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Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most enjoyable evenings of theater that was ever offered is the Shakespeare Summer Festival presentation of "Much Ado About Nothing" at the Sylvan Theater. The performances are professional, the costumes are enchanting, the setting is superb, the lighting and musical effects are magnificent—in short, the entire production is a sheer delight.

"Much Ado About Nothing" is a perfect vehicle for the versatile cast and their virtually ideal setting. I should add that another of this production's virtues is the fact that there is no admission charge, thanks to the sponsoring organizations, the Department of the Interior, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department. The professional touch, however, was made possible by the liberal financial support from many private organizations and individuals.

The Sylvan Theater, at the foot of the Washington Monument, is the perfect spot for such a performance, and Ellie Chamberlain, the producer, and Director Don Driver have utilized every natural and technical advantage at their disposal. If you are lucky enough to see the exceptional cast, headed by Marian Seldes and James Farentino, I commend you.
final performances. It is a rare opportunity and one which should not be missed.

I hope that next year Mrs. Chamberlain and her deft, magic touch will again infuse this play and turn it into Washington's most popular attraction. She is to be commended for her vision and imagination. Washington is indeed fortunate to have the benefit of her talents.

Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary negotiations have been, in the view of Mr. Harriman and his English counterpart, successfully concluded. They do not mark as the President has so rightfully expressed anything like "peace in our times" a phrase with some unfortunate connotations. The test ban as accomplished is to the British observer like the girl who has awaited overlong a proposal and is therefore not the catch she once was. One southerner I know said the news reminded him of the story of the rebel holdout in the War Between the States who held off a Yankee patrol for about a week before he ran out of food, out of water, out of ammunition, and out of spunk, the rebel's stronghold was finally and successfully rushed and when the Union sergeant towered over the emaciated holdout and shouted "We got ya reb." He replied, "Yeah, and a helluva gettin' ya got."

Well, regardless of the appraisal of what kind of 'a gettin' we got" in this proposed test ban and giving due credence to the validity of calls for caution in affirmatively counting on any presentiments by Khrushchev this much is to be said: the continuing, jointly expressed compassion for a world divided against itself is not a very satisfactory substitute for some affirmative action, however limited. Unless and until the two major camps in this division can weld one or two points of agreement the bridge across the schism of doctrines and interest that now are so wide and deep will not start abuilding. The peace that is war will remain with the ever-present threat that it could start on the escalator to the nuclear weapon.

The debate in the Senate will run a heavy tide of reasons why we dare not sign this treaty. Any person even slightly informed or aware of our past disappointments would have to admit to some risks involved in the signing. But it is our belief that the greatest risk we take in this small step is one of complete disappointment by Khrushchev's failure to honor the pact. We know of this risk going in. Can we not therefore in the face of possible improvement hope that we can change from a peace that is war to a peace that is conflict, realizing that even this degree of change could be for the better and provide a possible beginning for a bridge that ultimately must be built.

Eleventh Anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF
HON. A. FERNOS-ISERN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the Members of the House and Senate who spoke in the respective Chambers, or elsewhere, in commemorating the 11th anniversary of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I regret most exceedingly that the extreme demands on my time because of pressing legislative work on July 25, prevented me from appearing in this Chamber to invite you personally to join in observing the Commonwealth's birthday.

As you may know, on the occasion of the 11th anniversary of the founding of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT spoke to the people of Puerto Rico, in San Juan, as the personal representative of the President of the United States. I was an old friend returning to Puerto Rico to join in anniversary festivities. The people of Puerto Rico felt deeply honored by the visit of the distinguished Senator on this very important occasion.

I am sure that my distinguished colleagues will find in Senator Fulbright's speech, which I include here, genuine appreciation of Puerto Rico's progress on many fronts and of Puerto Rico's inspiration to the inter-American community:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED JULY 26 BY SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT IN SAN JUAN, P.R.
"PROGRESS AND THE RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH"

Governor Muñoz-Marín and distinguished guests, it is a great personal privilege to represent the President of the United States on this memorable occasion and to bring to your Governor and the Puerto Rican people his cordial greetings and best wishes. It also gives me great personal satisfaction to return as an old friend who deeply admires the outstanding record which Puerto Rico has made as a progressive, forward-looking community of fellow citizens engaged in the vital task of making democracy work in this part of the world.

