and his mother died in 1918 during the influenza epidemic. The children went to Brownwood to live with their grandparents, since their father was a carpenter and contractor who traveled widely across the state constructing the wooden derricks for oil wells.

Phinney graduated from Brownwood High School in 1927 and entered the University of Texas. He quit in 1929 because of the lack of funds and went to work with the Texas Highway Department as a field clerk. He stayed with the department until he was employed by the Texas Relief Commission.

Rather than accept a transfer to become IRS district director at Buffalo, N.Y., Phinney is choosing to remain in Austin, where he and his wife can be near their daughter, Mrs. Karl Conrad. He's just "gonna farm and ranch."

Phinney also says he just can't bear leaving all the longtime friends who have paid him so much taxes and "so many compliments."

And there have been many, such as a tribute entered this month by U.S. Sen. John Tower in the Congressional Record: "Mr. Phinney has enforced our tax laws throughout the Austin District firmly, efficiently and fairly. He has done so in a non-partisan manner which has won him great respect from people of all political persuasions. He is a man of unquestioned integrity and honor."

Leon Jaworski, past president of the American Bar Association, said recently, "He's a genuine good fellow with strict ethical conduct, high integrity, undeviating fairness."

Frank Rea, immediate past president of the Texas Society of Certified Public Accountants, said, "Nobody enjoys paying taxes, but Bob Phinney has done more to make it a pleasure by his cooperation with the public and those who advise taxpayers. He has intense dedication and fairness."

Phinney says, "I tell various groups when I speak to them that those initials they use on me actually mean 'Sweet Old Bob.'"

THE TRAGEDY OF LITHUANIA

HON. WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, today, June 15, should not be allowed to pass without pausing for a moment to commemorate a tragedy which occurred on this date 33 years ago. Today is the anniversary of the forcible annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Although this event is most keenly appreciated by Americans of Lithuanian extraction, it has symbolic meaning for all of us and affords an opportunity to reflect upon those nations and peoples who are so much less fortunate than we here in America.

Freedom is so commonplace in our country that we are often guilty of forgetting what it has taken to preserve and protect it. And we are even more at fault for not appreciating fully the situation of those many peoples of the world who pray daily for just a fraction of what we take for granted.

In just a few short years, the United States will mark 200 years of progress and comparative safety—secure in the knowledge that we have always had a

June 15, 1973

19931

country to build and believe in. In other parts of the world, there are those who have only the belief—their country is no longer theirs. Thirty-three years ago today the Baltic nation of Lithuania lost the one thing that we Americans cherish above all else—the freedom to govern ourselves and to decide our own fates and fortunes.

I call upon all my colleagues in this body and to all of my fellow citizens—to all the free nations of the world to pause a moment and reflect on these freedoms, and to ask that men everywhere respect the spirit of man, and grant those same freedoms to those who will work for it and protect it from abuse by those who may not understand what it is all about.

LITHUANIAN ANNEXATION

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, June 15 is a day of sadness and reflection for Lithuanian-Americans and Lithuanians throughout the world. On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union declared that small nation a constituent republic and brought to a close 20 brief years of Lithuanian independence. The U.S. Government never has recognized the forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. and has continued to treat Lithuania as a sovereign nation. As a people, we recognize the right of all people to choose their own form of government.

Since 1940, Lithuanians have continued to resist the Communist regime. Last year, three citizens burned themselves to death to protest Soviet domination. On this tragic anniversary, I join with all Lithuanians and Americans in honoring this heroic struggle for freedom, and to reaffirm the ideal of self-determination for all the Captive Nations.

ANNEXATION BY FORCE

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to note that today is the 33d anniversary of the annexation by force of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although the Russians brazenly contend that Lithuania is one of the Soviet Socialist Republics, events since June 15, 1940, consistently demonstrate how false that assertion is. The active efforts of Lithuanian partisans from 1944 to 1952 hardly represent any love for the Soviets. The periodic uprisings within Lithuania during the last 20 years are a constant reminder that while suppression continues, acceptance does not, has not, and will not.

CXIX—1258—Part 16

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lithuanian nationalism is indeed a marvel to behold. It is so strong that all Soviet efforts to quench it have been massive failures. The Gem of the Baltic is, in sum, a great, abrasive thorn in the side of the bewildered bear. The sole solution, short of outright extermination, something even the Russians no longer can even consider, is to free Lithuania.

Thus far, the Soviet Government has not seen fit to do this. But, in the long run, it will be the only course the Russians will be able to follow. We have heard more and more about the difficulties Moscow is having with the vast diversity of nationalities under its yoke. The Russification program has yielded understandable hostility, causing great worry to the regime. The Soviets would like to think that the U.S.S.R. is a huge melting pot, as is the United States. But the melting has not happened because the joining together has been by force rather than by decision of those being absorbed.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to add my words to those of my colleagues which will commemorate this sad date in Lithuania's history.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS

HON. THAD COCHRAN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today my cosponsorship of two bills that will better provide education and health benefits to our veterans.

H.R. 2254 will remove the time limitation under which an eligible veteran may exercise his educational benefits. A great many of our veterans are unable to exercise these benefits immediately upon returning from their service to our Nation. This measure will encourage these deserving Americans to upgrade their job skills which in many cases have become outdated during their tenure in the military.

Many of our veterans are becoming more and more aware that the unemployment statistics are highest among those who are least skilled. This bill will give many veterans a second chance for a decent job and a decent life.

The second bill I am cosponsoring will help to alleviate a different, but no less deserving, problem common to a group of veterans who have paid a very high price in the service of their country. I am referring to the veteran who has 100-percent disability.

H.R. 8071 provides that veterans in this category will be able to receive emergency treatment at non-Veterans' Administration hospitals at Government expense in cases where travel to a VA facility would endanger life.

I feel that these Americans deserve this consideration, and I trust my colleagues in the House will support both of these measures to assist this most deserving group.

I. F. STONE ON IMPEACHMENT:
PART I

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I. F. Stone has just published a three part series on the subject of impeachment in the New York review of books. Although it includes a review of two recent books on the subject of Raoul Berger's Impeachment: The Constitutional Problems, and Michael Les Benedict's The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson, the series also stands by itself as an excellent and thoughtful study of the nature of impeachment and its relevance to current developments in the executive branch of our Government.

