migration and Nationality Act, to enter California on a temporary basis to harvest our crops. But the Secretary says he will not do that.

So it appears that we will get more beans, which already are bulging the seams of Government warehouses with the taxpayers footing the bill.

## CORRECTING INJUSTICES IN SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for consideration of this body a bill designed to correct a real injustice in our social security laws.

The Social Security Act requires that a person under the age of 72, if he is to receive full benefits coming to him under the law, cannot earn for himself more than $100 a month. If he is able and willing to use his skills to work and help beyond that to meet his own financial needs he is penalized for that effort.

If a social security beneficiary accumulates annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700, then the Government withholds from his social security check $1 in benefits for every $2 of annual earnings above the $1,200 figure.

If he earns more than $1,700 then his social security benefits are reduced by whatever amount he earns above that figure.

My bill would simply double the amount which social security beneficiaries can earn through their own efforts without being penalized.

Under this bill a person receiving social security benefits can earn up to $2,400 a year without being penalized for his effort. It would mean that our older citizens would have a better opportunity for helping to take care of their own needs—certainly an opportunity which the Government should not prohibit.

There is ample evidence to show why this bill ought to be approved in this session of the Congress.

First, social security benefits by themselves are almost totally inadequate to meet the daily requirements of persons over 65.

Second, most of us are aware of the substantial public support for an increase in the earnings limitation. Several bills have been introduced in the past to achieve this objective. Letters have flowed into Congress from all parts of the country expressing support.

Third, at a time when we are giving special attention to help for senior citizens, it is an ironic contradiction that the Government should actually penalize older people who are able and willing to supplement their income.

Surely not all persons over 65 are the same. There are great differences in their needs and abilities. Government should make a maximum effort to provide help where the need is the greatest. And those who can take care of themselves should be given every chance to do so.

For many senior citizens who are able to work, idleness means boredom, a feeling of futility, and perhaps it may affect their physical and mental health. For many of them the opportunity to utilize their earning power provides a healthy feeling of usefulness and self-reliance.

It is an opportunity we should not deny to them. We should provide all American citizens, in whatever ways we can, with the best chance possible for achieving economic independence. And with that objective in mind I urge early consideration and approval of my bill.

## PRESIDENT SHOULD CALL CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF NATO

(Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today suggested to President Johnson what I consider to be a powerful and peaceful way to take the initiative in the not-so-cold war with the Communists.

In a letter, I suggest that the President call a constitutional convention of North Atlantic Treaty Organization nations.

The object of the convention would be to propose for ratification a plan to unify the military, monetary, trade, and foreign policies of the nations which make up NATO. The mere proposal of this convention would put us in a positive position in the contest with communism, strengthen our position of free world leadership and put the Communists in a difficult defensive position.

Since World War II we have been hopping from one Communist-inspired crisis to another—Berlin, Lebanon, Quemoy, Cuba, Vietnam. It is high time we take the initiative and put the Communists on the defensive. The constitutional convention idea is both powerful and peaceful, as American history itself attests.

The work our forefathers did in Philadelphia in 1787 in creating the U.S. Constitution did more to strengthen freedom and extend peace than any other act in history. Under the Constitution, States beset with monetary, trade, and military problems—weakened by division—were brought together effectively and permanently. This unity was achieved in a system that gives the Central Government needed strength but protects individual liberty and the authority of local government.

The problems confronting the free nations today parallel in many ways the problems the 13 Original U.S. States faced. Today, as then, division weakens the cause of freedom and magnifies the problems of the free world.

In his Farewell Address on leaving the U.S. Presidency, George Washington warned against "entangling alliances" and added these significant words:

> To the efficacy and permanency of your (the United States) Union a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute. They must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which alliances in all times have experienced.

As presently constituted, the NATO organization of today must be classified as one of the undependable entangling alliances about which Washington warned. Certainly it is doing no better than Articles of Confederation which failed to meet the problems of the 13 Original States in the preconvention period. Infractions and interruptions of the alliance are apparent at every turn of the road. A government for the whole of NATO is just as indispensable today as it was for the 13 Original U.S. States in 1787, when a Constitutional Convention was called.

Those who prize freedom today must somehow match the achievements of our forefathers in 1787.

## INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

(Mr. YOUNGER (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House passed an authorization increasing the capital of the Inter-American Development Bank by $750 million, the increase to take place in three stages of $250 million each and the first increase to be included in the 1965 fiscal year.

Quoting from the Summary of Activities of the Inter-American Bank for 1964, we find this quote:

> A primary concern of the Bank in the field of economic development has been to increase the volume of external funds available for agriculture and industry. This is being accomplished through loans made directly by the Bank to private and public enterprises and through loans made to Latin American financial institutions which relend the proceeds in turn to small- and medium-scale producers, thus benefiting the small-scale businessman and farmer who has previously not had access to international credit facilities.

While the House was taking this action, the President was addressing 370 American international business and banking leaders at the White House and made a plea to them in these words:

> I want you to go back to your offices and call in your controllers and your vice presidents. I want you to ask them to consult you every time they face a decision that involves sending money abroad. And I count on you to cut those outflows to the bone.

It seems to me that much of the Federal Government money which goes abroad does not return. I believe the debate shows that the Inter-American Development Bank is now making 85-percent soft loans and only 15-percent hard loans. It is true that business has invested a lot of money overseas, much of it upon appeal from the Federal Government. Up until the end of 1956, individuals and private business organizations had invested a total of $33 billion overseas. At the end of 1963, this oversea investment had risen to $66 billion but these investments return dividends

every year and assist in our balance of payments.