Eleven years ago the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was proclaimed. The Constitution was conceived by Puerto Rican minds and drafted by Puerto Ricans. It is a document which is the foundation of our Commonwealth's public life. It is constitutional and economic interests; and the hope for a better world based on these principles."

In the past 11 years Puerto Rico has matched the inspired words of its Constitution with inspired deeds. It has shown that democratic ideals can be translated into great achievements by resolve and imaginatively hard work, with the help of mutual self-help. The record is here for all to see. It is a sober, dramatic, unassailable record which gives us hope and confidence to the people of this island as they prepare for the tasks ahead.

In many fields Puerto Rico has become the model and pioneer for the hemisphere. When the American Republics met at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in the summer of 1958, the task was to chart less than the charting of a new course for the people of the new hemisphere. In the words of the "Declaration to the People of America," which was there adopted, the Alliance for Progress was to be founded "on the basic principle that free men working through the institutions of representative democracy can best satisfy man's aspirations, including those for work, home and land, health, and schools." The declaration added, "no system can guarantee true progress unless it affirms the dignity of the individual which is the foundation of our civilization."

This declaration, as well as the Charter of Punta del Este, summarizes the aspirations of the peoples of Latin America for a better life and a better world. The documents from Punta del Este, therefore, represent a peaceful, democratic revolution based on self-help measures and free external assistance. To these objectives the United States has pledged wholehearted support.

It is altogether fitting and proper on the occasion of this community celebration to talk about how Puerto Rico, by its own self-help measures, by its wise and imaginative use of all available resources—including its own—has helped to modernize the small countries of Latin America—has actually pioneered in many of the areas of social and economic development in which the Alliance for Progress is dedicated.

The Charter of Punta del Este looks forward to a rate of economic growth in Latin America of not less than 2.5 percent per capita per year. Puerto Rico has achieved a current growth rate of nearly 5 percent per capita per year—one of the highest in the Western World. This increase in productivity has been accompanied by a substantial increase in per capita incomes, a significant economic growth to all the citizens of the Commonwealth. This, of course, is one of the basic objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este. This means the increase in purchasing power and economic well-being among all sectors of the population of the Commonwealth, an increase in productivity, an increase in product, a significant increase in per capita income. This is the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services. The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.

To that end Puerto Rico undertook of its own accord, its efforts to avoid tax evasion and to provide the basis for an efficient public administration, committed to honest government and the general welfare, are other signal landmarks in the Commonwealth's progress. The Commonwealth has achieved an affirmative legislative and executive action and through the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services.

The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.

To that end Puerto Rico undertook of its own accord, its efforts to avoid tax evasion and to provide the basis for an efficient public administration, committed to honest government and the general welfare, are other signal landmarks in the Commonwealth's progress. The Commonwealth has achieved an affirmative legislative and executive action and through the growth of enlightened labor-management relations. Puerto Rico ranks only after Great Britain, Canada, and the mainland United States in the percentage of national income that goes to wage earners in the form of salaries and services.

The progress of the Commonwealth is truly a striking example of democratic achievement.
As Governor Muñoz-Marin pointed out a few years ago, "There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about." Puerto Rican people in their hard, uphill effort has commanded the respect of their fellow citizens in the United States and of the entire world.

On this occasion of its 11th anniversary, the Commonwealth is entitled to take pride in the advances made in all its prospects. When one contemplates the poverty, the illiteracy, the social injustice and the political instability which afflicts so much of the world today, it is natural to wonder why, in contrast to the world about her, Puerto Rico has succeeded.

After 20 years of political experience, it is my conviction that one of the indispensable and most significant ingredients of your success is the discriminating judgment which you have repeatedly shown in the selection of your chief executive, the Governor. As free citizens of this Commonwealth, you have exercised the power of the franchise responsibly and intelligently, for which you are to be congratulated high.

It is my privilege today to convey to the Puerto Rican people the admiration and appreciation of all Americans for their progress toward the goal defined by Governor Muñoz-Marin as a society based on the "maximum respect for that minimum minority which is the individual."

To Authorize the Mailing of Lottery Tickets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 7656, which would authorize the transmission through the mails of lottery tickets and other material relating to a lottery operated by a State or political subdivision thereof.

I have introduced this bill because I believe that the Federal law prohibiting the transmission through the mails of lottery information should be amended so as to exclude State and local governments.

