

June 1, 1965

11701

Be there. Spark their imagination with a battery of your own shocking ideas. You'll get a charge out of it.

VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, writing in today's Washington Post, Edward T. Follard calls patience and stamina our Nation's most needed requirements in connection with the pursuit of the war in South Vietnam. His reference is to patience and stamina on the part of all the American people.

Other Senators have stated, here on this floor, that Communist governments, particularly those in Hanoi and Peiping, are betting on American's well-known impatience, and believe that we shall tire of the constant demands of pursuing a faraway war. Many of us have regretted the attention given to those who already have tired of the struggle and want our Government to extricate us, for these well-publicized protestors feed the hopes of Hanoi and Peiping.

Most Americans support President Johnson, who has affirmed our intention of staying in South Vietnam and seeing the battle through. Most Americans want to show the Communists that they cannot get away with aggression against their neighbors. As a nation, I am sure, we do possess the patience and stamina that are needed for the task.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Follard's article, entitled "Patience, Stamina—Vietnam Requirements," printed in the RECORD.

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

PATIENCE, STAMINA—VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS (By Edward T. Follard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn-out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 8, or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775-83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and

their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will not be defeated and will not grow tired. Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will, if necessary, carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war a police action.

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was decadent.

DOMINICAN HOPE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the "Inside Report" of reporters Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, which was published in the Washington Post of May 28, does much to clear the air regarding the American hope for the Dominican Re-

public, and to "give the lie," as they wrote, "to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors right-wing military juntas and does not trust the anti-Communist left."

According to their article, the U.S. action in Santo Domingo effectively blocked the possibility of a coup by Communist elements. As it turned out, that was an easier task than the job of gluing together a progressive government with staying power.

I ask unanimous consent that the Evans-Novak article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1965]
(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

DOMINICAN HOPE

SANTO DOMINGO.—Having liquidated the undeniable threat of another Cuba in the Caribbean, the United States is now liquidating the threat of a return to strong man, rightwing military rule.

The intense effort going into this work ought once and for all to give the lie to shrill critics who have been spreading the false rumor that President Johnson really favors rightwing military juntas and doesn't trust the anti-Communist left.

The intensity of the effort to rehabilitate the left-of-center leaders still holed up in the cobweb of narrow streets in the old city has not yet been fully reported. Nor, it should be added, has the collateral and perhaps more important effort to deal with that stubborn political primitive, Col. Antonio Imbert Barrera. Tony Imbert now claims (without a shred of proof) to hold the confidence of the whole country except for the revolutionary forces here.

The best place to start the story is in President Johnson's oval Office in the White House one day last week. Among those present were Secretary of State Dean Rusk and his Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Thomas Mann. In a voice mixed with sadness and anger, the President said he was being blamed for using the U.S. Marines to establish and support a return to military dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. Nothing could put him in a false light, the President said.

Almost as the President spoke, Tony Imbert's military forces were mopping up the last remaining rebel pockets north of the U.S.-patrolled corridor that separates the rebel forces in the heart of the city from Imbert's. This mopping up, far from proving that the United States was helping Colonel Imbert, was an essential event to permit McGeorge Bundy, the President's eyes and ears here for 10 days, to begin his serious talks with rebel leaders. Serious talks were impossible while the two sides sniped at each other.

But once the United States had the two sides apart, with 22,000 marines and paratroopers in the middle, the stage was set for serious bargaining. Subtly and ever so gently, Tony Imbert was warned that, if he continues to insist on his claim to be the head of the legitimate government, the United States might find itself unable to locate enough cash to pay Imbert's troops.

Not only that, but the United States might also not come through with budgetary-support funds which Imbert must have to pay the country's Government workers.

In the end, of course, it may be necessary to go much farther to force Imbert to agree on a non-Imbert government.

Along with this no-nonsense maneuver to cut Imbert down to size, the United States

has now reappraised Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, with interesting results.

Instead of finding a front for the most dangerous elements in the rebel camp, as Colonel Caamano had been repeatedly characterized in the past, the United States now finds a soldier-politician who is the unquestioned rebel strong arm.

Where before the shadowy figure of Hector Aristy was regarded by the United States as Caamano's gray eminence, today Caamano is described not as a tool of Aristy or of Communist elements within the rebel camp, but as his own man—trustworthy, honorable, and fully capable of keeping any agreement he finally signs.

Thus, the conclusion is inescapable that, having eliminated the possibility of a Communist coup by swift, bold action on April 28, the United States is now promoting a progressive government. The problem is to glue one together out of the wreckage of Dominican politics.

THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM—REFLECTIONS ON MEMORIAL DAY, 1965

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1965, has come and gone, but the reason for this solemn holiday still haunts the minds of some of us.

On this day, each year, the American people rouse themselves from other thoughts and pursuits, to honor the memory of the thousands of Americans who have given their last full measure of devotion in the defense of our freedom.

From thousands of bunting-draped speakers platforms in villages, hamlets, towns, and cities all over this land, once more came the oft-repeated words: "So, on this Memorial Day, we pause to honor those"—and so forth.

The speakers' words, the sound of muffled drums and taps—echoing over green fields filled with neat white crosses, row on row, soon fade away, and are forgotten as we turn again to the harsh realities which face the living. So, until next Memorial Day most of us will forget the real significance of the day: the fact that without the sacrifices of our honored dead, our free Nation and the world as we know it would not exist.

We also tend to forget the fact that throughout our history there have been extraordinary men—heroes—who have given that extra measure of devotion, and by their example have inspired others to rise to greater heights in defending freedom in its hours of danger.

Most conspicuous among those heroes are the comparative handful of men who are entitled to wear the Congressional Medal of Honor.

The Medal of Honor, our Nation's highest award for military valor, is given only to those who have acted with supreme courage, with total disregard of their own safety, in the face of the most hazardous conditions. It is bestowed by virtue of an act of Congress, and reflects our Nation's gratitude to those who, in moments of uncommon risk, offered in our defense everything they had including life itself.

Any man who has served in combat knows that many who qualify for decorations do not receive them, because their deeds of valor were not observed, or because there were no survivors to recount

them. However, this fact should not detract from the tribute we pay those who did earn our Nation's highest award for heroism.

The Medal of Honor itself is merely a token, a gesture of recognition of "Conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty," and for sacrifices which cannot be measured or repaid in terms of worldly goods.

The harsh fact that we have not always remembered and properly honored our Nation's outstanding heroes was once again forcefully brought to my attention by an article in This Week magazine which was distributed with Sunday newspapers, all over the country, on May 30.

The article, entitled "The High Cost of Heroism," was written by Joe McCarthy, and was particularly timely, coming as it did on Memorial Day.

Mr. McCarthy traced the sad history of the shameful treatment accorded some of our Congressional Medal of Honor winners. Among others, he cited the protracted tax troubles which plagued World War I hero Sgt. Alvin York.

I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to the editors of This Week magazine and author Joe McCarthy for nudging our national conscience about the manner in which some of our Nation's greatest heroes have been ill-treated, ignored, and pushed aside.

I commend this excellent article to all Senators, and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE HIGH COST OF HEROISM

(Our Medal of Honor recipients have a brief moment in the sun and unfortunately a long time in the shade.)

(By Joe McCarthy)

On this Memorial Day, as America honors its war dead, it might be well to consider how much honor is paid to our greatest war heroes—the gallant band of 283 surviving recipients of the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award for bravery "above and beyond the call of duty."

Until recently, the ceremonial recognition given regularly by the Government to the wearers of the Medal of Honor was a special red-carpet invitation to the President's inauguration. The medalists were seated in a place of prominence among the dignitaries near the President and treated as VIP's at the inaugural balls. They had to pay for the trip to Washington themselves, or hitch a ride on a military aircraft, one of the few privileges that goes with the medal. Free living quarters were available at military posts near the Capital.

"Every 4 years they made us feel pretty important," says one aging medal recipient from World War I. "We looked forward to it."

But last January, at President Johnson's inauguration, the red carpet was not rolled out. The invitation sent to Medal of Honor men included no special seats among the top-ranking guests and no tickets to the gala balls. A letter explained, regretfully, that there were no free beds for civilian medal recipients at Fort Myer or Fort McNair. By and large, those who did go to the inauguration were the few men who live near Washington.

It was said, unofficially, that the administration wanted to emphasize achievements of peace rather than the memory of wartime

heroics; the medalists singled out for special recognition at the Johnson inauguration were outstanding scientists, artists, educators, and professional people decorated with the civilian Medal of Freedom.

THE PRIVILEGES OF A MEDAL HOLDER

Along with the privilege of getting free transportation on military planes, if space and flights are available, a Medal of Honor recipient rates only two special benefits not given to other veterans. He can apply for an optional Government pension of \$100 a month after the age of 40, and, if his sons are qualified, they may obtain appointments to West Point, Annapolis, or the Air Force Academy without congressional recommendations.

It is widely assumed by servicemen that veterans wearing the Medal of Honor's blue and white-starred rosette in their lapels are legally entitled to receive a hand salute. But such a courtesy is not required by Army, Navy, or Air Force regulations.

As a matter of fact, the bill awarding the \$100 a month pension was passed by Congress a few years ago, not as a needed financial benefit but simply because the legislators realized that the medal winners were receiving little or no recognition from the Government for their wartime heroism.

The author of the pension measure, Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, himself a World War II infantry officer with the Silver Star and the Croix de Guerre, pointed out to Congress that the United States at that time was lagging far behind Britain and France in showing official gratitude to outstanding patriotic heroes. When TEAGUE introduced his pension bill, they were receiving \$10 a month after the age of 65, a pension authorized before World War I.

"The \$100 a month they're getting now isn't enough to live on, of course," a Government official said a few weeks ago. "It's just something to let them know we haven't forgotten them."

The Government official was asked if any further increase in benefits for Medal of Honor recipients was planned for the near future.

"There are no such plans," he said.

ROLLCALL OF FAME

Today's living 283 Honor Medalists range in age from 89-year-old Maj. Frank C. Anders, who won his medal in the Philippine Insurrection of 1899, to 30-year-old Capt. Roger H. C. Donlon, decorated last December by President Johnson for bravery in Vietnam. They include such well-known names as Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, Gen. Jimmy Doolittle, cowboy movie star Audie Murphy, Marine flyer Joe Foss, who was elected Governor of South Dakota and is today commissioner of the American Football League, and Charles A. Lindbergh, who was given the medal for his solo flight across the Atlantic in 1927.

Many of the medal holders have stayed on in the armed services until retirement, or are still on active duty waiting to retire, and a large number of them are in modest paying Federal and State Government jobs. There are 27 medalists working in various cities, for example, as employees of the Veterans' Administration, Department of Veterans' Benefits, the result of an order issued by President Harry S. Truman at the end of World War II directing the VA to hire any Medal of Honor recipient who applied for a job in that Department.

A typical medalist employed by the Veterans' Administration in Newark, N.J., is Nicholas Oresko, who singlehandedly charged and demolished two enemy machinegun positions in Germany in 1945, wiping out the second emplacement with grenades and rifle fire while severely wounded.

Not so typical is Henry E. "Red" Erwin, the only enlisted airman to win the medal in the Pacific in World War II, and now assigned

June 1, 1965

11695

as that headed by I. W. Abel walk with dignity and love of country. They are the envy of workers throughout the entire world. They raise their families on the "right side of the railroad tracks," to use a common expression.

Mr. President, I. W. Abel's election to the presidency of the United Steelworkers of America will benefit not only the members of his union but all American working men and women. Trade unionism today is a vital and integral part of our economy and way of life. In that sense, I. W. Abel's election will be of great benefit to the entire Nation.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSIONS TODAY AND TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Patents, Trade Marks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow, June 1 and 2, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the May 26 Philadelphia Inquirer, there appeared a clear and cogent dispatch on Vietnam by Jack Foisie. He reports that the conviction is growing in Saigon that even heightened pressure on Hanoi will not end the war in the south. He reports as well that the military situation within South Vietnam itself is quite serious.

This sort of reporting—straightforward, unemotional, factual—is of immense value to the public in understanding the situation that confronts the President as he strives to contribute to a reasoned peace in Vietnam. That has never been a simple question and it is, obviously, not getting any easier.

The article referred to points up clearly the grim choices which are looming in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

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

VIET WAR MUST BE WON IN SOUTH, EXPERTS SAY

(By Jack Foisie, special to the Inquirer and Los Angeles Times)

SAIGON, May 25.—The belief grows here that even all-out bombing of North Vietnam will not force the Communists to cease their war in the south.

Nor are the 45,000 American military men presently in South Vietnam going to be enough to win the war on the ground. Many thousands of combat troops will be needed, and even then the war will continue for years if it is to be kept nonnuclear.

This gloomy appraisal is common here. It may be due to the traditional impatience of the American, who, having been raised in a society where massive effort gets immediate results, cannot understand why it can't apply in Vietnam against the Communist concept of guerrilla warfare.

But the pessimism is evident not only among the Americans. Thoughtful Viet-

namese and foreign military men here are coming to the same conclusion. They are convinced the war can end only when the Vietcong guerrillas are whipped in the south. So strong is the enemy hold now on many regions that it will take a protracted effort involving tens of thousands of American troops to root them out of the jungles.

To have Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese leader, cry "uncle" and call off his attempt to take over the south, can never be done even by bombing Hanoi and other northern cities now inviolate under the American concept of slow escalation of air attacks.

Only the diehard airpower enthusiast believes the Communist will to resist can be broken, short of nuclear bombing. Most military men are convinced that land invasion of North Vietnam would be necessary. Even South Vietnam's leading airman, Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, advocates land invasion.

But this would put the United States in a position somewhat akin to the Russian planting of missiles in Cuba. President John F. Kennedy was willing to go to war if a hostile force remained at his doorstep. Red China's reaction certainly would be the same if Americans occupied North Vietnamese territory adjacent to China's southern border.

The bombings up north, so far restricted to the unimportant lower half, have failed appreciably to reduce infiltration of Communist-trained guerrillas. Even regular units of the North Vietnam Army now are showing up, either inside South Vietnam or just across the border in Laos. Elements of two regular North Vietnam divisions—10,000 or more men each, if at full strength—have been identified as being in the mountainous midnorthern area around Kontum.

We have bombed 27 sizable bridges and made 7 propaganda pamphlet drops in North Vietnam. The cost of these and scores of other missions conducted since the bombings began February 7 has been 43 planes lost and 25 pilots dead or captured.

But the Vietcong, losing hardly a man, have blown up as many bridges in South Vietnam in half that time. In the last 3 days they blew up four, according to the tally kept by the American military. And the foe's own propaganda efforts have been intensified to increase terrorist strikes at Government villages. There have been 200 civilian officials killed and 364 kidnaped since January 1, according to the American tally.

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR—REMARKS OF HON. ROBERT MOSES AT REOPENING OF MEXICAN PAVILION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, the address delivered by Hon. Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, 1964-65, at the inauguration of the art exhibition and reopening of the Mexican pavilion, on May 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964-65, CORP., AT THE INAUGURATION OF THE ART EXHIBITION AND REOPENING OF THE MEXICAN PAVILION, FLUSHING MEADOW, MAY 25, 1965

The Spaniards set a deep seal on every country on which her navigators and adventurers set foot in the days of discovery and colonialism. Language is only one of the heritages of their conquests. Mixed with native

culture, extraordinary civilizations developed. In Mexico this tradition has been persistent, growing, and proliferating. Here at the fair the artifacts, arts, agriculture, and burgeoning industries of Mexico mark an entirely new civilization built upon an old and a medieval one. You have leaped from primitive to Renaissance to the most advanced and sophisticated modern. Your Briareus has reached out a hundred arms to exploit all of your resources. Democracy and the social revolution have been slow to come, but now they are here in all of their enormous implications.

On the opening of this exhibit of artistic genius we offer our profound respects to a friendly neighbor on the continent we share, whose prosperity is ours, a country which has remained aloof from world wars, and whose ways are the ways of peace. We hail the priceless opportunity you offer our people to share in your institutions and progress.

