

Keating Says Public Should Be Upset By Lawmakers' Kin on 'Gravy Train'

Associated Press

Sen. Kenneth E. Keating (R-N. Y.) said last night the public has a right to be upset when Congress members employ relatives simply "to ride the gravy train."

Keating said he favored making public the payrolls of Senators, just as they are made public in the House, since he said "the taxpayers have an absolute right to know what is being done with their money."

Keating spoke in a television program filmed for New York State stations.

The office payrolls of Senators are not public record like congressional office payrolls.

In a survey of New York Senate and congressional of-

fice help last month. Both Keating and Sen. Jacob K. Javits (R-N. Y.), among others declined to reveal the pay scales of persons working under them because of longstanding Senate custom.

Both said no relatives were on their staffs, however.

Keating said he has never employed a relative on his of-

fice staff "and I never shall."

He said the public has a right to complain about relatives on Congressmen's payrolls when the relative does little or no work and is paid far above his ability.

On the other hand, he added, there are instances where relatives of a House member have done very hard and distinguished work.

"The trouble is there is always the danger of supposition that the employed relative is here to ride the gravy train, whether that is the fact or not," he said, adding:

"Nepotism can be just as unfair to the individual honestly employed as it is to the taxpayer in the case of those who aren't working at their jobs."

and the U.S. Forest Service are now jointly developing nearly a million acres of national forest for public hunting and fishing.

Mr. Fearnow continued: "Our expanding population will create many problems, and these will be particularly acute in the matter of outdoor recreation, where remoteness, scenic beauty, and unspoiled natural surroundings are important considerations. The U.S. Forest Service approaches this problem on the basis of multiple-use management. Timber production, watershed protection, game and fish production, and recreational use are conducted on the same area through careful long-range planning and coordination. As pressure on the land increases, we must turn more and more to this type of management if we are to meet expanding public needs.

"The cooperation and assistance of private landowners are essential if we are to meet this country's growing needs for forest products and services. Public meetings were recently held in Boston, Philadelphia, and Charlottesville to solicit recommendations from small woodland owners seeking means for meeting goals calculated for 1975 and 2000. We must gear up to meet these goals without delay. Much of Occapon Valley and the surrounding area is well suited to timber production under good multiple-use management. Hardy County has witnessed the mounting pressure of recreational use on adjacent national forest lands during the past decade. This can be taken as an indication of what is to come."

An important step toward facing recreation needs on a countrywide basis was taken when the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission was set up by the last session of Congress. This Commission is directed to make a nationwide inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation resources—to determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor resources—required by the year 1975 and 2000. This congressional action follows on the heels of programs already underway, including the well-known Forest Service program, Operation Outdoors. At last, outdoor recreation needs are receiving serious attention.

"The importance of interested and informed citizen groups in shaping plans for the future cannot be overestimated," Fearnow said. "Under our democracy, it is difficult to advance faster than public opinion and support. We have made great strides in protecting our forests from fire because we have had public support. The next few years will see other events of far-reaching importance. Our dynamic population growth and increasing amounts of leisure time, as the workweek grows shorter, hold tremendous possibilities.

"Forty-one thousand miles of new super-highways are to be built, making it easier than ever for city dwellers to reach rural areas. Additional roads will be needed in forest areas as management is intensified. But we must remember that people seeking relaxation and enjoyment of scenic, historic, and recreational wonders don't want to vacation where the noise and fumes of heavy traffic are oppressive. Streamside highways, with disturbed soil eroding into streams, can seriously damage fish habitat. Sixty million cubic feet of silt is being carried past Washington, D.C., by the Potomac River each year. Much of it comes from West Virginia. Research is under way by the Forest Service to determine means by which soil losses from forest roads can be held to a minimum. The eventual solution will surely involve careful advance planning. An informed and active citizenry is essential to obtaining and carrying through this type of coordination."

Fearnow, who supervises the rural development program for the eastern region of

the U.S. Forest Service, pointed out to this audience that areas which protect their scenic and recreational resources often find that they have a strong selling point for attracting desirable industries. Burned-over forests and polluted streams offer very little inducement for the investment of new capital. Industrial leaders have learned that it is far easier to attract and hold skilled labor and professional management people at plants located in attractive surroundings where wholesome outdoor recreation is available.

Offering as a slogan "Conserve what we have while we build for the future," Mr. Fearnow stressed the importance of conservation as a part of our national philosophy. He quoted the words generally attributed to the late Clifford Pinchot, first chief of the U.S. Forest Service: "A nation that loses its liberty may regain it, a nation divided may be reunited, but a nation deprived of its natural resources is doomed to a future of poverty and degradation."

