

man in the Senate to vote for cloture. I have had it voted upon me and others in connection with the Communications Satellite Corp. fight. We were just beginning to reach the people, and cloture was voted. I did not like it. I know that in an overwhelming proportion of instances, free debate has been used in the public interest.

However, I am impatient with the amendment of prayers, and with a filibuster even against the consideration of a measure. I say to the leadership that I am prepared in this instance to vote for cloture. Let us have a motion for cloture and bring this issue before the Senate, or fail. It is intolerable to have this kind of dilatory practice and procedure preventing the consideration of measures vital to the interest of the Nation. The President has said that it is important to the national interest that these measures be considered.

I expect to support the motion for cloture. I believe it will carry. However, if it should not carry, I shall join in the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to have evening meetings of his committee. He has already had certain members of his committee say that they would help by pledging that they would be present. I pledge that I will be present.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe all Members of the Senate should feel somewhat distressed over the fact that a request of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to hold hearings on subjects the administration considers to be vital and urgent, should be denied by the Senate itself.

If any committee should be given special permission to meet, it is the Foreign Relations Committee, because that committee, above all other committees, including the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, is the instrument of the Senate in meeting the unique constitutional responsibility which the Senate has.

The duty of making appropriations is certainly shared with the House, unless the House believes it has a particular priority with respect to a certain matter. Yet permission is given to the Committee on Appropriations to meet while the Senate is in session.

The Armed Services Committee shares its responsibility with the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives in the subjects that are considered by it. Both the Senate and House have responsibility in that field.

But, under the Constitution and the traditions of this country, the Senate has a special and prior responsibility in the field of foreign relations and foreign policy. I regret to hear denied by this body the request of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to sit while the Senate is in session, when other committees are permitted to sit. I believe that every Senator should give thought to the function of the Senate in this field and to the special responsibility which the Committee on Foreign Relations carries. Perhaps, in the future, we should obtain unanimous consent, or change the rules, in order to allow this committee to meet. The Committee on

Foreign Relations should be a primary committee of the Senate, because it has a unique responsibility and should be given special treatment instead of being denied the opportunity to meet, as is being given to other committees of the Senate.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. The question has been raised repeatedly today as to why committees are prevented from sitting to consider vital measures. Some of these measures are considered so important that they merit special recommendations by the President that they be given expeditious treatment. Included in this group and the authorization of \$13 billion supplemental for the Department of Defense in Vietnam, the foreign aid supplemental bill, treaties and various nominations. It is being suggested that the Senators who insist that the Senate follow its rules bear a high responsibility in that they are disrupting the orderly legislative processes. I believe it is imperative that we put that situation in proper focus.

What is the Senate considering at the present moment? It is engaged in considering a motion with respect to a measure which those in charge of the Senate's business have determined to be of top priority, No. 1. So long as it is priority No. 1, the Senate should devote its exclusive time and talents to this issue. Any time the Senate grows tired of the business of assigning first priority to the issue of compulsory unionism, over such important matters as the \$13 billion in supplemental appropriations for our boys in Vietnam and the prosecution of the war there, or the foreign aid supplemental, or confirmation of various important nominations, it should impress those in charge of the order of business in the Senate of these feelings. The majority leadership alone has the power to reassign priorities. Let those that are assessing blame for disruption of the orderly processes lay the blame at the proper doorstep.

That is what is involved here. It seems to me that the burden does not rest on those who say, "Let us give full intent as to the designation of priority." It is the business of Senators who are in charge of the order of the Senate to say that the issue of compulsory unionism, of repeal of section 14(b), shall or shall not have top priority. They bear the burden. I believe that it is important that we place the burden where it belongs. If other matters such as international, military, and national problems are more important, they should say so. Then the Senate can begin discussion and debate on these questions and forsake the pending issue, which can not compare in importance to international problems facing our Nation. Unfortunately the high priority given repeal of 14(b) appears to be based on the discharging of a political pledge, whether made on the platform or otherwise, to those who are interested in compulsory unionism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President—

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I should like to state that this issue can be settled in a matter of 2 hours. It would be very simple. The Senate engaged in 3 or 4 weeks debate on it in the past year. We have already had 8 to 10 days debate on it this year. I can promise the Senate, almost without equivocation, that a majority of the Senate is ready to vote on this issue.

I believe that we could almost get unanimous consent—if the opponents would not object—to a vote at 2 o'clock this afternoon and settle this issue, and it would all be over.

So, now, where does the shoe go? It goes on the foot that is impeding progress, because the Senate is ready to vote. A majority of the Senate is ready to vote to get this issue out of the way. Therefore, those who say that the Senate should not work its will on an issue are the ones who are holding up and impeding the progress of the Senate in preventing important committees from meeting and performing their duties, which are so important in the field of international affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we do not need 2 hours. We need only 30 seconds to withdraw the motion. My good friend the Senator from Tennessee should look at the Gallup poll and—

Mr. BASS. If the Senator will yield, let me say that Dr. Gallup does not vote in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It does not make any difference. I am talking about the public.

Mr. BASS. The public is represented in this body by a majority of the Senate. Let them vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not propose to let any irreparable injury be done to the citizens of this country in a city such as Washington where the political pressures are so well known. We take our case to the country in this fashion, and we propose to continue to do so as long as we have stamina and vitality enough to do it.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President—

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to suggest further to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee that the motion for cloture is still an available tool, if the Senate wishes to take up this issue. I do not believe that they will get to it because a two-thirds vote is necessary. But the motion for cloture is

spokesmen, himself concluded that the aims of the National Liberation Front are classically those of a national front preceding a Communist takeover. The North Vietnamese Communist Party coordinates the whole operation, Chaffard concludes. As the years pass and the leaders of the NLF make less and less of an effort to prove their disguise, it is more and more openly a clearcut Communist organization.

Mr. President, having suggested that the National Liberation Front was created by Hanoi and controlled by Hanoi, I should like to make another suggestion. At most, the National Liberation Front, even if we allow the very best construction of what we know about it, is only one of the smaller of many interest groups within South Vietnam. Even considered solely as a group within the area south of the 17th parallel, it has no standing that merits its being treated as anything other than one of the smaller of the interest groups in the region.

The Front commands a small segment of military forces and some political cadres, but still it is a tiny percentage of the total in the areas under dispute.

Thus, if the Front were to be accepted as an independent negotiating partner, it would be impossible on grounds of political reality, as well as on grounds of moral fairness and rightness, not to accept in like fashion a host of other and larger groups to be represented in such a political negotiation, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, I shall mention a few. The Catholics are at once obvious as a large group within South Vietnam, and the Mahayana Buddhists as an even larger group, particularly in some areas. There are other segments of Buddhist groups that have factionalized among themselves and could make a far better case for having a voice than the Front. The northern refugees, nearly a million strong, have a cause. The Southern Regionalists may have a case, and the Hoa Hoa, and the Cao Dai are minority political groups, larger than the National Liberation Front.

The South Vietnamese Army, the Vietnamese Civil Service, the labor unions, the Montagnards, the Nationalist Political Party, and other splinter political groups would each have as much validity in claiming the right to be recognized and to have a voice in a conference as would the National Liberation Front.

Whatever else we strive to do in our own national interest and in the interest of finding some common denominator somewhere, somehow that might enable us to find a less violent solution to the strife in South Vietnam, it is important that we not single out one of the more obscure groups in numbers, one of the more unrepresentative groups in South Vietnam, a group that is clearly and patently identified as an instrumentality and creature of Hanoi for special consideration in any negotiations, fancied or real.

At the very most that one could argue for their case, the members of the National Liberation Front might be entitled

at some point, it seems to me—if they accept the idea of living at peace within the country—to express their political views, as do other groups.

I suggest also that it is only through Hanoi that America can accomplish its central objective of finding a less violent end to the aggression from the north and of obtaining a removal of external interference from the affairs of South Vietnam.

We may leave it open to question as to whether we believe that any member of the National Liberation Front, or any member of the Hanoi government, can survive politically if he dares to negotiate because of the thesis that these men peddle among their party members and in the ranks of the faithful. But, be that as it may, I number myself among those who say that our own country should not be inhibited as it continually probes for any possible breakthrough, as the President has striven to do.

We must make doubly certain that in the future, as we look backward on this matter, the judgment of history can never point a finger of accusation at the United States and say that we did not try, that we did not create every conceivable chance.

However, in trying to create that chance, it is also important that we be realistic and that we not lose sight of the reason why we are there, in the dreams of what we would rather have happen if we had our way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may yield to the Senator from Ohio for questions, statements, or observations under the unanimous-consent agreement under which I yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

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

Mr. MCGEE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his thorough and accurate discussion of the background of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam.

I gather from his statement that he is of the definite conclusion that the purpose of all the discussions that have come from Ho Chi Minh and the Communists of the north has been to establish the National Liberation Front as the duly constituted government of South Vietnam. In substance, that is what I gather. I should like to have the Senator comment on that.

Mr. MCGEE. The evidence, both from sources in our Government, and from independent sources on the National Commission—which does not include Americans, but is made up of Canadians, Polish, and an Indian—establishes that same incontrovertible hard fact, that it is an instrumentality of Hanoi, aimed at imposing by force, or any other devious means, a Communist government in South Vietnam under the control of Hanoi.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am

in thorough accord with what the Senator has said. I have in my hand a paper showing 14 points laid down by the President of the United States as grounds for the settlement of the controversy in South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

Point No. 9 states:

We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

It seems to me that, with that proposal made by the President of the United States, the South Vietnamese should be given the opportunity to decide for themselves what type of government they want.

It is necessary to look to North Vietnam to see what its position is on the matter of open, free elections, to decide what type of government shall be had.

In connection with this statement, I call to the attention of the Senator what the North Vietnamese have said pertaining to open, free elections.

Mr. MCGEE. The North Vietnamese, under Ho Chi Minh, answered that question unequivocally in 1956, when all of the Geneva agreements broke down, when the intent of the agreements was torn to shreds, when we learned, through Hanoi and Mr. Ho Chi Minh, that by free elections they meant elections free of any opposition party except the Communist Party. One party rule: there was one party, one truth, one set of positions, one group that should prevail. That is the heart of his concept of free elections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I come down to the date of April 13, 1965, as further fortification for the statement just made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. I read:

Tokyo, April 13.—Premier Pham Van Dong of Communist North Vietnam has laid down a four-point program for peace that calls for the exclusion of all foreign interference in both the North and South.

I shall read point 3 and point 4.

Mr. MCGEE. These are statements from Hanoi?

Mr. LAUSCHE. From Hanoi.

Mr. MCGEE. The Premier of North Vietnam.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And we can assume that the statements were authorized by Ho Chi Minh.

These are the statements:

The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves—

So far, well enough. I continue—
in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Vietcong), without any foreign interference.

I ask the Senator if that does not mean that there must be a surrender to the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation before there can be what are supposed to be open free elections.

Mr. MCGEE. Indeed, that is obvious and conspicuous in the statement of the Premier of North Vietnam. They are using their own front and party that they invented, they created, they lead, and they control, which serves their purpose; and only if the people of South Vietnam accept the mandate of the Na-

February 1, 1966

with the hard facts of the power pulls that are the realities in southeast Asia.

As Prof. Bernard Fall has very carefully pointed out—and he has not been the friendliest historian on this question—the Vietcong operated until December 1960, he said in his book, as “the extension of the then existing Communist underground apparatus.”

In September 1960, the Third National Congress of Lao Dong, the Communist-front group in Hanoi, adopted a simple resolution urging the creation, from its deliberations of a front group to achieve unity in all of Vietnam.

Mr. President, that resolution, passed by the Lao Dong Party in North Vietnam at that time, goes on to say that “our people”—meaning the North Vietnamese in the Communist Party, the Lao Dong—must strive to establish a unified bloc of workers, peasants, and soldiers, and to bring into being a broad national unified front. These are not revolutions in the rural areas of Vietnam and not in the remote provinces of the 17th parallel. This is in the resolution adopted by the power in Hanoi in September of 1960.

From time to time it is asserted that the National Liberation Front was actually created south of the division line that separated the two Vietnams in 1954. Many of us have tried to find any substantive basis for this allegation. We have tried to find anything that would support in any way these assertions. So far nothing can be located. Nothing substantial has been submitted. These assertions have been contributed only by the members of the National Liberation Front themselves when they try to protest.

But none will meet the test of documentation. Not only is there evidence to the fact that the September and December statements in Hanoi contain no reference whatsoever to any endemic developments in Vietnam already in existence, but Hanoi goes on to suggest that they better “get with it” from Hanoi and inject such a front group in the south in order to provide the trappings for a rallying point for their cause, as they describe it.

Thus, it can be seen that the National Liberation Front was the creature of Hanoi. It was conceived in Hanoi, by Hanoi, and for Hanoi.

I am mindful of the many complications, the overlapping of issues, and the complexities of opinion of the problems in the South.

My comments here are aimed at serving only one purpose, and that is to lay bare the dimensions of the National Liberation Front about which so many in our country right now seem to be speaking so loosely and so inaccurately.

The leadership of the National Liberation Front is clearly identifiable, as well.

Until April of 1962, Professor Fall goes on to tell us in his book, the National Liberation Front had not disclosed any names of its alleged leaders. This was nearly 2 years after its inception, after it was cooked up in Hanoi, and still no mention of its leaders.

In spite of the fact that its program had been made public from the very beginning, when the names of some leaders

were finally revealed, it became clear that none of these avowed leaders had ever occupied any significant position in South Vietnamese political life either before 1954 or since 1954.

The purpose of indicating that, Mr. President, is merely to suggest that this entire enterprise was a concoction for psychological warfare purposes, in an attempt to inject and infuse into the complexities of the South—complexities still not grasped by some in our country—that this was a genuine civil war and this was the evidence for it, the National Liberation Front. Whatever elements of genuine civil strife there may be, and there are many, it is important we understand what they are.

I suggest they are not vested in the National Liberation Front. The sooner we eliminate that language, that term, from our attempt to analyze the conflict in Vietnam, the sooner it will be possible for us to deal straightforwardly with the hard issue of the core of the problem.

Many names were tossed into the hopper when the pressure was on Hanoi and on the South Vietnamese in the rural areas to produce leaders for the National Liberation Front, but the best that could be done was to pull up names of persons who had been for a long time open and avowed professional spokesmen for the Communist Party in the north. Thus, the name of the first Secretary General of the NLF, Mr. Van Hieu, who had been a Communist Party member, a known promoter of the Communist cause, and self-identified in that role ever since 1945, was selected. Never had he held a position of political responsibility in Vietnam before or after the French.

Or, similarly, the so-called chairman of the NLF. The chairman was another of the avowed, self-styled members of the Communist Party in the North. The National Liberation Front is forced to put such men forward as leaders because of a simple, significant fact; that is, that despite the turbulence of South Vietnamese politics, not a single significant non-Communist spokesman or group in the South has ever until now embraced the Vietcong or the National Liberation Front. The only admitted recognition and embracing that seems to go on is from foreign capitals far removed from southeast Asia.

Starting with Mr. Diem and the fall of his government, whether we take the students, or the Buddhists, or the so-called liberals, or the Catholics, or the military—any political group one seeks to identify in South Vietnam—to this day, critical as they may have been of Mr. Diem, protesting, as they were, conditions in Saigon, not a one of those groups has yet sought to embrace or endorse the Vietcong. None of them has been willing to acknowledge the validity of the National Liberation Front as a grassroots, native-born, native-controlled South Vietnamese political group. It is this that makes it imperative that we assign the National Liberation Front to its proper category, at its proper level, with its proper motivation: merely a child of Hanoi, an arm of the policy of Hanoi, an instrumentality in the tactics

of power politics that Communists have pursued since the end of World War II.

The role of the Communist Party in using, implementing, and engulfing the National Liberation Front is, it seems to me, beyond question. It is a role that has been identified in detail by the International Commission that the Geneva agreements of 1954 established in the hope that somehow a resolution of the impasse between the two Vietnams might be arrived at.

In a circular dated December 8, 1961, and available through the International Control Commission, the groups involved in the National Liberation Front were instructed to realize that:

The Vietnamese People's Revolutionary Party has only the appearance of being an endemic group within south Vietnam. When we recognize it for what it is.

The directive goes on:

We need this group in our efforts to take the south in the interests of the north. However, during any explanations, you—

Whoever the members of the party may be—

must take care to keep this intent strictly secret, especially in South Vietnam, so that the enemy does not perceive our purpose.

This is only another way of saying that the old front group operation was being translated into an operational and tactical plan. The National Liberation Front, incidentally, has never claimed that it was the government. It has never asserted that it had status as a government. It should be noted that the term “provisional government” has yet to be employed by the group in describing its role.

Thus it is not political in the administrative sense, and never has been. Yet there are those who refer to it recklessly as though it were an existing repository of power responsibility that ought to be dignified as a subject of negotiation.

This, further, is a characteristic of the National Liberation Front that helps us to strip it bare, it seems to me, of its outward manifestations and to show it for what it really is at the heart of the problem. The front is openly and clearly a creature of the government in Hanoi. It has operated repeatedly as Hanoi's political instrument for the purpose of taking over and imposing upon the south a Communist government. The front itself has no resemblance to genuine nationalist rebel organizations that have operated in other countries at such times as this. The fact that there may be within its membership some genuine South Vietnamese nationalists who are latecomers, who are looking for a place to roost, in their sincere sense of protest against the Diem regime, should not obscure the central fact that the origin, the leadership, and the purposes of this front group remain as I have just described them—to serve the ends of the Communist government in Hanoi.

The nature of the National Liberation Front has been well summed up by neutral observers, including George Chaffard, of L'Express, who after visiting National Liberation Front bands, and roaming around parts of South Vietnam and conversing with some of their

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

many years the boll weevil will be just an unhappy memory and that we can have many monuments erected to it in healthy and prosperous cotton-producing areas so that future generations may know that there once existed this very destructive pest. In many areas production of poultry, livestock, tobacco, and other crops have substituted, in whole or in part, for cotton.

When the Agricultural Act of 1964 was passed, it included a provision authorizing a special \$10 million cost-cutting research program for cotton. One of the most urgent needs of the industry today is to get the cost of growing cotton down so that farmers can compete with synthetic fibers at home and abroad, and with low cost foreign cotton production without resort to Government subsidy.

I delayed the conclusion of our hearings on the 1965 appropriation bill for several weeks in 1964 with the understanding that an amendment to the budget would be submitted requesting the Congress to appropriate this \$10 million authorization. Either there was a mix-up in communications, or somebody in the executive branch changed his mind because when the budget amendment was submitted, it did not include a request for cotton research funds. I pressed the Department of Agriculture officials and called representatives of the Budget Bureau before my committee in an effort to find out why no action had been taken to implement the enabling legislation. We were not able to find any conclusive answer to this question.

Our committee finally included, on our own initiative, additional funds for cotton cost-cutting research, but not the \$10 million. It is extremely difficult to add new appropriations for items not in the budget, and not justified by specific testimony, and this was one reason why we did not include the full amount.

Finally \$1,925,000 was included that year, for fiscal 1965, for cost-cutting research. Of this amount \$240,000 was for planning new facilities to cost a total of \$3 million, including the planning cost, to house such research.

In the committee report on the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for that year, we included a strong statement urging the Secretary of Agriculture to do what he could to see that the special \$10 million program was included in the budget for the next year, which was fiscal 1966—this current year. Even though funds for many new programs of great magnitude were requested in the budget, only a small increase was provided for cotton. I still cannot understand why the expenditure of this relatively small sum—almost infinitesimal when considered in terms of the cost of the current cotton program—is not considered to be a sound investment.

In any event, in the conference bill for the current year we included a substantial sum (\$2,685,000) for cost-cutting research as a part of the continuing research program. We also appropriated \$2,760,000 for construction of the new facilities, making a total of \$5,445,000 for the cotton cost-reduction program for this year. I hope that we will be able soon to go much farther with this very important program as we consider the budget for the fiscal year 1967 which begins on July 1.

In stressing cost-cutting research, I do not intend for a moment to downgrade other types of cotton research. I know there is great potential for improving the quality of cotton fabrics and cotton garments through the Department of Agriculture's utilization research program conducted primarily at the New Orleans Laboratory. We have had very important developments stem from this research, such as the wash-and-wear finishes, which have helped hold many of the cotton's

markets. I want to commend this organization and also the industry for its efforts and financial contributions to the expansion of this urgently needed research.

I turn now to another subject which is of vital importance to the cotton industry and to the general economy of the United States. That is the pending legislation on labor. Unfortunately, it appears that this administration, up to now, has refused to adequately take into account the very serious consequences of its past and proposed actions on the agricultural economy of this country insofar as its labor policy is concerned. I refer to two matters—the first being the refusal of the administration to permit the entry of urgently needed workers in Western States from our good friend and neighbor, Mexico, and the grossly unwarranted restrictions on the importation of our friends from the islands of the British West Indies and Canada to do farmwork, primarily in fruits and vegetables, both in the State of Florida and generally along the eastern seaboard.

I realize that cotton farmers across the belt have, to a very large degree, mechanized their operations to a point where they are using relatively few foreign workers. However, in those areas which continue to use them, the abrupt cutoff has had serious consequences. Unfortunately, completely mechanized production and harvesting of most fruits and vegetables is not possible with our present technology. While we are working on it, we may never learn to completely mechanize the production and harvesting of citrus fruits, for example. Up to this time, the present administration has recognized in a near adequate way the needs of only one of our large Florida producing agricultural industries, with supplemental labor from the British West Indies. In that industry, the Florida sugarcane producers are today using over 8,500 cane cutters from the offshore islands admitted by the Secretary of Labor because even he has found that American labor is not to be found to cut sugarcane by hand with machetes on the muck lands where it is produced and cannot be handled by machines. Some of the mills are understaffed with cutters, but I repeat, we have been allowed a near adequate supply in that field only.

In my nearly 20 years of service in the Senate, I do not recall ever having devoted more of my time and my energies to any one subject than I have in connection with endeavoring to obtain an adequate supply of farm labor including workers from Mexico, from the British West Indies, and from Canada. Hardly a day passed last year that I was not in conference with administration officials or was pleading on the Senate floor in a bipartisan effort, along with many of my colleagues, and particularly with the able junior Senator from California, the Honorable GEORGE MURPHY, for a reasonable administration of our existing laws with respect to the importation of supplemental foreign workers. Some crops were lost because of the shortage of labor and farmers and the Nation suffered the consequences. Some planting was discontinued—some production and processing was moved to Mexico. I do not know what this present year will bring, but it looks like we must continue this fight for justice and right particularly for our farmers who produce highly perishable seasonal crops.

At this point in my prepared remarks, I must digress in order to give full credit to Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, for a decision which he made last night which I think is sound and for which I commend him. I certainly want to see that Mr. Wirtz gets his due.

On contacting the Federal-State Frost Warning Service at Lakeland after I got here yesterday, I was advised of the serious threat

to agriculture offered by the existing cold wave which we are feeling here today in Jacksonville. Mr. Warren Johnson, who for years has headed up that very fine service at Lakeland, told me that the cold wave was going to have most serious effects upon the citrus crop, the sugarcane crop, the vegetable crop, and other perishable crops in our State, extending all the way from the vicinity of St. Augustine, a few miles below here, to and including the vegetable fields south of Miami. He stated the predictions for Sunday night's cold in the various areas of the peninsula and I could, of course, see for myself that the prospect was indeed a serious one.

Shortly after noon yesterday, therefore, I called Secretary Wirtz at his home in Washington and advised him of the situation and also of my feeling that a crash program would have to be set up with all possible speed to allow the importation of an added labor force from the British West Indies to harvest frozen citrus fruit and to complete the cutting of the cane in such a short time in each case as to forestall souring and spoilage. He was cordial, took the matter under advisement and last night he had one of his publicity men advise my administrative assistant in Washington that he (Mr. Wirtz) would assist our Florida industries in the matters mentioned if the freeze damage resulted in the degree that seemed reasonably certain. In other words, he pledged his assistance to our Florida producers who would be so adversely affected to help them salvage citrus and cane crops and I take it that the same would be true of other crops that might be salvageable by allowing a crash program of importation of the needed labor from the offshore areas in the British West Indies.

While the degree of damage is not yet completely ascertainable, it is now quite clear, after knowing the very low temperatures which existed last night and in many places for many hours, that serious damage has been sustained and that the loss can only be alleviated through the immediate build-up of much larger harvesting forces. I am grateful indeed to Mr. Wirtz for his responsiveness in this matter and I want you folks to know that while I have been extremely critical of him in other matters and may have to be again in the future that I certainly want to see that he receives full credit for his action in this particular matter.