In this spirit I now present to Señora de Diaz Ordaz, the wife of your distinguished President, Gustavo de Diaz Ordaz, who has done so much to usher in a new day for Mexico, a gold Unisphere charm, and our silver medallions with the symbols of our globe and of our city, as it enters its fourth century; to Prof. Fernando Gamboa, who assembled this remarkable exhibit; and to Mr. Alfonso Corona del Rosal, Secretary of National Resources. To Mr. Octaviano Campos Salas, Secretary of Industry and Commerce, and Mr. Agustin Salvat, Minister of Tourism, I present our plaques.

I now declare the exhibit officially opened.

CHIEF OF ARMY ENGINEERS LT. GEN. WALTER K. WILSON, JR., TO RETIRE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is appropriate to devote a few moments at this time to observing the retirement from public life of a man whose career has contributed to the well-being of every American and the growth and prosperity of every 1 of our 50 States—Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., the U.S. Army's Chief of Engineers.

General Wilson retires from the Army on July 1 after 36 years of truly distinguished service in war and peace. In these brief remarks I propose to touch only on the last 4 years of that service, his tenure as Chief of Engineers.

We in West Virginia have ample cause to be grateful that a man like General Wilson has been in charge of the Nation's foremost water resource development agency during those years. This is a time when we have been seeking a way out of the grip of a spiral of depression; and we have found in General Wilson and his agency a major force for hope and progress. They have not simply worked in our area, but have always tried to make their work meaningful and cooperative and responsive to our needs and our own endeavors.

Under General Wilson, the modernization of the Ohio River waterway has been pushed forward with great energy. Various major reservoirs similarly have been moved forward. A number of important studies have been advanced, notably a restudy of the Guyandot River and Justice Reservoir. Recreational developments, which we expect to be a major factor in our programs for stimulating economic growth, have been given especial impetus. Last year the Corps

of Engineers asked for and received from Congress a supplemental appropriation to accelerate project work in the Appalachian region; and this appropriation included provision for the expenditure of some \$900,000 for recreational improvements at just two major West Virginia projects—Sutton Dam and Reservoir, and Gallipolis lock and dam—plus more than \$2 million for the acceleration of work at seven or more other West Virginia projects. Finally, in response to the Appalachian Regional Development Act the Corps of Engineers under General Wilson has established a special Office of Appalachian Studies to work out programs through which the development of the water resources of the region can be fitted most effectively into overall programs for the revitalization of the regional economy.

West Virginia's experience with the Corps of Engineers is typical of that shared by all States. I am sure that every Senator here could bring forth many examples in his own State of the highly practical concern shown by the Corps of Engineers for the water problems of the American people, and General Wilson's effectiveness in translating that concern into action. One measure of this effectiveness is the fact that when General Wilson became Chief of Engineers, the Corps of Engineers' civil works construction program was about \$700 million per year; whereas now it is more than \$1 billion—a 40-percent increase in just 4 years—and this in a period of economy and retrenchment during which many Government programs were being cut back. This is a most impressive testimonial of the confidence felt by this whole Congress, representing as it does all the States of the Union, in the practical worth and the moral integrity of the Army's Corps of Engineers.

While carrying out these programs on the Nation's river basins, harbors, and sea coasts, the corps, under General Wilson, has also maintained its military construction program, which included the construction of a network of missile sites all over the Nation; has carried out unprecedented construction programs at Cape Kennedy and elsewhere in support of the national space program; and has played a leading role in recovery and reconstruction activities after several great natural disasters, including the Alaskan earthquake of last year and great floods this year.

One concluding observation: In commending the career of General Wilson as one of the Nation's great engineers and planners and executives, I have had at the same time to commend the corps which he has led. The fact is that the corps, under his leadership, has worthily carried forward a tradition of ability and integrity that goes back generations into the past, and is rivaled by few, if any, organization, anywhere in the world—a tradition which, I am confident, will be maintained with equal distinction under his successor, Lt. Gen. William Cassidy. I think sometimes we are inclined to overlook the tremendous value to the Nation of a tradition such as this. We tend to take the Corps of Engineers for granted, as we do our mountains and

ivers and other resources; when the fact is that, far from being ordinary or commonplace, the corps is unusual among human institutions for many qualities, not the least of which is the consistency, decade by decade, of the excellence of its leadership, which has been brilliantly exemplified by Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson.

I convey the sentiments of the people of West Virginia, and I think also of the Senate and the Congress, when I express my gratitude to him for his career of public service to us all, and wish him every continued good fortune in his forthcoming endeavors in private life.

SAM M. LEVINE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week brought the death of one of my State's finest citizens, Sam M. Levine, of Pine Bluff, Ark. Following his death, an editorial tribute to him was published in the Pine Bluff Commercial of May 23.

I had admiration and respect for Sam Levine, as did all who came in contact with him. I could pay him no higher accolade than to quote the concluding paragraph of the editorial:

When men want to know the reason for America's strength at its grassroots, let them study the life of Sam M. Levine in Pine Bluff, Ark.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

SAM M. LEVINE

It is not easy to sum up what the name "Sam Levine" came to mean in this town and in this State, but someone ought to try it. It would be instructive and salutary for future generations to know the breed of man we were able to produce in these times.

Any summation would have to include Senator Levine's rocklike devotion to the law, his deep and active concern with education, and his willingness to rely on reason, of all things, in politics.

He was an advocate—not only at the bar but in the legislature, and in public service.

Eventually, he became so well known as an advocate that his presence alone was enough to make his neighbors weigh their words and reassert their own principles.

Born and raised in south Louisiana, he later moved to Bonham, Tex., where he encountered another young lawyer—Sam Rayburn, who went on to become the venerable Speaker of the House of Representatives in Washington. Our Mr. Sam came to Pine Bluff, in 1913 to practice law.

People soon came to know Sam Levine as a force for stability in the community. He not only had a wit of his own, they realized, but he fully appreciated a sense of humor in others.

Sam Levine's gentle eyes became piercingly sharp once you started talking about something he took seriously—the law, for example. Admitted to practice law before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1923, he was on the State board of law examiners from 1942 to 1943, and once served as president of Jefferson County's bar association.

Mr. Sam's interest in education deepened as the years passed. At his death, he was a board member of the Institute of International Education—an organization in which he played an active role for years.

A firm supporter of the liberal arts, he never welcomed the reduction of education to training.

In his three terms as a State senator, Mr. Sam proved himself an activist and a man open to constructive ideas. It was Senator Levine who sponsored the act setting up a State forestry commission and another one establishing a retirement system for State employees.

Politics gave Sam Levine scope to assert his dedication to law, to principle, and to education.

At a time when others were overcome by panic, ambition, or fear, Senator Levine advocated reason.

Arkansas had reached the point where a legislator could win popularity by promising to protect the people against public education. Those were years when a legislator could say, as one representative did on January 28, 1959: "Nothing contained in this bill should be construed to reopen the schools." And this argument, mind you, was being offered in favor of a bill.

The following day, Mr. Sam rose to tell his colleagues in the senate: "In the past, this body has laid stress on mediocrity. Let's put the emphasis on excellence and superiority."

Senator Levine continued his fight down to the wire. He took the floor on February 6, 1959, to oppose scuttling the State's public schools.

First, he attacked the bill on legal grounds, where Mr. Sam was very much at home, by saying that it violated the Arkansas Constitution and "presupposes its own constitutionality."

Senator Levine went on: "This bill," he warned, "strikes at the integrity of the public school system. It can serve no purpose except to agitate, and to detract from the wholesomeness of the public school system."

Instead of destroying public education, he urged his fellow senators to strengthen it: "At this moment, we ought to rededicate ourselves to strengthening the country and to the enlightening of youth. The alternative is to slip into an abyss of oblivion. There can be no other end."

The Associated Press noted that other senators paid little attention to the gentleman from Pine Bluff. "His colleagues," reported the AP, "all but ignored him while drinking soft drinks, munching sandwiches, reading magazines and smoking cigarettes."

That did not dismay Mr. Sam. He continued to speak softly on behalf of reason, education and the law. And no matter how virulent the opposition, he spoke out as calmly and as naturally as he walked down Main Street, his Phi Beta Kappa key dangling from his tie pin. And slowly people began to listen.

When future historians want to know why the State was able to shake off panic and fear, they will find one reason in the words of Sam Levine.

Senator Levine's language acquired a natural courtliness over the years. Like the man himself, it was restrained, direct and well mannered.

It has been some time since a candidate for political office began his campaign by reminding the voters of their duties as Senator Levine did in 1960:

"While the candidate for this extremely high office must willingly subject his qualifications to the careful consideration of voters in the course of a strenuous campaign, there is also a corresponding duty imposed on the citizens to evaluate carefully the respective claims advanced by the candidates. I think it well to bear in mind that, particularly where an office of this type is being sought, the need of the candidate for the office is absolutely of no concern to the voters and should be entirely disregarded. On the other hand, the needs and demands of the office are exclusively to be considered."

Senator Levine continued his interest in politics after leaving the legislature, speaking up for improvements that are still needed—

regardless of value. Many argue the new rate still isn't high enough to encourage new car building.

Critics are hoping that some help will come from a bill now being considered by the Senate Commerce Committee. The measure would prod railroads to return empty cars to their owners faster by providing for higher rental rates; this, it is believed, would force car-short roads to step up construction of new cars. In brief, the bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to set rental rates at a level which would both fairly compensate the owning railroad and insure an adequate national supply of cars.

But at least one shipping group isn't waiting for congressional action on the car shortage. The Southwest Oregon Shipper's Traffic Association, which has 42 lumber, plywood, and particle board mills in its membership, is threatening to boycott railroads that aren't moving to increase the car supply. "We can easily determine which roads are building cars and have our interests in mind," says O. L. Stewart, executive secretary. "For those that are not, we will simply suggest to our members that they route their traffic around those lines if possible."

Mr. Stewart estimates his group accounts for about 60,000 carloads of traffic annually, with each carload worth an average of \$1,000 in freight revenues to the railroads.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM: TEACHERS PLEAD WITH A FORMER TEACHER—PART XVI

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, those to whom we in America entrust the education of our youth exercise a function second to none in importance to the future of our Republic, for the strength of our Nation is based on the character and understanding of its future citizens. Our teachers provide that. When teachers as a body take a position on matters vital to the conscience and conduct of our country, their plea deserves respectful attention.

In last Sunday's New York Times appeared an advertisement addressed by over 1,000 teachers in the New York metropolitan area to President Johnson. They urge negotiation in the Vietnam crisis and a cessation of the bombings. They express a wide and steadily growing sentiment. I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO OUR PRESIDENT, A FORMER TEACHER:

We are teachers in Metropolitan New York compelled by conscience to speak out against the American involvement in Vietnam.

While we hold differing opinions about the nature and purpose of our role in Vietnam, we are anguished that the might of America is being used to destroy that tragic land; we are horrified by the slaughter of innocents, by the tragic waste of American and Vietnamese lives; we are concerned that the conflict is widening and can only lead to greater horrors and worldwide destruction.

We support your commitment to negotiate this crisis. For the sake of humanity, we implore you to stop the bombings immediately and initiate a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

Ruth Abrahams, Emil Abrams, Murray Abramsky, Clarence L. Adams, Joseph Adams, Henry Addis, Abram Adelson, Leone Adelson, Sandra Adickes, Donna Adler, Florence C. Adler, Freyda

Nacque Adler, Arnold Adoff, Barbara Adoff, Claire Alexander, G. Alperin, Rhoda Altman, Matthew Altschuler, Frank Alwels, Jerome Anger, Jack Annunziata, Claire Antell, Clara Antin, E. K. Antonovsky, T. Arenson, Carlina Aretsky, Sarah Aron, Sandra Aronson, Leonard Arpel, Gertrude Asher, Dorothy Astoppe, Shirley Auerbach, Frances Bader, Elaine Bakallan, Mitzi Bales, David Balfour, Roy Balfour, Robert H. Balogh, N. Bancheck, Ann Bander, Irving Barash, Sylvia Barnett, Ben Baron, Sara R. Baron, Albert Barracano, Norman Barrish, Muriel Bartel, W. R. Barton, Priscilla Bassett, Herbert Bassow, Alfred Battaglia, Bernice A. Bauer, H. C. Bauer, Ben Bauman, Zaphirah J. Bauman, George Beauchamp, Jr., Irving Bechky, Norma Becker, Paul Becker, Robert Becker, Shula Beckerman, S. Bell, Vivian Belinson Teodarina Bello, Arnold Belush, Anne Bender, Alice Benjamin, Carl Benjamin, Lillian Bennett.

S. Berger, Terry Berl, Douglas Berman, Norman Berman, Suzanne Berman, Leonard Bernstein, Janet Berntsen, Maurice R. Berube, Diane Betchen, Sandra Biderman, Madeline Bini, Saul Birnbaum, Leonard Blackman, Edward Blaine, Cynthia Blanchard, Efram I. Blank, Emanuel Blank, Ted Bleecker, Barbara Blickstein, Samuel Block, Miriam Bloom, Murray Bloom, Dorothy Bloomfield, Gladys Blount, Ellen Blustein, Leonore Boer, W. Bogan, M. Bogursky, Tell Bookpry, B. Bortan, Joseph Botkin, Augusta Bowles, E. C. Boyce, B. L. Braunstein, Maggie Brill, Jack Brodsky, Janet Brof, Joanne B. Brooke, Albert Bronson, Myrna Bronstein, Leonore Brosius, Alice Brown, Harold Brown, Huntley Brown, Leila Brown, Louise J. Brown, Lyle Brown, Robert F. Brown, Sarah Brown, Jacqueline A. Browne, Lois Bryant, Carroll Buchanan, Walter Buchman, David Buddbill, Walter Budhis, Judith Bunche, James E. Burton, Maury Buxbaum, Una Buxbaum, Bernard Cammarata, Jim Campbell.

Shirley Caplan, Janet Carnay, Marian Carpenter, Pauline Carpenter, Thomas Carpenter, Roger Cartwright, Fred Casden, Bette Cassaro, Thelma Catalano, Al Caviochi, William Chafe, Lionel Chagrin, Evelyn Challs, Barbara Chamock, Sam Chapman, Hattie F. Charney, T. Charney, Neil A. Chassman, Wendy Chayette, Helen Cherno, Richard Chernick, Merton Chernoff, Elizabeth Chipura, Margaret Christenson, Fred B. Chunow, Lois T. Clapp, Marie C. Clapper, Doris Clark, Edwin Cobert, Arthur Cohen, Carl Cohen, Denore Cohen, Maxine Cohen, P. Cohen, Rachel Cohen, Rita Cohen, Rosalyn Cohen, Ruth Cohen, Sylvia Cole, Alice E. Coleman, Goldie Colodny, Lionel Comiser, Palma Conlon, Rose A. Connolly, Edna G. Cohrad, Louise Consiglio, Louis Conte, Clark Cook, Wm. D. Cook, Melissa T. Cooper, Lill Cooper, Renee Cooper, Raymond I. Coppell, E. L. Cornelius, Jan Cott, Rebecca Coven, Eleanor Cox, Mitchell Crespi, Alan Criswell, Morris S. Csgay, Juana Culhane, Ida Cummings, Norman Curtis, Pat Curtis, Anna Cutler, Evelyn Cutler.

Florane Cyrelson, Adeline E. Davia, Doris Davidson, Esther Davin, Nina Davis, S. Davis, W. A. Davis, Jr., Mary B. De Deka, Riricki De Diego, F. Delatorre, Joseph F. Demas, Rosalind Derman, Regina Dicker, Grace Ditzian, Carl Doerner, Mary A. Doin, Phyllis Dolgin, Irma Doniger, Jeanne Doran, Deborah

Douglas, Lenore Downey, James F. Doyle, Mary Jane Dreyer, Ray Dubin, N. Dunetz, Charles Eckstat, Adele Edelman, Eleanor Edelstein, Mildred N. Ehrlich, Sarah Einstein, Marke Elseman, Charles Eisenberg, Edith Eisenberg, Justine Eisenberg, Selma Eisenstadt, Judith Eisenstein, Michael Elias, R. Elias, Elizabeth Elliot, Bernice Elkin, Simon Ellison, Walter Elovitch, Frieda W. Emil, N. Charles Emil, Gerald Emmet, Rebecca Epstein, Mae B. Erlichman, Muriel Etlinger, Sampson Eurogen, Shirley Evans, Ernest Fabiitti, Carolyn Fabricant, S. Farhi, Edwin Farrell, Catherine Fearon, Mary Feeley, Walter Feingersh, Lily Feinstein, Alexander Feldman, Francine Feldman, Frances Fenichel, James Fenner, Herman Ferguson, Edith Ferrara.