The first item discusses the issue of whether the President is subject to subpoena before a court or grand jury, considering especially the 1807 treason trial of Aaron Burr, in which Chief Justice John Marshall, sitting as trial judge, issued a subpoena to President Thomas Jefferson. I include the text of this article at the conclusion of my remarks, and will insert the following two articles in succeeding issues of the RECORD:

The articles follow:

IMPEACHMENT

(By I. F. Stone)

I

The Federalist Papers explained that the new Constitution allowed for an exception to the doctrine of separation of powers. It provided for "a partial intermixture" in certain special cases. This was defended as "necessary to the mutual defense of the several members of the government against each other." So the President was given a veto over the legislature and the Congress the judicial power of impeachment as "an essential check . . . upon the encroachments of the executive." Impeachment was to be a "method of National Inquest into the conduct of public men," a way to try "the abuse or violation of some public trust."

There are two reasons for seriously considering the impeachment of Richard Nixon. One is that this may prove the only kind of legal proceeding in which the President's complicity in the unfolding Watergate and related scandals may be fully and fairly determined. The other is that only so grave a step may deter a future President from the abuses charged against the Nixon White House. Presidential power has grown so enormously, especially since the Korean War in 1950, and the temptations this offers an incumbent and his associates are now so great that impeachment and removal from office if convicted may be the only constitutional sanction to stem the trend toward Caesarism in the White House. And Caesarism, Gibbons may remind us, was the establishment of one-man rule *without outward disturbance to the constitutional forms of the old Republic*.

The first reason for considering trial by impeachment arises from the difficulty of ensuring a President's appearance as a witness in any ordinary court of law, much less before a grand jury. Even as the special prosecutor Cox takes over, there are already half a dozen criminal proceedings under way at different stages in various parts of the

Footnotes at end of article.

country, as outgrowths of Watergate and the related affair of the Pentagon Papers. The President, if he were a private person, would normally be sought as a witness in several or all of them; they take on more and more the aspect of a far-flung conspiracy; the filaments lead unquestionably into the White House, and to the Oval Office door. It may not be possible to arrive at a judgment of Nixon's responsibility without a chance to question him under oath, either as a witness or by interrogatories. Indeed it is possible that some indicated officials may go free when tried for lack of residential testimony or because the White House, on the blanket ground of national security, has withheld documents subpoenaed in their defense.

As this is being written the White House has burst into fury because an unnamed "Justice Department source" and "another knowledgeable source" dared to say aloud to the *Washington Post*² what is obvious to anyone following the news at all: first, that "there is an evidentiary pattern" which raises questions about the President's role in the whole affair, and second, that "the President should be given an opportunity to explain himself."

The *Post* reported that the prosecutors have therefore told the Justice Department there is justification for calling the President before the Watergate grand jury, but they are baffled about how and whether they can do it. Next day Ziegler said that Mr. Nixon would answer the questions of the prosecution neither orally nor in writing. This seems to bar not only submission to a subpoena but a voluntary appearance, or even a voluntary deposition. When asked why, Ziegler said it would be "constitutionally inappropriate." This seems to make impeachment the only way to get at the truth.

There is nothing in the Constitution, in the debates on its framing and ratification, or in its exposition in the Federalist Papers, that puts the President above the law, nor is there anything that says that serving him with a subpoena would be "constitutionally inappropriate" or that exempts him in any way from normal legal processes. There is much that suggests otherwise. The Framers of the Constitution encountered a widespread fear that the President might become a king; the impeachment power was intended to block the way. In England it could be used only against the King's ministers, never the King; here its chief object was the President himself.

The Federalist Papers said that while in England the King "is unaccountable for his administration, and his person sacred," the American President would be in no such untouchable category. They explained that a single instead of a plural executive was decided upon in order to make the Executive more accountable to public opinion and to make it easier to determine misconduct in order to remove him from office or to impose "actual punishment in cases which admit of it."³

But short of impeachment, can the President be compelled to appear in a court of law for misconduct in or out of office, or to testify in regard to the misconduct of his aides? This old constitutional controversy was freshly ventilated by a footnote to the Supreme Court's decision in the Earl Caldwell case last year. That footnote is being cited by lawyers who think the President can be made subject to court proceedings and that the impeachment process is not necessary to get at the whole truth of all the dubious activities which come under the general heading of "Watergate."

The footnote is in Mr. Justice White's opinion for the court. It is appended to his reiteration of the "long standing principle that 'the public has a right to every man's evidence,' except for those persons protected by a constitutional, common law or statutory

privilege." The footnote seems to imply that even the President has no such privilege for it says,

In *US v. Burr*, 25 F. Cas. 30, 34 (Cir. Ct. D. Va. 1807) (No. 14,692d), Chief Justice Marshall, sitting on Circuit, opined that in proper circumstances, a subpoena could be issued to the President of the United States.⁴

The Burr trial in 1807 was the only occasion on which a subpoena to a President was ever issued. Chief Justice Marshall's opinion in that case—where he presided over the trial on circuit, as Supreme Court justices did in those days—is the only "law" bearing directly and precisely on the question. Aaron Burr was on trial for treason. A scant few months earlier the President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, in a special message to Congress had declared Burr's guilt "placed beyond question." This message was based on a letter to Jefferson from a most unsavory character, General James Wilkinson,⁵ who had turned informer. Burr's lawyers asked that the President and the letter be subpoenaed.

It is hard to imagine circumstances that could more overwhelmingly justify a subpoena. Jefferson and Burr were old party rivals and bitter enemies; a tie vote between them in the electoral college in 1800 threw the election into the House of Representatives and almost cost Jefferson the Presidency. To declare Burr guilty in advance of trial was a gross abuse of power. The President, according to Leonard W. Levy's *Jefferson and Civil Liberties: The Darker Side* (Belknap Press, Harvard, 1968), "acted himself as prosecutor, superintending the gathering of evidence, locating witnesses, taking depositions, directing trial tactics, and shaping public opinions as if judge and juror for the nation." There is ample evidence for that harsh verdict.

The trial of Burr was not only a struggle between him and Jefferson, but between Jefferson and Marshall, the radical Democrat and the conservative Federalist. The Chief Justice, in deciding that a "subpoena duces tecum" could be issued—requiring Jefferson to appear with documents—based his reasoning on a principle which had been dear to the Jeffersonian Democrats. It was they who always insisted that the President was no king, and had constantly accused the Federalists of trying to make him an uncrowned monarch. In the unsuccessful impeachment of Supreme Court Justice Chase in 1804-1805 for his intemperate conduct in the Alien and Sedition Law cases in 1798-1800, one of their complaints was his refusal to subpoena President John Adams in the trial of Jefferson's friend, Thomas Cooper, for seditious libel.

