

ation. Ignace Paderewski worked tirelessly for his fellow countrymen and became their chosen head at the peace conferences concluding the first World War. For his unceasing labors, he was rewarded with the premiership of the newly created Polish nation.

With the rise of nazism, Germany, aided by Communist Russia, once more proceeded to conquer and divide Poland. Throughout the Second World War, though, the Free Polish soldiers fought well against the tyrannical powers, fighting for their country, marching to their national anthem: "On! On! From Italy's fair plain. Lead us on to greet our homeland; lead us back again."

Though a Poland still exists today, it exists in name only. Russian mastery controls its every move; Russian military might prompts the Polish Government to adhere to the Communist doctrine. But even today the courage of the Poles come forward. Some of their leaders, particularly Cardinal Wyszynski, have dared to speak and act against the present regime. Polish resistance erupts occasionally to cause international sympathy.

The people in Poland cannot celebrate their Constitution Day. We in the United States must honor it for them. We salute their Constitution so that it may always be remembered as a lamp of freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

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

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the debacle in Cuba has created a furor which is going to continue for some time. On the part of the United States, there were a number of tactical errors, not the least of which are already accepted by the President.

We do not want to display a disunited front in this situation but, surely, an observation seems altogether proper—and necessary.

Can you imagine the consternation of a Cuban, only hours before the revolt, hearing our President and Secretary of State state emphatically that the United States would not come to his aid? It undoubtedly put the damper on a general uprising. And then, a short time later, President Kennedy quite strongly said the United States would not sit idly by as communism advanced into this hemisphere. What is the Cuban's reaction now? Where was help when it was needed?

Next in this strange and danger-torn drama came the President speaking about the "lessons we have learned" from the popped balloon in Cuba. Let us hope we have secured a quick education.

I would specifically like to speak to you today about the Central Intelligence Agency. There has been an apparent movement to shift the entire blame for the Cuba mess on the shoulders of the CIA. This is wrong for high administration officials must share some of the blame.

However, the CIA's role in the invasion failure is under attack as well as CIA activity in general. The charges are somewhat unclear because of the very nature of the CIA's work—secrecy, of course, being an important factor.

Nonetheless, we can maintain a proper check and balance on the CIA without destroying the necessity for secrecy. The CIA now operates unchecked, and, oftentimes, off balance. And it does it with a blank check.

Nobody, not even Members of Congress, knows what the CIA spends. A recent newspaper report pegged it at \$7 billion. I cannot agree with that but some estimates run higher than that. Nobody knows and, in the light of many charges whether the Agency is even effective.

Even now, the President has called on the Attorney General and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to review our paramilitary and intelligence activities.

I hope this is not merely a smoke-screen to cover up errors made at the White House but a sincere attempt to pinpoint CIA mistakes—if there are any.

Just what is the CIA doing? Is it being effective? Is the cost worth it?

Is it worth \$2 million to purchase a hotel in a major middle eastern city in order to bug several rooms in the hope an enemy agent might stop there? That, I understand, was a CIA proposal some years ago.

Is it worthwhile to buy a drive-in movie theater, bugging all the car speakers, in the hope an enemy's conversation might be picked up among 200? That, too, was reportedly a CIA suggestion which fortunately got the axe before it went too far. These stories are significant if they reflect general CIA policy.

Historically, the Congress keeps an eye on the purse string. This, uniquely, is not the case with the CIA. And are we getting results worth the cost?

Look within the CIA itself: a special department was reportedly established, consisting of three persons. Within 3 years, this department had grown from those 3 persons to 400 and was costing millions to operate. Is this to go unchecked?

For these reasons, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, establishing a joint House-Senate committee to study and investigate the foreign intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Some bills in the past have put the FBI in the picture. I do not feel the FBI, which is doing a magnificent job, is of concern here. This resolution is concerned only with the CIA and its foreign intelligence operations. Although the committee would report to this Congress and dissolve, the resolution specifically directs the committee to look into the advisability of establishing a permanent joint committee to oversee the activities of the CIA and its expenditures.

We are concerned with three points. First, what is the goal of the CIA? Second, how will it achieve that goal? And, third, how much will it cost. Such a committee need not violate the necessary

secrecy. But it would look into the need for a proper measure of balance and restraint on such an important tool of our Government.

PRICE STABILITY MUST BE MAINTAINED

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

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is a belated but increasing interest in achieving price stability in our country and I am reintroducing the bill which I first introduced in the 86th Congress to make price stability one of the goals of the Employment Act of 1946.

This legislation was specifically recommended by President Kennedy's special task force to analyze the current economic position of the United States with special attention to the balance of payments. The recommendation was submitted to Mr. Kennedy on January 18, 1961. On April 11, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., spoke out strongly and clearly on the need to stabilize the prices of our commodities if all segments of our population are to reap the benefits of our productive system and we are also to remain competitive with the rest of the world.

My bill would make the maintenance of relative price stability an explicit aim of Federal economic policy, as it is already implied in the language of the Employment Act that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Maximum purchasing power is not being promoted when price levels are increasing.

The bill would give an important mandate to the President's Council of Economic Advisers—to work for both maximum employment and a stable cost of living, not one at the expense of the other.

Somewhere along the line many in our country seem to have forgotten that often times the most beneficial use of increased productivity is not to increase wages and/or profits, but rather to reduce the price of the product.

In recent years the increased earnings resulting from improved machinery, techniques, and skills have been devoted almost solely to increasing wages to the workers and profits to the owners. In fact, in some years wages and/or profits have gone up more than the increase in productivity. The inevitable result is that the price of the product goes up also and those consumers with fixed income—this is particularly cruel for retired people who cannot go back to work to increase their income—suffer a reduction in their purchasing power. Those who receive the larger profits and wages from increased productivity have more purchasing power temporarily; but as prices go up, before very long they have no greater purchasing power than before and everybody else has less.

But to the extent that increased productivity is used to reduce the price of the product, everybody gets an increase in purchasing power. The worker gets