Beatrice Fields, Anne L. Filardo, Edgar Fink, Louis Fink, Helen R. Finkel, Laurette Finkel, Frank A. Fimmel, Bennett Fisch, Sadie Fischbein, B. W. Fischer, Stanley Fisher, Edward Fishkind, David Fishman, Shirley Fishman, Mildred Flacks, Rosanne Flaum, Shirley Fleming, Deborah Flynn, Gavin Fogarty, Henry Fohr, Ellen Foreman, Leon Forer, Marion Forer, Joseph P. Forman, Ray Frankel, Jerry Freedman, Irene Freeman, Rema Freiberg, Elizabeth Freilicher, Edith Friedman, Eleanor Friedman, Is Friedman, Chet Filmer, Leo Frisman, Carl S. Fryburg, Morton Fuhr, L. Furst, Margarita Gaines, Jaclyn Gang, Donald F. Garber, Jewel Garill, Frances Garten, Mildred K. Garvin, Clyde Gatlin, Sheila Geist, Judith Gelarte, Lia Gelb, Maxwell Gelender, Sanford Gelernter, Cella Geller, Sid Gershoren, Ruth Gershowitz, Herman Gersten, Lloyd Gertz, J. Ghonseem, Harold Gilbert, Stephen Gilbert, Charles Gimenthal, Marjorie Gill, Beverly Gingold, Elizabeth Gineberg, Morris Glaser, Doris Glass, Rachel Glasser, Joan Godshalk, Jeanette S. Gold, Sylvia Gold, Etta Goldbaum, F. P. Goldberg, Lucy L. Goldberg, Dan Goldfarb, B. Goldhirsch, Grace S. Goldman, S. S. Goldman, David Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Philip Goldstein, Ruth M. Goldstein, Shirley Goldzweig, Lois Golipsky, Charles Goldner, Laura Goodman, Richard Goodman, Roger B. Goodman, Ruth Goodman, Alice Gorden, Albert F. Gordon, Bernard Gordon, Leo Gordon, Morris Gordon, Norman Gore, Pegl Goreluck, Leah Gorfein, Stanley Gotlin, Betty Gottlieb, David Gottlieb, Ed Gottlieb, Gordon Gottlieb, Leonard Gottlieb, Oscar Gottlieb, Anne Grant, Joel Green, Lesley Greenberg, Paula Greenberg, Etta Greenfield, Miriam Greenfield, Vivian Greenfield, Arthur W. Greenstone, Janey P. Greif, Mae Greitzer, Arthur Grenberg, Robert Groff, Betty Gross, Harold Gross, M. S. Gross, Carolyn S. Grossman, Milton Grubstein, Lillian K. Grumette, Diana Guadagnino, Ruth E. Gusthader, Lawrence Gutman, Matilda Gutman, Helen Gutstein, Norma R. Hairston, Carol Hallinger, Harriet L. Halpern, Judith Halpern, Stephen M. Halpern, Dorothy I. Halprin.

Irving Halprin, Natalie Halprin, John Halvey, Adele Handlers, Aaron Hankin, Ethel Hanauer, Glinne Hanrahan, Louis Harap, Norman Harenstein, Michael Harlow, Rosalie Harmon, Helen Harris, Jay Harris, Joan H. Harris, Louise Harris, Marjorie Harris, Mary W. Harris, W. L. Harris, Delores Harrison, Priscilla Haslett, Freddie M. Haughton, Ethel B. Hauptman, Nora Hauser, Louis

- Hay, Joyce Haynes, Philip M. Heary, Pauline Hecker, John Helbok, Harry Helfman, Betty Heller, E. R. Heller, Paul Heller, Irene Henken, Edward L. Herbst, Emanuel Herscher, D. Hercules, B. Herman, Erna Herman, Evelyn Herzfeld, K. Herzig, Joseph Heyman, Dorothy Hibbert, Nancy Higgins, Earl C. Hill, Ruby S. Hill, Carol Hiller, Shulamith Hirsch, Frances Hochberg, Sam Hochberg, B. Hoffman, Richard Hoffman, Sarah Hoffman, Eleanor Holden, Joan Hollber, David Honig, Marlene Honsner, William Horn, Norman Horowitz, Rosalyn Horowitz, Donald Horton, Jessica Howard, Joan M. Howard, Lois Howlett.
- Clara Hunt, Elizabeth Hunter, Marlene Hymel, Frank Ichuk, Grace Cohen Ichuk, Ellen Imberman, William Isaacs, Frieda Isenberg, Belmont Jabin, Stephen Jablonsky, Milton James, Helen Jackson, Carrie Jacobs, Claire Jacobs, J. Jacobs, Bob Jacobson, Eli Jacobson, Harriet Jacobson, Rosalie Jacobson, Roselyn Jacobson, R. Jalowski, Richard Janda, Davis Jeffrey, Wilhelmina Jenkins, Leslie Johnson, Michele Johnson, Bill Jones, Geraldine Jones, Herbert Jurist, Shulamith Justman, David Kabock, Meyer Kadko, Irwin R. Kafka, Alan Kahn, Barry Kahn, Murray Kahn, Rose Kaiser, Michael Kalin, Walter H. Kall, Joyce Kallir, Henry Kamin, Benjamin H. Kaplan, George Kapp, Miriam Kappelman, Ida Karp, Florence Kaslow, Hubert Katz, Paul Kaufman, Edith S. Kavado, Beverly Kelly, Phyllis Kelvin, S. A. Kempler, Walter Kendra, Jessie Keosian, E. M. Kessler, Gladys Kessler, R. Kessler, Louisa Keyes, Sylvia Kimmelman, Allan Kincher, Ronna Kinis, Howard Kirshner, Ed Klessane, Ronnie Klemmas.
- Betty Kletter, Blanche Koenigsberg, Alice Kogan, Morton Kogut, Kate Kolchin, Jules Kolodny, Robert Kolodny, Frances Korins, Sara Kornberg, Wilhelmina Kraber, Julius Kramer, P. Kramer Ruth E. Kramer, A. Krause, Elaine E. Krause, Peter Krauss, Stan Krefetz, Ellen Kregor, Eileen Krieger, Felix Kreitmar, Flore Krigsman, Sy Krinsky, Lillian Kristol, R. Krouse, Matilda Kruger, Aaron Krumbein, Suzanne Kupfer, Bernard Kurtin, Ralph Kurwein, Davina Kurwitz, Aml Kushul, Tom Laidman, Ira Landess, Lawrence Lane, Patricia Lane, Edward Lansky, Priscilla Lapolla, Judith Lakin, June Laufer, Mark Lavis, Ed Lawrence, Ralph Lawrence, Edward Lawrence, Geraldine Laws, Ida Lebow, Saul Lechtine, Charles Lederer, Eva Lederman, Isabella Lee, Jim Lee, Milton Leff, Hadassa Legatt, Martha Lehman, Robert Lehrer, Robert Leicester, Max Leive, Marion Leonard, Irma Leibow, David Lerner, Francine Lerner, Lea Lerner, Murray Lerner, Arlene Leven.
- Miriam Levenson, S. Leventhman, Claire Levine, Joan Levine, Morris Levine, Rae Levine, Ree Levine, Shirley Levine, Isabel Le Vita, B. Levy, Betty Levy, David Levy, Frieda Levy, Harriet Levy, Jane Levy, Mark Levy, David Lewin, Minnie Lewin, John L. Lewine, Carol Lewis, Claudia Lewis, Dorothy Lewis, Emanuel Lewis, Gertrude Lewis, Murray Lewis, Sylvia Lewis, T. Liao, Joan Licht, Anita Lieberman, Saul Lieberman, Malvina Liebert, Mildred Liebowitz, Arthur Linder, Nora Linn, Herbert Lipkin, Carol Lieman, Pearl Lipper, Arthur B. Lipsky, Helen Lipton, Henry Lipton, Roslyn Lipton, Adele S. Lithauer, Elsie Rae Litman, Robert Lokin, J. London, Marion London, Sylvia Louis, Sidney Lovett, Vivian Lowell, Eileen Lubin, Linda Lubow, Frances Lucas, Francis D. Lucas, Vincent D. Luciano, A. Ludwig, George Lunn, Edwin Lurzwell, Steve Lyons, Miguel A. Madrid, Morris Mailman, Rudolph Mainelli, Carl Makower, Frances M. Malden, L. Malkin.
- John B. Manbeck, Florence Manda, A. Manheimer, Naomi Maning, George Manley, Arlene B. Mann, Irving Mansfield, Edith Keller Marcus, Samuel C. Marencz, Edna Mark, Nathan Marks, Alice K. Marsh, Calvin Martin, Edward Martinson, Rebecca Martz, Esther Marcus, Beth Margolis, Florence Masler, Seymour Masler, Diane Mason, J. Mass, Oscar Mass, Geraldine Massers, Jennie Mastropaolo, Marjorie A. Mathias, Thelma Matcan, Anna R. Mathlin, Norma Matzkin, Bernice J. May, Steven Mayer, Ben Mazen, Elnora McCarter, Eugene A. McCoy, Roxanne B. McDowell, Polly McMillan, John Meehan, Ron Mehlman, Alice Meisel, Josephine Merolla, Virginia Mells, Marjorie Meyersohn, Thomas Micklow, Alvin Migdal, Charles Miller, Kenna S. Miller, S. Millman, Carmen Miranda, Martin Mirer, Sara Mitchell, Dagoberto Molerio, Albert Montare, W. E. Moore, James Morris, Peter B. Morris, Raye Morris, Selma Morris, Sidney H. Morrison, Michael C. Moross, Sidney Moskowitz, Mary Jane Multer, Carol Muster, James Nach, Shella Nacht.
- Ethel C. Nagel, Susanne Nagel, M. Natelli, Emily Nathan, Raymond Nazer, M. H. Needleman, Lillian Nekritz, Leonora Nelson, Rose Neufeld, Alice M. Newkirk, Carol Newman, Mr. and Mrs. David Newman, M. L. Newman, Renee K. Newman, Sylvia Newman, Ilene A. Nichols, Anna Nieves, Dorothy Noland, Magda North, Marianne Novak, Martin Novemsky, Jerome Novick, Nita Novick, Maxwell Numberg, T. Nunan, Gladys Nussenbaum, J. P. Olicker, Oscar Olshansky, John O'Neill, Dorothy Orland, Jeanne Ostriker, Esther Ostroff, Lynn Ostrow, N. L. Ovanin, Joseph Paladino, Frances Panitz, Gloria Paolella, Marsha Pargman, Helen Parker, Myrtle E. Parker, Barbara Patricola, Saul Pavlov, G. Pearlman, Natalie Pearlstein, Jules A. Peemoeller, Gladiola Peerman, Phil Peitz, M. Penn, Shirley Pentel, Theresa B. Perl, Joseph Perez, Edith Perlman, Joyce Periman, Maxwell Periman, S. Periman, Steven Parris, Barry Pessin, Juanita Peters, Marjorie Peterson, Elsie Pickus, Sidney Pilatsky, Rudolph Pinataro, Laurence Pkner.
- Paul Pitiuk, Berenice Pilekin, William L. Plummer, Bess Polin, Nancy Polin, Janet Pollack, Lilla Pollack, R. Pollak, Henry Pallet, Naomi Pommer, Robert Porterfield, Estelle Posner, Susan Powers, Isadore Powsner, Lucy B. Poyer, Bernice Prendergast, Nan Prener, Ann Price, Martin Price, Herminia Prieto, Burke Probitsky, Minnie Proctor, John Quinlan, Ellen Rabin, Elizabeth Rabinowitz, G. Radford, Herbert Rahinsky, Marte Ramirez, Sam Lewis Rand, Lawrence Raphael, Shelley Rapp, Doreen Rappaport, I. Rappaport, Shirley Rappaport, Ethel Ratner, Mary Rayburn, Miriam Rayburn, Arthur Razzio, Millie Rachany, Robert Redka, Stephen Reines, Bonnie Reisman, Richard Relyea, Edward Remain, Bernard Reznick, Bertha Rhodes, Julie Rice, Sheila Rice, Sylvia Richman, E. C. Ricken, Eleanor Riklin, Jeanne Ritter, Reuben Rivlin, Rosalie Rivlin, Joseph Rizik, Bernard Roberts, Celia Robinson, Earl Robinson, Jeanne Robinson, S. Robinson, Ella Root, Michael Rosa, J. H. Rosandy.
- Gertrude E. Rose, Albert Rosen, Marion Rosen, Miki Rosen, Natalie Rosen, Phyllis Rosen, Sandra Rosen, Eugene Rosenbaum, Rochelle Rosenbaum, Doris Rosenberg, Sylvia Rosenberg, William Rosenberg, Arlene Rosenblatt, D. J. Rosenblum, A. Rosenberg, Erwin Rosenfeld, Riva Rosenfeld, Rose Rosenfeld, Daniel Rosenstein, Emily Rosenthal, Irving Rosenwasser, Pearl Rosner, Arthur Ross, Lesley Ross, Naomi Rossabi, Martin Rosoff, Madeline Rostker, Pearl Rostov, Carol Roter, Alice Roth, Gladys Roth, Jacob Rothband, David Rothchild, Gussie Rothman, Henry L. Royston, Barbara Lee Rubin, Helen Vogatch Rubin, Morris Rubin, Richard Rubin, Anne Rubenstein, Helen Rugowin, Marianne Russo, Sean Ryder, Morris Sabbeth, Priscilla Sabbeth, F. Sabin, Betty Sacco, Sylvia Saffro, Jerry Safner, Jeane Salamy, M. Salant, Frances Saldinger, Alfred A. Salesky, Lee Saltzman, Morris Salz, Naomi Salz, Jessie Salzman, L. Salwen, Rhea Samaras, Esther A. Samson, Linda Samuels, Judith Sanderoff, David Sanders, O. Sandifer.
- Susan Sandler, I. Santo, Joseph D. Sapienza, Joseph Saspro, Audrey L. Satlin, M. Schachter, Phyllis Schaefer, Beatrice Schaeffer, Virginia Schattler, Charles Schaeckner, Irwin Schechter, Samuel Scherek, Florence Scherer, Toni Schiffer, Anne Schiller, Samuel Schindelheim, Lyvia Schlaefer, Berenice Schlakman, Irving Schlein, Bert Schlesing, Charlotte Schoenberg, Steven Schrader, Edith Schrank, Evelyn Schroeder, G. Schulhoe, Blanche Schulslaper, Blanche Schundelman, Roy Schunurkopf, Benedicta Schwager, Gloria Schwartz, S. Schwartz, Sol Schwartz, Sarah Schwartz, T. Schwartzbarth, Grace Schwartzman, R. Y. Scott, John Anthony Scott, Maria Scott, Luther W. Seabrook, William H. See, Julian L. Seid, Ruth Selden, Howard Serektan, Lane Serota, Barbara Sewell, David Shaine, Alex Shames, M. R. Shamroy, Shella Shankman, Jack P. Shapiro, Adele Shapiro, Ida Shapiro, Leo Shapiro, Louis Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Sidney Shapiro, Florence S. Shaw, Laura Shaw, Pearl Shetz, Barbara Shepetin, Bella Sherman, Ira Sherman, C. Shmel. Margery Shine, Flora Shore, Sylvia F. Shows, Mildred Sicles, Harvey Siegel, Edward Siegel, Marian Siegel, A. I. Sigal, Charles Sigmund, Donald M. Silber, H. Sillekens, Anita Silver, Myra Silver, Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Silverman, Myron Silverman, Abraham Singer, Barbara Singer, Gertrude Singer, J. Singer, Ann Sirotof, Linda Sklarow, Martha Skulsky, Helene S. Slater, Karen Slavin, Sarah Slotkins, Roslyn Small, Vilet Small, Bernice Smart, Alvin Smith, Betty Smith, Esther Smith, Geraldine Smith, Irene Smith, Lawrence Smith, Lucille Smith, Sylvia Smith, Jean Smolar, Helen W. H. Snlton, Mildred Snow, Sylvia Sokolow, Henry Solganik, Sidney Solomon, Jacqueline Spears, Lester Spelser, Vivian Spelser, Matthew Spetter, Madelon Spier, Blanche Solomon, Rebecca L. Soyer, Jerry Spitz, Susan Spitz, Richard Springer, J. Spoerri, Lillian Stahl, Elizabeth Starcevic, Alan L. Stein, Lillian D. Stern, Philip Stern, Frances Sternberg, Simon Stanislow, Eva Starfield, Martin Starfield, Ralph Stein.
- Nancy Steinberg, Evelyn M. Stimmel, Fred Storfer, Dorothy Stoneman, Martha Stodt, Barbara Straussman, Joseph B. Strum, Kieve Stubenhaus, Norman Stuber, Isabelle Suhl, George Sundel, Nicholas Surdo, Armas Suvanto, Frieda Sverdlove, N. Talbot, Irving Talmuke, Norma Tasman, Russel Tauber, Beatrice Tettel, Lloyd Temes, Harry Tenenbaum, Mildred Tenenbaum, Frances