Radio Liberation—Our Strong Voice of Truth and Freedom in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 31, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the great challenges facing the free world today is to assure the people behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and to do all possible to see that they receive all the news and truth we can get to them.

An outstanding organization which is doing fine work in this field is the American Committee for Liberation. By means of regular, effective broadcasts beamed to the people of the Soviet Union, the committee's Radio Liberation strives to get news and facts behind the Iron Curtain. Radio Liberation attempts to let the people of the Soviet Union make up their own minds—but with the other side of the story known to them, as well as the Kremlin line.

The effectiveness of Radio Liberation's efforts is attested to by the hysterical jamming tactics engaged in by the Russians, as well as the covert messages of response and encouragement which have been smuggled out through the Iron Curtain.

It has been my pleasure and privilege to work with the American Committee for Liberation on several occasions. They deserve the commendation of all of us for the effective manner in which they are carrying out their important work.

A recent article in the Scholastic Teacher edition of World West outlined well Radio Liberation's tactics and mission. I ask unanimous consent to have this piece printed in the Appendix of the Record.

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

[From Scholastic Teacher edition of World West, Jan. 12, 1959.]

MANAGES OF FREEDOM—FROM THE FREE WORLD, FOR 24 HOURS A DAY, RADIO LIBERATION BROADCASTS A "NEWSWAVE OF THE AIR" TO LISTENERS IN THE SOVIET UNION.
(By Oliver Bell)

How can the people of the Soviet Union get news that is not heavily censored with Communist propaganda? One organization that aims at this goal is Radio Liberation. For 24 hours a day it broadcasts to the Soviet Union from this side of the Iron Curtain.

Among Radio Liberation's main efforts is a drive to get the people of the Soviet Union to form their own opinions based on accurate information. It is felt at Radio Liberation that when enough people in the Soviet Union do so, the iron dictatorship of the Communists will be forced to yield increasingly to popular demands—demands for a government more responsible to the people themselves and for a system of political liberty.

Today there is only one official "truth" in the hand of the Soviets. That is the version of events put out by the Soviet dictatorship. But a large number of the Soviet people know they are being subjected to a flood of propaganda, and, consequently, there is a real hunger for other sources of information. Radio Liberation gives its listeners news. For example, it reports what Western proposals for disarmament are. Listeners can compare what Radio Liberation says with what the Soviet Government tells them, and draw their own conclusions.

"It goes further than that," an official at Radio Liberation explained. "Reviews of recent books that were best sellers in the United States, Britain, and France; talks on Danish cooperatives, or on poultry farming in the United States—we broadcast on subjects like these. Why? Because our listeners are isolated—their minds are isolated. We open the doors of the minds of our audience to what people in the West are thinking."

"You, in the United States, can hardly imagine the hunger among intelligent Soviet citizens for cultural talks. When they hear them they feel that they are—in their minds—citizens of the world. For a few minutes they have broken out of the closed Soviet system. Besides, Radio Liberation builds up its reputation for truthfulness by reporting soberly on cultural subjects."

To return to the Danish cooperatives, Radio Liberation tells its listeners how the Danish farmers manage to live well with the help of their cooperatives. This strikes deep in the Soviet Union. For the Soviets have regimented their farmers, while the Danes have not. Furthermore, the Soviets have never been able to produce an abundance of food, while the Danes have. Radio Liberation just gives facts and lets its Soviet listeners judge for themselves.

Again, Radio Liberation gives a talk on how chickens are raised in the United States. It gives home how farmers and consumers benefit from private ownership of farms. But Radio Liberation does not directly compare inefficient Soviet farming with efficient U.S. farming. It leaves that to whoever is listening.

Radio Liberation's work is necessarily a slow process of education. But it is sure that the words that it sends sailing through the air are having a mounting effect.

The American Committee for Liberation to the head office of Radio Liberation. Heading the committee is Howard H. Sargent, its president. He is a former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State. One of the committee's trustees is Dr. John W. Stuchlik, who presides and chairman of the editorial board of Scholastic magazine, and formerly U.S. Commissioner of Education (1954-55).

To run Radio Liberation is expensive. The millions of dollars a year that it costs come from private contributions—overwhelmingly from the United States. In this it differs from other organizations broadcasting to the Soviet Union, such as the Voice of America. The Voice is a branch of the U.S. Government, and its policy is set by the U.S. Government.

