

do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation." And democracy has prevailed because of the faith and courage displayed by our President Lyndon B. Johnson when he addressed a grief-stricken Congress and Nation on November 27, 1963: "This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us."

This affirmation has been proclaimed anew by every generation of Americans. It does not promise prefabricated solutions to the complex problems of democratic government. It recognizes that the essence of politics is the asking and reasking of the most difficult of all questions: What is justice? What is right? We can never seek these answers and never govern ourselves successfully on the basis of generalities, half-truths, and myths—no matter how superficially appealing they may be.

As one who has served in local government—the mayor of a city of over one-half million people, Minneapolis, Minn.—I believe I have some appreciation of the importance of local government in our Federal system. Those of us who have served at the local level come face to face with the tough daily problems of the relationship of government to the people.

And make no mistake about it, when the people think of government, they are primarily thinking of that government which touches their lives—the police and fire departments, the health and transportation services, the education and cultural facilities, and, yes, even the property taxes and the sales tax.

American Government is more than Washington. American Government is Washington, the State capitol, the county court houses, the city and village halls, the town meetings, and the thousands of independent separate governmental authorities that range from port authorities to sewage systems, from metropolitan airports commissions to the local school boards.

No nation in the world has had as much experience in self-government as ours. If there is one area of human activity in which we can claim superior knowledge and greater experience it is in the field of representative self-government. I salute those public officials—elected and appointed—who serve on the front line of public service and who all too often go unappreciated and unrewarded.

We are, however, exposed to some of the most remarkable notions about the role of the Federal Government in relation to the States, counties, and localities.

We have heard the shopworn phrases about "Washington's ever eager fingers of bureaucracy" grabbing responsibilities which supposedly have been defaulted by local governments. We are exposed to the same tired misconceptions of a pitiless Federal establishment solely "obsessed by the enlargement of its role and its personnel" and trampling over the rights of a helpless populace. We are told of certain unnamed people who "seek solutions only by concentrating more and more power in fewer and fewer hands."

These tired complaints demonstrate a most profound misunderstanding of the dynamics of the American federal system. As professionals in the increasingly difficult task of governing our counties, you know that State, county, and local government is not about to collapse from any merciless onslaught from Washington.

Indeed, the facts demonstrate that in recent years expansion of American government has occurred primarily at the State and local levels as these governments have struggled with the gigantic task of governing America. Financial and employment figures

tell much of the story. Since 1946, for example, State, county, and local governments and their budgets have grown more rapidly than the Federal Government despite our national commitments to national defense, space exploration, nuclear development, veterans' benefits, postal service, and welfare programs. While Federal spending has increased 46 percent over this period, State, county, and local expenditures have soared by over 400 percent. Federal taxes per capita have increased almost 75 percent, but State, county, and local taxes have jumped 213 percent. The Federal debt has risen by slightly more than 10 percent in the past 18 years; State, county and local debt has climbed by more than 400 percent.

This is not criticism; it is a factual analysis that tells the story of a growing and demanding America. The willingness of our State, county, and local governments to assume a greater share of our common burden deserves explicit recognition and commendation. So, let's stop suggesting that the localities have either sold out or caved in to the Federal Government. This is one Senator who considers them very much alive.

To those who say that the Federal Government is taking over our local governments, I can only point out that the number of Federal employees has declined about 10 percent since 1946—while employees of the State, county, and local governments have risen by over 100 percent. Not long ago the ratio of Federal employees was 19 per thousand of the total U.S. population; today that number has fallen to 13 per thousand. Of these 13, 5 are located in the Defense Department, 3 in the Post Office Department, and 1 in the Veterans' Administration. The remainder—about 600,000 employees—comprise about 100,000 persons less than it takes to operate the Bell Telephone System.

Government has indeed grown since World War II—right from the grassroots of America. And why has this remarkable growth taken place? I am sure you know the reason far better than I. Government has grown because America has grown. You see and feel America develop and grow every month—every year.

I came to the U.S. Senate in 1949. Since then, the United States has added people equal to the entire present population of Great Britain and we continue to grow at the rate of 3 million new persons each year. These people have needed roads, housing, jobs, police and fire protection, water and sewer systems, transportation facilities and the whole range of essential services which comprise good government in the 20th century.

The country is now gripped by an industrial and technological revolution which, when coupled with our population growth, requires us to create 300,000 additional jobs each month just to stay even in terms of unemployment percentages. Life expectancy has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 70 years today; 1,000 people per day reach the age of 65. In 1950 there were 2.3 million students in institutions of higher learning; by 1970 there will be 7 million—more than a 300-percent increase. We are still lacking 60,000 classrooms in elementary and secondary schools if we want to eliminate overcrowding. Each year 100,000 qualified high school graduates fail to attend college because they lack the necessary funds. Can responsible government simply ignore these social and economic realities? Of course not.

Those persons who denounce the response of our Federal, State, and local governments to these forces remind me of the Kansas farmers who tried in the 1860's to lynch a weatherman because he correctly predicted a tornado.