I am not suggesting that the private business organizations and individuals should continue to send money overseas at any such rate, but I cannot reconcile the fact that the President on the one hand recommends that the taxpayers' money should go overseas in the name of the Federal Government while at the same time recommending that individuals and business organizations should stop sending any of their money for investment overseas. It is the old story that what is good for the goose ought to be good for the gander.

## SOUTHEAST ASIA POLICY

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the very curious elements of today's public discussions regarding our southeast Asia policy is the fact that so many Americans, including some high officials, appear to be entirely unable to learn from the lessons of history. For years now the Communists of Asia, as well as elsewhere, have followed their tactics of continual public agitation and subversion, and continual probing for weak spots, ready to advance when they can, or to bide their time when they cannot.

Their efforts to portray the United States as morally wrong in Vietnam are paying off for them. It was only a few years ago that our foreign policy was predicated on the supposition that having witnessed the advance of Communist domination throughout China, North Korea, large parts of Laos, and North Vietnam, we would draw the line where South Vietnam was concerned, and act to show that this was the line we would defend.

But now, partly because in the past 4 years we appeared to be hesitant about our determination on this point, as evidenced by our eagerness to accommodate the Communists in Laos, thereby leaving the Ho Chi Minh trail open for Communist infiltration into South Vietnam, the Communists of Asia are pressing harder. And with this, some would have us believe that South Vietnam is not, after all, the place for us to draw the line. These people say that maybe Thailand is the place. Or maybe Singapore, or perhaps the Philippines.

This phenomenon, and where it can lead us, is given excellent treatment in a column by John Chamberlain appearing in the Washington Post of February 18, 1965, called "Back to Waikiki and Key West." I request that it be reprinted here and I urge its consideration:

BACK TO WAIKIKI AND KEY WEST

(By John Chamberlain)

The sudden heightening of the conflict in southeast Asia last week caused an almost instantaneous polarization of sentiment inside the United States that was reminiscent of the war and peace party standoffs of the late 1930's. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, who happened to be on a speaking expedition to New England, sat for a 15-minute filmed interview denouncing our "warmongers in the Pentagon," and the film was subsequently run off as the piece de resistance at a big peace rally in the Yale Law School auditorium in New Haven, Conn.

The Young Americans for Freedom quickly got into the act with denunciations of WAYNE MORSE's crew of peacemongers. To anyone with vivid memories of the bad blood of the late thirties, when the America Firsters and the William Allen White prowar committee members were busy impugning each other's motives, it was all a little ominous.

What is especially sobering is that an internal quarrel over our Far Eastern policy could, if events cause it to sharpen, end up by becoming considerably more debilitating than the battle of the 1930's.

The peace party of the pre-World War II times was a mixture of pacifists and isolationists, but the vast majority were fundamentally motivated by a loyalty to the land of their birth. Practically none of the America Firsters wanted to see a Nazi victory and there were certainly no admirers of Japanese expansionism among them.

When Pearl Harbor came, most of the America Firsters got in the war as a matter of course. Charles Lindbergh, for example, tested war planes for the Ford Motor Co., and later flew some incognito missions in the Pacific. Chester Bowles became such a big wheel in the Roosevelt wartime price control apparatus that everyone forgot he had been a member of America First.

The difference in the pre-1941 atmosphere and that of the present is that many members of our current peace party are at least half-convinced that the Russians and the Red Chinese represent "progressivism." Nobody would have said that of the Nazis; indeed, Anne Lindbergh, who was accused of calling fascism "the wave of the future," actually said that the Nazis were the "scum on the wave of the future." The peace party, this time, isn't calling the Red Chinese "scum."

Instead, there is every effort, to make it appear that the United States, by becoming involved in South Vietnam, is morally in the wrong. Senator MORSE speaks of "our outlawry in southeast Asia." We are accused of supporting "unpopular, illegal governments" even in cases where we are willing to accept any government that happens to have the support of whoever or whatever happens to be the constitutive power in a land that has never known democracy.

This columnist does not go for the conspiracy theory of history. It is my contention that it is contagion, not conspiracy, which explains the spread of doctrines that prevent the West from making a stand for its own values anywhere outside its own narrow borders. The contagion is abetted by a dominant group in the State Department that has obviously never made any basic study of Marxist theory and practice.

Put into a nutshell, the foreign policies of both Soviet Russia and Red China are based on a sapper's concept of a never-ending warfare. It is a matter of tunnelling and undermining wherever such tactics promise to pay off.

The guerrilla and the fifth columnist are the conscious agents of the enemy. But there are the unconscious ones—the stupid intellectual who never can look beneath the surface, the shallow moralist who falls for holy verbiage, the person who believes that socialism is coming anyway so why make a fight of it.

To win in a sapper's war, one has to know the enemy for what he is and be prepared to meet him on his terms if you aren't willing and able to impose your own. But we are too honorable to help Chiang Kai-shek put his own guerrillas ashore on the Chinese mainland, and too simple hearted to give the green light to an infiltrating government-in-exile for Cuba. We never learn, and so we are destined to lose. Our frontiers in the future are likely to be the sands of Waikiki and the beaches of Key West.