The second matter in which the administration's labor policy offers a grave threat to agriculture is in the field of proposed enlargements of the minimum wage laws.

Although hearings on minimum wage legislation were held last year, no action was taken in the Senate. A bill was reported out of committee on this subject in the House of Representatives, which would have imposed minimum wages on farmworkers. In addition it would have eliminated most of the agricultural processing and handling exemptions. Apparently, the House leadership decided that they did not have the votes to pass the bill, so action was postponed until this session of congress.

It seems that some of our self-styled friends of the laboring men are unwilling to recognize the inflationary impact and the inevitable unemployment which would result from the imposition of a minimum wage of \$1.75 per hour in agricultural employment. It is my earnest hope that a little more reason and a little more commonsense will prevail in this field of legislation during this session of Congress.

A third matter having a serious impact on agriculture, though it affects other employment even more greatly, is the most fundamental issue facing the Nation this year in the field of labor. It is, of course, the effort of the administration and of the labor hierarchy to have Congress repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This section au-

thorizes States to enact so-called right-to-work legislation which permits an employee of a business firm having a union contract to decide whether he desires to join or not to join the labor union. This so-called right-to-work provision is a part of our Florida constitution. Our State was the first to place it in our constitution. Repeal of section 14(b) would inevitably mean that the right-to-work laws now in effect in 19 States would be cast aside. No additional State could adopt right-to-work statutes or constitutional provisions.

Employees of companies having unions would have to join a union within 30 days or their employer would be forced to fire them. Thus workers would be forced to pay dues to an organization to help, among other things, finance extensive political activity which, in some instances, would be contrary to the views of the workers. Workers would be forced to abide by union rules or be fined by union officials. Union officials would not need to be concerned so much as they are now with justifying their activities to their members in order to gain financial support. Members who refused to pay dues would lose their jobs. The Senate is receiving vast piles of mail from union members who do not want to see 14(b) repealed.

Those of us in the U.S. Senate who feel that the repeal of section 14(b) would be a further serious impingement on the rights of individuals and the rights of the several States, and who feel that compulsory unionism is fundamentally wrong, appear to be slightly in the minority. Therefore, we have no alternative except to discuss the issues involved in this matter at such length as to try to arouse the American people to the fact that passage of this bill will seriously jeopardize our liberties.

This course is now commonly referred to as an extensive educational program. If we can get this message across to enough people, I feel confident that we will have the votes to thwart the attempt to remove this vital section from the laws of our land. I may say to you that we have a number of teachers in the Senate who have agreed to discuss the issues at some length during this educational discussion. They have prepared their lessons well and are willing to stay overtime, if necessary, to get the facts across to the American people. I have confidence in our ability to win this fight.

In conclusion I want to discuss briefly a problem confronting you and other farmers for which there probably is no fast cure. There was a time when the voice of the so-called farm bloc was heard loud and clear in the State legislatures and in the Halls of Congress. For a number of reasons, maybe the evolution of farming, the exodus of millions of small farmers to other pursuits, the sharp decline of the small family farm, this voice has become less compelling of attention, despite the valiant efforts and excellent services of your own council, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Grange, the cooperative groups, and other farm organizations. There is a tendency for the general public to lose sight of the fact that production of food and fiber is absolutely vital to the welfare of ourselves and all the peoples of the world. For those not farm oriented either by experience or association, there is little attraction to dedicated service on congressional Committees on Agriculture.

It is a grueling task that requires many hours and days of study and downright hard work unaccompanied by much press comment or many headlines. But the real problem is lack of unified support among the several farm groups of sound, constructive farm legislation.

I have no pat suggestions for restoring the farmer to his former position of great influence in the national legislative picture, but each of you may want to give serious

thought to the condition I have described to the end that some cultivation might be initiated at the "cotton roots" to see that your voice in the legislative Halls might again carry that stentorian ring that it once did in years gone by. The old adage "United we stand, divided we fall" is still true and it applies peculiarly to American agriculture today where so many divisions now exist.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, before passing to the next argument that is used to bolster the argument for compulsory unionism, I should like to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] for comments or remarks upon any subject of his choosing, under the following conditions: That my rights to the floor will not be impaired by my so yielding to the Senator; secondly, that any remarks I may make subsequently to the time he makes his remarks or comments will not be counted as a second speech on my part on the motion before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Carolina for his courtesy. While I do not desire to address myself to the question of 14(b) at this time, I will have something to say about the subject at a later time. I wish to discuss for a few moments one of the issues that is very prominently being discussed both on the floor of the Senate and around the country at large at this time. These issues stem from the President's peace offensive at Christmastime, the enunciation of some of the wishes of some Members of this body, by letter and in other forms, and I should like to speak in particular about one of the issues that seems to be looming ever larger in the minds of the doubters and those who, for other reasons, or for their own reasons, oppose the President's position on the role of the Vietcong in the crisis that faces the world in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, the role the Vietcong, and in particular the National Liberation Front, as the Vietcong are sometimes mistakenly called, has suggested some of the most misleading and untrue profiles of the tortuous conflict in Indochina.

In its proper context, it seems to me that the National Liberation Front needs to be viewed in the perspective of the changing tactics of the Communist Party in the many years of the cold war and to distinguish between tactics and strategy.

This is a tactical shift rather than a strategic shift, the kind of shift that had its beginning when the men in Moscow sought, first of all, to close in on areas closest to the sources of Soviet power; namely, countries in Eastern Europe, where the armies from Russia were already in occupation.

This was the device of imposing on their presence the presence of a great power in the selection of front govern-

ments and, ultimately, ruling governments, in most of Eastern Europe.

The second stage of the Soviet tactics then came in the form of bringing pressure on contiguous territories not directly occupied by the Russian armies, but next door, so that by infiltrating leaders, manpower, supplies, and propaganda, they could fish in the troubled waters of postwar devastation. This was notably true in the cases of Greece and Turkey.

We experienced the third phase of Communist world policy soon thereafter in Berlin, where the great gamble was on the rattling of the nuclear sabers, the threat of total war, and the intimidations that go with the inhibiting compulsions of so-called free societies in the more civilized portions of the globe. That was met at Berlin.

Then there was the flagrant, open commitment of troops in direct combat in Korea.

Finally there was the testing of nuclear intentions of power balances in the endeavors of the Soviet Union to transfer the vestiges of their power to the weights in the scales of power balances in the Western Hemisphere, notably in the case of Cuba.

Now we find the latest phases in the tactics expressing themselves in southeast Asia in the form of the National Liberation Front.

It has been suggested in the debates in this body and in the discussions in the press and in other communications media that the United States has been neglecting the possible path to peace that would lead through dealing directly with the National Liberation Front, and that somehow we have to find it possible to acknowledge the existence of the front and to deal with this front directly as a negotiating power in the conflict in Vietnam.

It is in regard to this last of the tactical shifts of the Communists that I should like to devote some special time in my remarks.

The National Liberation Front, will be able to have all of its views represented at any negotiations to which Hanoi might agree. The U.S. Government has made its intentions clear on this point. Again and again the President has referred to unconditional discussions or negotiations with any government.

Thus, if Hanoi were to accept such a bid it would be with the full understanding that the National Liberation Front would be represented through Hanoi, or with Hanoi at such a conference table.

However, thereby hangs a good bit of the misconception that has tended to engulf some portion of our population. That is the connection between the National Liberation Front and Hanoi.

The record also shows that the National Liberation Front was in fact created by Hanoi. It remains under the control of Hanoi.

I believe that the sooner we disabuse ourselves of the idea that somehow this is some endemic development within the borders of South Vietnam, some sort of peasant rebellion against Saigon, the sooner we shall be able to come to grips

son's policy, the conclusion is inescapable that the policy is to seek at the conference table what we have been unable to obtain by armed force—a South Vietnam controlled by a Saigon military government which has no popular base whatever. In a situation of military stalemate, any political settlement must be based on compromise reflecting the military situation, which means that both Communists and non-Communists must participate in the peace and in the interim government responsible for keeping the peace until free elections could be held. By rejecting this crucial principle the President has in effect surrounded his offer of unconditional negotiations with an obviously unacceptable condition.

The case for renewed expansion of the war is attributed in part to top secret messages from military commanders warning that during the bombing pause Hanoi has continued infiltration of troops and supplies to the south. Yet, according to Secretary McNamara, the infiltration continued, at a steadily increasing rate, throughout all the 11 months of air attack. If the bombing did not stop it, there is no special significance in the fact that the cessation of bombing did not stop it. To make this an excuse for resumed bombing is specious and deceptive. The United States did not halt its own buildup during the bombing pause—we landed 7,000 troops only 10 days ago—and so has no ground to demand that the North Vietnamese should have halted theirs.

The President also can cite an urgent dispatch from Ambassador Lodge alleging that the bombing was really a great thing after all—that if it did not halt the infiltration, still it hurt the Communists' morale, to such effect that a lot of them are getting beriberi. This looks like the same shabby self-deception that has been pressed upon our people at every stage of this dismal war. At every stage, the people have been told that the military effort which produced such minimal results in retrospect was about to score exciting victories in the future; and at every succeeding stage the people have painfully learned that the new promises did not fulfill themselves any more than the old ones.

The reason is quite clear. The United States occupies the position in Vietnam of a foreign, white, Western, rich intervener in a domestic revolution, and in such a situation all our awesome military power is simply ineffective against the desire of the Vietnamese people to run their own lives.

The illusion that by waging war in Vietnam we are saving the world from communism can best be dispelled by consulting those we profess to be saving. The clear and overwhelming counsel of the non-Communist nations that matter is for curtailment of the war and a peaceful settlement. If the United States now expands the war instead, and so makes a peaceful settlement more difficult if not impossible, we shall earn not the world's gratitude, but moral isolation.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Feb. 1, 1966]

PEACE AND WAR

In a dramatic move timed immediately to follow resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, President Johnson has asked the Security Council of the United Nations to intervene in the Vietnam conflict by calling for an international conference and a cease-fire. This is an important if long-delayed gesture by the United States that holds the possibility of opening the way to peace and only emphasizes the sincerity of President Johnson's desire to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the American move in the United Nations. In fact the good effect of the appeal to the U.N. was in

part vitiated by the prior order to resume the bombing. Continuation of the bombing pause would have been a far more effective complement to the U.N. resolution than the renewed bombing attacks on North Vietnamese targets, which will almost certainly lead to further escalation of the war. More men, more planes, more ships, more money, more materiel, more wounded, more dead—these are the unmentioned but probable sequels to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. The course the war took during the previous bombing raids proved that even if the attacks slowed down infiltration from North Vietnam, they did not prevent it. North Vietnamese soldiers and materiel had been going south in quantity long before the bombing pause.

There is no reason to believe that renewed bombing can bring a different result. The United States could bomb Hanoi and Haiphong and even destroy all of North Vietnam without wiping out the threat posed by China. In fact, the danger of a ground war with Communist China, and perhaps a nuclear world war, would thereby be brought considerably closer.

President Johnson argued that "if continued immunity" were given to North Vietnam, "the cost in lives—Vietnamese, American, and allied—will be greatly increased." But if 100,000 or even 500,000 more American troops are sent to Vietnam, as is predicted, many more lives are surely going to be lost. What was a morass is becoming a bottomless pit.

President Johnson said that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our pursuit for peace." In this he is, of course, completely sincere. The great conflict over Vietnam that has arisen in the United States is precisely over the meaning of "the pursuit for peace." A number of respected and informed Senators and Representatives; military men like Generals Gavin and Ridgway; academic specialists, teachers, and clerics; and a great many friendly foreign statesmen and commentators, all believed and said that the bombing of North Vietnam ought not be resumed. They all felt that peace had not been given a full and fair chance. They all fear the consequences of the United States getting more and more deeply involved in Vietnam.

So far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, the decision has now been made. American troops in the field must be supported; but so must American efforts—inside the United Nations and outside it—to reach an honorable settlement in order to restore peace and self-determination in Vietnam.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I was encouraged to receive recently from the Chicago District Council of the Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks a resolution expressing its strong support for my truth-in-lending bill.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution signed by Mr. William G. Denison, president, and Mr. Kenneth A. Stone, secretary-treasurer, of the Brotherhood be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION ON TRUTH IN LENDING BILL
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY &
STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
THE CHICAGO DISTRICT COUNCIL,
January 19, 1966.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.
Whereas the consumer is many times gouged by carefully camouflaged sky-high

interest rates and hidden finance charges on so-called easy credit dealings with merchants and lending institutions; and

Whereas consumers need and deserve more Federal protection in order to receive full value for every dollar that they spend to feed, clothe, and house themselves and their families; and

Whereas consumers today are particularly subject to lack of information on the terms of costs of credit and are too often unaware of the full cost of a credit transaction, and therefore unable to compare financing costs because of nonstandard ways of reporting interest charges; and

Whereas disclosures of all finance charges in borrowing or credit-buying arrangements is essential to help consumers protect themselves against abnormally high interest rates and excessive credit charges. Such protection would be required by truth-in-lending legislation before Congress. It would simply require the lenders to disclose the total amount of the loan cost and finance charges expressed in dollars and cents and as simple annual interest rate on the unpaid balance: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Chicago District Council wholeheartedly supports the truth-in-lending measure now pending in Congress.

This resolution was unanimously adopted by the Chicago District Council at its regular meeting held on Friday, December 17, 1965. Copies to be sent to Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, Representatives in Congress and Grand President C. L. Dennis.

KENNETH A. STONE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Attest:

WILLIAM G. DENISON,
President.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HELPING DEVELOPING NATIONS TO IMPROVE THEIR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, President Johnson sent to Congress today his annual request for foreign aid authorization. The President has emphasized the importance of helping developing nations to improve their educational systems.

It is not surprising that education is, almost without exception, the first major goal of developing nations.

To millions of people in the less-developed parts of the world, progress is a schoolhouse.

For that reason, many countries are asking for—and getting—more help with education than any other field of technical assistance. In fiscal 1965, one out of every five AID-financed experts overseas was working in some aspect of education.

Most of these technicians—four out of every five—are staff members of American colleges and universities at work in specialized training programs—training doctors, nurses, public health officers, farm experts, engineers, and public administrators.

Coming the other way, to study in our universities and colleges, are thousands of foreign technicians and professionals who return to their countries to take over the supervision of public education in multiple fields. Since point 4 began in 1949, the United States has financed the training of 94,000 foreign specialists in U.S. institutions, and 19,000 more in the educational institutions of other countries.

In addition, the United States has helped to finance national construction

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1581

agent by getting on with doing the job. The annual cliff-hanging authorization debate is, furthermore, a deterrent to AID's recruiting the top quality people it so badly needs. I am sure, that Members of Congress could well use time freed from an authorization wrangle to the benefit of other pressing matters—in-cluding the ways in which AID actually operates.

We Americans pride ourselves, as we should, on the realism and the efficiency with which we conduct large business enterprises. If we accept, as we must, that long-range planning is equally an imperative for large public enterprise, we shall not hesitate to confer a measure of it on something so vital as foreign aid.

We should support President Johnson's request for long-range planning in the field of foreign aid.

BIG BROTHER

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure held hearings last year on IRS tactics in the Boston IRS district. At that time Mr. Alvin M. Kelley was district director.

We found that IRS had used lock picks to break and enter, had used illegal wiretaps and bugs, and had even resorted to the use of Army sniper scopes.

Although Mr. Kelley disclaimed both knowledge of and responsibility for such activity, he seemed far from repentant.

His lack of repentance is apparently still with him. He was recently promoted to regional commissioner in Chicago. In his acceptance speech he gave every indication of continued use of eavesdropping devices "when necessary."

Will the IRS never be reformed?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a clipping from the Chicago Daily News of January 21, 1966, on this subject.

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

IRS CHIEF HERE VOWS USE OF "BUG"

Alvin M. Kelley, new regional commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, has pledged a war against organized crime with the use of electronic eavesdropping devices when necessary.

"I would not like to give comfort to those who think we will not continue our use of intensive surveillance techniques," Kelley said.

Kelley said the Intelligence Division of the IRS, which works on criminal violations, has made progress against crime syndicate figures.

In 1965, while he was district director of Boston, Kelley appeared before a Senate subcommittee probing the use of electronic listening devices by Government agents.

Kelley, 50, was sworn in Thursday by U.S. District Court Chief Judge William J. Campbell at ceremonies attended by about 80 Federal employees.

THE RESUMPTION OF BOMBING
IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday's decision by President Johnson to resume the bombing of military targets and supply lines in North Vietnam to the

same extent as before the pause—based as it is on urgent military considerations—deserves the support of the American people.

At the same time, I approve of the President's determination to continue the peace offensive on a high-priority basis, by his new initiative in the United Nations, based on Pope Paul's suggestions. By the President's action, he is giving the people of the United States and the world every reason for confidence in the determination of the United States to act as a servant of freedom and justice.

I also believe that it is now more urgent than ever that Congress launch a full-scale debate on Vietnam in order to bring congressional and Presidential policy into complete accord.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY
REFORM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for several years, experts on international economic problems have stressed the need for monetary reform. Many of them devised plans for such reform. But the discussion stayed in the wings, a theoretical problem debated by specialists.

Last fall, monetary reform moved to the center of the stage, as a result of the bold initiatives undertaken by the President. Secretary of the Treasury Fowler carried to all the European capitals the President's plea to get things moving. As a result, intensive work has begun to develop agreement among the major industrial countries on international monetary policy.

Later this year, we expect these negotiations to move into a second stage where other nations of the free world will also be represented. Before long, the world should be able to free its monetary system from domination by the pace of gold mining in South Africa, and the willingness of the Russians to part with their gold. As the President says, we can look forward to "an agreement that will make creation of new reserve assets a deliberate decision of the community of nations to serve the economic welfare of all."

Progress on this front is urgent. The Council of Economic Advisers' report shows how far world monetary reserves are lagging behind world trade, and it explains the threat to the growth of trade that can arise unless funds for international payments begin to grow more rapidly.

The Council's report also describes a promising road to new reserve creation in a two-pronged approach that creates a brandnew reserve unit and simultaneously expands the important automatic lines of credit at the International Monetary Fund. Such a program will give new life and new vigor to world trade and the world's economy. This is a complicated technical area—many countries and many views have to be heard. But it is an issue that is central to the economic welfare of the whole world.

The administration deserves congratulations for fulfilling so clearly America's role of world leadership on this important issue.

THE BOMBING: BEFORE AND
AFTER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, last week I joined with 14 other Senators—all Democrats—in a letter to the President, in which we expressed our collective judgment against the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam.

The President has now made his decision to resume the bombing. He has given his reasons, and the issue is settled.

However, two editorials have come to my attention that I think should be made a part of this RECORD. The first, appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 27, summed up the case against a renewal of the bombings at this time. It was written prior to the announcement of the President's decision. The second editorial appeared in this morning's edition of the New York Times. It is an appraisal after-the-fact which deserves thoughtful reflection.

I ask that both editorials may be published at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 27, 1966]

CLOSER TO A TRAGIC MISTAKE

By every sign, the psychological buildup is underway for a resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam and for another escalation of the American military commitment. We believe President Johnson will make a tragic mistake if he adopts this course.

He will be doing what the responsible leaders of Britain, France, Japan, and the United Nations, among others, have explicitly urged him not to do. He will be rejecting the counsel of many of the wisest Senators in his own party, and defying the opinion of large numbers of his countrymen. Having projected himself before the world as a champion of peace in Vietnam, he will be creating a situation that not only makes peace improbable, but greatly increases the risks of Chinese intervention.

The President is said to believe that his peace offensive has fully convinced all well-disposed people around the world that only Hanoi stands in the way of negotiations for an honorable settlement. He should beware of becoming the captive of his own propaganda. Even those who accept the sincerity of his desire for negotiations would not necessarily agree that the way to obtain them is to escalate the war once more. And it is impossible for the most favorably disposed friends to ignore the inconsistency between his generally admirable 14 points and his refusal, at the critical point, to make the one concession most obviously necessary to bring about negotiations.

The critical point is the role of the Vietcong, which controls two-thirds of South Vietnam's territory, in both the peace talks and the political future of South Vietnam. So far as his own words go, Mr. Johnson has adopted the ambiguous stance that the Vietcong might be represented in negotiations by Hanoi, and that their views would be considered. But at the level of Secretary Rusk there is no ambiguity. Mr. Rusk repeatedly states that any peace talks must exclude participation by those who have been doing most of the actual fighting, and that there is no place for them in the political future of the country.

Since Mr. Rusk would not hold the position he does if he were not carrying out Mr. John-

concerned to request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to comply with these standards. The act requires future Federal construction, building, or installation to be provided with waste disposal facilities.

On January 25 of this year, the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, under the able direction of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], as a result of hearings held in major cities throughout the country, issued a report calling for a national expenditure of \$20 billion, including a \$6 billion Federal contribution over the next 6 years, to control water pollution.

In his budget message, the President proposed a program and funds to implement this important legislation enacted by the Congress last session, in the following terms:

Increased urbanization and industrialization have resulted in a rapid buildup of pollutants in the environment. Expenditures to deal with these problems will increase by \$92 million to \$331 million in 1967.

This increase will allow acceleration of research on pollution and training of more manpower to deal with pollution problems. The attack on air and water pollution and the solid waste problem will be intensified under recently enacted legislation which also established a Water Pollution Control Administration.

A new program will be started in selected river basins to demonstrate methods for a broad attack on the water pollution problems of an entire basin. Water pollution from existing Federal installations will be reduced in accordance with the recent Executive Order No. 11258, and a similar directive governing air pollution is planned. Legislation will be proposed to (1) strengthen water pollution enforcement authority, including the registration of those responsible for discharging effluents into interstate and navigable streams, and (2) expand research, training, and control programs and demonstrate new techniques for waste treatment.

The trend in legislation seems to look solely to the Federal Government to solve this problem through increased financial contributions. This will be necessary, but we must remember that the increase in pollution is caused by more advanced agricultural and industrial uses and if we are to come to grips with this problem we must have the support of private industry. One way of increasing the participation of private industry is to give industry a financial incentive to purchase and install facilities for the abatement of water and air pollution. It is only proper that where industries purchase expensive equipment and facilities to reduce pollution—which facilities bring no financial return on their investment but are devoted to the greater public purpose and benefit—that a portion of that cost should be borne by the public.

In the January issue of the monthly letter published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, there is an interesting article on this subject entitled, "Progress and Pollution—Can The Link Be Broken." In the body of that article the question of private industry purchasing equipment to control air and water pollution receives the following comment:

If businesses and communities are to be expected to install control equipment on a massive scale to abate air and water pollution, more thought will have to be given to methods of inducing them to make the necessary investment. It needs to be frankly recognized that there is little motive in most cases for the individual business unit to assume unusual costs in order to reduce or prevent pollution, particularly if competitors aren't doing so. Control equipment is nonproductive so far as yielding any marketable product is concerned. In a competitive industry, it may represent the marginal item of cost that prices a company out of some market. Recognizing this, a community eager to attract new plants may be tempted to relax in enforcing pollution regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, despite the fact that installation does not produce profits many segments of industry with a sense of public obligation are investing large sums of their own operating funds.

There is wide interest everywhere in water conservation and water pollution controls. The National Junior Chamber of Commerce has made this subject a major objective and it is important to the whole Nation.

The bill we introduce today on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would amend the Internal Revenue Code by increasing from 7 to 14 percent the investment credit to those companies that purchase equipment and facilities abating, controlling, or eliminating air and water pollution.

I should like to speak of the work of the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] who has been in the forefront in proposing economic incentives to private industry as a method for the control and elimination of pollution. The bill which we now introduce was offered by him on the floor of the Senate as an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1964 and was cosponsored by some 25 Senators. The Senate voted to accept the amendment. I regret, however, that the amendment was dropped in the ensuing conference with the House. On April 1 of last year, Senator RIBICOFF introduced a bill, S. 1670, which would encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting companies to amortize for income tax purposes the cost of this equipment over a period of 36 months. As a start, I do not believe it matters greatly which approach the Congress takes; that is, whether the Congress increases the investment credit or provides for a faster writeoff of equipment and facilities or a combination of both.

I hope that these bills will be considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate as well as the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and that in their studies and research they will compare the merits of the two bills. I feel strongly that Congress should give private industry an incentive to carry out this difficult, expensive, but altogether

necessary task of clearing up our streams and air. In the last analysis, many of the problems are caused by the great technological advances in our industrial development. Unless we enlist the support of industry in this battle, I do not feel that the problem can be adequately dealt with by Federal and State governments—and, indeed, municipal governments.