It had always been the Federalists who argued that the President was answerable to no judicial process but impeachment. Now in the Burr trial Chief Justice Marshall ruled that the law of evidence, i.e., the law as it was developed in the mother country, allowed for only one exception to the persons who might be summoned for the defense in criminal trials, and that was the King. "It is a principle of the English constitution," he said, "that the King can do no wrong," and "although he may, perhaps, give testimony, it is said to be incompatible with his dignity to appear under the process of the court." But the Chief Justice said one of the differences between a president and a king was that the former "may be impeached, and may be removed from office on high crimes and misdemeanors." He also said the first magistrate of the Union was no different, in so far as judicial process is concerned, from the chief magistrates of the States under the Articles of Confederation, and they were all subject to subpoena.⁶

This was good Jeffersonian doctrine and no doubt explains why counsel for the government at least twice admitted this during the trials—for there were actually two trials of Burr, one for treason and then, after his acquittal, another for misdemeanor. "A sub-

poena may issue for him [the President]," Alexander MacRae of the government's staff admitted, "as against any other man." But he argued that the President was not bound to disclose "confidential communications."⁷ The prosecutors of Burr agreed on two occasions that the President was subject to a general subpoena, i.e., an order to appear and to testify. But they insisted that he was not subject to a *subpoena duces tecum*, i.e., an order not only to appear but to bring with him documents he considered confidential.

Marshall ruled to the contrary. The real obstacle he confronted was not in the realm of constitutional theory but in that of power. What was the Chief Justice to do if the President declined to obey? Have federal marshals arrest the President for contempt? Put him in jail until he agreed to testify?

Both Marshall and Jefferson backed away from a confrontation. In this, as in other instances, Marshall was careful not to push assertions of judicial power so far as to undermine the principles he was trying to establish. For his part, Jefferson was not anxious publicly to put himself in a position where he would be flouting his own democratic principles; in this case, in putting the Presidency above the law. Marshall issued the *subpoena duces tecum* but it was never served on Jefferson.⁸ Even had it been served, Marshall's opinion left Jefferson a face-saving way out. The loophole was pointed out by the late Supreme Court Justice Burton, in an essay on Marshall's conduct at the trial of Burr.⁹ "The Chief Justice," he wrote, "stated that, while this [the issuance of the subpoena at the request of the defense] was the court's inescapable duty, it remained for the President to indicate in the return whether his executive duties would constitute a sufficient reason for not obeying it."

Jefferson for his part was prepared to use just such a loophole. Before receiving Marshall's decision on the subpoena, Jefferson pointed out in a letter to Burr's prosecutor that Burr was the central figure in an alleged conspiracy. Other trials linked with Burr's were being held "in St. Louis and other places on the western waters." To comply with calls for personal appearance at these various trials "would leave the nation without an executive branch," while the executive "is so constantly necessary, that it is the sole branch which the Constitution requires to be always in function." Jefferson said the Constitution "could not then mean that it [the executive] should be withdrawn from its station by any coordinate authority." But he did offer to give testimony by deposition, an offer which was never taken up by the defense.

In a second letter to the prosecutor two days later, after seeing Marshall's opinion, Jefferson took a stronger line, though only in this private letter and not in a public declaration to the court. "The leading principle" of the Constitution, he insisted, was the independence from each other of the three branches of government. "But would the executive be independent of the judiciary," he went on, "if he were subject to the commands [italics in original] of the latter, and to imprisonment for disobedience; if the several courts could band him from pillar to post, keep him constantly trudging from north to south and east to west, and withdraw him entirely from his constitutional duties?" This was hyperbole of Nixonian proportions. Marshall was certainly not trying to "band him from pillar to post."

Jefferson indicated that he was prepared to resist a subpoena for his personal appearance by force, and that the Constitution had given him more force than the Chief Justice with this very purpose in mind! "The intention of the Constitution," as Jefferson put it, in stately but fallacious language, "that each branch should be independent of the others, is further manifested by the means it has furnished to each, to protect itself from enterprises of force attempted on them by

the others, and to none has it given more effectual or diversified means than to the executive."¹⁰ Jefferson had an army and navy, the Chief Justice only a handful of marshals. The corollary would be that the President could override the Supreme Court because he had more battalions than the Chief Justice. This was on a par with Jefferson's conduct generally in the Burr case, which remains a blemish on his libertarian record.

But after all these bold, though private, affirmations of defiant power, Jefferson hedged by supplying the desired document to the prosecutor. The prosecutor—to quote Mr. Justice Burton's account again—"later announced that he had the requested letter in his possession and was ready to produce it." The submission of the letter by the President was thus voluntary—in form at least. But with it Jefferson made sweeping claims of executive privilege which Nixon can also use. "All nations," Jefferson wrote the prosecutor, forgetting that most of the nations he referred to were hardly models of freedom for our young Republic, "have found it necessary for the advantageous conduct of their affairs, [that] some of these executive proceedings, at least, should remain known to their executive functionary only. He, of course, from the nature of his case, must be the sole judge of which of them the public interests will permit publication."¹¹ Such was the heady effect of the presidency even on Jefferson when he set out to wreak vengeance on a hated rival.

But the battle between Jefferson and Marshall was like one of those bouts in which the antagonists make the most devastating faces at each other, emitting blood-curdling screams, yet somehow never come to blows. Jefferson's sweeping assertions of executive privilege were confined to private correspondence. Attorney General Rogers in 1958, during the Eisenhower Administration, nonetheless cited them as precedents in a memorandum which asserted—in more sweeping fashion than ever before—the President's power to withhold information from Congress. They will undoubtedly be cited again as precedents for withholding information from the courts should Nixon's testimony be sought, or White House documents subpoenaed, in prosecutions growing out of the Watergate scandal.¹²

The Rogers memorandum, in defense of the White House claim to "uncontrolled discretion" to withhold information, said Marshall ruled in the Burr case that "the President was free to keep from view such portions of the letter which the President deemed confidential in the public interest. The President alone was judge of what was confidential." A painstaking study by Raoul Berger for a forthcoming book on executive privilege has demonstrated that this completely overstates the case and the circumstances.¹³

Actually, on the document subpoenaed, as on the personal appearance of Jefferson, a confrontation was avoided. The prosecutor, George Hay, had objected that it was improper to subpoena the document because it was a private letter to Jefferson and "might contain state secrets, which could not be divulged without endangering the national safety." Jefferson nonetheless furnished it "voluntarily," so to speak, and left it to Hay "to withhold communication of any parts of the letter which are not directly material for the purposes of justice."¹⁴ He made no claim that it contained state secrets.