## UNDERWITHHOLDING OF FEDERAL INCOME TAXES FOR 1964

(Mr. CLANCY (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as April 15 draws near, more and more taxpayers are learning the sad truth about the underwithholding of Federal income taxes during 1964, leaving them in the difficult position of not having adequate funds readily available to meet their tax liabilities.

Although this problem was anticipated by many of us who knew that payroll deductions were not being made at the rate of tax liability, it is clear that a large number of taxpayers were unaware of this withholding snafu.

In order to lessen the impact of the tax burden facing so many of our citizens, I am cosponsoring a bill which will give taxpayers until April 15, 1966 to pay one-half of the 1964 withholding deficiency. The balance of the deficiency would be spread out through 1965, in this way taking care of the extra underwithholding.

Enactment of this measure should obviate the need of using up savings and should prevent any undesirable effects on the economy as a result of decreased purchasing power. I strongly urge early and favorable action on this proposal.

## OBLIGATIONS OF GERMAN GOVERNMENT IN MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the cancellation by West Germany of her agreement to supply Israel with defensive military equipment is an abject and deplorable surrender to the blackmail of the Nasser dictatorship. Morally, the West German position is indefensible. It will prove to be harmful and self-defeating even to the Germans. Appeasement has never worked in international relationships and the history of this century is replete with such examples.

I urge that the Bonn government reconsider its actions and evaluate both public opinion throughout all the free world and carefully assay the damage her actions threatens in upsetting the balance of power that has prevailed in the Middle East. Chancellor Ehrhard's government must understand that their course of action is designed to weaken Israel and to strengthen Egypt, both militarily and in terms of prestige and influence. It will serve to encourage and inflame Arab passions and will be a dreadful disservice to Israel, the only nation in that part of the world that looks to the West and is dedicated to freedom.

We admit there are a lot more current things to worry about than what will happen in a couple of hundred years. But it ought to be on our conscience if we contribute to the downfall of Western civilization.

But just who will the "barbarians" be? Maybe they will be the Chinese. They have, for at least 4,000 years, "known" that they are the chosen people.

It may turn out they are right—just because today we are heading for the Great Society—and maybe oblivion.

## Futility of the Administration's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 22, 1965*

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the continued reliance on existing Federal farm programs illustrates the failure of this administration to discover a broad and effective solution to the plight of the American farmer. A prerequisite for any successful solution would necessarily involve a gradual dismantling of the costly and waste-producing system of price supports, which benefit only the relatively prosperous one-third of the rural community. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal outlines the futility and wastefulness of the present farm program and offers some constructive alternatives.

The revival of the soil bank idea to remove good acreage from production through the payment of premiums overlooks the fact that overcultivation is a direct result of the price-support sytsem which encourages farmers to cultivate as much land as possible. It would also cost, by conservative estimates, $1 billion a year.

What is needed, as the article points out, is a return to something approaching a free market in agriculture, which would lead to the idling of less desirable land and the conversion of it to other uses.

At the same time, the Government should spur efforts of rural communities to provide new jobs and encourage retraining and other educational programs which could fit farmers for more useful types of work.

Under unanimous consent, I include the Journal article in the RECORD at this point:

TWO SIDES OF THE FARM COIN

"We need to change much of our thinking on farm policy * * *. We need to separate the social problems of rural America from the economic problems of commercial agriculture."

Thus President Johnson recognized, in his farm message to Congress last week, that there are two sides to the farm coin, a fact that the Government up to now has largely ignored. There is the relatively prosperous upper one-third of the rural community, which gets most of the benefit from present price supports. And there are the rest of the farmers, who are either so small or so inefficient that they draw little help from current programs.

Recognition of this rural division is basic to a realistic approach to the problems of the farm economy. But there is a second step of equal importance: A gradual dismantling of the costly and waste-producing system of price supports. This step the administration still shows no willingness to take.

It's hard to explain this reluctance on any ground other than politics. Mr. Johnson clearly recognizes that successful farming has become a sizable business; he notes that a good farm in the Midwest now requires capital of close to $100,000, more than 10 times the figure for three decades earlier. There is no economic justification for continued coddling of this group and for the rest of the farmers the support system has long been a delusion.

Nonetheless, the administration proposes not only to preserve the present price supports almost intact but to launch other efforts to control agricultural surpluses. The most prominent of these is a revival of the old soil bank idea, paying farmers for taking land out of production.

The soil bank failed before because farmers, quite naturally, idled only their least productive acres. The Government now proposes to overcome this obstacle by paying premiums for taking good land out of production; conservative estimates place the cost of such a program at a staggering $1 billion a year.

This proposal overlooks the fact that the present overcultivation of farm land is largely a direct result of the price support system, which encourages everyone to cultivate as many acres as possible. A return to something approaching a free market in agriculture would, in all probability, lead to the idling of a good deal of less desirable land and the eventual conversion of it to other uses.

Elimination of price supports in stages, moreover, would free a great deal of money for helping the farmers who really need help. There is no question that the Government has an obligation to aid these farmers, since their troubles stem in considerable measure from the distortions created in the rural economy by past and present Federal programs.

If the Government wants to help the poorer farmers, it might consider that a free market farm economy would create additional jobs; for one thing, it would have to take over much of the present crop-storage activity of the Agriculture Department. The Government could certainly aid and encourage this employment-boosting conversion.

The Government could at the same time spur the self-help efforts of rural communities to provide off-farm jobs. It's conceivable that the Area Redevelopment Administration, as the President suggests, can be helpful in this, though the ARA's past record shows that, as Mr. Johnson also says, the agency is in need of improvement.