I am very much in favor of the recent action of the New Hampshire State Legislature in establishing a State lottery for the purposes of raising revenue to provide State aid to more and better schools and public debt amortization.

Governor King and the people of New Hampshire are to be congratulated for the adoption of this proposal. It is a substantial prize if the purchaser's bond number is picked in a lottery. If the New York State law is amended to permit this, the lifting of the Federal prohibition would aid greatly in the sale of such bonds.

New Chairman Discusses Role of the House Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of last week, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman Marble, and I offered to you, the Honorable John E. Rankin of Mississippi, the new chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered two outstanding addresses in New Orleans, La., in which he discussed the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The first of these addresses was delivered before the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation and dealt particularly with the role of the committee in relation to national security.

Both because of the important subject matter of this address and because it reflects the broad viewpoint and philosophy of Mr. Rankin, with his new and heavy responsibilities as chairman of the committee, I am happy to include the address in the Record. I hope it will receive the thoughtful attention of all our colleagues:

The Committee and National Security

(By Representative Edwin W. Willis, Democrat, of Louisiana)

I would first like to say how pleased I am to be here in New Orleans to address you, the delegates to the annual convention of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, your friends and neighbors. I love Washington, but I love Louisiana—the grassroots of America and its people—more. It is always a pleasure for me to return to my home State, to meet and talk with its people, to get down to earth again—if I may use that phrase—after some time in the rarified atmosphere of Washington.

It was most fortunate that I was able to be here for the presentation of your Freedom Awards. I say with all sincerity that it has been inspiring to be a witness to this program, to see the awards being given, to know that America is doing it for itself—its people, their time and effort to their country. It is heartening to know that organizations such as the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation are alert and perceptive enough to encourage and award those who work for freedom's cause.

My congratulations to each of the award winners—and to you, the members of the Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, for initiating the program. I hope you will continue it for many years to come.

Freedom is everybody's job. It is the job of farmers, the job of educators, the job of clergy, the job of Members of Congress—and of every man and woman in our country. This morning, I have seen something of what the people of Louisiana are doing for freedom. I think, therefore, that it would be...
It is because the House knows—just as you and I—that freedom in every part of the globe is today challenged by the most deadly enemy it has known since the dawn of civilization. That enemy, the world Communist movement, has its roots in the United States. It is the finding of the Congress of the United States, for 25 years, voted funds for the purpose.

Then there are the Communists, who, since the dawn of civilization—of which civilization is essentially a Communist one—have been working to establish the Communist state throughout the world. The Communist movement has always been a...
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query into its activities. It did, however, hold 16 executive hearings in which it thoroughly explored NSA's personnel and security procedures. The committee's investigatory targets were 2000 man-hours of 16 States—developing the facts for these hearings.

Where were the results? Twenty-two reforms in security and personnel practices were instituted by the NSA.

The panel was dismissed.

The Director of Security resigned upon request—as did two other officials in his office.

Seventy-six other NSA employees were dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In addition, the committee drafted a bill which will establish sound security practices in the agency for all time. That bill was passed by the House just a few weeks ago.

Can there be any question about the fact that, by inquiring as it did in this case, into the administration of security practices by an agency of the executive branch, the committee made a very real contribution to our Nation's security and welfare? It focused upon a lax situation which it found when it began its inquiry. Today, I believe the NSA's security procedures are as tight and efficient as they can be.

The Communists and other enemies of the committee are forever charging that the committee has done little or nothing in the legal field and that its contribution has been one of mere exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work.

It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote its line and win acceptance for it from the millions of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

What distresses me and this is a sad commentary on our times after years of exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work. It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote its line and win acceptance for it from the millions of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

For these reasons the committee is of the opinion that the operation of such organizations as the American Legion is a menace to the security of the United States, and that a law should be passed to prevent the financial operations of organizations such as the American Legion.

The committee was dissatisfied with the results of the Internal Security Act. It did it by the House of Representatives.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is in good hands. I am certain that they will preserve the committee, and that the committee will continue its vital role in the preservation of our Nation.

A Fair, Imperial, and Controlled Test for Krebiozen

Extension of Remarks of

Hon. Abraham J. Multter

of New York

In the House of Representatives

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 596, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a five-year, fully controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on for many years; I believe it is now time to the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary test. I believe that, after a five year, fully controlled test, it will be clear whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering that cancer brings and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the other room of this hotel on the subject of "Education for Victory," meaning, of course, education about communism.