Jefferson neither tried to exercise the absolute privilege he had claimed nor delegated it to Hay. On the contrary, as Berger points out, Hay emphasized that "he was willing to show the entire letter to the court to suppress so much of the letter as was not material to the case." Far from asserting absolute privilege, Berger shows, "the government was perfectly willing to leave it to the court to determine whether portions of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

letter were in fact privileged. It insisted only that the portions so adjudged should be withheld from the defendant." More will be heard of this argument in the Burr case as similar issues arise in the trial of the Watergate cases.

The issue in the Burr trials was complicated because the defense objected, as Berger relates, "that the court could not judge whether the confidential portions were relevant to the defense until that defense was fully disclosed, and that defendants were not required to make such disclosure until they had put in their case."¹⁵ The issue was never resolved. Though Marshall issued at least one subpoena to Jefferson, and perhaps a second,¹⁶ neither was actually served on the President and he succeeded in avoiding an appearance. As for the Wilkinson letter to Jefferson, it was never introduced into evidence, though Jefferson—as we have seen—supplied a copy to the prosecutor. A subpoena *duces tecum* was finally served on Hay.¹⁷ But for some reason the defense never pressed the issue to a conclusion.¹⁸ The battle ended in a draw; Marshall laid down the law, but was unable to enforce it against a recalcitrant President. That has been the pattern ever since.

What history shows is that any President who chooses to defy a subpoena, as Nixon has said he will, can get away with it, though the defiance may bring dismissals in criminal cases and lost verdicts by default in civil cases. But the President himself can go scot free. That leaves only impeachment. Even on impeachment a President cannot be compelled to testify before the Senate when the charges against him are tried, or even to answer by deposition if he chooses not to. But not to answer those charges would be to abandon a full defense and make his acquittal less likely.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Nos. LXIV and LXVI, Everyman's Library, pp. 333, 337, and 338.

² The May 29 story was by the redoubtable team of Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward, who have made journalistic history in the Watergate affair.

³ No. LXX, Everyman's Library, p. 362.

⁴ *Branzburg v. Hayes* (June 29, 1972), Footnote 26 to the majority opinion.

⁵ Described in Samuel Eliot Morison and Henry Steele Commager, *Growth of the American Republic* (Oxford, 1962), vol. 1, pp. 389-390, as a man "still in Spanish pay while Governor of Louisiana Territory and ranking General of the US Army" who had already discussed with Burr a wild scheme to "liberate" Mexico from Spain. He then decided Burr was "worth more to betray than to befriend" and sent Jefferson "a lurid letter" denouncing what he termed a "conspiracy to dismember the Union."

⁶ *U.S. v. Burr* (Case No. 14,692d) 25 Fed. Cas., p. 34.

⁷ Albert J. Beveridge, *Marshall* (Houghton, Mifflin, 1919), vol. 3, p. 438. Chief Prosecutor Hay also made the same admission and argued the same distinction when motion for the subpoena was first argued.

⁸ For this bit of information in a murky situation I am indebted to Professor Julian P. Boyd of Princeton who is now editing what will be the definitive edition of Jefferson's works.

⁹ See his *Occasional Papers* (Bowdoin College, 1969), p. 52.

¹⁰ The letters may be found in Randall's *Life of Jefferson* (New York, 1858), vol. 3, pp. 210-212.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

¹² The memorandum may be found at pp. 551-566 of Hearings by the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers, of the Senate Judiciary Committee, 92nd Congress, 1st Session, on Executive Privilege: The Withholding of Information by the Executive, and S1125, July 27 to August 5, 1971, over which Senator Ervin presided.

¹³ The preliminary results of his re-

searches—drawn upon here—were published in "Executive Privilege v. Congressional Inquiry," *UCLA Law Review*, vol. 12, No. 5, August, 1965. The memo is quoted on pp. 1109-1110.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 1107-1108. The italics seem to be Berger's.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1108.

¹⁶ Beveridge's surmise in his biography of Marshall, vol. 3, p. 522, based on a reference in a letter by Jefferson to the prosecutor.

¹⁷ This, the most elusive fact amid all the complexities which bedeviled me in preparing this article, I finally pinned down on p. 520, vol. 3 of Beveridge's *Marshall*. Beveridge gives as his authority David Robertson (*Trials of Aaron Burr*, vol. 2, pp. 513-514), the reporter who covered Burr's trials and who published his account in 1808. I was unable to locate a copy.

¹⁸ Beveridge's *Marshall*, vol. 3, p. 522.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 33d anniversary of the forceful annexation of the peace-loving people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviet Union. Yet the brave people of the Baltic States have never lost their determination to resist their captors and regain their freedom.

The post-war history of Lithuania bears grim testimony to this rejection of forcible incorporation. From 1944 to 1952, anti-Soviet partisans struggled for freedom against the Soviet military occupation in protracted guerrilla warfare at a cost of over fifty thousand Lithuanian lives. During Stalin's era, over one-sixth of the Lithuanian people were deported to Russia and Siberia in an effort to depopulate and subjugate the Lithuanian nation.

To this very day, Lithuanians are risking and sacrificing their lives in defiance of the Communist regime, and they continue in their struggle for the right of national self-determination and individual religious and political rights. The United States has never recognized the forceful annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. This steadfast policy of the United States gives succor to the Lithuanian people and reinforces their determination to await national independence while it also discourages the Soviet policies of Russification and effective absorption of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

The 89th Congress passed, by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 416 to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia before the United Nations and other international forums and to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of restoration of rights to the Baltics. I call for support of the spirit of this resolution and hope that attention will continue to be centered on the plight of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

FLAME OF LIBERTY STILL BURNS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 33d anniversary of the takeover of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union.

The brave citizens of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia have repeatedly and dramatically demonstrated over these three tragic decades that they reject the Communist regime, that it is contrary to their concept of the freedom of man, of his right to self-determination for himself, his family and his native land.

Despite discouragements and setbacks, despite the loss of more than a fourth of their population during these years of Soviet terror and occupation, the flame of liberty still burns brightly in their souls.

I wish that space in the RECORD permitted insertion of the text of The Violations of Human Rights in Soviet Occupied Lithuania, a report prepared and issued by the Lithuanian American Community, Inc., on February 16, 1973. It is a heartbreakingly résumé of the violations of every basic human right to religious freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of opinion and all the other freedoms guaranteed by the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. I would hope that my colleagues would avail themselves of this document from the Lithuanian organization, 405 Leon Avenue, Delran, N.J. 08075.

