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Mike's comments on President Kennedy's speech on Berlin of 7/25/61
Having made that general statement, I wish to say to my friend that we need to face up to the problem of trade. We need to recognize, I think, that we need to make some moves to develop our trade policies. The British have recently been less successful in trade relations. It would be highly desirable if we were to take some steps to strengthen our trade policies.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute, to complete my thoughts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. In saying what I have said about the British, I did not, of course, in any way exclude the French, with whom we are very friendly and with whom the President visited when he visited President de Gaulle, whose problems in Algeria we regard with the greatest sympathy.

The British obviously need some help to sustain their part of the job. When we are talking about these great words—I do not call them brave words, these great words with great deeds, not only in our words but in our actions, our words and actions must be consistent. When we are talking about these great words, I do not call them brave words, these great words with great deeds, not only in our words but in our actions, our words and actions must be consistent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, apropos of the remarks of my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) a few moments ago, and also the remarks of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), preceding those remarks I should like to make the following observation. It is all right to say that our allies in the NATO organization are in greater danger than we, and therefore should do more. It is true that they are in greater danger.

The fact is, however, as we learned in World War I and in World War II, that without the assistance of the United States, with the full force and weight of our strength behind the allied nations, victory in any of those wars would have been a very different proposition. So I think that we must face the situation, as Presi-dent Kennedy stated in his address to the United Nations in a spirit of complete partnership and cooperation and do whatever may be necessary to foster our friends, who is a dis-tiling and strengthening our bonds with the other nations of Western Europe, shoulder more of the burdens of keeping the free world free.

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) has explained the fact that our great country today owes more money now than the rest of the whole world put together. The President has endorsed our national debt. No country is making greater sacrifices for freedom than is the United States. But we should not be asked to do our share without a share in the effort to help the other countries as well.

If the countries of Western Europe took steps to help themselves not only economically but also with respect to military aid, the President last night, we would go far toward solving the problem.

I wish to say that I was able today to tell the Senate what I learned last summer in Western Europe as to the effort our allies are making. Unfortunately, our own military personnel in those countries do not tell the whole story. They report that our so-called allies are not making an effort to live up to their NATO obligations. But this is not so. I saw this with my own eyes.

We carried the load during World War I, during World War II, and during the Korean War. We were overburdened, but we carried the load on behalf of the forces of freedom. We paid 94 percent of the cost of the Korean conflict although it was supposed to be a full United Nations operation. Of all the military personnel who died in Korea, outside of the Koreans, 96 percent were Americans. I do not want this to happen again.

Those who are in the most danger to-day are, in my opinion, putting forth the least effort. I hope the President will take action whereby our so-called allies will make sacrifices similar to those we are called upon to make.

Unfortunately, I fear that as soon as we use our allies to share the burden of our military obligations, we also impose additional burdens on them. This is not only a question of economic aid, but a question of political and military assistance.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. ELLENDER. The question is whether we can ensure that this is not the case.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield. Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?
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Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield. Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield. Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from New York is suggesting this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Louisiana is suggesting that this country loan more money to England? Where does he suggest we obtain this additional money?
be shortsighted if we did not try to get that potential realized.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, last Tuesday President Kennedy addressed the Nation on the Berlin situation and related matters. It was a clear call to duty and responsibility.

He set forth the needs of defense, with neither panic nor trepidation, with neither brushiness nor timidity. Rather, he spoke with firmness and clarity, firm on the need for a well-reasoned long-range plan for strengthening the Armed Forces for a multiplicity of eventualities.

He set forth the general scope of the sacrifice which this will involve. This sacrifice must be made if we are to maintain the present international position of the United States and freedom. The first installment is in terms of personal sacrifice on the part of the young men and women who will be called to augment the Armed Forces, and in terms of the $3.5 billions for additional military and civilian defense expenditures which will be required for the next few months.

These measures, Madam President, and others must be set in motion regardless of immediate development in the international situation. What may ensue in the next few months no one can foretell. Mr. Kennedy is looking squarely at the dangers in the situation and acting prudently.

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, I desire to express my views on the President's message. It was a sober, dispassionate, objective presentation on the problem confronting us. His theme was that to achieve and maintain peace, it is essential that we possess a military strength adequate to cause the Soviet Union to pause and think of the consequences if it precipitates war.

He related responsibilities as citizens and as a nation, and abandoning our honor and the memory of the patriots, soldiers, and heroes of the past will not lead to victory. Failing to win will accelerate the coming of the day of violence.

Yielding now will give encouragement to the Communists to precipitate difficulties in other parts of the world and upon our very borders. If we give in now, where do we stop?

