FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in view of the statement on U.S. foreign policy issued yesterday by the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership and the newspaper reports of Senator Dirksen's denial that this means a break in the bipartisan policy on foreign affairs, I wish to make a few remarks.

I believe that the Republican administration on foreign policy where I consider the policy to determine it, without regard to party affiliation.

However, I believe that it is the duty of a member of the Congress to propose alternatives and, in that spirit, myself have proposed them as they related to the administration policy on Berlin and Israel and the Near East and other issues. I believe that such alternatives are needed in the formulation of the bipartisan foreign policy, and I'm going forward to the substitute proposals to be presented by the Republican leadership in this spirit.

In foreign policy, Senator Dirksen cataloged a highly suspect coalition government in Laos, participated in the delivery of West New Guinea into the hands of Indonesia without a vote of the people, and stood passively by while India by force of arms seized Goa, a Portuguese possession," he said.

In his speech, Senator Dirksen added, the administration supported armed intervention by the United Nations in the Congo and voted against its NATO ally, Portugal, on her African colony of Angola in a U.N. resolution.

In Europe, "our Berlin stand, while generally commendable," has been accompanied by emphasis on conventional forces as contrasted to prior emphasis on nuclear arms. This has "created serious distrust on the part of our allies, West Germany and France."

In this hemisphere, the Cuban fiasco, the Peruvian diplomatic blunder, and the founding of the Alliance for Progress have done much to impair our efforts in Latin and South America.

Finally Senator Dirksen charged, "many of the administration's foreign policy advisers believe the Soviet Union is 'maturing' and that a policy of concession will hasten the process."

"This is a miscalculation that should be rapidly remedied. The Berlin wall, Soviet shipments to Cuba, and Communist action in Vietnam show that the cold war is just as intense and menacing today as it has been anytime since it began 17 years ago."

We believe this retreat from the absolutely essential condition of inspection is a mistake of major dimensions." He said. The Republican leaders, he added, want the offer withdrawn "immediately."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that the time on the Independent Offices appropriation bill will be up at 4:30 p.m. My colleague [Mr. KEATING] has been waiting a long time to speak. He informs me that he needs 20 minutes. Would the Senator from Wisconsin express a unanimous-consent request to extend the time for 5 minutes more?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not mind a bit. I shall go through my amendment as rapidly as I can. I have 20 or 25 minutes more to go. Many Senators are waiting to vote and leave. If no Senator objects, I am willing to do as the Senator has requested.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is 12 minutes before the hour of 4:30, when the time expires. I have used 5 minutes and the Senator from New York takes 15 minutes, it leaves no time on the bill. This bill is an important bill, as has been demonstrated by the great variety of amendments which have been offered this afternoon.

I should like to ask the Senator to modify his request, or I will request that the unanimous-consent request be modified, for an extension of 1 hour, so that the Senator from New York may have 15 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may need 20 minutes. I shall not take that much if I do not need it, but I intend to speak on a subject which I believe is of great importance.

Mr. ALLOTT. The chairman of the subcommittee is not in the Chamber. As the ranking minority member of it, I hope I may take the responsibility of adding the extra 5 minutes, and I will take that responsibility.

The PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from New York yield 20 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. The request is for an additional hour on the bill, and then whatever time the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yields to the Senator from New York is entirely up to him.

The PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have been waiting all day. I rarely would be as insistent as I am. I am about to speak on something that I believe is of interest to Members of the Senate. It has to do with the situation in Cuba. It is a matter of urgency and importance, and I would like to have it understood that I may have 20 minutes to discuss it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has just entered the Chamber, so I will leave the decision to him. He is in control of the time on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is time.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time remains?

The PRESIDENT. Ten minutes remain.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to extend the time on the bill by 1 hour.

The PRESIDENT. The request is for an hour from 4:30.

Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDENT. The time expires.

The PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

SOVIET ACTIVITIES IN CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have prepared some remarks for delivery to-day on the subject of Cuba and the activities of Russian military personnel, which are probably in an effort to interfere with our operations at Cape Canaveral.

This morning additional facts came to my attention which indicate the danger of the stepped-up flow of Soviet so-called technicians to Cuba and the threat which their activities pose to the security of the United States, largely as a result of their effort to interfere with our operations at Cape Canaveral.
I am reliably informed—when I say "reliably informed," I mean that has been checked out from five different sources, and I am certain I can state it as a fact—that between the dates of August 4 and August 15, 10 Soviet vessels anchored at the Marante dock area at Mariel. The dock area previously had been surrounded by the construction of a high einder-block wall. The site seemed too suited to troops. Troops is what I mean, and not technicians. They were wearing Soviet fatigue uniforms.

On August 13 five Soviet torpedo boats unloaded and were moored at La Guantana. There is every indication that the naval complement to handle these boats disembarked at the same time.

Again let me emphasize that these could not reasonably be called technicians.

On August 13, 1,000 non-Cuban personnel in fatigue uniforms were seen working in the area of First La Guantana, all probability on or near a missile base located in that area.

