

the encouragement and support of such an institution is a dramatic step for our foreign policy in the Far East. It also marks a constructive and we believe preferable alternative to post-World War II American aid.

WORKING BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Asia Aid Request: Official Transcript of President Johnson's News Conference at the White House," the Washington Post, Wednesday, June 2, 1965.

Bell, David E.: "Regional Cooperation in South and Southeast Asia," a speech

delivered at the International Development Conference, Washington, D.C., May 26, 1965.

Black, Eugene R.: Statement on southeast Asia economic and social development presented to the House of Representatives Banking and Currency Committee on July 29, 1965.

Black, Eugene R.: Statement to the meeting of the consultative committee of experts on the Asian Development Bank, Bangkok, Thailand, June 28, 1965.

"Inter-American Development Bank: Basic Information," Inter-American De-

velopment Bank, Washington, D.C., October 31, 1964.

Johnson, Lyndon Baines: Remarks of the President at Shriver Hall Auditorium, April 7, 1965, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Rostow, W. W.: "Economic Development in Asia," the Department of State bulletin, volume 52, May 31, 1965, publication No. 7898.

United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, report of the ministerial conference on Asian economic cooperation, January 6, 1964.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: *Phillipians 4:6: In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.*

Almighty God, who art everywhere, we lift up our hearts to Thee in worship and give Thee thanks for this fellowship of God-fearing men and women with whom we share Thy mercies and adore Thy name.

May we be of one heart with all who seek Thee, of one communion with all who love Thee, and of one purpose with all who serve Thy holy will in faithfulness and joy.

Teach us that we are one, united with Thee and with one another in one nature, one duty, and one destiny, and may we all strive to be messengers of Thy mercy, ministers of Thy truth, and doers of good to our fellow men in their struggles and sorrows.

Grant that the day may speedily come when humanity shall feel the throb of a new power and the thrill of a new joy, liberated among men and nations and causing that change in their inner life, which is more brotherly and Christlike.

Help us to believe that the good of mankind does actually exist, and the injury of one is the hurt of all. Inspire us more with that down-reaching love which gives itself gladly and sacrificially for the sake of needy and wandering humanity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1402. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Rosendo Barahona;

H.R. 1443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olga Bernice Bramson Gilfillan;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of Esterina Ricupero;

H.R. 1820. An act for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon;

H.R. 2678. An act for the relief of Joo Yul Kim;

H.R. 2871. An act for the relief of Dorota Zytka;

H.R. 3292. An act for the relief of Consuelo Alvarado de Corpus;

H.R. 5024. An act to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, and the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claims Act of 1964, with respect to the settlement of claims against the United States by members of the uniformed services and civilian officers and employees of the United States for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to their service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6719. An act for the relief of Mrs. Kazuyo Watanabe Ridgely; and

H.R. 9570. An act to amend the Federal Firearms Act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve applicants from certain provisions of the act if he determines that the granting of relief would not be contrary to the public interest, and that the applicant would not be likely to conduct his operations in an unlawful manner.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 647. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 3128. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi; and

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 481. An act for the relief of Winnifred Evadne Newman;

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska;

S. 803. An act for the relief of Ching Zai Yen and his wife, Faung Hwa Yen;

S. 1168. An act for the relief of Timothy William O'Kane; and

S. 2393. An act to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965.

JOHNSON ECONOMIC POLICIES
PRAISED BY FINANCIAL WRITER
DISCREDITING FEDERAL RESERVE
CHAIRMAN MARTIN'S 1929
WARNING

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement by J. A. Livingston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, financial writer J. A. Livingston's column appearing in the Washington Post's September 1 edition is a refreshing refutation of Federal Reserve Chairman Martin's famous prediction last June that a 1929 type economic bust may be just around the corner.

In contrast, Mr. Livingston accurately emphasizes the important differences between 1929 and 1965, rather than finding all sorts of disquieting similarities. Livingston lays a large part of the blame for depression miseries on President Hoover's do-nothing policy foisted upon him by Benjamin Anderson of the Chase National Bank and others. He denies that this would happen under present day economic policies.

Livingston's explanation is good as far as it goes. The one great flaw in his analysis is, I believe, his omission of the fact that the Government between 1929 and 1933 intentionally reduced the Nation's money supply by an unbelievable 25 percent. So the Government, through the Federal Reserve—contrary to Livingston—was not merely on the sidelines, but was actively pursuing deflationary policies which resulted in history's greatest economic catastrophe.

President Johnson, in his Economic Report to Congress last January, gave much credit to stable long-term interest rates and excess bank reserves for the record-breaking prosperity starting early in the Kennedy-Johnson administration in 1961—noting at the same time, however, that the general level of interest rates is now higher than at any period since the early 1930's. There is no question that wise Government policies and wise private decisions together are responsible for our sparkling economic performance. I would hope and pray that the costly and tragic mistakes of the past will not be repeated, but with the independence-obsessed Federal Re-

serve Board moving farther and farther away from the official administration policies, one just never knows.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Livingston article follows:

HOOPER, JOHNSON PHILOSOPHIES CONTRASTED
(By J. A. Livingston)

For no reason except that September marks the 36th anniversary of the end of the Coolidge-Hoover boom, this column is dedicated to the twenty-niners, those New Era hopefuls who sought fortune—and to hell with fame—on margin in Wall Street, even as their forebears 80 years before, the forty-niners, reached for riches in California with pick, shovel and grubstake.

The twenty-niners have their 1965 counterparts—the believers in the new economics, including President Johnson and Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. But there's an essential difference.

The economists of the New Era preached the philosophy of ever-rising consumption: Keep up demand and prosperity will take care of itself. Installment selling was just becoming respectable. Employment was expected to mount year after year.

Therefore, total purchasing power would increase. Corporation profits would soar. Stocks would be split. Stockholders couldn't miss. So Wall Street had its ball.

Then came the crash. A dream went dead. The rugged optimist became a confirmed fatalist: "Whatever goes up comes down, it's natural law, look at the long-term chart—the hills and the valleys; the periodicity. Depressions are inevitable."

The "new economists" of today also rely on ever-rising consumption. They call it aggregate demand. And 20 years of postwar prosperity, marred only by four short and shallow recessions, have given them confidence: Man can master his economic destiny. If men cause depressions, surely men ought to be able to prevent them.

Society—men and women working together—can achieve what individuals and corporations, acting separately and in their own self-interest, cannot accomplish.

The New Era economists of 1929 were shortchanged by the rugged individualism of the day. When depression engulfed America, President Hoover was paralyzed by doctrine. His heart was with the poor, but his conviction was with William Graham Sumner, who had taught at Yale at the turn of the century, and Benjamin Anderson, the economist for the Chase National Bank.

Sumner and Anderson preached economic Darwinism: Depressions root out the weak and unfit. The strong survive. The result is progress. Let the Government referee, but not intervene.

Yet when production slumped and joblessness mounted, the rugged individuals ruggedly rushed individually to their respective storm cellars. The ever-upward vision vanished. The New Era economists who talked so positively of ever-expanding consumption had no way to implement it.

Today the expounders of the new economics think they have: There is a philosophy of political participation. If private demand is not adequate to buy the goods and services produced, then the Government—by increasing its own purchases of goods and services or by reducing taxes—can supply the missing purchasing power. It will not stand aside and let the weak perish.

Instead of letting labor go to waste, the new economists would use social resources to construct bridges, hospitals, roads, schools, or even private homes and washing machines. Work provides wealth. Idleness generates despair, desperation, and riots.

The individual can't go into debt to provide work for his fellow man, but all of us, collectively, can take the risk and so enrich each other and the Nation.

The new economics however, does not satisfy the inborn pessimist, the constitutional skeptic. He looks at the long-term chart of business and says: "There's always something. If it isn't economic, it's political. If it isn't a banking panic it's Vietnam or an outflow of gold or social disorders. The human mind is not big enough to encompass, to grasp entire, the all-too-human universe."

The new economists are not chart-bound. History is theirs to make, not to be worshipped as inevitably repetitious.

And to try out their philosophy of Government positivism they have President Johnson. Unlike President Hoover, he is willing to use national resources to cope with social problems.

This distinguishes the 1965 aggregate demandists from the 1929 consumptionists. They have Government on their side instead of on the sidelines.

AMENDING RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill amending the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act. I am scheduling hearings on this bill beginning on Wednesday, September 8, and we expect to proceed expeditiously with the bill.

As Members know, a bill—H.R. 3157—providing benefits for spouses of retired railroad employees passed the House earlier this year, and passed the other body on September 1 with an amendment increasing the base wages subject to tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act. There is considerable controversy about this latter amendment and in the opinion of many, the form in which the amendment is proposed is unconstitutional.

I am attempting with this bill which I have introduced today to provide a resolution of the controversies that exist in this area. The bill provides as follows:

First. The bill provides exactly the same benefits for spouses of retired railroad employees as was provided in the bill as passed by the House and the Senate this year.

Second. The bill increases the base wages subject to railroad retirement tax to \$550 a month, effective October 1, this year. Because of some complexities involved in the medicare legislation, this will mean that the medicare program for railroad employees will be administered by the Railroad Retirement Board, rather than by the Social Security Administration.

Third. The third provision of the bill provides for an immediate reduction in the rates of tax paid by employees and employers under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, so that the tax burden on employees and employers will remain the same for the remainder of this year as it would have remained had there been no increase in the base. Then the tax rate will increase by 0.25 percent as of January 1, 1966; will increase by

0.25 percent as of January 1, 1967; will be increased again by 0.25 percent as of January 1, 1968; and then a final 0.25 percent as of January 1, 1969.

These increases will restore the Railroad Retirement fund to the position of actuarial balance in which it stood as of January 1 this year.

PEACE THROUGH LAW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the World Conference on World Peace Through World Law to be held in Washington September 12 to 18 is a significant event and deserves thoughtful attention. In a world torn by strife and gunfire, it introduces a note of hope and promise.

The Conference has several objectives, including the codification of international law. Its basic objective is to promote judicial as opposed to military settlement of international problems.

The simple and sad truth is that nations still operate in what the philosophers call the state of nature, a state in which self-preservation is the first and foremost law.

Of course a myriad of judicial settlements have occurred between parties of different nations, and these settlements are precedents which are part of what is known as international law. But no nation is obliged to accept these precedents except where contracts, agreements and treaties so stipulate. Even where stipulations exist, breaches can and do occur. When this happens, the nation powerful enough to come out on top wins the point of "law."

Therefore, the conferees gathering in Washington September 12 must acknowledge, inwardly if not outwardly, that so long as nation-states operate in this primitive state of nature, world law which is meaningful as a means of achieving a just world peace is impossible.

Peace can, of course, be achieved through law. For example, law enables the people of the United States to live at peace with each other. Disputes within the United States are settled without war, and the same legal protections are afforded to the weak as to the strong. But this peace is possible not because of law alone. The judicial branch alone does not and cannot do the job. An executive branch able to enforce the judicial findings is essential, as is a legislature able to write law. In short, government is the force that makes possible peaceful relationships—not just law alone.

Therefore, the real objective of the conferees must be government, not just law alone.

Those who seek world peace through world law must begin by building the foundations for supranational institutions of government. This cannot be

done at once. It cannot even be wisely considered on a worldwide basis at the present time. Governmental systems are too diverse. The Soviet Union Government, for example, came to power by conspiracy, continues in power through conspiracy and if the past is a guide to the future it will ultimately be overthrown by conspiracy. Even attempting to establish supranational governmental institutions which would include a powerful conspiratorial force like the Soviet Government would be too hazardous for consideration.

But the beginning need not be on a worldwide scale. The sensible starting point is the group of nations commonly known as the Atlantic Community. This community embraces peoples experienced at self-government with long-standing traditions in law and protection of individual rights. Most of them are presently allied for military purposes in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but this, of course, is not a government. It is but an alliance, and as George Washington so wisely warned, all alliances are subject to infractions and interruptions.

The world law conferees could wisely consider a first but giant step toward world law. That step would be the transformation of the NATO alliance into a supranational government able to write law and enforce judicial rulings within its constitutional scope for the whole of the union.

I hope some consideration will be given to this idea by the conferees. Reprinted below is an interesting commentary on the approaching conference published in the Washington Post today and written by the able columnist Roscoe Drummond:

WORLD LAW MEETING—DEFEAT OF THE CYNICS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

Mark down the World Conference on World Peace Through Law in Washington, September 12-18, as a signal and magnificent defeat for the cynics.

The cynics said it couldn't be done. They said it was silly to think it could be done and sillier still even to try it.

The cynics said that, with hot war in many parts of the earth and cold peace everywhere, this would be no time to talk about peace through law.

But the leaders of the American Bar Association didn't think so at all. They thought this was the best time to start, because something needed to be done before it is too late.

World law, let alone world peace through law, is not just around the corner. Far from it. But a tremendous and exciting start has been made.

As a result, more than 2,500 leading lawyers and jurists from 110 countries, including 65 chief justices, 153 high court justices, and 59 attorneys general or ministers of justice will gather in Washington to draft plans for new international courts, to codify and strengthen international law, and to build acceptance for an alternative to force—for resort to the bench rather than resort to the battlefield.

The first such conference in history was held in Athens in 1963 when the leaders of the legal profession from more than 100 countries formed the World Peace Through Law Center, which now has 2,000 dues-paying members, a sizable annual budget, and a \$100,000 gift for a world headquarters building.

It has already compiled the first of 50 volumes bringing together all of the international law existent into a world law code for ready use.

It is developing proposals for expansion of the World Court through regional courts for easier access and for still lower trial courts to make it easier for nations to turn to law to settle many lesser disputes.

It is publishing for the first time a directory of law, judges, and lawyers of the world, a long-needed and valuable tool for the legal profession.

Lawyers from most of the Iron Curtain countries will be present for the Washington conference, which is a meeting of individuals, not of governments. Lawyers from North Korea and North Vietnam have not responded. Peiping coined a phrase and denounced the meeting as an "imperialist plot."

It all began 8 years ago, when the president of the American Bar Association, Charles S. Rhyne, followed Winston Churchill, Chief Justice Warren, and the Lord Chancellor of London to the podium in London's historic Guildhall and proposed that all lawyers join in a common effort to make law strong enough to replace force as the controlling factor in the fate of man.

Rhyne, a Washington lawyer, has been working at it ever since.

It is safe to assume that things will keep on happening. Two reasons are:

Lawyers constitute the most powerful segment of society in almost every country on every continent.

When the legal profession of the entire world mobilizes its influence and talents, as it is now doing, a powerful force is in motion. This is no miracle, but a solid beginning that points the way in which the nations must move if we are ever to lay hold of a means to make peace equal to our means to make war.

The world's legal profession is magnificently giving its services to a new client—civilization itself.

REAPPORTIONMENT DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Would a quorum call be in order, in order to get Members to the House floor to sign the reapportionment discharge petition?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman is so well versed in the rules of the House that the gentleman knows the answer to that inquiry.

EQUALITY IN AMERICA: A PROMISE UNFULFILLED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there follows an analysis of the Republican coordinating committee's position paper on human rights issued August 30, 1965. Most of this is a fine statement of principles which could probably be endorsed by more Democrats than Republicans.

Democrats might question, however, the claim that "for a century and more

the Republican Party has struggled more consistently and effectively than any other political party for justice and progress in human rights." Consistency has never been noted as a virtue of Democrats. But effectiveness has.

And there may even be some Republicans who would feel that the leadership of Lyndon Johnson, when he was majority leader of the Senate, was at least as important as the leadership of President Eisenhower in producing the 1957 Civil Rights Act.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The claim is made that the Republican voting rights proposal "would have resulted in more effective law and broader protection of all voting rights of all citizens."

This could probably be dismissed as pardonable pride of authorship. The so-called Republican proposal was that put forth by Congressman WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, who is also chairman of the task force that produced the position paper on human rights.

It would have made two principal changes in the law that was enacted:

First. It would have established the number of complaints received by the Attorney General as the criteria for determining voter discrimination, rather than the existence of a literacy test and a low level of voting participation.