In conclusion, I should like to point out with respect to the bill we introduce today, that the Treasury has estimated in 1964—at the time the amendment was offered—that the loss of revenue for the first year would be \$25 million; the second year \$30 million, and over the long run approximately \$50 million annually. This, of course, might be subject to some change today, but I do not believe by any substantial amount.

When we think of the huge amount of funds the Federal Government is contributing and the even greater amount of funds it is urged to contribute, our bill represents a modest start in aiding private industry in this most important field.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the well-reasoned remarks of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] in support of the legislation which he has introduced to accelerate industrial investment in facilities to control and abate environmental pollution.

As ranking majority member of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution I have been actively involved in recent legislative efforts to combat air and water pollution. The 88th Congress enacted the Clean Air Act, of which the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] was the primary sponsor. And last year, under the vigorous leadership of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the 89th Congress enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Amendments of 1965.

It was my privilege to cosponsor both these measures and to participate in the hearings, the executive sessions, and the drafting of the final legislation. Throughout this process, it has been my conviction, shared by other members of the Senate Committee on Public Works as well as many Members of this body, that the protean tasks of combating and eliminating environmental pollution will not be accomplished without the cooperation of private industry.

Many segments of business, especially in recent months and years, have evidenced a highly cooperative attitude in this field and have given every indication of a desire to control air and water pollution. However, the Federal Government has not yet applied all the instruments at our disposal to enlist industrial cooperation to the fullest extent. I speak with specific reference to tax incentive legislation to promote greater investments in pollution abatement facilities.

The cost of abatement of industrial pollution, Mr. President, is truly a staggering one. Though we do not have refined figures on the problem for all segments of industry, informed persons tell me that it will be much greater than the

February 1, 1966

next person in aspirations, their hopes to survive in dignity, their dreams to grow in affluence.

It is this on which our decision rides. It is this on which the course of the debates in this body hinge. That is the reason why I have taken these few minutes today to make a part of the RECORD what I think is an unassailable, factual account of the origin of the National Liberation Front, of the role it occupies with and for Hanoi, and plead with my colleagues in this body, in all the differences we may have, at least to strip away the falsehood, strip away the hoax that engulfs the NLF.

Once we do that, it seems to me that we have a better chance more realistically to deal with the hard-gut issues of Vietnam.

As I terminate these comments, thank my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] for his courtesy in yielding to me at this time that I might develop for the RECORD the story of the beginnings of the National Liberation Front, how it was conceived, and for what purpose it was conceived. That is what really counts. The point of the National Liberation Front remains what is described in the simple word "front." It is a front. It is a facade, and nothing more. Let us not be deceived any more than we were deceived anywhere else around the world by new psychological tactics of the Communists in Moscow in one interval, and by the psychological tactics of the Communists in Peiping at another interval, and now the Communist group operating currently out of Hanoi.

If my friend from North Carolina is of such mind, I would like to return the floor to him, and thank him for his courtesy.

Mr. ERVIN. Let me assure my good friend from Wyoming that I was asked to yield the floor to him in order for him to make a very clear statement about the status of the Vietcong. I think it was a most worthwhile statement because of the need to have that status clarified. We have had much loose talk about negotiating with the Vietcong. To me the Senator from Wyoming has made it clear that it would be about as sound a basis for negotiation as if some country would demand that when it entered into negotiations with the United States, in addition to the officials representing the United States, there should also be negotiations with members of the Masonic Lodge, members of the Knights of Columbus, members of the Ku Klux Klan, the Protestant churches and the Catholic churches—

Mr. McGEE. And the B'nai B'rith.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes; the B'nai B'rith, the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith; and the various unions, the members thereof, and different social organizations as well, because they have been sustained within the borders of the United States on the same basis, except that they have been less turbulent and their activities have been more gratifying.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator's comment is quite appropriate. The point of parallelism is drawn excellently. I would assume that the Senator would want these

comments to be included in the context of my remarks rather than as a part of his remarks.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, because they are relevant to the speech that the Senator made, and not to my speech.

During the delivery of Mr. ERVIN's speech,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much for yielding to me. I note that, with his usual legal ability, he has covered every eventuality which might occur within the next few minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my previous unanimous-consent request be broadened to permit the Senator from Kentucky to introduce bills, and to engage in colloquy with other Senators for such questions, answers, observations, and statements as he or they may care to make in connection with such bills, under the same conditions.

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

INVESTMENT CREDIT FOR PRIVATE INDUSTRY COMBATING WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his courtesy in yielding to me. I know it is very difficult for him to give up his time to me, but I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ERVIN. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that it is always wonderful to have an opportunity to be courteous to such a courteous gentleman. I yielded to him notwithstanding the fact that I had a long speech to deliver, and I do not know whether I shall have sufficient time to complete the speech today.

For that reason, I intend to ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue my speech at a subsequent day without having my speech of today counted as a speech on the pending subject.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in behalf of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and myself, I send to the desk a bill to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution. I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks, and that it lie on the desk until a week from tomorrow, through next Wednesday, for additional cosponsors.

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

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this bill would increase the present investment credit of 7 to 14 percent for those industries purchasing and installing facilities and equipment controls that would abate or eliminate air and water pollution.

The Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, during the last several sessions of Congress has held extensive hearings on the subject of water and air pollution. As a result of this study by the committee, several bills were passed by the Senate and enacted into law.

The Water Quality Act, which became

Public Law 89-234, provides for a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, increases from \$100 million annually to \$150 million annually the grants for waste treatment facilities over the next 2 years, and increases individual project grants from \$600,000 to \$1.2 million, and multiproject grants from \$2.4 to \$4.8 million. It sets up a 4-year, \$80 million program for demonstration grants involving new or improved methods of controlling pollution from storm sewers. Finally, it authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish water quality standards in interstate waters in those situations where the States have failed to take action.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] deserves great credit for his leadership in this field. He introduced the bill and conducted the hearings. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] also, as the ranking member of the subcommittee, deserves great credit, as does my cosponsor. I opposed the bill first introduced and passed, for, as I stated in my individual views and in debate on the floor of the Senate, I thought the first bill gave too large a grant of authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in fixing water quality standards. I pointed out also that private industry in the State and local communities would be required to bear the chief burden of installing antipollution facilities, and that the bill as originally passed by the Senate did not provide adequate provisions for their participation in the establishment of these standards.

However, these provisions of the Senate bill were remedied in great measure by the House bill, and I supported the bill finally agreed upon in the House and Senate conference.

In April of last year, the committee held hearings on amendments to the Clean Air Act. The purpose of that act is to provide for the establishment of standards for automotive vehicle emissions, the establishment of a new Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to conduct a national research and development program, and for international control of air pollution where a foreign country is adversely affected by air pollution from sources within the United States.

This law also contains a title 2 designated as the "Solid Waste Disposal Act," which authorizes a total of \$92.5 million for 4 years to be used by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Interior for research, demonstrations and training in connection with disposal of garbage, refuse, and other discarded solid materials.

The committee reported favorably and the Senate passed S. 560, the Federal Installations, Facilities and Equipment Pollution Control Act, which is designed to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution of Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. The bill authorized necessary funds for the installation and maintenance of waste disposal systems in Federal buildings to meet the standards established by the Secretary and makes it mandatory upon the agency

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post for April 14, 1965, entitled "North Vietnamese Peace Program Calls for End of All Interference"; and a statement on U.S. official position on Vietnam.

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

**NORTH VIETNAMESE PEACE PROGRAM CALLS FOR
END OF ALL INTERFERENCE**

TOKYO, April 13.—Premier Pham Van Dong of Communist North Vietnam has laid down a four-point program for peace that calls for the exclusion of all foreign interference in both the North and South.

The New China news agency, quoting a North Vietnamese broadcast, said the points were made by Dong Monday in a report to the national assembly in Hanoi.

The four points made by Dong, the agency said were:

"1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Vietnam people: Peace, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

"2. Pending peaceful reunification of Vietnam, while Vietnam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam must be strictly respected; the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops and military personnel in their respective territory.

"3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Vietcong), without any foreign interference.

"4. The peaceful reunification of Vietnam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference."

The "stand expounded above * * * is the basis for the soundest political settlement of the Vietnam problem," Dong said. "If this basis is recognized, favorable conditions will be created for the peaceful settlement of the Vietnam problem and it will be possible to consider the reconvening of an international conference along the pattern of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam."

The New China news agency said that on the first point "according to the Geneva agreements, the U.S. Government must withdraw from South Vietnam U.S. troops, military personnel and weapons of all kinds, dismantle all U.S. military bases there, cancel its 'military alliance' with South Vietnam. It must end its policy of intervention and aggression in South Vietnam * * * The U.S. Government must stop its acts of war against North Vietnam."

Dong said U.N. intervention in Vietnam would be "inappropriate" because the United Nations is "basically at variance with the 1954 agreement." The 1954 agreement halted the war between the French and the forces of Ho Chi Minh, now president of North Vietnam, and left the country divided.

U.S. OFFICIAL POSITION ON VIETNAM

The following statements are on the public record about elements which the United States believes can go into peace in southeast Asia:

1. The Geneva Agreements of 1954 and 1962 are an adequate basis for peace in southeast Asia.

2. We would welcome a conference on southeast Asia or on any part thereof.

3. We would welcome "negotiations without preconditions" as the 17 nations put it.

4. We would welcome unconditional discussions as President Johnson put it.

5. A cessation of hostilities could be the first order of business at a conference or could be the subject of preliminary discussions.

6. Hanoi's four points could be discussed along with other points which others might wish to propose.

7. We want no U.S. bases in southeast Asia.

8. We do not desire to retain U.S. troops in South Vietnam after peace is assured.

We support free elections in South Vietnam to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice.

10. The question of reunification of Vietnam should be determined by the Vietnamese through their own free decision.

11. The countries of southeast Asia can be nonaligned or neutral if that be their option.

12. We would much prefer to use our resources for the economic reconstruction of southeast Asia than in war. If there is peace, North Vietnam could participate in a regional effort to which we would be prepared to contribute at least \$1 billion.

13. The President has said "The Vietcong would not have difficulty being represented and having their views represented if for a moment Hanoi decided she wanted to cease aggression. I don't think that would be an insurmountable problem."

14. We have said publicly and privately that we could stop the bombing of North Vietnam as a step toward peace although there has not been the slightest hint or suggestion from the other side as to what they would do if the bombing stopped.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I hasten to add that at the beginning of this problem, in 1954, 1955, and 1956, we did not divide Vietnam. Vietnam was ultimately divided by the forces and the power blocs which were operating in that area at that time. We did not divide Korea. That was an expedient aimed at trying to achieve the transition from total war to some kind of peace.

We did not divide Berlin. We did not divide Germany, but, we are confronted by the hard facts of a divided world, nonetheless.

As Adlai Stevenson put it on one occasion so much more eloquently than I:

Our real choice is not that of a divided world or one world, but a divided world or no world.

We have long since learned of the necessity to accommodate ourselves to a reasonable division of the areas of power. It is what some in the old fashioned days used to call, "restoring the balance of power." Those are dirty words. The mere mention of balance of power inflames some of our friends in this body. It also inflames many of my former cohorts in the academic world who regard balance of power as a dirty phrase. Indeed, it is. It is wrong. It is immoral. But, it is a fact of life. For, in all of the great progress which we have made in technological know-how, in scientific endeavor, in medical solutions to hitherto defiant health problems, in all of this great progress which we have made, we have made virtually no progress in the science of orderly existence on earth.

If Napoleon Bonaparte were to come back to earth today, he would recognize the same vestments of nationalism and national power in the world, they have changed little in 250 years.

It is a sorry commentary that the only substitute that civilized man, so-called, has been willing to accept for war, is the

balance of power. Therefore, it behooves us, upon whose shoulders has been thrust by history the responsibility to reestablish that balance in the world, to start with the hard facts of international life; namely, the balance of power.

Of course, that is not the end that we seek. That is not the goal. But, that is our starting point, not our stopping point.

Unless we can reestablish the balance of power in the world, we cannot meaningfully plan or even hope for a more stable society of man in the years ahead.

That is what rests upon our conscience as well as upon our shoulders in this role of leadership which we assume. We did not choose it. We did not seek it. But, as the emerging power of great strength in the wake of the disasters of World War II, we inherited it. We inherited it from the British, from the French, and from the Dutch.

Unless we can re-establish the balance of power, we will simply forfeit to a world in chaos and international anarchy.

This opportunity gives us our beginning. Once we achieve it, Mr. President, we will have then won the opportunity for which the war was waged—that is, the opportunity to do it a little better, the opportunity to improve upon the trappings of the world order, if we can.

But, we have got to win the opportunity first. That opportunity remains ever elusive if we do not restore the balance of power. We have come a long way along the road of balancing the world in the wake of World War II—a long way. We were tested in Greece and Turkey, Iran, Berlin, Korea, and Cuba. Now it is Vietnam.

Each crisis, in its own terms, by its own forces, was the measure of our willingness to assume the responsibility of power in drawing the line of balance around the globe. Such a line has almost been drawn. We can begin in the northern area of our earthly domain in Finland, and with a piece of chalk sketch a line on the globe down across eastern Europe, above Greece and Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Pakistan and India, almost to the China Sea.

That represents a firm line that has been drawn, not by a geographer, not by a theoretician, not by a philosopher, but by the sheer balancing force of the counter power. One source of that power was vested in Moscow, and the other in the United States of America. But the line has been drawn, and it has produced a greater semblance of order in the world—in that part of the world, that is—than at any time since World War II. But only in the East has it remained in a vacuum, in a total state of futility.

We have come so close to rebalancing the globe that it would be a forfeiture of deep responsibility finally to stop now, finally to be so near and yet stop when it is still so far.

That is the reason why it makes a difference what we do now, and that is why we are in Vietnam. That is why we have no rational, no meaningful, no moral alternative but to stay there for the present, to draw that line there, and to epitomize in our own vestments of power the hopes of those nations and lesser people in numbers, though no lesser than the

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1617

tional Liberation Front, directed from Hanoi, will they be permitted to make "their own self-determining way" for the future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will suffer my repeating the statement, because it is very significant, and it has not been emphasized anywhere, so far as I know:

The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, without any foreign interference.

Does that not mean that all the other people whom the Senator has mentioned will have nothing to say, except that the election shall be conducted by the South Vietnam Liberation Front?

Mr. McGEE. Not only conducted by it but counted by it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I ask the question: If the election is carried on in that way, will it or will it not be a duplication of the one-party elections which have been held in all other countries where the Communists have said, "We will have open, free elections"?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed it would be. We should learn that fact from history. History can teach us some important lessons in that respect. I hope it taught us that lesson in Greece, where exactly the same demands were made in 1945 and 1946, and we were compelled to hold the line, even in support of a king and royalty and some black-market groups, in order to win the votes for a genuine self-determining development in Greece. It meant that for a time we had to abandon the good guys in the rural areas of Greece who were involved in that civil war situation.

In Germany the same thing was true. This was exactly what the Communists had in mind when they wanted free elections in Germany, provided that members of the Communist Party conduct those elections.

The Communists cannot stand free elections in Berlin. They cannot stand free elections in Eastern Germany, because they would be swept out immediately by the German people. This is an old hoax, and the fact that some of our people here in America are taken in by that hoax, after the lessons we should have learned from the cold war, is an exceedingly distressing factor of our time, and makes the chances of an opportunity for winning peace in Vietnam all the more difficult, even now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to be a travesty and an insult to the intelligence of the people, when the North Vietnamese state that: "We want the issue settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, but in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation."

Our Government has said that it is content to permit the people of South Vietnam to determine what type of government they want. In twisted words, North Vietnam, through its Premier, has said that it wants the people of South Vietnam to determine what type of government they want.

Yesterday the President of the United States asked that Ambassador Goldberg

take up the matter in the United Nations. I suggest at this time that an exploration of the legitimacy of the proposals by North Vietnam and by our Government should be made by the United Nations, with a view of bringing about open, free elections, supervised by the United Nations or by a new international agency created to observe the elections. I should be happy to hear the Senator comment on that suggestion.

Mr. McGEE. I say to my friend from Ohio that this is indeed an interesting and provocative suggestion. I feel compelled to say, on my own behalf, that it will probably be a great deal more complicated than that. It is not like aiming toward elections in Greece, where they have had a far more sophisticated experience with some of the trappings of self-government or responsible local government, at least, for many years, or in Germany, where such capabilities existed wherever free elections could be had.

In South Vietnam, we have the tragic circumstance that there has been almost no experience in self-responsibility in government. We would only be deluding one another if we agreed that in trying to stage now what we might call free elections, we would achieve elections such as we think of in the American vernacular or in the experience of other countries in the so-called free world. I do not believe that can happen very soon.

But I believe that we should try to win them by drawing a line. We must try to draw a line in Vietnam for the Vietnamese to grow into that kind of responsibility, allowing time and opportunity for them to rise to this capacity, which all peoples can do if they are not suppressed from the outside by forces that are deliberately geared to prevent their self-expression.

If we include the timing in our concept, and realize that perhaps in our time we shall not see any genuine free elections so-called, because the people yet have to grow up with that kind of experience, then we could say, "Yes, indeed; take any means for a chance for whatever determination they choose to make, but free from any imposition on what they do from Hanoi or any of the other areas to the north."

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is soundness in what the Senator has declared. The point, however, which I am trying to make is the approach to the problem from the standpoint of the immediate time that our Government is prepared to have open and free elections, to the extent they can be obtained with the present untrained experience of the South Vietnamese, while the North Vietnamese have made, in the words of their Premier, false and beguiling statements that they wish the people of South Vietnam to determine what shall be done but, quote, "in accordance with the program of the liberation front." This absolutely means the old Communist type of election.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator is correct. Let me suggest that even if there may be some dispute over the degree to which the people of South Vietnam—or similar areas which were too long under colonial domination—might be capable of rising to self-government, the fact remains that

we know the surest way they will never obtain it would be to turn them over to the Communists. Whatever else our feelings may be, at least we have a moral goal in the matter of what we believe, and political righteousness in terms of freedom for all people to make their own determination of what they wish to live with, and what conditions they will accept, and so forth. We also know how they cannot get that by surrendering to forces from the outside that would move in by sheer power, and cram its doctrine, its methodology, and its leadership down the throats of its neighbors.

It is the prevention of such a situation that we stand for in this country.

I hope we are not trying to make little democrats out of everyone—and with all due respect to my friends on the other side of the aisle, I mean little democrats with a small "d." I hope we are not trying to make little Americans out of everyone.

To me, American foreign policy is simple, and that is to uphold the right of every nation, of every people, anywhere, to determine its own future, its own destiny within its own confines, so long as it does not impose its attitudes upon its neighbors by force, or have to succumb to imposition from its neighbors by force.

That is as simple and as plainly as it can be put. Let the nations work out the variations of the future they want.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my position, and I am quite certain that it is the position also of the Senator from Wyoming, that when we made the statement that we support free elections in South Vietnam, to give the South Vietnamese a government of their own choice—which we did in a brief statement, and simply put—we declared what the Senator has just stated a moment ago to be his concept of the philosophy of our Government.

If the Liberation Front really wishes peace, it would seem to me that it would go to the negotiating table and there discuss ways and means to insure free and open elections. But, that they will not do.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator does not blame them, does he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I blame them because—

Mr. McGEE. Because that would destroy them.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They wish South Vietnam to be surrendered to them—

Mr. McGEE. Of course. They cannot afford to negotiate. They cannot afford to compromise. They cannot afford to settle. Their only hope is to settle by the imposition of force—their force—on only one kind of peace; namely, their peace. They cannot afford anything else.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Another condition laid down by the Premier is that all foreign troops be pulled out, and then that elections be held in accordance with the concept of the Communists in holding an election.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much for his comments.

Mr. McGEE. I also wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for his valuable contribution in this dialog that we have been able to spell out on the floor of the Senate.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1629

What we are now witnessing is the American economic miracle and, since the Nation is now into the sixth year without recession, it is time to recognize that this miracle is not accidental.

At a time when communism is still claiming it is the wave of the future—though neither in Red China nor in the Soviet Union can Communist agriculture feed its own people—maybe competitive private enterprise has something to be said for it.

We must be doing something right.

When President Eisenhower submitted a 1958-59 budget of \$72 billion, Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey screamed at the White House that such a spending binge would "bring on a recession that would curl your hair." It didn't.

The \$112.8 billion budget Mr. Johnson presented to Congress this week is a big budget but, because of the vigor and growth of the economy, it does not dangerously strain the resources of the Nation.

Eisenhower's \$72 billion was often cited as the biggest peacetime budget ever. But it wasn't. Not that it wasn't the biggest at that moment, but it wasn't a peacetime budget. It was a peace-plus-cold-war budget.

And Mr. Johnson's \$112.8 billion is not a peacetime budget. It is a peace-plus-cold-war-plus-hot-war budget and the President put his finger on its economic soundness when he pointed out in his economic message that, while our defense needs are great, our economic growth is far greater.

There is no doubt that there are large uncertainties in the budget. The uncertainties are the war-cost estimates and the revenue estimates. They could both be wrong. They usually are.

If they prove to be, the President will have to propose higher taxes and cutting back some homefront spending to hold inflation in check.

NEED FOR BAIL REFORM

(Mr. SCHWEIKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill which will establish for the first time a formal statutory removal procedure to be followed by bail bondsmen and supervised by U.S. judicial officers in the State to which an alleged bail jumper has moved. It is a simplified form of the current extradition process and requires that bondsmen procure an arrest warrant from a U.S. commissioner or U.S. judge and then bring the bailee before that official for a hearing. The Federal officer would issue a removal warrant to the bondsman only after he had satisfied himself that the accused was the person sought, that he had been admitted to bail in another State and had violated the provisions of that bail, and that the bondsman is a valid representative of the bonding company. If the removal warrant was issued, the accused would have to be returned promptly to the State from which he had fled. Bondsmen who fail to comply with these provisions of my bill would be subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

The dangers of the present system have been made clear by the actions of bondsmen in a recent episode involving one of my constituents. Presently, convicted criminals that escape have more rights than alleged bail jumpers who have not been convicted of any crime.

No. 16—12

At present, the law does not prescribe procedures in this field. In fact, bondsmen today base their actions on a Supreme Court decision handed down in 1872. I believe that the due process of the law can only be assured by enactment of this bill. It will merely require bondsmen to follow the same procedures now used by policemen under similar circumstances. Presently, bondsmen enjoy special powers not given even to the police. I feel that it is imperative that the operations of bail bondsmen engaged in recovering fugitives in another State must be subject to the careful supervision of the courts to protect the basic rights of all concerned.

I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague, Senator TYDINGS, who is introducing this bill today in the Senate.

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

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS OF CURRENT MILITARY SERVICE

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, much concern has been expressed in recent months over the benefits that were available to veterans of current military service. These men are, of course, entitled to many of the benefits that our grateful Nation has bestowed upon its war veterans. Two notable exceptions, however, are educational benefits and hospitalization for the treatment of non-service connected disabilities.

I have introduced a bill to authorize educational benefits for veterans of service after January 31, 1955, and I anticipate that my colleagues in the House of Representatives will soon have an opportunity to vote on a bill on this subject.

I am today introducing a bill making veterans with service after January 31, 1955, also eligible for hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities on the same basis as veterans of a period of war. We have all seen instances, Mr. Speaker, of men who were separated for disabilities which the Veterans' Administration holds are not service connected. These men, in many instances, are unable to establish the fact that their disabilities originated in service. When they require treatment for such conditions, the existing law prohibits it.

It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration will accept a veteran applicant for treatment in one of its hospitals until such time as service connection is either established or ruled out. The bill I am introducing today will provide statutory entitlement to this hospitalization with the same limitations regarding the veteran's ability to pay and the availability of a bed as is contained in existing law for war veterans. I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure.

VIETNAM

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated some of the compelling reasons that the United States is again using air power against the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese supporters.

He could have told in more detail how much the bombing pause has allowed the Vietcong to increase their supplies and strengthen their resources. There is no question but that the Vietcong have benefited from a buildup in supplies during the bombing pause. How much this may lengthen the war and how much it will cost in lives no one can say.

This was a decision of the President, and only time will tell whether the pause contributed to finding a peaceful solution to the Vietnamese problem.

What has been most disturbing is the public appeals of several prominent Senators to continue the bombing pause. I do not question the right of these representatives to voice their dissent to the policies of the President, even though they are of his party, but to publicly ask for an extension of the pause after he had already told congressional leaders of the compelling arguments for resumption of the bombing could serve little purpose here and was misinterpreted abroad.