I suggest that it is time to talk sense to the American people. It is time to ask this fundamental question: What should be the

appropriate roles of the Federal, State, county, and local governments in terms of the social and economic realities of 1964? Can we devise methods and procedures whereby the unique capabilities of each level are used to the fullest? Will each segment of our Federal system be prepared to allocate the human and economic resources necessary to get the job done? These are questions worthy of a free people determined to make democracy work.

In seeking these answers, one fact stands out above all others: the respective levels of government in the American system are partners in a common enterprise. The basis for this truth has been recognized since the dawn of our Republic. Writing in the *Federalist Papers* (No. 46), James Madison noted that "the Federal and State governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people." In our democracy the people are masters at all levels. If this is true, and I believe it is, it makes little sense to drive a wedge between the people and the government at any level.

Government and people are collaborators in the common cause of securing the national interest, not mutual antagonists contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap all of this up in fancy political theory, we have attained a sound and workable *modus operandi* for our Federal system. No one advocates running everything from Washington. Indeed, the major Federal agencies have delved an immense amount of decisionmaking to their State and regional offices which are generally run by local individuals. Most Federal programs are administered on terms highly favorable to the States and localities: the Federal Government provides a substantial portion of the money, demands certain minimal standards, and the rest is left to the wisdom and abilities of local officials.

The development of these methods and procedures has proceeded for many decades, during the ascendancy of both major parties, and is about as bipartisan an operation as the observance of the Fourth of July. Beginning with the Kestenbaum Commission in 1954, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee in 1957, and continuing with the permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by act of Congress in 1959, the question of Federal relationships has received—and is receiving—detailed and searching reexamination. The Senate and House have subcommittees specifically charged with similar responsibilities. Topics ranging from government in metropolitan areas to periodic reassessments of Federal grant-in-aid programs have recently occupied the Senate subcommittee of which I am proud to be a member. All of these bodies are constantly exploring for ways to improve what is already a remarkably effective system of intergovernmental relations.

As President Johnson proclaimed so eloquently in his address at the University of Michigan on the great society: "The solution to these problems does not rest on massive programs in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities."

Let's look at some specific situations. You—as county officials—and I—as a former mayor of Minneapolis—have direct knowledge of the severe limitations on the revenue resources of our local governments.

As many of you know, for many years I have been concerned with the revenue losses accruing to county and municipal governments due to tax-free Federal properties. I have attempted to devise an equitable formula of Federal payments in lieu of taxes.

This effort to devise such a formula should be resumed in the 89th Congress.

Consistent with the requirements of national defense, the Federal government should advocate fiscal and monetary policies and sponsor action programs to increase local tax revenues. The Kennedy-Johnson administration has been doing just this through the tax cut, the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation schedules.

These policies have produced the longest sustained period of economic growth in 110 years, a factor which certainly enhances the revenue resources of governments at all levels in our Federal system.

There is, of course, one problem of special urgency and importance now confronting our country. The issue of civil rights and racial justice challenges the wisdom, abilities, and resources of our Federal, State, and local governments to an extent not equaled by any other issue of this century. And its resolution will only be possible through the unique relationship of partnership and co-operation which characterizes the American system.

In passing the civil rights bill we sought to create a framework of law wherein men of good will and reason could attempt to resolve peacefully the difficult and emotional issues of human rights. Passage of the bill certainly did not solve these problems, but it did establish certain channels and procedures to make their solution more probable.

As county officials, you know that most of this burden rests upon the shoulders of our local governmental officials. Only when communities and States are unable to meet their responsibilities set forth in this act is direct Federal action authorized. This is surely within the best traditions of our American system.

Every responsible public official has the obligation to see that civil peace is maintained across this land. No solutions to these terribly difficult problems are possible in the midst of chaos, violence, and disorder. As I have stated on numerous occasions: Civil wrongs do not make civil rights.

But neither can we afford to believe that by driving angry mobs from the street we are touching the festering sores of unemployment, dilapidated and overcrowded housing, drug addiction, and hopelessness which afflict the ghetto areas of our large urban centers.

We speak of restoring civil peace to our cities, and so we must. But let it be a peace with justice. Let us understand that we can no longer postpone the massive problem of restoring our decaying cities in both a material and spiritual sense. We can no longer afford the luxury of pretending that the problem is unreal, or that it will somehow go away, or that the people trapped in these ghettos rather enjoy their misery.

No responsible public official suggests that the States, counties, and cities are prepared to command the financial and human resources needed in this historic job of urban restoration. Without the active cooperation of the Federal Government, we can never achieve the massive programs of academic and vocational education, job training, youth work, mass transportation, slum eradication, recreational and community development which are essential in saving our cities. This is a job we postpone only at our gravest peril.

There is one area of responsibility which is the special task of the Federal Government; namely, to preserve our national security during these trying years of the cold war.

I am shocked that any candidate for the Presidency could stand on this platform and assert that "we are disarming ourselves and demoralizing our allies." I find it difficult to believe that any candidate for high public office could be so tragically misinformed

about our defense posture to suggest that "our guard is dropping in every sense."

In an attempt to close the information gap which must have contributed to such misleading statements, let me summarize the facts about the administration's record in bolstering our national defense.

The administration has invested a total of \$30 billion more for fiscal years 1962-65 than would have been spent if we continued at the level of fiscal year 1961, the last year of the Eisenhower administration.