In addition, the Government could participate in setting up retraining and other educational programs that could better fit farmers for more fruitful lines of work. It could provide job information and other services that would assist farmers in the process of rural reconversion.

There is no scarcity of such alternatives. The President proposes that the present National Agricultural Advisory Commission, now heavily weighted with farmers, be changed to a broader based Commission on Food and Fiber; the commission may come up with useful ideas. Perhaps it will even see the futility of present price supports.

By acknowledging that the farm coin has two sides, the administration has made a start. But if the Government is not to go on forever pouring the taxpayers' coin into profitless programs, it will finally be necessary to take the second step and free the farm market of its Federal fetters.

## GOP Magnificent in Viet Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. DEL CLAWSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 22, 1965*

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on the birthday of the first President of these United States, we customarily recall his advice to his countrymen upon resigning that high office. One hundred and sixty-nine years later, certain of his words retain a particular appropriateness for Americans today:

The unity of government which constitutes you one people is also now dear to you. It is justly so: for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize.

Commemorating the spirit of President Washington's Farewell Address, I ask consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, paying tribute to the bipartisanship of our minority leaders in the present threat to "peace abroad." The article follows:

GOP MAGNIFICENT IN VIET CRISIS
(By William S. White)

Magnificent is the word for the Republican Party and its congressional leaders in the crisis of national purpose and national will and national honor that is rising in southeast Asia.

Rarely in history has a minority party given such wide and generous support to an administration of the opposite party as is now being granted to President Johnson in his efforts to help halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam and thus to blunt the most recent grave challenge of international communism to peace and world order.

The assistance being extended by the outs to the in President, Mr. Johnson, is if anything, even greater than that extended to a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, by Mr. Johnson and his senior Democratic colleagues when the Republicans held the White House and the Democrats held Congress.

Whatever else may or may not be done in this Congress by Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois, the Senate Republican leader, and Representative GERALD FORD of Michigan, the House Republican leader, it will be dwarfed by the historic contribution they are making to keep this country strong and united in the face of foreign war.

Indeed, watching them at work one can almost believe that as a Nation we may have actually reached here, for a time anyhow, that heretofore impossible and unattainable ideal—a politics, as to foreign affairs, of a maturity to match the complexity and gravity of these affairs in this decade. No doubt politics as usual will shortly descend over the scene; even so DIRKSEN, FORD and company are entitled to the most earnest of salutes for what thus far they have done and tried to do.

In their actions the phrase "responsible opposition" is taking on the dignity of fact; it is a reality and not merely an expression of what is desirable. If the President is able to bring this Nation through the trials of Vietnam without the stain of appeasement on the one hand or the horror of major war

in Asia on the other these men will have played a memorably significant part.

It is a curious thing to see how, when the heat is really intense and the way ahead is hard and hazardous, some high political reputations begin to look just a bit dubious and some hitherto more or less routine and pedestrian reputations begin to develop a strength, a vitality and an intellectual candor that had been, by most people, wholly unexpected.

So it is now. Some so-called foreign policy experts on the Democratic side in Congress speak for a new and cleverly worded form of isolationism. Because things are admittedly sticky in Vietnam because the non-Communist regime we assist is admittedly weak and scarcely "democratic" as we understand the word, these people have only a policy for surrender wrapped up in talk about the righteousness of "negotiation."

But negotiations are not possible with marauders until first they have been forced to cease their killing and looting and until first they have given some evidence that the end of any new negotiation will not be the same as the end of all other negotiations going back to 1954—that is, uninterrupted Communist aggression.

So DIRKSEN, FORD and company see the reality for what it is, describe it for what it is, and rejecting short-term partisan gain at the expense of the administration, stand with the President and the Democratic majority—and, in this case, with the vital interests also of the United States of America.

Now, FORD is a young man and no doubt has much of life and hope ahead of him. But DIRKSEN is an elderly man, by definition a man nearing the end of the long trail, and a far from hale and well man, too, if it comes to that. He has taken many a lump in his time, and a good many of them, in my opinion, he had coming to him. For he was not always the DIRKSEN of today; not any part of the DIRKSEN of today.

But for the last 4 years, at minimum, no public man alive has more faithfully, more courageously, more wryly and more responsibly served the higher purposes of this country. There ought to be a kind of medal for unassuming—and absolutely irreplaceable—service of this kind.

## George Washington, Creator of the Purple Heart Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 22, 1965*

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with many of the achievements of our first President, whose birthday we celebrate today, but few of us are aware that he was the creator of the Purple Heart Award, a badge of military merit.

The first Purple Heart Award was made on August 7, 1782, the day George Washington issued the order for its establishment at Newburgh, N.Y.

In 1932 Gen. Douglas MacArthur issued orders to reactivate this award which had honored the heroes of the War for Independence.

It is fitting that this award created by George Washington, one of the Nation's past great military leaders, has been used in recent years to confer distinction upon our outstanding military heroes.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of Washington's order in the Appendix of the RECORD:

U.S. ARMY HEADQUARTERS,
*Newburgh, N.Y., August 7, 1782.*

Orders of the day: For fatigue tomorrow, the 2d Massachusetts Regiment.

Countersign—York, Lancaster.

The general, ever desirous to cherish a virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or bindings. The road to glory in a patriot Army and free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and is to be considered a permanent one.