Second. It would have eliminated the requirements that States found to practice voting discrimination obtain the approval of a Federal court for changes in their voting laws.

The House of Representatives rejected this proposal 248 to 171. Twenty-one Republicans joined the Democrats in voting against it.

This section of the position paper also poses three questions for the President:

First. Why Texas was not covered under his initial voting rights bill and is not effectively covered now?

Second. Why vote frauds and dishonest elections, such as have occurred in Chicago and Texas, were not covered under his proposal?

Third. Why should challenged votes be counted and if found invalid be used possibly to determine the outcome of an election, including the election of a President?

The questions are so misleading they should probably be regarded as rhetorical. But, if one regards them seriously, it is not necessary to turn to the President to get answers.

They are:

First. Texas is covered under the Voting Rights Act exactly the same as any other State. The purpose of the question is to imply that the criteria set forth in the act for determining the existence of voter discrimination—a literacy test and a low level of voter participation—were drawn to exclude Texas. That would be difficult to prove when the same criteria have excluded 40 other States and the District of Columbia. Texas certainly is not the only one of these without a literacy test. Nor is it the one with the lowest level of voter participation.

Second. The purpose of the legislation was to deal with voter discrimina-

tion, not with vote frauds and dishonest elections. There is other legislation dealing with those problems.

Third. A challenged vote is counted only if the challenge has not been filed in time to be ruled upon before the election. The list of registered voters must be published each month, and 10 days is allowed to challenge a voter. A hearing examiner has 15 days to determine the validity of the challenge, and an appeal may be taken to court which must rule in 15 days. The last list of registered voters must be published 45 days before the election. By law, therefore, every challenge filed up to 40 days before the election must be ruled on. And the likelihood is that even challenges filed after that time would be ruled on before the election.

PROTECTING THE SANCTITY OF THE BALLOT

The position paper contends:

Additional legislation is clearly required to uphold the sanctity of the ballot.

But no attempt is made to define the provisions of the legislation that may be needed.

If the Republicans feel this need, they should certainly come forth with concrete proposals which can be judged on their merits.

That would certainly be better than indulging in the idle rhetoric of a "position paper" or organizing programs of voter intimidation such as the notorious Operation Eagle Eye used in the 1964 presidential election.

EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT EDUCATION

The paper declares:

We effectively support a massive campaign against illiteracy in the United States.

It is unfortunate that more Republicans did not share this sentiment when the poverty program was enacted in 1964 or when the administration's education bills were under consideration this year.

As it was, 81 percent of the Republican Members of the House of Representatives voted against the poverty program, and 69 percent voted against the elementary-secondary education bill.

EMPLOYMENT

The paper accuses the administration of doing little to implement the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 calling for the establishment of an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. And it contends that full implementation of these provisions have been hampered because members of the Commission were not appointed until May of this year.

This conveniently glosses over the fact that the act authorizing the Commission did not become law until July 1964, just prior to the Republican National Convention and the nomination of Senator Goldwater as the Republican candidate for President. How quick the Republicans would have been to criticize President Johnson had he named the members of this new and extremely important Commission in the midst of a presidential election campaign. And how quick they are to complain about the few weeks the President took after the election to find

the best possible persons to fill these positions.

The fact is that the President proceeded with care and deliberation, the members of the Commission have been named, its offices are open, and its work is now well underway.

By comparison with the issue made of the time it has taken to get a good Equal Employment Opportunities Commission underway, the position paper dismisses the entire poverty program in a single sentence:

The antipoverty program, which was originally aimed at helping the poor including many members of racial minority groups, has already deteriorated into a shameful example of predatory political patronage for the big city machines.

That is resounding rhetoric. But the conclusion will come as a surprise to the bosses of the "big city machines" it refers to. They have been complaining about the poverty program almost as loudly as the Republicans—because they feel it has not provided the patronage they had expected.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AND FACILITIES

The paper charges that the administration has not been vigorous enough in enforcing the section of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting discrimination at publicly owned and operated facilities such as parks and libraries.

Yet it notes that 18 suits have been brought by the Justice Department to enforce this part of the act. And it passes over, without mention, the large number of complaints which have been resolved through mediation.

STATE, PRIVATE, AND LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY

The position paper makes the sweeping accusation that "the whole trend of Federal legislation in the present Congress has been at the expense of State responsibility."

No specifics are alleged.

Yet the fact is that no President has been as diligent as President Johnson in seeking the views of Governors, involving them in his deliberations, and proposing legislation to strengthen the ability of the States to deal with their problems.

States have a vital role under the poverty program. States are equally important in highway programs, housing programs, hospital construction programs, area redevelopment, and virtually every aspect of Federal activity.

A detailed analysis, in fact, would probably show that this Congress had done more to expand Federal assistance to State governments to a level greater than it has ever attained before.

CONCLUSION

The Republican position paper finally reaches the conclusion, supported by nothing to be found elsewhere in the paper, that "this administration has failed to enforce the law of the land."

How?

Where?

When?

It does not say.

Little wonder that the members of the Republican coordinating committee were unable to agree on the paper when they

met to consider it on August 30. And little wonder that the text was not distributed until 2 days later.

NEEDED: A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. At the same time I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] for his determined efforts to persuade Congress to take a hard look at the intelligence operations of the United States and to establish such a committee.

For it is true that, in the language of today's New York Times:

Congressional supervision of the Nation's intelligence activities is obviously inadequate. A joint committee, similar to that which watches over atomic energy, has been urged by many Members of Congress; it is badly needed.

We do not need to look far for evidence of this need. The current disastrous incident involving attempted bribery of Singapore's Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew by a CIA agent strongly supports the Times' contention that "the country can no longer be sure that either the State Department or the White House is exercising the requisite supervision over an agency about which the public knows almost nothing at all."

The gentleman from Wisconsin has led efforts since 1953 to create such a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. I am happy to recognize his interest and concern in this area and to join him in the effort to establish such a committee.

The resolution I introduce today would establish a joint committee to be composed of seven Congressmen and seven Senators selected by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate on a bipartisan basis. It would make continuing studies of intelligence activities and problems. Although the committee would not expect to concern itself with the details of day-to-day operations of the intelligence agencies, the CIA and similar agencies would be expected to keep it currently and adequately informed.

The time has definitely come for Congress to assert a more formal and extensive supervision over the burgeoning intelligence operations of our Government. Such supervision is needed to eliminate waste from individual agency budgets, to avoid unnecessary duplication of intelligence efforts, to assure that programs operate effectively.

Most importantly, however, such congressional supervision is needed to assure that the standards of morality honored by American society are not completely

undermined in the conduct of our international intelligence activities.

Cause for concern over this moral breakdown is not limited to the Singapore case, but arises also from the factual content of recent television programs which detail the implication of the CIA in objectionable practices in Latin America and elsewhere.

These incidents clearly discredit and debase our national prestige in the eyes of the world.

Congress cannot afford to delay asserting its supervision until these activities result in a fiasco of such proportions as to actually jeopardize our national security.

I believe that the editorial from today's New York Times states a compelling case for the establishment of the Joint Committee on Intelligence as proposed in the House concurrent resolution I have introduced today. I commend it for your serious consideration:

SUPERVISING THE CIA

The case of the Singapore bribe attempt raises serious questions about the Central Intelligence Agency and its role in American foreign policy.

Initially, the State Department flatly denied Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew's disclosure that in 1960 a CIA agent had offered him a bribe to cover up an unsuccessful CIA effort to penetrate Singapore's intelligence service. Only after Mr. Lee released a 1961 letter of apology from Secretary Rusk and threatened to put incriminating tape recordings on radio Singapore, did the State Department's embarrassed spokesman confirm the incident.

The spokesman explained that the State Department officials responsible for the initial denial were not fully aware of the background of the incident. And the CIA, as the Times diplomatic correspondent Max Frankel reported yesterday, "apparently relayed the denial of wrongdoing that it customarily issues to the rest of the Government when confronted by such charges."

All this is dismally reminiscent of the false State Department denials in the 1960 U-2 case that broke up the Paris summit conference with Russia. After the Bay of Pigs disaster, President Kennedy ordered new procedures established to assure that the State Department would be adequately informed of CIA activities so that it could exercise policy supervision. The Killian watchdog committee, originally appointed by President Eisenhower, was revived, given a far more vigorous role, and in 1963 placed under the chairmanship of former White House adviser Clark Clifford.

Evidently some or all these safeguards have now broken down. What is most disturbing is not the certain damage done in Singapore, but the possibility of more serious delinquencies. The country can no longer be sure that either the State Department or the White House is exercising the requisite supervision over an agency about which the public knows almost nothing at all.

The Clifford committee evidently is already looking into the case. A congressional investigation is also in order. Congressional supervision of the Nation's intelligence activities is obviously inadequate. A joint committee, similar to that which watches over atomic energy, has been urged by many Members of Congress; it is badly needed.

Serious damage has been done to American relations with many governments by CIA activities in the past, particularly in Asia. In Jakarta last spring, President Sukarno and many members of his cabinet were reading a new American book, "The Invisible Government," and using its confirmation of CIA intervention in the 1958 Sumatra uprising to

justify their hostility to the West and increasing friendship with Communist China. Similar hostility exists in Burma and Cambodia. It is vital that Washington establish the kind of firm supervision of the CIA that can prevent such blunders in the future.

EPISCOPAL MINISTER BLAMES RIOT ON KING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing indeed to read in David Lawrence's column in the Washington Star of September 2 that a ranking member of the clergy has stated from his pulpit that the blame for the trend toward violent disregard of the law and authority can only be laid at the doorstep of Martin Luther King. Further, he acknowledges and condemns the support of civil disobedience to constituted authority being lavishly given by many of the clergy.

The remarks delivered by the Reverend Dr. Robert B. Watts, of La Jolla, Calif., as contained in Mr. Lawrence's column, should be must reading for every Member, and I would like to insert it here in the RECORD for all to see:

It isn't often that a clergyman has also had a successful career as a Government lawyer and in private business. Ministers have rarely had the opportunity to study the law of the land as was the experience of the Reverend Dr. Robert B. Watts, pastor of an Episcopal church in La Jolla, Calif.

A sermon delivered by Dr. Watts since the Los Angeles riots deprecates the doctrine that it is all right to disobey an "unjust" law. The latter idea, enunciated by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Negro leader, has aroused considerable objection not only among clergymen but among laymen as well throughout the country.

Dr. Watts graduated from Yale Law School, where he was editor of the Yale Law Journal. He practiced law in Chicago and New York, and was chief assistant U.S. attorney in New York City for several years and served also as Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. He was with the National Labor Relations Board for 9 years from 1934 to 1943. For 3 of these he was general counsel of the Board and argued many of its cases in the Supreme Court of the United States. He served also in business as vice president and general counsel of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp. and later with General Dynamics Corp. He was ordained in 1958 in the Episcopal diocese of Los Angeles. Dr. Watts, in his recent sermon, said:

"There has been advanced by various philosophical followers of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., one of the most extraordinary suggestions ever made in Anglo-Saxon or American legal annals. As a mixture of sophistry and soft headedness, brewed by nonlegal or corroded legal minds, I assert that this suggestion has spawned the present wave of destruction now sweeping the country.

"In brief, this proposed doctrine is that if any individual citizen or group of citizens, after meditation, come to the conclusion that any law is unjust; and further conclude that if apprehended he or they are willing to accept the penalty imposed for violation of the law—then it becomes morally justifiable to break the law openly and notoriously.

"Of course the worst thing about this doctrine is that there are no dividing lines in it. If it is valid for a small violation, it applies equally to a more serious one. Once you start this approach there is no stopping. It is like a roller coaster which nears the top of the track. Once you push it over a little bit, it plunges down all the way.

"The amazing thing is that many clergy of this church, including both priests and bishops, have openly and officially accepted this doctrine. Episcopal clergymen have received written expressions of this doctrine for their guidance. And large numbers of clergy of this and other communions have been sent, or have gone on their own volition, to Southern areas for the sole purpose of expressing racial concerns by open law defiance pursuant to this new assertion of moral right.

"Finally, as sorely distressed Christians, we see instance after instance of reluctance on the part of elected officials to meet lawlessness quickly and firmly lest there be an adverse effect upon their personal political careers at the ballot box. Thank God not all our officials are of this character, but too many are."

Dr. Watts declared that it ought to be perfectly clear that no person, "however exalted he may be or regard himself, has the right to say that what was wrong before becomes morally right if the acting party is willing to be punished if caught." He pointed out that clergymen have a duty not only to support the Constitution and laws of the land, but to reject the doctrine "of a morally justified civil disobedience." He urged that there be no compromise with lawlessness, and he added that Christians should "seek by all lawful and proper means to help our neighbors to achieve civic equality of treatment and betterment of opportunity for self-improvement."

While it is understandable that there should be a difference of viewpoint as to the wisdom of participation by the clergy in public demonstrations, there has been much discussion among the clergymen as to how far such activities should extend. There is widespread sentiment that clergymen, as individual citizens, may express themselves freely on problems of human behavior, but that ministers ought not to take part in "sit-ins" or "lie-ins" in any mass protests which can incite violence.

It is apparent that many of the younger clergymen are taking the position that, since the objective is worthy, any method used to achieve it is permissible, whereas the clergymen of more mature years, irrespective of their sectarian affiliations, are arguing that clergymen have the same obligation as do other citizens to obey the law.

STEEL AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation is watching anxiously as negotiations continue between the major steel companies and the United Steel Workers. Everyone appreciates, I believe, what would happen to our prosperity here at home if nearly half a million steelworkers were to be idled by a strike, and if hundreds of thousands more were to be laid off in other industries because of a shortage of steel. But that is not the only threat which faces us.

The whole country has another stake in these steel negotiations. That stake is nothing less than the world strength of the American dollar. To preserve the strength of our dollar, we have launched a successful campaign to achieve a balance of payments in our trade relations with other nations. The success of that campaign is now in jeopardy. Steel plays a large role in this Nation's balance of payments and, unless a peaceful and responsible settlement can be reached without a strike, that role in the months ahead will be exceedingly destructive.

Back in the mid-1950's, steel made a large, positive contribution to our balance-of-payments situation. America's balance of payments last showed an annual surplus in 1957—a surplus of some \$520 million. In that year, steel exports exceeded steel imports by some \$825 million—more than our entire balance-of-payments surplus. Last year, however, we showed a deficit in our balance of payments of \$3.1 billion. And in that year, steel imports exceeded steel exports by \$146 million. The effect of the decline of exports and the rise of steel imports on our balance-of-payments problem is, therefore, clear. Of the \$3½ billion unfavorable shift in our balance of payments which has occurred over the last 7 years, steel alone has accounted for almost \$1 billion, or one-fourth of the total.

Much of this shift in the competitive position of American steel can be traced to the paralysis caused by the 1959 strike. That strike, lasting 116 days, dealt a severe and crippling blow to our balance of trade in steel. As domestic supplies of steel became uncertain, and then dwindled, American companies looked for new sources, and they found them. New channels of trade were opened, and American firms soon discovered that good quality steel could be bought abroad. When the strike ended, those channels remained open. Steel imports continued at more than twice their prestrike level.

This year, the American payments deficit will be sharply reduced from last year's \$3.1 billion level. The superb voluntary cooperation of our banks and our manufacturing companies in their lending and investment policies is thus adding mightily to the strength of the dollar.

In the second quarter of this year, our balance of payments achieved its first quarterly surplus in nearly 8 years, in the amount of \$132 million. But we earned that surplus in spite of a steel trade deficit of \$221 million during the same quarter. American steel users felt they had to hedge against the threat that labor and management in steel might once again let the industry shut down.

The steel deficit makes the overall surplus even more remarkable. But it also shows the magnitude of the economic problems that brinkmanship in steel negotiations have created for this country. Even without a strike, the steel trade deficit is likely to be half a billion dollars this year.