Tepper, B. Terry, Mae Terry, Carole Theil, Rachel Tholfsen, F. Thorpe, P. Tholfsen, Lary Titelman, Aaron Toder, Saul Toder, Eitnor Tolbert, Aaron Traister, Susan Traub, Ruth Traub, Shirley Trapido, Abraham Tretin, Rosemarie Trimball, A. Tucker, Kathleen Tucker, Lynette V. Tucker, Adele Tulman, Muriel Turner, Mark Ubeiman, Jo Ubogy, Elizabeth Urani, Milton Unterman, Semah Unterman, Gayle Veeder, Dora J. Vernt, Gwen Vetter, Theresa Vigo, Thomas Waber, Carol Wagner, Leo Wagner, Thomas E. Wahn, Gertrude Waldeyer, Gabriel Waldman, Ellis Wallach, Lillian Wallach, Lottie Wallach, William Walters, L. Waltznia, Violet Ward.

Carl V. Warren, Michael Warman, L. G. Watkins, Ernest Waxman, Bernice Webb, Ray Wechsle, Roberta Wedeen, Suzanne Weidberg, Hazel C. Weill, Herschel Weinstein, Irving Weinstein, Suzanne Weinseln, Henry Weinstock, Bernard Weintraub, Joshua Wiesen, Adele F. Weiss, Blanche Weiss, Malvina R. Weiss, Nancy Weiss, Norman Weil, Fromma Wellman, Marilyn Weldfeur, Margaret Werthman, Edna Wetler, Evelyn Wexler, Clementene Wheeler, Joel White, Charlene Whittaker, Harvey Widell, Polly Wilderman, Hilda Wigder, Natalie Wigler, Jerome Wilkins, Ed Williams, Miriam Wills, Geraldine Wilson, R. Wirte, R. Witre, Susan Witner, Joseph Wohl, Jerry Wolf, Lois C. Wolf, Miriam Wolf, Helen Wong, Mable S. Wood, Elaine Woodburn, Mildred Woogen, Barbara Wortman, Rosa Wrinfrieki, Frances Wunder, Lionel M. Yard, Shirley Yasner, Ann Youdovin, J. Zaddin, Stanley Zelman, Allen Zelon, Stan Zibulsky, Julius Zieger, Eva Ziesk, Alex Zimmerman, Marsha Zimmerman, Frances Zipplin, Helen Zirilstein, Esther Zlatchin, J. Zoffin, E. Zucker, Lester Zwicker.

For additional information, contact Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam, cochairmen: Sandra Adickes, Norma Becker, 520 East 12th Street, New York, N.Y., 10009.

A GOVERNMENT OF MEN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I predicted in this Chamber a year ago that the real meat ax in the 1964 Civil Rights Act was title VI, which enables officials in Washington to determine what constitutes discrimination in any program or facility receiving Federal assistance.

I expressed the opinion then that if the 1964 bill became law it would change the kind of government the people of Virginia have known, and the kind of government that had its origin at Jamestown in 1618.

I said that under title VI every little bureaucrat could say, "This is my rule on discrimination." Supporters of the bill disagreed with me, pointing out that the President would have to approve all of the rules and regulations.

But, regardless of who makes or approves the regulations, Virginians have found out recently how far reaching title VI is in its application.

For example, the doctors and hospital officials of Virginia and adjoining Southern States were told recently by an official of the Public Health Service how completely they must integrate any hospital receiving Federal funds.

In a separate development, the

Augusta County Board of Supervisors recently found it necessary to seek the advice of members of the Virginia congressional delegation in clearing up what they regard as ambiguities in some of the pledges they are being asked by State and Federal officials to sign.

One of the questions raised by the county supervisors was whether they should be required by the State to sign an agreement relating to the use of certain Federal funds for educational purposes which are expended by local school boards. The county supervisors argued that they have been asked by the State to execute an agreement concerning which they would not have full responsibility for compliance.

The county supervisors also contended the wording of the agreement was not clear as to whether it imposed personal liability for compliance on the individual signing it on behalf of the board of supervisors.

A second question raised by the Augusta County Board of Supervisors relates to the renting of office space in county facilities to various Federal agencies, such as the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

I am informed that the county entered into a compliance type of agreement covering such rented space indicating that they do not engage in discriminatory practices. But the supervisors are objecting to additional provisions being placed in the lease in regard to damages in the event of a breach of the compliance agreement.

In regard to hospitals, I have just received a copy of a paper prepared by Assistant Surgeon General Harold M. Graning, chief of the Division of Hospital and Medical Facilities, Public Health Service, in which he outlined to officials of the Carolinas-Virginias Hospital Conference what they must do under title VI of last year's law if they receive any Federal aid funds.

The Public Health official gave the following as examples of some of the questions "you may find useful in examining the facilities with which you are associated":

Are patients admitted without consideration of any factor pertaining to race, color, or national origin?

Are the same entrances, admission offices, waiting rooms and other general service facilities available to and used by Negro and other patients?

Are patient room assignments made without regard to race, color, or national origin?

Are patients assigned to semiprivate four-bed bedrooms and wards without regard to race, color or national origin of the other patients?

Are all services and facilities available to patients without regard to race, color or national origin?

Are dining spaces and cafeterias available to and used by patients, staff, trainees, and employees without discrimination?

Are all clinics, emergency, and outpatient services available to and used by Negroes and other outpatients?

Are professional qualifications and character the only criteria applied in granting or denying staff privileges?

Do Negro physicians having staff privileges serve on a rotation basis in clinics and emergency and outpatient departments on the same basis as other physicians?

Are trainees, interns, or other trainees assigned to service with patients without regard to their race, color or national origin?

These are only some of the questions which should be asked. As you can readily see from this sampling, every effort should be made to comply with both the spirit and letter of the law.

Mr. President, if these are only "some of the questions" which should be asked, it is difficult to imagine any that were left out.

These recent developments indicate I was not exaggerating when I spoke last year about what would happen under title VI.

RETENTION OF SECTION 14(b) OF TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have recently received communications from two important chambers of commerce in my State. Both express support for retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. I fully agree with the views expressed by these chambers. In order that other Senators may be advised of the depth of Texas feeling on this subject, I ask that there be printed in the Record a letter from the Athens chamber and a newsletter from the Lamar County chamber.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ATHENS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Athens, Tex., May 25, 1965.

Senator JOHN TOWER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: The Board of Directors of the Athens Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record opposing any change in section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. We object to any proposals that will either delete this section from the act or to any change that will destroy its effectiveness.

It is our feeling that this section adds materially to the freedom of choice by American working men and women. We do not believe that membership in any organization should be a requirement in getting a job just as we do not believe that membership in a chamber of commerce should be a requirement for operating a business.

We respectfully bring this to your attention and ask that you oppose any changes in this section.

Very sincerely,
LINDEN R. LEWIS,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF
LAMAR COUNTY,
Paris, Tex., May 1965.

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would eliminate the right-to-work law in Texas, and force any man or woman getting a job with a business in which employees are represented by a union, to join the union and pay the initiation fees and dues; or to look for work somewhere else. Under the existing law he has the choice to join or not join and his job cannot be taken from him because of his decision.

How can unions give service to members when their membership is compulsory, and there will be no need to prove that they can serve the people?

The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act could lessen the desire of large firms to locate in Lamar County or Texas because the right-to-work law makes for better working conditions.

June 1, 1965

Repeal of section 14(b) is contrary to section 703(a) of the Civil Rights Act which states that you cannot have unlawful employment practices that discriminate against any individual with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Irving News Texan recently published a strong and reasonable editorial advocating retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law. This editorial has been called to my attention by a number of distinguished Texans, including Mr. Phillip Reid, chairman, of the board and president of the Irving Bank & Trust Co.

In order that other Senators may share the views expressed by the News Texan, I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

PRESIDENT IS PAYING ONLY LIPSERVICE TO FREEDOM IF SECTION 14(b) IS REPEALED

A great deal of lipservice is paid to freedom by the present administration. But President Johnson's recent declaration favoring the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley certainly should make voters wonder just who all this freedom is for.

Apparently, it is for those groups and organizations which make the most monetary contributions to campaign funds.

Repeal of section 14(b) would write off the books the right-to-work laws of 19 States, including Texas. But even more unjust, it would force into labor unions thousands of workers who do not desire membership. It, in essence, gives American workers the choice of either going union or not working at all.

The public has given President Johnson strong support in committing this country's Armed Forces to the preservation of freedom throughout the world. But here at home, the President evidently gives a different definition to the word freedom.

Compulsory "anything" is not a cornerstone for strength. It is a license for abuse.

Just how strongly the President feels about the abolishment of the right-to-work section in the Taft-Hartley law is really not known. He made only passing reference to it in Tuesday's labor message to Congress. However, the "Johnson treatment" of Congressmen does not always involve loud public proclamations. What the President is doing behind the scenes is much more important.

The reason behind the request for repeal, of course, is the Democratic Party's obligation to labor for support in the past national election. It is the shame that a political party must tamper with the freedom of thousands of American workers just to remain in power. But this is what is happening.

One union publication recently referred to the retention of section 14(b) as "compulsory open shop." This is like saying the compulsory right to vote or the compulsory right to bear arms or the compulsory freedom of religion. Even under the hated section, anytime a worker gets tired of non-unionism he may join a union.

Compulsory unionism relieves labor leaders of the responsibility of making their unions and the union benefits attractive. Under compulsory unionism, the worker is not guaranteed anything in return for his union dues. He is only guaranteed that there will be union dues. In short, compulsory unionism destroys the incentive of labor leaders.

Also it must be recalled that given the conditions of a closed shop, it is easier to maintain the coercive discipline on which militant unions depend in time of strikes.

Trade unions have been a dynamic force in the development of the United States.

During the early days of the industrial revolution, unions did cure many inflicted labor wounds by management. But in recent years, the main function of unions has been to push the wage-price spiral further upward. Since businessmen cannot combine forces like unions, there would be nothing to stop labor leaders from accelerating the spiral, and with it, inflation, under closed shops.

The arguments against compulsory unionism are many, but one may be considered basic. And this argument is the cornerstone to our entire society. Is this to be a truly free country, or must a man under duress, need a union card to earn a living and support a family?

If President Johnson and the Democrats intend to pursue the repeal of section 14(b), then let them do it under some label other than "liberalism." It is pure and simple tyranny.

Mr. President, I have received a most important letter from the employees of the Roy Klossner Co., of San Antonio. In it they most emphatically support retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

I am in full agreement with them, and in order that other Senators may be advised of the urgency with which concerned Texans view this matter, I ask that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE ROY KLOSSNER CO.,
San Antonio, Tex., May 21, 1965.

Hon. JOHN TOWER,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We urgently recommend that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act remain as it now stands.

We as employees of the Roy Klossner Co. feel that the repeal of this act would take away one of our precious liberties. Anything that you can do to help retain this law will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

THE EMPLOYEES OF THE ROY
KLOSSNER CO.

**REPORT OF SECRETARY OF THE
TREASURY ENTITLED "UTILIZATION
OF U.S. GOVERNMENT FOREIGN
CURRENCY BALANCES"**

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a report from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, entitled "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances."

The report is in response to an inquiry I made on March 1, 1965, as to whether, in view of the U.S. balance of payments and outflow of gold problem, it would be useful to review the treaties, contracts and arrangements under which we own and generate foreign currencies.

The inquiry was made to the Secretaries of Treasury and State, and a copy was sent to the President. The Treasury report, received under a letter dated May 27, 1965, is self-explanatory.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report and the preliminary correspondence published as part of these remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1965.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report "Utilization of U.S. Government Foreign Currency Balances" supplements the material provided by the Secretary of the Treasury in his letter to you on March 12. It was prepared in cooperation with the Departments of State-AID, Defense, Agriculture, and the Bureau of the Budget.

You will note that the actions underway are not in terms of final accomplishment but rather involve continued search at all levels for further progress.

I know that you will welcome the efforts to effectively use our foreign currency balances to benefit our international payments position in ways which will not involve an adverse withdrawal of resources from countries in whose economic development we have a great interest and to which we extend foreign assistance.

I deeply appreciate your concern and value most highly your active cooperation in our efforts to further strengthen our international payments position.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

**UTILIZATION OF U.S. GOVERNMENT FOREIGN
CURRENCY BALANCES
NATURE OF THE PROBLEM**

How can our foreign currency balances be used to provide additional benefit to our balance of payments?

On December 31, 1964, the U.S. Government owned the equivalent of \$2,937 million in foreign currencies. Of this total, \$1,556 million is committed under our foreign aid program for use by the aid recipient countries for economic development and for the common defense. The balance, \$1,381 million, is designated for U.S. Government use; and, of this balance, \$1,239 million is in the currencies of the eight so-called excess currency countries: Burma, Guinea, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, United Arab Republic, and Yugoslavia. This concentration of \$1,239 million of excess currencies is further accentuated by the fact that 85 percent of it is held in three of these countries—India, Pakistan, and Poland. In contrast to our expenditures in the Western European countries, which greatly exceed our supply of their currencies, it is in the eight countries listed above that our balances are in excess of the normal operating expenditures of the Government.

These foreign currency balances have accrued primarily under our food-for-peace program and have increased in total as the program has continued over the years. Sales of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 contribute substantially to the total U.S. overseas aid effort which, in turn, is designed to strengthen the economies of recipient countries and hasten the day when they can finance their import requirements on commercial terms. Meanwhile, sales are made for payment in foreign currency to countries which cannot pay for their needed food requirements in dollars. Most of these countries are recipients of dollar assistance.

OBJECTIVES OF UTILIZATION OF LOCAL CURRENCY

The essential problem we face is one of finding means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own so as to further save overseas expenditures in dollars, strengthen the economic position of aid recipients, harmonize usage of the currencies with other U.S. aid programs and advance our foreign policy objectives.

Basic to consideration of the problem of increased U.S. use of foreign currencies is the

to the VA office in Montgomery, Ala. To make himself presentable enough to hold a job with many contacts, Erwin spent more than 2 years in a veterans' hospital after the war undergoing skin-grafting surgery on his burned and disfigured face. In a B-29 on a bombing mission over Japan a phosphorus bomb caught and ignited in the plane. To save the plane and the other men in its crew, Erwin groped for the burning bomb, picked it up, and carried it forward to the copilot's window with his hands and clothing in flames, and dropped it outside.