It seems to me a careful reading would convince many in the House of the need to expeditiously adopt House Concurrent Resolution 29, which I introduced in earlier Congresses and again in this, calling on the United Nations to insist on fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples, and to see that the Soviet Union abides by its U.N. membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations.

The full text of my resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 29

Whereas the United States of America was founded upon and long cherished the principles of self-determination and freedom; and

Whereas these principles, expressed in the sovereign quality of nations, are the very reason for the existence of the United Nations, as set forth in the charter of that world organization; and

Whereas the United States and all other members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves to make these principles universal and to extend their benefits to all peoples; and

Whereas, on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was accepted both by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, defining said rights as relating to citizens of all member states; and

Whereas, since 1918 Soviet communism has, through the most brutal aggression and force, deprived millions of formerly free peoples of their right to self-determination; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has unanimously expressed in Public Law 86-90, approved July 17, 1959, its revulsion at the continued enslavement of the peoples of Eastern and East Central Europe who

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

were described by the said public law as captive nations; and

Whereas the Hungarian, Polish, Czech, Slovak, Carpatho-Ruthenian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Estonian, East German, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Albanian, Ukrainian, and White Ruthenian peoples may only look to the United States and the United Nations for the restoration of their national self-determination and political independence; and

Whereas the member nations of the United Nations have failed to bring before the General Assembly for successful discussion the problem of self-determination and political independence of the peoples of Eastern Europe; and

Whereas, despite the numerous resolutions passed by the United Nations General Assembly, Russian occupation troops are still maintained in Hungary and the issue of their removal has not come up for discussion in the Assembly since 1962; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States and to the perpetuation of free civilization that the nations of the world act in concert through the forum of the United Nations in demanding national self-determination and political independence for the peoples enslaved by Communist governments; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America, in article II, section 2, vests in the President of the United States the power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties and to appoint Ambassadors: Now, therefore, be it.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to instruct the United States Ambassador to the United Nations to request at the 1968 session, that (1) the United Nations insist upon the fulfillment of its charter provisions based on self-determination of all peoples in the form of the sovereign equality of states and condemnation of colonial rule; and (2) the Soviet Union be asked to abide by its United Nations membership obligations concerning colonialism and interference with the sovereignty of other nations through the withdrawal of all Soviet Russia troops and agents from other nations now under Communist rule and through returning to their respective homelands all political prisoners now in prison and labor camps; be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States is further authorized and requested to use all diplomatic, treaty-making, and apointive powers vested in him by the Constitution of the United States to augment and support actions taken by the United States Ambassador to the United Nations in the interest of self-determination and political independence of these nations.

KINDERGARTEN CAPITOL

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in 1969, I sent a flag, labeled "this is to certify that the accompanying flag has flown over the U.S. Capitol," to the kindergarten class of Mrs. Jean Parks in Bellmawr, N.J.

Last week, just 4 years later, I received from Mrs. Parks' class, a beautiful folder, containing a picture of the class, and their most recent project, a most accurate scale model of the U.S. Capitol. I only wish that each and every Member of the Congress could see this magnificent reproduction.

June 15, 1973

I was so inspired by their work that I told the story to the Roll Call newspaper. I submit the article to the attention of my colleagues:

KINDERGARTEN CAPITOL

In 1969, Rep. John Hunt (R-NJ) sent a flag, labelled "this is to certify that the accompanying flag has flown over the United States Capitol," to the kindergarten class of Mrs. Jean Parks in Bellmawr, New Jersey.

This year, Rep. Hunt received a tiny paper flag mounted on a toothpick pole, labeled "this is to certify that the accompanying flag has flown over a model of the U.S. Capitol."

Mrs. Parks explained (on stationery tagged "Architect of the Capitol, Bellmawr, N.J.") that her kindergartners constructed the model from a diagram on the back of a Mini-Wheats cereal box, using "several milk cartons, cooky tins, paper towels, wheat paste, styrofoam, straws, and a Cool Whip bowl."

Perhaps Capitol (Washington, D.C.) Architect George White should consult with the young New Jersey recyclers before planning the West Front extension. They just might send him a few spare Cool Whip bowls.

A DAY OF REFLECTION

HON. WILLIAM M. KETCHUM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Speaker, June 15, 1940, marks the date that Lithuania was forcibly annexed into the Soviet Union. Since that time the Lithuanian people have continuously struggled to reject the oppressive Communist system from Lithuanian soil.

In 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk reaffirmed U.S. policy toward Lithuania and I think these same words bear repeating as they most certainly reflect my sincere feelings. He said:

United States support of the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for freedom and independence is reflected clearly in our refusal to recognize the forcible incorporation of your country into the Soviet Union and in the warm sympathy manifested by the American people in the Lithuanian cause.

In continuing to look resolutely toward a free and independent existence, the Lithuanian people both here and abroad have established a firm foundation for the hope of free men everywhere that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.

Sometimes, we as Americans tend to forget the hardships and the day-to-day fears that face the freedom-seeking people of the world who are subject to Communist rule. However, the brave people of Lithuania and those from the other Baltic States have never lost their determination to fight for this freedom. Over 30,000 people have lost their lives since 1940 and 1952 alone. These people are a determined and courageous people who are willing to fight for that which is denied them: religion, political belief, and human rights. They continue to risk and sacrifice their lives in order to attain that which is inalienable to all men.

We, as Americans, must never lose sight of our continued commitment for freedom, and we must never turn our backs on the freedom-loving people of the world who have the guts to continue their struggle against oppression.

June 15, 1973

I call on each and every American to pause and reflect for just a moment in recognition of the brave people of Lithuania. We must never forget them.

ELIAS BOUDINOT—PATRIOT AND THE FIRST PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 200th anniversary of the formation of the United States of America, some attention should be brought forth in honor of the men who had taken part in formulating and establishing this great Nation.

Many suggestions have been brought to the attention of the Bicentennial Commission as to what scope our celebrations will take when we celebrate the 200th anniversary.

I am of the firm belief that we should put into proper perspective the accomplishments of the many people who were a part of the growth of our Nation from its formative years and continuing through to the present time.

Among other matters, there seems to be some doubts as to who was really the first President of the United States. Many claim John Hanson for this honor, others proclaim Samuel Huntington. Now, I have received the text of a paper presented by Mr. Robert R. Atterbury, Jr., of my congressional district, outlining his reasons why Elias Boudinot of New Jersey should be considered as the first President of the United States.