A strike would greatly enlarge that loss. In the opening days and weeks of a strike, orders placed abroad would quicken. If the strike continued, imports

would continue to rise. A long strike would cost this country an additional 3 million tons in our steel trade balance, a loss of about another \$400 million. And many of the foreign suppliers are now insisting on long-run contracts as their price for taking on new customers. Such contracts would continue even after the strike were settled. The loss could again be permanent, as it was in 1959. The costs would be borne by both management and labor in steel, and by the whole Nation as well.

With steel imports already running over a million tons a month, filling more than 10 percent of all our domestic needs, we can ill afford a further increase because of a strike.

We have asked American industry to conduct its investments abroad in such a way as to cut foreign exchange costs. We have asked our banks to limit their loans outside this country. We have reduced the amount of duty-free souvenirs that Americans traveling abroad can bring back into this country. We have asked these sacrifices of the American people and of American industry, and they have responded magnificently. They are entitled to ask that the steel negotiators be similarly concerned about defending the dollar as they carry on their discussions.

By continuing operations, by maintaining stable prices, by moving ahead with its dynamic modernization plans which call for investment outlays of \$2.3 billion next year, the steel industry can reverse the trend of the past in world markets. It can join our other industries in demonstrating once more the miracle of American productivity and efficiency which generates the world's largest trade surplus. The future of our trade position in steel is vital to steelworkers, to stockholders and management, and to the whole Nation. Whether that position is to improve, or grow steadily worse, lies in the hands of the men negotiating the steel labor settlement today.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, THE GOLD DRAIN, AND YOUR DOLLAR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1965, the Republican coordinating committee approved an outstanding report submitted by its task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policy entitled, "The Balance of Payments, the Gold Drain, and Your Dollar."

The task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policy is composed of distinguished citizens from public and private life who have expert knowledge of this complex field of policy. The chairman of the task force is Maurice H. Stans, who was Director of the Budget Bureau of the Federal Government during the Eisenhower administration. The vice chairman is Mr. George Champion, chairman of the board of directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York City. Along with these distinguished

citizens, the following members serve on the task force:

William H. Avery, Governor of Kansas.

Julian B. Baird, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, 1957-61.

FRANK T. Bow, Representative from the 16th Congressional District of Ohio.

George S. Eccles, president of First Security Corp., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Mrs. Rosemary Ginn, Republican national committeewoman for Missouri.

Cliff Hansen, Governor of Wyoming.

Kenneth C. Kellar, Kellar, Kellar & Driscoll, attorneys, Lead, S. Dak.

Peter O'Donnell, Jr., chairman of the Republican Party of Texas.

Clarence B. Randall, Special Assistant to the President on Foreign Economic Policy, 1956-61.

Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, 1957-61.

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission, 1953-58.

Robert D. Stuart, Jr., national committeeman for Illinois.

Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, 1953-58.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator from Delaware.

The subject matter of this report is one of the most difficult and persistent problems which confront the National Government. As might be expected from the caliber of the people who participated in drafting this report, the document clearly analyzes the basic causes and presents nine specific workable recommendations for coping with them. This report should lead to better understanding of the nature and gravity of the problem. I hope that it will spur the administration to a reconsideration of some of its policies in order to deal effectively with a situation which could contribute to a breakdown in the international monetary system and a depression of serious proportions.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the text of the report made by the task force on Federal fiscal and monetary policy of the Republican coordinating committee:

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, THE GOLD DRAIN, AND YOUR DOLLAR SUMMARY

I. The U.S. balance-of-payments position and loss of gold evidence a critical situation.

The facts

The gold supply of the United States has dwindled from \$23 billion to under \$14 billion in the last 8 years.

In the first 6 months of 1965 the loss of gold was \$1.2 billion, exclusive of a transfer to the International Monetary Fund.

The country is committed to keep approximately \$9 billion in gold to back its currency, leaving less than \$5 billion of gold to use in foreign payments.

For the last 7 years American dollars have been flowing overseas (for investments, imports, loans, foreign aid, tourism, military purposes, and other spending) at a rate that has exceeded the inflow of dollars from other countries by an average of about \$3 billion a year.

As a result, the country now owes \$28 billion in short-term dollar balances held by foreign claimants, for which they can demand payment, directly or indirectly, in gold.

The margin of our exports over imports has shrunk alarmingly in recent months, at the rate of about \$2 billion per year, from earlier levels.

In early 1965, the net outflow of dollars was stemmed only by the Government's admittedly temporary expedient of harshly restricting American direct business investments abroad and limiting private lending overseas.

The significance

The United States has failed to bring its international balance of payments into even temporary equilibrium except by the imposition of ultimately self-defeating Government controls.

The Government's management of the Nation's monetary and fiscal affairs has shaken the confidence of other nations in our ability to find lasting solutions to our balance-of-payments problem.

The international monetary system, which relies heavily on the dollar as the key international reserve currency, has been impaired by the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits to the point where drastic changes in the system are being called for.

Unless these conditions are corrected promptly, they can lead to loss of value for the dollar, loss of American strength at home and leadership abroad, loss of vigor in our economy, and loss of jobs, welfare, and security for individual Americans.

II. The Democratic administration has not only failed to deal effectively with these conditions but has contributed to making them worse:

It has attempted to reassure the public with unwarrantedly optimistic statements instead of facing the problem with appropriate action.

It has consistently opposed the use of time-proven methods of monetary and fiscal restraint.

It has adopted artificial controls over the outward flow of capital as an expedient to avoid the decisive steps needed for an effective long-term solution.

Its major actions, which restrict American investment in foreign countries, are such as to be ultimately self-defeating.

Many of its efforts and proposals have been so picaresque as to be meaningless, such as cutting down the small amount of goods American tourists can bring back from overseas without payment of duty.

It has persisted in out-of-date programs which involve excessive military spending in Europe.

It has allowed foreign aid programs to cause an excessive drain of our dollars.

It has allowed the balance-of-payments difficulties to grow to a point where proposals are being made for changes in the international monetary system which seem destined to reduce the role of the dollar as the principal international reserve currency.

It has followed monetary and fiscal policies which impair the Nation's capability to deal constructively with economic recessions.

III. The Republican Party recommends that the following measures be adopted by the administration and the Congress without delay:

1. Give top priority to developing a solution to our balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves.

2. Jointly, with our allies among the major industrial and trading nations, work aggressively to strengthen international monetary arrangements along noninflationary lines.

3. Lend support to a monetary policy which will narrow interest rate differentials between the United States and other countries.

4. Adopt domestic fiscal policies which avoid inflation and which preserve an ample reservoir of strength to deal with any un-

expected crisis or unfavorable economic development.

5. Enlarge efforts to build export trade, including tax, depreciation, and other economic policies, and the encouragement of technological and productive superiority, to enhance the competitive position of American business and labor.

6. Increase promotional efforts to encourage foreign tourism in the United States, with greater reliance on private agencies.

7. Redetermine the extent of need, under present conditions, for United States military forces in the European theater, with the objective of reducing our expenditures there.

8. Confine American military assistance generally to countries' committee to the side of the free world in the struggle against Communist subversion and aggression.

9. Reduce the cost of foreign economic aid programs, primarily by directing assistance to those countries which maintain a hospitable climate for private investment capital, and by stimulating private initiative here and abroad to lead in their development.

This Republican program calls for the responsible use of fiscal and monetary policies, for realistic reductions of Government overseas economic and military programs, and for steps to increase the return flow of dollars. It would provide a fundamental and lasting solution to our balance-of-payments problem.

Once a program of this character took hold it would be possible to discard the administration's expedients. The recent restrictions on duty-free imports by American tourists could be relaxed immediately. The stop-gap measures to limit private overseas investment—the interest equalization tax and the so-called voluntary restraint program—could be dismantled at an early date.

Adoption of this Republican program would serve notice to the world of our determination to manage our financial affairs constructively, to defend the dollar, to build our national vigor, and to enhance our moral, military and economic power to outperform and outlast world communism.

It would allay concern over the adequacy of international liquidity and provide a solid foundation for world economic stability, development and prosperity.

In addition, it would enable the United States, as the possessor of the world's strongest economy, to deal from a position of rebuilt and growing strength in negotiations to improve the international monetary system.

All Americans can proudly and confidently support this program and its objectives.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS, THE GOLD DRAIN, AND YOUR DOLLAR

The balance-of-payments problem in the international accounts of the United States, and the outflow of gold from the United States, are symptoms of a danger affecting every American's job, and income, the future prosperity of the rest of the world as well as the United States, and, in the larger picture, the question of whether the free world will maintain the economic strength to prosecute and eventually to win the cold war.

Continued failure to deal adequately and promptly with the problem could contribute to a breakdown in the international monetary system with the possibility of bringing to the United States and other free nations a depression of serious proportions and duration. In such circumstances, everyone would suffer.

This paper analyzes the problem as follows:

1. Evidence of the problem.
2. How the situation developed.
3. The problem today.
4. The failure of the Democratic administration's attempted solutions.

5. The Republican recommendations.
6. The urgency of achieving a lasting solution.

Evidence of the problem

Existence of the problem is confirmed by the volume of material appearing in the public press about it, the profusion of speeches being given by administration officials telling what they are doing about it, their claims that their efforts are working, their explanations of failures, and their attempts to answer criticisms of their policies. Repeated warnings by monetary organizations, experts, and officials abroad indicate their concern.

Only this year the administration recommended, and Congress passed, a bill which eliminated the requirement for gold as a backing for the deposit liabilities of our Federal Reserve banks, retaining only the 25-percent gold requirement against the note liabilities of the Federal Reserve system. This was an emergency measure to free more of our gold stock for payment of foreign claims. The administration had allowed itself to be forced into a position where it had to change the law or break it. The move postponed an eventual reckoning, but contributed nothing to finding a solution for the basic problem or to stopping the demand for gold.

Dramatic, objective evidence is also available in the economic statistics:

1. Beginning with 1958, the United States has had a large international payments deficit every year, which means that more dollars have flowed out of the country than have come back into it.

2. Gold has been moving overseas to finance part of these deficits, with the result that the country has lost about one-third of its gold stock of 8 years ago.

3. The short-term claims of foreign holders against the United States are now twice its gold stock, and if all the holders of these claims were to demand payment in gold we could not pay half of them.

In short, there is widespread agreement among authorities, among leaders of both political parties, within the Government of the United States and among officials of other countries, that the U.S. international finances are in disorder. The statistics show clearly that this is the case.

How the situation developed

For many years prior to World War I, and until the depression of the 1930's, England was in effect the world's banker. The pound sterling was recognized everywhere as the preferred medium for payment of international debts, transfers of capital across national borders, and for foreign exchange uses generally. In the thirties, this international payments system broke down and balances began to be settled in many different currencies with continually fluctuating rates—a condition which in itself hampered international trade and was an obstacle to general worldwide recovery from the great depression.

Following World War II, the United States emerged as the world's strongest economy. The economic strains of war were less severe on it than on other combatant nations. Its industrial plants were not damaged as were those of other countries. The accumulated demand of the war years resulted in a rapid expansion of our industrial plant and brisk economic activity.

At the same time, the United States assumed responsibility for helping to repair the destruction in other countries. The wartime "arsenal of democracy" for Western civilization converted itself into the peacetime supplier of goods, services, and capital to rebuild the ravaged economies of our friends and enemies alike. In this the efforts of private capital were supplemented by Marshall plan grants and by other foreign aid programs.

This employment of national strength and wealth resulted in the establishment of the dollar as the world's principal reserve currency. It was an accidental benefit. It was unplanned. But it helped the world and it bestowed prestige on the United States as the world's financial and economic leader.

During much of this postwar period the United States ran a deficit in its balance of payments, as dollars flowed abroad to help rebuild the world. The dollar was in demand everywhere. It was not just "good as gold," it was better. The United States became the world's banker, providing its international currency needs. Its balance-of-payments deficits, if held within reasonable limits, would not have been dangerous; they would, up to a point, have merely offset the surpluses of the war years, while helping to meet the world's need for international financial liquidity.

But by the late 1950's things were beginning to change. The "dollar gap" had disappeared. We were faced abroad by rebuilt industrial nations competing with the United States for export markets and investment opportunities. Deficits continued, however, as did foreign military and economic assistance commitments, the latter with emphasis transferred largely to underdeveloped and Communist-threatened nations.

As the finances of industrial nations improved, it was only natural that their officials and bankers felt it wise to build their gold holdings. This, too, would not have been harmful to the United States if it had been held within reasonable bounds. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. Failing to respond adequately to our gold losses and our balance-of-payments deficits, the Democratic administrations since 1960 have not applied the measures necessary to maintain the Nation's gold supply and the future strength of the dollar.

In 1959 and 1960, when the balance-of-payments deficit first became a matter of concern, the Eisenhower administration had responded promptly, as noted in the January 1961 Economic Report of the President: " * * * the effort centered on measures to increase U.S. exports and to reduce the balance-of-payments impact of Government military and economic programs abroad in a manner consistent with our responsibilities."

Specifically, the Eisenhower action included these steps: (a) a national export expansion program, including improved arrangements for guarantee of short- and intermediate-term export credits by the Export-Import Bank, and active governmental support for reduction of foreign discriminatory restrictions on U.S. goods and services; (b) reorientation of activities of commercial attaches of our embassies abroad and State Department policy generally, from one of assisting foreign businessmen in selling to the United States, to a policy of promoting export sales of American products; (c) measures, as early as October 1959, to tie military and economic assistance activities of the Department of Defense, International Cooperation Administration, and Development Loan Fund to procurement in the United States; (d) an executive order in January 1961 prohibiting U.S. citizens and organizations from holding gold abroad; (e) measures in 1960 to effect a progressive reduction in the number of military dependents in Europe; (f) initiation of negotiations with Germany that eventually resulted in that country assuming a major share of the cost of maintaining U.S. military forces there; (g) appropriate monetary and fiscal policies to provide incentives to attract foreign funds and to keep dollars at home, as well as to avoid the potential inflationary pressures that could have developed in the course of financing a large public debt increase in 1959.

This multipronged approach, which was accepted in the United States and abroad as both timely and effective, was inadequately followed up by the succeeding Democratic administration. It even blithely reversed some of the most effective measures.

So now a truly ironic situation has developed. The revitalized and financially stronger European governments have grown alarmed at our lack of financial discipline and have decided that gold bars may prove a better long-term investment than dollars. This conviction on their part has been affirmed by their concern about present U.S. policies of stimulating growth by artificially low interest rates and unduly expanded credit.

Whatever the motivation of other governments, the result has been that they have put pressure on the dollar, exchanging it for gold. The consequence, for which our own Government's policies are responsible, has been an undermining of the dollar's standing as the world's leading reserve currency.

The administration's attitude of nervous disapproval of foreign gold demands, its meager palliatives and harshly restrictive efforts to remedy matters, together with its continuing barrage of publicity to bolster domestic political confidence, have caused growing concern. Actually, the administration's attempts to deal with the problem are compounding it rather than solving it.

The problem today

Few people realize fully the extent to which the prosperity of the United States, and of all other nations, is dependent on the exceedingly complex arrangements for the international flow of money and gold, whether as payments for imports and exports, as investment capital, as intergovernmental loans and grants or as changes in the reserves backing an individual country's currency.

Nor are they fully aware of how easily and rapidly that whole system, which is based primarily on confidence, can deteriorate through poor management.

The key to understanding the situation created by the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and loss of gold lies in understanding how the world's money supply is provided and how that supply is used to fuel the world's economic machinery.

There is not enough gold in the world to handle all the transactions for which a medium of exchange is needed. Faced with this situation, creditors in international trade will accept hard currencies in lieu of gold. A hard currency is one that is both in good supply and is well-managed by its country of origin, so that people have faith that it will remain hard and not deteriorate through inflation.

When the supply of gold to handle world transactions is inadequate, an additional medium of exchange—a hard currency—is needed to supply liquidity. The liquidity for world use today is supplied principally by the U.S. dollar. The British pound has been in second place as a "key currency."