Furthermore, Radio Liberation is not the same as Radio Free Europe. This last organization is also financed by private contributions, but it broadcasts to the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe—Poland, Czechoslovakia, and others.

OF THE AIR

Nearly 6 years ago, on March 2, 1949, Radio Liberation went on the air. A staff had been assembled that included a large number of former Soviet citizens. These defectors as they are called, have all escaped from the Soviet Union. When they broadcast to the Soviet people, the defectors know what the interests of their audience are. They are not foreigners talking to the Soviet people, they are fellow countrymen.

In Russian and 17 other languages spoken in the Soviet Union, Radio Liberation broadcasts its messages. To the people of the Ukraine, it speaks in Ukrainian; to the Turkic peoples in their own tongues. Programs are specially tailored to these different audiences. For instance, the head of the Turkestan broadcasts is Vell Zunnun. Formerly he edited a newspaper for the people of Turkestan. But it was a newspaper controlled by the Soviet Government. During World War II, Zunnun was captured by the Germans. Having suffered under the Soviet system, he refused to return home after the war. Now, employed by Radio Liberation, Vell Zunnun is—in the opinion of the Kremlin—a capitalist scoundrel.

For the rulers of the Soviet Union attack Radio Liberation ferociously. "It is an organ," said the Moscow newspaper, *Izvestia*, "for spreading vile falsifications and black slanders fabricated by the American intelligence." Other attacks on Radio Liberation frequently appear. Radio Liberation feels that this proves that it is accomplishing its purpose.

The Soviet rulers make desperate efforts to prevent Radio Liberation from being heard. Ten minutes after it went on the air, the Soviets began to jam it. Jamming is the broadcasting of radio signals on the same wave length as another station to drown out that station. To avoid jamming, Radio Liberation switches from one wave length to another—and manages to get through to its listeners.

LETTERS FROM

This is known through many reports brought out by visitors to the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Radio Liberation regularly asks listeners to write to innocent sounding addresses—continually altered—in the free world. Letters arrive. Some are written in a sort of code. "Your relatives will be very grateful that you are young and strong enough to do intensive work for the betterment of others," one postcard said. It meant, "I approve of Radio Liberation broadcasts. Keep them up." Fear of the consequences of writing what they think makes Soviet citizens use such a roundabout way of expressing themselves. Some brave writers speak out directly. One wrote that the Communists "are as scared of your words as the devil is scared of incense. Many people listen to you but they are afraid to write letters."

To do the job of broadcasting constantly interesting material to the Soviet Union, Radio Liberation has a large staff in Munich, West Germany. They must keep informed on events in the Soviet Union. Therefore maintain listen to 25 Soviet radio stations. Files of Soviet newspapers, magazines, and

books are studied. Persons who have escaped from the Soviet Union are interviewed. This makes it possible for Radio Liberation to analyze events in the Soviet Union for its listeners. Again and again, Radio Liberation details how the rulers of the Soviet Union oppress the Soviet people.

Extracts from books that carry a message of freedom, and which are forbidden in the Soviet Union, are put on the air. Discussion of these books is also broadcast. "Dr. Zhivago," now a best seller in the United States, was banned in the Soviet Union. This Nobel Prize-winning novel by a Soviet author, Boris Pasternak, has recently been featured prominently by Radio Liberation.

Messages from outstanding figures in the free world are also sent over Radio Liberation. And the anniversary of the famous uprising in one of the Soviet Union's slave-labor camps—the Vorkuta uprising in 1968—is marked each year by a special program.

Some broadcasts originate in Radio Liberation's studios in New York, some in Munich. Transmitters are located in West Germany and Taiwan (Formosa). Recordings are sent to Taiwan and thus Radio Liberation pours its words into the Soviet Union from the West and from the East.

If you were in the Soviet Union today, you could listen to these words of hope:

"This is Radio Liberation, the voice of your fellow countrymen abroad. We are for freedom from arbitrary rule, for a government of freely elected representatives of the people, and for peace throughout the world."

Widespread Caribbean War Is Seen up to Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Wednesday, March 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article by Mr. Frank H. Bartholomew, president of United Press International, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Tuesday, March 10, 1959:

WIDESPREAD CARIBBEAN WAR IS SEEN UP TO CASTRO

(By Frank H. Bartholomew)

SAN JUAN, P.R., March 9.—The Caribbean area today presents all three Americas—North, South, and Central—with another Balkans on their doorstep that could erupt in warfare.