Mr. Atterbury has presented his arguments very clearly and, I believe, very convincingly that Elias Boudinot should be honored with that distinction so that history may record it for all time.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues in this House can be fully informed as to this matter, I wish to include as part of my remarks the text of Mr. Atterbury's speech made before the Paramus Historical and Preservation Society at Ridgewood, N.J. on June 1, 1973.

The remarks follow:

ELIAS BOUDINOT—PATRIOT AND FIRST PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

(By Robert R. Atterbury, Jr.)

Good evening. Mrs. Norwood, when she became aware of my interest in securing for Mr. Elias Boudinot, and for the State of New Jersey, the recognition to which they are entitled during the up-coming Bi Centennial, very kindly offered me this opportunity to present to you my reasons for contending that Mr. Boudinot was, actually, the first president of the United States of America.

George Washington was, of course, the first President *under* the Constitution, but he was preceded by a number of Presidents of the Continental Congress including, at a critical point in time in relation to this discussion, Mr. Boudinot, who happened to be President of the Continental Congress in April of 1783.

Senator Mathias, of Maryland, is strongly sponsoring John Hanson for this honor, and Representative Steele, of Connecticut, is sponsoring Samuel Huntington, and we will examine their claims later.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Perhaps some of you have not heard of Elias Boudinot previously, as history has not accorded him the attention he deserves, and so if you will bear with me for a short time I would like to give you a brief sketch of the man.

Elias Boudinot, born May 2nd, 1740, was the fourth by that name and lived until October 24th, 1821. He studied law under Richard Stockton, who was a neighbor and who married Elias' older sister, Annis. Later, on April 21st, 1762 Elias married Richard's sister, Hannah Stockton.

It was said of him that "neither a classical academy education, baptism by George Whitefield nor early and arduous study of law could mar the serenity of Elias' temper or the poise of his good sense."

On June 11th, 1774 he became one of nine original members of the Committee of Correspondence for Essex County in connection with a proposal to call a Continental Congress and in March 1775 he and William Livingston hurried the New Jersey Assembly into approving the proceedings of the First Continental Congress.

As a member of the New Jersey Provincial Congress, to which he was chosen in 1775, he was successful in obtaining eight or ten half casks of powder which he sent to General Washington at a time when the army was down to eight rounds per man and was the first such powder to reach Washington in response to this urgent appeal.

On the evening of April 23, 1775, as Chairman of the Committee of Safety in his home town of Elizabeth Town (now just Elizabeth) he received a copy of the alarm sent out by the committee of Watertown, near Boston, to raise the country and advise of the battle of Lexington. He was also one of two men sent to the Continental Congress in Philadelphia to seek advice. In April 1776 he thwarted Dr. John Witherspoon's attempt to rush New Jersey into declaring independence.

On June 6, 1777 Mr. Boudinot was appointed Commissary General of Prisoners and head of Intelligence with the rank of Colonel. Because he could not get any money or supplies from the Congress, as he had been promised, and because Gen. Washington implored him to serve, Mr. Boudinot put up \$30,000 of his own money and all his personal credit into caring for the prisoners held by the British. In this effort, General Washington promised to share half the loss should there be any. Eventually, after much difficulty, Mr. Boudinot recovered most of these funds.

November 20, 1777 Mr. Boudinot was elected a delegate to the Continental Congress, and while a member served on over thirty committees, usually as chairman.

November 4th, 1782 Mr. Boudinot was elected President of the Continental Congress and, in that capacity signed, on April 11th, 1783, the Proclamation declaring a cessation of arms and on April 15th, 1783 the Congress ratified and Mr. Boudinot signed a preliminary treaty with Great Britain whereby the Crown acknowledged that the thirteen colonies were free and sovereign and independent states. It is at this point, I maintain, that the United States of America actually came into being.

On October 18, 1783 President Boudinot signed a proclamation establishing the 2nd Thursday in December as a day of public Thanksgiving, discharging the army, and removing Congress to Princeton, N.J. This, so far as is known, is the origin of Thanksgiving Day as we know it today.

Boudinot presided at Nassau Hall when General Washington was formally thanked for his services and also escorted Washington to New York for his inaugural after the adoption of the Constitution. Incidentally, he was also one of four men involved in the design of the Great Seal of the United States of America.

He helped obtain ratification of the Con-

stitution and was himself elected to the House of Representatives in the First, Second and Third Congresses thereunder. He was the first Counsellor named by the United States Supreme Court and he led the defense of Alexander Hamilton in the assault upon his conduct of the Federal Treasury. He was appointed by George Washington to succeed Mr. Rittenhouse as Director of the Mint in Philadelphia, in which capacity he served from 1795 until 1805 when he resigned July 1st to study the Bible. He wrote several books, helped organize and was the first president of the American Bible Society.

Mr. Boudinot was greatly interested in attempts to educate the Indians and even allowed a Cherokee attending a mission school to take his name. He also aided deaf mutes and the poor. Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography refers to him as Doctor Boudinot, but I have not as yet found out how he acquired that title—probably an honorary degree from Princeton.

Elias Boudinot was a very close personal friend of George Washington. Benjamin Franklin was a neighbor in Philadelphia and when Alexander Hamilton, at fifteen years of age, arrived in this country in November 1772 from the West Indies he carried with him a letter of introduction to Elias Boudinot who took him into his home and sent him to school.

It is also of interest to note that his Father was part of a syndicate that purchased 42,500 acres comprising the present Township of Franklin, HoHoKus and Ridgewood.

Benjamin Franklin appointed him (the Father) Postmaster at Princeton. He also had a 1/13 interest in the Wawayanda Patent and copper interests near New Brunswick.

So much for the historical record. Now let us get on to the serious business of President Boudinot's right to be recognized as the First President of the United States of America, and the State of New Jersey's right and obligation to press for that recognition.

Let us, now, examine the merits of the claims put forth by Senator Mathias and Representative Steele.

Representative Steele's claim on behalf of Samuel Huntington rests upon the fact that Mr. Huntington was President of the Continental Congress when the Articles of Confederation were ratified in 1781 and remained in that position. As Rep. Steele said in his letter to me dated July 1st, 1971, "The claim of both Senator Mathias and me assumes one basic theory: that the first government of the United States was under the Articles." This, of course, is the claim that I dispute.