Most of the medalholders are members of the Medal of Honor Society, which meets every 2 years at reunions and publishes a quarterly bulletin and newsletter to keep the highly exclusive group informed of each other's doings. The current president of the society is Thomas J. Kelly, a New Yorker who worked his way through law school after winning the Medal of Honor and now serves as an Administrator in the Manhattan office of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Even among the annals of Medal of Honor citations for the past century, which crowd every page with unbelievable stories of selfless daring, the account of Kelly's award-winning exploit under fire stands out.

As a 21-year-old medical aid man, Kelly was attached to an armored infantry platoon which was caught by a surprise attack while crossing an open clearing in Germany. The platoon and Kelly ran from the plateau-like exposed ground to the protection of a downhill slope, leading dead and wounded Americans behind them.

Going back into the clearing to bring the wounded to safety meant crawling and running under fire from the surrounding woods for a distance of 300 yards, but Kelly decided to try it. On his first trip he led out a group of seven blinded and shocked casualties who were able to walk under his guidance. Then he went back across the exposed terrain again and again, carrying and dragging more wounded soldiers. Two other GI's, who tried to help him, were both killed. Kelly made 10 trips in all, rescuing 17 fallen men from the field of sweeping machine-gun fire and exploding mortar shells.

"YOU KNOW WHAT'S RIGHT"

"I thought of Sister Saint Peter, one of the nuns who taught me in parochial school," he said recently. "I could feel her gold ring tapping against my forehead, as it did when she was trying to teach me something, and I could hear her saying, 'Tom Kelly, you know what's right and what's wrong. There are wounded men out there—go and get them.'"

As president of the Medal of Honor Society, Kelly hears more about the problems of medal winners than anybody in the Pentagon or the Veterans' Administration. Many of the war heroes in his fraternity feel that they get too much recognition—of the wrong kind.

"Wearing the Medal of Honor can be harder than winning it," Kelly said. "A medalholder sometimes finds his commanding officer, or his boss in civilian life, leaning over backward, making sure he isn't treated any better than anybody else because of his medal.

"If he makes a mistake, or gets into trouble, he's likely to be given a rougher punishment than he would have gotten if he didn't have the medal. He's always carefully walking a tightrope in the glare of the spotlight."

TROUBLE MAKES HEADLINES

An automobile accident or a bankruptcy, a divorce trial or a friendly party turning into a noisy brawl, any of the misfortunes that ordinarily wouldn't be mentioned in the newspapers can make headlines if a Medal of Honor hero is involved.

"The ones you read about are the few who are having personal troubles," Kelly says, "so people think many Medal of Honor men

have a terrible time trying to adjust to civilian life. Nobody writes about all the rest of us who are quietly raising families and worrying about the mortgage payments like everybody else."

The Medal of Honor heroes best known by postwar newspaper readers are indeed the ones plagued by the most troubles, such as tobacco-chewing Charles E. "Commando" Kelly, from Pittsburgh, the 36th Division's one-man army in Italy. Chuck Kelly, as he was called in his outfit, has occupied more space in newspapers since the war than during it—thanks to his prolonged struggles with unemployment, illness, and financial woes. Sgt. Alvin C. York, who died last September at the age of 76, became almost as famous in the last 20 years for his income tax litigations as he was for his World War I heroism. Sergeant York's feat of 1918 was hailed by Marshal Foch as the greatest accomplishment of any soldier in all the armies of Europe. In a 4-hour skirmish in the Argonne Forest in 1918, York and a few companions killed 25 Germans and captured the rest of an enemy machinegun battalion, 4 officers and 128 enlisted men.

A modest and unpretentious Tennessee mountaineer, York firmly refused after the war to capitalize on his Medal of Honor. Finally he was persuaded that a movie biography, starring Gary Cooper, could inspire patriotism. For the film rights to his life story, York was paid some \$150,000, most of which he gave away to worthy causes and needy friends.

Then York was hit by an income tax and interest bill for \$172,000. His case dragged through courts for years. The Internal Revenue authorities finally agreed to settle for \$25,000, raised by public donation.

Probably the most shaky postwar readjustment attempted by any Medal of Honor recipient was the one tackled by Audie Murphy. Murphy, who won more decorations than any other soldier in World War II, received his Medal of Honor award for holding a woods attacked by the Germans almost singlehanded, personally killing or wounding 50 of the enemy. He left his cotton-growing hometown of Farmersville, Tex., after the war and went to Hollywood to become a movie star.

Now 40—he was only 20 when he won the Medal of Honor—Murphy is comfortably and solidly established in filmland and as a millionaire cowboy movie star, the only horse-riding actor still working regularly in motion pictures. He appears in four or five westerns a year, low-budget films that are shown mainly in small-town theaters.

Murphy was regarded as a "hot" prospect when he first came to Hollywood, and Murphy's friends believe that he might have become a glamour star if he had patronized the right people in Hollywood. But he kept the right people at arm's length and never regretted it.

"I have only a nodding acquaintance with Hollywood-type people," Audie once said. "I say nodding to them and they say nodding to me."

Murphy enjoys his role as a western performer. His peaceful existence in Hollywood is marred only by gossip column mentions of a Medal of Honor hero being thrown out of Sunset Strip nightclubs. It is another holder, but everyone thinks the columnists are writing about Murphy, who never goes to nightclubs.

Murphy makes a point of never identifying himself publicly with his Medal of Honor, which he has given, along with his other medals, to his two young sons. He avoids meetings of the Medal of Honor Society and turns down invitations to appear in his reserve uniform at parades. However, he went to a PTA meeting in Gardena, Calif., recently and made a speech on "What the Constitution Means to Me."

SALUTE TO GLORY

The most impressive salute ever given to Medal of Honor holders and perhaps from the looks of things, the last one, was a special reception attended by 240 wearers of the award at the White House on May 2, 1963, the largest gathering of the medalists in one place in the history of the United States. As the heroes of six wars filed past President Kennedy, shaking his hand, some in wheelchairs and others on crutches, the President's sister-in-law, Mrs. Robert F. Kennedy, made a remark which well described the emotion of the spectators:

"It is like watching a million flags march by."

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, when Thomas Paine said, "There are the times that try men's souls," he was describing the pressures of life nearly 200 years ago. That great patriot might be dismayed to find, were he alive today, that the pressures and crises have multiplied; that these times are far more trying, perhaps, than the relatively placid days of the American struggle for independence.

But Tom Paine would be cheered, I believe, by the courage, the patience, the skill, and the fortitude of this Nation's Chief Magistrate, Lyndon B. Johnson.

I am thinking particularly of our President's policy in the Vietnamese conflict: welding forcefully this country's awesome strength and destructive power, yet always holding out the hand of peace, offering to our adversaries a reasonable and workable settlement, if they will but agree to negotiate.

This, I believe, is statesmanship of a high order; and I believe that in these "times which try men's souls," we can draw strength from our President's conduct in his office.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two excellent articles, by Michael Padev which reinforce and expand upon these views. The articles were published in the Indianapolis Star of May 5 and 14.

I also commend to other Senators an excellent editorial entitled "Negotiations on Vietnam." It was published in the Washington Evening Star of May 18. I also request that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 5, 1965]

ANALYSIS OF TACTICS: JOHNSON REVOLUTIONIZES FOREIGN POLICY (By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson has completely revolutionized American foreign policy in the last 3 months—since the beginning of the bombing raids on Communist North Vietnam.

Southeast Asia, and now the Caribbean, are the regions where this new Johnson policy has been tried. But its repercussions are bound to be worldwide, and its effect on the future course of international developments is certain to be decisive.

What Mr. Johnson has done is to put the United States squarely "on the map" as the greatest power—fully aware of its overwhelming strength and willing, as well as able, to

use that strength in defense of U.S. national interests and international peace.

In the last 20 years or so Mr. Johnson's predecessors were, in most cases, rather power shy. They were apologetic about America's enormous military strength and tremendous economic and industrial capacity.

Wherever and whenever limited American military strength had to be used—as, for example, in Greece and Turkey, in Berlin, Korea, and the Middle East—this was always under the auspices of some "international" sponsorship.

The idea was conveyed that there was something basically wrong in the use of American military strength. Yet the only wrong thing about it was the fact that the idea itself was wrong.

The use of military strength is not "wrong" by itself. It depends on who uses it, how, and for what purpose.

In this field (the use of military strength) the record of the United States is second to none. The United States is not a colonial or imperialistic power, it holds no foreign country in bondage and it never has waged wars for conquest.

Contrary to what leftwingers and "liberals" say, the world is not afraid of American military power. To the contrary—all supporters of freedom and democracy, as well as all enslaved nations—in Europe, in Asia, and everywhere else—always have welcomed and welcome now the display and the exercise of American military power. This is so because they know that American power is their friend and protector.

The quick, forceful, and determined use of American military power in southeast Asia and the Caribbean will—we can be certain—greatly increase American influence throughout the world.

All our true friends will welcome with relief and satisfaction the news that, at long last, the President of the United States is following a foreign policy worthy of the leader of the free world—a policy based on the use of adequate U.S. strength where aggressors have to be stopped and where Communist conspiracies have to be defeated.

The success of this policy can best be judged by the angry and desperate howls coming from the Communist camp. The Communists are hurt—badly—and they shriek the louder because they did not expect such a hard blow to come from the United States just now.

For many years, the Reds were accustomed to American inaction in the face of their growing provocations. But now the man in the White House shows that he can act—and now. When shot at, he shoots back right away, without even consulting the United Nations.

And as L.B.J.'s guns are the best in the world, and his aim is deadly accurate, the Reds are beginning to realize they are in the wrong game.

This soon will bring the Communist leaders to an "agonizing reappraisal" of their policy toward the United States.

The one thing that the Communists don't want—and cannot afford to have—is a real showdown (a "confrontation," as Washington diplomats would say) with the United States. They will change their policy when they see that a confrontation might be inevitable. We then shall be on the road toward a more peaceful world.

[From the Indianapolis Star, May 14, 1965]

L.B.J.'s SPEECH WAS EFFECTIVE PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

(By Michael Padev, Star foreign editor)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's speech before the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists yesterday was a very skillful and a very effective step of public diplomacy.

The President said things and proposed policies which are meant to—

1. Further deepen the rift between Moscow and Peiping.

2. Make the Hanoi Communist regime think twice before agreeing to accept any military help from Red China.

3. Strengthen the "peace party" among North Vietnam's Communist leaders.

Contrary to what liberal experts on Communist affairs predicted, the escalation of the Vietnam war has not drawn Soviet Russia and Red China together. To the contrary, it has moved them further apart.

The Red Chinese press is now full of scornful attacks on the Soviet leaders, who are accused of kowtowing to the American imperialists and of being scared to help the glorious Communist comrades in North Vietnam against the American "paper tigers."

But Red China is not helping North Vietnam either. Though the Soviet press has so far been silent on the matter, Soviet and East European Communist diplomats have been pointing out in talks with Western officials that it is the Red Chinese who seem to be scared, in spite of the bombastic war propaganda.

By stressing that Red China is the only danger to peace in Asia, President Johnson has given a diplomatic "helping hand" to the Soviet leaders in their difficult struggle against Peiping.

This is a very clever political move. The United States should do its utmost to worsen the quarrel between Soviet Russia and Red China. Disunited Communists are much less dangerous than united Communists.

It is also obvious that all is not well between Red China and the Hanoi Communist government.

The U.S. bombing offensive against Communist targets in North Vietnam has made Hanoi suffer very dearly for its "war of liberation" in South Vietnam.

Red China also supports this "war of liberation." But there are no Red Chinese casualty lists, no Red Chinese bridges are bombed, and no Red Chinese communication lines are destroyed.

As the U.S. air offensive against Hanoi continues and is extended, the North Vietnam Communist leaders cannot fail to see that their country is the only victim in a war which is supposed to be common Communist property.

The unequal share of sacrifices, hardships and privations is never a good basis for a lasting alliance between states.

Sooner or later the Hanoi Communists leaders will point out to their Chinese comrades that a peaceful settlement with the United States might prove to be the only way to save North Vietnam from destruction and devastation.

Red Chinese propaganda about the United States being a paper tiger must sound very hollow in Hanoi just now for it is the Hanoi leaders who know, from painful experience, that the paper tiger has very sharp teeth, indeed.

By offering again "unconditional discussions" for peace, coupled with an imaginative and constructive American plan for technical assistance to an international cooperative development project in southeast Asia, President Johnson has appealed directly to the "peace party" among Hanoi's Communist leaders.

There should be no doubt that such a "peace party" does exist in Hanoi. We often believe, mistakenly, that all Communists think and act alike. But this is not true, especially in times of stress, emergency or war.

We can be sure that there is, at present, a very strong group of North Vietnam Communist leaders who doubt, or who begin to

doubt, the wisdom of continuing the "liberation war" in South Vietnam.

Mr. Johnson's speech was meant to strengthen the hand of exactly this group of Hanoi leaders.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 18, 1965]

NEGOTIATIONS ON VIETNAM

President Johnson's call for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, combined with the idea that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side," is being wildly misinterpreted by some people in this country and abroad.

Critics of administration policy have seized on these two phrases to bolster their hope that a sellout in Vietnam is in the making. If a negotiation can be started, they say, it will be based on our recognition of a military stalemate in Vietnam. Whether or not the Communist Vietcong is accepted as a party to the negotiation, its status as a political power will be conceded.

The United States, these people believe, will be willing to accept participation of the Vietcong as a major element of a coalition government in South Vietnam which will ultimately lead to the reunification of the country under the leadership of Hanoi.

The President, in our opinion, means no such thing. A willingness to negotiate unconditionally does not mean that we are prepared to accept any and all conditions to achieve peace in Vietnam. And to say that no purely military solution is in sight does not mean that the United States is resigned either to a Vietcong victory or an indefinite stalemate.

The President, in short, is not seeking a negotiation in order to consecrate a defeat. Much of his speech last Thursday was devoted to the task of pointing out that the struggle against the Vietcong is being waged on political, economic, and social levels which are concurrent and complementary to the military war. Nothing that he has said could be interpreted to mean that this struggle against Communist domination will not be ultimately successful.

No negotiation undertaken under the present circumstances is likely in any event to produce a final settlement of the Vietnamese problem. The United States, as the President has made clear many times, cannot accept any formula which compromises the freedom and independence of South Vietnam.

What may be negotiable are the terms for a cease-fire in the south, together with an end to infiltration of men and arms from North Vietnam and the bombing of North Vietnamese installations.

It is possible also that the groundwork could be laid for elections in South Vietnam within a reasonable time after a cease-fire. Such elections held under international supervision would determine the role of the Vietcong in any future South Vietnamese government. It would also, very probably, determine the issue of reunification according to the wishes of a majority of South Vietnamese.

It is quite understandable that a solution along these lines should satisfy neither the Communists nor those who would like to see a surrender of South Vietnam. The reaction from Hanoi and Peiping so far indicates that the Communists for their part have by no means abandoned their hopes of conquest. And they at least do not seem to be under the illusion that they can win at the bargaining table what they cannot win on the battlefield.