While we desire our purpose and belief not to suffer the loss of our rights in Berlin, the people of our country should know and believe it to be a fact that without military strength we will not precipitate violence, but that if it is to come, it will be the consequence of the unalterable purpose of the Soviet. The Russian people should understand that we want peace, and that we will strive in every honorable way possible to achieve that peace through negotiation on matters that are, indeed, consistently with the security of our country.

The details of the implementation of the President's expanded preparedness program will have to be studied before I can express an opinion on it.

Madam President, I would also wish to commend the discussions with respect to our military leaders.

Madam President, I do not approve of participation by our military leaders in the political matters taking place between our respective political parties, especially insofar as they partake in it ostensibly in the performance of their duties. However, I cannot approve the increased attacks that are made upon our military men. If I had to plan to advance communism in the world, I would urge the destruction of the confidence of the people of the United States in our military men. When we lose confidence in our military structure, we shall make an advance toward the success of communism that will be unprecedented.

The Communists are probably dropping the seeds, hoping that they will unwittingly be fertilized by our leaders, thus bringing attacks on our whole military structure.

For, one, do not subscribe to it; and I want the people of my State to know that, in my judgment, I want the military vigorous and alert, the virtue of our system of government and point out the evils of the Communists.

Tragically, we are frightening the military from speaking about the good ness of our Nation; and I cannot subscribe to it.

COUNTER-OFFENSIVE FOR TRIUMPH OF FREEDOM

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, President Kennedy sounded a trumpet for a national alert and a mustering of strength to defend the cause of freedom in Berlin and elsewhere in the world. The Nation, I am confident, will respond patriotically.

In my judgment, the President's talk served the following purposes:

First, he warned Khrushchev that we, as a nation, will resist to the last resort—act "when the chips were down," ready, alert, strong, to defend the rights and the cause of freedom.

Second, he reminded us of the great seriousness of the present crisis.

Third, he announced the establishment of a stronger foundation of military strength which the Reds best understand—to cope with the threats not only in Berlin, but around the globe.

From all the evidence, the struggle between East and West will become sharper in the days and years ahead.

This is particularly true in areas where the Western nations and tells Khrushchev, "You cannot take over this land or people."

By recent action, too, we have analyzed an attempt to twist the twisted, distorted logic of Soviet policy which charges that any nation resisting Communism is, in the current, itself an aggressor. In addition, we, with our allies, have clarified that war over Berlin—now at peace—would be "blood on the hands" of the Communists, not the West.

The right of self-determination by a people behind, as well as in front of, the iron and bamboo curtains fortunately also has now become a "negotiable" issue, one which we can—and should—diligently pursue.

With a stronger military defense, we must also undertake a stronger counter-offensive in the nonmilitary field—economically, politically, ideologically.

In the struggle, however, we need a new national attitude. Defense, alone, or containment is no longer an effective policy. Rather, we must assume a counteroffensive and not only defend free lands that exist, but contest, with the Communists, for recognition of the rights of self-determination for peoples and lands now within the Red orbit.

This will require a new national spirit and policy, not simply of defending freedom against aggression, but of mobilized, dedicated efforts to go forth to assure the triumph of freedom in the world.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, the President's speech last night clearly defined the issues between the free world and communism. It was a strong and justified statement of our position. I am in full accord with the firm and unequivocal stand that has been taken.

It would be fatal to appease Russia or to recognize Red China. I am convinced that the course outlined by the President is the course we must take. Actually, he properly prepared for war to avoid a shooting war.

I hope Russia has reached the peak of her power. There are some signs that she may be losing ground. Not one of her satellites is her friend. Thousands upon thousands of East Germans have been fleeing that unhappy country. Red China's difficulties are gradually becoming known.

But these signs must not deter us from the immediate necessity for military strength beyond traditional invincibility. This may cost up to $50 billion this year. And we must recognize that once our military buildup is started it will continue a long time.

Ten years of cold war have been predicted by well-informed authorities.

This means huge deficits or huge taxation. The other is production of costs in all nonessential areas.

After his notable address last night, the President's attention should be turned immediately to curtailment of all nondefense expenditures—including those recommended since January—which may be desirable but not absolutely necessary.

Our fiscal deterioration is emphasized by the fact that President Eisenhower early in January estimated a surplus for the year which ended June 30. President Kennedy later in January said the deficit would be $1.5 billion. Actually the deficit was nearly $4 billion. There were more billions more in deficit spending this year.

Our ability to pay for invincible military power over the long period ahead will depend upon the ability to maintain fiscal solvency. Critical re-assessment of what Federal expenditures are essential must go hand in hand with