Everytime a prominent American suggests a softening of our policy in Vietnam unfortunate consequences follow in Asia. Our friends, the South Vietnamese, are constantly concerned that that United States will pull out of Vietnam and leave them to the retaliation of the Vietcong.

The North Vietnamese and the Chinese take each such statement as further proof that our strength is ebbing and our determination is weak.

The most important factor in bringing the Communists to negotiations is to convince them that we are absolutely determined to see the problem through to a reasonable solution. If they think we are about to withdraw or give up, such misconceptions will only prolong the fighting, causing more American servicemen to be killed, and hamper efforts to find a peaceful solution.

Consequently for several Senators to publicly pressure the President on this subject, even after the decision to resume had been made, was a move unwise in conception and harmful in execution.

If further debate is to be had on this subject, let us try to keep it within the realm of matters which can still be changed, and let us try to phrase our questions in such a way as to leave no doubt of our firm resolution.

CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTING

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to some statistics which I placed in the Record on Thursday last, January 27, 1966, which appear on page 1307 of the Record. These figures are startling when the proximity of the 1966 congress-

sional primary and general elections is considered.

In my remarks I have pointed out that more than 25 percent of the Members of this House will be affected if a congressional districting bill, already passed here and amended and now pending in the other body, is enacted into law to bring congressional districts to within 10 percent of each other in population. One-fourth of the districts represented in this House would have to be altered to conform to that legislation, and although its effective date may be postponed, its provisions could be influential with legislatures now discussing congressional redistricting.

Mr. Speaker, in my compilation of statistics on that subject I have used the figures which existed in North Carolina prior to the very recent redistricting in that State.

I would like further permission, Mr. Speaker, to note that the figures used in my previous remarks must be adjusted as necessary to reflect the changes in North Carolina districts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have supported the foreign aid program for 17 years, sometimes somewhat reluctantly, but at the same time I have felt free to criticize the foreign aid administration when I thought they were wrong. They do not like criticism, and consequently I was not one of those who got an advance notice of what they are proposing in a new foreign aid program, nor was I one of those invited down for a briefing yesterday. But if what I hear around the floor is correct, it has taken them 6 or 7 years to approach what I have been suggesting that they do for a long time, and that is quit trying to industrialize emerging nations, nations which have no basis for industrialization, no technical know-how, and no skilled personnel.

We should try to concentrate upon the basic things, namely, teaching them how to feed themselves and how to produce enough food so that they will not be on a starvation diet, and how to start with very basic and elementary education. If the AID agency is sincere in trying to carry forward a program like this, I might find it possible to support foreign aid for the 18th time. But having watched them in action, I will be very

careful to scrutinize their requests and ask questions, even if it is at the risk of being left out of the briefings. I think I will be able to survive and get the information anyway.

THE FOREIGN GIVEAWAY

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wondered where one of the previous speakers got so much information about the President's foreign aid program in view of the fact that the White House message has not been read. The gentleman from Ohio, my friend Mr. HAYS, throws some light on the subject. Apparently it was at a closed-door meeting at the White House yesterday.

I would hope that the President, if he is going to ask for a 5-year foreign giveaway program, would let a few more of us in on the takeoff as well as the landings.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I was not concerned about not being invited to the briefing. I just hope that they do not take me off the list when they have food down there. That is what I like to know about.

Mr. GROSS. I was not personally concerned about it either, but I do think that perhaps others ought to be in on the takeoffs as they are staged.

THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 374)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend a foreign aid program to help those nations who are determined to help themselves.

I recommend a program to help give the people of the less developed world the food, the health, the skills and education—and the strength—lead their nations to self-sufficient lives of plenty and freedom.

I propose to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less developed world, and cut out the worst. I also propose to make the basic changes the times demand.

My recommendations are grounded in the deep conviction that we must use foreign assistance to attack the root causes of poverty. We must concentrate on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves.

This is the lesson of the past. It is the hope for the future. It is the guiding principle for a nation ready and will-

ing to cooperate with the industrious, but unwilling to subsidize those who do not assume responsibility for their own fate.

During the past year I have given our foreign assistance program the most sober and searching review. I have questioned the merit of each program. Special groups have concentrated on the particular areas of food, education, and health. A Cabinet committee has examined the details of our general economic and military assistance.

Thus, the steps I recommend today have been developed in the light of advice from senior officials in the executive branch, congressional leaders, and experienced advisers from outside Government. They also have been developed with full recognition of our balance-of-payments situation.

They emerge from a rigorous examination of our past experience.

They are informed by compassion and shaped by the history of two decades.

They are the proof of our devotion to the works of peace.

They reflect our vision of a world free from fear and ripe with opportunity.

They will shape the legacy we leave our children.

The quest for peace is as old as mankind.

For countless centuries man struggled to secure first his home, then his village, then his city. It is the unique heritage of our century that men must strive for a secure world.

Peace, plenty, freedom—our fathers aspired to these as we do now. But the fateful truth of our age is that all our personal and national hopes hang in a balance affected by events and attitudes half a world away.

We have paid a fearful price to learn the folly of isolation. We have learned that the human misery which infects whole nations with a thirst for violent change does not give way to mere slogans. We have learned that the works of peace require courage and foresight. The need knows neither national boundary nor narrow ideology.

We have demonstrated this understanding in many ways over the past two decades. Our military strength has protected many countries threatened by invasion from without or subversion from within. Our economic assistance programs have rebuilt Europe. We have helped untold millions to gain confidence in peaceful progress, where there has been neither peace nor progress for centuries.

We will never know how many crises have been averted, how much violence avoided, or how many minds have been won to the cause of freedom in these years. But I believe we have many such achievements to our credit.

Yet today the citizens of many developing nations walk in the shadow of misery: half the adults have never been to school; over half the people are hungry or malnourished; food production per person is falling; at present rates of growth, population will double before the year 2000.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit of Truth, whose ways are higher than our ways, and whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts, we feel Thy call to us. We cannot rest until we have more nearly approached Thy goodness, Thy love, Thy holiness. We pray in all of our human agencies a deepening of the desire to find and follow Thy laws for men. Just now especially we long for this in governments. And we pray especially in these hours for our own Government. We thank Thee for her greatness, her ideals, her achievements. In these very critical days let Thy blessing rest upon this House of Representatives, the President of the United States, our courts, and all the governing bodies of our Nation. Help us to be strong and unwavering as we carry the burdens of world leadership. Keep us humble. Keep us persistent in the quest for world peace, by every legitimate means, even as we stand faithfully against aggression and tyranny. O God, our Father, hear our earnest prayer, for all men and nations, and be to us all not only the God of the nations, but the Father of each of us, in the name of Him who is the Wonderful Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Gelsler, one of his secretaries.

SELF-HELP AND U.S. FOREIGN AID

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased by the stress President Johnson placed on the need for more self-help by countries seeking economic aid from the United States. This emphasis on more self-reliance reflects a growing recognition that our economic assistance programs must be genuine partnerships if they are to succeed. The burden must be shared, but the major portion of the burden should be carried by the developing nations themselves. Economic development is an inside job. With all its wealth and technology, the

United States cannot induce progress in other nations from the outside.

On the other hand, the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America now know that a far better life is possible. They know that ignorance, poverty, and despair are not inevitable facts of life. In the face of this new awareness and the new aspirations to which it gives rise, the rich nations of the world can no longer afford just to help their underdeveloped neighbors sustain themselves on the brink of survival. Such a course would eventually lead to worldwide disaster. There is no doubt that we must assist in this struggle for a better life. In doing so, however, we should continue to insist upon adequate standards of performance from those who seek our aid. Our most vital contribution should be assisting the drive toward self-reliance. For us, this is the only practicable course; for new nations with a strong sense of national pride and purpose, it is the only acceptable course.

As the President has emphasized, self-help means more than cost-sharing on individual projects. It means firm commitments about how the finished projects will be used and maintained. In the President's concept, self-help must include such things as the restructuring of a tax system to make it more effective and more equitable; the enactment of stringent fiscal measures to insure that temporary gains are not swept away in a tide of inflation; the institution of agricultural and land reform so that the farmers may realize a better return for their labor.

What we are trying to do in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is to get the less-developed countries started on an upward spiral of rising production, rising income, and rising standards of living so that they eventually will be able to continue on their way unaided.

President Johnson has made clear his determination that U.S. foreign aid shall not be used as a worldwide relief program with the needy nations lined up for handouts from the rich. He is determined, rather, that our aid will be used to help developing nations achieve economic independence as well as political independence. I know that he will receive the enthusiastic support of the Congress in his efforts.

PRESIDENT MADE RIGHT DECISION

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

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson made a forthright, courageous, and wise decision. He is right in resuming the bombing of North Vietnam—the

Communist aggressor. The President extended the olive branch of peace. He even gave the aggressor time to reconsider his infamous actions and offered to negotiate. The President's gesture of peace was rejected by additional ruthless aggression. The President had no alternative but to attack the source of aggression.

The enemy took advantage of the truce to strengthen his base of aggression. The enemy used this time to prepare for further aggressive action against the peaceful Vietnamese people and against American soldiers stationed in Vietnam for peace and to prevent the spread of war.

Having returned from Vietnam only last week, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you this is welcome news to the American men at the fighting front and to freedom fighters of all nationalities. We cannot permit sanctuaries free of attack when aggression is spawned and nurtured against freemen from those sanctuaries. We must destroy those bases of aggressions and international crime. We are in war and every means at our disposal should be used to insure final victory over the forces of tyranny and evil oppression. We must protect our men with every means at our command. We should barricade the coast of North Vietnam and prevent their instrumentalities of death from reaching our boys at the fighting front. We should destroy the airfields, generating plants, and industrial complexes of North Vietnam. The President's action will encourage the Koreans, the Thais, the Philippine people, the Republic of China, and the forces of freedom all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, our men in South Vietnam from General Westmoreland to the private in the foxhole, the Vietnamese military, news correspondents, and civilians in every walk of life are virtually united in their desire to see victory in the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

Upon my return from South Vietnam, I, along with others, made this recommendation to the President. President Johnson has my support in his heroic effort to halt Communist aggression and restore peace to the world.

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

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

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, January 29, I had the pleasure of viewing Edwin L. Weisl, Jr.'s appearance on Theodore Granik's award-winning "Youth Wants To Know." In these crucial times when the need for a better understanding of the critical issues of

February 1, 1966

verse business behavior but the "inevitable concomitant," as the President's Science Advisory Committee has noted, of technological activity.

Businessmen, while they direct much of this activity, can neither be credited with all its benefits nor held uniquely accountable for all its unwanted byproducts. The dividends and debits alike are society's to share.

If substantial pollution-control costs are to be built into the business process, it is society at large that is ultimately going to pay the price of those costs just as it now pays for other social objectives—such as factory safety, abolition of child labor, and minimum wages—that have become accepted costs of doing business. Clean water and clear air simply aren't free goods. Recognition of this is the vital prerequisite to the development of sensible abatement programs.

The bill (S. 2857) to increase the investment credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, introduced by Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to

the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2857

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 46(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of qualified investment for purposes of determining the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by adding after paragraph (4) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) FACILITIES TO CONTROL WATER AND AIR POLLUTION.—

"(A) In the case of section 38 property which consists of facilities or equipment to control water or air pollution, the amount of the qualified investment shall be twice the amount determined under paragraph (1).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'facilities or equipment to control water pollution' means a facility or equipment used to control water pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of wastes from any type of manufacturing or mining process, including the necessary intercepting sewers,

outfall sewers, pumping, power, and other equipment, and their appurtenances.

"(C) For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'facilities or equipment to control air pollution' means a facility or equipment used to control atmospheric pollution or contamination by removing, altering, or disposing of atmospheric pollutants and contaminants from any type of manufacturing or mining process."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 2, 1966, at 10 o'clock a.m.

As an investment banker, Eugene Meyer proved an immediate success. In short time he had a seat on the stock exchange and was serving as director of a large number of corporations. When World War I began, he was called to Washington to serve as a member of the War Industries Board. In 1918 he was appointed a special assistant to the Secretary of War in connection with aircraft production, and reorganization of the Department of Production. President Wilson named him Director of the War Finance Corporation of the United States. A few months later he became Managing Director and remained such throughout the life of the Corporation. Retiring from that position at the close of the war, he was rehired in 1921 to fight the effects of postwar inflation, pumping credit into American agriculture.

Under President Coolidge, Eugene Meyer reorganized and held office as Commissioner of the Federal Farm Loan Board. Under President Hoover he became Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. In 1931, in the midst of the depression, he drew up the bill creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the most useful Federal agency conceived under President Hoover. Indeed, it is history that virtually every financial emergency law proposed by President Herbert Hoover was suggested, in whole or in part, by Mr. Meyer.

In 1933, Mr. Meyer resigned his public office and bought control of the Washington Post, which under his guidance was to become one of the outstanding newspapers of the United States.

As a newspaper publisher, Mr. Meyer did not, however, retire altogether from the political world or forsake the other needs of the community. As publisher, he was not above serving as reporter on occasion, and as an editorial commentator. Meanwhile, he continued to serve as a philanthropist to his city and his country, which tradition he introduced as far back as 1904. In that year, at the age of 29, he donated a considerable amount to Yale University, his alma mater. The same spirit prevailed when, in World War I, as a personal cost of a large sum of money, he brought to Washington men who were vital to the war effort. Still later, in the same vein, he established the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation for the support of public services including university scholarships, some of which are awarded to the sons and daughters of public servants. The spirit of philanthropy was ever-present in him. Eugene Meyer was a great American. He had an intense love of his fellow human beings. He was truly "one of God's noblemen."

Many times over the years I have begun speeches by saying I was proud and happy to be wherever I was—and truly so. It seems too easy a formula for this occasion—though I am, indeed, proud and happy. More accurately, I am honored and quite humbled by your generosity.

The current revolution in medicine and the organization of medical care has become almost a commonplace in nonmedical literature in this last few months. Enactment of the medicare program, of course, is the cause of much of this interest. But medicare has grown out of needs and possibilities which, while more keenly felt and clearly enunciated recently than in the past, have been apparent for some years. It is well that the issue is now being dramatized for the American people—for the progress is real and imminent and will touch all of us.

Most immediately it touched you—doctors, nurses, all who staff the Nation's hospitals. For it is you who have urged much of the change in the kind of expert care now available and who will bring it to reality.

The challenges ahead are impressive. To a large extent they demand reconciling goals which—while not precisely conflicting—do

have different imperatives. Medicine is increasingly and necessarily dependent on a delicate and complex technology. Now shall this be reconciled with a sick person's need for personal warmth—and our growing understanding of the effect this has on the course of his illness? We are beginning to approach abstruse and thrilling questions about the chemical nature of life and its processes. Can we dedicate the necessary energy and time to this inquiry and still act on our recent awareness of a hospital's broad human responsibility to the community it serves?

These and similar questions resolve into a single, central question: In the light of rapidly changing social, economic, and scientific conditions, how can the most productive relationship between physician, patient and hospital be achieved? The answers carry implications for personnel, administration, construction, research, education—the full gamut of medicine and medical practice.

It is particularly important that university hospitals approach the question imaginatively and vigorously—for they mold the physicians of the next generation and set the example for thousands of other hospitals. Washington is fortunate in having George Washington University Hospital. You are growing, inquiring, learning—expanding your concerns as well as you bed capacity, alluring yourself with the future. You have much to be proud of and much to look forward to.

In the effort ahead of you, the Government will support, encourage, aid. Between us we can build a most productive partnership. This plaque is witness to the possibility. But the bulk of the effort—as it has always been—must be yours. Yours is the knowledge, talent and skill. Fulfillment of some of the deepest of men's hopes rests with you, and in this sense, you are doing God's work. I am honored to be associated with your effort.

In closing, may I say that I deeply appreciate and I am very grateful to all those associated with George Washington University in presenting the very fine plaque to me and to Senator BIBLE, which honor Mrs. McCormack and I shall treasure for many years to come.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, without the least hesitation I want to associate myself with the fine remarks made by the majority whip, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, yesterday. Additionally, I wish to commend him for the excellent contribution he made as one of the panelists on the CBS special news program of Sunday, January 30, when the question facing this Nation in Vietnam was discussed for 90 minutes.

In my judgment, President Johnson had no alternative but to order the resumption of aerial strikes against North Vietnam. All of us appreciate the sadness the President felt when he announced this action. He and his administration patiently awaited some sign of willingness on the part of the North Vietnamese to negotiate. Through 37 days of forbearance, not one flicker of interest was displayed. Instead rather blunt rebuffs were made to all overtures. The fact that the Vietcong and North Vietnam have rejected every effort for

peaceful negotiation has clearly indicated that there is no possibility for peace at this time.

It must be said by any unbiased observer that the efforts of the President have been overwhelming in the pursuit of a peaceful solution. He has gone far more than the second mile. He has repeatedly committed the administration to the principle of unconditional discussions leading to the negotiation of the cessation of hostilities and a peace settlement. He has expressed readiness to utilize mediation efforts by United Nations members, and especially by United Nations Secretary-General U Thant. He has also proposed a billion dollar development fund for southeast Asia.

All of this indicates a deep sense of responsibility on the part of the President to explore every means possible to find a solution to problems in Vietnam.

With his announcement of today, the President has again forcefully asserted his sincerity of purpose by instructing Ambassador Goldberg to immediately take this problem to the Security Council of the United Nations.

If the request by the President for the intervention by the United Nations achieves success, we will all rejoice. I join with my colleagues in upholding the hand of the President in this matter and giving him my prayerful support.

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

[Mr. ROSENTHAL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY, CYO CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL.

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1965, the Catholic Youth Organization of Chicago presented their award "For God and Youth," to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for his outstanding work in support of the welfare of our Nation's young. In accepting the award the Vice President addressed the CYO Convention with a most stirring speech. With permission, I would like this speech printed into the Record at this point:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, CYO CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., NOVEMBER 13, 1965

Your excellency, monsignor, reverend clergy, and my friends of the CYO, I am deeply honored to receive this award, "For God and Youth." I favor both.

You young people of CYO exemplify what is right with the youth of America. You are our builders of the future. You will uphold our Nation's best traditions and practice good citizenship and civic responsibility.

You are working, in the words of Pope Paul, to "create a world that is more humane by promoting the common good for all."

We are a young country. And we are getting younger all the time. The average

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

1645

ciation with Mr. Yancey, countless young men have gained a moral foothold upon life, and a considerable number have gone on to college and professional studies.

Joseph J. Yancey, loyal friend of youth and pioneer worker for high Christian ideals in a unified community, the Catholic Interracial Council of New York is happy to present you as the recipient for 1952 of the James J. Hoey Award for Interracial Justice.

HAROLD A. STERNS,
President.

FLOYD HAWOLL,
Chairman, Board of Directors.
JOHN LA FARGE, S.J.,
Chaplain.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BUREAU OF
EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS,

August 30, 1965.

Mr. JOSEPH YANCEY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. YANCEY: It was a pleasure having you in the office last week to tell us about your extended trip to Latin America. I am writing at this time to thank you again for the fine work you did for the American specialists program.

We now consider you something of a veteran, for you have been abroad under our program a number of times. In view of your splendid accomplishments in the past we had no doubt that this latest trip would be successful also. Nevertheless, we were still delighted at the laudatory reports of your work that have come in from our Embassies. The reports repeatedly speak of your high professional competence and your friendly, pleasant personality. We are advised that you were very popular with coaches and athletes alike, and that in addition to refreshing track and field knowledge, you also imparted a good deal of new information to the people with whom you worked. The general feeling of the posts may be summed up by the comment from the Embassy in San Salvador which stated: "We would be glad to have him back any time, and heartily recommend him to other posts."

It was indeed generous of you to take such a long leave of absence from the Internal Revenue Service in order to make the Latin American trip. We are most appreciative of your time and effort in so successfully promoting good will toward our country, and we hope you have the feeling of satisfaction that comes with the knowledge of a job well done.

Sincerely yours,

PAXTON B. JOHNSON,
*Program Officer, Division for Americans,
Abroad.*

(Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

GI BILL FOR GOOD

(Mr. HOWARD (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to ex-

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Mr. Speaker, in lieu of the current state of world affairs and the sacrifices our servicemen are being called upon to make, I believe it is important for the Federal Government to provide a plan under which veterans who have served in the Armed Forces will be eligible for educational assistance, death and disability compensation, farm, home, and business loans.

We need only cite the GI bills covering World War II and Korean war veterans to see that they actually saved the United States money. Veterans who availed themselves of these programs—including myself—have raised their income and educational levels. As a result, our society as a whole has improved. The old GI Bill of Rights cost the Government \$14.5 billion. However, the persons who took advantage of this bill are now better educated and are returning higher taxes to the U.S. coffers at a rate expected to pay back the amount twice and possibly three times over in the course of a lifetime.

Our draft law is necessary but it does require these young men to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces for a required period of time. These young men have been called upon to make the personal sacrifices associated with military service; yet they have been denied the readjustment aids so vitally needed to help them catch up with those of their contemporaries who were not in service.

Some Members of Congress favor a very limited so-called "hot war" bill but I think this falls short of our needs. The bill I am about to introduce will provide a plan which is coherent and equitable, and applicable to all servicemen without regard to where they may be directed to serve in response to the exigencies of the cold war or crisis situations.

A leading New Jersey newspaper, the Red Bank Daily Register, recently carried an editorial which I hope every member of this House will read. At this point I would like to insert into the RECORD the editorial which recently appeared.

GI BILL FOR GOOD

Long-stymied efforts to enact a new GI bill of rights are expected to succeed early in this year's session of Congress. The administration and its spokesmen in the House reportedly have relaxed their opposition to a measure already passed by the Senate to grant education and home loan benefits to men who have served in the Armed Forces since the Korean war GI bill expired in 1955.

The administration blocked the legislation in the past because of its cost, which is not a sound reason for opposing a program which would be as much in the Nation's interest as that of its individual beneficiaries. The change in attitude apparently arises from the political climate generated by the increasing hazard to U.S. servicemen in Vietnam, which is not the best reason for adopting the program.

There is no better argument for a new GI bill than the experience with the original one for the veterans of World War II. While it was conceived primarily as a way to reward the millions whose lives were interrupted and permanently changed by that great struggle, the Nation as a society got a great deal more out of the program than it put in.

In terms of dollars alone, the return in taxes from the men and women who used the educational provisions of the first GI bill is expected to total 2½ times the \$14.5 billion governmental outlay. But more important are the services supplied by the doctors, dentists, teachers, lawyers, clergymen, businessmen, tradesmen, and thousands of others who got their schooling with the aid of the law.

It was the most extensive Federal aid to education program in the country's history, which makes continued carping about the "threat" of such Federal aid the more difficult to understand. Still, that is no harder to understand than arguing against a new bill on the ground that it would cost too much.

By the same token, there is no need to justify support for the legislation as a Vietnamese war GI bill of rights. Regardless of whether the servicemen fighting in the jungles there merit a reward, the return on investment is so promising that the Nation can scarcely afford to pass it up for its own sake alone.

Instead of passing a Vietnamese war GI bill—as there were GI bills after World War II and the Korean war—Congress ought to pass a permanent GI bill.

EUGENE MEYER PAVILION

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. Moss) was granted permission to extend his remarks in this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 21, 1966, the Eugene Meyer Pavilion was dedicated at the George Washington University Hospital. The late Eugene Meyer was a great supporter of George Washington University, and as everyone knows, he was very active in the field of business, philanthropy any civil works. The pavilion is a wonderful tribute to his memory and represents the latest of medical equipment, which truly emphasizes the greatness of the late Eugene Meyer. The pavilion, with its excellent medical facilities, will be of great assistance to the hospital itself, and patients will derive much benefit from the medical improvements.

The George Washington University honored Senator BIBLE and me by presenting to us two very fine plaques, which have been installed in the lobby of the Eugene Meyer Pavilion. On that occasion I had the honor to address the group that was assembled to dedicate the pavilion. In my extension of remarks, I include the speech that I made on that occasion:

Dr. Elliott, president of George Washington University, Mrs. Eugene Meyer, board of trustees, Senator BIBLE, distinguished guests and friends, born of pioneer stock, in the literal sense, Eugene Meyer was to become, in time, a pioneer in his own right, blazing paths of glory in several areas of endeavor, and establishing a record unsurpassed in the field of business, philanthropy and civil works.

Eugene Meyer's father immigrated from France to California via the Isthmus of Panama, settling in Los Angeles, in the 1870's. There he became successful as a commercial banker in the French firm of Lazard Freres.

Young Eugene Meyer was educated in the public schools of San Francisco and spent a year at the University of California, concluding his studies at Yale, from which he graduated in 1895. Six years later he opened his own investment banking house in New York City.

not a comfortable position for the heavy-handed Texan who is used to having his own way in most everything except perhaps, his daughter's marriage.