What have these additional \$30 billion procured for America's Defense Establishment:

A 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200-percent increase in total megatonnage in our strategic alert forces.

A 60-percent increase in the tactical nuclear force in Western Europe.

A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

A 44-percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

A 75-percent increase in airlift capability.

A 100-percent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

An 800-percent increase in the Department of Defense special forces trained for counter-insurgency.

Today we have more than 1,100 strategic bombers, 800 fully armed and dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers (30 times the number we had in January 1961), 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 nuclear submarines (compared with 32 missiles available in 2 submarines in January 1961), 16 combat-ready Army divisions (compared to 11), 79 tactical fighter squadrons (compared to 55), and a planned Navy fleet of 683 ships (compared to 817 proposed in the budget in fiscal year 1961).

Funds expended for military research and development have increased by 50 percent over the level prevailing during the last 4 years of the Republican administration.

On June 3, 1964, President Johnson summed up the situation quite succinctly with this statement: "In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world."

It was precisely this massive array of balanced military forces which permitted President Johnson to select the appropriate response to the outrageous attack on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Kennedy had demonstrated similar firmness and skill during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. But prior to 1961 this Nation lacked a credible limited war capability and thereby ran the grave risk of being unable to muster the type of military response which punished an aggressor but avoided the risks of all-out nuclear war.

Today this Nation is prepared to meet any type of military threat to our national security. Our allies understand this fact—and so do our enemies.

There is one final area—the war on poverty—which cries out for the full involvement and participation of all segments of the American system. The war on poverty is crucial because it involves the meaning of one cherished word—"America." We hear much these days about the need to encourage individualism and self-reliance—and these qualities are important components of the American character. But let us never forget that America has—from its very beginnings—possessed another national trait which sets us apart from all other peoples: a profound sense of obligation to assist the less fortunate in this country and around the world. This is the essence of the word—

"America"—and the heart of the democratic faith.

The Statue of Liberty standing in New York Harbor symbolized this feeling to the millions of immigrants who came to make a new life on these shores. We now have the opportunity to provide a similar beacon of hope to those 35 million Americans who find themselves aliens in our prosperous and affluent society.

The Congress won the first battle of the war on poverty by passing President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation is founded squarely on the American principles of federalism; all levels of government will have an opportunity to participate in implementing the broad range of programs included in the act. In particular, the community action programs authorized in title II will rely heavily upon the expertise, experience, and skill of our local units of government.

But this legislation is only the beginning. The war on poverty is related intimately to our crusade to build the great society which President Johnson described with these words:

"The great society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice. The great society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community. * * * But most of all, the great society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

This is a vision which merits the total commitment of every American. This is a vision worthy of our faith that man does possess the courage, wisdom, charity, and love to govern himself. And—never forget—the great society will be a product of all levels of our Federal system, laboring together in pursuit of this common goal. Not Federal against State or county against municipality, but one free people joined in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious word—America.

A VERY GRAVE ERROR, OR HIGH-LEVEL IRRESPONSIBILITY?

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, and again on Tuesday, in discussions before this body, I took issue with the President of the United States over his preemption of this country's retaliatory attacks upon Communist Vietnam's PT boat installations in the Gulf of Tonkin. My question was directed at the propriety of the President's action in announcing our retaliatory air attacks 1 hour and 39 minutes before the attack actually started.

By such action, the President is guilty of at least one of two very serious mistakes: First, he made an almost unbelievable technical error in timing; or, second, he and his White House advisers made a very irresponsible, grandiose political play to the American public to gain a prime television audience. I certainly prefer to believe the first. But in either case, it is hard to conceive of a more flippant, irresponsible attitude to-

ward the realities of both war and foreign policy, being shown by persons in such high offices. All America should be concerned over the facts surrounding and hidden in this matter.

Because certain members of this body have questioned my remarks in this matter, even to the point of questioning their authenticity, I take this time to, point by point, substantiate the critical facts. I will also discuss some of the facts as presented by the Pentagon, the White House, the national news services, and the commander of the attacking force involved; and further explore the extremely grave questions that this irresponsible action has raised.

On Tuesday, August 4, following the unprovoked attack by the Communist Vietnamese PT boats upon the U.S. destroyers *Maddox* and *C. Turner Joy*, the President made a television announcement to the American people. The announcement was made at 11:36 p.m., eastern daylight time. In his announcement, the President said:

Repeated actions of violence against the Armed Forces of the United States must be met not only with alert defense, but with positive reply. That reply is being given as I speak to you tonight. Air action is now in execution against gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Vietnam which have been used in these hostile operations.

The events of that historic night were reported in the August 7 edition of the *Washington Post* as follows:

The President went on the air to announce what was happening at 11:36 p.m., e.d.t., Tuesday, and talked for 6 minutes. At 12:02 a.m., Wednesday, McNamara told a news conference that some of the action had already taken place.

Now the facts are that the initial attack, the attack on Quang Khe, the southernmost PT boat base, did not commence until 1:15 a.m., eastern daylight time. The first attack on the northernmost base, Hon Gay, did not take place until 3:45 a.m., eastern daylight time, a full 4 hours and 9 minutes after the President's nationwide television announcement. This time schedule is available through the Secretary of Defense's Pentagon office. The final attack, a restrike on PT bases at Vinh, was at 4:45 a.m., eastern daylight time. This was over 5 hours after the President's television announcement.