G. WASHINGTON,
*Commander in Chief.*

## Secrecy in Government Should Be Eliminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 22, 1965*

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should take every step possible to reduce secrecy in Government, and I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues in urging the passage of legislation to assure that Government records are available to the public. Too long the records of Government agencies have been shrouded in mystery and secrecy, surrounding the operations of our Government in a paper wall, which sometimes even a Congressman cannot cut, and preventing citizens from access to information to which they are rightfully entitled.

Under th provisions of the bill I am introducing today, every Government agency would be required to "make all its records promptly available to any persons." However, sensitive information areas would be exempt, such as security and personnel matters and information that private concerns must submit to the Government. To enforce the right of citizens to receive information to which they are entitled, my bill provides that if a person is denied access to public records, he can go into a Federal district court and obtain an order for the production of agency records or information improperly withheld from him. It would be up to the Government to prove its right to withhold the records, and the courts could punish agency officials for contempt if they refused to comply with a judge's order.

The eight categories of "sensitive information" exempt from my bill are: national security secrets specifically protected by executive order; documents solely related to personnel records and practices; information specifically protected by other laws; privileged private commercial information obtained from the public, such as trade secrets; agency memorandums dealing solely with matters of law or policy; personnel and medical files; files of law enforcement agencies dealing with investigations; and reports of financial institutions submitted to regulatory agencies.

Secrecy in Government should be eliminated. It is by having a citizenry, knowledgeable in all facets of Government, that we remain strong. Freedom of information belongs to citizens whose Government is by the people, of the people, and for the people.

Congress should enact freedom of information measures to assure the free access of information from Government agencies, it can also lead the way by opening many of its executive, or secret, hearings to which the public is barred.

## Congress Has a Responsibility To Find the Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Monday, February 22, 1965*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most authoritative spokesmen for the U.S. Navy, and the armed services in general, has long been the Navy Times.

I am always interested in reading this publication, and I consistently find articles and commentaries of particular significance to Members of Congress.

In this connection, I wish to call attention to the editorial in the February 24 issue of the Navy Times.

This editorial focuses on numerous issues emanating from the Department of Defense, and the editorial concludes with the sentence: "Congress has a responsibility to find the answers."

Mr. Speaker, I unhesitatingly say that Congress will analyze and probe the issues referred to, and Congress will find the answers.

I therefore submit the editorial into the RECORD with the simple notation that it speaks for itself.

UNWISE—AND ARBITRARY

In a series of related moves Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has decreed:

Virtual abolition of the Army Reserve, leaving it a conglomeration of individual replacements.

Putting some of the drill pay units into the National Guard, abolishing the rest and abolishing many existing National Guard units.

That key executive, legislative and judicial officials must leave the Ready Reserves of all services.

That many members of the Standby Reserve may not maintain proficiency nor qualify for retirement.

Steps to curtail travel by Congressmen to military activities, particularly those overseas.

If Congress allows all these things to be done without first having its clear say on the

islature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate unit shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

*"Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A resolution adopted by the Council of the Town of Woodside, Calif., favoring a constitutional amendment relating to reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to protect the economies of the States and territories by enacting legislation providing that 10 percent of the individual and corporate Federal income tax generated in the States and territories be retained and returned to the States and territories for their exclusive use beyond Federal control

"Whereas vast amounts of income taxes and other taxes are being siphoned each year into the Federal Treasury from the several States and territories, which lessens the ability of those governmental subdivisions, and its peoples, to meet their obligations on the local level and to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rise in cost of State and local governments and to meet the demand of needed improvements; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is being pressed on all sides for various and sundry uses of the taxes so collected; and

"Whereas the Federal Government's attempts to make amends therefor, by returning to the States certain funds in the way of grants-in-aid, subsidies and dollar-matching enterprises conceived at the national level ofttimes complicate the economic problems of the several States and political subdivisions; and

"Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulations from the Federal Treasury; and such shifting of funds results in considerable loss due to increased administration requirements, entails additional burdens on the States and territories by requiring matching funds, and deprives the States of a proper direction and control over such funds; and

"Whereas experience now dictates that of the funds collected by the Federal Government from the above sources, a portion thereof in many areas of relief and assistance can be better utilized by the several States and territories if left therewith prior to their deposit and retention in the Federal Treasury, thereby reversing the trend of centralizing all of the funds therein: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to adopt legislation whereby the States and territories would receive from the appropriate district director of Internal Revenue, at the end of each quarter, 10 percent of all taxes collected on individual and corporate income under Federal statutes which would be deemed revenue for the States and territories, to be used by the States and territories as their several legislative bodies might dictate without any Federal direction, control or interference; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of the Senate of the State of South Dakota transmit copies of this resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson; to the Honorable KARL MUNDT, and the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, and the Honorable BEN REIFEL, Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota, within 10 days after the passage and approval of this resolution.

"Adopted by the senate February 1, 1965.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 15, 1965.