Currencies get into world circulation through their home country running a balance of payments deficit, more dollars (for instance) flowing out each year than flowing in.

In the postwar period, the world looked to the dollar with confidence; the willingness of foreigners to hold the increasing amount of dollars resulting from the recurring annual deficit in the U.S. balance of payments was a sign of the dollar's stable value and acceptability as a dependable medium of exchange. But these accumulated deficits have now built up to \$28 billion worth of dollar claims against the United States with only about \$14 billion in gold stock to pay them (of which only \$5 billion is now legally available for such use).

So, the problem resolves itself into four critical aspects:

1. How to manage our economic affairs to merit and retain a role of world financial leadership.
2. How to manage the world's key currency, the dollar, so as to maintain confidence in it.
3. How to maintain adequate but not excessive international liquidity.
4. How to strengthen present world monetary arrangements.

The problem of confidence in the management of the dollar is central. If other countries regain confidence in that management, a balance-of-payments deficit of reasonable size can be a symptom of strength, not of weakness. Dollars bearing interest will again be in more demand than non-interest-bearing gold. And the gold drain will either terminate or reverse itself.

Under these circumstances, the United States, with its house in order, and its currency the strongest in the world, can take the lead in improving international monetary arrangements to achieve world economic growth and stability for the years ahead.

The failure of the Democratic administrations' attempted solutions

The Democratic administrations have had almost 5 years to solve the problem but have failed to do so, because they have attempted to deal with symptoms rather than underlying causes. Like treating a patient with a fever by putting him into a tank of cold water, this may alleviate some of the discomfort, but it is no substitute for a good antibiotic to kill the germ responsible for the ailment.

The Democratic administrations have tinkered with the difficulties by attempting to adjust some items of inflow and outflow of payments. They have not gotten at the basic causes, the principal ones of which are their own monetary and fiscal policies. In seeking to achieve political objectives by easy money policies, and by entering into large governmental spending commitments, they have sown the seeds of future economic weakness. These policies do not inspire confidence at home or abroad.

Most of the direct steps the administration has taken have been too little and may also have been too late. Some have been of so little consequence as to have negligible effect. The measures that have had some effect are of a short-run type, sure to be destructive in the longer run of our national and international interests.

Here are the principal measures undertaken by the administration:

1. Reduction of duty-free allowances for American tourists returning from other countries.
2. Export trade promotion and assistance.
3. Promotion of foreign tourist travel in the United States.
4. An interest equalization tax.
5. The President's "voluntary program" to reduce private U.S. investments abroad.
6. Partial tying of foreign aid to exports; and steps to offset overseas military costs by sales of military material to other countries.

There have been other steps, too, but they are miniscule. For example, tours abroad by West Point and Annapolis undergraduates were canceled; this will save less than \$1 million in a multibillion dollar problem, at the loss of familiarizing our future officers with military installations and terrain in countries where they may someday be called upon to defend American interests. An item like this, which reduces the average annual dollar outflow by about one one-hundredth of 1 percent at a cost in future military advantage, is a "little-think" approach.

The widely publicized recent move to reduce further the duty-free allowance to

returning American tourists is an unnecessary harassment of the citizenry to give the appearance of action in the hope that time will make a real effort unnecessary. The administration in 1965 proposed the momentous step of reducing the allowance from \$100 to \$50. The Congress wisely rejected this bit of silliness.

Promoting export trade is sound policy. At present only 4 or 5 percent of the American gross national product goes into export channels. Much more needs to be done to build our export markets.

Increasing foreign tourist travel in the United States is highly desirable. Reducing our present "tourist gap" (what our tourists spend abroad less what foreign tourists spend here) of \$1.6 billion or more annually could help our balance of payments and stimulate better international understanding in the process. However, coupling such a program with injunctions to Americans to stay home is international double talk not conducive to achieving either objective. Cultural isolationism is a poor weapon with which to advance the cause of a free society against the aims of communism.

Twice the administration has attempted to stem the adverse balance-of-payments tide by major expedients. In 1964, it requested and secured from Congress an interest equalization tax to reduce American portfolio investment overseas. When this failed to produce all the desired results, it adopted in 1965 a "voluntary program" for restriction of private U.S. investment abroad. These measures turn back the clock on 30 years of progress from isolationism and protectionism toward progressive reduction of barriers and toward an expanding world movement of capital and trade. They are steps backward, inviting retaliation in kind, for which this country and the rest of the world will suffer.

Actually, one of the largest continuing and expanding sources of dollar inflows is the returns on investments made in earlier years. A study made by the Brookings Institution estimated that, on a cumulative basis, the dollar outflow initially entailed in new direct foreign investment and loans is fully offset in 5 years by the dollar inflow it produces, and that by the 10th year it has produced inflows more than twice the amount of the initial outflow. The administration's policy of restricting foreign investment means that in future years this increasing return flow is sacrificed to the expedient of temporary relief from tough decisions that ought to be made in other areas. This is penny wise, pound foolish government.

Apart from the potential loss in investment income, the administration's restrictionism entails other major fallacies. It is hostile to business freedom, it militates against international cooperation, it inhibits growth of free markets, it reduces export opportunities, it tends to cause balance-of-payments problems for other countries, it invites retaliatory protectionism, and impedes the development of economies in other free world countries by denying to them the capital to build the stability and strength to withstand Communist enticements. It is contrary to all that America stands for.

Another serious concern relative to the so-called voluntary controls is the sanctions available to the Government for enforcing voluntary compliance and the possibility that under the stress of some future temporary emergency such voluntary controls might be hardened into compulsory controls. Undesirable as controls by Government intrinsically are under a free enterprise economy, their imposition on international commercial and financial exchanges has the added penalty that they are interpreted abroad as possible signs of a deteriorating economic position.

When so much of the problem has to do with maintaining the confidence of the financial community at home and abroad in the management of our monetary affairs,

such measures, or even indications that such action may be considered, have a strong tendency to compound the problem rather than contribute to its solution.

The Democratic administration concedes that the restrictions on foreign investments are intended as temporary measures, not a permanent solution. It hopes that a permanent solution will somehow happen, but it has no evident program for causing it to happen. It has freed some domestic gold reserves by getting Congress to withdraw part of the requirement of gold as a backing to our monetary and banking system, but this merely bought time—it created no more ability to pay international debts.

The deficits of recent years would have even larger effect for the fact that some foreign countries have made prepayments on their postwar debts to the United States. It is doubtful that this can be relied upon much longer as a significant source of payment inflows, in view of the relatively small remaining amounts that are likely to be collected from the countries that have made such prepayments.

The United States cannot solve this problem by reducing gold reserves, nor by a facade of restrictive, short run, penny wise, little-think, isolationist measures. Such measures may cover the problem up for a short time, but are misleading none of the experts at home or abroad. It is their confidence, in this case, that is the key to the problem.

Neither will the American people be satisfied for long with little more than good intentions. They will look for careful analysis, depth of understanding, discrimination between cause and symptom, and purposeful and determined actions.

The Republican recommendations

Top priority must be assigned to restoring and maintaining a reasonable balance in the Nation's international payments through genuinely effective, long-range policies. To this end, the Republican approach rests on the following premises:

The solutions should be directed at underlying causes, not merely at symptoms.

They must contribute to both domestic and international economic stability and growth.

They must help to provide adequate but not excessive international liquidity and world monetary reserves.

They should make possible the prompt withdrawal of restrictive government controls over American investments in foreign countries.

They should foster expanding international trade, travel, investment and cooperation among free world nations and people.

They must be aimed at strengthening, and then maintaining, the U.S. position of international financial leadership.

The Republican Party recommends that the following measures be adopted by the administration and the Congress:

1. Give top priority to developing a solution to our balance-of-payments problem which will be lasting and constructive for the rest of the world as well as for ourselves.

2. Jointly, with our allies among the major industrial and trading nations, work aggressively to strengthen international monetary arrangements along noninflationary lines.

The role of the United States should be to lead in consideration of any changes in the world monetary system. It cannot permit other countries to usurp its position as the world's banker or to lead it into unwise compromises.

International meetings are timely from the standpoint of the present need for improved world monetary arrangements. Prospects for the success of such meetings will be greatly improved, however, when the United States can participate from a position of leadership based on management of its international payments through

sound long-range policies rather than on expedients such as so-called voluntary controls of capital outflow.

The United States should develop its positions and its plans for strengthening the world's monetary relationships. The objectives should be:

1. The supplying of adequate but not excessive world liquidity.

2. The providing of a means of discipline to assure adjustments by countries when needed to keep their international accounts close to balance.

3. Maintaining of adequate facilities for emergency coping with temporary balance-of-payments deficits of individual countries.

4. The providing of policies and means to promote expanding and competitive trade and unrestricted movement of capital.

5. The assuring of arrangements to reduce the possibility of individual countries disrupting the international monetary structure through unsound domestic economic policies.

The International Monetary Fund has met these requirements with a laudable degree of success. Further improvements to maintain that record and to augment the capability of the Fund to achieve these objectives are now in order and preferable to radical plans for change or to creation of wholly different experiments through new international systems.

Changes in the world monetary system should be evolutionary and gradual, to minimize speculation and instability. They should progress in orderly fashion. The present system, stemming from the Bretton Woods agreement, has bridged the transition from World War II's ravaged world to today's vastly expanded international trade and capital development. It can be adapted to present world needs without revolutionary change. The United States should point the way.

3. Lend support to a monetary policy which will narrow interest rate differentials between the United States and other countries.

The administration's failure to encourage use of corrective monetary policy is a major underlying cause of the balance-of-payments problem. Its rigid and uncompromising commitment to easy money as a magic key to domestic expansion is a poor choice of means as opposed to wise and flexible policies serving all the valid goals of domestic and international expansion. Our European creditors are watching with increasing impatience for the United States to exercise the monetary discipline which alone can establish their confidence in the continued soundness of the dollar.

The administration has consistently favored a policy of artificially low interest rates, regardless of cost to other national objectives. Low interest rates are appropriate in a period of economic slack; they are wholly inappropriate during a period of high economic activity marked by inflationary warnings and accompanied by an unsolved balance-of-payments problem. Interest rates which are market determined, rather than politically determined, will rise in periods of high demand. In so doing they act as a brake on reckless expansion of credit, curb the tendency to excesses in the business cycle, apply restraint over the outflow of funds from the country, attract inflows from other nations, and moderate inflationary tendencies. This administration's policy of insistence on artificially low interest rates is damaging to our national interests both in courting domestic inflation and in contributing directly to our balance-of-payments problem.

In the past 4 years, the administration's easy money policies have expanded credit twice as fast as the rise in real production. Interest rates are well below those in other industrial countries, and the amount of personal, private, and government (local and State as well as national) debt in the United

States is so high as to be cause for comment if not general concern.

All of this risks loss of confidence in the dollar. Foreign holders of dollars know by bitter experience that sooner or later credit inflation brings price inflation. They know that failure to use monetary and fiscal policy properly has been a major cause of every devaluation of currencies in history.

Further credit inflation in the United States could involve the heavy risk of a boom and bust pattern which would be damaging at home as well as abroad. Responsible use of credit policy can help avert such developments, and contribute to balanced expansion in both domestic and international economic sectors.

4. Adopt domestic fiscal policies which avoid inflation and which preserve an ample reservoir of strength to deal with any unexpected crisis or unfavorable economic development.

The administration's fiscal brinkmanship can lead to disaster. The Vietnam situation, for instance, will involve many billions of dollars in increased military spending, and may provide a severe test of whether we have the reserve economic strength to provide adequate flexibility with which to meet this heavy increased burden on the budget without pronounced inflation.

A nation, like an individual, should preserve a reserve of strength, because it can never know when emergencies will develop. It is unwise to assume that new economic nostrums can repeal the ups and downs of the business cycle or immunize us from the fiscal demands of military emergencies. The overstimulation of growth by excessive Government spending, with deliberate deficits in times of unprecedented prosperity, are an invitation to crisis.

The administration claims credit for having held the budget deficit to \$3½ billion in the last fiscal year; but this is after crediting \$3 billion of largely nonrecurring receipts from Federal Reserve bank surplus, liquidations of Government stockpiles, and sales of loans and mortgages. A minor recession like that of 1958, with the budget already so overburdened, could result in a deficit of \$20 to \$30 billion or more under the present administration's policies. This would not only be inflationary; it would very likely ignite already apprehensive feelings in world financial circles and could result in a run on the dollar that would play havoc with our whole economy and hopes of continued progress. The adjustments for every person from such a consequence could be unbelievably harsh. They would mean vastly higher costs of living, reduced hours of work, fewer jobs and less income, the wiping out of savings, pensions and insurance, and the decline of morale and purpose.

This is not a prediction that these things will happen. It is a warning that they can happen. The safe course is to avoid economic fantasies that rigidly deny common sense and the repeated experience of history. Our Government spending policies must not reject entirely the proven worth of capital creation through saving, building reserves for emergencies, and maintaining a long run balance between income and expenditures.

5. Enlarge efforts to build export trade, including tax, depreciation, and other economic policies, and the encouragement of technological and productive superiority, to enhance the competitive position of American business and labor.

One of the most favorable factors of inflow in our balance of payments equation in recent years has been the excess of our exports over imports. American technology has outpaced the world and its products are in high demand.

Notwithstanding this, American exports are a very low percentage of our national output and are exceeded in this proportion by many European countries and by Japan.

The potentials are much greater than we have achieved, and our present Government activities to induce increased trade could be improved. Our share of total world export trade has not kept pace with the growth of world exports since formation of the European Common Market. Here again, improved results can be obtained through coordinated private and Government action.

Independent committees of economists, businessmen, labor leaders, export-import bankers, and marketing experts, cooperating with the Government, should be encouraged to devise and promote new and imaginative practical means for increasing sales of American products and services abroad. This should include stimulating, and removing impediments to, American private investment in other countries. Such investment builds markets for American-made goods. Private enterprise needs only to be unleashed, and made aware of the existence and location of markets, for our exports to mount under the stimulus of the profit motive.

The Government can help by adopting tax, depreciation, and other economic policies that enhance the competitive position of American business and labor. It can further relax depreciation allowances to encourage plant modernization. It can stimulate industrial research. It can gradually reduce the tax burden within responsible fiscal policy. It can aid in locating potential markets and communicating that information to appropriate industries. It can help by increased dissemination in diplomatic circles of the truth that freedom of enterprise in all nations will build an expanding economy and trade from which every nation will be the better and stronger.

The administration should particularly address itself vigorously to negotiating reduced barriers to trade with European countries. It should make a determined effort to further enhance the status and responsibilities of State Department commercial attachés.

Purposeful measures to reorient policies and personnel consistent with the changes in international trade conditions of the past 10 years are urgent. The situation is no longer one of the "dollar gap" and world recovery, but one of brisk competition with other revitalized nations.

In recent months the margin of exports over imports has shown an alarming drop. While some of this can be attributed to temporary conditions, it appears likely that the favorable 1964 margin of our foreign trade will not be repeated in the near future unless more aggressive and effective governmental action is applied.

6. Increase promotional efforts to encourage foreign tourism in the United States, with greater reliance on private agencies.

Americans spend billions of dollars touring in other countries, and this undoubtedly contributes in many ways to improved understanding among peoples. Contrary to administration policy, American tourism abroad should not be discouraged.

Other nations might well benefit, too, if more of their residents knew the United States at first hand. Expenditures by foreign tourists in this country are now around a billion dollars a year, less than 40 percent of what American tourists spend abroad. With increased prosperity around the world, many more foreigners could be attracted to this country, especially if they could be made confident as to costs, facilities and attitudes. The administration's efforts at improvement have been marginally effective.

This is a job that can be done best by private action with effective Government support. Independent committees of travel agencies, hotel and motel owners, transportation companies, the press, and others should be encouraged to develop programs for enticing tourists to this country. The effective operation of such programs will do more for

the United States by word of mouth goodwill from satisfied visitors than any amount of official Government propaganda. Our balance of payments can be improved in this manner while the people, customs and intentions of our country are appreciated by more and more friends from other nations.