The Pentagon news report on the attacks states:

Aircraft attacking Hon Gay experienced moderate to heavy antiaircraft fire during the attack from numerous gun positions. * * * Also, all operating guns aboard all of the patrol craft were fired throughout the attack.

The Communists had the opportunity of over 4 hours notice of the impending attack on Hon Gay.

The Secretary's statement continues:

One (1) A-4 Skyhawk from *Constellation* was shot down by antiaircraft fire during the attack on Hon Gay. The pilot reported he was hit after completing his second attack on the patrol boats in Hon Gay Harbor. He indicated that his plane was uncontrollable and that he was ejecting. Witnessing pilots, who were also being subjected to heavy antiaircraft fire, indicated that they

saw a splash approximately 3 miles from the harbor entrance, which could have been the downed Skyhawk. A 60-second beeper, which is normally activated when a chute opens, was heard over the radio, but there has been no confirmed report of the sighting of a parachute. Lt. (jg.) Everett Alvarez Jr., of San Jose, Calif., previously reported as missing, was the pilot of this plane.

A second aircraft from *Constellation*, an A-1 Skyraider was lost due to antiaircraft fire during the attack on Loc Chao. No parachute was seen and the aircraft was observed to crash into the sea in the vicinity of the Loc Chao Estuary.

The grave question arises, "Would our fliers have been captured or killed if the enemy had not had the opportunity of forewarning?" Yes, the parents, the wives, and the families of the American boys that were killed or captured in those air strikes are going to be asking a grave and penetrating question, "Would we have our own son, or husband or daddy if the planned attack had not been announced an hour and 39 minutes ahead of time?" Americans will ponder this question and others, in the days and weeks ahead.

A GI soldier leaking information to the enemy 1 hour and 39 minutes in advance of a raid would be tried for treason, and he could expect grave and serious consequences.

A study of these time differentials raises many questions. What if bad weather or other conditions had caused a lengthy delay in our attack? Would we then have met Chinese Communist jets head on? The attack was an apparent military success, but the outcome could easily have been much different.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the emotion of the moment, and the apparent success of the venture hide a most grave situation, a situation that seems to me to spell irresponsibility at the highest level. Certainly, the Pentagon's and the White House's awkward attempts to cover up this horrendous blunder only go to prove how extremely irresponsible this unfortunate television announcement really was.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in what appeared to be a most feeble attempt to explain away this deplorable occurrence, issued a list of reasons why the President's television announcement was made at the time it was. He said:

By that time [President's TV program] U.S. naval aircraft had been in the air and on their way to their targets approximately 1 hour. Hanoi, through its radar had then received indications of the attack.

Even the most naive must ask, How did Mr. McNamara know that our planes had been picked up by the North Vietnamese radar? In fact, a statement by Rear Adm. Robert B. Moore, commander of the task force that led the raids, indicates another situation. He said on August 10, in an interview with United Press International, that in his opinion, our planes had not been detected by the enemy radar at the time of the President's prime television performance. In addition, news reports from the scene of action—reported by Newsweek magazine, Monday, August 10—states.

The first attack group, six F-8's from the *Ticonderoga*, flew low under the storm clouds,

hoping to cross up enemy radar. They succeeded.

Secretary McNamara further excused the preemption by saying:

The time remaining before the aircraft arrived over their targets would not permit the North Vietnamese to move their boats to sea or to alert their forces.

But we know from the Secretary of Defense's own reports that the Communists were at their antiaircraft batteries, and surely all must agree that it does not take an hour and 39 minutes to move a modern automated PT boat, even with a crew as small as two or three men, and possibly, some boats had been moved.

Further, Mr. McNamara said,

It was important that the people of our country learn of the manner in which their Government was responding to the attacks on its vessels from their President, rather than from Hanoi, which was expected to announce the attack at any moment.

Here, it is apparent that the Secretary is caught up in his own web of deception, for the North Vietnamese would not, or could not, have announced the attacks for at least an hour and 39 minutes. They had not even been attacked. Most certainly, by the time they could have made the announcements, most Americans would have been in bed and out of view of their television screens. In addition, I cannot believe that any American is so suspicious or desirous of immediate military information that he would jeopardize the lives and safety of American boys fighting to protect the honor of this Nation.

The Secretary of Defense further said:

It was desirable that the North Vietnamese Government and others be told as soon as possible the character of the attack.

In answer to this, I say that a telephone call to the appropriate embassy here in Washington, D.C., at the beginning of our first attack, would have been sufficient to notify Hanoi and Peiping of our limited intentions. There seems little reason to give our Communist enemies a full hour and 39 minutes to prepare defense against, and to shoot down, attacking American planes.

Indeed, by this weak and illogical explanation, the administration seems to be saying to the mothers and wives of American fightingmen, "We are sending your sons and husbands to fight for their country, but we are informing the enemy of our action, so they can have their guns ready to shoot down your boys when they arrive."