"LEM OVERPECK,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"CHARLES DROZ,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"WALTER J. MATSON,
*"Chief Clerk."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 5

"Concurrent resolution protesting the proposed combination of the Veterans' Administration regional office now located at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., with the regional office in St. Paul, Minn., and the resultant problems such combination would create for South Dakota veterans

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration has maintained a regional office in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., since that Federal agency was set up following World War I, and such office has handled the administration of veteran law affecting the veterans of South Dakota, and adjudication of their claims without undue expense of time or money to such veterans; and

"Whereas this has been a service affecting the physical and economic interest of 70,000 veterans and economic interest of their families, comprising in all a substantial portion of the population of the State; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration now proposes to combine the Sioux Falls regional office with the St. Paul regional office at St. Paul, Minn., along with the files and the administration and adjudication of South Dakota cases; and

"Whereas this proposal was made without consultation with or approval of the Congress; and

"Whereas it can mean only delay and added expense to South Dakota veterans and their accredited representatives and service officers in the protection of the interest of said veterans, with a minimum economy of space or personnel: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the South Dakota Legislature protests said transfer and urges that it be reconsidered and that the regional office in existence in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., be continued in existence; and that copies of this resolution be sent to the President, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and members of the South Dakota delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the senate February 5, 1965.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 15, 1965.

"LEM OVERPECK,
*"President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
*"Secretary of the Senate.*

"CHARLES DROZ,
*"Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"WALTER J. MATSON,
*"Chief Clerk."*

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution, requesting the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River reservoirs

"Whereas it was the pledge of the Corps of Engineers that the Missouri Basin development program would cause the adjacent landowners no economic loss;

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers has failed to delineate the take lines of the Missouri River dams with visible markers; and

"Whereas the taking lines of the Missouri River dams are by metes and bounds rather than along political subdivision lines; and

"Whereas the owners of land adjacent to the Missouri River dams have been forced to hire private surveyors to plat and to survey the take lines, and then mark such take lines;

"Whereas it is unfair to the adjacent landowners to have to pay for such surveying and the establishing of such markers; and

"Whereas the lack of adequate markers for the take lines results in a problem of great magnitude affecting a large number of the citizens of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), respectfully requests the Corps of Engineers to establish visible markers delineating the take lines of the Missouri River reservoirs; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Secretary of the Army of the United States; to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable GEORGE MCGOVERN, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; and to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable BEN REIFEL, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota."

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 3, 1965:

S. 985. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes: Mr. CLARK, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Authority of February 9, 1965:

S. 1071. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes: Mr. MUSKIE.

Authority of February 10, 1965:

S. 1108. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, in order to make permanent the authorization for certain payments under the provisions of such laws, and for other purposes: Mr. BASS, Mr. FONG, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

Authority of February 17, 1965:

S. 1140. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment: Mr. RIBICOFF and Mr. SCOTT.

## NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Frederick G. Dutton.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

## ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York:

Article entitled "'Starved' East Seeks Vast Recreational Area," written by Aubrey Graves, and published in the Washington Post of February 21, 1965.

## VIETNAM CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, developments in Saigon once again point to the coup-on-coup-on-coup procedure which seems now to have become the adopted policy of the Vietnamese leaders, themselves. This possibility has been inherent in the situation at least since the deplorable assassination of President Diem, and certainly since the coup which unseated his successor, General Minh, about a year ago. In a statement on the floor of the Senate, almost a year ago to the day, these questions were raised:

> Does this coup mean simply that the cards of military power in Vietnam have been reshuffled? Does it mean merely that military coup begets military coup and the second is but a precursor of the third? How many will it take before these changes have become totally irrelevant to the life of the Vietnamese people? Until their only significance will be in terms of who shall receive our aid and wield the power which it represents in Vietnam?

The answers are becoming very clear, and they are regrettable. The number has reached, according to the latest available reports, at least 13 coups or attempted coups. If this process continues it would appear to me that we shall be handcuffed and hogtied in our attempts to assist the people of South Vietnam. The result of this process may well be that the Vietnamese military factions will engage in increasingly violent struggles with each other while the Vietcong guerrillas sit, waiting, on the sidelines. And at the end of the process, the people of South Vietnam, already close to the point of exhaustion, may well be placed on a platter in the lap of the Vietcong.

We are being boxed in by our friends, or at least by the leaders through whom we have sought to assist the people of Vietnam. This is an incredible situation, which had to happen to be believed. Despite the intense efforts of three Presidents of the United States for more than a decade to help the people of Vietnam establish and maintain their freedom, the President of the United States, today, is placed in the unenviable position of trying to find a way out of a labyrinth which becomes more tortuous and more complicated with each passing day.

It is my belief that the President, aware of all the factors, is faced with a situation, not of his making, for which there is no clearcut answer. He has worked day and night with his advisers to try to devise a way to provide some breathing space and some time to evolve more effective policies. He has acted as Commander in Chief with great courage, firmness, and restraint. Time and again the ground has been cut out from under him by those who have the most at stake. President Johnson can be counted on to continue to work with complete dedication on this problem; but the quicksands of Saigon's power politics and military conspiracy make this task infinitely more difficult. They underline the instability of the Vietnamese leaders, who seem to be more interested in personal power and prestige than in winning their own war. The leaders should realize that in the present situation, their country—not ours, their war—not ours, their future—not ours, lie in the balance. The people of South Vietnam, not their personal prestige, are what matters. Without their dedication to the needs of the people, without regard for self, their prestige is likely to be swept away, and soon. The United States is committed to aid the people of Vietnam. It is not committed to continued subsidy of intramilitary struggles for power and prestige, with American lives and resources. The jealous generals of Saigon should realize that the hour is very late in Vietnam.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rise to support the majority leader 100 percent in what he has said. Is not our objective in Vietnam to support those who wish to remain free? If the leaders fight among themselves and weaken themselves to such a degree that they cannot be leaders of the free nation, then we shall have failed in our principal objective.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. It makes the task of the Vietnamese people more difficult; it makes our task in that country more difficult.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Almost impossible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Quite difficult.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had not intended to comment on the tragedy of Indochina. However, I feel it somewhat incumbent upon me to rise for a moment to point out that international communism seeks to destroy a free people. If I have read the 1953 accords correctly, in 1954 communism agreed to respect the 17th parallel, and not continue any more marauding attacks upon the innocent human beings who lived then and who live now south of the parallel.