7. Redetermine the extent of need, under present conditions, for U.S. military forces in the European theater, with the objective of reducing our expenditures there.

The time has long since arrived when a substantial reduction of our military establishment in Western Europe would appear to be wise if not necessary. Approximately 700,000 military and associated personnel are still being maintained in Europe, at a net outflow in the balance of payments of about \$1.5 billion (approximately half the recent annual balance-of-payments deficits). A force of this size was unquestionably desirable 15 years ago, as an emergency protective matter, when our European allies were weak and relatively defenseless. But with their economic recovery, the Western European countries should be able to marshal their own conventional forces against invasion, backed by our continuing firm commitment to assist in their defense. A small detachment of our forces can serve as evidence of this commitment, backed by our newly demonstrated ability to airlift reinforcements swiftly to any place in the world from central bases in the United States, and by our strategic air and missile striking forces.

An immediate reappraisal of the extent and character of our European-based military forces and financial commitment in the light of these changes in conditions should be undertaken both in our country and with our friends abroad as a matter of urgency. The results should substantially reduce our expenditures there.

These observations are backed by military experts and have been enunciated by both Democratic and Republican leaders. They were expressed by the Democratic majority in a 1965 report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress:

"The committee urges that the review of Government expenditures abroad focus particularly on the possibility of reducing our troop commitments in Europe * * *. Our overseas manpower was not cut back to the extent which the massive increase in our airlift capability would have permitted * * *. We must reduce our military expenditures in these countries."

There is no reason why our European friends, given a full appreciation of our views should continue to depend on us to carry such large forces on their soil. Our commitment to the preservation of freedom in Western Europe will not be reduced by a return of a considerable portion of these forces to our shores.

8. Confine American military assistance generally to countries committed to the side of the free world in the struggle against Communist subversion and aggression.

Last year American military assistance was given to more than 60 countries. In some nations American-supplied arms were used in local revolutions by forces inimical to free world interests. A more discriminating selection of military aid beneficiaries is necessary.

Our military assistance programs should be limited generally to countries and administrations which are clearly committed to the free world and opposed to international communism. Military aid should consist almost exclusively of equipment produced in American plants, and should be directed to the free nations surrounding the Communist orbit, who are our first line of defense, and nations seriously threatened with Communist takeover by subversion or revolution. Any exceptions should be rare and should be required to be clearly justified

in terms of our own overriding national interests. It is unsound to give weapons to nations when we cannot be sure that they will be used in our common defense, or to nations from whose hands they may proceed into the possession of enemy forces.

More realistic overseas military assistance programs will reduce the burden they impose on our balance-of-payments problem.

9. Reduce the cost of foreign economic aid programs, primarily by directing assistance to those countries which maintain a hospitable climate for private investment capital, and by stimulating private initiative here and abroad to lead in their development.

There is little doubt of the basic desirability of our foreign economic aid objectives. In their 17 years many of these programs has served effectively in building the free world and promoting the development of emerging nations. But this does not necessarily warrant their continuance at present levels.

In fiscal 1965, loans, grants, and other assistance of various kinds were made to an approximate total of 100 countries. There is little doubt that close examination will show incredible inefficiency, waste, mismanagement and misdirected effort in many of these programs. Some loans are made in dollars on terms which clearly indicate that neither the principal nor interest is ever going to return to this country. Some grants merely help to support local political objectives or to pay running expenses of insolvent governments. Some programs support foreign government-owned projects which ought to be done by private agencies under appropriate local incentives and encouragement. Many are of doubtful value to the country intended to be beneficial. Many should be ended. A realistic evaluation of these facts would result in a significant reduction in foreign aid costs.

The growth of industry and capital in the developing nations would be achieved more efficiently and more effectively under the discipline of the profit system than under any other form. This is the secret of our unparalleled American material progress and it should be exported with confidence and conviction.

Private initiative, both from the United States and within the underdeveloped nations should be recognized and encouraged as the key to sustained growth and development. Private capital can perform far more effectively than government socialism. Our aid ought to be directed to nations that accept this philosophy.

Furthermore, other industrial nations of the free world should be induced to shoulder a larger share of the burden of assistance to developing countries, both directly and through United Nations multilateral programs. Their efforts in this respect should be commensurate with their capabilities.

Assistance to other nations by the U.S. Government should be limited largely to our foodstuffs, fibers and goods—and only to the extent needed by them in excess of their ability to pay. The United States should and can also provide technical assistance in solving problems of agriculture, industry, commerce and government in accordance with the proven procedures evolved in our own country.

Such measures would benefit other nations more in the long run because we would be showing them the solid way to development and growth, within the potentials of their own resources and capabilities, rather than stimulating the illusion that largesse from the American taxpayers will bring "instant progress."

The administration position appears to be that all such expenditures are absolutely necessary, and that every effort is being made to minimize their balance-of-payments impact. It argues that 80 to 85 percent of economic aid purchases are tied to exports

and that more than one-third of military expenditures are offset by military exports from the United States.

While much of foreign aid is tied to specific exports, in many cases such aid releases dollars which otherwise would be spent in the United States, to be spent instead in Western Europe. Some experts maintain that this occurs to such a degree that our economic foreign aid is effectively tied to net exports to the extent of only 50 to 60 percent. A more realistic policy would concentrate our efforts in countries where help can be used soundly and stop the flow of dollars to areas and for purposes which merely support purchases from other nations. Such a policy need not damage our economic development efforts.

As part of foreign aid reforms, the number of beneficiary nations should be reduced. Commitment by recipients to free enterprise principles should be a precondition to economic aid wherever possible.

Finally, the various aid expenditures—grants, loans, international loan funds, agricultural products, Peace Corps, United Nations multilateral programs, refugee relief, and others—should be brought together into a single appropriation request for consideration by the Congress each year, so the American public is fully informed as to the total involved.

These measures would reduce the drain of our dollars and make the entire program more effective as an instrument of foreign policy, as a contribution to world progress, and as an aid to individuals and nations in learning that solid lasting growth is best attained by responsibility, planning and work under the incentive of private ownership and competition.

An analysis of the derivation of balance-of-payments deficits shows clearly that the international transactions of the private sector in this country are regularly in balance. The Government's outlays for military and economic aid programs overseas exceed its receipts of dollars from foreign countries, and in that sense account for the entire balance-of-payments deficits of recent years.

It is ironic that, under these conditions, the administration's major actions to deal with the problem have been restrictive measures directed at the private sector. Clearly, a major review of Government spending overseas is in order, and recommendations 6, 7, and 8 are directed at that objective.

The urgency of achieving a lasting solution

Apprehension about the future of the international monetary situation is increasing. The United Kingdom is facing a severe monetary crisis. France is converting more and more of its liquid holdings to gold. These events have raised storm signals for countries all over the world. The result could be a serious contraction of world liquidity and economic activity. This must not happen.

Whether the problem is an immediate one of impending economic dislocation, or the longer range one of strengthening the international monetary system, in both cases management of the dollar and maintenance of confidence in it are central to achieving successful solutions since it is the world's principal medium of exchange.

The Republican Party would be derelict if it did not raise its voice to call attention to an extremely serious situation in time for effective action.

The dollar is still the world's strongest currency. The United States is still the leader of the free world. There is yet probably enough time for prompt action successfully to correct the present deteriorating situation and maintain our position as the leader in building a world society where every man can share in the material benefits that are a precondition to individual freedom, dignity, and opportunity to lead the good life.

In publishing this paper, the Republican Party serves notice to the party in power that it must be responsible for the consequences of continuing failure to take prompt and suitable action to solve this vital problem.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1965 AND THE NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, for several years the Russian imperialists have vehemently denounced our annual Captive Nations Week observance. This year's observance was preceded by a violent attack from none other than Russia's chief ideologist, Mikhail Suslov, who is also a member of the Central Committee's Presidium and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. Here is the core of his message:

Especially disgusting is the villainous demagoguery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke.

There have been often equally sharp denunciations. What is significant in all of these cases is the morbid fear with which the Russians have consistently viewed the Captive Nations Week resolution and the annual observance. This alone should warrant a thorough and systematic investigation by us—to find out why, how we can profit from it, what new legislation is required to bolster the bastions of freedom.

All this points up again the pressing need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee would make this necessary, thorough and systematic investigation, and very likely would produce solid contributions similar to those of preceding congressional committees that concerned themselves with the Katyn Forest massacre and Communist takeovers. It was my privilege to serve on the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. This was over 10 years ago. The Congress can well take pride in the historic contributions of that committee. But the work begun in the fifties must be extended by us in this decade, especially in view of this mysterious fear on the part of the Russian Communist leaders. Who can say that the causes of this behavior are not worth looking into?

Mr. Speaker, many of our distinguished Members have commented on the 1965 Captive Nations Week and have furnished selected examples of the week's tremendous success. I wish to join them in paying tribute to the National Captive Nations Committee and its associated organizations for the conduct of the week and also in having the following, additional examples of the week's observance which I will include in my remarks: First, in the State of Ohio, the Governor's proclamation and that of the mayor of Dayton, along with several

items of Dayton's observance; second, news items on the week in Svoboda of July 17; third, an interesting UPI story on the Gerald Brooke show trial; fourth, the Buffalo observance program and a declaration from nearby Canada; and fifth, a proclamation, programs, news reports, and addresses during Pittsburgh's observance of the week:

STATE OF OHIO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus.

PROCLAMATION: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK,
JULY 18-24, 1965

Whereas the harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive: Now, therefore,

I, James A. Rhodes, Governor of the State of Ohio, do hereby designate the week of July 18-24, 1965, as Captive Nations Week and urge that all citizens support this annual recognition of the plight of the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe.

JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas many nations throughout the world have been enslaved by the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Communist Russia; and

Whereas the peoples of these captive nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States of America are linked by bonds of principle and family to those who love freedom and justice on every continent; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper to manifest clearly to the peoples of these conquered nations the moral and ideological support of the Government and the people of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom, self-determination, and national independence: Now, therefore,

I, Frank R. Somers, mayor of the city of Dayton, Ohio, do hereby proclaim the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week, and do invite the people of the city of Dayton to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and do urge them to study the plight of the Communist-dominated nations and to recommit them-

selves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of these captive nations.

FRANK R. SOMERS,
Mayor of the City of Dayton, Ohio.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Kettering-Oakwood Times, July 29, 1965]

CEREMONY HELD FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Last week's local observance of Captive Nations Week was climaxed Sunday with a special program at the Captive Nations Shrine in Dayton, where Brother Peter Lindenmann of Chaminade High School was the guest speaker.

The shrine is located near Holy Cross Church, 1920 Leo Street, where a large part of the congregation is of Lithuanian descent. Captive Nations Week has been established in accordance with joint congressional resolution and Presidential proclamation and is Public Law 86-90.

The purpose of the National Captive Nations Committee, according to Executive Director Donald Miller, of Washington, D.C., is to keep people of the free world aware of the fact that many freedom-seeking men, women, and children are still behind the Iron Curtain.

"It is also important for us to remember that many people living in our own area still have ties behind the Iron Curtain," said Dorothy McNab, local representative for the organization.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, July 24, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS RITES SCHEDULED

Captive Nations Week will be commemorated in Dayton tomorrow at 11 a.m., at the monument of three crosses at the Holy Cross Church, Leo and Regis Streets.

The special week was set aside in Congress in 1959 to make Americans aware of the plight of those behind the Iron Curtain.

Brother Peter Lindenmann, of Chaminade High School, will be the speaker with benediction by Rev. Titas Narbutas, pastor of the Holy Cross Church. Several nationalities will be represented at the program.

JULY 23, 1965.

A WAVI EDITORIAL
(By Gregg Wallace)

A listener has said, "But what can I do about the captive nations?"

A good question not easily answered.

Today, there are more than 25 nations in the world under direct or indirect control and domination of the horrendous Communist leaders. These people—literally millions—are no different than you and I, except in one area: Too many have either given up in utter futility or others have known nothing other than captivity.

As individuals we can do little, but as a collective society, made up of masses of individuals—with strong political backing—we can, as suggested by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, "begin to focus the spotlight of world attention and opinion on the total breadth of Sino-Soviet imperio-colonialism."

In other words, it is incumbent upon the entire free world, to raise in one united voice in decrying the menace of communism. We can't do it with vacillation, with compromise, with weak spines or with what continually amazes me: The unrealistic, dream-world attitude of the peaceniks, that is, ignoring completely the inhuman atrocities committed by the world's Red leaders while condemning any attempt made by the United States to halt this infringement on human dignity and freedom.

The more blase might say this is oversimplification, or even a bit corny.

Well, if one gets that impression we merely call your attention to the reaction printed last year in *Ivestia*, the Communist voice

in Moscow: "With every passing year Captive Nations Week becomes a nuisance." It failed to indicate specifically for whom.

Professor Dobriansky concludes, "During Captive Nations Week we can begin to concentrate on the freedom aspirations of 17 million North Vietnamese, and, from there, on those of all other captive nations."

Finally, we recall your attention to the expression of late President Kennedy, in full view of the Berlin wall: "For those who think there is no difference between freedom and slavery, let them come to Berlin."

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, July 22, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK GIVES BOTH PROMISE AND WARNING

"Give me liberty or give me death!" These famous words of Patrick Henry in 1775 should strike a warm note in the hearts of all loyal Americans yet today—and especially this week, Captive Nations Week.

Today we who live in a free society often take for granted and forget the meaning of freedom handed to us as our birthright. We forget that this costly birthright was bought with the blood of our fathers and forefathers. We forget the reason why our boys are fighting and dying for freedom in Vietnam. We forget that we must fight for freedom if we are to keep it.

But there are those who cannot forget. There are those who cannot forget the despicable brutality and tyranny of the Communists who now fearlessly dictate to the countries behind the Iron Curtain. There are those who cannot forget the frightful fact that more and more nations are being subdued to the same plunder by the continuous Communist aggression. There are those who cannot and will not forget the liberty and independence now deprived them.

Captive Nations Week, set aside by Congress as the third week in July, therefore, serves a dual purpose. First, it extends hope for the future to millions of captive people—that someday they may be emancipated and once more enjoy the freedom of their own homeland. Second, it is a warning to all Americans—what happened to once-free people could happen to us.

SILVIA D. ERIKSON.

KETTERING.

[From Svoboda, July 17, 1965]

LOCAL CAPTIVE NATIONS COMMITTEES URGED AT WOMEN'S CONVENTION

UKRAINIAN DELEGATES ATTEND GATHERING

NEW ORLEANS, La.—A call for the creation of local Captive Nations Committees in American communities was made at the 74th annual convention of the General Federation of Women's Clubs by Mr. Mary Dushnyck, delegate and secretary of Women for Freedom, Inc., an anti-Communist organization. Held at the Jung Hotel in New Orleans, La., from June 7-11, the convention was attended by over 2,000 delegates.

Mrs. Wm. H. Hasebroock of Nebraska is the president of the GFWC which has 11 million members, comprised of 15,500 clubs in 49 States and the District of Columbia, and 150 international clubs in 53 countries. Included in the latter are the Ukrainian National Women's League of America ("Soyuz Ukrainok") and Women for Freedom. Mrs. Anastasia Volker, a UNWLA vice president and public relations chairman, represented the UNWLA at the convention.

WARNS OF RED THREAT

In her report, delivered at the international luncheon on June 9, Mrs. Dushnyck, who is an organization chairman of the UNWLA, warned of the constant threat of communism in our midst, especially Communist activity on our college campuses and attempts to infiltrate the civil rights groups. She commended the GFWC for its

resolution on the "Menace of Communism" and urged its implementation by members joining local Captive Nations Committees or forming new ones by writing to the National Captive Nations Committee, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. She also outlined the purposes of WFF and especially the contributions of its president, Mrs. Geraldine Fitch, a known columnist.

Mrs. Volker, in her detailed report, outlined the aims, activities, and contributions of the UNWLA to the culture, education, and welfare of the Ukrainian and American communities.