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I support action taken to demonstrate our willingness and determination to stand firm and strong against the Communist aggressors. But I cannot understand, condone, or tolerate the irresponsible and unwise action taken by this administration last Tuesday night, in announcing our military intentions a full hour and 39 minutes before the actual attack; nor can I, or will I, tolerate such action which thrust unnecessary dangers upon American fighting men.

I have been calling and working for a positive foreign policy since the beginning of this administration. If we are to prevent escalated war and further hos-

tile provocations, the United States must make it unmistakably clear to the Communist aggressors that we will not back down in the defense of American lives and freedom, and further, we are prepared to use whatever force necessary to maintain this firm foreign policy.

I wish to include news release No. 579-64, from the Office of the Department of Defense with the time schedules discussed. Further, I have all other material and releases, herein referred to, on file in my office:

SUMMARY OF CARRIER AIR STRIKES AGAINST TARGETS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Following are the results, based on latest reports, of the 64 attack strike sorties flown from the U.S. Navy aircraft carriers U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* and U.S.S. *Constellation* to five targets in the Gulf of Tonkin, North Vietnam:

(a) Of the some 30 patrol craft sighted during the attacks, it is estimated that 25 patrol boats were destroyed or damaged.

(b) Ninety percent of petroleum storage facility at Vinh destroyed.

(c) Seven antiaircraft installations in Vinh area destroyed or severely damaged.

The U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* aircraft conducted three of the attacks against North Vietnam patrol boat concentrations and their associated support facilities. One strike was on the boats and facilities located at Quang Khe. The second and third were on additional boats and activities at Phuc Loi and on the petroleum storage area located at nearby Vinh. In addition, there was also a restrike made on the Vinh oil storage area.

The Quang Khe attack, which took place at 1:15 a.m., e.d.t., was accomplished by six F-8 Crusader jets. The strike at Phuc Loi, including the nearby oil storage area at Vinh, was conducted at 1:25 a.m., e.d.t., by six F-8 Crusaders, six A-4 Skyhawks, and four A-1 Skyraider aircraft. Ten A-4 Skyhawks and four F-8 Crusader jets participated in the restrike at Vinh at 4:45 a.m., e.d.t. An estimated eight storage tanks were set ablaze during the first attack on Vinh. From two to four additional tanks were set ablaze during the second raid.

Moderate antiaircraft fire was encountered during the first strike on Vinh and two antiaircraft positions near the oil storage area were attacked and destroyed. During the restrike, a heavier concentration of antiaircraft was encountered and an estimated five guns of a six-gun position were subsequently destroyed.

One Crusader aircraft sustained flak damage during the first attack on Vinh but proceeded safely to Danang, South Vietnam.

Navy aircraft from the carrier *Constellation* began a simultaneous attack on the remaining two targets, Hon Gay and Loc Chao at 3:45 a.m., e.d.t. Ten A-4 Skyhawks, two F-4 Phantoms, and four A-1 Skyriders, participated in the attack on Hon Gay. Five A-4 Skyhawks, three F-4 Phantoms, and four A-1 Skyriders participated in the raid on Loc Chao.

Five patrol craft were sighted during the attack on Hon Gay and it was estimated that all five were destroyed. At Loc Chao, two of the six patrol craft sighted were seriously damaged. Both attacks lasted 25 minutes.

Aircraft attacking Hon Gay experienced moderate to heavy antiaircraft fire during the attack from numerous gun positions on the hill overlooking the harbor. Also, all operating guns aboard all of the patrol craft were fired throughout the attack. The Navy aircraft utilized 2.75-inch rocket and 20-millimeter strafing attacks at both Hon Gay and Loc Chao.

One A-4 Skyhawk from *Constellation* was shot down by antiaircraft fire during the attack on Hon Gay. The pilot reported he was hit after completing his second attack

on the patrol boats in Hon Gay Harbor. He indicated that his plane was uncontrollable and that he was ejecting. Witnessing pilots, who were also being subjected to heavy antiaircraft fire, indicated that they saw a splash approximately 3 miles from the harbor entrance, which could have been the downed Skyhawk. A 60-second "beeper" which is normally activated when a chute opens was heard over the radio, but there has been no confirmed report of the sighting of a parachute. Lt. (jg.) Everett Alvarez, Jr., of San Jose, Calif., previously reported as missing, was the pilot of this plane.

A second aircraft from *Constellation*, an A-1 Skyraider was lost due to antiaircraft fire during the attack on Loc Chao. No parachute was seen and the aircraft was observed to crash into the sea in the vicinity of the Loc Chao Estuary.

A third aircraft from *Constellation*, an A-1 Skyraider was hit by antiaircraft fire in the vicinity of Loc Chao but made a safe return to the ship with minor damage.

THE VIETNAM SITUATION AND THE RADAR CLAIMS

(Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. FOREMAN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the administration of our Government has officially claimed that President Johnson's announcement of U.S. Navy reprisal against North Vietnamese PT boat bases 1 hour and 39 minutes before it began did not provide the North Vietnamese defenders opportunity for a prior warning. The administration officially claims that at the time President Johnson spoke our aircraft already had been picked up on North Vietnamese radar.