Tensions appear to be mounting steadily in the potentially explosive military-political situations involving the island republic. If the first gun is fired in invasion attempts against the probably initial targets of the Dominican Republic or Haiti, it seems equally probable a whole series of wars may start in chain reaction around the Spanish Main.

The decision appears to rest on the dramatic person of Fidel Castro, who ousted dictator Fulgencio Batista from Cuba and who is credited with supporting revolutions in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Nicaragua in the Caribbean and Paraguay in South America. His argument is that their Presidents are as dictatorial as Batista was.

Outraged his zeal, revolutionaries from these target nations have been holding meet-

ings in Cuba, many of them public and well advertised, to formulate their own plans.

A typical incident was observed by this correspondent in a crowded Rancho Luna suburban restaurant outside Havana. Multicolored handbills distributed at the tables called for "Liberation of Santo Domingo (the Dominican Republic)" and concluded "down with the tyranny of Trujillo."

To Castro and his supporters, Dominican strongman Gen. Rafael Trujillo is the prime symbol of sustaining dictatorship.

An excited Dominican leaped on a table, called for silence and addressed himself to the Cubans present:

"As you fought in the jungles of Oriente (Provincia), so will we soon fight in the forests of the Dominican Republic."

A public address system in the restaurant played the Cuban revolutionary song, "Day of Freedom," ending in a simulated burst of machinegun fire.

SHOULD BRING FOR ACTION

Some of these revolutionary groups in Cuba appear ready for immediate action.

Haiti, under President Francois Duvalier, seems to be regarded as the ripest target at the moment with an invasion unit under former Haitian Senator Louis de Jole announcing itself ready to take off this month.

The overthrow of Duvalier in Port au Prince would not only place a man friend to Castro in control but would give the Cuban leader an operating base against Trujillo—his primary target—since Haiti and the Dominican Republic share the same island.

Responding to the mounting pressure, Trujillo has announced formation of an anti-Communist legion of 25,000 men armed with new machineguns to supplement his regular army.

PLANS LAID IN CUBA

The probability at the moment is that Castro himself would not directly participate in any military move against the target nations. But he is believed to have given so much direct encouragement and the promise of arms to revolutionaries from these lands that they may launch offensives on their own, unless he orders them to stop. But, so far, offensive plans continue to be made in Cuba, while defense measures are taken in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua and Paraguay.

There seems a good chance that the warlike talk in all the countries visited by this correspondent may subside, exhausted by its very violence.

Despite all threats, no trigger has been pulled yet. And each day without gunfire is one more day of stability.

At the same time, it is evident that the emotional heat of exiles is so high and arms so plentiful that an international military adventure may start anywhere in the Caribbean unless the man of the hour in Cuba takes specific steps to halt it.

How To Write Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. ELIZABETH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 9, 1959

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Record which appear Veterans of D.C. in the

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3557

As I understand, the House Ways and Means Committee met in executive session this morning to discuss the possibility of extending the temporary unemployment compensation program.

I am informed, too, that hearings are scheduled to begin on April 7 on possible extension of the temporary unemployment program in mid-1958.

The task, now, is to get the necessary action—not only by the States and, as necessary, by the Federal Government—but also by local communities in, first, helping to meet the needs of the jobless while out of work, and, second, to create employment to brighten their future.

A factor of major concern, too, is that, while there has been substantial economic recovery, the rate of reemployment has not kept pace.

This situation deserves serious consideration by Congress, the Department of Labor, the States, industry, labor, as well as the general public.

AWARD TO REPRESENTATIVE CARL ELLIOTT, OF ALABAMA, BY PARENTS' MAGAZINE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the January 1959 issue of Parents' magazine announced an award to three persons for outstanding service to children.

Representative CARL ELLIOTT, who represents the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, has been named a winner of Parents' magazine's annual medal award "for outstanding service to children." Other winners, announced today, are Dr. Harvey E. White, physics professor who conducts "Continental Classroom," a network educational television program, and Arthur C. Ringland, father of CARE, the postwar foreign relief program.

As chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, Representative Elliott led the fight last August for the passage of the National Defense Education Act, the first major breakthrough in Federal aid to education in 40 years. It authorizes student loans, teaching fellowships, funds for science equipment and foreign language teaching, vocational education, and testing-counseling services.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks the brief announcement regarding the award to Representative ELLIOTT.