Senator Mathias bases his claim upon the fact that John Hanson (who preceded Elias Boudinot and whose coach Elias purchased when he assumed office) was the first President *elected* under the Articles. It is interesting to note, however, that Mr. Hanson was elected "President of the Confederacy."

My contention is that the Continental Congresses, both before and after the adoption of the Articles of Confederation, were only ad hoc committees, not fully recognized by the colonists and not at all recognized officially by any foreign power.

The United States did not exist, in fact, until President Boudinot signed the preliminary treaty with Great Britain; at which time, and in which manner, the Crown acknowledged the independence of the colonies. This is what created a new nation and gave status to the new government which was shortly given full diplomatic and international recognition by foreign governments which proceeded to assign ministers whose credentials were submitted to, and received by, Elias Boudinot as President of the United States of America. President Boudinot also signed treaties in that capacity with Spain, France, Holland and Sweden.

This, it seems to me, establishes beyond contradiction, that Elias Boudinot was the first President of the United States of America.

It is true that, when signing the Proclama-

tion for the cessation of arms, Mr. Boudinot signed "XXX in the year of our Lord 1783 and of our Sovereignty and Independence the Seventh," indicating that he dated the existence of the United States of America from the Declaration of Independence in 1776. However, I think that this was a bit of colonial bombast, and I am sure that Jefferson Davis signed documents similarly and considered the Confederacy (or should I say the second Confederacy?) to have existed since the dates of secession.

Had George Washington suffered the same fate as Robert E. Lee, the Declaration of Independence would not have any greater effect today than the Secessions of the Civil War period.

How close it came to that during those seven long years may be realized when one considers that Alfred Hoyt Price writes in his "New Jersey and the Revolutionary War" that in December 1776 (six months after the Declaration of Independence) "the State government virtually ceased to exist, its more prominent members going into hiding and the Continental Congress had de-camped to the safety of Baltimore," and also that 2,700 New Jersey citizens including members of the Assembly sought the King's pardon and renewed their allegiance to the Crown. He also writes that "in several districts the Loyalists were in the majority. The pressure of the British army in New York and on Staten Island and the British warships in the Hudson for seven of the eight years of the war made loyalty to the Crown as popular as it was safe in neighboring Bergen and Essex counties! On January 12th, 1783 Alexander Hamilton wrote 'Every day proves more and more the insufficiency of the confederation, and at this time several states including Delaware, Maryland and Georgia had not even sent delegates, and many delegates did not attend the Congress.'

How close collapse was may be gathered from the writing of Mr. Boudinot himself, in his Journal of Events of the Revolution. He wrote that in the autumn of 1777, with the army at White Marsh and the enemy at Chestnut Hill with George Washington opposite, the British withdrew and "Thus the defeat of the American Army was again providentially prevented" and again "another providential escape of our army happened at Morris Town in the year 1777-8". Thus it is obvious that the Continental Congress, the Articles of Confederation notwithstanding, was in dire danger.

In February of 1778 in reply to General George Washington's urgent plea for wagons to haul provisions to Valley Forge, Governor Livingston wrote "it is impossible for this State to cure the blunders of those whose business it is to provide for the army; and considering what New Jersey has suffered by the war, I am justly certain it cannot hold out another year if the rest will not furnish their proportionable share of provisions."

One must remember that not only were most of the important battles fought in New Jersey or on its perimeters, but the Jerseymen, either with the Continental Army or as Militia, did more than their share of the fighting.

The American and British armies had twice swept through the State, foraging and pillaging as they went, and twice swept back upon New York.

The question of the French alliance is bound to come up, and probably some will contend that France did recognize the United States, and brought Spain in with her. It is true that secret representations, such as Silas Deane, were sent to seek aid from France. The Count Vergennes kept Deane waiting so long that he was packing to go home in despair when news of Saratoga reached Paris and the Count sent his man, Girard, to fetch Deane.

The New Larned History says that Ver-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

gennes, in March of 1776, had discussed with his associates in the cabinet the advisability of the two crowns (Spain and France) taking advantage of England's preoccupation with the colonies and whether it would be politic to give the insurgents secret assistance. Vergennes went on to say that Providence had evidently chosen that very hour for humiliating England and that by rendering the assistance of the Americans as desperate as possible the exhaustion caused by the internecine war would prostrate both England and the colonies and afford an opportunity to reduce England to the condition of a second rate power. Not being able to do that, he went on to suggest secret assistance. The New Larned History also goes on to point out that "It is a settled rule of diplomacy that a minister should not be pressed upon a foreign court by which it is understood that he will not be received." In disregard of this rule the colonists did send agents to several foreign courts where, save eventually for France, they were not received. Thus "The policy of sending ministers to European courts where such ministers were not received worked injuriously to the United States from the mere fact of their non-recognition."

After Saratoga, Count Vergennes became anxious for a treaty including Spain. Spain hoped to secure her borders on this continent and at the same time regain Gibraltar. France wanted anything that would disconcert England and to secure fishing rights in our coastal waters.

John Richard Green writes in his "Short History of England", The World's Great Classics, by the Colonial Press, copyright 1899: "XXX and by the yet more fatal news that this disaster (Saratoga) had roused the Bourbon courts to avenge the humiliation of the Seven Years War" by concluding an alliance with the revolutionists. When peace was discussed with Spain and France, Spain refused to suspend hostilities without the return of Gibraltar and France proposed that England give up all her Indian conquests except Bengal. But England fixed them.

The colonies became tired of waiting and made their own peace, which was a prelude to treaties with the Bourbon powers.

The Beaumarchais incident is another case in point. In 1778 Silas Deane went to France as our first secret agent. After having finally met with Count Vergennes, arrangements are made through an intermediary, a Monsieur Beaumarchais, for an old frigate loaded with everything wanted. The British found out about it and made spirited protest to the King of France, with whom they were temporarily at peace, and the King issued a strong proclamation promising death, etc. to anyone connected with such a scheme and ordered the frigate unloaded. It was, but its cargo was loaded on three merchant vessels at night and they arrived safely. It was well understood by Congress that this was a gift from the King of France but when someone, thought to have been Thomas Paine, let the cat out of the bag, Congress received a "warm memorial" from the French Government and Congress had to deny that the King had anything to do with it and assert that the shipment was a common mercantile contract. Thereupon, Beaumarchais called upon Congress to pay the whole purchase price with interest. This incident in itself, even though an open alliance was later hastily contrived, is proof that France did not in reality regard the Continental Congress as a bona fide government but rather as a tool with which to get at the English. It seems to me that the aid she gave to the colonies, aside from Lafayette which was personal, was much the same as the aid England later gave to the South during the Civil War.