At an air speed of 500 miles per hour a jet aircraft travels approximately 825 miles in 1 hour and 39 minutes. If the naval aircraft were that far away, it obviously would have been impossible to detect them and identify them as intending an attack.

Contrarily, if the aircraft were within credible radar range they must have been maneuvering on varying courses during the 1 hour and 39 minute period from which it would have been impossible to identify them as intending an attack.

Both yesterday and the day before yesterday I called on the administration from this forum to explain this obvious defect in its claim. No explanation has been made. Again, I call for an explanation.

BEEF IMPORTS

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

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in its lead editorial this morning, the Washington Post in effect argues that the American cattle industry is expendable in the interests of larger foreign trade policy objectives.

This editorial reflects an attitude all too prevalent in the higher policymaking echelons of the Johnson administration. For as I have pointed out many times in the past, the crux of our Nation's beef import problem lies in our Government's failure to look after the

interests of domestic producers as foreign countries protect their domestic economic interests.

In my speech of August 4, I stated that while our domestic beef industry has been under growing economic assault from foreign producers, notably those of British Commonwealth nations, the Johnson administration has failed to take the firm steps necessary to safeguard our vital national economic interests.

Is it too much to ask—

I said in that speech—

that this administration be willing to protect American cattlemen as other countries protect their own?

In this regard, I cited British imposition of direct tariff increases as a means of enforcing beef import controls. Actually, the British have relied on methods other than direct tariffs to enforce such controls in the interests of market stability in that country. In fact, according to the authoritative study of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Foreign Agricultural Service, an agreement was reached last year, 1963, for at least one beef-producing country completely to curtail shipments into Britain to stabilize cattle prices there.

Obviously, the affected producing country might be expected to face a surplus problem unless the U.S. market provided a substitute for lost British trade. In this way, stabilized British cattle prices could result in further market instability in the United States. By my point here is not to criticize such an agreement, for the British are within their rights to attempt to stabilize their domestic markets. This supports my primary point on August 4 that the British have never hesitated to take whatever domestic economic steps they felt necessary to protect their own economy.

British Commonwealth nations have constructed a veritable maze of trade barriers, both direct tariff and nontariff in nature, to protect their livestock and meat industries. The Foreign Agricultural Service cites instance after instance of Australian and New Zealand prohibitions and inhibitions against meat produced in the United States.

In fact, a combination of such barriers protects over 50 percent of the affected industries of these British Commonwealth areas, although both Australia and New Zealand are among the largest beef exporters in the world.

Once again, I cite these arguments not to dispute the right of other countries to impose such domestic restrictions as they believe are needed to protect their native producers. Rather, all I am asking is that our own U.S. Government exercise equal rights in seeking to stabilize our own beef market here.

In this regard, I find it strange that some spokesmen for Britain and British Commonwealth countries, as well as the Common Market countries, argue against our right to protect our domestic interests in the way they protect their own. For whether the British and other foreign nations curtail U.S. products by means of direct tariff or indirect nontariff barriers, when they object to U.S.

MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

pages 41-42-Missing

1964

other country to exploit our markets with impunity and that any complaint if it runs counter to a Johnson administration policy is not only unwarranted but unjustified. This editorial is certainly unfair to a great industry of the United States and with your permission Mr. Speaker, I wish to have it printed in the Record as it appeared in this morning's edition of the Washington Post:

MEAT IMPORT MISCHIEF

The success of the Kennedy round of tariff cutting negotiations and, indeed, the position of the United States in world trade will be seriously jeopardized if the House follows the Senate in imposing rigid quotas on imported meat products.

A very sharp increase in the output of Choice beef has driven down domestic prices, enveloping the producers in a painful cost-price squeeze and causing many of them to incur losses. The economic distress of the cattlemen is real, but in ascribing their plight to imports and in demanding that Congress impose rigid quotas on virtually all imported meat products, they are the victims of a delusion that could undermine this country's international trade policies.

If this country were importing grain fed, Choice grade beef, one might be able to make a case against imports as the cause of the distress. But virtually all of the imported beef is of the grass fed "manufacturing grade," the low-priced type used for hamburger and luncheon meat products. These products, being in a much lower price class, do not compete directly with Choice grade domestic beef.

If the House goes along with the Senate and the quotas are imposed, the cattlemen will not obtain an ounce of relief in the shape of price increases. Relief will not come before beef production is reduced by culling out cows and bulls and slaughtering more calves for veal. But the undesirable side effects of imposing quotas would be instantly manifested. Consumers in the lowest income brackets, those living in poverty, would be deprived of inexpensive meat, a point made by the League of Women Voters and other consumer groups in opposing the quota bill. And there would be instant retaliation against U.S. exports, especially by Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Mexico, the four allies which are signatories to the recently established voluntary quotas on beef.

Total cash exports of U.S. agricultural products are now running at the rate of \$4.6 billion a year and imports of meat products are running at the rate of \$280 million. The question which the Members of the House of Representatives must coolly consider is whether it is worth jeopardizing \$4.6 billion in agricultural exports in order to stop a \$280-million trickle of meat imports. They have to decide whether it is worth offending our allies and violating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in an effort to assist the cattlemen that is rated no chance of success by either logic or experience.