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

FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO CHILDREN PARENTS' MAGAZINE IS PROUD TO HONOR REPRESENTATIVE CARL ELLIOTT, DEMOCRAT OF ALABAMA

A staunch champion of Federal aid to education, this distinguished legislator from Alabama has worked assiduously over the years to help America's school children. Passage last August of the National Defense Education Act—most important aid-to-education measure enacted by Congress in 40 years—was a singular achievement for Mr. ELLIOTT. As chairman of the House Education Subcommittee, he took the lead in piloting the bill through rough legislative seas. Today and in the future, this 46-year-old lawyer and father of four can be counted on to strive for what he believes—better education for all United States youngsters.

BENEFITS FOR CORPORATIONS BUT NOT FOR SELF-EMPLOYED RESULT IN UNFAIRNESS AND INEQUITY.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on February 24, 1959, the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House of Representatives H.R. 10, a bill to permit self-employed persons, such as doctors, lawyers, dentists, accountants, veterinarians, and others, to take a current deduction for a limited amount of investment in certain types of retirement annuity or a specific type of retirement trust.

In explaining the need for the bill, the Committee stated:

This bill is intended to achieve greater equality of tax treatment between self-employed individuals and employees. Under present law the employees of a business can achieve this postponement of tax on retirement income savings if the employer pays into a qualified pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan what he might otherwise have paid directly to the employees. These amounts can be placed in a tax-exempt pension trust or they can be paid as premiums on an annuity policy with a life insurance company. In either case the business firm gets immediate deductions for amounts contributed to the plan and the employee is not taxable until he draws down his benefits under the plan. An employee is permitted to defer tax in this manner even though he may have a nonforfeitable right to the employer contribution under the plan.

This tax deferral for an employee's interest in a pension, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plan has two important advantages. In the first place, it permits the employee to have a larger initial investment in retirement savings upon which more investment earnings may accumulate. In addition, most employees will be in lower tax brackets after retirement than they are during their productive years. The tax deferral under a qualified plan permits some income from the years in which an employee is likely to be subject to higher surtax rates to be taxed in the retirement years when he may be subject to much lower rates or even may have unused personal exemptions.

I have previously indicated my support of the principle contained in H.R. 10. I wish to reiterate that endorsement today.

Within the past few days I was surprised and disappointed to note, through the press, that the Republican leadership and President Eisenhower oppose this proposal because they claim it would cost the Treasury \$365 million annually in revenue. The administration also expressed concern over possible extension of the program.

If this is the position of the administration with regard to this proposal, then it has a clear duty to eliminate the tax privilege now enjoyed by corporations in setting aside retirement funds for their executives and other employees. Employer contributions to pension plans in 1957 amounted to nearly \$4 billion. This means that these business firms realized an estimated \$1.9 billion in tax benefits as the result of deductions for such contributions, while corporate employees gained materially from deferred taxation. Yet no such opportunity exists for the self-employed. This is unfair and discriminatory.

The administration is firmly opposed to tax-deferment on retirement funds

for doctors, writers, dentists, tutors, and other self-employed individuals. Why does the administration permit corporations to use tax-exempt moneys for retirement benefits for corporation officials? The principle of share-and-share-alike is essential to a democratic society, particularly in the collecting of revenues for the operation of government. This principle is violated when an accountant, lawyer, author, or teacher cannot defer taxes on modest sums set aside for old age, but the president or manager of a motor or tobacco company can enjoy very substantial retirement benefits which his corporation has been able to list as a normal business expense under the revenue laws of the United States.

Mr. President, I urge the administration, if it wishes to persist in its opposition to proposals such as H.R. 10, to follow the course of equity and thus eliminate the unfair advantage now enjoyed by corporations and their executives.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I compliment the Senator from Oregon upon his remarks relating to H.R. 10, because the argument he has presented is absolutely logical and should be persuasive. If special tax consideration can be given to the large income group at the corporate level, there is no reason in the world why self-employed persons should not receive the same benefits. Like the junior Senator from Oregon, I support the objectives of H.R. 10, and I look forward to the opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am pleased that his great influence and prestige in this body will be used to try to gain this fiscal equity. It seems to me that, if the administration is to say that there shall not be these tax-exempt retirement benefits for self-employed persons, then certainly the same principle should be applied to individuals who are employed by the great industrial corporations. The principle should be share-and-share alike when it comes to tax-free retirement benefits. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota for his support and encouragement.