The state of the Union message was disturbing in that it carried the message of a man who labors for a consensus on the one hand with a program of massive welfare now being extended into a worldwide application in apparent hopes that the impoverished across the land will join the legions of L.B.J. boosters among the welfare recipients here at home. On the other hand the tone came through of a man who realizes that two centuries of progress, bringing us to the point of being the greatest and most generous civilization the world has ever known, still find leaders of rival world forces bent on our destruction. The obligations of protecting that civilization at the expense of losing points in the "world opinion poll" are not as easy to face as are suggestions for spending money among the poor.

LYNDON; WHAT HE DIDN'T SAY

Midst all of the suggestions for advancing the spending for welfare, the new Department of Transportation, and the 4-year terms for Congressmen (well calculated to gain congressional favor) there were a number of pertinent points that were totally ignored. We hope that responsible Members of the Congress will raise these points on the floor for debate and demand that they be included in any program of action that we may embark upon.

We heard nothing of the demands of labor for wage increases of 30 percent and more in the railroad operating unions and in the transit unions of New York. He did admit in a press conference, the following day, that the settlement of the transit strike in New York had far exceeded the guidelines of non-inflationary price and wage adjustments. He didn't do anything about it though, to no one's surprise.

Floridians noted a lack of emphasis on the space program. With all other aspects of Government spending given a good leg up on the Great Society train it seemed significant that this vital program was totally ignored in the picture Lyndon painted. A sharp cut-back in spending for space could have a quick reaction on the economy of Florida.

The rights of people in Vietnam to determine their own destiny was made clear. The rights of the millions of people who have been gathered unwillingly into the community of captive nations to those same rights of determining their destiny was ignored. In fact it was strongly suggested that we step up our trade with those who had done the captivating of these people.

Mounting evidence of Communist terrorism in South and Central America was ignored. Numerous countries are feeling the increase in this reprehensible tactic of the Vietcong in this hemisphere from the Dominican Republic to Brazil. Plans for assistance to these nations were not mentioned.

There was no mention of the plan recently announced to settle the problem with Panama by a treaty amounting to almost total surrender to forces of the radical left. When sovereign U.S. territory is given away by treaty, or at least is in the position where it is about to be offered to the Senate for ratification, it would seem to be worth mentioning in the state of the Union message.

Rising threats of inflation were skimmed over without a backward glance. Cost-of-living figures are rising at a rate that should create some interest among people other than those getting hurt. No one thing can defeat the aims of the war on poverty faster than inflation. If there is to be any victory in that war there must be curbs on inflation. An example on your own table is the reduction of the weight of a standard loaf of bread from 1½ to 1¼ pounds while

retaining the same size. Perhaps you haven't read the wrapper; it might be interesting.

There was no mention of accepting the help of the well-trained and equipped army of Nationalist China to aid our cause in South Vietnam. There was also no mention of extreme vulnerability of our forces to a sudden and massive air attack from China with nuclear weapons or conventional bombs. There was no mention of the tremendous stock of supplies being shipped regularly to our enemies by our so-called friends.

There was no mention of the weapons of war being supplied by Russia and her Eastern European stooges to the Hanoi war effort. The idea of increasing trade with these countries must seem strange to a man looking down the barrel of a Polish-made rifle, built with steel from a plant supplied by the United States and delivered with trucks along a road we cannot bomb; trucks built with the capacity of plants assisted by U.S. dollars.

The state of the Union is not quite as suggested by last Wednesday's message.

Salute to Louie Vinocur

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, this coming Friday evening, February 21, 1966, there is scheduled in my hometown of Painesville, Ohio, a surprise dinner in honor of one of Lake County, Ohio's outstanding citizens. The dinner is in honor of Mr. Louis Vinocur, county administrator, Lake County, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those who will be present, and for the countless thousands of taxpayers of Lake County who have benefited by Mr. Vinocur's services, I would like to outline a few facts about this very likeable gentleman.

Louis Vinocur started to work for the Lake County Commissioners on December 1, 1960. At that time it was my pleasure to be serving on the board of county commissioners. He was recommended to me by my fellow commissioner, John D. Hadden. Mr. Vinocur brought with him over 15 years of experience in the State auditor's office and a thorough knowledge of county finances and procedure. As the years went by, Lake County became the fastest growing county in the State and Mr. Vinocur's experience proved to be of tremendous value. His insistence on the investment of idle county funds has saved the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars. A great personal tribute to Mr. Vinocur is the fact that, while he himself is a staunch and loyal member of the Grand Old Party, he has served in the capacity of administrator under the administration of both political parties. In his job he has always put the good of the public before personal political consideration.

Louis Vinocur is a strong family man. He now resides with his wife, Mercedes, at 7 North Park Place in Painesville. A daughter, Mrs. Roberta Friedkin of Mas-

sachusetts, and a son, Sander, have made him the proud grandfather of five lovely children.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to call Louis Vinocur a personal friend. He is a close confidant of mine whose advice I have often sought and will continue to do so. I hope to be in Lake County on Friday night to say along with his hundreds of friends, "Thanks Louie."

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I wish to insert a statement by County Commissioner John Hadden concerning Louis Vinocur. This excellent statement most adequately reflects the thoughts of thousands of Mr. Vinocur's friends:

As an example to the youth of today who may feel an inadequacy in the future of America or in the benefits of education, we of Lake County, Ohio, point with pride to our appointed county administrator as an ideal to strive toward.

This gentleman, Mr. Louis Vinocur, as a peasant lad in southern Russia—with his family at the turn of the century—walked across Russia to the North Sea to seek a better life in America. Going first to Montreal and then to Cleveland, he progressed through education and application, working his way through school and earning his degree from Ohio Northern University.

He has served the public of Lake County and the State of Ohio faithfully and well and has now reached the pinnacle of his years. A successful man—with a fine family—a faithful public servant with integrity, honesty, candor, and fearlessness, combined with friendliness and a warm human nature. His legacy will be a good life and a dedication to duty that the student of today would do well to emulate.

Congress and Vietnam—Peace and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take the liberty of including herein two editorials which appeared in the New York Times—one in the January 31 edition entitled "Congress and Vietnam," and the other in this morning's edition entitled "Peace and War."

I believe these articles merit the consideration of all Members of the Congress, and I therefore commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 31, 1966]

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

With 200,000 American troops in Vietnam and growing concern that many more may have to join them there, pressure is increasing in Washington for a formal, full-dress congressional debate on U.S. policy in this area.

We believe that a comprehensive discussion of this issue in the Senate—or in both the House and the Senate—is extremely desirable. A matter of this great importance deserves more adequate and more organized attention than is provided by the occasional statements individual legislators have made in recent months. Moreover, the situation in Vietnam and the scale of American involve-

ment there have changed drastically since the Tonkin Gulf incidents of the summer of 1964 that produced the blank check congressional joint resolution President Johnson has recently cited as legal authority for his present use of American forces in Vietnam.

There is certainly no lack of opportunity for the needed great debate on Vietnam policy. Both chambers of Congress have before them the President's request for an additional appropriation of \$12.7-billion to finance military and economic activities in that area. Senator GRUENING has introduced a resolution to deprive the President of authority to send draftees to southeast Asia, while Senator MORSE has sponsored a bill to repeal the 1964 joint resolution on which the President relies. A major discussion of Vietnam would be appropriate to consideration of any or all of these matters.

The argument can be made that such an open clash of opinion would strengthen the conviction in Hanoi and Peiping that the United States is tiring of the Vietnam war and will abandon Saigon sooner or later. But this argument is not very persuasive since the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists are already well aware that a significant number of Congressmen and other Americans have publicly indicated their lack of enthusiasm for escalating that conflict.

Congress must engage in a full and systematic debate on Vietnam policy if it is to meet its constitutional duties as well as its members' moral obligation to the voters they represent. Such a debate could help educate the people of this Nation—many of whom are undoubtedly hazy about why American boys are fighting and dying so far from home—on the issues involved, and the nature of the choices before the country. Life might be simpler for the administration if Congress merely continued to rubberstamp its Vietnam policy, but President Johnson's political position both at home and throughout the world would be much stronger if his actions won formal and explicit congressional endorsement after full airing of all points of view. Those who oppose a congressional debate encourage belief, in Hanoi and elsewhere, that the present White House policy in Vietnam has less domestic support than the President claims it has.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 1, 1966]
PEACE AND WAR

In a dramatic move timed immediately to follow resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam, President Johnson has asked the Security Council of the United Nations to intervene in the Vietnam conflict by calling for an international conference and a ceasefire. This is an important if long-delayed gesture by the United States that holds the possibility of opening the way to peace and only emphasizes the sincerity of President Johnson's desire to put an end to the war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam was not deferred at least until there was some evidence of the success or failure of the American move in the United Nations. In fact the good effect of the appeal to the U.N. was in part vitiated by the prior order to resume the bombing. Continuation of the bombing pause would have been a far more effective complement to the U.N. resolution than the renewed bombing attacks on North Vietnamese targets, which will almost certainly lead to further escalation of the war. More men, more planes, more ships, more money, more materiel, more wounded, more dead—these are the unmentioned but probable sequels to the resumption of the bombing of North Vietnam. The course the war took during the previous bombing raids proved that even if the attacks slowed down infiltration from North Vietnam, they did not pre-

vent it. North Vietnamese soldiers and materiel had been going south in quantity long before the bombing pause.

There is no reason to believe that renewed bombing can bring a different result. The United States could bomb Hanoi and Hainphong and even destroy all of North Vietnam without wiping out the threat posed by China. In fact, the danger of a ground war with Communist China, and perhaps a nuclear world war, would thereby be brought considerably closer.

President Johnson argued that "if continued immunity" were given to North Vietnam, "the cost in lives—Vietnamese, American and allied—will be greatly increased." But if 100,000 or even 500,000 more American troops are sent to Vietnam, as is predicted, many more lives are surely going to be lost. What was a morass is becoming a bottomless pit.

President Johnson said that "the end of the pause does not mean the end of our pursuit for peace." In this he is, of course, completely sincere. The great conflict over Vietnam that has arisen in the United States is precisely over the meaning of "the pursuit for peace." A number of respected and informed Senators and Representatives; military men like General Gavin and Ridgway; academic specialists, teachers and clerics; and a great many friendly foreign statesmen and commentators, all believed and said that the bombing of North Vietnam ought not be resumed. They all felt that "peace" had not given a full and fair chance. They all fear the consequences of the United States getting more and more deeply involved in Vietnam.

So far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, the decision has now been made. American troops in the field must be supported; but so must American efforts—inside the United Nations and outside it—to reach an honorable settlement in order to restore peace and self-determination in Vietnam.

Oren Harris

SPEECH
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the people of the Fourth District of Arkansas sent to this body a bright, young and aggressive attorney from El Dorado, Ark. Ever since then the people of Arkansas and the United States have greatly benefited from the service here of the Honorable OREN HARRIS. Unfortunately, OREN is now leaving this body to assume a seat on the bench of the Federal District Court in Arkansas. The House of Representatives will sorely miss him.

For the past 8 years as chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee OREN HARRIS has originated, fought for, and succeeded in enactment of legislation which touches deeply upon the life of every person in this country. His investigative and legislative skills have led to progressive laws in fields ranging from the make believe world of radio and television to the very real worlds of public health, commerce, and transportation. Under his chairmanship the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—

very difficult one because of the sensitive and complex nature of its jurisdiction—has gained a stature seldom known in the history of this body.

I think I speak for all my colleagues here when I say that I am happy to see the Federal judiciary gain a member of OREN HARRIS' stature. And I think I also speak for them when I say I am sad to see OREN HARRIS leave the House of Representatives. We wish him god-speed and good fortune.

Associated Industries of Alabama State
Position on Packaging and Labeling
Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all the Members to an important report made to the members of the Alabama delegation at the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. The report deals with the labeling and packaging bills and was presented to the conference by Mr. Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to the vice president of the Chemstrand Co. at Decatur, Ala.:

PACKAGING AND LABELING

(Statement in the public affairs field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation, January 24, 1966, by Whitfield King, Jr., assistant to vice president, Chemstrand Co., Decatur, Ala.)

S. 985, HART; H.R. 643, MULTER; H.R. 770, GILBERT; H.R. 993, FARBERSTEIN, H.R. 1576, ROOSEVELT, and H.R. 1664, CELLER—AIA has been on record as opposing this type legislation since its introduction several sessions ago.

This legislation would empower the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration to adopt and enforce rigid regulations over the packaging and labeling of consumer nondurable goods, including:

Control of the weights and volumes in which goods may be packaged and sold, regardless of whether existing practices are deceptive.

Control of the sizes, shapes, and dimensions of packages.

Absolute prohibition of "cents-off" promotions and the use of such label terms as "economy size."

Control of pictorial illustrations on labels. Specification of label terms that may be used to describe package sizes, such as "small," "medium," and "large."

Requirement that sufficient information as to ingredients be stated on labels.

Specification of type-size and location of net contents on labels.

In addition to foods, drugs, and cosmetics, the law would cover hundreds of consumer package goods, and affect many heavy industries engaged in producing or fabricating packaging materials.

Our association cannot support this legislation for the following reasons:

1. In many respects this legislation merely duplicates provisions in the existing law. The Chairmen of both the Federal Trade

1548

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 1, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from North Carolina in his commendation of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the statements of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Oregon.

AIR ATTACKS ON NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, now that the President, as a matter of national policy, has made the decision to renew air attacks on North Vietnam, I would hope they would be undertaken against more meaningful military targets. The result to us of such a change in military policy would be a major increase in the effectiveness of our conduct of this war.

In my report to Chairmen RUSSELL and FULBRIGHT about my recent visit to South Vietnam, I said:

Air operations against North Vietnam have been relatively ineffective, to the point where these operations should not be resumed unless there is more target license; license to hit such military targets as powerplants, oil stores, docks, etc.

My conclusions in this regard were partly the result of rereading the conclusions of the strategic bombing surveys of 1945 and 1946.

It would seem that we are attacking the least important targets most, the more important targets less, and the most important military targets not at all.

I agree with some leading military authorities that a real air effort to knock out important military targets, instead of periodic attacks on targets of far less importance such as bridges, barracks, and buses, might eliminate the necessity of sending hundreds of thousands of additional ground troops to South Vietnam.

In this way we would be using the qualitative advantage characteristic of our sea and air power, instead of struggling with the enemy on a quantitative basis where they are strongest, on the ground, in Asia.

So far our attacks on North Vietnam have been a nuisance but they have not done any real damage to the enemy's growing military potential.

Attacking more important North Vietnam military targets could be done with the same planes and pilots that are now being used; and would result in less cost and less casualties in South Vietnam.

COMMUNICATIONS RELATING TO RESOLUTION OPPOSING UNCONSTITUTIONAL WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain telegrams and communications which I have received in support of my opposition to the unconstitutional and illegal war in South Vietnam be printed in the RECORD.

I have received over 450 wires since Sunday. Except for four of them they all support my opposition to the illegal Executive war in Vietnam. I am insert-

ing the four critical wires also with my answer to them.

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

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your courageous stand on Vietnam. Let's trust U.N.

Mrs. JAMES THOMPSON.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone on your Vietnam position. We cannot police the world.

Mr. and Mrs. TRUMAN JOHNSON.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Concerning CBS television appearance thanks again for standing firm on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. J. P. DELORD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Press for peace.

MATHEWSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, let's give the country back to the people. We don't need a Texas dictator.

GEORGE H. WEBER.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

When Secretary Rusk speaks of our commitment in Vietnam tomorrow I hope someone will ask him how about President Johnson's commitment to the American people when he gained our trust by campaigning on a reasonable attitude in Vietnam and has subsequently betrayed us by pursuing immoral and illegal aggression there.

JANE ERICKSON.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I'm gratified by your courageous stand on southeast Asia policy.

THOMAS DUNCAN.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

More power in efforts to restore responsibility to elected representatives regarding Vietnam.

MARY STAHL.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor your courageous stand against the Vietnam policy of the President and his experts. We fear the cost of our sons in the defense of the corrupt power groups in Vietnam and elsewhere. We fear the consequence of American bombing anywhere.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES E. NELSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you and Senator CLARK. Your reference to that dictator was perfect. Senator Boggs should try, for a change, to operate this country as a private enterprise. I am fed up with all this waste and graft. Why should we support all these countries, nobody pays my bills.

THERESA STEIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your opinion concerning the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Thank you.

NICK SAMMONS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to President Johnson with 58 signatures: "We the undersigned Unitarian-Universalists believe that the moratorium on the bombing of North Vietnam should be continued. We welcome your peace campaign efforts and recommend you make unequivocal your willingness to negotiate with the national liberation front as an independent force."

E. L. HELLER.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your stand on the Vietnam policy.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH H. GILL.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your resolutions on Vietnam. Our illegal immoral offensive unilateral action there must end.

MARVI and VIOLET METTLETON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for a Senator who speaks the hopes of those who don't want war.

Rev. BRUCE KLINE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete agreement with you on Vietnam. Insist on United Nations participation.

ROBERT BRADEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I was proud of my Senator on CBS-TV. Please convey arrival to Senator CLARK.

PAT DUREN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Saw you on TV. Didn't vote for you but back you 100 percent.

CHARLES L. O'BRIEN.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1549

ASTORIA, OREG.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agreed with your plea on CBS program.
Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM C. REUTER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your eleviston stand on Vietnam greatly
admired. Continue your fight to end this
war.

Mr. and Mrs. W. R. STONE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am on your side. Keep
going.

PATRICIA BRAXTON.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Re Vietnam, thank you.

ALAN YOUNG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Re headlines Sunday Oregonian dear Sen-
ator bravo.

Mrs. ALFRED POWERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on continued strength of
your stand on Vietnam. We support you
completely.

Mr. and Mrs. VERN RUTSALA.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Admired your position in Sunday debate.
Likewise all your efforts regarding Vietnam.
SIDNEY BERLAND.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse wholeheartedly position regarding
Vietnam. Approve views expressed by CLARK,
MUNDT, and yourself.

Dr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE ROSENTHAL JR.

EUGENE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Behind you 100 percent.

NOEL and DOROTHY DANN.

SALEM, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

American eagle becoming vulture. Civil-
ization jeopardized. Congressional respon-
sibility demands continued denunciation of
Pentagon's heinous solution.

MARTHA FULLENWIDER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I would heartily endorse your continuing
efforts to place the issue of the Vietnam war
or peace efforts before the legislative branch
for debate rather than in the executive
branch of the Government exhibit the de-
ciding influences on policies in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. JAMES L. SCHNELLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete agreement with you on
Vietnam. Insist on United Nations partici-
pation.

ELWYN BRADEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree on your Vietnam stand, your
search for truth, respect your unpopular
stand.

Mr. and Mrs. IVAN ICKES.

HOMINY, OKLA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue opposing President's Vietnam
policies. Surely reason will prevail.

Dr. and Mrs. V. MAZZARELLA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous challenge to the unhu-
man and illegal activities of the Government
in Vietnam deserves full support.

ERWIN FEHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Of course Johnson is exceeding his con-
stitutional rights. The situation is desperate.
God prosper you.

FLORENCE BATTERSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily commend you and associates for
opposing our stupidity southeast Asia. Our
military must leave.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK G. CLARK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your efforts for Vietnam
de-escalation; please continue.

JUDITH LUSTIG.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

By all means rescind the 1964 Presiden-
tial mandate. Good luck.

PATRICIA E. ROWE.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,

January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Against resumption of bombing. Favor
full congressional debate on alternatives to
present unsatisfactory Vietnam policies.

MIKE JOELL.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my fullest support on trying to
halt escalation in Vietnam. Am absolutely
opposed to President Johnson's chauvinism.

HELEN STRIEDIECK.

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our Nation owes you gratitude for your
position on Vietnam. Urge you continue
courageously.

ALINE E. HOWER.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Washington, D.C.:

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Please support the Fulbright position
on Vietnam and try awhile longer for dip-
lomatic settlement.

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY B. FORTMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and are grateful for your
steadfast sanly and courageous fight to get
us out of this most unwanted war. Keep up
the fight.

SARAM AMERLING and

Dr. MARTIN SHEPARD,
Representing 14 residents of 50 West
96 Street, New York City.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Stage talkathon for rescinding.
Atrange maximum publicity. Hit Senate and
public with facts.

ALICE FRANKLYN BRYANT.

FULLERTON, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. Con-
gratulations, we need more independent
thinkers like you.

R. SHURY.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

If the President resumes bombing without
allowing time for action by Congress to re-
vise previous actions, I request that you ini-
tiate impeachment proceedings without
delay. There will be only one rubicon.
Please reply to this message collect.

GEORGE C. THOMSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your fight against this immoral, undeclared war has my fullest support.

JOANNA DE JESU.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your fight against illegal war is one voice worthy of the name human being.

DAVID H. MANN.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Gratitude to you for your courage and efforts. World survival depends upon men like you.

IRENE WALKER.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We ask your continued support of Senator FULBRIGHT on his latest stand on Vietnam, thank you.

JAMES E. HENNINGSON.

HAMPDEN, MASS.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our full support to you and associates for Vietnam stand.

JULIA WINETROUT,
KENNETH WINETROUT.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your courageous efforts for rational politics for constitutional legality and democratic process. Fully support your fight against presidential dictatorship. Agree Rusk, McNamara should be ousted. Thank you for speaking the American conscience. God bless you.

HANS NOLL,

Professor of Biology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As American citizen, taxpayer, and registered voter, I humbly request that you order withdraw of the memorandum giving President Johnson authority to conduct the conflict in Vietnam as he sees fit. If state of war exists, let's declare it or get out.

ROBERT S. SHAW.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In complete accord with your views on Vietnam, please continue efforts to prevent holocaust.

Mr. and Mrs. SPENCER W. FRANC.

PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight to rescind your resolution of the 1964 approval. We Americans are proud of you.

ESTHER CREEK.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations.

JOSEPH LYRICA.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly concur with your proposal for Vietnam.

JOHN TURNER.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: Please continue your efforts for peace in Vietnam. All community supports you in your efforts for peace.

GEORGE STOGEL,
TERRY STOGEL,
ANNA YATES,
ABRAHAM YATES,

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were one of Americas great independent leaders. You have become a moral coward. Please support President.

ROBERT CHARLES.

ARDSLEY, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge full disclosure foreign policy. Get out of Vietnam.

THE LRENS ARDSLEY'S

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support doubts and questioning of our present Vietnam policy. Urge continuation of debate.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES FRANK.

GARDENA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We offer our support and encouragement. How can we help you?

ALFRED FANTL.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your Vietnam position and repudiate Rusk's.

ELMER P. DELANEY.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our unqualified support of your courageous and forthright stand on the Vietnam war.

Mrs. ELIZABETH E. JONES,
Mrs. FREDERICK ELLIS,
Dr. FREDERICK E. ELLIS.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Revere your efforts to return sanity to high places.

FREDERICK SMITH.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is high time for people who back your position on Vietnam to let you know that they do. I count my wife and me among them.

THOMAS W. APPICH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend and support you for your courageous peace efforts. We urge you to continue.

Mr. and Mrs. I. SHARROW.

WHITING, IND.,
January 29, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse completely Vietnam stand. More war is not the answer. Don't give up.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT W. SIEVERS.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Demand executive orders be rescinded and stupid war in Vietnam brought to a close.

ROBERT R. HART.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand for nonresumption of bombing implementing Geneva Agreement.

Mr. and Mrs. A. LOZIER.

MONTE VISTA, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your stand to rescind southeast Asia resolution will urge our Senators support you.

ADRIAN and MARY RAMUS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your effort toward peace in Vietnam. Please continue your efforts.

JERRY and BEVERLY DANIEL.

COLUMBIA, Mo.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support appeal to prolong North Vietnam bombing lull. Urge continue your efforts.

DAVID WURFEL,
PAUL WALLACE,
RICHARD DOHM,
ARTHUR KALLEBERG,
DAVID LEUTHOLD,

Political Science Department, Missouri
University.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your courageous efforts to resist the President's disastrous military solution to Vietnam's political and social problems. We feel present policy doesn't reflect a true consensus and will serve to provoke war with China.

VETERANS AND RESERVISTS TO END THE
WAR IN VIETNAM.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly support intended Monday action to limit executive authority for war without congressional consent.

I. H. POLLACK.

WHEATLAND, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your effort to rescind the congressional resolution approved on August 10, 1964, Public Law 88-408. We are counting on you to limit the powers of the President in regard to the Vietnam war.