H.R. 1839, the meat quota, passed as a rider to a House bill, has been sent to a House-Senate conference committee where there is little chance of reaching a compromise that would not conflict with established trade policies of the United States. Hopefully, this bill will be defeated on the floor of the House, and in the event that it passes, killed by a Presidential veto.

LEO SZILARD'S 10 COMMANDMENTS

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

No. 158—10

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1964, I announced from the well of the House the death of Dr. Leo Szilard, and noted the grief of the Nation at the passing of this famed nuclear scientist who, working with Enrico Fermi and others under the grandstands at Stagg Field at the University of Chicago campus, achieved the first atomic chain reaction. He was a great man in every sense and I was enriched by his personal friendship.

Today I received a letter from Mrs. Leo Szilard, 2380 Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, Calif., with a translation of her husband's "10 commandments" which he wrote in German a number of years ago and by which he always abided. Because of their great and moving interest to so many persons in every part of the world, I am extending my remarks to include Mrs. Szilard's letter and the "10 commandments" of her famed husband.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Many years ago, while still in Europe, Leo wrote his own "10 commandments." He wrote them in German and was never satisfied with any attempts at translation; he considered them untranslatable. They were therefore published only in the German edition of his book, "The Voice of the Dolphins," and are known only to a few.

To me they represent his true "last will and testament," and I want to share it with our friends whose kind words and deeds have given me so much comfort after Leo left me; I got him back a little bit reflected, as it were, in the mirror of his friends.

On this occasion, for those of our friends who do not read German, a colleague and friend of Leo at the Salk Institute has kindly prepared the enclosed translation at my request.

Thank you for your wonderful tribute of June 1.

Sincerely,

GERTRUD W. SZILARD.

TEN COMMANDMENTS

1. Recognize the connections of things and the laws of conduct of men, so that you many know what you are doing.
2. Let your acts be directed toward a worthy goal, but do not ask if they will reach it; they are to be models and examples, not means to any end.
3. Speak to all men as you do to yourself, with no concern for the effect you make, so that you do not shut them out from your world; lest in isolation the meaning of life slips out of sight and you lose the belief in the perfection of the creation.
4. Do not destroy what you cannot create.
5. Touch no dish, except that you are hungry.
6. Do not covet what you cannot have.
7. Do not lie without need.
8. Honor children. Listen reverently to their words and speak to them with infinite love.
9. Do your work for 6 years; but in the seventh, go into solitude or among strangers, so that the memory of your friends does not hinder you from being what you have become.
10. Lead your life with a gentle hand and be ready to leave whenever you are called.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President made a difficult but necessary decision to strike back at the North Vietnamese torpedo boats and their bases, following several instances of unprovoked attacks by the North Vietnamese upon certain of our naval units in international waters.

This decision was one which the Congress almost unanimously supported and it was one which met with the approbation of the American people.

Many of us are very disturbed, however, and concerned with the sequence of the timing of the announcement by the President 90 minutes prior to the actual engagement and have found the explanation by the Defense Department entirely unsatisfactory.

Accordingly, I have requested the Armed Services Committee to commence an investigation to determine the extent to which the security of this operation may have been compromised and who was responsible for advising the President in the matter.

My letter to the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON of the Armed Services Committee, reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1964.

The Honorable CARL VINSON,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The developments in southeast Asia, which provoked U.S. action in the Gulf of Tonkin last week found Congress practically unanimous in support of the decision of our Commander in Chief, President Johnson.

Many Members of Congress, however, are very concerned about the apparent serious breach of security attending the event of our retaliatory attack upon the torpedo boat bases in North Vietnam and the nationwide TV announcement made by the President last week—1½ hours before the air strike.

As a former Air Force communications and security officer, having served incidentally in China during World War II, I am personally shocked that the Defense Department did not coordinate its operations and communications and advise the President so this announcement would have been timed to protect the security of the air strike.

An explanation has been given that it was desirable to have the news given first to the American people by the President and not by the Hanoi or other Communist news media. It was also stated that North Vietnamese radar had picked up our planes when the announcement was made. Aircraft with 500-miles-per-hour-plus speeds can travel 750 miles in an hour and one-half. Radar doesn't pick up aircraft at such distances.

The obviously unsatisfactory coverup with such conflicting pronouncements from the Pentagon by Secretary McNamara and others should be immediately investigated by the Armed Services Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. GROVER, JR.,
Member of Congress.

PROTESTING SQUANDERING OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

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

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those in this House who already have protested the squandering of the taxpayers' money, year in and year out, in what euphemistically is referred to as the foreign aid program. In all probability this body will again have the foreign aid bill for consideration, and I feel it is time to delve deeply into the uses to which this money is to be put. Before voting more foreign aid, we should consider how the billions of dollars which have been shoveled into the program over the past years have been applied.

I view the foreign aid appropriations as one of the most blatant examples of wasted tax money. I do not contend that all the money has been wasted; most certainly somewhere in all the billions that have been poured into the coffers of well over 100 nations since the end of World War II some good has been accomplished. I believe it is proper that we should offer aid to certain nations for certain specific needs. But I cannot support this annual giveaway program that rewards dictators and fosters the most horrible forms of oppression; I cannot condone funneling millions of dollars into countries whose political philosophy is inimical to the most elementary ideas of freedom.