THE BERLIN TIME BOMB

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, not since Pearl Harbor has our country been in such grave peril as it is in today. Not since I have been in Washington have I spoken in the Senate on so grave a subject. Khrushchev and his Communist coconspirators for world dominion have set a time bomb for the West. It is up to us either to defuse the bomb or to be destroyed by it. His time bomb is his ultimatum that the West get out of West Berlin by May 37. In open violation of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreement, Khrushchev has ordered the Allies out of West Berlin. The soldiers of the United States, of England, and of France, are ordered to pack up their baggage and surrender Free West Berlin to the Communist dictators. We of the West, the United States, England, and France owe a duty to freedom. We are in Berlin by

solemn international agreement. We owe a duty to keep the torch of liberty lit in West Berlin. If we let the Iron Curtain of communism engulf West Berlin, we will have seen a second Munich in our time; a second Munich far more terrible and more disastrous in its results than the first.

What is happening in West Berlin? Since the Iron Curtain of communism lowered over East Germany, more than 3 million people have escaped from East Germany and to the freedom of West Germany and to the West generally. One quarter of a million people per year flee Communist domination in East Germany and come to the West; most of them come through West Berlin. About 4,500 a week escape from East Germany to the West. Khrushchev has said that he is interested in the people in Berlin, and that, he says, is why we ought to get out. Yes, Khrushchev is interested in the people in Berlin because he does not want these living witnesses, a quarter of a million of them a year, to come to the West, living witnesses, as they are, of the terror and failure of communism. Four thousand of them a week are coming West to tell us of the terror and hardship and cruelty of life back of that Iron Curtain.

Yes, Khrushchev is interested in the people of West Berlin, because he does not want these living witnesses—a quarter of a million of them a year—pouring out to West Germany, mainly through West Berlin.

At this time, as in all periods of grave crisis, all of us stand firmly with President Eisenhower. If the Soviet leaders think they will find us divided in our fight against communism—divided by political parties or divided by political ideologies or divided on any other ground—they have made what will prove to be their greatest mistake, and perhaps their fatal mistake. Personally, I think we ought to follow the diplomatic policy of another great President, Theodore Roosevelt, who said, in another international situation of tension, "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." When the President defies the Russians, then cuts our military forces, he speaks loudly but carries a little stick.

It is my earnest hope that, as an emergency measure, we shall immediately move to an advanced position of military readiness, and that we shall build up our military preparedness and efficiency. We cannot negotiate from strength if the President continues to insist on military weakness. All of these administration moves to further reduce our military forces should be, at least temporarily, abandoned. We can cut back the Army, and we can balance the budget; but while doing all that, we might lose our liberty.

On the contrary, as a nation, we should work 24 hours a day to build missiles of diplomacy and to prepare for war, as a power for peace. But, Mr. President, we are not building missiles of diplomacy when we do not build any missiles at all.

As the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, we cannot fail here to hold high the torch of freedom, to light the way for freedom around the world.

We are the only Nation that has the strength to save West Berlin; and the free world is looking and watching to see whether we will have the resolution and the courage to do so. We will not fail to be ready, and to fight, if forced to, for the heritage for which our forefathers fought and gave their last full measure of devotion.

Mr. President, in this hour of peril, it is discouraging to hear the President recommend budget cuts that amount to saying: Let us weaken our military defenses.

Mr. President, one of the finest and most decisive editorials I have read on this subject was published this morning in the Washington Post. The editorial is entitled "Mr. Eisenhower's Defense." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1953]

Mr. Eisenhower's Defense

The impetuous statement by President Eisenhower yesterday on defense spending leaves no doubt as to the clarity and depth of his feeling. Whoever one may think of his arguments, the Chief Executive certainly has been exhibiting vigor in his recent and more regular news conferences. Even if there were a surplus in the Treasury, he said, he would not put more money into the Armed Forces although he might spend more on aid to our allies. He regards the criticism of his defense policy as something burdensome upon his office, and he gladly will write in Congress and elsewhere to calm down.

In the present situation respecting Berlin, obviously, it is imperative to present a united front. The President, as Commander in Chief, has made plain his determination to resist any intimidation by the Soviet Union. Most of the proposals in Congress would not materially improve the American military posture in the near future in any event. It is important that Mr. Khrushchev not be misled by the confusion that thinking that there is any ambiguity in the country's support of the President over the Berlin issue.

Beyond that consideration, let us put aside the immediate circumstances of the President's remarks yesterday and analyze his case from a longer range standpoint. Mr. Eisenhower wants to avoid both provocation and undue excitement. Evidently he views the Soviet threat over Berlin as one of a series of Communist pushes similar to the Chinese threat over Quemoy, and he believes that a firm stand and steady nerves will cause the Soviet leaders to back away. There is much to be said for this view on the basis of past experience.