IRENE CREPS,
MRS. ENA DELCO CREPS,
THERESE PORCELLA.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your opposition Vietnam involvement. Please continue your efforts in behalf of peace.

ESTHER WURM.

STAMFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your efforts for peace and agree that the legality of our undeclared war against North Vietnam should be questioned.

MORRIS and VERA SCHUPACK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I strongly support your statement today relegating the power of declaring war to the people of the United States. Please hold fast.

DANIEL GOLDEN.

70 P.D. INTEL., CD FIRENZE,
January 29, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

I sent President Johnson this message. Don't let shelling start again. It is terrible almost apocalyptic mistake. His misfortune that would fault like cyclone also on Ameri-

can people. Accomplish this Christian did of religion historical and political hope.

God will give you also historical and political reward. Hold on. Peace may not be so far.

Apocalitch did.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you on the stand you have taken on Vietnam.

JEAN AND GEORGE USATCH.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you. Beg you to stand firm to help all from destruction.

Respectfully,

MRS. DOROTHY REID.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.:

(Please see that copies are made for Senator G. AIKEN, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Senator A. GORE, Senator M. MANSFIELD, Senator W. MORSE, Senator THOMAS DODD, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Senator JACOB JAVITS, and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY.)

Support your and other Senators' efforts to continue pause in bombing North Vietnam with aim to obtain ceasefire in Vietnam.

Lillian Berkowitz, Jean Berman, Emma Lou Bi Tham, Helen Bonime, Clarence Broadnax, Beulah W. Burhoe, B. D. Burhoe, Phyllis Cady, Georgia Cassimatis, Clarabelle Chankaya, Ida Davidoff, Anna Lee Dayton, Maurisette Dembitzer, Frieda Easton, Murray Fox, Anne Gladstone, Dorothy Golof, Susanne Gordon, Gordon Hall, Doris Halowitz, Cynthia Harrison, Mary Hennessey, Dorothy Hermann, Helen Hubbell, Dorothy Isenman, Molly Jacobson, Rose Jarmak, Edward Jarvis, Helen Jennings, Katherine Jones, Joan Kahn, Anne Marie Kearney, Clara Michael, Lillian Moore, Rhoda Moss, Esther Nothnagle, Jan Park, Helen Varsons, Lottie Perutz, Katherine Phelps, Ann Rappaport, Angela Reitzer, Margaret Reynolds, Sherwin Rosenstein, Frank Sales, Shirley Sarkin, Marriet Schneider, Gertrude Schuchard, Elizabeth Sharnik, Ruby Shaw, Eleanor Sheldon, Phyllis Slingerman, John Sommer, Clarence Taylor, Beatrice Vogler, Helen Welch, Social Workers in Fairfield County.

NORTHRIDGE, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your efforts against escalation. Regain the rights of Congress.

Mr. and Mrs. S. H. MANN.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support Senator FULBRIGHT's position favoring immediate negotiations in Vietnam.

Rev. and Mrs. LEWIS WHITEHEAD.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Suddenly a ray of hope has come with Senator FULBRIGHT's statement on Vietnam. Please support.

GARY FOSTER.

KEW GARDENS, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation with your position on Vietnam.

WILLIAM OLTMANS,
Dutch Journalist.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your opposition to bombing Vietnam and urge continued efforts toward negotiating.

ELIZABETH HELFRICK.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam especially with napalm.

GEORGE WM. MARTIN.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my support and blessings in attacking this heinous war in Vietnam, God speed.

DR. BERNICE BAUMMAN.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions know Pentagon prevaricated August 2, 1964, Tonkin. See TIME magazine following United States attack PT's.

MRS. RITA FRELICH.

ELKINS PARK, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support you 100 percent in your courageous stand on Severeld program and in Congress. You are truly a sane voice crying in a wilderness of irrationality.

ADELE KLEIN.

CASPER, WYO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud and endorse your proposed resolution urging Vietnam debate.

MARIAN M. NILSON.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Watched the program. You were marvelous. I'm a Missouri Republican, but I vote for your ideas. Keep up your thoughts regarding Vietnam.

HOYT NELSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on Vietnam as enunciated on Severeld's program admirable. Situation alarms us.

Mr. and Mrs. FRED BERGMAN.

MARTINEZ, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your advocacy of debate of our Vietnam involvement.

VIRGIL BOGARTH.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo Senator MORSE. I support your Vietnam views wholeheartedly as does the conscience of the American people. Curtail F.B.J. Fire Rusk and McNamara and end this mess by direct negotiations with the National Liberation Front.

WILLIAM HANNAH,
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

Am with you 100 percent on views expressed today on CBS. Feel free to advise Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY I have said this.

VOI NEY F. MORIN,
BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam. Please continue in your determination to have the American people presented with the true facts. God speed you.

Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD PERLMAN,
ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We saw you on CBS. We support your stand.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES L. COPP,
ROCKAWAY BEACH, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your stand in reference to Vietnam. Your views on TV program were superb; as parents we appreciate.

The SUTTINS,
CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

With all our heart and mind endorse your position and are grateful for your efforts in behalf of all that is decent and humane.

Dr. and Mrs. AARON LEARNER,
MEMPHIS, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks.

Mrs. RUBY HASSELL,
SOUTH BEND, IND.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily agree with your reasoning concerning Vietnam. Keep urging U.N. settlement.

PAUL WEDDLE,
PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I endorse your comments on CBS panel this date. May you continue saying them.

Dr. SAMUEL HAZO,
Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts
and Sciences, Duquesne University,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with you on solution of Vietnam. Keep up good work.

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE SPONAGLE,
LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We approve of your courageous stand on Vietnam TV today.

The L. W. DENEVAN,
KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for courageously speaking up.

DEAN COPPING,
WEBSTER GROVES, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your views, keep plugging for our American boys.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM A. THAU,
EVANSVILLE, IND.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue good fight for Vietnam peace negotiations.

ROBERT FENNEMAN,
KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree 100 percent with your position on the Vietnam situation.

KATHERINE AND DON VAN VLEET,
MOORESTOWN, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position on Vietnam. I am your distant cousin. Heart surgeon in Philadelphia.

DRYDEN MORSE, M.D.,
HAVERFORD, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Entirely behind your views, please keep trying.

GERTRUDE L. ROBGINS,
Mrs. Edward Robgins,
PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support Vietnam stand. Public must have full-scale debate, learn facts now being withheld.

Mr. and Mrs. M. R. HAGERTY,
FERNDALE, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your stand on Vietnam.
ANDRE PENNELL,
Clerk of Detroit Friends Meeting.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urged you in 1964 to run for nomination for Presidency. Again I say please, please, please, announce now your candidacy for Democratic nomination for President at next election, start campaigning all over country to give people facts, not lying generalities and banalities concerning Vietnam war.

M. C. PINCOFFS, JR.,
BOSTON, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Republican mothers draft-age son sends unlimited congratulations. Demand return congressional rights. See STENNIS telegram.

Mrs. KATHRYN R. GRANT,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous Vietnam stand especially letting the people have the truth. Suggest you introduce bill requiring all taxpayers to send in 10 percent more tax April 15 to pay current cost of Vietnam war. This would slow inflation and might even halt the war.

HARRY A. BARTII,
LA MESA, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We have agreed with you on Vietnam. From the first we heard you on radio today. We were proud of you. We are Democrats. Worked hard in Johnson's campaign. If the Senate allows this war to be escalated, we will deserve what we get.

Mr. and Mrs. GILBERT CARLSON,
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in fullest agreement with your policies regarding Vietnam and hope you can induce the administration to clarify all the issues pertaining thereto.

ROBERT AND RITA ROBILLARD,
STAMFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept our wholehearted support of your positions re Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT STEMBER,
WEYMOUTH, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree wholeheartedly with your position as stated on "Today" program, keep talking.

ROBERT T. MCKENZIE,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, Senator MORSE, on Vietnam stand. We're not in favor of the undeclared and illegal war. Hope your censorship of President will be successful. We're not in favor of war or draft in any

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1553

sense. Your actions and deeds in our thoughts and prayers. Keep it up.

GAIL and BILL NEWHALL.

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for leaders like you. If you keep speaking we may be saved yet.

Mrs. THOMAS FRIST.

SOUTHFIELD, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard and watched Vietnam perspective. Congratulations. Continue our support.

NEL and VILOET TUCKER.

SHELburne, VT.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your support of halt in Vietnam bombing and negotiations with all parties concerned.

PIERSON and ALICE OSTROW.

SCARBOROUGH, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bless you, thank you, imaginative, sustained efforts peace Vietnam.

LESLIE and ALICE BALASSA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the National Board, YWCA, I urge your support for a policy of continued patience and conciliation in the Vietnam situation. We have the deepest sympathy with the President in his heavy burden of crucial decision and are profoundly anxious that he should be fortified and encouraged to the utmost by realizing the great public support behind his efforts to avoid escalation and keep the spirit of negotiation even when these efforts appear to elicit no response as yet.

Mrs. LLOYD MARTI,
President, National Board, YWCA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following is copy of telegram sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, White House, Washington, D.C.: "Bombing resumption of North Vietnam will inevitably shatter chances of peace. War with China will draw in Soviet Russia on the side of China. We urge that you accept the counseling of Senators FULBRIGHT, CLARK, MANSFIELD, and others who are dedicated to the preservation of world peace."

JOHN WEILBURG,
JOHN F. RYAN,
LINDA F. BASCOMBE,
PATRICK FLANAGAN,
IRVING BEREZIN,
DOROTHY BEREZIN,
DOROTHY STULL WEILBURG.

DEERFIELD, ILL.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your opposition to war as an accepted instrument of national policy.

JACK CROOK.

ALBANY, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please press for continuation of bombing pause.

Mrs. ROBERT LAMAR.

ROCKVILLE CENTRE, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

For God's sake and the world's do not resume the bombing. Deescalate. Recognize the NLF. Stand up for humanity and against Senator STENNIS and the Pentagon.

M. CLYDE,
Miss LORA,
Mrs. F. FRIEDMAN.

CUMMINGTON, MASS.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent refer Vietnam peace issue to United Nations. Continue demand clarification administration policy. Bless you.

Rev. DAVID ROSE.

GAINESVILLE, FLA.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your protest against U.S. policy in Vietnam. The glaringly faulty official estimates of the situation since 1964 demand a revision of our whole Asia policy.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE G. FOX.

LAFAYETTE, IND.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Assure you our support urging continued bombing suspension North Vietnam. Your leadership appreciated.

HARVEY BATY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 28, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for questioning Rusk. Sincerely hope you can halt the snowball.

MAR and ELIZABETH WHITCOMBE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Prevent world war III. Continue to challenge basic assumptions of our foreign policy. Indispensable that bombing not resumed and N.L.F. be considered main party in negotiations.

Mr. and Mrs. S. ROSENBLUM.

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 29, 1966.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have our utmost admiration in respect for your courageous stand on our undeclared war in Vietnam. We could only wish that you were our Senator. We think in the end, history will be grateful for men like you. We sincerely hope that you can keep reason alive and most desperately hope that your views prevail. We must negotiate with those whom we fight, the NLF. You have our support, what little it is, in your efforts. We do not belong in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. ALLEN KOENIGSBERG.

PASADENA, CALIF., January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please reply collect would it be effective if we the people all loyal law abiding Americans organized a doorbell-ringing census, block by block, polling voters regarding Vietnam and sending results to Washington. We do not believe that past polls represent present thinking of American voters.

JUNE MARSH,
PEGGY BLACK AND COMMITTEE.

SEATTLE, WASH., January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are courageous. We admire, and support you in your attempt to force a test vote on the President's authority to wage illegal war.

Mr. and Mrs. H. K. LARSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 30, 1966.

Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your honest, wise, courageous stand against administration's dangerous course in Vietnam. Urge you to oppose further American involvement in southeast Asia and to work for withdrawal of our forces as first step toward peace.

Dr. ALBERT PARETS.

NEW YORK, N.Y., January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: I wholeheartedly support your efforts to gain full and open debate on the Vietnam situation.

HAROLD BECKER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your efforts to stop the illegal war in Vietnam. More people are with you than you might think, and the number is increasing daily. Please continue the fight.

CHARLES SOPHIE,
RICHARD ELLEN,
KENNETH AND ALLAN WALD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Be assured of my support and that of millions of Americans in your efforts to end brutal Vietnam war.

Bless you.

BERNARD GERSTEN.

WILTON, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you wholeheartedly in your effort to rescind the broad powers given Johnson in 1964, in the conduct of the Vietnam war.

Dr. and Mrs. CARL MILLER.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agreeing with Mansfield report that failure of negotiations probably means general Asian war, we favor both Morse resolutions for Senate to investigate Vietnam policies and terminate President's war-waging authority

so that Congress maintains right to declare war or seek peace.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN C. COBB.
Dr. and Mrs. STANLEY COBB.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your policy on Vietnam.
God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. DOMKE.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your policy on Vietnam.
God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. J. A. DOMKE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support resolution limiting President's powers re military action. Work for peace through U.N.

Mr. and Mrs. MANUEL GELLESS.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your courage and intelligence in advocating the rescinding of that misbegotten mandate.

Mrs. RUTH YEAGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hundreds of members, friends, relatives congratulate you for your courage, wisdom, humanitarianism in opposing escalation of Vietnam war.

WOMEN'S COMMUNITY FORUM.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam. Grateful for your voice of sanity.

Mr. and Mrs. E. SHINE.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
January 29, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I ask you to support Senator FULBRIGHT'S challenge of Vietnam policy.

Mrs. A. L. COLEMAN.

MOBILE, ALA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am for WAYNE MORSE's policy in dealing Vietnam.

Mrs. RALPH C. STANARD.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your remarks on television today are sound, responsible, and courageous. Please continue your struggle against a dreadful war in Asia. Please teach your colleagues what revolutions are all about.

MARTIN,
Harvard University faculty.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand for peace in Vietnam.

IRVING and HANNAH SCHWARTZ.

WYNNEWOOD, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views over the air today meets our 100 percent unqualified approval. God bless you in your efforts.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN H. STUTT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position against the immoral, illegal, and unconstitutional Asian war.

JOHN ONG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As an American I congratulate you on your extraordinary courage on CBS today.

Mr. and Mrs. WALTER B. BAKER.

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in complete agreement with your views.

BILL BARTISH.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Concur completely inquiry presidential war powers and Asian policies. Advocate U.N. arbitration.

JENTE DANIEL.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Complete agreement remarks on "CBS Reports" deepest appreciation an American family.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES A. BURNS.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courage, honesty, and intelligence, keep it up.

VIRGINIA CRONICK.

PLACENTIA, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

In full support of your resolution on Vietnam, best of luck.

R. T. HUNTER.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you Senator for your stand on Vietnam. I agree with you 100 percent. Let us have an open debate in the Senate and Congress and all over the country, not for 10 hours, but for 10 weeks. Let us also let the U.N. handle it.

AARON SHPIEGELMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are not alone in your courageous fight for peace.

W. SALTZMAN.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a credit to our Nation.

TOM and BETTY O'CONNOR.

NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard television debate. Support your stand. Urgent people hear truth of our position.

TERENCE BUTLER.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

WAYNE MORSE, man of greatness, I salute you. Down with the war hawks. End this immoral war in Vietnam before catastrophe engulfs the world.

Mrs. BERTHA DERKOWITZ.

SHORTHILLS, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you take action regarding your statement and convictions on Vietnam, am appalled at path our Government is taking. I speak as a loyal American, a student of foreign policy, and a believer in the U.N. as a potential arbitrator.

Mrs. WILLIAM CAVANAGH.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

May you rank with Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, F.D.R., and J.F.K. and be nominated for Nobel Peace in 1966. Bless you, Senator, for perhaps guiding our country to the United Nations. Your television outspoken convictions regenerated our hope in America.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT ADAMS.

URBANA, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: We applaud your courage and integrity and support your position on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. MICHAEL LEWIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope that you will persist in your efforts for peace in Vietnam. Thank you.

JOHN DUFFY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As conservative Democrat horrified resumption bombing. My support to you and others seeing danger clearly.

Mrs. ARTHUR W. LANE.

CLAREMONT, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you in opposing further escalating war in Vietnam.

JESSE BEER.

BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Cannot praise you enough for your speech in regard to war declaration.

SUZANNAH HATT.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous Vietnam position. Cease fire pending United Nations mediation is only solution.

Mr. and Mrs. MARK LUSTICA.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

One thousand Stanford students support your opposition. Keep up the good work, make information public.

Mr. and Mrs. DENNIS PIRAGES.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We are most deeply ashamed of our country's action of the past 24 hours. As voting constituents of the State of Oregon we heartily endorse your criticisms of America's Vietnam policy and urge you to press for full and open debate on the Vietnam war in the U.S. Senate.

JAMES L. SWENSON,
GEOFFREY A. MOORE,
ARTHUR E. WILSON.

NUTLEY, N.J.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your views Vietnam. Keep fighting for legality, morality, sanity, and the preservation of the species.

CONSTANCE BARTEL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly commend your recent proposed resolutions in opposition to existing administration policy on Vietnam. Congressional debate on this topic is essential now.

Mr. and Mrs. CHARLES W. STEELE.

LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Resist America's abhorrent and cynical warring.

JAMES DUKARM.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Work for peace.

SHAREN NLTING.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your efforts to curb Presidential power re Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES BRYANS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Thank God for courageous men that I think and act like you for our country.

BURRIS GRIMWOOD.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you on yesterday's broadcast. We are proud of your courageous leadership.

PENELOPE TURTON.
MARGARET WELCH.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Have wired Senators KUCHEL and MURPHY to support your stand. Rescind President's war power immediately.

MABEL M. ROCKWELL.

RIVER FALLS, WIS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good fight on Vietnam. Mr. and Mrs. L. FELDHAMMER.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I am and always have been a Republican. I have in the past disagreed with you on many of your domestic and foreign policies. However support whole heartedly your viewpoints on Vietnam as presented on CBS this Sunday afternoon January 30.

Mrs. VIGGO M. JENSEN.

JACKSON, MISS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The position you took nationwide television today took great personal courage. May I offer my grateful appreciation.

ROY BENKE.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with you 100 percent, good luck, keep up the good work.

B. E. HUFFMAN.

RICHMOND, VA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can't help but express my boundless admiration for your stand on the Vietnamese war on Sunday's television program. The morality of your position, uniquely consistent in all your thinking, breaks through the fog of murky semantics. For me, you stand head and shoulders

above all your contemporaries. For me, you walk with Isaiah.

Sincerely yours,

I. GORDON FELS.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am completely in accord with your views regarding Vietnam as outlined by you in the Sunday's CBS panel discussion.

Mrs. EVELYN W. BOWEN.

SAN LORENZO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Broad based bay area group prepared to call meeting in San Francisco to push for full and open congressional debate on Vietnam in support of your challenge and efforts of other Senators and Representatives. We could draw 15,000 to 20,000 with 2 weeks' notice, including the pro- and anti-war community and the many still undecided questions. Would such an electorate mandate for debate be pivotal? Could we get California Congressman and yourself or FULBRIGHT or McGOVERN here for a Sunday meeting if we pay the bill? Can we reach you by phone for your answer today or tomorrow?

DR. FRED GORDON.

SAUNDERSTOWN, R.I.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your strong statements to stop the war in Vietnam. You have gained the respect and gratitude of all peace-loving Americans for your intelligence and human integrity.

Mrs. SARAH KABAT.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The opinions and proposals expressed by yourself on the "Congressional Debate" moderated by Eric Severeld on television this afternoon, were by far the most reasonable I have yet encountered on the Vietnam problem. I am in complete agreement with your position. However, I am not at all familiar with the "Mansfield report" from which you quoted. The report from your discussion seems most pertinent. I would therefore appreciate information as to where I might obtain a copy.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK S. ZIMNOCH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please make every effort to work for peace in Vietnam. Thank you. Praying for you.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD COCHRANE.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please stop this insane war in Vietnam let the United Nations settle everything, bring any Vietnamese who don't want to be Communist. We'll take one family in with us. I worked in an Army hospital, McGuire General in Richmond, Va., in World War II, we had amputees. I have four sons now ages 15, 13, 11, and 3 and I won't let them come home without arms and legs for the

1556

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 1, 1966

military group in this country who are taking over and idiots like Senator DIRKSEN. I have always been a Democrat but now I'll vote for anyone who will promise not to try and boss the whole world. President Johnson got in under false pretenses. Goldwater, at least, let us know he would have a war like this.

ROSEMARIE D. SCHALLERT.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and support your position on war in Vietnam.

PETER BALLOU.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mothers all over the United States support your stand on legality Vietnam war. Save our sons.

Mrs. ELLIOT WAX.

HERMOSA BEACH, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building.

Sir: You were magnificent on Eric Sevareid's program Sunday. Many Americans, I am sure, got the message. Don't give up. Take care of your health. Regards.

As ever,

Dr. and Mrs. IRWIN COLE.

CROTON ON HUDSON, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your long courageous fight against war is beginning to yield results. Congratulations.

RICHARD O. and SOPHIA A. BOYER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, firm Vietnam stand, hope success for full Senate investigation.

WILLIAM C. BOHN.

UNIVERSITY CITY, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We offer you our firm support on your courageous stand with regard to Vietnam.

Prof. and Mrs. PAUL CHASSY.

FITCHBURG, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your position on Vietnam and urge your continuance of it despite attack.

KENNETH WILSON.

STOCKTON SPRINGS, MAINE,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Listening CBS broadcast. With you 100 percent. Keep hollering.

MAYNARD and AIMEE MACEWEN.

VALLEY STREAM, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. NAT HARRIS.

HEWLETT, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily agree with your position. Keep up the fight. Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. IRVING PRESCHL.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: Wholeheartedly with you. Take the question to the United Nations.

JOSEPH N. RICE.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full support to you and FULBRIGHT against Johnsons illegal, ridiculous war.

MIKE RAUGH.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Endorse your Vietnam position, urge continuous forthright explanation to people as on today's TV.

Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN SCHULMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We continue to applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. You are not alone.

Mr. and Mrs. JULIAN BERCOVICI.

MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Time is right for responsible opposition to Vietnam escalation. Nation desperately needs more national leaders such as yourself to lead responsible defense to this illegal and immoral war. I support your position and urge continued active organization of responsible calls for peace.

RICHARD L. BISHOP.

EDMONTON, ALBERTA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

As an American citizen I extend firm support for your opposition to Johnson's actions in Vietnam which go far beyond the limits of constitutional authority, international law, or civilized morality. Johnson's actions are degrading American prestige here in Canada.

Mrs. JO DURIE.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. We thank God there are still men like you. We thank you for being today's man without fear. With deep respect.

Mr. and Mrs. O. J. NORTON.

EUREKA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Your views expressed on Vietnam today were 100 percent in agreement with ours. You carried the show in spite of the stacked opposition. The opposition may be interested to know the people are not behind Johnson 100 percent. Keep up the good work.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT TAUFEST.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily support your efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam.

CELIA WOLSKI.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your peace efforts.

SAUL NIEDORF, M.D.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We appreciate your forthright Vietnam stand. Please preserve. You have the support of most Americans.

PHIL ALMA and GARY PATTON.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Acknowledge with deep gratitude your peace efforts in best interests of our Nation.

Mr. and Mrs. A. WEISS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your sensibility, integrity, and courage are the very things our country needs in these perilous times.

ROSE and WILLIAM COLAVITO.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support TV statement clarification of policy submission to U.N. recognition NLF continued bombing pause.

JOHN and JANE NEVIN.

LEAWOOD, KANS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We wholeheartedly support your position on Vietnam and have so advised our Senators from Kansas today.

Mr. and Mrs. LEE BREKKE.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse every effort to bring about peace in Vietnam.

SAM and DIANE WIDMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your policy completely and are thankful for a WAYNE MORSE in our Senate. Bravo for your courage and commitment.

SHIRLEY and IRVING MICHELMAN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your Senate service has been a long record of iconoclastic independence. I believe your

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1557

efforts to restore the rule of law and control of reason to our course in Vietnam is the peak of your career, requiring sheer toughness and scarce courage.

PAUL LION.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a citizen I agree with you for reasons not political, but humanitarian, believe in practicality and life.

MARGARET MCGREGOR.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in favor of limiting President's power in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. CHARLES CRIST.

LAKE SUCCESS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

My family and I thank you for trying to secure peace.

HAROLD M. SUSS.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position as stated on TV. You clarified in our minds the peculiarity of the Vietnam situation. What secret papers are you talking about? We are thankful that you are in Washington fighting our battle for commonsense and peace.

Dr. and Mrs. MORTON BARNET.