Today, because of the haphazard methods which have been used to indiscriminately spread billions of dollars all over the world, we find ourselves helping countries, at the expense of our own economy, on the other side of the Iron Curtain.

Today, we are caught up in our own duplicity, for we find ourselves the bankers of opposing forces throughout the world. Instead of breathing the air of freedom and economic assistance, the program has generated conditions of armed hostility between nations who should be good neighbors. Pakistan and India, for instance, both receive our aid, and they face each other in unconcealed enmity. We help Nasser and the rotten prison state of Haiti, and Sukarno and other Communist-oriented nations have accepted the American dollar while sneering at "Uncle Sap." Our plan appears to have neither identity nor sensible direction, for these are not the only examples of how foreign aid has crippled the cause of freedom.

I cannot help but wonder just how Americans must feel about the deposed leaders of countries who milked the foreign aid cornucopia for millions of dollars, these taxpayer dollars ending up in these leaders' Swiss bank accounts. It must be difficult for Americans living on low incomes to understand why their Government throws more money into wasteful efforts when, all the while, they must worry over the price of bread. But the giveaway continues, and too often the money of our American people is accepted with undisguised disdain, and lines the pockets of officials rather than solving economic problems.

The President is asking for more than \$3 billion for foreign aid. Yet, still in the pipeline, in available funds, is the

staggering sum of more than \$7 billion waiting to be given away. But this is not all. The poor citizen of the United States is paying more than \$3 billion interest a year on the money the Government has borrowed for its foreign aid plans.

The U.S. Government is borrowing money at a rate of interest four times as great as the interest it is asking in return for loans which may not even be repaid. If this is sensible or responsible, then we live in an unusual era.

On top of this, there are so many people involved in the giving away of the taxpayers' money that one wonders if anyone knows what is going on. There are more than 70,000 people being paid to dispense these billions, and there are 28 Federal agencies working at it. Roads have been built that lead to nowhere and Cadillacs have become the symbol of the recipients of foreign aid—while people starve within sight of such opulence and live under the terror of gestapolike police states.

I would suggest that a few changes should be made in our foreign aid program. First, cut the number of personnel involved in the program by at least 50 percent—they will not be missed by our taxpayers.

The second step should be a complete reanalysis of the way foreign aid funds are being used. Let foreign aid be on a project basis, and let the projects—each and every one of them—be approved by the Congress of the United States. With the \$7 billion already in the pipeline, I see no reason to appropriate another \$3 billion at this time. I cannot see any reason for going deeper into debt by paying interest on money which is standing around unused.

I would like to see an end to foreign aid funds being given to dictators and to support economies which are socialistic, communistic, or just plain unrealistic. The American people expect their Government to operate on sound fiscal principles, so why should they not expect their Government to ask the same of other countries whom we assist?

The forces of democratic government are waging a life-and-death war with communism throughout the world—why should not the American people demand that their tax money be used to support only those nations which offer their citizens something more than oppression and varied stages of slavery?

Is it too much to ask that the billions of dollars the American people have given to help others should be used on projects that offer help for those who most need it, rather than end up in the pockets of the greedy and dishonest?

TRADE EXPANSION AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on June 25 of this year, I joined with more than 50 other Members of this House, includ-

ing members of both parties, in introducing a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The proposed legislation would prevent further tariff reductions under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act in all instances in which imports have, in the past 5 years, demonstrated their competitive advantage in the domestic market by capturing a liberal share of it. Under these circumstances, it is clear that the existing tariff is not repressive, nor is it in need of another cut, let alone one of 50 percent. To slash the tariff would be to invite disaster for many of our industries, with no redeeming benefit to offset the damage. The proposed legislation would prevent this.

It has often been said by the free trade doctrinaires that the superior American industrial prowess, based on advanced technology and heavy capital investment, has nothing to fear from import competition. This is an unfortunate hold-over from classroom economic theories that have not been tested in the marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the view of the price-profit system, which was so darkly frowned upon in recent years, was the outgrowth of narrow considerations dreamed up by highly emotional attitudes.

Profits were condemned as the quest of purely selfish interests and not applauded for what they are—the energy fuel of the private enterprise system. Wages were correctly regarded as the principal foundation of purchasing power, but their dependence on a lively business activity was not correctly assessed.

It was because of complete failure to understand the American productive system with its complex interdependence among certain uniquely American creations of the technological, regulatory, merchandising, and economic mechanisms, that the free-trade philosophy was foisted on this system with the intemperate impatience that we still witness. It has had one very distinct effect; namely, the flight of American capital abroad in search of competitive opportunity. These investments are needed at home; and as a result of flight abroad, they are becoming more rare in the domestic market.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for the Record a discussion of this subject in a paper that probes into hitherto neglected corners of economic and psychological factors. It brings together a combination of considerations that have been overlooked but that explain the uniqueness of the American economic system. It throws much needed light on the vulnerability of this system to external forces that threaten the grounds of its confidence in the future.

The paper was presented to the committee on resolutions of the Republican National Convention, July 9, 1964, in San Francisco. Its author is O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the National Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. The analysis is an eyeopener. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.