Similarly, the President believes that defense should be a planned and controlled program that does not vault up and down with the passions of the moment. This is a sound theme often stressed by Gen. George C. Marshall. Mr. Eisenhower also makes a telling point in challenging those who want more defense spending to advocate a tax increase (although the exact need for an increase at this time is not clear, and although some believe in a strengthened defense, including this newspaper, have already found the tax issue.)

Further, the President rightly concludes that there can be no limited war directly between the United States and the Soviet Union. It would be folly, he states, for this country to become involved in a ground war with the 170 Soviet divisions, although he does not believe that a similar war over Berlin would free anything.

If these are the principal arguments of the President apart from concern over a balanced budget—as which he still shows extraordinary devotion even though the balance of his own budget is in many ways phony—what are the arguments on the side of increased defense? In this newspaper's opinion they fall into two categories, protection against actual danger, and improvement in the American negotiating position.

First, there is the possibility of miscalculation by the Soviet Union. Surely it is in the interest of this country, even with its capability for all-out nuclear war, to be able to negotiate with something less if the situation warrants. It is quite true that in present circumstances the Western Allies could not match the Soviet divisions, and they would be foolish to try. But situations are conceivable in which it might be to the interest of both sides to keep a ground clash limited. The casualties from all-out nuclear war, in the unhappy event that one should develop, surely would surpass any imaginable casualties in limited war, on the ground or otherwise.

Even if a direct clash with the Soviet Union is avoided, there is a strong case for adequate limited war forces to cope with clashes on the periphery. If Mr. Khrushchev were led to believe that this country would have only an all-out response, he might be tempted to nibble—or to induce others to nibble—in the thought that the President would not make the terrifying decision to unleash nuclear war that probably would result in devastation of this country too.

Second, there are the perils of the missile gap myth. If the Soviet leaders were to think that the United States were far behind in the race, that the manned bombers were being outstepped by improved air defenses and that its missiles were cumbersome and in soft road lanes; they might at some point take the gamble to strike. Whether the gamble would be a frightful mistake, and whether we would be able to reduce the Soviet Union to ashes in retaliation, would not matter very much once the fearful step were taken.

Even more important, in this newspaper's opinion, are the psychological considerations. Few persons seriously think that the Soviet Union is about to join war on the United States or Western Europe tomorrow morning, but a great many persons, including responsible men of both parties in Congress, are concerned because they see their country slipping into a second-best position.

Secretary McNamara has acknowledged that there will be a missile gap and that it is administration policy to accept that situation. Both he and the President have indicated a low priority for limited war preparedness. Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated their reservations about the new budget—and, incidentally, it is to be hoped that they will not be disadvantaged because they have stated their honest views in response to questioning from Congress. They may not be right, but Congress is entitled to know their thinking.

The purpose of a defense program, of course, is to avoid war. A deterrent that did not deter an enemy from starting a war would be useless; all the retaliation we might be able to unleash would not compensate for the initial blunder. The fundamental American objective, apart from preventing attack, is to make possible realistic negotiations toward some reduction of war dangers. Mr. Eisenhower himself has been eloquent in voicing such a wish.

But the experience with the Soviet split and international incidents should have convinced us by now that the Soviet leaders are altogether unlikely to be reasonable if they think they can overthrow the United States and its allies. That is the real problem of the missile gap and the lack of limited war preparedness and such ancillary issues as the reduction in military man-

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

3559

power—not that they make attack imminent, but that they disarm the United States psychologically and render the American negotiating position far more difficult on a host of issues far beyond Berlin. When the administration willingly accepts a second-best position for the United States, it is time to take notice.

The basic question boils down to whether the country is willing to pay an insurance premium, which in this instance would amount at least to an additional \$2 billion in fiscal 1960. Congress cannot compel the President to spend more money for defense, but it can seek to persuade the President with an emphatic statement of its belief in the need for an expanded and more realistic missile program along with more attention to limited war requirements. If congressional leaders will combine a reasoned program embodying the conviction of many Members with proposals for additional taxes if necessary to finance such a program, can anyone doubt that the American people will support it?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRUX in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In his presentation, the Senator from Texas made the statement that he regretted to hear the President say that we should weaken our defenses. I have never heard any such statement by the President. There may be a difference of viewpoint between various military officials, and perhaps between the Senator from Texas and myself, over the particular allocations of funds for the defense of our country. But certainly the President of the United States has never made such a statement.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I did not quote the President as saying that we should weaken our defenses. I said the effect of the President's recommendation of reduced military expenditures would have the effect of saying that we would weaken the defenses of the United States, and that we should, instead, build them up at this time.