Frankly, as regards both the field of law and education, I must say that I think I can say with complete truth that every member of the committee wishes that there would be no need for a committee. But I am afraid that the day ever comes when the committee is abolished because there is no longer a Communist fifth column in this country and thus no need for a Committee on Un-American Activities.

That day however—I am afraid—is a long way off. And until that day comes— I can assure you that each member of the committee will do its utmost to see that the committee is not deterred for any reason from carrying out the function assigned to it by the House of Representatives.

Each year, of course, an effort is made by the Communists, their stooges, and some misguided but well-intentioned liberals to abolish the committee. Naturally, this creates a problem. Despite this, I am convinced that there is no need to fear that this move will ever be successful. I have too much faith in the Congress to believe that, as long as we are a democratic society, a law can be passed to protect this Nation from those who would destroy it.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 596, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a five-year, fully controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on for many years; I believe it is now time to the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary test. I believe that, after a five year, fully controlled test, it will be clear whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering that cancer brings and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the
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query into its activities. It did, however, hold 16 executive hearings in which it thoroughly explored NSA's personnel and security procedures. The committee's investigatory targets were 2000 man-hours of 16 States—developing the facts for these hearings.

Where were the results? Twenty-two reforms in security and personnel practices were instituted by the NSA.

The panel was dismissed.

The Director of Security resigned upon request—as did two other officials in his office.

Seventy-six other NSA employees were dropped for reasons of sex deviation.

In addition, the committee drafted a bill which will establish sound security practices in the agency for all time. That bill was passed by the House just a few weeks ago.

Can there be any question about the fact that, by inquiring as it did in this case, into the administration of security practices by an agency of the executive branch, the committee made a very real contribution to our Nation's security and welfare? It focused upon a lax situation which it found when it began its inquiry. Today, I believe the NSA's security procedures are as tight and efficient as they can be.

The Communists and other enemies of the committee are forever charging that the committee has done little or nothing in the legal field and that its contribution has been one of mere exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work.

It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote its line and win acceptance for it from the millions of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

What distresses me and this is a sad commentary on our times after years of exposure of this front device—is the way the party, through these organizations, can still entice good people into doing its dirty work. It gets them to lend the prestige of their names, to give their time and money, to promote its line and win acceptance for it from the millions of non-Communists. Through them the party has also taken millions of dollars from the pockets of non-Communists and made widespread use of their time and talents, to help destroy America.

For these reasons the committee is of the opinion that the operation of such organizations as the American Legion is a menace to the security of the United States, and that a law should be passed to prevent the financial operations of organizations such as the American Legion.

The committee was dissatisfied with the results of the Internal Security Act. It did it by the House of Representatives.

The committee's life is in the hands of the Congress and of the people of this country. It is in good hands. I am certain that they will preserve the committee, and that the committee will continue its vital role in the preservation of our Nation.

A Fair, Imperial, and Controlled Test for Krebiozen

Extension of Remarks of

Hon. Abraham J. Multter

of New York

In the House of Representatives

Wednesday July 31, 1963

Mr. MULDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 596, which would authorize and direct the National Institutes of Health to undertake a five-year, fully controlled test of Krebiozen and would direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold action on any new drug application before it on Krebiozen until the completion of such a test. The resolution would further authorize the appropriation of $250,000 to conduct the test.

The arguments and discussions over Krebiozen have been going on for many years; I believe it is now time to the controversy by having the National Cancer Institute conduct the necessary test. I believe that, after a five year, fully controlled test, it will be clear whether Krebiozen serves any useful purpose in the treatment of cancer. It seems unnecessary to mention the pain and suffering that cancer brings and the number of people who lose their lives each year because of this dread disease. All of us are familiar with it; all of us know from personal experience, either through family or friends, the fearful toll taken by cancer.