In the last several weeks, in California, I have stated that it is too late to argue over whether we should have gone to the assistance of the Vietnamese in 1954. That day is past. I agree with the majority leader when he observes the stringent difficulties which the people of South Vietnam face in continuing lack of stability on the part of that government. Here in America we can hope—for the sake of peace and for the sake of mankind—that stability will come to the Government of South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, let the world—friend and foe, alike—understand that the United States has made a commitment, and that the United States does not breach its commitments. We seek peace. When this country is faced with danger, those on this side of the aisle, representing the minority, the loyal opposition, stand behind the Chief Executive of our country, whoever he may be.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

## READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will be read by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], heretofore designated for that purpose by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. PEARSON advanced to the desk, and addressed the Senate, as follows:

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, this is indeed one of the honored days in American history, and I am beholden for the opportunity to participate in this manner.

It may be of some interest to know that Washington's Farewell Address was not delivered to Congress, either in person or by message; but on September 19, 1796, was conveyed to the people of the United States through the press. This was done for four purposes: First, although the people had received word that Washington would not again be a candidate, he wished to make some formal declaration of this fact; second, the address was to serve as a rallying cry of support for the National Government; third, it was to admonish the American people concerning excessive partisan politics; and, last, and for which the speech is most famous, it was to admonish the American people against foreign en-

the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; contantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for distinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
*17th September, 1796.*

## EIGHTY-THREE PERCENT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SUPPORT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY OF MEASURED RETALIATION AGAINST COMMUNIST MILITARY STAGING AREAS IN NORTH VIETNAM

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced House Joint Resolution 341 which announced the sense of Congress in support of President Johnson's policy of measured retaliation against North Vietnam's military installations as the situation requires. It was encouraging to me to read this morning in the Washington Post the latest Harris survey which shows 83 percent of the people in this country believe that Mr. Johnson was right in ordering retaliatory bombings. It is my hope that the Members of the House will read the Harris survey and that we will get early action on House Joint Resolution 341. Adoption of this resolution would not only put is on record in support of our President but would also let the people of South Vietnam know that despite their own internal difficulties, we recognize that to withdraw from South Vietnam at this time would open the whole of southeast Asia to Communist aggression. Furthermore, it would be my hope that Congress would approve House Joint Resolution 341 so that the Communist aggressors from North Vietnam would realize this country will not treat Communist aggression and subversion in South Vietnam with impunity.

For the United States to chose any other course at this time would be an open invitation to the Communists for a complete takeover of all of southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress can take comfort in the knowledge that the American people are overwhelmingly in support of President Johnson's decision to stand up to Communist aggression and subversion in South Vietnam. True, the American people are concerned about escalation but so is the President.

Mr. Johnson is charting a very cautious course which serves notice on the Communists that they must be prepared to suffer the consequences of their aggression in South Vietnam, but at the same time the President is being most careful not to involve us in an all-out war in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, the Harris survey follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—RAIDS ON NORTH VIETNAM STRONGLY SUPPORTED

(By Louis Harris)

The American people have closed ranks firmly behind President Johnson in his decision to bomb Communist supply bases in southern North Vietnam. In a just-completed nationwide survey, 83 percent of the public believe Mr. Johnson was right in ordering retaliatory bombings.

Underlying the mood of public opinion in the country, however, is a deep concern that

the fighting in Vietnam could escalate into a major war with China. Most people want to avoid military action that will lead to such an escalation.

A heavy majority of 75 percent of the American people favor an eventual negotiated settlement of the whole Vietnam issue. Clearly, however, they do not see this moment as the time to ask for such negotiations. An even larger 79 percent say that in their judgment a U.S. withdrawal would doom all of southeast Asia to being overrun by the Communists. Eight out of ten people feel it is very important that this not happen.

What course, then, do people believe this Nation should follow in the sensitive and delicate days ahead? The clear mainstream of American opinion is this: We should shore up the effort of the South Vietnamese to resist further Communist advances, use retaliatory airstrikes only when extreme guerrilla activity warrants it, and when we have made enough show of power so the Communists can see we will not yield, then finally negotiate a settlement.

The people are very clear about what has already happened: A big majority of 82 percent believe that the U.S. bombings to date have been merely retaliation for attacks on and killings of American soldiers, not an effort to extend war to North Vietnam.

Perhaps surprisingly, a majority also sees the Chinese Communists, rather than the North or South Vietnamese Communists as the real force behind the recent stepped up guerrilla activity.

People were asked:

"Do you feel that the recent attacks and killings of American soldiers stationed in South Vietnam are mainly part of the civil war in South Vietnam, or that the Communist government of North Vietnam is mainly behind them, or that the Chinese Communist government is mainly behind them?"

| | *Percent, total Nation* |
|---|---|
| Part of civil war in South Vietnam | 7 |
| North Vietnam behind them | 26 |
| China behind them | 53 |
| Not sure | 14 |

As for future bombings, people are quite explicit about what they would and would not like to see done. When asked about extending U.S. bombings to the whole country of North Vietnam, instead of confining them to supply bases in the southern part of that country, a plurality of 4 to 3 believes it important to keep the targets limited to southern Communist bases. Similarly, when asked if they think bombings of China are going to be necessary, by 2 to 1, people believe such bombings can be avoided.