On August 3 a large convoy of military vehicles manned by Soviet personnel was observed on the highway in Las Villas Province. The convoy moved in military order and contained the first amphibious vehicles observed in Cuba; also Jeeps, 8 x 6 trucks, and tracked trucks.

On August 5 there was a movement seen of a 64-vehicle convoy heading west on Carretera Central. The convoy was moving in military order. It included tanks, cannonlike trailers, and flatbed trailers.

On August 8 there was observed a night movement of a convoy on Carretera Central. Flatbed trucks were observed transporting concave metal structures supported by tubing. The convoy included a number of closed vans. The convoy appeared to be moving toward an installation 4 to 5 kilometers from Caminmar in a closely restricted area believed to contain a rocket installation.

There have been other observations of activity there, which have been confirmed.

On July 27 the unholy alliance between Castro's Cuba and the Soviet Union took its most serious turn. Between July 27 and August 15 their joint activities have been coordinated in an alarming way, which poses a serious threat to the security of the Western Hemisphere.

So far no action has been taken by our Government. The President has said that he has no evidence of Soviet troops in Cuba. If he has no evidence, I am giving him evidence this afternoon, Mr. President.

The American people have not been informed of the dangerous situation which exists 90 miles off our mainland.

Mr. President, the American people are asking with new urgency, What is going on in Cuba? So far the answers received have not satisfied.

Since July the Soviet Union has greatly stepped up shipments of men and equipment. More than 20 cargo ships have arrived from Communist sources. More than five thousand so-called "technicians" have arrived in the course of the past year. Soviet statistics reveal that by the end of the year the Soviets will have shipped nearly $1 billion of goods and arms to Cuba. Cuban trade with non-Communist countries will be down to about 30 percent next year and Cuba will be virtually isolated from the free world—a Communist channel through which the Soviets can operate unchecked and to a large extent unobserved.

What are the Soviets planning to do with their new island fortress? It is estimated by some authorities that since conditions there are worse now than they have been in years. What are they going to build with this new equipment? What will the army of technicians be required to maintain? So far we have had a number of answers, but in my judgment, none of them tell the true story.

Tass, the Soviet press agency, has announced the arrival of the consignments consist of industrial equipment, flour, food, and fertilizer and that the "technicians" are agricultural experts and economists who will try to get the faltering Cuban economy back on its feet. That is not true, Mr. President.

There is no doubt that Cuba needs food and needs expert help. Castro and his fellow travelers have plunged the country into a state of depression, private initiative has been matched for generations. But the Communists are not known for their humanitarian motives and impulses. I for one very much doubt that the Soviets are sending Castro his own food, which is in short supply, to help Castro out of his difficulties.

More ominous reports suggest that the Soviets are constructing missile bases and sending over technicians and experts to man them. In this way the Soviets could expect to discourage determined refugees of other nations from this hemisphere from any kind of concerted attack on the Cuban dictatorship. They could also be preparing to resist increasing Internal dissatisfaction against his regime. That supposition, which our Government has never openly admitted or discussed, is a source of serious concern to the people of all the Americas. It should be fully aired. The dangers inherent in the situation should be known and appreciated by all the people of this hemisphere, and particularly by those nations which so far have actively blocked measures to combat the menace of Castroism.

Another very real possibility and, in my judgment, a probability that should be a source of even greater concern to the United States and which has so far not been openly discussed at all. In this country is that the Soviets are deliberately taking advantage of the proximity between Cuba and Cape Canaveral to conduct other activities. There is no question at all of the possibility of interference with American space flights by sensitive equipment mounted in Cuba and operated by Communist experts. It poses also the additional menace of the advanced electronic resources which the Soviet Union now possesses to construct elaborate and sensitive listening devices. Such devices could monitor all the direct communications and other channels used by us in the early stages of flight. With skill, and effort, it would be very possible for the Soviets to duplicate these signals. They thus might be able to alter the direction, the thrust, or the speed of a missile, completely the purpose of any launching.

At the most, what this means is that U.S. astronauts to be launched in the future could be sitting ducks for any kind of interference the Soviets might want to stage. At the very least, it means we must move urgently to develop the techniques necessary to combat this kind of Soviet interference. At the very least, it is a source of serious concern to the people of all the Americas. It should be fully aired.

The other possibility, of moving our launching site from Cape Canaveral, would be an equally difficult operation that would slow down our program substantially. Moreover, Cape Canaveral offers advantages, in its eastern outlook, its proximity to the equator, and its relative remoteness from heavily built-up areas, that would be hard to duplicate anywhere in the country.

Mr. President, let me make this clear. So far, there is no evidence to indicate that the Russians have yet played any part in the rather alarming number of launch failures at Cape Canaveral. I have spoken with a number of technical experts in this field both in and out of Government, and in my judgment, the increased and actual interference in U.S. launchings is entirely within the capability of the Soviet Union. And we all know that it is just the kind of thing that might be expected of the Soviets.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that such an effort would be expensive. But we all know that right now the Soviets are spending more money just to jam our Voice of America programs than we spend on our entire Information Agency budget. We can do a lot more worthwhile, I am certain, with a little extra expense.