I strongly urge that this resolution be given immediate consideration by the
President Should Ban the Test Ban Bandwagon Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CRAIG HOSMER OF CALIFORNIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last when President Kennedy addressed the Nation on the partial test ban treaty he called for full discussion and debate, not only in the Senate, but amongst the American people. However, Kennedy strategists appear to be attempting to choke off such debate and full scrutiny of the pact. The Senate majority leader (Mr. Mansfield) has made optimistic statements both about support for the treaty and the shortness of time in which it will be considered. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman have claimed very widespread support for it amongst the public and in the other body. Administration leaders, columnists and commentators also have taken it upon themselves to assert to the effect that "almost everybody is for the pact." The administration has given out stories that it is popular in capitals all over the world.

Obviously, these statements are not based on any widespread and accurate information on just what is the state of opinion either amongst the public or in the other body. Senator after Senator has stated he is reserving judgment on just what is the state of opinion either amongst the public or in the other body. Senator after Senator has stated he is reserving judgment on the matter until more facts are in.

Despite the President's words last Friday, consciously or unconsciously, administration stalwarts have adopted the strategy of rushing consideration of the treaty as fast as possible, before thoughtful consideration can be given to it. This is a strategy of choking off debate and discussion, both by limiting it in time and by stampeding public opinion. Before the average person even gets to consider the matter, he is being told everybody is for it. This is the old bandwagon technique so effective in political campaigns. It is calculated at getting support by implying anybody on the opposite side is out of step.

I call upon the President to match his words last Friday with action. To do so he must order his subordinates and associates to cease and desist their shabby tactics and give the Nation the opportunity he has promised for full and fair evaluation of the claimed advantages and claimed disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty.

Diamond Jubilee Celebration of St. Vincent de Paul Parish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI OF WISCONSIN IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Wednesday, July 31, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Sunday to have participated at the diamond jubilee celebration of my parish church in Milwaukee, St. Vincent de Paul Parish.

St. Vincent de Paul's has established a reputation during its 75 years for outstanding achievement in spiritual, civic and cultural activities. Twenty-seven sons of the parish and 57 of its daughters have answered the call to the religious life. The parish has sponsored cultural activities in the fields of art, music, and drama.

The day of celebration began with a solemn high mass of Thanksgiving at which the Most Reverend William E. Counins, archbishop of Milwaukee, presided and homily was given by St. Vincent de Paul's distinguished pastor, the Right Reverend Monsignor S. J. Studer. Deacon and subdeacon were the able parish assistants, the Reverend Albin Sovinski and the Reverend Edward Wawrzyniakowski.

The diamond jubilee also was observed with an evening banquet. Upon that occasion I gave the following address for which I ask permission to insert in the Record:

REMARKS OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT DIAMOND JUBILEE CELEBRATION, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PARISH, JULY 20, 1963

It is a singular honor for me to be a part of this celebration today, as we commemorate the diamond jubilee of our parish, St. Vincent de Paul Parish.

This is, indeed, a happy and memorable occasion. The words of the gradual of the mass for Easter are particularly appropriate today: "This is the day which the Lord has made. Let us rejoice and be glad."

Let us therefore, briefly review the past and its lessons, the present and its problems, the future and its portents.

First, the past. Since this parish was founded 75 years ago, there have been truly amazing advances in science and technology. Diseases like cholera, smallpox, typhoid, and diphtheria which once ravaged whole communities and caused untold suffering have been conquered. The invention of the internal combustion engine has made possible the vast array of automobiles, trucks, and buses that ply the highways of the world. It has created millions of new jobs and revolutionized our society.

Second, the present. As a Member of Congress, I have—through the years—spoken to hundreds of groups. None of them, however, has held for me the same esteem for his character. We cherish him in our affections as a venerable man of God.

In recent years, Monsignor Studer, you have had many trials and tribulations, particularly with respect to your health. All of us have been concerned for your physical well being. We thank God for granting us the privilege of knowing him, and working with him, share the same esteem for his character. We are all indebted to him for his spiritual counsel and advice. We cherish him in our affections as a venerable man of God.

In recent years, Monsignor Studer, you have had many trials and tribulations, particularly with respect to your health. All of us have been concerned for your physical well being. We thank God for granting us the privilege of knowing him, and working with him, share the same esteem for his character.
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As an example, look as the progress we have made in recent years in fighting cancer. The disease was once incurable. Today many thousands of people are saved by treatment or surgery, and a large number have a cure for it, and then a preventative.

Why? Because we have fought this evil calmly and intelligently. The American people have contributed millions of dollars for research. Our best doctors, scientists and hospitals are learning everything they can about the disease. This is the way the cure will be found and this enemy of mankind eliminated.