ADJUSTMENTS REQUIRED FOR FULL EQUALITY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, James Reston recently devoted his widely read column in the New York Times to an

TABLE 7.—Education and Experience—Continued
 JOB VACANCIES BY MINIMUM EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENTS

	Years of schooling required									Total	Stand- ard error of total number of job vacancies
	0	1 to 7	8	9 to 11	12	13 to 15	16	17 to 19	20		
Horizontal percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None.....	4.6	6.8	6.0	11.3	28.9	9.3	29.4	1.4	2.3	100.0	-----
1 to 3 months.....	12.2	0	17.3	28.1	37.4	2.9	2.2	0	0	100.0	-----
4 to 6 months.....	37.8	3.2	11.2	10.8	20.3	15.9	.8	0	0	100.0	-----
7 to 11 months.....	0	0	2.2	56.5	40.2	0	1.1	0	0	100.0	-----
1 year.....	0	15.1	4.6	5.5	52.2	11.9	4.2	.2	6.3	100.0	-----
2 years.....	3	7.2	5.1	37.6	30.8	5.7	11.2	2.0	.1	100.0	-----
3 years.....	0	27.1	20.6	3.4	22.0	3.7	18.9	2.8	1.4	100.0	-----
4 years.....	0	0	51.5	4.2	28.9	1.0	8.7	3.0	2.7	100.0	-----
5 years.....	0	22.7	1.4	7.9	31.6	9.6	22.0	3.1	1.7	100.0	-----
6 years.....										(9)	-----
7 to 9 years.....										(9)	-----
10 years or more.....										(9)	-----
Total.....	4.2	7.8	11.1	13.5	30.2	7.9	21.2	1.6	2.3	100.0	-----
Vertical percent distribution											
Minimum period of related experience:											
Less than 1 year: None.....	62.9	49.6	31.0	48.0	55.1	67.2	79.9	50.8	59.3	57.6	-----
1 to 3 months.....	5.0	0	2.7	3.6	2.2	.6	.2	0	0	1.7	-----
4 to 6 months.....	28.2	1.3	3.1	2.5	2.1	6.3	.1	0	0	3.1	-----
7 to 11 months.....	0	0	.2	4.8	1.5	0	.1	0	0	1.2	-----
1 year.....	0	12.6	2.7	2.7	11.3	9.8	1.3	.8	18.1	6.5	-----
2 years.....	9	10.4	5.2	31.3	11.5	8.0	6.0	13.8	.5	11.3	-----
3 years.....	0	15.3	8.2	1.1	3.2	2.1	4.0	7.7	2.7	4.4	-----
4 years.....	0	0	30.4	2.0	6.3	.8	2.7	12.3	7.7	6.6	-----
5 years.....	0	10.5	.4	2.1	3.8	4.4	3.8	6.9	2.7	3.6	-----
6 years.....	0	.3	16.0	1.0	1.7	0	.7	1.5	0	2.6	-----
7 to 9 years.....	3.0	0	0	.7	1.0	.3	.9	4.6	4.4	.9	-----
10 years or more.....	0	0	0	0	.4	.5	.4	1.5	4.4	.4	-----
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-----

¹ Statistically unreliable owing to large relative size of standard error.
² Distribution statistically unreliable owing to small number of reported vacancies.

NOTE.—(1) Data in all tables relate to Monroe County, N.Y. and to Feb. 12, 1965.
 (2) Components do not necessarily add to totals owing to rounding.
 (3) Unless otherwise stated, the source for all tables is the NICB survey.
 (See text.)
 (4) All standard errors are rounded to 3 significant digits.

The sample for the NICB February survey was designed to obtain reliable information from employers of all sizes and in all major industry groups. Nine different size groups (in terms of employment) were used in the sample design. In addition, 10 different industry divisions were separately sampled. All employers with 250 or more employees were included in the sample. Of 416 employers chosen, 10 were found to be out of business on the survey date, 3 were seasonally closed, 3 refused to provide information, and 1, a very small employer, could not be contacted by an interviewer. Substitutions were made for two of the refusals, in medium-sized firms. Of those employers available to respond, 99 percent did so. Of those responding, 48 percent reported one or more job vacancies.

The interviews were carried out by six members of the staff of the conference board and eight employees of Bernardine Slade Market Research, Inc. Prior to the February survey a number of extensive exploratory interviews were conducted with Rochester employers. A pretest of 45 small- and medium-sized employers was conducted in January. Also, a conference board employee conducted a postenumeration quality check after the February survey of 14 employers previously interviewed.

Our experience with these surveys has led us to the tentative conclusion that the collection of job vacancy statistics is a feasible operation when the information is obtained by interview and the groundwork in the community has been carefully prepared. Employers were cooperative in almost all cases and readily understood the concepts and definitions. A preliminary analysis of the results indicates that they are reasonable and consistent with other information. Our final judgment, however, must wait upon the results of the two additional sample sur-

veys in Monroe County, one in May and the other in August 1965.

JOHN G. MYERS,
 Senior Economist, Special Projects,
 Office of the Chief Economist.

AMERICAN PUBLIC PATIENCE BIG REQUIREMENT FOR SUCCESS IN VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Edward T. Folliard, a columnist for the Washington Post, has written a thoughtful and, wise article on the great importance of patience and stamina on the part of the American public with regard to Vietnam. He says, in part:

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons, and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PATIENCE, STAMINA: VIETNAM REQUIREMENTS
 (By Edward T. Folliard)

The most important requirement for success in Vietnam, aside from fighting men, weapons and diplomacy, may turn out to be patience and stamina in the United States. In Hanoi and Peiping, the Communists are betting that Americans are short on both of

these qualities, and will not be able to match their own Oriental fortitude.

It is a fact that Americans are not noted for patience. Indeed, we have made a virtue of impatience, and this doubtless has had much to do with the Nation's greatness. Ours is a country in a hurry, as is exemplified in the slogan:

"The difficult we do immediately. The impossible takes a little longer."

This is admirable, but what happens if the war in Vietnam is a long drawn out one? It could become the longest war in which the United States has ever engaged. It certainly will become that if Donald Johnson, national commander of the American Legion, is right. The Legion chief, who recently visited South Vietnam, said at the White House last week that he could envision the struggle going on for another 5, 6 or 7 years.

American intervention in South Vietnam began in the Eisenhower administration, but the current buildup in manpower was ordered by President Kennedy, and the first American casualties were reported late in 1961. Therefore, if the fighting should continue for another 5 years, it would set a record for American involvement with a foreign foe, exceeding in duration the Revolutionary War (1775-83).

President Johnson is eager for a settlement in Vietnam, but he has vowed to hang on there until the Reds of North Vietnam and their Vietcong allies end their aggression against South Vietnam. He says that the United States will "not be defeated" and will "not grow tired." Moreover, the Texan believes that his successor, or successors, will if necessary carry on the struggle after he leaves the White House.

That still leaves unanswered the question of how the American people would behave if the conflict is prolonged. It is an important question. In writing about the Korean war

in volume II of his memoirs, former President Harry S. Truman said:

"What a nation can do or must do begins with the willingness of its people to shoulder the burden."

The American people saw the Korean war through, but their patience was badly strained. There were hawks and doves then, too. But in between were millions of Americans who just weren't persuaded that this Nation's involvement was worth the cost in lives and treasure.

Sir Winston Churchill said later that this one act by Mr. Truman—his boldness and swiftness in going into Korea—entitled him to be listed among America's great Presidents. It seemed at this time, however, that the Missourian never quite succeeded in explaining to the mass of his countrymen what was at stake in Korea, and he was jeered for calling the war "a police action."

President Truman had strong backing when he first sent American troops to Korea under the banner of the United Nations. But as the conflict dragged on, it became a political issue at home, and Senator Robert A. Taft and other Republicans began calling it "Truman's war."

In spite of this division, which carried over into the 1952 presidential campaign, the Communists realized after a year of fighting that the map of Korea couldn't be changed by violence. After a signal from Moscow and Peiping, negotiations for a truce began on July 10, 1951. The negotiations continued for 2 years; finally, the armistice agreement was signed at Panmunjon on July 27, 1953.

Back in the spring of 1951, President Truman had fired Gen. Douglas MacArthur as Far East commander. He disagreed with MacArthur's proposal to attack Red China and he disagreed with MacArthur's shibboleth: "There is no substitute for victory."

"The only victory we seek," said Mr. Truman, "is the victory of peace." But in saying this, he insisted that the Communists would not be allowed "to keep the fruits of their misdeeds." And so the war ended where it began.

The war in Vietnam is very much different from Korea. President Johnson's objective, however, is much the same as Mr. Truman's: to show the Communists that they can't get away with aggression against their neighbor.

Mr. Johnson has said that the United States has no desire to conquer North Vietnam and that "there is no purely military solution in sight for either side." Barring a change in policy, this would seem to leave the United States with only one course of action: to hang on until the Communists decide, as they did in Korea, that fighting is no longer profitable.

The Communist leaders of Hanoi and Peiping, as has been said, are betting that Americans don't have the staying power to go the route. A generation ago, Hitler and Mussolini were saying that the United States was "decadent."

L.B.J. IN SANTO DOMINGO NOT TOO LITTLE OR TOO LATE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Chicago Sun-Times of May 30, Eric Sevareid discussed the Santo Domingo situation. He said, in part:

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor, and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "Too little with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "Too soon with too much."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DOMINGO REDS NEVER A MYTH

(By Eric Sevareid)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—The tide of second guessing about the American intervention in Santo Domingo—as to its justification, its size, its methods and its aims—had reached oceanic proportions by the time this writer managed to get to the first European city established in the New World. Here in what Columbus called "the land of God," had come the first teachers and preachers, yet here remains, after five centuries, one of the political hellholes of the hemisphere, its soiled streets once again thronged with armed men from abroad.

The scenes of bitter sorrow in Santo Domingo have been well described; there are other things, perhaps, worth putting down at this late date. I thought I had rarely seen such brave work by combat reporters, rarely such emotional involvement on the part of some of them, rarely such a wealth of unconfirmable reports and rumors, rarely such a disastrous lack of contact between reporters and American officials who were not only physically remote but for a long time silenced by Presidential orders. And rarely have I read such certain conclusions in American press editorials about a phenomenon in which so much was uncertain and inconclusive.

For me it is impossible to believe that the Communist threat was a myth, impossible to believe that a democratic and stable government could have been formed by the impassioned leaders of thousands of armed and impassioned people, a vast number of them youngsters. It is hard for me to believe that we could not have prevented the tragic fighting in the northern part of the city, easy to believe that we did prevent an even more awful bloodletting in the congested downtown region.

I cannot understand the cry that we put in far too many men. An airport, several miles of corridor and a safety factor with a long perimeter require thousands of soldiers who require other thousands to support and supply them. Nor can I understand the complaint that the President acted with too much haste. Over many years I have been adjusted to the complaint of "too late with too little." I find it hard to make a quick switch to the complaint of "too soon with too much." I fail to understand the editorialist who points out with disdain that after all, there were only a few handfuls of Communists present. In a very real sense their lack of numbers is their strength. It was because they were few that former President Juan Bosch had not bothered to deal severely with them. It was because they were few that they could do much of their work undetected. It was because they were few that foreign opinionmakers could make the Americans seem ridiculous and give us a propaganda defeat. As former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin reminds us, Communists do not make revolutions, they take them over.

And their small number in various other Latin American countries lies near the heart of the profound dilemma that confronts the United States for the future. Revolts are brewing in other nations to the south. In all these revolts Communist elements will be present. Are we to put down every uprising because a Communist threat is present? Obviously we cannot, even though some of these uprisings probably will produce Communist governments.

But nothing in this realm of human action is inevitable; the game is not lost as long as

we act on the assumption that it can be won. There are Latin societies strong enough to handle the Communists. Others will be galvanized into counteraction by Communist victories or near victories close by their borders.

Meantime, the nonsense arguments should stop. To say that the United States has kept the Dominican Republic from enjoying a free, stable democratic government is nonsense; we have given them another chance to find their feet on the long, hard road to democracy. To say that the real fear in Latin America is of American gunboat diplomacy is nonsense; every literate Latin American knows that American interventions have always been temporary while communism is permanent.

It is nonsense to indulge any longer the self-conscious idea that Latin America's troubles are the fault of the United States. Some are; most are the fault of Latin America. Its ways of life are superior to ours in more than a few respects, but not in respect to the art of government. In the last century and a half there have been in all of Latin America approximately 3,700 coups, rebellions, and civil wars.

INVESTIGATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the May 28, 1965, issue of the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., entitled "Justice Action on Baker Overdue."

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

JUSTICE ACTION ON BAKER OVERDUE

Well over a year ago, Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, had urged continued Senate investigation of Robert G. Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democrats. He wanted the Senate to be free of criticism that "someone high in the Government" was being protected.

Senator WILLIAMS also noted then that it was time for the Department of Justice to begin criminal prosecution in the Baker case.

Earlier in 1964 the head of the Justice Department's criminal division had said his office was conducting an important investigation into Baker's affairs "to ascertain the possibility of false statements, conflict of interest, bribery, fraud against the Government and conspiracy."

Then late last year it was revealed that a Federal grand jury in the national capital had started an investigation of conflict of interest and other charges against Baker.

The onetime protege of Lyndon B. Johnson had refused, under 5th amendment protections, to testify and to provide requested information before the Senate Rules Committee. His refusal was legally proper because of the possibility of court action against him.

The whole series of revelations—still far from complete—came after a civil suit had been filed against Baker in September of 1963, a suit charging that he had used political influence in the award of contracts in defense plants for a vending machine firm. Since then there have been out of court negotiations for settlement of this case.

It is no wonder now that Senator WILLIAMS is concerned over a pending summary report from the Senate Rules Committee. From unofficial leaks, he has come to the belief that a desperate effort is being made to discredit him while the committee's majority Democrats and the Johnson administration are trying "to save Baker from legal prosecution at all costs."

States after a temporary absence abroad, and aliens who are natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere.

It repeals the definition and concept of a quota immigrant and defines the professional classes of preference immigrants to include doctors, lawyers, teachers, professors, clergymen, and engineers.

It defines in one place an "eligible orphan," the confusing definition of which exists currently in three separate sections of the law.

Section 3 of the bill essentially repeats the language of the present act which requires a visa and a passport for every arriving immigrant. It broadens the authority of the Attorney General to waive these documents for returning residents.

Section 4 of the bill makes technical changes in the language of the excluding provisions contained in section 212 of the act. The material changes are:

The words "mentally retarded" are substituted for the language "feebleminded." "Epilepsy" is deleted as a mandatory exclusion ground.

Both of the above changes were based on the testimony of the Surgeon General's office.

Other changes are required to delete language which would become obsolete with the elimination of the quota system.

Section 5 of the bill removes the word "physical" from the language of section 243(h) of the act which permits the Attorney General to stay the deportation of an alien whom he believes would be subjected to (physical) persecution on his return to his homeland. This provision recognizes that the more subtle, mental, moral, and emotional sanctions imposed on their captive citizens by these totalitarian regimes are no less a basis for our refusal to return these people to their native lands and to such oppression. This sanction also makes other conforming changes.

Section 6 of the bill amends section 244 of the act, the suspension of deportation procedures, to make eligible for that privilege citizens of Western Hemisphere countries and aliens who entered the United States as crewmen, presently ineligible under the terms of the current act.

Section 7 of the bill amends section 245 of the act, the adjustment of status procedure, to make eligible for adjustment to permanent residence within this country, any alien in the United States (other than a native of the Western Hemisphere) who, if abroad, would be eligible for the immediate issuance of a visa. It removes the current ineligibility of crewmen for the privilege.

Section 8 of the bill amends section 249, the "registry" provisions, by advancing the date of entry of eligibles from June 23, 1940, to December 24, 1952. Under the amendment, any alien who entered the United States prior to the latter date and has resided here since, and is of good character, may be granted the status of a permanent resident. The section is, in effect, a limited statute of limitation against deportation.

All cases which result in the grant of permanent residence status by application within the United States under sections 244, 245, and 249 will also result in the deduction of 1 number in the overall ceiling of 225,000 immigrants a year.

Section 9 of the bill prescribes a uniform cost for immigrant visa issuance of \$20, and authorizes the partial deposit or prepayment of such fee at the time of registration.

Section 10 of the bill repeals the Fair Share Refugee Act (secs. 1, 2, and 11 of the act of July 14, 1960), rendered unnecessary by the provisions for visa issuance to refugees under the preference classification of section 203(a)(7) of the bill.

The repeal of this provision should result in the use of the more appropriate visa-issuing procedure as the method of docu-

menting alien refugees for admission to this country and to limit the use of the parole provisions of the act (sec. 212(d)(5)) to the purposes originally intended—the temporary reception of persons arriving in the United States without documentation and under emergent circumstances, e.g., shipwrecked crewmen, and so forth.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

EXPANDED PROGRAMS OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 196)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The American people want their Government to be not only strong but compassionate. They know that a society is secure only where social justice is secure for all its citizens. When there is turmoil anywhere in our own country, our instinct is to inquire if there is injustice. That instinct is sound. And these principles of compassion and justice do not stop at the water's edge. We do not have one policy for our own people and another for our friends abroad.