DALLAS, TEXAS,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Over the years your courageous, often solitary stand in the Senate has been supported by millions of your constituents. Today, we, in Texas wish you to know that you are respected and admired more than ever. Thank you for speaking the thoughts of silent Americans who are often misrepresented and seldom understood. Your courage has further renewed our hopes for the reclamation of man who, by his very origin, is disposed to peace and good will.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. GARDNER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue strong efforts, peaceful settlement Vietnam. Our faith and prayers are with you.

MRS. WALTER E. LITTEN.

KALAMAZOO, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are in complete accord with your views in the Vietnam debate expressed today.

Mr. and Mr. W. T. TUBERTY.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
January 31, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Have just heard the TV debate and your fine presentation.

No. 16—3

I have traveled and lectured in Asia and I know you are so right. Hundreds of millions of people in the world deplore our country's cynical disregard of the United Nations and our military policy in Vietnam. More power to you.

PAUL GREEN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I am a strong Republican but my greatest respect and admiration I pay to you for stand on the war in Vietnam. Regardless of party we should have more Senators like you. Sincerely,

HARRY MCFATHRIDGE.

MIAMI, FLA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to Senators GEORGE SMATHERS, SPESARD HOLLAND, and Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER. I strongly urge you as my Representative to give Senator WAYNE MORSE your full support and cooperation in bringing the Vietnam war before the U.N. Security Council.

BARBARA DIAMOND.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Congress and the war, attaboy, keep it up and cheers for the voters of Oregon.

KATHERINE MOONEY.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position re Vietnam. Am advising President and others.

DAVID G. FUNK.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge an immediate and peaceful settlement of the conflict in Vietnam.

LARRY and DIANE LITTEN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position Vietnam. Urge joining with other Senators for maximum pressure on President to prevent bombing resumption and instead seeking disengagement through referral Security Council United Nations.

SAUL A. LIVINE.

GOYNDON, MD.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work about Vietnam.

S. J. EBELING.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Emphatically behind your position. Congratulations Vietnam perspective. Await information as to procedure. Thank you.

JOSEPH TREGGOR.

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for your excellent presentation on the debate Sunday. Continue your fight for arbitration by the U.N. Save the lives of youth. No war. We are with you. Persevere.

RUTH M. HARRIS.

COSCOB, CONN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your leadership on policy in Vietnam. Completely support your position.

RALPH and JOSEPHINE POMERANCE.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator, we wish to express our full support in your responsible and worthy effort to return this administration authority to the limits of reason.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN H. FELBER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for voicing so eloquently your opinion on the CBS television program.

EDNA and CARLA SNYDER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully endorse and support your position on the Vietnam crisis. The Senate has responsibility in time of serious decision. We are not yet a dictatorship.

MARGARET ST. AUBYN.

OAKLAND CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend your courage in denunciation of correct position on CBS Vietnam special.

JOE FEIT.

CHICO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree on illegality of Vietnam war and urge full congressional debate.

Mr. and Mrs. LEE A. STUKEY.

MALIBU, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply admire your courageous stand. The world has never needed patience and reason more.

CAROL POTTENGER FRY, M.D.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your position on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. C. A. TUBBURY.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE: We young people offer thanks for wonderful statement. We have fought against war. It is good to know

1558

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 1, 1966

there are so many sane voices in adult community.

JUDITH, DAVID, and ESTHER TEICH.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your frank words and determined stand for peace. Keep it up.

ELIAS CRITCHLOW.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your brave battle and admire your courage.

MARIANNE SMITH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve your present actions in bringing resolution to Senate for debate. Deeply grateful for facts as presented on TV today. Urge that you continue as spokesman for American people are demanding President Johnson take Vietnam issue to U.N.

Mr. and Mrs. MEYER EISENBERG.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your present stand. Please do all possible to stop bombing resumption.

SUZANNE WERNER,
JUDITH GARTUND.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your move to stop the illegal war.

ELMER BENDINER.

ARCADIA, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am ex-World War II veteran and I am 100 percent on your stand of Vietnam.

BILL ROWE.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on Vietnam is heartening to all Americans who want a just peace. Stand firm.

ESTHER S. KECHLEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for an articulate, informative, and courageous stand in the face of an incoherent and uninformed opposition.

JILL REINLIEB.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Good luck with your bird hunting. And may your efforts cause the hawks to take flight.

JOHN HIGGINS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your stand on TV Sunday p.m. against escalating the war in Vietnam. Second your proposal to withdraw blanket approval to Johnson to conduct undeclared war. Urge you to support Pope Paul's suggestion for neutral arbitration by the United Nations.

JACOB C. LESSINGHE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We salute your courage and forthrightness in opposing so firmly the unlimited powers of the President to accelerate the war in Vietnam when we could be acting through the United Nations to maintain the peace. Your bold and direct language and your fierce fight to bring the whole truth of our situation before the American public without deception and without flattery. So that we might take full responsibility for our Nations policies in chewing aggression instead of excusing it does you credit as a brave critic.

AUBREY B. HARTER.

STANFORD, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strong support here for your stand on Vietnam; urge speedy investigation of U.S. policy.

MARY and THOMAS C. MOSER.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely in agreement with your Vietnam policies. Keep up the good work. God bless you.

Mrs. KEITH F. ALEXANDER.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have kinship with mankind. Support you all the way.

JOHN RAGSDALE.

WINTER PARK, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam war on Sunday TV. You changed some votes.

PAUL SANGREE.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Support appeal to United Nations Security Council. North Vietnam attacks will probably strengthen Communist cause.

CARL KEITH.

URBANA, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I give you my support on your stand of the U.S. role in the Asian war.

MARY JANE SNYDER.

BOSTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam policy.

RICHARD L. MARTIN.

NOVATO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and thank you for forceful clear antiwar stand.

A. V. BRERETON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your excellent broadcast yesterday. Stick to your guns. Let's get it to the United Nations. MORSE for President. Regards.

R. W. CAVELL.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Affairs Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support your current efforts to open congressional debate on Vietnam policy.

JAMES W. GARDNER.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight.

The SPIEGEL FAMILY.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely in agreement with your Vietnam policies. Keep up the good work. God bless you.

Mrs. ALFRED BOELSCH.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support and commend you on your position on Vietnam.

ETHEL DORFMAN.

MEREFORD, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my respect and admiration for your stand on issues concerning Vietnam war. Don't let Mr. Boggs snow you with around-the-bush talk. United Nations is the answer.

GEORGE MASSO.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your good fight on Vietnam. Millions of us are behind you.

JOHN M. THEA LOGAN.

SHEBOYGAN, WIS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your Vietnamese position all the way.

SOL BENSMAN.

ATLANTA, GA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations excellent television appearance. We support your resolutions. Must stop bombing.

JON JACOBS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Commend introduction resolution rescind-
ing powers of President to make illegal war,
support you for peace.

EDWARD GOODLAW.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep up the good work, we need more like
you to make people think.

CORA L. STEFFES.
GLENCOE, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your stand against
bombing Hanoi and further escalation.
Mr. and Mrs. MARVIN MANDEL.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We respectfully suggest that you vote to
revoke the Presidential mandate on Vietnam.
Dr. and Mrs. GUSTAV MARTIN.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
My deep appreciation to your excellent
presentation for peace on special Vietnam
program yesterday.

Mrs. CARL JENSEN.
PORT WASHINGTON, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:
Keep up the fight to persuade those Sen-
ators to sign your resolution curtailing the
President's war powers. We citizens are 100
percent back of you. That \$12 billion supple-
mental appropriation for Vietnam must not
go through.

ESTHER CREED.
RIDGEWOOD, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate House, Washington, D.C.:
Support your views on Vietnam whole-
heartedly. Please continue your fight.
Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT G. FLEURIOT.

COLLEGEVILLE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:
Fight like ----. We're with you. Fill-
buster if need be.

ALLAN RICE.
PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Executive war illegal. Urge Senate take
stand. Rescind Asia resolution. Stop bomb-
ing.

Prof. KEITH and ELIZABETH BOYLE.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your courageous TV
appearance, agree with you 100 percent, keep
up good fight.

ALLAN BLACK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Support fully your resolutions to rescind
1964 congressional approval Presidential
action Vietnam and complete investigation
all aspects U.S. policies Vietnam. Will advise
my congressional representatives accord-
ingly and urge submission of problem to U.N.

HEBRERT WEISBERG, M.D.
CAROLINE HUBER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Issue a call, we will answer, 500 students
faculty, local citizens lead us.
STANFORD COMMITTEE FOR PEACE IN
VIETNAM.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Horror and shame, President's resumption
bombing. Urge you continue fight against
the new Hitlers.

WILLIAM and MARY GANDALL.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Thank God for you, the only voice pro-
testing the war.

POWELL FAMILY.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Your presentation on CBS was reasonable
and persuasive, we urge you to continue your
campaign to inform the American people of
the facts of our involvement in Vietnam.
P.S.—We particularly support your effort
to involve the United Nations.

FRED and RUTH HOEHLER.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We approve your resolution to rescind the
blank check given the executive branch on
Vietnam. It has been grossly and stupidly
misused and should be, as your second reso-
lution demands, thoroughly investigated and
exposed. We, too, would like to know how
every Member of the Senate stands. Best
wishes.

Mr. and Mrs. PHILIP NEWELL.
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Support your heroic efforts urging for solu-
tion ending war in Vietnam, urge you con-
tinue.

Mr. and Mrs. RIVING LERNER.
UNION CITY, N.J.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Total in agreement your desires re, John-
son's illegal war. Fire office boys Rusk and
McNamara. My letter Armistice Day 1965 to
Johnson via Mrs. Johnson and ridiculously
answered by Fenilist Greenfield, State De-
partment Assistant, in direct contrariness of
my ardent views, copy of which I will furnish
upon request, strictly advocates to stop this
Mongolian holocaust before it is too late.
Mongolians are not Causasians, Johnson

great disappointment to me, just another
Truman.

Sincerely,
Mrs. HELENE ROOT.
CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations for your courage and
greatness on Sunday TV.
Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM BEGIC.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Heartily endorse your views on Vietnam.
Keep up the good work.

L. ABRAMS.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations, your marvelous, on criti-
cisms of Vietnamese Insanity.

MARGURITE YOUNG.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We applaud your stand on Vietnam.
Mr. and Mrs. E. HARRITON.
NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
With your continued zeal peace-loving
desires of our people will not bog down.

JOHN ABRAMS.
BROOKLYN, N.Y., January 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Keep up the fight we must stop this
war.

Mrs. BETTY F. GOLDBLOOM.
ROCHESTER, N.Y., January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We strongly support and congratulate you
for your stand against resumption of bomb-
ing of North Vietnam and for a full debate
on the issue.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
Liberal Party of Monroe County.
BROOKLYN, N.Y., January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Endorse every word by Senator MORSE on
Vietnam perspective, January 30, 1966.

McKINLEY WHEELER.
NEW YORK, N.Y., January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
You were heroic, magnificent on CBS.
Keep fighting for peace and sanity.

ROBERT and JOAN HOLT.
FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations for your admirable and
courageous stand re terminating Vietnam
war and for turning matter over to the
United Nations.

MAXWELL J. MARDER, M.D.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the fight. We must stop this war.
Mrs. BETTY F. GOLDBLOOM.

ALDERWOOD MANOR, WASH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God for your voice of truth on Vietnam. I pray that it shall be heard before it is too late.

DALE NOZIGER.

SKOKIE, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Again today you spoke for reason, prudence, peace, national morality, and international law. Heartfelt gratitude.

Dr. DAVID B. BARRON.

WELLESLEY HILLS, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly oppose resumption of bombing and escalation in Vietnam.

Mrs. STEWART A. ARMSTRONG.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your call for thorough investigation of our Government's objectives and policies in Vietnam and we oppose resumption of bombing in North.

HELEN and EDWARD COLBY.

BELMONT, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just heard congressional debate on Vietnam on CBS Television. Wish to express 100-percent endorsement for position of Senator WAYNE MORSE. We are conservative Republicans who voted for Goldwater.

Mr. and Mrs. MARC G. WOLMAN.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your public pursuit of truth and law applauded. How can we secure Mansfield report?

Mr. and Mrs. BRYAN OGBURN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our support to you and Senator FULBRIGHT for your Vietnam policy.

Dr. and Mrs. KURT SCHLESINGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Americans owe you eternal gratitude continue your efforts for peace. Many support your view.

Mr. and Mrs. VICTOR LUDWIG.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations—your present struggle to help restore sanity and commonsense to our foreign policy with regard to Vietnam and elsewhere is typical of your boundless cour-

age. Your long unbroken Washington record of vigorously fighting for justice, integrity, honesty, compassion, morality, and ethics in domestic and international affairs has long been greatly admired by both of us. Please accept our humble thank you and appreciation.

Mr. and Mrs. K. C. HOAGLUND.

HARRISBURG, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

To those of us who share your views and fears regarding the Vietnam situation, it's most heartening to hear you on Eric Sevareid's program on Sunday afternoon. Thank you and congratulations for your highly articulate and sane presentation.

Mrs. HENRY M. MILLER,
SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our most sincere congratulations on your courageous effort to limit the President's authorization on the war in Vietnam and institute a Federal investigation of the U.S. role in that country.

Ed J. BREIS, *Preside*,
Congregation Ail Souls
Unitarian Church.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your CBS discussion. Yours is still a minority position but the questions you have raised hopefully will lead more people to rethink the problem.

Mr. and Mrs. EDWARD F. LINCOLN.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position and efforts to end the tragedy in Vietnam. Thank you.

PERRY and EVELY WINOKUR.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue heroic Vietnam struggle for sake of America history. Will condone. Can I help?

ERROR COWAN.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your discussion on the TV program Sunday was the only part of the discussion that made sense. I am with you 100 percent.

Mrs. X. E. WALLACE.

ELKHART, IND.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with views expressed on today's TV panel show. We sincerely hope your advice will be heeded.

EDNA and PAUL WILMOT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to congratulate you and to express great admiration for your honesty, wisdom, and courage.

MARY HENDERSON.

KEZAR FALLS, MAINE,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE: Thank you for so eloquently and articulately expressing our sentiments concerning Vietnam. Please continue your efforts with Senator FULBRIGHT for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. R. GIOVANELLA,
Mr. and Mrs. H. CHAUKLIN,
Miss LOUIS GIOVANELLA,
Mrs. K. RAFFY.

LARCHMONT, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your heroic fight for end to Vietnam war.

Prof. and Mrs. PAUL DAVIDOFF.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on Senate speech. Keep up opposition to hawks, autocrats.

Thank you, thank you.

JOE PALMER.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator MORSE, on your heroic television statement you have our full support. Please continue your efforts for peace.

SELMA and MICTOR TIECH.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the great work on your stand against bombing of Vietnam.

DORIS HERRON.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Your forthright elucidation on today's television conference was great.

DONALD and MARY JANE RACKNER.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We gratefully strongly support Vietnam position you clearly responsibly expressed on CBS Sunday P.M.

BOB and ESTHER MITCHELL.

EAST WILLISTON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of Chamber Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate you on your courage on today's TV program. We agree with your opinions and program and have wired President, our Senators, and Congressmen.

Mr. and Mrs. ROSS BUCHALTER.

NEWPORT, R.I.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for what you said on television this afternoon. You made great sense. Please keep the pressure on.

Gratefully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES G. VERMILLION.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1561

CAMPBELL, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

God bless you. Keep up the good work.
Mrs. EARL RICE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your stand on our Vietnam policy.

Mr. and Mrs. S. DOROFF.

MAPLEWOOD, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for the good fight to save humanity from a terrible fate.

Mr. and Mrs. MILTON SCHACHTER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for bringing Vietnam issue forcibly before the people. We all want peace.

Mrs. CATHERINE LESTER.

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
January 31, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Commend highly your argument over network opposing U.S. policy in Vietnam. Continue your fearless fight for the sake of America and the world. The people must know the truth. Soon it could be too late. Don't let opposition silence you (WAYNE MORSE knows his rights). I salute you.
Mrs. GRACE KTOFT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your resolutions to retrieve congressional authority and responsibility from Johnson and the Pentagon.

KENNETH H. and RUTH R. GLASGOW.

CULVER CITY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend your courageous efforts against war in Vietnam. Urge U.N. action.
NORMAN BAILOW AND FAMILY.

SHERMAN OAKS, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Approve action to rescind President's Vietnam war mandate and support peace efforts through U.N.

ELEANOR and ROBERT SCHMORLEITZ.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After World War I Germany was, according to the Versailles Treaty, to be policed to prevent rearming for 20 years by the United States, France, and England and was forbidden submarines forever but \$90 million per year. The U.S. Army policed Germany and prevented them from rearming from 1918 until 1924, the French Rothschilds from 1924 until 1928 did the same. The English Rothschilds paradoxically instead of preventing

Germany rearming rearmed Hitler to fight Communistic Russia and in 1933 in violation of the Versailles Treaty gave Hitler the right to build 10 submarines which grew to 400 and they would have in World War II, as in World War I, have starved England if the United States had not entered World War II that the English Rothschilds started by not policing Germany and preventing their rearming from 1928 until 1932. After France pulled out of Germany the Rothschild Industries of France and England are now selling munitions to Hanoi and our troops are a proving ground for the developing of deadly Russian weapons. According to trade journals L.B.J. has used up the stockpile of World War II 1,000-pound bombs and to tool up to make them again would cost millions of dollars, wreck our economy and take a years time to get started. The 1,200 tons of bombs we dropped per day for the past year is a lot of bombs to make every day this year. Actually the French tried to save the Rothschilds rubber plantations in Laos but failed and actually that is what the United States is trying to do now. You according to my thinking were the only sensible Senator on the TV panel today.

Regards,

JOSEPH P. RUTH.

PARAMOUNT, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have wired California Senators urging they support your upcoming resolution. We endorse your views.

BENJAMIN and MARY SALAZAR.

MISSOULA, MONT.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your views about Vietnam and trust you can make them prevail.

HARVEY CURTIS,
Webster University of Montana.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue and intensify your courageous protest against escalating war.

Prof. RONALD A. REBHOLZ.

CANTON, MASS.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fine broadcast on Sunday. Please continue your fight for peace not too late.

SHERWOOD HOUSEHOLD.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your new resolution to force Senate vote on Vietnam.

LOU MAURY.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We think you are taking the right position on Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. LEONARD B. THOMPSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Your opinion wholeheartedly supported. Organizing support Severeid's TV historical.

President Johnson's reports must be published.

JEAN B. PETERS.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

We thoroughly support you in your stand on the Vietnam issue.

WILLIAM R. PIERRON,
THELMA M. PIERRON,
OLIVIA K. HAMELIN.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Completely support position against resumption of bombing. Beg you continue fighting for national sanity.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD FOSTER.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We were moved by your courage and concern over the dangers in Vietnam which you expressed on television today. We fully support your conviction.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN TUCKER,
Department of Art,
Western Washington State College.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for opposing illegal, self-defeating, disastrous Viet war from bottom of my heart.

GEORGE HILL, M.D.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your ideas on Vietnam. All success in continuing the fight.

LILLIAN COHEN,
A New Yorker.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your statements on the Severeid program were magnificent. You speak for millions of Americans.

Dr. and Mrs. DANIEL SIMON.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wholeheartedly support your stand on the war in Vietnam and endorse your proposed legislation which will limit the President's broad powers to escalate the war in Vietnam. We sincerely hope your efforts will win widespread support.

Dr. and Mrs. I. D. PODORE,
Mrs. HENRY KLEINMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I fully support the actions being taken by yourself and others to bring about a rational end to the war in Vietnam. The Government must know that perhaps a silent majority of private citizens do not support this futile war and wish it a speedy end.

ROBERT KOLKER.

FALL RIVER, MASS.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Appreciate your support of cessation of bombing, negotiating with Vietcong, use of United Nations arbitration.

Rev. HAROLD MELVIN.

BLOOMFIELD, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. Pray your wisdom prevails.

Mr. and Mrs. BENTON BERMAN.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:
I wish you were representing New York State in the Senate. Your suggestions offered during the Severeid program won my admiration. You are right. The American people do not know what is going on. I do not and I try to find out through all the media available to me. I believe in the U.N. too, and if necessary in declaring war. If John Kennedy were writing "Profiles in Courage" today he would write about you.

Vaya con dios,

MARIE BULLOCK.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Appreciate and agree with your stand expressed on CBS today. Carry on.

Rev. LUTHER BORGES.

New York, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We agree with you 100 percent about Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. LEON JANCZAK.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Call to your attention much active and latent support in Connecticut for your dissent, continue.

LARRY J. BERCOWITZ.

CHERRY HILLS, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
TV good. Full support. Amen.

JOHN EGGE.

HASTINGS ON HUDSON, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
My wife and I and numerous friends support your position on Vietnam and urge action.

ADRI. MEEROPOL.

DAYTON, OHIO,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Bravo for your timely and valiant stand on the Vietnam situation. Please let me know how I may help.

VERA L. TIMM.

St. LOUIS, MO.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I agree with your ideas as expressed Sunday, January 30, on CBS program, the Congress and the war. I am wiring Senator SYMINGTON and Congressman CURTIS to support your views on the Vietnam war.

JANE H. YOUNT.

NORTH EAST PA.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Bravo. God bless you. Keep fighting.

MRS. CARL RIZZO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Urge you continue investigation involvement in Vietnam regarding possible U.N. action, negotiation, or enslavement.

LOUISE CHACON.

LYNCHROOK, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
I admire your courage and agree with your suggestion of how to settle Vietnam war.

SARAH S. UTZKY.

RUTHERFORD, N.J.,
January 30, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
HONORABLE DEAR SIR: You are to be commended for your courageous stand during CBS Congress in the War TV appearance. Would that a majority of your colleagues were as sincerely committed to our cause. If available would appreciate copy of MANSFIELD and Galbraith reports.

Respectfully,

J. GREGORY AILEY.

MADISON, WIS.,
January 30, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We completely support your Vietnam position and appreciate your courage.

ELSA FAUERBACH,
EDNEY ANDERSON,
VIRGINIA LIDBROKE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We fully support your views on Vietnam stated January 30. Take conflict to U.N. Keep up the good work.

CHRISTINE GREFFITH,
SALLY CROSS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Army officer with son in Vietnam agree completely your policy: please continue so.

GARY, IND.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Congratulations on your television appearance. We agree.

MARION MASON.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
We wholehearted with you in the problem peace be turned over to United Nations.

ETHEL STROM.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Our hearts, hopes, thanks are with you in your continued initiative toward negotiating Vietnam peace.

RICHARD C. FOUST FAMILY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Thank you for this afternoon; congratulations and stand fast.

E. DUNN.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
We applaud your position on Vietnam and urge you to continue pressure for negotiated peace through U.N.

Rabbi LEON KRONISH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:
I heartily concur in your thoughtful and courageous stand on Vietnam. We rely on you to safeguard our liberties at home and abroad at this critical time.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER EHRLMAN LAZARD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Thank you for your courageous, patriotic, and wise presentation of the case for peace in Vietnam.

HAROLD CAMMER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Dear SENATOR MORSE: God bless you for your stand on Vietnam.

Mrs. F. E. HYDE,
Mrs. ISABEL McLAUGHLIN.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:
Along with others in our community we stand behind your stand in the Senate to get United States on the road to peace and withdrawn from Vietnam. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER JOHNSON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:
Very pleased with your stand in asking for Senate study of Vietnam problem. Am seriously concerned least we play into Russian hands by being drawn deeper into war. As we and China struggle, Russia enjoys our former peacemaker role and grows strong. Possibly she waits for South American eruption if we wear out men and wealth and lose allies from illogical war in wrong place.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1563

The bull in a bull ring dies because an obvious red flag distracts him from a clever enemy. I pray our Nation's intelligence can win over our blind pride in brute strength.
Sincerely,

MARVIN BORELL.

DOWNEY, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous stand opposing Vietnamese war. Bring this undeclared war to declared peace.

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL BERLAND.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your efforts and support your position on Vietnam.

FRANCES and PHILLIP BRODSKY, WENDY
and ROBERT REASENBERG, EUGENE
BRODSKY, SALLY MORRIS.OAKLAND, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We fully back your stand on Vietnam. May your voice always ring loud and clear.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK SKURSKI.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your opposition to escalation of war. Continue to press for negotiation.

KEITH R. BENTZ.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnamese policy.

DAVID HELLERSTEIN,
ROGER KOHN,
TOM ZANIELLO.PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position against bombing. Urge continuous protest and recognition of Vietcong in negotiations.

JOHN W. LITTLA.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your efforts to end Vietnam war. Keep up the battle for peace.