Now, you must do the same thing about what is today mankind's deadliest enemy—communism. This is a political, social and ethical cancer. It not only destroys men's bodies; it destroys their minds, and corrupts their minds—and kills their souls.

This cancer, too, must be destroyed—and it will be. In the past, we have tended to fight communism on the basis of instinct and emotion rather than knowledge. Now the picture looks brighter. We are beginning to see more clearly, more logically, the enemies in the field. We are-sided by the first rule of warfare—know your enemy.

We are faced with an implacable adversary who threatens our country, our civilization and the very concept of freedom. We perceive that we will not have any real security until the bulk of our citizens and public officials know this enemy well. Until this condition prevails, we cannot be assured of safety.

What do we have to know about him? We must know his basic philosophy and doctrines, his objectives and the methods he uses, and continue to use—to achieve those objectives.

And—let's not kid ourselves—this is a big order. There is no one of us who can comb over all the facts and conforming the situation. Communism is not a simple thing. It is attempting to undermine us on many fronts: economic, diplomatic, propagand, cultural, and scientific, as well as political. Its strategy is carefully planned; its tactics clever and varied. It has thousands of tricks, ruses, and deceptions. It makes abundant use of lies and half-truths. It is not something we can learn all about quickly, and if that is so, our enemies have an advantage.

But, as I said before, things are looking up. Here in Louisiana and in many other States, we are teaching about communism in our schools and institutes. In our own university seminars and study conferences are being held. In hundreds of communities, American reds are beginning to come to grips with the grass roots level and doing a very effective job.

And here is something that should be of interest to you on this point. A bill has been introduced in Congress to establish a national Freedom Academy, where key leaders from every walk of life in our country can be sent to get a solid, thorough grounding in the essential facts about communism. The Senate has completed hearings on this bill. The House version of the bill has been referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is too early for me to predict—or even hazard a guess—about what will be the outcome of Congress consideration of this measure. At the time the committee was established, however, it is significant that such a bill should be introduced in the Congress of the United States. It is the first time that not only bipartisan, but both conservative and liberal, support that is not only bipartisan, but both conservative and liberal.

This is an indication of how much serious concern there is among the people of this country that is so vital to our national survival—the study of communism.

Here in the New Orleans area, you are doing what you can to promote knowledge and study of communism, and I hope you will continue this important work.

And now I would like to outline for you some of the things the Committee on Un-American Activities is doing in the field. Some of the facts I will cite will surprise you, but they will give you an idea of the depth and breadth of the job we are doing to help the American people develop their educational efforts. They will also give you a better idea of the overall contribution it has made to our country.

The committee has been in existence for a quarter of a century. We celebrated our 25th birthday on May 26 of this year.

During these years the committee has heard the testimony of over 3,500 witnesses; has published over 500 separate volumes of hearings; has published reports; has distributed over 7½ million copies of these documents to the American people; has been the initiator of over 40 security laws and amendments thereto enacted by the Congress; and has had over a dozen of its policy recommendations accepted by the executive branch of the Government.

Despite this record, there are some people—in addition to the Communists—who seek to create the impression that the committee's efforts to support their demand, they make all kinds of false charges against the committee—charges which, I hope, are based on ignorance and misinformation rather than evil intent.

I challenge these people to name any institution in the country—public, private, or political—that has given the American people so much solid, substantial information on every phase of communism as the committee has. American people, over the last 20 years, have been informed about communism and the threat it poses. I am sure that the committee's activities on Un-American Activities can claim major credit for it.

What about the committee? How does it operate?

There are those who claim that the committee does not operate in a very insidious manner, but these charges are often based on misinformation. The committee's goals are to clear up the confusion and misconception, to provide the American people with the necessary information, and to make them aware of the threat that communism poses. The committee's procedures are designed to protect the constitutional rights of those who appear before it.

The truth is that in the area of fair procedures, the committee has been a model for the Congress. It developed its own subcommittee on rules and procedures. A copy of these rules is presented to the American Bar Association reviewed by some persons.