It is perfectly evident that the American people do not want to see the war extended to North Vietnam. The main reason is that they do not want any provocation that would bring Red China into the fighting with their own troops and planes. By almost 3 to 1, people believe that taking the war to North Vietnam would bring the Chinese directly into the fighting. And this, quite clearly, the people do not want to see happen, for as many put it, such action would produce "a big war" between the United States and China.

But the public also sees disaster if the United States takes an opposite course of withdrawal now from Vietnam. People were asked:

"From what you have read or have heard, in your opinion do you think if we now withdrew from Vietnam, the Communists would take over all of southeast Asia or do you feel that might not happen?"

| | *Percent, total Nation* |
|---|---|
| Communists would take over all southeast Asia | 79 |
| Might not happen | 10 |
| Not sure | 11 |

When asked a followup question on the importance of preventing the Communists from such a takeover of southeast Asia, 79 percent replied very important.

The public is clearly in the throes of making some of the same choices now facing our national leadership. In Deerfield Beach, Fla., a retired skilled laborer said, "I'm in favor of anything to prevent war, but as conditions are now, I see no alternative but to stay on and do what has to be done to end this thing once and for all. We must not let the Communists go any further."

A 27-year-old machinist in Aliquippa, Pa., added: "If we don't stand our ground, more Communists will come in as they did in Cuba."

But most are also not unmindful of the risks. A businessman in Decatur, Ill., said, "The French fought with their best troops for 5 years without victory. I'm for advisors and arms and ammunition from us. But I don't want another Korea with a lot of American blood shed."

A white-collar man in Danbury, Tex., summed up the dilemma, "I think as long as we are over there, let's fight to win. If we aren't going to fight to win, let's come home." Then he paused and added, "The trouble is, I'd like to do both, and I don't think we really should do either."

In the end, therefore, the largest group of Americans believe we should continue to hold the line in South Vietnam. Although the number who want to negotiate right now and get out is rising and the number who want to take the actual fighting to North Vietnam is dropping. Back in November, again in January just before the stepped-up fighting, and now just after the bombings, people were asked:

"Which of these three courses do you favor for the United States in Vietnam: Carry the war into North Vietnam, at the risk of bringing Red China into the war; negotitate a settlement with the Communists and get out now; or continue to hold the line there to prevent the Communists from taking over South Vietnam?"

[Percent]

| | February | January | November |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hold the line | 46 | 40 | 40 |
| Negotiate and get out | 35 | 23 | 20 |
| Carry fighting to North Vietnam | 12 | 17 | 20 |
| Not sure | 7 | 20 | 20 |

The people have backed their Commander in Chief overwhelmingly in ordering the retaliatory bombings, but only to show the Communists they can't get away with attacks on and killings of Americans. But the people also make it abundantly clear that they want no part of precipitating a war with China.

Rather they seek a buildup of United States and South Vietnamese strength to the point where a negotiated settlement that might save southeast Asia can be achieved. The difference between the 75 percent who say a negotiated settlement should be our ultimate objective and the 35 percent who say "negotiate and get out" today is recognition by the people that negotiations can be conducted only from strength.

## OUR GOVERNMENT POLICIES ARE INCONSISTENT

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the President has properly expressed great concern over our balance-of-payments problem and our dwindling gold supply. He has asked for more exports and for a reduction in American capital being invested overseas.

The Secretary of Labor appears to have missed the message. The end of the bracero program and our California farmers' difficulties in finding qualified American farmworkers to replace the braceros will contribute further to our unfavorable balance of foreign payments situation. Exports of California fruit and produce, which have been running about $30 million a year, are likely to dwindle or disappear entirely.

If labor is not available for harvesting California crops, there will be a commensurate increase of crop imports from Mexico. The seriousness of this prospect from a balance-of-payments standpoint will be readily noted in a review of the imports going back to 1952. Since that time, agricultural imports from Mexico to the United States have increased by 65 percent.

Imports of some Mexican crops, harvested at about one-eighth of the labor cost prevailing in California, have increased as follows:

From 1958 to 1963: Fresh strawberries from 5,000 pounds to 2 million pounds.

From 1952 to 1963: Canteloupes from 6 million pounds to 110 million pounds; oranges from 6 million pounds to 50 million pounds.

From 1955 to 1963: Fresh tomatoes from 66 million pounds to 242 million pounds; tomato products from 400 pounds to 6 million pounds.

Also, because of the uncertainty of being able to harvest crops in California, there is an ever-increasing tendency of canners and processors to move to Mexico. Even a few California growers have moved their operations to Mexico and others have made tentative plans to do so.

The farm labor problem in California also threatens to saddle American taxpayers with greater farm price support costs. This is because tomato, lettuce, and strawberry growers who cannot find American harvest laborers are converting their acreage to the planting of dry beans and other field crops which require little or no hand labor. These crops qualify for Federal Government price supports—tomatoes, lettuce, and strawberries do not.

The President, in his recent farm message, said he would like to have the cost of farm price supports reduced. Even without the authority of the bracero law to stand on, the Secretary of Labor could help the President do this by permitting Mexicans, under provisions of the Im-