BILINGUALISM URGED

Under the theme of "Service for Freedom and Growth," the GFWC convention held several stimulating panel discussions on diverse subjects, such as: "Morals at Stake on the Newsstands," "Volunteer Groups, Key to Community Betterment," "Approaching Problems of Alcoholism," "The Communist Danger," and others. A panel on education urged bilingualism from early childhood.

Reports were given on GFWC contributions to such worthy projects as the Congressional Medal of Honor Grove, Hope, rural schools in Mexico, Radio Free Europe, programs in Africa and the Near East, CARE, helping foreign students immigrants to the United States, and Korean widows, etc. Some of the addresses included "Our American Legacy in the 20th Century," "The Evolution of France in a Changing World," and "Our Changing Environment—Good or Bad?" Among the speakers were Charlton Heston, the screen actor, Benson Ford, of Ford Motor, the Honorable Alex A. Masas, Greek Ambassador to the United States, Peter Lind Hayes, newspaper editor, and others.

The delegates also enjoyed the famous southern hospitality for which New Orleans is noted: a plantation tea at the home of Mayor and Mrs. V. Schiro, a special fabulous Mardi Gras ball and reception, attendance at a naturalization ceremony in court, an international tea given by Mrs. Schiro at a museum, at which Pierre de Mirmont, Consul General of France, and Mrs. Lydia Balaban, a Ukrainian resident of New Orleans, were present, and numerous other festivities.

[From Svoboda, July 17, 1965]

NATIONWIDE OBSERVANCE OF SEVENTH CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK STARTS TOMORROW—PRESIDENT JOHNSON ISSUES SPECIAL PROCLAMATION

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC) under the chairmanship of Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the UCCA, has launched in full its activities for the annual observances of the Captive Nations Week, scheduled for July 18-24, 1965. All Governors and mayors of larger cities have been contacted for early proclamations.

On July 2, 1965, President Johnson issued the annual Presidential proclamation of Captive Nations Week, in which he called on the people of the United States "to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities," and urged them "to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

UKRAINIAN GROUPS LEAD IN OBSERVANCES

In all major cities of the country large-scale observances are planned with State and city officials taking part in them. From California to New York and from New Mexico to Massachusetts public rallies, religious services, and manifestations are planned by special committees honoring the seventh Captive Nations Week observance. All Members of the U.S. Congress have been invited by Dr. Dobriansky, in his capacity as chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee, to take active part in these solemn

observances and to make appropriate statements on the floor of the Congress.

"We earnestly seek your participation in the week's observance in Congress, giving recognition to the fact that over two dozen captive nations with a population close to a billion people represent a powerful deterrent against overt Soviet Russia and Red Chinese aggression and thus a formidable force for world peace with freedom and justice," Dr. Dobriansky stated in his message to Government representatives.

In all major cities throughout the country Ukrainian groups, especially branches and member organizations of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, are staging Captive Nations Week observances.

CEREMONIES IN GREATER NEW YORK

The Seventh Captive Nations Week observance in Greater New York is sponsored jointly by the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED), the Assembly of Captive European Nations (ACEN) and American Friends of the Captive Nations (AFCN).

On Sunday, July 18 at 10 a.m., a solemn mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral will be held, with the Right Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, presiding and the Right Reverend Monsignor Timothy J. Flynn giving the sermon and extending the welcome of His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman.

On Sunday, July 18, at 11 a.m., morning prayer and Holy Communion at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine.

National groups, with flags, are requested to assemble at 9:40 on Sunday, July 18 on west side of Fifth Avenue, opposite St. Patrick's Cathedral.

On Sunday, July 18, at 12:15 p.m., at ACEN House, 769 United Nations Plaza, across the street from the United Nations, a flag-raising ceremony will be held. The principal speakers will be Congressmen OGDEN R. REID, Republican, of New York, and LESTER L. WOLFF, Democrat, of New York.

On Tuesday, July 20, at 12 noon, Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York will issue a proclamation on the Captive Nations Week in the city of New York in a ceremony to be attended by representatives of many nationality groups and organizations.

On Friday, July 23, at 7 p.m., the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations will host Mr. Yaroslav Stetzko, president of ABN, at a press conference in New York's Commodore Hotel. A banquet will follow the conference, at which Mr. Stetzko will be the main speaker. Also appearing with speeches will be U.S. Congressmen SEYMOUR HALPERN and LEONARD FARBSTEIN as well as representatives of various nationality groups.

"THE WHITE HOUSE.

"A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, 1965

"Whereas the joint resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), authorizes and requests the President of the United States to issue a proclamation each year designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

"Whereas all peoples yearn for freedom and justice; and

"Whereas these basic rights unfortunately are circumscribed or unrealized in many areas in the world; and

"Whereas the United States of America has an abiding commitment to the principles of independence, personal liberty, and human dignity; and

"Whereas it remains a fundamental purpose and intention of the Government and people of the United States of America to recognize and encourage constructive actions which foster the growth and development of

national independence and human freedom: Now, therefore,

"I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the week beginning July 18, 1965, as Captive Nations Week.

"I invite the people of the United States of America to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to give renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

"In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

"Done at the city of Washington this second day of July in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 198th.

"By the President:

"LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
"DEAN RUSK,
"Secretary of State."

[From Svoboda, July 17, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1965

In 1959, the Congress of the United States adopted unanimously what has become known as the Captive Nations Week resolution, in the form of Public Law 86-90, providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. In addition, the law authorizes the President of the United States to issue a proclamation on the week each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

In keeping with the spirit of the law, the National Captive Nations Committee, headed by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, has worked out a program for this year's nationwide observance urging the widest possible support for President Johnson's policy in Vietnam and other areas of the globe threatened by Communist aggression. Prominent themes of the 1965 Captive Nations Week that must be brought to public attention with reinforced vigor and conviction include the following:

Peace with justice and freedom, support of all captive nations being one of our most powerful deterrents against a hot global war.

Full support for the President's action in Vietnam, preventing further Communist takeovers.

A "poltrade policy" toward the totalitarian Red empire, i.e., trade based on political concessions.

Complete exposure of Sino-Russian imperialism in the United Nations and other councils, concentrating especially on Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, and other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

Establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the U.S. House of Representatives, signifying American dedication to the eventual freedom of all captive nations.

Creation of a Freedom Commission and Academy.

Inauguration of a Captive Nations Freedom Stamp series, including a special stamp honoring Ukraine's post laureate and champion of liberty, Taras Shevchenko.

This year's Captive Nations Week is of special significance as Communist onslaughts on the free world's outposts, dramatized by the war in Vietnam, continue to cause grave concern to all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Moreover, the few misguided voices from some of our campuses calling for the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam, leave the impression—aptly utilized by Communist propaganda—that the United States and its allies can be pressured into eventually recognizing the status quo in divided Europe and Asia thus rescinding on their promises to defend freedom where it still exists and extending it wherever possible. There are some in this country who would do away with the Captive Nations Week and all that it stands for in the

belief that it is nothing but an obstacle to the "relaxation of tensions" and "peaceful coexistence." They are unwilling to recognize that any such relaxation can only follow, not precede, the realization of self-determination through free elections in the nations held captive by the Kremlin overlords, and that there can be no end to the cold war as long as an Iron Curtain divides Europe.

Yet it is an uncontested fact, recognized by prudent statesmen and top military experts in the West, that the captive non-Russian nations constitute a powerful deterrent to Soviet aggressive moves, and that their aspirations to political freedom deserve full support on both moral and practical grounds. To a large degree, the success of our foreign policy depends on the recognition of this fundamental weakness and vulnerability in the seemingly impregnable wall of the Red empire. Orientation toward all the captive nations and support of their manifest desire to break the chains of slavery and oppression is of paramount importance to the preservation of our freedom and the establishment of permanent peace on earth.

This is the essence of the captive nations resolution; this is the message of the Captive Nations Week. Let us see to it that during the week-long observance, starting tomorrow, it is voiced across the Nation, as once again we pledge our dedication to the ideals of freedom and independence for all captive peoples, first and foremost, those of our most martyred Ukraine.

EXILES—WITH BROOKE

(By Neil A. Martin)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The sentencing of a 28-year-old British teacher to 5 years "deprivation of liberty" by a Soviet court was seen today as a strong warning to anti-Communist exile groups.

The teacher, Gerald Brooke, yesterday received a sentence of 1 year in prison and 4 years in a "strict regime labor colony." He allegedly confessed to charges of visiting Russia for the Popular Labor Alliance, a Russian exile group based in West Germany.

The charges alleged Brooke smuggled anti-Soviet materials into Moscow. It was the first official Soviet admission that an anti-Communist underground exists in Russia.

The alliance, or "NTS" as it is known by its Russian initials, is one of several anti-Communist exile groups operating out of Western Europe and the United States. They are actively engaged in funneling money, propaganda, spy equipment and, reportedly, an occasional agent or two into Eastern Europe and Russia.

Several leading figures connected with some of these groups were in Washington this week for the annual observance of Captive Nations Week, designated by Congress in recognition of the peoples that have been swallowed up by communism.

Some emigres viewed Brooke's show trial as a clear warning to exile groups operating underground networks into Communist countries. They said the wide publicity given to the trial by the Soviets was intended to "scare off" anti-Communist contacts inside Russia and to dry up normal channels of communication.

Others said that although Brooke was arrested last April, the trial was purposely held off until now to coincide with the U.S. captive nations celebration.

But they all agreed that efforts to stir up unrest within the Communist orbit would continue regardless of warnings from the Kremlin.

Jaroslaw Stetako, head of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations (ABN), the largest exile organization in Western Europe, told UPI that his group will continue to do what it can to encourage "national liberation revolutions" within Eastern Europe and Russia.

Both the NTS and ABN have claimed successes in their propaganda war against the Communists.

NTS claims its leaflets were responsible for 300 Red Army defections during the 1953 German revolt. The organization is also said to have slipped agents into Russia and engaged in other cloak and dagger activities.

Likewise, ABN has reported Kremlin actions to suppress anti-Soviet movements inside Russia, strikes, and demonstrations by non-Russian students and workers, and sporadic guerrilla resistance in certain areas of the Ukraine.

But in their aims, the Munich-based ABN differs sharply with the NTS, headquartered in Frankfurt. NTS is principally a Russian exile group, the ABN is composed of more than 25 non-Russian and very outspoken anti-Russian exile groups, representing Ukrainians, Armenians, Georgians, Estonians, and others.

NTS envisions a future Russia, free from communism, but also would preserve the territorial integrity of a Russia largely unchanged from the days of the czars.

The ABN, however, distrusts Russians in power—Communist or otherwise—and advocates a dismemberment of the Soviet Union into independent states, much in the manner of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires after World War I.

THE CITY OF BUFFALO OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18-25, 1965

Citizens of Buffalo:

Fellow Americans:

Highlights of the week's program:

SUNDAY, JULY 18

A.M.: Religious observances in Catholic and Protestant churches of the city.

At 2 p.m.: Cavalcade of cars and marching groups from Main and Tupper proceeding to city hall.

At 3 p.m.: Official civic opening program at the McKinley Monument in front of city hall. Main speaker: Hon. HENRY P. SMITH III, U.S. Congressman, 40th District, New York.

WEDNESDAY, JULY 21

Civic luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo and CCOCNW at Hotel Statler Hilton, Terrace Room.

At 12 noon: Guest speaker: Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, U.S. Congressman, 41st District, New York.

SUNDAY, JULY 25

From 7:30 p.m.: Captive Nations Week festival with colorful program in Delaware Park, rear of Albright Knox Art Gallery. Guest speaker: Mrs. Edith Hyder-Jester, from Washington, D.C., well-known champion for freedom of all captive people.

Fellow Americans, residents of the Greater Buffalo area, the Captive Nations Week annual observances in Buffalo and across the country are in accordance with Public Law 86-90 issued by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President in 1959. It is each and every citizen's responsibility to abide by this law of the Nation.

Let's all be at the official civic opening on Sunday, July 18, 1965, at 3 p.m., at city hall.

CITIZENS' COMMITTEE TO OBSERVE

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK.

A DECLARATION SUPPORTING THE UNIVERSAL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, U.N. COLONIAL DECLARATION, GENOCIDE CONVENTION

"Like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and like the United Nations Charter, the United Nations Declaration on Colonialism was intended to be universal in its application to subject people everywhere.

"To divert from its evil practices, the U.S.S.R. has long preached against the sins of others.

"Our Canadian aim is to provide perspective for the strident demands which the U.S.S.R. makes on behalf of others, for the rights and benefits denied to the subject people of the Soviet Union.

"The United Nations Assembly has no cause to be selective in its denunciation of oppression." (A speech by Heath Macquarrie, member of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations Assembly, November 23, 1962.)

Ever since the inception of Marxist-Leninist communism—ideology alien and hostile to democratic ideals as expressed in the above-named pronouncements of the United Nations—the entire world has lived in fear of war and the surrender of basic human rights cherished by individuals and nations.

Due to Russian imperialism and colonialism, existing even before the Communist revolution of 1917, many national groups that were contained within the boundaries of czarist Russia have lost their independence but are still striving to maintain their distinctive national entities. Others have been obliterated. When the Communists took over the Russian empire, they promised freedom and independence to the component nationalities. These promises have all been broken. Efforts to gain self-determination are ruthlessly suppressed.

With the subsequent surge of communism in Europe the Soviet Union entered into and carried out secret agreements with Hitler.

These resulted in the conquest and partition of independent Poland and the seizure by Russia of the three Baltic states: Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Although Nazi Germany and her allies were eventually defeated, the wrongs occasioned by the Hitler-Stalin accord have yet to be righted. Bluntly speaking, the Western allies have not yet achieved their war aims, declared in the Atlantic Charter but compromised at Yalta, and the United Nations is unwilling to act. Eastern Europe is being sacrificed on the altar of an illusory coexistence.

By means of armed invasion, fraud, terror, genocide, coups d'etat, violence and subversion, the Soviet Union has gained domination over many lands which had lived at peace and enjoyed self-determination before the Communist-Nazi conspiracy.

On these so-called satellite countries the Communists have inflicted their totalitarian political and social ideology, combined with the attempted Russification of the populations.

Elsewhere in the world, the Soviet Union is exporting, with the aid of Communist missionaries in various guises, its ideology under its hypocritical and unilateral slogans of "peace," "justice," "humanity," "brotherhood," and "national liberation."

Here in Canada, these phrases are used by the Communists and their sympathizers to ensnare the gullible.

We need not name here the many national groups that are now existing under the yoke of Russian imperialism and colonialism, and which, under the most elementary considerations of truth and justice, are entitled to self-determinations. Most of these captive people are well known, such as the Albanians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Byelorussians, Cossacks, Croats, Czechs, Slovaks, East Germans, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians, Macedonians, Poles, Rumanians, Serbs, Slovenes, and Ukrainians. Given the opportunity, they will prove themselves the friends and the allies of the West.

In spite of its record, Soviet Russia entered the U.N. organization and, with the utmost hypocrisy, endorsed its terms of membership. Red China, with an equally sinister background may do the same, and widespread propaganda is now being circulated in Canada and elsewhere to that end.

The tendency of certain influences in the world to corrupt and disrupt the West and thus consolidate Red conquest is contrary

to the original spirit of the United Nations. A unilateral and regional application of measures cloaked with false professions of "high ideals" will never serve the cause of peace and justice as envisioned by the U.N. Charter. It will merely serve the gluttonous appetite of ever-advancing communism for the spoils of conquest and of the submission of its victims. Perversion of the high ideals expressed by the founders of the United Nations will lead to the annihilation of the democratic Western World.

Therefore, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, of nations large and small, to maintain international peace and security, and, to that end, to take effective collective measures for the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples" (United Nations Charter).

We express our solidarity with the nations and individuals now subjugated by Communist imperialism and colonialism.