In my judgment, Mr. President, all the Soviet equipment, which undeniably includes radar and electronic devices, is not only to prop up Castro economically; it is not only to build missile bases, which could easily be sabotaged; but it is also designed deliberately to put the Communists in a position where they can interfere with the American space effort at Cape Canaveral. The thousands of technicians are arriving, not only to teach the Cubans how to build their economy, not only to fight missiles, but not only to interfere with common action by all the nations of the hemisphere, but above all to build and to man espionage and interference stations and to keep a constant eye on, and very likely to control, also a finger in the important U.S. launching scheduled to take place.
at Cape Canaveral through the coming years.

Mr. President, so far the American people have not had a frank answer from their Government as to what the real dangers of a Communist buildup in Cuba are. Our present policy is just to look at the other side of the fence and somehow Castro will just disappear. The present influx of Soviet men and technicians shows what a vain, blind, and misleading hope this has been. Castro is not a bad dream or a nightmare that will go away when morning comes. He is a dangerous reality. He will not go away merely because we rub Aladdin’s lamp and wish for his disappearance. And he is not very likely to fall, no matter how much he abuses and antagonizes the people of Cuba, for the Soviet forces that stand behind him are now too much for mere refugees and rebels.

Therefore, at this point, Mr. President, Castro has virtually handed theCommunist monopoly to the Soviet scientists that can be turned right through the middle of our entire space effort, that can endanger the lives of our astronauts, and that can critically slow down vital defense developments. It is time for the people of this country and of this hemisphere to have the truth, the whole truth, about what Castro and his Soviet cohorts are up to. Only with full knowledge of the seriousness of the situation can we develop a strong national policy with the support of the people of the United States.

Our present look-the-other-way policy in Cuba depends to a large extent on popular ignorance of the facts and wishful underestimation of the dangers that are present. Will we have to wait until more and more of our launchings at Canaveral go wrong before we suspect the worst? Will we have to wait until the Russians have established a space monopoly before we weigh the dangers of the Cuban situation? Will we have to wait until Castro dies of old age before we recognize that the Soviet stronghold which is being established at this minute on the island of Cuba is undeniably a loaded gun that can be aimed directly at our military and space efforts?

Mr. President, the time for the truth is now and I hope the American people will be provided with the truth while there is still time to deal with it, before it is too late.

In my judgment, the first step which should be taken—immediately—would be to present the matter to the Organization of American States. We should lay the facts before them and urge upon them the need for prompt and vigorous action in a concerted way to meet this threat to their future security as well as to the security of the United States. Time is short. The situation is growing worse. I urge upon my Government that prompt action be taken.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12711) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the pending amendment would cut back the NASA appropriation about 5 percent below the budget estimate. It would cut it back $188 million. It would also cut it back $103 million below the Senate recommendation, which is below the estimate.

I offer the amendment because the appropriation is still more than 100 percent higher now than it was last year. The NASA appropriation is still the most rapidly rising cost of our Federal Government by far.

I am deeply concerned about the impact of the huge increase in spending for space and aeronautics on our Nation’s other vital needs. I am concerned particularly about the impact of the spending on the Nation’s other vital needs and goals.

I emphasize at the beginning that I do not question the importance of our space effort. I wholeheartedly favor the manned lunar probe enthusiastically. The significant question is whether or not we have the responsibility of considering the space program carefully and thoughtfully, and pruning out expenditures which I think we can show would be either duplication or wasteful.

One of the basic responsibilities of Congress is the designation of funds for various programs, taking account of priority and the amount of money which can be wisely spent in any program. It may be that money is being poured into NASA without a reasonable examination of the scale, and with priorities being made at a faster rate by far than can be prudently used. As a result, fiscal precaution is being thrown to the winds in our Nation’s space program.

The available evidence points to one example after another of a disturbing lack of concern about cost and basic budget discipline in this program.

The amendment is designed to provide some of that discipline by forbidding some of the conspicuous examples of waste. It is not a meat ax by any means; it is a scalpel.

SPECIFIC PROXMI RESEARCH OPERATIONS REDUCTIONS IN SPACE SPENDING

Referring to the first part of my amendment, under the heading "Advanced Research" there is the figure, for 1963, of $18 million. Under VSTOL aircraft the figure is $4,650,000. The total is $30 million. I would cut it back to $8 million. That would be in line with the Senator’s recommendation of the NASA budget, no question about it.

Mr. ALLOT. I cannot find the page the Senator refers to. First I should like to say that basic research in supersonic transport development is going on in two places, one is in the Department of Defense, with which the Senator is completely acquainted, and has discussed many times. The other is in the Federal Aviation Agency. It is the last line item in the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. However, there is also an item under the NASA authorization. It was untouched in the appropriation bill to which I have referred, providing for $18 million for supersonic commercial transport. It is on page 79 of the report. We can come back to this item later.

Along the same lines, NASA is carrying on research on the short-takeoff-and-landing—STOL—and the vertical-takeoff-and-landing—VTOL—aircraft developed by the military. NASA is carrying on the research to determine