It would be possible to continue in this way, but I hope that the point has been made sufficiently.

June 15, 1973

References for the information contained herein include Elias Boudinot by George Adams Boyd, The New Larned History, Dictionary of American Biography, Journal of Events of the Revolution by Elias Boudinot, New Jersey and the Revolutionary War by Alfred Hoyt Bill, Short History of the English People by John Richard Green, (The World's Great Classics) and Appleton's Cyclopedic, all of which, except Green's Short History of England, can be obtained through the Public Library in Ridgewood.

Thank you for your patience.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. COTTER, Mr. Speaker, today is a sorrowful day for Americans of Lithuanian descent. For on this date in 1940, Lithuania was forcibly annexed into the Soviet Union, beginning a sad era in its history which continues to this day. Yet, despite more than 30 days of political and religious repression, attempts at depopulation, and other tragic hardships, the struggle for Lithuanian freedom goes on. The courage and sacrifice of these determined people was brought home with new force last year by the mass demonstrations of protest against Soviet occupation, culminated by the self-immolation of three Lithuanian youths. These actions demonstrate beyond the ability of words that the Lithuanian people have not acquiesced to annexation, but rather still strive for independence and freedom.

Let us take the time on this sad anniversary to recognize that this valiant struggle is still going on, to remember our obligation to those who quest for, and are willing to sacrifice to attain, freedom, and to acknowledge the efforts to gain national self-determination by Lithuanians the world over, with the fervent hope that they will be successful.

BEATITUDES FOR BUSINESSMEN

HON. MARK ANDREWS

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, Harry E. Olson, Jr., senior pastor of Messiah Lutheran Church in Fargo, N. Dak., some time ago wrote "Beatitudes for Businessmen." With the present day tension and atmosphere of distrust, I felt that I would like to share these thoughts with my colleagues and friends so I am asking consent that they be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Harry Olson, incidentally, is the first clergyman from North Dakota to have been invited as guest chaplain for a session of the House of Representatives. We are very proud of him and I am sure that his words will continue to have a profound effect on people everywhere.

BEATITUDES FOR BUSINESSMEN

(By Harry E. Olson Jr.)

Blessed will be the man who will trust other men.

Blessed will be the man who is determined to control himself.

Blessed will be the man who not only counts his blessings but makes his blessings count.

Blessed will be the man who can turn his barricades into bridges.

Blessed will be the man who works hard but does not press.

Blessed will be the man who does not demand achievement but deserves it.

Blessed will be the man who is willing not only to improve his circumstances but more willing to improve himself.

and its sister republics Estonia and Latvia, and I hope it never will.

Those of the Lithuanian people who have not been murdered or deported have not accepted the absorption of their nation by the Soviet Empire, although it is all but impossible for them to protest effectively. Two million Americans of Lithuanian stock have not accepted the obliteration of their ancestral home from the map of Europe. Like their friends and relatives across the sea they hope and pray that the hell of communism will, like the earlier hell of national socialism, soon come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, more than 70 new countries have joined the family of nations since the end of World War II. It would be merely an act of simple justice for the Soviet Union to restore freedom to Lithuania and its Baltic neighbor.

the state of Lithuania. Anniversaries are either occasions for joy or despair. This Lithuania anniversary is an occasion for despair. The Lithuanian people have continuously struggled to reject the oppressive Communist system from Lithuanian soil ever since the forcible annexation on June 15, 1940. Regrettably, a generation has grown to adulthood without knowing the blessing of freedom, democracy and justice.

From 1944 to 1952, anti-Soviet partisans struggled for freedom against the Soviet military occupation in protracted guerrilla warfare with a loss of 50,000 Lithuanian lives.

During the Stalin era, more than one-sixth of the Lithuanian population was deported to Russia and Siberia.

Not long ago a Lithuanian youth burned himself as a martyr in protest against the denial of the right of national self-determination, the denial of religious freedom, political freedom and the denial of human rights by the Soviet Union.

The United States has never recognized the forceful annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic States into the Soviet Union. We should maintain this steadfast policy and hopefully this will keep the flame of hope burning in the hearts of the freedom loving citizens of Lithuania until such time as they are granted self-determination.

THE TRAGEDY OF LITHUANIA

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today is the 33d anniversary of the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. Almost a third of a century has elapsed since the people of that small republic lost their national independence and their individual freedoms. Our Nation has never recognized the conquest of Lithuania

THE PLIGHT OF LITHUANIA

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 15, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is the 33d anniversary of the forcible annexation into the Soviet Union of

SENATE—Monday, June 18, 1973

The Senate met at 11 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we turn to Thee in faith and trust, for Thou alone art the source of our joy and peace, and of all wisdom and strength. Without Thee we lose our way. Confusion and uncertainty overcome clarity and certitude. But with Thee there is wisdom and strength. By the light of Thy presence guide us through the maze of our strange and difficult times. Overrule our human errors by the magnitude of Thy grace. Keep us ever faithful to Thy commandments revealed in Thy word and to the law of love made known in the cross. At the end, may we hear the divine approbation, "Well done, good and faithful servant." And to Thee shall be the glory and the praise. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 12, 1973, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1235) to amend Public Law 90-553, authorizing an additional appropriation for an International Center for Foreign Chanceries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 15, 1973, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEONID BREZHNEV'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the field of foreign policy, President Nixon has been extraordinarily successful as attested to by his visit to Peking, the promulgation of the Nixon doctrine and, incidentally, the reduction of U.S. military forces overseas from 3.5 million men to 2.3 million, an adjunct to our foreign policy, and his visit to Moscow and the agreements reached there.

President Nixon extended an invitation to Mr. Brezhnev over a year ago. It was accepted some months ago, and now Mr. Brezhnev is here in this country as a guest of this Nation.

While here, I do not expect Mr. Brezhnev to discuss our internal affairs, which are entirely outside his ken, as he has so stated; and the same would apply to any other representative of a foreign country or ours in other countries.

Mr. President, I, for one, do not fear that we will be "taken in" by Mr. Brezhnev. I have full faith in the President of the United States in the conduct of foreign affairs, in which area he has been most successful. I do not downgrade this meeting between Mr. Brezhnev and President Nixon although, frankly, I do not expect anything of a highly significant nature to emerge therefrom.

I would assume that they would discuss trade matters, space matters, energy matters, and the like, and that there would be final agreements announced on the basis of negotiations, heretofore