Mr. and Mrs. M. KELEMAN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We admire and support your efforts to bring an end to Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER LEACH.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We commend you and urge your continued efforts to move Vietnam problem to United Nations.

DIANNE and PAUL NEWMAN.

MERCER ISLAND, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator MORSE: We fully support your position on the war in Vietnam and wish you success in your effort to rescind the President's authority to wage an Executive war.

JESSIE BLOOM,
MARCELLA BENDITT,
MORTIMER RAYMAN,
MICKEY and LEO SREEBNY,
CYRUS and GRACE RUBIN.PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations. Stand against bombing in Vietnam. Urge United Nations investigation and control of consulate.

MARION DUNLAP.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The following Democrats condemn the present illegal U.S. involvement in Vietnam and demand issue be placed before United Nations. Stop Johnson's dictatorial usurpation of legislative powers.

PAUL A. HALL,
PAUL J. HALL,
FRANCES M. HALL,
MARK ROSEN,
JOSEPH SCHULTZ,
JACK SCHULTZ,
SAPPHIRE HALLRADNOR, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I completely support your courageous stand and agree with your political view. Keep up the good work.

Mrs. RICHARD V. ZIMMERMANN, Jr.,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,

Washington, D.C.:

Americans everywhere applaud your questioning our so-called commitments in Vietnam. Congress alone can make war or peace. Why has Congress failed to protect this power?

JOHN UPTON, M.D.
ANNA LOGAN UPTON.BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your position on Vietnam and urge you to keep up your campaign to obtain peace.

M. GRAVIN.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo * * * let them explain hypocrisy of defeating tyranny by aiding tyranny.

RAY E. DE BARRA.

CHILlicothe, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your excellent debate on CBS program of yesterday (secrets) in

State Department save on Vietnam should we as you so admirably stated to the American public for their own appraisal.

Very sincerely yours,
BREWER AND BREWER & SON,
PAUL BREWER CONAWAY, President.MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We concur in the courageous stand you are taking to clarify position in Vietnam.

LEONARD and MARY HILDEBRANDT.

DULUTH, MINN.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard your comments on Vietnam perspective today. For God's sake stay healthy and keep talking or we are lost.

BRUNO SCIPIONI.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 30, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse your stand to rescind the 1964 resolution and your solution in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. W. LLOYD MAGIE.

SWARTHMORE, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your position on Vietnam urge use of U.N. for arbitration.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN A. PRICE.

OAK PARK, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam.

CHARLOTTE KLEISS.

NEWTON, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Warmly applaud your forthright statement in today's televised Vietnam discussion regarding honorable course for America.

Mr. and Mrs. E. B. KOVAR.

LILLIAN, ALA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your stand in reference to the bombing of North Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

I. B. and C. H. RUTLEDGE.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You were magnificent. Have my complete support. Please keep fighting.

Dr. GORELICK.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation on your stand today concerning Vietnam. United Nations must be used.

DORIS and JOHN DELGADO.

1564

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 1, 1966

STONY POINT, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Disinayed by resumption of bombing North Vietnam. This action violates international law and brands the United States as determined to bring about world war III.

LEO F. KOCH.
MARY W. KOCH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations NBC debate, agree your position completely. So advised JAVIER, KENNEDY. Please keep pressure up.

PETER SABIO.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Debate tremendous, what can we do to support you?

CLEON STOCKER.

STONEHAM, MASS.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your views on Vietnam war have my complete support, let United Nations do the job.

RUTH BARTON.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Vietnam stand.

J. W. LASLEY,
Attorney.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly protest resumption of bombing, doubt President's sincerity about peace, urge Senate initiative for peace.

ARIS ANAGNOS.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We highly approve your courageous stand and hope you continue your questioning of the war.

HILDEGA CHASE JOHNSON,
MANSI KERN and FAMILY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your determined, consistent, and courageous leadership against involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR IESENBERG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous Vietnam stand. Press on Foreign Relations Committee secrecy.

J. SANDERSON.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgent you continue outspoken remarks regarding administration's policies. Civilization's future at stake. Keep it up.

LOIS BEESTER.

GALLIPOLIS, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support without reservation your remarks CBS show Sunday.

CHARLES E. HOLMER, Jr.

NORTH HIGHLANDS, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Gratified to hear your timely remarks on TV debate. Saddened by President's decision to resume bombing.

Mrs. JEWELYN CARTER.

ALBION, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard you on TV. Congratulations on peace efforts.

ARTHUR W. MUNK.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support you in full in your action regarding Vietnam.

Mrs. ROSE L. BROWN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Palo Alto Chapter, American Association United Nations, representing 350 members, thank you for your efforts to limit Vietnam war and urges you to continue.

ISABELL ROSE,
President.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Beg you redouble effort along line of fine and important letter to Johnson on Vietnam. It cannot be too late to stop this escalation by administrative fiat.

NANCY STOVER.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincere thanks and deepest gratitude for your leadership on Vietnam.

MAGY WRIGHT.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your fine and courageous presentation of Vietnam situation. Keep it up.

S. A. SOUTHER.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in accord with your opinions 100 percent our country needs many more honest unselfish legislators.

JOHN and DORIS NIGHT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support two resolutions you offered in Senate Saturday, January 29.

CERTRUDE GOTTLIEB.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegrams to Senator TYDINGS, Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland. I wish to express support for position taken by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon on the CBS program January 30, 1966.

Best wishes,

JOHN A. SULLIVAN.

FREMONT, OHIO,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely support your Vietnam statements. Both veterans World War II Republicans. Please continue opposition.

Rev. and Mrs. REUBEN RADER.

PLEASANTVILLE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I love my country best and WAYNE MORSE next. Your continued leadership is crucial to the peace of the world.

ELAIN KLEIN.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your courageous words on this immoral involvement in Vietnam, please stand firm.

IRENE TICE.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I applaud your courageous denunciation of Johnson's immoral and illegal Asian war.

CLIFFORD BORBAS.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support your views expressed on CBS program, yesterday.

GERALD H. BIDLACK.

DUBOIS, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank God we have a man like you in Congress. Rescind the mandate, and let's turn this over to the United Nations as Pope Paul and you suggest.

ROBERT F. COCHRAN.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

ROSLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your voice yesterday was like a breath of fresh air in a smoked-filled room. Congratulations.

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL PANZER.

PLEASANTVILLE, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on brave and forthright TV statement Sunday. Heartily support your resolution and have informed my Senators.
CONSTANCE HOGARTH.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your magnificent performance on CBS. We fully support your position on Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM ROTH.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo. Your words on Sunday telecast were apathetically expressed and urgently needed.

Mr. and Mrs. DELBERT E. BLAKE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly commend and support your continued position on Vietnam. Hope you can convince your colleagues to work with you for peace efforts and cessation of bombing.
EVELYN ELDRIDGE.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your efforts to debate Vietnam policy in Congress, protest bombing North Vietnam.

WINIFRED J. HEARN.

STROUDSBURG, PA.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Full approval and deep appreciation for your stand Sunday. Letter follows with policy suggestions.

PETER COHEN.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

As a concerned American I urge you and the committee on Foreign Relations to continue and to intensify your questioning of administration policy in Vietnam. You are the last resort of the American people.
EDWARD M. KEATING.

HANCOCK, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your TV presentation January 30th. Keep up the good work on insisting the war in South Vietnam be brought before the United Nations.
GORDON J. JAASKELAINEN.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous efforts to bring peace to Vietnam.

STUART and JANET DOWTY.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We are behind you 100 percent. We would like your views discussed more.

PHOEBE and JOE WALSH.

FULLERTON, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We salute you on your position in Vietnam.

JAMES E. GROOM.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We pray for your good health to keep up your good work for real peace.

Dr. and Mrs. LEONARD SCHEINMAN.

UTICA, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Listened to CBS. Thought your views excellent. More Senators should share same. If our so-called allies do not do something we should pull all men, money, equipment out of Europe and Asia and let them take the burden of defending themselves.
Sincerely yours,

GEORGE ACEE.

DUNKIRK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: The Government of the United States has again outraged the tenuous peace of the world. Best wishes for the success of your effort to bring the Government to reason. All those recognize the wisdom of restraint and judgment at this critical time. We congratulate you on your courage.

MICHELE D. STAUFFER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Expenditure, lives, money, Vietnam, insane. Present U.S. bombing nullifies power of Congress and foundation UN.

DULCIE THEORSTENSON.

HEREFORD, TEX.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous stand on the Vietnam war merits the highest praise. Please accept my thanks.

Rev. V. W. MARCONTELL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your efforts. Full debate on present illegal Vietnam policy.

GEORGE C. KISKADDON.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Resumption of Vietnam bombing contrary to human ethics seed UN peace.

JEROME B. and JOAN AFALERT.

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your excellent Vietnam stand and value your continued leadership toward wiser policy.

MALCOLM CORRELL.

DENVER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to commend you most heartily for your courageous position and statements in Senate and on CBS radio panel Sunday opposing administrations dangerous policies in Vietnam believe increasing number of Americans support you even if not heard from hope you can secure many other Senators to support prompt study of U.S. position in Vietnam.

EDWARD L. WHITTEMORE.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My family and I thank you for frankness instead of claptrap.

PATRICK DEVANEY.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Continue your courageous struggle against the war. You speak for millions of Americans.

BRIAN KELLEHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heard you yesterday on CBS Forum. Appreciate your work and support your position wholeheartedly.

JACQUELINE LOWENGARD.

BOULDER, COLO.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are deeply concerned with the pursuit of bombing diplomacy. We support your important efforts to bring the Vietnam holocaust to an end.

DOROTHY and JULIUS LONDON.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We commend you for your views as expressed on Eric Sevareid's broadcast. Time for open discussion in Congress before the American people is long overdue. Today there is doubt and dissension in our country regarding our foreign policy and commitment in Vietnam. Let this policy be carefully examined and also effect some discipline and control over foreign aid given to these allies shipping supplies to be used

1566

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

February 1, 1966

against our fighting forces and endangering them.

Very sincerely,

KATHERINE SCHUSTER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous action is uniting the opposition to our militaristic administration. Tell all you can.

DOROTHY HILL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. Do what you can.

NATALIE SCHMITT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I protest the resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Stop the bombing now.

WILLIAM G. GARWOOD.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Fullly support your position in Vietnam.

PATRICIA JUDSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I support your stand on Vietnam. Stop the bombing. Recognize the Vietcong.

GEORGE PETERS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Continue support of opposition to war. Americans will yet see the light. God bless you.

THEODORE HERSHBERG.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We who are denied the truth support you. Mr. and Mrs. H. R. ZANDER.

BURNSVILLE, MINN.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your Vietnam stand.

WALTER LUND.

EL DORADO, ARK.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thanking you for present stand taken in regard to Vietnam conflict.

VICTOR DUMAS.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We absolutely stand behind you in your heroic rationality. We cheer and support you.

Mr. and Mrs. RONALD PHIPPS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge continuation of your efforts to bring Vietnam policy under congressional examination. Your constituent.

TERENCE EMMONS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Eastbay Joint ILWU Legislative Committee represent more than 5,000 ILWU members and their families support your position on Vietnam as expressed on television Sunday. We urge you to continue your efforts for full debate on this paramount issue so that an informed citizenry may help put our Government on the right road to a policy consistent with law and the aspirations of all Americans for a sound and lasting peace.

WILLIAM BURKE,
Secretary.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Persist in your efforts to clip Johnson's war wings. Withdrawal of all our forces is the solution to the ungodly mess in south-east Asia.

SUE BROWDER.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your efforts to stop war. Dissent means freedom.

ETA C. ABRAHAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo and thanks on your CBS Vietnam presentation yesterday, agree 100 percent.

Mrs. GRACE DOWMAN.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol,
Washington, D.C.:

Our hopes are still with you in your struggle for a sane policy on Vietnam. Today's tragic decision must be reversed.

PETER NICHOLS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulation on your stand on Vietnam. Keep up the good work.

JOSEPH MOORE.

CHELTENHAM, PA.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

SIR: Your appearance on Sunday's TV debate was absolutely thrilling. It is a rare occasion that a Senator has the guts to candidly speak out on TV about true facts on Vietnam to the people and to the President who has been less than truthful to the Nation. I agree with your enlightened position 100 percent. Please send a copy of the Gilbraith report.

WILLIAM TOTO.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree now time to withdraw 1964 resolution. American people deserve debate. Keep up your dissent.

RICHARD R. THOMPSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American people want democracy by debate; not by dictatorship. Keep calling for Vietnam debate.

J. T. VERNALLIS.

MOUNTAIN VIEW, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please do not allow the President to end debate on Vietnam.

JOHN and ANN MATTHIAS,
STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

OAK PARK, ILL.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Millions of frustrated compassionate Americans thank you for opposing Johnson's war. Please keep up your fight to bring truth and reason to our executives.

EUGENE FRANCES BARBOUR.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your stand on Vietnam and support efforts to end his illegal war.

BARRY LOEWER,
Department of Philosophy,
Stanford University.

MARJORIE LOEWER,
Department of Classics,
Stanford University.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Vietnam bombing immoral. We are trading lives for prestige and affluence. Please make us heard.

PAUL F. DICKERT.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
January 31, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

No, don't bomb. Urge acceptance Vietcong legitimate bargainers. Supervised free elections.

LARRY BARTIL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hang on. Continue to be the sole voice of reason in Congress. We admire your guts and only hope that you may somehow save us from world war.

ERIC, MARSHA, and BJORN NILSON.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position. Deplore resumed bombing. Push for Senate debate to stop war escalation.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER B. YOUNG.

February 1, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

1567

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
January 1, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:We fully support your request for a full
debate of the Vietnam issue in Congress.

BERNARD YOUNG.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Appreciate your effort to have Senate re-
view foreign policy and restore war powers
to Congress.

ERICH and ELIZABETH LINDEMANN.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Grateful for your courageous stand. Rec-
ommend your continuing pressure for United
Nations action toward Vietnam settlement
and congressional debate.Roberta Roberts Klotsche, Sandra
Brown, Atty. and Mrs. Jack Eisen-
drath, Mr. and Mrs. Don Olesen, Dr. and
Mrs. Arnold Kaufman, Mrs. Almo
Brown, Evelyn Knapp, Mrs. Richard How-
ell, Bertha Rubin, Mrs. Marian Leidgen,
Dr. and Mrs. Morton R. Phillips.NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:We cheer your courageous stand in de-
nouncing escalation in Vietnam you make us
proud as Americans.

THE STEIN FAMILY.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:Thanks for your courage in questioning
our administration on Vietnam. It is indeed
heartening to have a voice echoing the con-
cern of those of us who are deeply troubled
by American colonialism in southeast Asia.
J. M. KEATING.PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Please continue the fight against President
Johnson's policy in Vietnam.L. J. RATHER,
Professor of Pathology,
Stanford University.PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Urge you do all possible to halt bombing
in North Vietnam immediately.

HARLAN ROBINSON ABRAMS.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Congratulations on courageous efforts to
stop Vietnam war many students, faculty at
Stanford behind you.

MARCELLE DABBERACCI.

CHICO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Congratulations on stand on Vietnam.
Keep fighting. We can't vote for you but
you have our moral support.

Mr. and Mrs. TOM RODGERS.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:Vietnam is matter only for U.N. action.
Profoundly grateful for your leadership in
opening Congressional debate. Applaud your
protest against executive measures, support
your attempt to rescind 1964 Congress
resolution for intervention, there is no war
with honor.

MIRIAM YOUNG.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Sir: It is obvious to me that President
Johnson wishes to ignore and squelch con-
gressional debate concerning the constitu-
tional legal, and moral question on the Viet-
nam war. The Security Counsel of the
United Nations cannot and will not agree
on any solution. I wholeheartedly support
your challenge of the administration policy
along with several of your colleagues. This
is the best way to help American boys in
Vietnam and prevent further useless slaugh-
ter more important if the American people
were given the truth surrounding this issue
you would gain sufficient support to prevent
a disastrous spreading Asian war. You are
one of the few true American patriots left
and I know that your courageous states-
manship will continue. Would you please
copy your supporters in the Senate.

ROBERT DRAKE.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:I oppose escalation of the war in Vietnam.
Stop the bombing.

MARCIA RUOTOLO.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:I look to Congress now to do whatever in
its power to stop the present administration
from leading us ever closer to a third world
war.

MATTIE WEST CROW.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Commend your stand on the Vietnam crisis.
Please remain outspoken on behalf of peace
in Vietnam and throughout the world. The
real world leadership of the United States is
possible only by bringing peace to the world.
MARIAN and CHARLES LUFU.INGLEWOOD, CALIF.,
January 31, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Tremendously impressed by your CBS
statements on Vietnam. Would like trans-
cript if possible or other information.

C. J. BOEDEKER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:You are absolutely right in your assump-
tion the majority of American people are op-
posed to the Vietnam war. Please do not re-
lax your efforts to have the southeast Asia
resolution rescinded enlisting EHA differenceof Senators GRUENING, LONG, and Chairman
FULBRIGHT.

IDA E. SCHIMWEG.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
February 1, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.Senator MORSE: We support your continu-
ing opposition to the unnecessary and unjust
war in Vietnam. Yours is the kind of fight-
ing we believe in.JUDY BUCK.
MAX MOLINARO.
DANIEL ESTERSOHN.
DAVID FERLEGER.

PENN STATE UNIVERSITY.

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
January 31, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Yesterday's Senators' debate should be
printed for public distribution. Our local
publisher does not even know of the debate.
R. E. HAESLY.Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the fol-
lowing telegrams were received and an-
swered by me. I also ask unanimous
consent that they be printed in the Rec-
ord at this point.There being no objection, the tele-
grams were ordered to be printed in the
RECORD, as follows:ROWAYTON, CONN.,
January 31, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:Your files will indicate my support of
much of what you fought for over these
many years. Perhaps it is time you take a
back seat. America needs no disappointed
politicians to bite at her heels. President
Johnson deserves your support. Your ego
is proving your undoing.

MANUEL HERMIDA.

FEBRUARY 1, 1966.

Mr. MANUEL HERMIDA,
Rowayton, Conn.:You will fall as did MacBeth in washing
the blood off your hands. Ordinarily I put
such wires as yours in the file reserved for
crackpot mail. However, you should know
better.WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.SARANAC LAKE, N.Y.,
January 30, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:I disagree with everything you said on the
Vietnam TV program. I consider your policy
un-American and pro-Communist.

Dr. F. X. IPOLYI.

January 31, 1966.

Dr. F. X. IPOLYI,
Saranac Lake, N.Y.:Your wire makes you look as ridiculous as
you apparently are. Why don't you volun-
teer to substitute yourself for a drafted boy
in Vietnam and you do the dying for him?WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.EAST AMHERST, N.Y.,
January 31, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:It is our considered opinion that we must
not back away in Vietnam. No person and
no country has ever avoided a conflict as
long as the second party insisted on fighting

and refused to discuss peace. This is a sad fact of life and sadder fact of history. We sincerely believe that a failure of responsible leaders to support the President in Vietnam will seriously hurt the chances of our four children to inherit a peaceful world and will ultimately force us to an even greater war.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST RUDA.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

Mr. and Mrs. ERNEST RUDA,
East Amherst, N.Y.:

Your four children will have no world to inherit if you support our illegal war in Asia which will end up in world war III, if the President isn't stopped.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

GULFPORT, MISS.,
January 28, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Catastrophe and appeasement your battle cry during period of ultimate survival American democracy.

GEORGE LANDWEHR,
New Orleans, La.

JANUARY 31, 1966.

Mr. GEORGE LANDWEHR,
New Orleans, La.:

Your wire constitutes pure nonsense.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator.

DEDICATED SERVICE RENDERED IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DURING RECENT SNOWSTORM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to take a minute or two to call the attention of the Senate to the public services being rendered in the District of Columbia by a large number of dedicated public servants who have worked on behalf of the District of Columbia far beyond the call of duty.

I speak for a moment as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which works closely with the District Commissioners, the Police Department, the Fire Department, and various welfare agencies.

I hope we are cognizant of the fact that since the disastrous storm struck, our District Commissioners have been at their desks through long hours of the day and into the night. Also, our Police Department has performed great dedicated service for all of us as has our wonderful Fire Department.

I have taken some time, Mr. President, to go to the various parts of the city to observe our Police Department and Fire Department at work.

I wish to say to our policemen and firemen this morning that we are greatly indebted to them. All of the people of the District of Columbia are indebted to them. The people of the District of Columbia are also indebted to the service department in charge of cleaning the streets.

What is being done is a herculean effort to remove this snow. A word of commendation and congratulation is certainly due for the devoted public service that is being extended to us up and down the line by District employees.

The people whom we have hired by the hour to work in our behalf under very

inclement weather conditions also deserve our thanks.

I talked with one of the Commissioners yesterday. He said that some of these men have gone to work at 6 a.m. and have worked until 9 o'clock and 10 o'clock at night with no time off for meals except for the coffee and sandwiches that have been handed to them on the job.

Too often in our busy lives in the precincts of the Senate we are not fully aware of the services being rendered to us by officials of the District of Columbia and its employees. I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate today as a member of the District of Columbia Committee and express my thanks and pay this deserved tribute to not only the Commissioners, the Police Department, the Fire Department, the welfare agencies, and the service department that is working on the snow removal, but to each and every one of those who have worked so hard in behalf of all of us to meet this emergency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there further morning business?

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS, SO-CALLED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I fully agree with the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who urged in this Chamber that the majority leader should propose maintaining the Senate in session around the clock, 24 hours a day, until such time as this prolonged discussion in depth or filibuster against taking up and considering repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law on the merits of the proposal is voted on. It happens that according to the calendar I am one of the older U.S. Senators, but I am certain that no one need fear my health will be impaired were we to have these prolonged sessions in order to dispose of legislative business that was left over from the first session of the present Congress.

People are only as old as their doubts, their lack of confidence, their fears, and their despair. In that regard I feel at least 40 years younger than some who oppose the repeal of section 14(b) and yearn for the era of William McKinley. In those days the major labor problems were whether or not to lower the working day to 12 hours or whether Government had the right to limit the working hours and control the working conditions of men, women, and little children.

Many of those expressing strong opposition to repeal of section 14(b) are never heard calling for higher wages. They never speak out for greater job protection or security. They opposed Federal aid to education and hospital and medical care for the elderly and other beneficent legislation for the welfare of all Americans. It is only when they are urging the adoption of right-to-work laws, so-called, or retention of section 14(b) that they show any interest whatever in the problems of American workers.

Then, we hear cries of anguish from all sorts of committees, each claiming to seek freedom for the captive union member chained to his union against his will. Their concern for union members is as phony as the so-called right-to-work laws they advocate. Their real interest is in weakening the labor union movement, and in establishing a cheap labor force.

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act will not affect in the least labor relations in States such as Illinois or Ohio. We have no so-called right-to-work laws in these States. In fact, in Ohio in 1958 our citizens by a majority of more than 800,000 defeated the proposed right-to-work amendment to our constitution.

Whether the present effort to repeal section 14(b) is passed in the Senate as it was in the House of Representatives will really have no effect on labor relations in the State of Ohio, in Illinois, and in 29 other States. It will affect 19 States in which less than 29 percent of Americans live and work. In these 19 States, mostly in the South and Southwest, the wage scale for men and women who work in industry is substantially lower than the average in States where there are no so-called right-to-work laws.

By repealing 14(b) the Congress can make a substantial contribution to the war on poverty—without adding any expenditure items to the Federal budget—since repeal will give unions in those low-wage States an opportunity to build their strength and win decent wages and working conditions for the underpaid workers who are the true victims of section 14(b).

Though other factors are unquestionably involved, the fact is that in States with so-called right-to-work laws labor standards are lower. These States lag behind free collective bargaining States in economic growth and in per capita income. Their workmen's compensation laws, minimum wage laws, and unemployment compensation laws are weaker, and other laws protecting workers are less effective or nonexistent. In this space age, economic factors do not recognize State boundary lines. Since 1958, the jobs of at least 15,000 Ohio workers have been transferred to States with so-called right-to-work laws, where wages are lower and legislation to protect working men and women less stringent.

In human terms, people in right-to-work States have a lower standard of living. They do not receive as much for their work. They cannot buy as much. Their job conditions are poorer, and their job security shakier. What is worse, their prospects for improvement are dimmer, and their children's future less promising.

Despite the misleading title, right-to-work laws are not meant to help working people or to guarantee anyone a right to a job. In reality, they are union-busting laws. Since passage of the Wagner Act, the cornerstone of Federal labor law has been encouragement of labor organizing and of free collective bar-