We call upon our representatives in the United Nations, the Government of Canada, the people among us who stand for democracy in justice, our spiritual leaders in whom is vested the propagation of our faith in God, to strive to apply without fear or reservations, and restore the high ideals embodied in the original United Nations Charter, the Declaration of Human Rights, the U.N. Declaration on Colonialism and the Genocide Convention to the nations and individuals now existing under Communist imperialism and colonialism.

"Deus, Justitia, Libertas," the Canadian Loyalist Movement.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, by joint congressional resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), the third week in July was designated as "Captive Nations Week" until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world; and

Whereas the cause of human rights and personal dignity remains a universal aspiration; and

Whereas the United States is firmly committed to the cause of freedom and justice everywhere; and

Whereas it is appropriate to manifest to the people of the captive nations the support by the National, State and local governments and the people of the United States of their hopes for the recovery of their freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, David Stahl, by virtue of the authority vested in me as deputy mayor of the city of Pittsburgh, do hereby proclaim the period of July 18-25, 1965, to be Captive Nations Week in Pittsburgh, and ask our citizens to give due recognition to this occasion.

Done this day, July 20, 1965, at the office of the mayor, in witness whereof I have hereunto set my signature and cause the seal of the city of Pittsburgh to be affixed.

DAVID STAHL,
Deputy mayor,
City of Pittsburgh.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK OBSERVANCE LUNCHEON PROGRAM, PICK-ROOSEVELT HOTEL, WEDNESDAY, JULY 21, 1965, 12:15 P.M.

Master of ceremonies: Michael Komichak. Presentation of colors: U.S. Marine Corps Color Guard.

National anthem: Mrs. Anna Komichak. Pledge of Allegiance: Mark Komichak (Boy Scout Troop 314 of McKees Rocks).

Invocation: Msgr. Victor Pospishil, St. John the Baptist Ukrainian Catholic Church, S.S., Pittsburgh.

President's proclamation: Mrs. Guna Naruns, Latvian Society of Pittsburgh.

Greetings and proclamation from city of Pittsburgh: Councilman Walter Kamik.

Address: Commissioner Blair F. Gunther. Introduction of committee and guests. Remarks: Dan Drew, American Legion. Address: Dr. Anthony Kubek, Dallas University.

Benediction: Rev. Paul Markowitz, First Hungarian Lutheran Church.

RADIO LOG: CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROGRAMS, WPIT AM-FM, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Sunday, July 18, 6:30 p.m.: Georgetown University Forum: "Captive Nations Week, 1965."

Monday, July 19, 8:30 p.m.: Walter Uhlbricht's "Security System and the Berlin Wall of Shame."

Tuesday, July 20, 8:30 p.m.: Bob White, Washington correspondent, urges support of the captive nations.

Wednesday, July 21, 8:30 p.m.: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky talks about Captive Nations Week resolution.

Thursday, July 22, 8:30 p.m.: Dr. Ilgvars Spilners reports on Russia's takeover of the Baltic nations.

Friday, July 23, 8:30 p.m.: Canon Joseph S. Altany gives eye-witness account of life in present-day Slovakia.

Saturday, July 24, 5:30 p.m.: Georgetown University Forum: "Captive Nations Week, 1965."

Sunday, July 25, 6:30 p.m.: Dr. Anthony Kubek: "China and Cuba—Myths and Realities."

PITTSBURGH OBSERVES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The Pittsburgh observance of Captive Nations Week, 1965, began on Saturday, July 17, when flags of the captive nations were carried in the American Legion parade held in downtown Pittsburgh as a climax to the Legion's State convention.

Highlight of the Captive Nations Week observance was a luncheon at the Roosevelt Hotel with 120 people from civic, fraternal, veteran, and nationality groups participating. The principal speakers were Judge Blair F. Gunther, commissioner of Allegheny County; Dan Drew, of the American Legion; and Dr. Anthony Kubek (Slovak), head of the history department at Dallas University in Texas and author of the book "How the Far East Was Lost." The national anthem was sung by Mrs. Ann Komichak and the colors were presented by an honor guard of U.S. Marines. The invocation was given by Msgr. Victor Pospishil, of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, Southside Pittsburgh. Councilman Walter Kamik, who is of Polish descent, delivered greetings on behalf of vacationing Mayor Barr, of Pittsburgh, and also read the proclamation from the mayor's office. Mrs. Guna Naruns, of the Latvian group read President Johnson's proclamation. The benediction was pronounced by Rev. Paul Markowitz, of the Hungarian Lutheran Church. Michael Komichak, secretary of the Captive Nations Committee in Pittsburgh, was master of ceremonies. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky telegraphed greetings to the luncheon on behalf of himself and Chairman George Meaney. The luncheon received good coverage by radio, television, and the newspapers.

During Captive Nations Week radio station WPIT presented daily radio programs, eight in all, to commemorate the week. The programs were directed by Michael Komichak. Participating in these programs were Dr. Dobriansky, Senator DOMINICK, Congressman FEIGHAN, Washington Correspondent Bob White, Canon Joseph S. Altany, Dr. Anthony Kubek and Dr. Ilgvars Spilners. In addition to the radio programs there were three television interviews with Dr. Kubek and one with Michael Komichak.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 22, 1965]

BOMB HANOI, HISTORIAN URGES

Peaceful coexistence with Communist nations means "surrender on the installment plan," the Captive Nations Committee was told.

That is true because the Soviet Union has become the biggest colonial power in history, Dr. Anthony Kubek told a committee luncheon yesterday in the Pick-Roosevelt Hotel.

Dr. Kubek, head of the Dallas University history department, was chief speaker at the affair headed by Michael Komichak and attended by nationality groups whose native lands are Red led.

He noted that Communist nations hurl the charge of imperialism at America, but said the Reds have taken over most of central and eastern Europe which they now hold in subjugation.

"Before World War II the Russians had 200 million people, but the Communists now rule half the world," said Dr. Kubek, a native of Ambridge.

He called the Yalta Conference "one of the greatest blunders ever made by the United States, because it led to Communist domination of Eastern Europe and China. President Roosevelt was a sick man at that conference."

At a press conference Dr. Kubek said the Reds are testing President Johnson in Vietnam "to see if he means business. If he does they are in trouble."

The speaker urged that Mr. Johnson order the bombing of Hanoi, capital of North Vietnam, and ports of that country through which its forces are armed.

Another speaker, Commissioner Blair F. Gunther, urged that American schools be purged of Communist teachers or those who sympathize with Communist aims.

He urged support of a bill now in the legislature which would block Communists from tax-supported schools. Author of the bill is Representative John T. Walsh, McKeesport Democrat.

Mr. Gunther estimated there are 500,000 Communist sympathizers in America "doing everything possible to subvert the Nation."

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, July 22, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS GROUP MEETS: HISTORIAN-AUTHOR ASKS FULL SUPPORT FOR L.B.J.

President Johnson must be backed up all the way in South Vietnam, the Pittsburgh Captive Nations Committee was told here yesterday at a luncheon in the Roosevelt Hotel.

Principal speaker at the luncheon was Dr. Anthony Kubek, head of the history department of Dallas (Tex.) University and author of the book "How the Far East Was Lost."

SEES TESTING OF L.B.J.

Dr. Kubek, a native of Ambridge, told his audience the Communists are now sizing up President Johnson to see if he is "soft" and can be written off as easy prey to their tactics in Asia.

"But if they feel he means business, they will realize they're in trouble," Dr. Kubek said, adding:

"He can go down in history as one of our greatest Presidents if he is determined to smash communism."

Dr. Kubek advocated heavy bombardment of Hanoi, the North Vietnam Communist capital, and the seaport of Haiphong. He said that it will be impossible to win in Vietnam unless these two points are crippled.

AIMING AT ALL ASIA

Dr. Kubek said the Communist aim is to win in South Vietnam and then take over Thailand, Burma, the Philippines, and Japan "and drive the free world out of Asia."

Other speakers at the luncheon included county commissioner Blair F. Gunther and

Michael Komichak, secretary of the Pittsburgh Captive Nations Committee.

The committee was formed to promote assistance for Eastern and Central European nations now under Communist domination.

ADDRESS BY HON. BLAIR F. GUNTHER, ALLEGHENY COUNTY COMMISSIONER, BEFORE THE CAPTIVE NATIONS LUNCHEON, HOTEL ROOSEVELT, JULY 21, 1965

In 1959, the Congress of the United States adopted unanimously what has become known as the Captive Nations Week resolution, in the form of Public Law 86-90, providing for the designation of the third week of July as Captive Nations Week. In addition, the law authorizes the President of the United States to issue a proclamation on the week "each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world."

It was altogether fitting and proper that the President of the United States issued a 1965 captive nations proclamation on July 3 so that it would appear in the Nation's press on July 4. The purpose was to symbolize the unbreakable relationship reached between American freedom and the independence of all captive peoples.

This year's Captive Nations Week is of special significance as Communist onslaughts on the free world's outposts, dramatized by the war in Vietnam, continue to cause grave concern to all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. Today, our country is in the thick of another war whose issues will determine the fate of freedom in Asia. History is repeating itself and once more our young men, thousands of miles from their homeland, are fighting and dying so that for millions under Far East skies the bell of freedom may ring again. But even if we spring to the aid of brave peoples whose freedom is in jeopardy, it is the height of shameful inconsistency to disregard the pitiful plight of once free people. It is a falsely pious policy to advocate that it is now necessary, in the interests of world peace, to accept the "status quo," including the permanent captivity of once proud people. Have we not learned a lesson from the futile "peace in our time" of Chamberlain when he faced the demands of Hitler with an umbrella and no sword? We have followed the Chamberlain pattern when we did nothing to help in the fight for freedom during the Cuban, Polish, and Hungarian uprisings. I believe we have now reached the end of the line and the battle for freedom all over the world is on.

We have two tasks before all of us who want to see the eventual freedom of the captive nations. One is to strengthen popular support for the Government's policy in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. The second is to encourage day-by-day demands for more freedom for the captive peoples within the Communist empire. The freedom aspirations of the captive peoples throughout the world are the only deterrent against the present communistic aggression. For this reason, they are a powerful force for peace throughout the world.

We in America have made many mistakes. We are good soldiers, good businessmen, and we have some of the outstanding sportsmen in the world. But when it comes to diplomacy, we have made mistakes. We have to admit that Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, where we made some of the most stupid decisions which we will regret in American history, were bad mistakes. Maybe they were mistakes of the head and not the heart. Maybe our intentions were right, but the intentions of the other side were not right. The trouble with Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam was that there was one witness that wasn't present at these agreements; that witness was God.

My friends, those of us who know something about war realize that weapons alone are not enough. We need other things. We

need diplomacy. We have our academies at Annapolis and West Point, and these are fine. But what America needs today, and I've been advocating this for years, is a good, solid academy for diplomats to be trained by the best known talents in the United States, so that our diplomats can stand up to the Communists at the U.N. and other meeting places in defense of freedom. This might appropriately be called a Freedom Academy. Unless we do that, arms alone will not win peace or friends for us in the world.

Now as for the Communist threat here in America. The real and very great danger to which America is subjected by the Communist movement throughout the world is not due to the number of actual and avowed Communists in America, as J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, said in one of his New York speeches, it is, instead, due to the vastly greater number of Americans who, while they associate freely with Communist enterprises, do not affiliate with the Communist Party. Mr. Hoover states that there are more than a half million Communist collaborators in this category, while the total avowed Communists does not exceed 55,000. This is of vital importance because there has been a great show in indignation by the liberals of the country against the "guilt by association" tactics of current investigations into the Communist conspiracy. The Communists are encouraging opposition in the United States toward strong policies against Communist aggression in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

I am asked at various public meetings as to what we here in America can do to help preserve the freedom of our people. We can do several things:

1. We can teach more American history in our American schools. How do we expect to have our younger generation respect America if they know nothing about her?
2. Dismiss all teachers in all schools who are Communist sympathizers.
3. Anyone who obtained his American citizenship by deceit, by swearing to uphold the American form of government and now wants to overthrow it, should have citizenship papers revoked and be shipped back to the country of his origin, or to any country he considers a better place than the good old United States of America.
4. Union men should do everything possible to throw the "Commies" out of office and of their unions. They are creators of chaos in the labor world. They owe no allegiance to labor; only allegiance to the Communist conspiracy.
5. Let us place upon the Communists and Communist sympathizers the "X-ray of truth" in every walk of life.

A SPEECH MADE BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN LATVIAN ASSOCIATION, PITTSBURGH CHAPTER, DR. I. J. SPILNERS, OVER RADIO STATION WPIT, JULY 22, 1965, 8:30 P.M.

Good evening. When the U.S. Congress designated the third week in July the Captive Nations Week, the joint resolution in part stated: "Since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and all of the free peoples of the world."

One of the many nations, which is listed as a victim of the Communist Russia in this declaration is my native land Latvia. I will tell you about Latvia and also about Latvian good neighbors on the shores of the Baltic Sea—Lithuanians and Estonians. With them we share the same tragic fate.

It happens, that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania border on the east with Russia—a country whose people have had the bad fortune in the past of being ruled by autocratic and imperialistic czars and now are ruled by communistic and imperialistic dic-

tators. The Russian people have never known a representative government. All the Russian rulers have had one common aim—to maintain and expand their empire. As every student of Russian history knows, the rulers of Russia sitting within the Kremlin walls in Moscow have for hundreds of years directed their armies to conquer the neighboring people and then to go on beyond. Their goal, always ideologically camouflaged, was to force access to the Baltic Sea, Arctic Ocean, Pacific Ocean, Indian Ocean, Caspian Sea, Black Sea, and the Mediterranean. And, indeed, they have been very successful in forming their vast colonial empire by annihilation, expulsion, and subjection of the people standing in their way.

Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania are standing in their way to the Baltic Sea. This was very simply admitted by Stalin: "Czar Peter the Great wanted to secure harbors on the Baltic Sea. We want to have the same." At the end of the First World War, the Baltic States gained their independence. The Communist rulers wanted to recapture these countries for their Russian empire and Lenin ordered his armies to attack. But the Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian soldiers defeated the invading Russian Communist armies and the Soviet Union signed non-aggression treaties with the Baltic States.

The 22 years of independence which followed saw a great surge forward in all spheres of life in the Baltic countries. They were prosperous countries and factors of peace and stability in Europe. The Baltic States gained diplomatic recognition, were admitted to the League of Nations and the Foreign Minister of Latvia had the honor of being elected the President of the governing body of this international peace organization.

This did not suit the plans of Stalin and Hitler, however. In 1939 their Soviet Socialist and National Socialist governments, respectively, concluded the so-called nonaggression pact, according to which they secretly agreed that Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, eastern Poland and Bessarabia in Rumania belong to the Russian sphere of influence. At the time when the Russian Communist armies were invading Finland and jointly with National Socialist forces of Germany were dividing Poland, the Russians were also exerting an ever-increasing pressure and threats toward the Baltic countries. Finally, the opportune time for attack arrived in June 1940 after France had collapsed under the German attack. Stalin gave his 300,000 men big armies and mechanized forces, which were concentrated on our borders, the order to invade the Baltic States. Military occupation, jailing of our governments and subsequent annexation and incorporation by devious means into the Soviet Union followed in quick succession.

Then came terror, torture, executions, and deportations to the slave labor camps in Siberia and the Arctic regions. Thus, Latvians, Estonians, and Lithuanians lost larger proportions of their men, women, and children than any other nation engaged in the most terrible holocaust of war.

Does the present Government of the Soviet Union recognize these past mistakes? Not at all. The crimes against the Baltic peoples have never been recognized as such by either Khrushchev or the present rulers. On the contrary, all the information coming from the Baltic area indicates that any deviation from the rigid Communist political and economic rule is suppressed. Likewise, the ethnic identity of Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians is systematically suppressed. Transplantation of Russians and Russian culture and institutions into this area is being carried out relentlessly. The population statistics published by the Soviet Union clearly indicates a decrease of Balts in their home areas and a corresponding increase of others, mostly Russians. There are constant threats and pressure on the young Baltic

people to go to work in far-removed regions of the Soviet Union. Thus, the world is witnessing one of the most flagrant cases of physical and cultural genocide, perpetrated on the Baltic people by the rulers of the communistic Russian Empire. It is also the most flagrant case of colonialism, instituted, and exercised in an age when every year the addition of new independent nations to the United Nations is celebrated as realization of the prized principle of self-determination.