There are those who have an interest in the committee to continue this important work. We are abiding by the first rule of warfare—know your enemy. We are determined to help the committee's work can be to you, but they will give you an idea of the depth and breadth of the job we are doing to help the American people.
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Similarly, there must be some indoctrination, some value judgments offered and advanced, when teaching about communism. Let me illustrate what I mean: communism teaches the students about life pastly different from our own. The students are presented with the way of life offered by the Communists. Questions naturally arise in their minds: "Is their way of life as good as, better, or inferior to, our own?" How do we get our system better, equal to, or inferior to that of the Soviet Union?" "Is our system of private property and private enterprise, or, conversely, the Soviet system of collective ownership?"

And many other questions must be answered by the student. He has to make a judgment. Given all the facts on many of these issues, our students will be able to come up with the right answers.

But not all the questions are as simple as those I have just mentioned. Some are much more complicated. The Communists have devised clever propaganda arguments for their side, and young students cannot always readily see through them. We must help them.

He turns to his teachers, his parents, and other adults for help and guidance. Are you going to turn him down? Or will you help him; or, on the contrary, feed him—false facts—false values—false hopes—false dreams about our own country, to protect him from what some people call "indoctrination."

The claim of the anti-indoctrinators that making the student form a judgment against communism is gray, rather than black and white, is actually an argument for indoctrination. The more gray area there is, the less black and white there is, the more difficult the problem and the more the student needs help in making a value judgment.

As a part of this: We must be on guard in every school in America, in every school in the United States, against any infiltration of communism. We must rip out any and all ideas of communism when they appear. There are a few people, I am sure, who will be afraid of this. They will say we are fear-mongering. But I must tell you this: If we do not fight the infiltration of communism, it will destroy us, and if we do not fight the infiltration of the Communist party, it will destroy us.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt
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Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the death of anyone been felt as a personal loss by an entire country. When Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt died last fall, a nation grieved, and, indeed, the whole world mourned.

Such affection and respect are not extended to every man and woman. Such sentiments are reserved for those who do not seek them, who in their daily living have exhibited the purest virtues, who know no prejudice, whose greatest love is mankind.

What Mrs. Roosevelt saw in 1948 as the ideal for a Declaration of Human Rights is what should guide men of all nations, races, and creeds. "Personal rights, such as freedom of speech, information, religion, and rights of property; procedures for defending persons accused of crime; social rights, such as the right to employment and social security, and the right to enjoy minimum standards of economic, social, and cultural well-being; political rights, such as the right to citizenship and the right of citizens to participate in their Government.

Millions who knew such misery and dejection during the depression will long remember the humanitarian spirit which Mrs. Roosevelt brought to the White House. Those millions of us who have been so eager for the United Nations to succeed are well aware of and thankful for the hopeful enthusiasm which she has infused in that organization tirelessly and magnificently.

Mrs. Roosevelt will be remembered not because she sought fame, or reward, but because she had a deep sense of what she knew to be right and she spent her life seeking that goal.

Broadcasting and Politics

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1963, Chairman Oren Harris, of the Communications and Foreign Commerce, addressed the first National Broadcast Editorial Conference. This conference, which lasted 3 days was sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters and the School of Journalism at the University of Georgia, and was held on the campus of the University at Athens, Ga.

The subject of broadcasting and politics is of particular interest not only to Members of Congress but also to public officials and candidates for public office in State and local governments.

The Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting hearings on broadcast editorializing in general and on my bill, H.R. 7072, in particular. The purpose of my bill is to amend section 315 of the Communications Act to give candidates for public office who are attacked in a broadcast editorial an opportunity to reply in person.

Chairman Harris' address went in considerable length into some of the problems presented by broadcast editorializing, and raised many questions to which answers must be sought in the public interest. Therefore, I am enclosing the text of the address at this point in the Record:

Broadcasting and Politics

(Speech of Hon. Oren Harris)
The subject "Broadcasting and Politics" is certainly a challenging one. In discussing it with you, I do not expect to provide you with easy answers to many difficult questions. My hope is to pose some pertinent questions for your critical consideration.

In recent years there have been several Supreme Court decisions, one of which sets forth a congressional policy toward broadcast editorializing. The Act does not specifically permit or specifically prohibit broadcast editorializing nor does it lay down any ground rules for such editorializing.

In no area of broadcasting is this more true than in that area of programing and program control which seeks to deal with broadcast editorializing. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that those persons who are engaged in the field of broadcasting whether as broadcasters or as program directors, must make skillful tightrope walking a regular habit if they aspire to become successful broadcasters.