A vast revolution is sweeping the southern half of this globe. We do not intend that the Communists shall become the beneficiaries of this revolt against injustice and privation. We intend to lead vigorously in that struggle. We will continue to back that intention with practical and concrete help.

In southeast Asia today, we are offering our hand and our abundance to those who seek to build a brighter future. The effort to create more progressive societies cannot wait for an ideal moment. It cannot wait until peace has been finally secured. We must move ahead now.

I know of no more urgent task ahead. It requires more of us, more of other prosperous nations, and more of the people of southeast Asia.

For our part, I propose that we expand our own economic assistance to the people of South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos.

I propose we start now to make available our share of the money needed to harness the resources of the entire southeast Asia region for the benefit of all its people. This must be an international venture. That is why I have asked Mr. Eugene Black to consult with the United Nations Secretary General and the leaders of the poor and advanced nations. Our role will be vital, but we hope that all other industrialized nations, including the Soviet Union, will participate.

To support our own effort, I ask the Congress to authorize and appropriate for fiscal year 1966 an additional \$89 million for the Agency for International Development for expanded programs of

economic and social development in southeast Asia.

This money will serve many purposes:

First, Approximately \$19 million will provide the first installment of our contribution to the accelerated development of the Mekong River Basin. This is an important part of the general program of regional development which I outlined at Johns Hopkins University on April 7. This money will enable us to meet a request for half the cost of building the Nam Ngum Dam, which the international Mekong Committee has marked "top priority" if the Mekong River is to be put to work for the people of the region. This will be the first Mekong power project to serve two countries, promising power to small industry and lights for thousands of homes in northeast Thailand and Laos. The funds will provide also for:

Powerlines across the Mekong linking Laos and Thailand.

Extensive studies of further hydroelectric, irrigation, and flood control projects on the Mekong main stream and its tributaries;

Expansion of distribution lines in Laos.

Second, Five million dollars will be used to support electrification cooperatives near three provincial towns—Long Xuyen, Dalat, and Nha Trang—in South Vietnam. Co-ops, which have been so important to the lives of our rural people, will bring the benefits of low priced electricity to more than 300,000 Vietnamese. We hope this pattern can be duplicated in towns and villages throughout the region. I will ask that we provide further support if the pattern meets the success we believe possible.

Third, Seven million dollars will help provide improved medical and surgical services, especially in the more remote areas of Vietnam, Laos and Thailand. South Vietnam is tragically short of doctors; some 200 civilian physicians must care for a population of 15 millions.

In Laos the system of AID-supported village clinics and rural hospitals now reaches more than a million people. But that is not enough. We propose to extend the program in Laos, assist the Thailand Government to expand its public health services to thousands of rural villages, and to organize additional medical and surgical teams for sick and injured civilians in South Vietnam.

Better health is the first fruit of modern science. For the people of these countries it has far too long been an empty promise. I hope that when peace comes our medical assistance can be expanded and made available to the sick and wounded of the area without regard to political commitment.

Fourth, Approximately \$6 million will be used to train people for the construction of roads, dams, and other small-scale village projects in Thailand and Laos. In many parts of Asia the chance of the villager for markets, education, and access to public services depends on his getting a road. A nearby water well dramatically lightens the burdens of the farmer's wife. With these tools and skills local people can build their own

schools and clinics—blessings only dreamed of before.

Fifth. Approximately \$45 million will be used to finance increasing imports of iron and steel, cement, chemicals and pesticides, drugs, trucks, and other essential goods necessary for a growing civilian economy. This money will allow factories not only to continue but, through investment, to expand production of both capital and consumer goods. It will provide materials for urgently needed low-cost housing. And it will maintain production incentives and avoid inflation. It is not easy for a small country, with a low income, to fight a war on its own soil and at the same time persist in the business of nation building. The additional import support which I propose will help Vietnam to persevere in this difficult task.

Sixth. An additional \$7 million will supplement the present program of agricultural development and support additional Government services in all three countries, and will help in the planning of further industrial expansion in the secure areas of Vietnam.

Much of the additional assistance I request is for Vietnam. This is not a poor and unfavored land. There is water and rich soil and ample natural resources. The people are patient, hard-working, the custodians of a proud and ancient civilization. They have been oppressed not by nature but by man. The failures of man can be redeemed. That is the purpose of the aid for which I now ask additional authorization.

We are defending the right of the people of South Vietnam to decide their own destiny. Where this right is attacked by force, we have no alternative but to reply with strength. But military action is not a final solution in this area; it is only a partial means to a much larger goal. Freedom and progress will be possible in Vietnam only as the people are assured that history is on their side—that it will give them a chance to make a living in peace, to educate their children, to escape the ravages of disease and, above all, to be free of the oppressors who for so long have fed on their labors.

Our effort on behalf of the people of southeast Asia should unite, not divide, the people of that region. Our policy is not to spread conflict but to heal conflict.

I ask the Congress, as part of our continuing affirmation of America's faith in the cause of man, to respond promptly and fully to this request.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 1, 1965.

THE FAILURE OF NEW YORK CITY TO IMPLEMENT THE JOB CORPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLEAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate two young men from New York City who have become the unsung heroes of the antipoverty war.

Perhaps they deserve a parade up Fifth Avenue—ticker tape and all. They certainly deserve to be remembered in the history of the antipoverty war.

The administration of the city of New York is the second largest in the Nation. It has proclaimed its own war on poverty.

Over the last year, the city administration has set up an antipoverty operations board, hired employees, moved and moved again into new and better offices. It has spent, or seen spent, several hundred thousand dollars in antipoverty work.

The city administration has insisted it understands the vastness of poverty in New York City. More than a million residents have incomes of less than \$1,600. Some 75,000 youths are out of school and out of work.

And presumably the city administration saw the importance of the Job Corps. Recruiting out of school and out of work youth, the corps would get youths off the streets, give them work, inspiration, and skills.

And so in March, the Office of Economic Opportunity asked New York City to recommend 830 youths for the Job Corps initial enrollment.

Plenty of youths wanted to get in the Job Corps. Although New York has had no substantive publicity for the Corps, some 1,597 youths have written to the Corps from New York City. Across the Nation, some 300,000 have written in. They are applying at the rate of 15,000 every week.

Presumably, on the call of the Office of Economic Opportunity, New York's antipoverty organization shifted into high gear.

Each youth had to be interviewed. A form had to be made out, a physical taken. Eight hundred and thirty had to be selected from some 1,600 known volunteers, from some 75,000 out-of-school and out-of-work youngsters.

Presumably, the New York antipoverty organization would send forms to Washington. Waiting computers would correlate each applicant's needs with various Corps center programs, and would assign him to the appropriate center.

Presumably, this activity went on for more than 2 months. And then someone asked what had been done? Were all the youths in camps using up the quota for New York? Could not the city, with summer here, get the Office of Economic Opportunity to allocate more places for its thousands of needy youths?

But in more than 2 months—by the end of May—the New York City antipoverty organization had gotten not 830, not 300, not 200, not 100, not even 10 youths in a Job Corps camp.

The organization had gotten just two—exactly two—New York youths in Job Corps camps.

But am I being sarcastic, unfair?

True, only two got into camps. But the New York organization actually did screen 26 applicants, and sent the forms to Washington.

Yet the figures deceive. For of the 26, this efficient New York City administration filled out 7 of the simple forms incorrectly. They had to be returned.

I understand that the problem of screening applicants in New York City has run into many conflicts and difficulties.

One of these conflicts is centered on the question of who is going to give the required medical examination. The Government pays a fee for each examination.

I realize this is not really funny.

It is not even sad.

It is inexcusable—especially in a city where a million people suffer destitution, where 500,000 are on welfare, where narcotics has cut the hope from countless lives, where poverty breeds poverty and thousands of youngsters find no way out; where frustrations and desperations abound.

The Job Corps was created by Congress to reach young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are largely unemployable because they lack education and skills. It is aimed at young people who have not completed high school and who have not found work. At the conservation camps and training centers, basic education and job training are being provided for some 2,500 youths, and by June 30, 10,000 will be enrolled.

This program is being ignored by a city government which should be painfully aware of the social dynamite.

Two weeks ago the Office of Economic Opportunity had to ask the New York State Employment Service to step into New York City and screen 200 applicants.

New York City lags behind every major city in the country. Until the New York Times reported on the situation on May 15, not a single New York City youth was actually at a Job Corps center.

Mr. Speaker, since the city antipoverty operations board is apparently incapable of doing the screening, I call upon Sargent Shriver, the Director, and the Office of Economic Opportunity to set up special emergency screening centers in New York City to process applications immediately.

Congress provided this resource almost a year ago—and we must put it to use—now, before another troubled summer—to help deprived youth break the chains of poverty.

A BILL TO BRING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 to bring under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board those building and loan associations and similar institutions in the District of Columbia which are not now subject to such regulation.

At the present time, the District of Columbia statutes neither regulate these institutions directly nor do they confer

upon the Home Loan Bank Board the power to regulate the 15 associations chartered by the District of Columbia. It is time that these associations be placed under the supervision of the Home Loan Bank Board.

The following is an analysis of the bill I have introduced today:

ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 5 OF THE HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933 (WITH RESPECT TO BUILDING AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

The attached draft for a bill would add to subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 provisions giving District of Columbia building and loan associations and similar institutions the same statutory lending and investment powers as Federal savings and loan associations, and concurring on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same regulatory and enforcement powers that it has with respect to Federal savings and loan associations.

At present, there are 24 institutions of the savings and loan type (in addition to two associations having only branches in the District) which are operating in the District of Columbia. Of these 24 institutions, 9 are Federal savings and loan associations and 15 are District of Columbia associations. At the close of the calendar year 1964, total assets of these Federal associations amounted to \$587 million and total assets of these District associations amounted to \$1.4 billion.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is the examining and supervisory authority for District of Columbia associations, as well as for all Federal savings and loan associations wherever located. However, the existing provisions of the District of Columbia statutes do not provide adequate authority for the regulation and supervision of District associations.

Thus, for example, the District of Columbia statutes neither regulate directly, nor confer on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the power to regulate, the lending practices of such associations. This is true of such vital matters as the types of real property on which loans may be made, the requirement of appraisals, the maximum percentages of value that may be loaned, and other matters customarily dealt with in the statutes of the various States and territories either by direct provision or by the conferring of regulatory authority.

Likewise, the District of Columbia statutes do not confer adequate authority over the establishment and maintenance of branches by building and loan associations in the District. It is true that the provisions embodied in subsection (c) of section 26-103 of the District of Columbia Code provide that no building association, except those engaged in and doing a building-association business on March 4, 1933, shall do a building-association business or maintain any office in the District until it has secured the consent of the Board. However, even assuming that this provision relates to the establishment of branches by such associations, it is to be noted that all building and loan associations incorporated or organized under the laws of the District of Columbia which are now operating in the District were incorporated or organized prior to that date.

At the present time all building and loan associations doing business in the District have obtained insurance of their accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. While associations which apply for such insurance are required by statute to agree to certain types of regulation, the regulation to which they are thus required to agree is limited. For example, the only provision as to regulation of loans is with respect to certain loans beyond 50 miles from the association's principal office,

and there is no authority to regulate the establishment or maintenance of branches.

On the other hand, the Board has express and adequate authority to regulate Federal savings and loan associations, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, under section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, subsection (a) of which authorizes the Board, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, to provide for the examination, operation, and regulation of such associations.

The attached draft bill would end this anomalous situation. It would give District of Columbia associations the same statutory lending and investment authority as Federal associations and would at the same time place in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the same regulatory and enforcement powers which the Board has with respect to Federal associations.

Subdivision (1) of this amendment would provide that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, with respect to all incorporated or unincorporated building and loan associations and similar institutions of the District of Columbia, or transacting or doing business or maintaining any office therein, shall have the same powers and functions as to examination, operation, and regulation as are now or hereafter vested in or exercisable by the Board with respect to Federal savings and loan associations. The reference to unincorporated associations is included because certain associations organized and in actual operation before March 4, 1900, are permitted by a specific provision of law to conduct or carry on business without being incorporated.

Subdivision (2) would extend to such building and loan associations and similar institutions the provisions of subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 as now or hereafter in force. That subsection provides for the appointment of conservators, receivers, or supervisory representatives in charge for Federal savings and loan associations in cases of insolvency as defined therein, violation of law or regulation, unsafe or unsound operation, concealment of books, records, or assets, or refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs for inspection. It also provides for administrative and judicial proceedings.

The existing District law provides for taking possession of a building and loan association where it is insolvent or is knowingly violating the laws under which it is incorporated, and for the appointment of a receiver where the association discontinues operations for a specified period. However, under existing District law such matters as unsafe or unsound operation, concealment of books, records, or assets, and refusal to submit books, papers, records, or affairs for inspection are not specifically made grounds for taking possession, and it is not clear whether the existing law authorizes the taking of possession in the case of foreign associations doing business in the District.

Subdivision (3) of the proposed amendment would extend to District of Columbia associations the lending and investment provisions of subsection (c) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 and other enactments of Congress applicable to lending and investment by Federal savings and loan associations which have their home offices in the District, except provisions applicable solely to converted associations. It would provide that no provisions of statute other than those so applicable to Federal savings and loan associations shall be applicable to lending or investment by such District associations.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXXII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to ex-

tend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns drug addiction in New York and is part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 8, 1965, and follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FREE-DRUG PLAN: ALREADY TRIED, ALREADY A FAILURE

(There is no known cure for the cancer of dope addiction, but one of the most frequently mentioned hopes is the "British system," which proponents contend would cut crime by permitting addicts to receive legalized drugs free. But the "British system," like many other proposed solutions, is more myth than fact. Paul Weissman reports as he looks into the subject in today's article as part of the continuing "New York City in Crisis" series on narcotics addiction.)

(By Paul Weissman)

The problem: drug addiction. The solution is simple enough, some say: give addicts all the drugs they want.

Virtually every citizen concerned with addict crimes has speculated that free drugs will eliminate the more dangerous social aspects of narcotics addiction.

It is where researchers begin and disciplined people, insistent that the world in which they live be made orderly and safe now—not next week, next month or next year—end up. Their argument is this: does society not have a duty to supply a small percentage of the population, with drugs to protect the majority? The great mass of the population of the city now face murder, assault and robbery by addicts who steal \$1 billion a year to support their habit.

Remove the profit in heroin, the battle cry goes, and addicts will cease stealing to support their habit.

In recent years, the rallying point for free-drug advocates has been a plan called the "British system," based on the idea that Great Britain dispenses heroin, morphine and other opiates for a few cents a dose to anyone who requests narcotic drug "treatment."

A PREVIOUS EXPERIMENT

But the "British system" is not the first plan to give free drugs to addicts.

The need for a quick, permanent cure which would eliminate the social byproducts of drug addiction is nothing new in America. Immediately after World War I, the first hue and cry to "Take the profits out of addiction" began. A radical idea known as the "clinic plan" started in New York City in 1919. For the first time, addicts who registered at clinics were legally given, at low or no cost, enough heroin or other drugs to maintain themselves. As it does now, the idea seemed to make sense, and some 30 other cities followed suit.

By 1925, every one of the clinics had been closed. The cure rate was nil. Clinics found that as soon as they cut down an addict's dosage he became a ready customer for the black market.

Others learned for the first time how to "make a croaker" (feign illness) to obtain more drugs than they needed, and then sold them on the black market or persuaded friends to try a shot. Forged prescriptions became a thriving business. Worst of all, the very fact of the existence of the clinics removed the constraining idea that drug addiction was morally wrong and physically damaging. Large-scale teenage addiction appeared for the first time, and in New York the addiction rate rose sharply—and so did the crime rate, as the unregistered addicts stole to pay for their black-market supply.

World War II, with its embargo on air and sea travel cut sharply into the degree of narcotics addiction in this country. When

the war ended, the Mafia rediscovered the huge profits in heroin and addiction flourished anew.