What can be done to correct it? Important allies of the Baltic people are those nations which do not recognize annexation of the three Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union. Here, I would single out the United States who have refused to recognize the annexation of the Baltic States for the past 25 years. Our Government continues its full recognition of the diplomatic representatives in Washington of the once free Baltic Republics, according them all rights and privileges which are due diplomatic missions representing sovereign countries.

On June 14 of this year, both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress dedicated their sessions to commemorating the loss of independence by the Baltic nations 25 years ago.

On June 21, this year, in an unprecedented move, the House of Representatives passed a resolution by 298 yeas and no nays urging the President of the United States "(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; and (b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples."

On June 23, the Honorable Dean Rusk granted an audience to a delegation of the Joint Baltic American Committee. On this occasion the possibilities to regain the freedom and independence of the Baltic people was discussed.

What can we as individuals and citizens of this country do to help the cause of freedom for the captive peoples?

We can write to the President asking him to put the issue of the Baltic peoples and other captive nations on the agenda of the United Nations. This year, the United Nations celebrates its 20th anniversary. There will be many opportunities on this occasion in many cities, including Pittsburgh, to remind the fair-minded citizens that the high principles stated in the United Nations Charter apply also to the captive people suffering under the communistic Russian colonial rule. We must realize that this international organization is not failing because of the shortage of funds but because of the shortage of devotion to international peace and justice for all. A tacit consent to aggression by the communistic imperialists in the Baltic and elsewhere does not help this organization to remain ideologically solvent.

We can study and encourage others to study the history of imperialistic Russia. There is much ignorance, even in high places and in our universities on this subject. Since its beginning the Russian empire has grown tenfold. Is it all Russia now? No, it is not. It is still mostly conquered land.

Are all people living within the boundaries of the empire Russians? No, they are not. Half of them are conquered people. Therefore, let us not call everybody living in the Soviet Union "a Russian." Most newspapers either through negligence or ignorance often make this mistake. Let us help them and correct them when they call an Estonian chess grandmaster, a Latvian athlete, a Lithuanian actor or an Ukrainian artist "a Russian." Let us correct also those people who through ignorance use the term "Soviet peo-

ple," a term conceived by extremist nationalists who favor russification and destruction of all other nationalities. There are many peoples living in the Soviet Union, but there are no "Soviet people."

Above all, let us try to maintain our personal contacts with the captive peoples so that they know that their own kin in the free world have not forgotten them and are active on their behalf, so that they know what opportunities for mind and welfare a free society and their own freely elected government would offer.

If we succeed in reaching the minds of the captive people, especially the young people, with these ideas, the dissolution of the communistic Russian empire will follow soon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. FEIGHAN, for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama in four instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 481. An act for the relief of Winfred Evadne Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 779. An act for the relief of Henryka Lyska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 803. An act for the relief of Ching Zal Yen and his wife, Faung Hwa Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1168. An act for the relief of Timothy William O'Kane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2393. An act to authorize additional GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 positions for use in agencies or functions created or substantially expanded after June 30, 1965; to the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1044. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, certain lands in the city of Norfolk, State of Virginia, in exchange for certain other lands; and

H.R. 10342. An act to authorize the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, a Member of the House of Representatives, to accept the award of Officer in the French National Order of the Legion of Honor.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

AUGUST 24, 1965.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII, I, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, move to discharge the Committee on Rules from the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 515) entitled "A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4644 to provide an elected Mayor, City Council, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," which was referred to said committee August 11, 1965, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Abraham J. Multer.
2. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
3. Clarence D. Long.
4. Donald J. Irwin.
5. Frank Annunzio.
6. Lynn E. Stalbaum.
7. Don Edwards.
8. James Roosevelt.
9. Jonathan B. Bingham.
10. Ralph J. Rivers.
11. James H. Scheuer.
12. Spark M. Matsunaga.
13. J. Edward Roush.
14. Patsy T. Mink.
15. George Grider.
16. George E. Brown, Jr.
17. John R. Schmidhauser.
18. Henry S. Reuss.
19. William D. Ford.
20. Frank Horton.
21. Carlton R. Sickles.
22. Henry Helstoski.
23. Samuel N. Friedel.
24. Paul J. Krebs.
25. Fred B. Rooney.
26. Barratt O'Hara.
27. John A. Race.
28. Lloyd Meeds.
29. Robert N. C. Nix.
30. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
31. John Brademas.
32. Ray J. Madden.
33. Samuel S. Stratton.
34. Adam C. Powell.
35. Edward P. Boland.
36. Robert L. Leggett.
37. Augustus F. Hawkins.
38. Weston E. Vivian.
39. Lester L. Wolf.
40. Ken Hechler.
41. John J. Gilligan.
42. Robert E. Sweeney.
43. Jeffery Cohelan.
44. John E. Moss.
45. Frank E. Evans.
46. Morris K. Udall.
47. Hervey G. Machen.

48. J. Oliva Huot.
 49. Charles A. Mosher.
 50. William L. St. Onge.
 51. Charles A. Vanik.
 52. Brock Adams.
 53. John H. Dent.
 54. Paul H. Todd, Jr.
 55. Joseph Karth.
 56. Richard S. Schweiker.
 57. Charles S. Joelson.
 58. Joseph G. Minish.
 59. Harold T. Johnson.
 60. Daniel J. Ronan.
 61. Lionel Van Deerlin.
 62. John R. Hansen.
 63. James J. Howard.
 64. James Harvey.
 65. James G. O'Hara.
 66. Thomas C. McGrath.
 67. Herbert Tenzer.
 68. David S. King.
 69. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.
 70. Edward J. Patten.
 71. Alec G. Olson.
 72. Phillip Burton.
 73. Billie S. Farnum.
 74. James C. Corman.
 75. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
 76. Emilio Q. Daddario.
 77. John Conyers, Jr.
 78. William B. Widnall.
 79. William A. Barrett.
 80. Ogden Reid.
 81. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
 82. John J. Rooney.
 83. Ken W. Dyal.
 84. Brad Morse.
 85. Edward R. Roybal.
 86. James G. Fulton.
 87. Torbert H. Macdonald.
 88. Donald M. Fraser.
 89. Richard L. Ottinger.
 90. William D. Hathaway.
 91. Chet Holifield.
 92. Leonard Farbstein.
 93. Julia Butler Hansen.
 94. William S. Moorhead.
 95. Dante B. Fascell.
 96. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
 97. John G. Dow.
 98. William T. Murphy.
 99. Rolland Redlin.
 100. Sam M. Gibbons.
 101. George M. Rhodes.
 102. Daniel J. Flood.
 103. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
 104. Leo W. O'Brien.
 105. Thomas Ludlow Ashley.
 106. Henry B. Gonzalez.
 107. Lucien N. Nedzi.
 108. John V. Tunney.
 109. Edward A. Garmatz.
 110. William L. Dawson.
 111. Edna F. Kelly.
 112. Charles Farnsley.
 113. James C. Cleveland.
 114. William J. Green.
 115. Richard Bolling.
 116. Kenneth J. Gray.
 117. William F. Ryan.
 118. Silvio O. Conte.
 119. Robert McClory.
 120. George P. Miller.
 121. Jacob H. Gilbert.
 122. Joseph P. Addabbo.
 123. John A. Blatnik.
 124. Sidney R. Yates.
 125. Rodney M. Love.
 126. Dominick V. Daniels.

127. Elmer J. Holland.
 128. Alphonzo Bell.
 129. Seymour Halpern.
 130. Claude Pepper.
 131. John Culver.
 132. Thaddeus J. Dulski.
 133. Edith Green.
 134. John V. Lindsay.
 135. Harley O. Staggers.
 136. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
 137. Frank M. Clark.
 138. John J. McFall.
 139. Stanley Greigg.
 140. Melvin Price.
 141. Richard T. Hanna.
 142. Joseph Y. Resnick.
 143. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.
 144. Robert F. Ellsworth.
 145. Roy H. McVicker.
 146. James M. Hanley.
 147. Richard D. McCarthy.
 148. Wendell Wyatt.
 149. James A. Byrne.
 150. Roman C. Pucinski.
 151. Hugh L. Carey.
 152. Richard Fulton.
 153. John C. Kluczynski.
 154. Florence P. Dwyer.
 155. Charles H. Wilson.
 156. William Broomfield.
 157. Frank M. Karsten.
 158. Stanley R. Tupper.
 159. N. Neiman Craley, Jr.
 160. Barber B. Conable, Jr.
 161. Raymond F. Clevenger.
 162. Emanuel Celler.
 163. Robert P. Griffin.
 164. James Kee.
 165. George H. Fallon.
 166. Michael A. Feighan.
 167. Robert T. Stafford.
 168. Ronald Brooks Cameron.
 169. Thomas E. Morgan.
 170. Bernard F. Grabowski.
 171. James H. Morrison.
 172. Lee H. Hamilton.
 173. George F. Senner, Jr.
 174. Henry P. Smith III.
 175. William R. Anderson.
 176. Cecil R. King.
 177. Robert T. Secrest.
 178. Harlan Hagen.
 179. Walter H. Moeller.
 180. Clair A. Callan.
 181. William T. Cahill.
 182. John C. Mackie.
 183. Jim Wright.
 184. Philip J. Philbin.
 185. J. J. Pickle.
 186. Harold D. Donohue.
 187. Eugene J. Keogh.
 188. James A. Burke.
 189. Jed Johnson, Jr.
 190. Winfield K. Denton.
 191. John M. Murphy.
 192. Wright Patman.
 193. Clark W. Thompson.
 194. John Young.
 195. Thomas S. Foley.
 196. Earle Cabell.
 197. Richard White.
 198. Eligio de la Garza.
 199. Thomas G. Morris.
 200. Johnny Walker.
 201. Ed Edmondson.
 202. Robert J. Corbett.
 203. Robert N. Gialmo.
 204. Dan Rostenkowski.
 205. Carl D. Perkins.

206. Fernand J. St Germain.
 207. Compton I. White, Jr.
 208. Graham Purcell.
 209. John S. Monagan.
 210. Joseph P. Vigorito.
 211. Arnold Olsen.
 212. Bert Bandstra.
 213. Charles L. Weitner.
 214. James A. Mackay.
 215. Floyd V. Hicks.
 216. Robert B. Duncan.
 217. Clement J. Zablocki.
 218. George E. Shipley.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1550. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement) Office of Naval Material, Department of the Navy, transmitting semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over, for the period January 1, through June 30, 1965, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1551. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of 57 Stat. 380, 59 Stat. 434, and 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

1552. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting determinations relating to partial deferment of the March 1 and September 1, 1966, construction payments due the United States from the El Paso County Water Improvement District No. 1, Rio Grande project, N. Mex.-Tex., pursuant to Public Law 86-308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1553. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered into and list of persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10775. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 10115. A bill authorizing the residents of the District of Columbia to make known their preference on the question of home rule and, if they wish, to elect a board for the purpose of preparing a municipal charter for submission to the voters and to Congress, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 9273. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law relating to the printing as House documents of certain proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 10872. A bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds among members of the Confederated Bands of the Ute Indian Tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 10873. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to establish a program of group life insurance which shall be provided by private insurance companies for members of the uniformed services who are on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 10874. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to eliminate the provisions which reduce spouses' annuities by the amount of certain monthly benefits, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the rates of tax under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 654. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Con. Res. 487. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H. Res. 569. Resolution that there be printed as a House document the dedication ceremonies of the "Carl Vinson Room," the hearing room of the Committee on Armed Services in the Rayburn House Office Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 10875. A bill for the relief of Rafaela Loroño; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 10876. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10877. A bill for the relief of Arun Kumar Pattani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKLE:

H.R. 10878. A bill for the relief of Anderson G. Matsler, senior master sergeant, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore [Mr. METCALF].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate is now adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 7, 1965

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 2½ seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of September 2, 1965, until Tuesday, September 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 3, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include my report to my constituents of February 11, 1965:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE CONSIDERS
APPALACHIA BILL

(Washington Report From Congressman
JIM MARTIN)

The Committee on Public Works, of which I am member, is considering the Appalachia bill at the present time. This is one of those pieces of legislation upon which a Member of Congress must search the deepest recesses of his conscience to find the answer as to how he should vote. One thing is certain, when a bill comes before the House a Member must vote either "Yes" or "No." It is not possible to say, "Yes, but * * *." There is no argument with the objectives of the Appalachia bill. All of us are concerned with the poverty of some of our people. I am deeply aware that there are those in the 7th District who are victims of poverty through no fault of their own. We should and must find a way to help them.

The problem arises in considering what the present proposal will do. Congress is being asked to vote billions of dollars of your money to help better the economic condition of a part of our country. Some of this money will be spent in our area, in the counties of the 7th District. Here are some of the questions in connection with the bill demanding an answer:

"How much of the total money will be spent in Alabama? Will the funds be used to help those in need or will they be used instead as a political slush fund? Are the

funds going to be spent on legitimate projects which will bring lasting benefits to our people? How much of the money is going to States which do not have critical problems?"

To find answers to these questions I intend to thoroughly study the bill, take part in its consideration before my committee where I will have an opportunity to question its sponsors and those who will administer it. Only after such thorough consideration will I make up my mind on how I will vote.

Of one thing you may be sure, I will not use the poverty of some of our people for political purposes. I will vote my honest convictions in what I believe to be the best interest of the people I represent. I shall report my vote and the reasons for it to you so that the people will be the final judges of my action.

ALABAMA DEFENDED

I was proud to be a member of the Alabama delegation in the House last Thursday when we presented a united front in defense of the people of Selma and other communities in our State. For days we had been reading distorted stories of happenings in Selma. We were able to put into the RECORD facts which the people in other sections of the Nation had not had the chance to read. We showed that the people of Selma were making a conscientious effort to obey the law and that racial tensions and hatreds were being stirred up by imported agitators whose main purpose is continuing racial tensions rather than helping to find proper solutions to trying problems.

BRIEFS OF THE WEEK

A startling exposure of Soviet piracy was made this week by Prof. John Isaacs, director of the Scripps marine life research program. He disclosed that a Navy radar picket ship chased a Russian fishing trawler away from an anchored buoy 150 miles off the coast of San Diego. The Russians had stripped the buoy of instruments. This was not the first case of such piracy. The Russians know we are ahead of them in learning the secrets of the sea, and a shortcut to catching up is to frisk our research buoys and steal our equipment.

Here are some facts on spending during the last 4 years of Democrat administration: 1961, spending \$99.5 billion or \$2.3 billion more than was received; 1962, spending \$107.7 billion or \$5.8 billion more than was received; 1963, spending \$113.8 billion or \$4.1 billion more than was received; 1964, \$120.3 billion or \$4.8 billion more than was received. The outlook for fiscal 1965 is for spending \$121.3 billion or \$4 billion more than will be taken in, and the forecast for 1966 is spending amounting to \$127.4 billion with an additional \$4 billion deficit. Yet we are being told this is a frugal administration.

I am happy to report that my wife, Pat, is enjoying an active part in the political life of Washington. She was elected as treasurer of the 89th Congress Club, an organization of the wives of Members who were newly elected in November.

Survivorship Benefits for Servicemen—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 3, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following my earlier remarks on survivorship benefits, I include as a part of my remarks a table showing the benefits available to a private first class who suffers a service-connected death and who leaves a widow and one child:

SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEN DYING
FROM SERVICE-CONNECTED CAUSES

ASSUMPTIONS

Private first class, U.S. Army; age 20 at death, death was service-connected, 2 years service at death, 2 years in grade at death, assumed average monthly pay was \$160, base pay at death was \$148.50 a month; left