In no area of broadcasting is this more true than in that area of programing and program control which seeks to deal with broadcast editorializing. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that those persons who are engaged in the field of broadcasting whether as broadcasters or as program directors, must make skillful tightrope walking a regular habit if they aspire to become successful broadcasters.

The purpose of such an examination is to establish what the facts are and to identify such problems as may exist which are of public concern. I submit to you that we are faced with a situation requiring no less than a close look at this type of editorializing. In the past we have made an examination of broadcast operations conducted fairly and impartially.

In the course of the hearings on the House resolution proposing to suspend section 315 of the Communications Act at the one end and the licensing standard of the public interest at the other end, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power has been conducting hearings during the past week on broadcast editorializing. I am familiar with the occasion for these hearings.

In the course of the hearings on the House resolution proposing to suspend section 315 for presidential and vice presidential candidates during the 1964 campaign, frequent reference was made to broadcast editorializing. In particular, the concern was expressed by the Commissioners that broadcasters be required to disseminate them to the public. By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered the private outpourings of individuals destined to reach only a pre-selected group. The participants in broadcast editorializing cannot, in my opinion, claim any right of privacy seeking to screen the public from their scrutiny. However, there may be limits which should be imposed upon such scrutiny, and I trust your committee will want to explore what these limits should be.

Personally, I have been for some time a strong advocate of broadcast editorializing. In a speech I made in May 1958 to the National Association of Broadcasters, I had this to say on the subject of editorializing—and I quote:

"In reading the reports on the recent NAB convention at Los Angeles, which many of you may have attended, I was glad to see that the key speakers appealed to you, the broadcasters, to make use of your right to editorialize. I agree with the speakers on it and I hope you will do so and will do so freely, and in so doing you will of course observe the rules of fairness which the Communications Act imposes on broadcasters as a part of the requirement that broadcasters must operate in the public interest."

In editorializing you will not be able to look at broadcast editorializing and editorializing for or against politicians.
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Incidentally, your conference may want to explore the question whether fairness to politicians and fairness to the public are necessarily one and the same. I may be prejudiced and therefore not a good judge. As George Bernard Shaw has remarked: "The love of fairplay is a spectator's virtue, not a very profitable one for a politician." I do not doubt that politicians, as a rule may object to having their "rights" of answering broadcast editorialists for or against political candidates.

As was testified in the course of hearings before the NAB committee on editorializing we must nevertheless strive to do so. The very fact that the House of Representatives has called this conference seems designed to deal with one important aspect of the communications Act of 1934 to editorializing by broadcast licensees for or against political candidates.

When it comes to aspirations, interests, and important aspect of broadcast programing is a most wholesome and constitutes a valuable area is wholesome and constitutes a valuable ground rules in the area of broadcast programing. The House of Representatives has called this conference seems to attempt the discussion of the principles underlying section 317 of the Communications Act to editorializing as broadcast becomes law, however, Congressman Moss ought to be congratulated on his efforts to place before the public a concrete proposal designed to deal with one important aspect of broadcast programing.

Let me attempt to make some observations which I hope will focus attention on some aspects of the public interest which I believe are of transcending importance.

Broadcast editorializing is but one aspect of broadcast programing. Regulation of broadcast programing by government as well as self-regulation by broadcast licensees is a serious subject. This is true of regulation by government as well as self-regulation by broadcast licensees. Since all broadcasters require a government license before they are permitted to engage in broadcasting, there is a natural tendency for broadcasters to regard editorializing as well as political candidates. The very fact that the House of Representatives has called this conference seems designed to deal with one important aspect of broadcast programing.

If there has been a regrettable tendency towards uniformity among broadcasters, this tendency ought to be counteracted to the utmost possible extent by organizations which purport to represent broadcasters.
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If there has been a regrettable tendency towards uniformity among broadcasters, this tendency ought to be counteracted to the utmost possible extent by organizations which purport to represent broadcasters.

Wonders, likewise, would it not be inappropriate for broadcast licensees to editorialize on such issues or candidates over their broadcast programs, including broadcast editorialists, by establishing minimum standards with regard to personnel or facilities?

Similarly, what are we to expect that newspapers are pretty uniform or that magazines are, and that standards with regard to their contents could be established? And if editorializing is to be regulated by the courts, the courts had better be given minimum standards for their personnel or facilities.
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