TAX SECOND CALL

Ten years ago, the hue and cry to legalize drugs began again. The National Academy of Sciences among others, was unalterably opposed to the plan. It offered four basic objections:

1. It is impossible to maintain addicts on a uniform level of dosage.
2. Ambulatory treatment of addicts, as shown in the days of the "clinic plan," was impossible.
3. Clinics would facilitate introduction of new addicts.
4. Such a policy of free drugs would be contrary to international conventions and national legislation.

As for the "British system," the great abiboleth of advocates who would "take the profit out of addiction," by legalizing drugs, it is very little different from American law. Not only does England subscribe to the same international conventions controlling narcotics as the United States, its laws are not dissimilar.

The "British system," as Dr. Granville Lorimer and Dr. Henry Brill reported to Governor Rockefeller in an exhaustive 1960 study, is largely a term invented by Americans.

In 1966, Britain had 833 addicts maintained on drugs. A large percentage were people who became addicted in medical treatment, others were members of the medical profession addicted, authorities believe, because of the easy accessibility of the drugs. The figure of maintained addicts today, the British believe, is close to 800.

As the annual report on drug addiction of the British Department of Health points out: "In no case may dangerous drugs be administered except for medical or dental need where it has been similarly demonstrated that the patient while capable of leading a useful and relatively normal life when a certain minimum dose is regularly administered, becomes incapable of this when the drug is entirely discontinued."

Not a few people have pointed out that England's narcotics problem exists in a different environment than the streets of New York. The crime rate in the United States is roughly four times that of Britain and the divorce rate is 10 times higher. And yet, it is true, a few British addicts are maintained on drugs. The British Department of Health provides this example of a stabilized addict: "Mrs. C., a housewife, is an old lady and a lifelong neurotic. Suspected of a crush-fracture in the midthoracic region after a fall she has complained of constant pain despite spinal support. With four methadone tablets, each of 5 milligrams per day, she manages her household duties. There has been no plea to increase the dose. On the other hand withdrawals have led to such a reaction that the home and family have suffered."

EXPERTS UNDETERRED

Drs. Lorimer and Brill concluded 6 years ago:

"The British system is the result of a favorable situation, not the cause of it." They said the lack of a narcotics problem in England was not the result of superior law enforcement, but the lack of a market.

Despite this, there are a few experts who still argue that a plan to "take the profit out of addiction" should be tried in the United States. They say that such a step should be the most carefully controlled experimental level. Experts who oppose such experimentation with heroin will quote the philosopher Santayana, as they have in the past. They will say, "He who does not heed the lessons of history is condemned to repeat them."

They argue that such experimentation in the proper hands is worth another trial, recognizing the danger that it must not hold out undue hope to addicts that heroin may

eventually be dispensed free and thus deter them from giving up their habit. Their rationale is that it should be tried because there may be enough Mrs. C.'s in America for whom drugs that are now illegal do represent the closest thing to a cure.

A major problem in the United States is that if little is known about the nature of drug addiction, even less is known about the addict. Few experts who are not politicians, will deny that addiction statistics made available either by the New York City Health Department or the Federal Bureau of Narcotics are, at best, minimal figures. These statistics represent for the most part addicts who come in contact with the law. In order to support these figures, some public officials like to believe that almost every addict is arrested at one time or another. But medical authorities have reported that there are in New York and other parts of the United States, sizable numbers of addicts with enough money to support their habit or the ability to avoid getting caught in possession of narcotic or dangerous drugs. Their habits and patterns of addiction are totally unknown to the authorities.

An Dr. Charles Winick, a leading researcher in addiction, has pointed out, "There appears to be no one kind of psychiatric diagnosis which is common to drug addicts. All kinds of people can and do become drug addicts. The psychiatric classification of the addict does not determine the progress of his addiction."

But there are certain generalizations that can be made without addicts. He is, many psychiatrists say, a person who appears to be living in defiance of convention and law, but in fact is someone in flight, someone struggling to escape reality. Like the compulsive gambler, his life at first is one of danger under control. He steals. He beats the police. He cops. He avoids jail—for a while. And the habit grows. When it becomes large enough, the danger is no longer under control. The addict becomes his need and virtually every aspect of his existence is conditioned and satisfied with one demand, one love, one fact: heroin. He has reached the world of dead souls.

THE ADDICT'S SUBCULTURE

In New York City, because of the high addiction rate, this addict's world has become an entire society in itself, a subculture, with its own mores, values, rewards, and heroes.

"I beat the fuzz," an addict will say on a street corner. "I made the scene."

But as Jeremy Larner noted in his study of teenage addiction in New York, the addict, although he is outside of and deprecatory of normal society, is acutely dependent on it. This means that the jails, hospitals, and rehabilitation centers in which he lives and moves are the crucial environmental factors on him. The conditions in these places should be such as to seek to cure him. In fact, they—and other city facilities—are of little help.

A crucial factor in the city's failures in its battle against addiction has been that it has initiated almost no valid research. Addicts are extremely difficult to examine and even more difficult to treat. Because they tend to be unusually dependent, under questioning they invariably hand up the answer any questioner wants to hear. In New York, very few researchers, psychiatrists, or social workers have taken the time or trouble to examine the addict in his natural environment: on the street. And those who have, mostly from private clinics, are rarely listened to.

Most of all, the addict desperately needs to know where he stands, must in fact know clearly what kind of treatment he can expect in the courts, from the health department, in hospitals and after. As older addicts talk endlessly of their experiences in the Federal hospital at Lexington, Ky., younger addicts hash over days at Manhat-

tan General, Metropolitan, Napanock (a correctional institution) and Rikers Island (city jail).

The problem is that if the community itself is confused and impotent when it comes to dealing with the addict, how can the community then expect the addict to come to grips with his problem with himself and his problems with society?

This has been the problem, accentuated by lack of research, in New York City. There are some areas where research has been done, mostly in the public announcements of "cures" or dramatic progress. The danger of aiming at panaceas is that they may in fact precipitate new problems as serious as those they were intended to resolve.

Such is the situation with the Metcalf-Voelker law adopted by the State in 1963. This law permits arrested addicts, under certain circumstances to elect civil commitment in a hospital in lieu of prosecution. After period of confinement, usually 3 or 4 months, the addict is paroled for a period not to exceed 3 years. In practice, a large proportion of addicts reject civil commitment because they prefer to take a chance on a suspended sentence or even 6 months in jail rather than face a long parole. Metcalf-Voelker, or article 9 of the State mental hygiene law, as it is legally known, has been further complicated by the seemingly arbitrary judicial selection of those who are to be eligible. And controlled State research on those who are committed has been extremely limited.

The city's research programs have similar conflicts between hopes and results. Two major projects are now being conducted with the aid of city funds. One is being done—with a Rockefeller Foundation grant meeting part of the costs—by Dr. Vincent Dole. He is attempting to discover whether addicts can be maintained on an ambulatory basis on a 20-year-old synthetic narcotic called methadone.

Before Dr. Dole began his experiments, the drug had been used for at least a decade in hospitals withdrawing addicts from heroin addiction. Methadone eased the terrible withdrawal symptoms and helped wean the addict from the more addictive drug. But some addicts complain that after leaving hospital facilities they were left with a methadone habit, then returned to heroin and found they had to kick addiction to two different drugs.

Dr. Dole's experiment is important because if it is successful, vast hospital facilities, the city hopes, might not be needed to treat addicts. The theory is that an addict would appear once a day for a shot of methadone which, hopefully, would suspend his craving for heroin.

"Our good old methadone," is the way Narcotics Coordinator Dr. Catherine Hess describes the drug. "It has no highs and it has no lows."

A GIMMICK?

One present problem is that city officials are anxious to announce that drug maintenance using methadone is a major step forward in the war on addiction, though Dr. Dole's initial experimental group involved only eight patients. The pressure to prematurely put forth maintenance on methadone as a "gimmick that worked" brought Dr. Alfred M. Freedman, chairman of the department of psychiatry at Metropolitan Hospital, to issue this caution at the Gracie Mansion Conference on Narcotics Addiction:

"There is a growing body of opinion among the informed laity in New York," he said, "that maintenance will remove the more irritating aspects of addiction, such as criminality, from the community. As professionals in this field, we owe it to the public not to make misleading and premature claims. We do not know, for example, what proportion of addicts will make methadone a drug of choice. Our own experience

shows that many will abuse whatever agent is at hand—but how strong an attachment will remain to illegal drugs is still an open question."

A second experiment underwritten by the city is being conducted by Dr. Eric Simon. He is attempting to determine the effect of heroin on cell tissue as a step, perhaps, toward finding an agent that will counteract the effect of heroin.

Virtually the only major study being conducted in New York that will attempt to provide valid statistical data as guidelines for rehabilitation of criminal-addicts is now being conducted in Washington Heights, at one of the health department's intake centers. An extension of an experiment conducted by the New York State Parole Board, now partly financed with Federal funds, the present study is attempting to establish the effects of various kinds of parole in keeping addicts off drugs.

Leon Brill, who is in charge of the program, has established three separate groups of parolees. The control group is assigned to any probation officer. A second group reports to officers with special narcotics training. Still another group reports to officers who are also trained in narcotics, but carry unusually small caseloads and have closer contact with parolees. Dr. Hess describes the latter portion of the study as a reaching out kind of program.

The Federal Government is also continuing substantial research into the causes and possible cures for addiction.

Today, as last year, a decade ago and a century ago, there are no known cures. Something more is understood today of the factors that will turn an individual who is addiction-prone to actual use of drugs, and something is known of the nature of the addict himself.

But for all the vast resources of the city of New York, much of the work now being done that has become meaningful in planning programs is not conducted in municipal facilities, but voluntary agencies. Limited by pitifully small budgets and inadequate facilities for hospital aftercare, these agencies have been accepting the addict for what he is and treating him in any way they can.

The ability of the voluntary agencies to report results is severely limited. Yet Teen-Challenge, East Harlem Protestant Parish, Daytop Lodge, Henry St. Settlement House, and a dozen other organizations have made pioneer contributions not only in guiding addicts away from drugs, but contributing to understanding of the nature of the problem as it exists on the streets of New York today.

Other organizations, some highly publicized, also have real accomplishments. Synanon, the most controversial of all, has developed techniques that have been adopted by Daytop Lodge in New York and Dr. Efram Ramirez, operator of the most successful of all clinics, in Puerto Rico. But Synanon, which has no medical staff, does not often mention the contribution required for admission that preselects its patients or the fact that a number of patients remain only a short time, leave, and return to drugs.

Synanon has found popular approval among politicians and even social workers, but not with the medical profession, which argues treatment of addiction is, in fact, a medical problem. Other critics of the organization attack the extreme public relations tactics Synanon frequently goes in for in order to raise funds. The latest example is a soon-to-be-released film, "Synanon" that not only misrepresents the nature of the problem of drug addiction, but concludes in grand Hollywood fashion: Love conquers all, including heroin.

SHORT ON RECORDS

Lack of staff and lack of facilities in many organizations also hamper accurate reporting of research findings. Dr. Robert Baird,

the physician who operates Haven Clinic, claims to have treated 1,000 addicts with a 35-percent success rate. He has shown no one any medical records, yet newspapers and television stations have accepted his statistics with little question. Evidence does exist that he has helped some addicts. To what extent, on what drugs, in what way? No one knows. Dr. Baird says he is doing a one-man job without time for records, but at the same time, he adds his real purpose is to "wake up the medical profession to the need of doing something about addiction."

Dr. Baird wants city, State, Federal, or voluntary funds for an \$8 million addiction clinic in Harlem.

The fact is, virtually that at present and in the foreseeable future, there are no cures for heroin addiction. This does not mean there is no treatment possible. New York City is already 10 years behind in planning and organizing any real program. The situation has become so critical that a program is no longer needed that will come to grips with the problems this year or next. New York needs a guiding hand capable of planning a step-by-step 10-year program that will provide a sequence of facilities that can treat addicts.

Among those things that have been learned from voluntary agencies and ex-addicts is that in every case where an addict has gone off the drugs a conversion of some kind takes place after he has withdrawn. It may be a psychiatric conversion, a conversion induced through constant group therapy or even as a result of continual contact with a strong, guiding figure. For others it has been a religious conversion. The essence of Synanon's method is to imbue the addict in an artificial power structure, remove from his home environment, where he must struggle to rise from kitchen attendant to jobs that carry higher status and more importance. Some ex-addicts are able to leave Synanon completely. Others remain in the organization as fund raisers and active proselytizers.

Doctors have speculated that the "maturing out" process, that leads addicts to quit drugs at 35 or 40 or even 40, is in itself a kind of conversion.

A SUDDEN REALIZATION

"It was a lousy life," reports one ex-addict. "A day came along when I just realized I wasn't getting anything out of the way things was. I decided to quit drugs without anyone's help. How many guys do you know can say that?"

The community is faced with the enormously expensive problem of creating not only the kind of facilities, it needs, but also finding people capable of contributing to the conversion of the addict. Here are principal suggestions for achieving these goals:

Predetoxification centers are needed that will not only give the addict hope by telling him of treatment that is available, but motivating him toward a cure. This is now being done almost entirely by voluntary agencies.

Recreational therapy and, in a small way, occupational therapy, should be started in hospitals, and the city is doing some of this now. The basic problem is any addiction program is not only intensifying care and motivation at every step of the way but stretching out the program itself. Addicts, many specialists say, cannot be forced to take what may be the next proscribed step until they are ready.

Posthospital centers should not be recreations of West Side Rehabilitation Centers, as the city now plans, but facilities either in the city or a rural area where basic therapy can take place. An important step in this phase, as voluntary agencies have learned, is to teach the ex-addict he is capable of producing something of value: a cabinet, a group project, poetry or painting.

When the addict is ready, and only when he is ready, he should be promoted to a

facility where actual work in a carefully controlled environment is done. It is a step for men "on the road," but men still too shaky to resist the temptation of drugs. Workshops, labor gangs, public works projects or farmwork might be suitable as a pretraining step before actually preparing a man for a job.

In a final stage, the addict, living on the outside, would be responsible for managing his own finances and staying on a job. He would still be able to rely on staff members for help, but not forced to report as a parolee. As the work not only of Synanon but other agencies has proved, ex-addicts can be the most useful of all personnel not only in eventually staffing such a vast program but as active combatants in the community against narcotics.

HANDLING THE COST

By beginning to plan such a program on a 10-year basis now, medical experts would have an opportunity to test the strength of each link in the chain as it is fashioned. Because of the vast expense in programs of this kind—it cost roughly \$15 a day to keep a man in prison, \$26 in a hospital—Federal and State budgets would have an opportunity to amortize the load.

The program would effectively remove addicts from their environment and the source of supply of drugs. Eventually, it would use the addict as an effective agent in curbing further drug addiction.

At present, the alternatives are few. Not long ago, the Rev. Norman Eddy, who has spent a decade fighting addiction in East Harlem and unympathetic officials at city hall, offered another solution:

"All you need to do," he said, "is revitalize this city and the rest of Western civilization. Heroin is a pain killer and this is a painful world for some people to live in not only esthetically, but spiritually. It's quite possible," he said, as he pushed open the door from East Harlem Protestant Parish's center for addicts, "that heroin addiction is a sensible answer for some people."

No one who had seen him run his fingers through his white hair as he said it or heard him sigh as he stepped on to 103d Street could ever have forgotten what he said. It was a voice of despair. He did not believe anyone on earth—including New York—really cared about freeing the people in his parish from heroin addiction.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXXVIII

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. SWEENEY) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article concerns possible ways of dealing with the narcotics problem.

This is the final article on drug addiction in the series on "New York City in Crisis" and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of April 9, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—FIGHTING THE DRUG MENACE, WHAT COULD BE DONE

(By Paul Weissman)

(The gimmicks have failed, and now the city must find effective ways of combating narcotics addiction and of rehabilitating the tens of thousands of its victims. It will not be easy, inexpensive, or quick. The beginnings of a comprehensive program can no longer be sacrificed to politically inspired but discredited methods. In this final article of the "New York City in Crisis" series on narcotics addiction, Paul Weissman presents