This is no time to weaken our defenses. Certainly we cannot effectively negotiate with the Russians over West Berlin at the same time that we are weakening our military defenses.

When we fired the very small satellite past the moon, the Army's representatives said, "At last we have gotten back in the same league with the Russians, as regards missiles." There was no statement that we had caught up with them.

The administration seems to take the attitude, as regards missiles, that we shall permanently take second place to the Russians, for the administration continues to talk about how many years it will take us to catch up. I think we should have a "crash" program, regardless of what it may cost, so that we will catch up.

The fine editorial published today in the Washington Post states it might cost \$2 billion a year. Suppose it does. In the case of a nation with a gross national product of approximately \$450 billion a year, suppose it were to cost \$5 billion or \$10 billion a year, even

that much would be a cheap price to pay for the liberty of our Nation. Even if it cost \$50 billion, that would be only one-ninth of our gross national product.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I do not know of one Senator who would not place the safety of the country above budget balancing or any other consideration, nor would the President of the United States. He has recommended expenditures less than the expenditures of the preceding year. The question is how far we are to proceed with this, that, or the other element of our national defense. That is a subject upon which reasonable men may differ. But certainly to charge, even by implication, that the President of the United States is seeking to weaken our national defense is entirely unjustified, in my opinion.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When it is known that the Russians have 175 ground divisions ready for combat, and equipped with the most modern tanks and other implements of war; and when we have recommendations, from the Executive, to cut back the meager hundreds of thousands of our ground forces, how can it be said that that will not weaken the defenses of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Texas feel that if we had an additional 25,000 or 30,000 men in the Army or in the Marine Corps, that would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Certainly. I think that if we weaken one point on the perimeter of our defense—whether it be the Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy, or the Air Force—if only one segment is weakened, the whole will be weakened. In my opinion, our armed forces are now down to the absolute minimum.

We must remember that sudden peril calls for an enlargement of our military forces. In such a case, we must have some men in uniform, and trained, in order to be able to train the new recruits. But in view of the present rapid turnover—with our young men coming into the services for two years, and then leaving—the forces we now have are scarcely large enough for the necessary training groups, the irreplaceable cadre that is required to train the young men who are coming into our armed services.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield again to the Senator from New York?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator from Texas explain how he would expect to deploy any additional forces of American soldiers in Berlin—in an area where we do not have control of the perimeter—and how the addition of a certain num-

ber of men to our ground troops at this time would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin? I am not talking about the overall effect of additional ground forces. But the statements that additional troops would have anything to do with the defense of Berlin is, in my judgment, entirely beside the point.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Of course, not being a military tactician, I have not attempted to say just how those men would be used in the perimeter of Berlin. Naturally, that is a function of the generals. But the military have testified that they need these forces; and I think the rationale of history shows beyond peradventure of doubt that we need all the troops we now have; in fact, if anything, we need more.

In the case of missiles, we are certainly behind; and certainly we need to expand our missile development and research and other missile work all along the line; and we need additional funds to modernize the weapons of our ground forces and the weapons of all our other forces.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As to the number of men we need for our military defense, I am not talking about that subject at all. I am addressing myself to the remarks of the Senator from Texas, which are quite similar to other remarks we hear so often these days—namely, that we are weakening the defense of Berlin by not bringing additional ground forces into the Army and the Marine Corps. In my judgment that has nothing whatever to do with the defense of Berlin and there would be no way to deploy large numbers of additional forces in the Berlin area, nor would the men be prepared to be deployed there, under the existing state of affairs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York seems to argue that the forces we now have in Berlin and West Germany are considered as separate from the rest of the defenses of the United States. We have men deployed in 13 nations; and all of them are members of the Armed Forces of the United States. In Korea, the situation has reached the point where we have to take into our forces—the two infantry divisions we have there—a large percentage of Koreans, simply because we do not have enough American soldiers there to fill out those two divisions, which are there for the preservation of democracy in South Korea.

Now to pull that down, to weaken in any respect the meager, inadequate forces we have, will certainly weaken the defense of this country. What are we doing to mobilize planes against the probability that we should have to again supply West Berlin by airlift, as we did before? We are doing nothing about it. We are talking about standing firm in West Berlin, and yet we are getting recommendations from the executive branch to further reduce our conventional Armed Forces. It is a course of weakness, not of strength.