

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6739

But when you hope it will be nice for him he adds, apologetically: "Ah señor, I am leaving soon with my family for Florida."

Through all of this the Cubans have retained their infinite capacity for courtesy and friendliness.

In many visits to Cuba I have never once been treated with discourtesy—despite being taken much of the time for an American. The same applied on this occasion, even though I tried to buy American magazines. The shelves were stacked high with Mao and Lenin, and a flood of Communist-bloc literature.

From the harbor wall where boys still cast for snapper, I looked back, before leaving, on a city that has worn itself out.

Russians move in by the thousands; but the heady fervor of rebellion has spent its force.

For Havana, 3 years and 7 months later, the "Barbudos" (bearded ones) are but a memory of what might have been.

Nothing is left now but the soldiers—and the slogans—and everywhere the guns.

Home Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 13, 1962

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am pleased to include an editorial and feature article printed in the East Side News, a local publication with wide distribution in my congressional district relating to a "home peace corps" proposed by one of my constituents, Mr. Joseph Fisch.

I have, in this session of Congress, introduced legislation to create a domestic peace corps whose primary purpose would be to combat the problem of juvenile delinquency. Mr. Fisch's proposal would, in my opinion, foster better international relations between our country and the nations abroad. I think Mr. Fisch is to be commended on his excellent proposal and am contemplating the introduction of legislation based thereon:

HANDS ACROSS THE SEAS

Never before has the home peace corps been presented to the American people.

It is a novel plan which should merit the earnest consideration of our President. It is replete with unlimited potentialities to foster a better understanding between our Nation and the countries abroad.

Under the plan proposed, American hosts would have an opportunity at firsthand to show the American image in action. Foreign visitors would see how we live at home, how we work in factories, plants and businesses, how our schools and universities are conducted, how we spend our leisure time, etc.

With the adoption of such a plan, America's true national image could be projected, which would do more to create good will and better international relations than the propaganda we constantly hear on radio or read in the foreign press.

We urgently call upon the editors of our city's newspapers to help us in bringing this plan to the attention of the American people, because we believe that a better appreciation of our way of life could best be promoted between ourselves and those who visit our shores.

HOME PEACE CORPS PROPOSED TO PRESENT TRUE AMERICAN IMAGE TO THE WORLD AT LARGE

A bold plan which would permit virtually all Americans to participate personally and directly in the objectives of President John F. Kennedy's Peace Corps was proposed today by Joseph Fisch, lifetime East Sider, attorney, and prominent community leader, in an interview with Abraham Schlacht, publisher of East Side News. Fisch's idea would enable Americans from every walk of life to become part of a "home peace corps" and serve their country without any interruption of their normal life or business routine, and without the necessity of leaving America.

President Kennedy's Peace Corps program, Fisch explained, has basically two objectives: (1) The export of specialized technical skills to select underdeveloped countries, and (2) the dissemination abroad of a favorable American "image" by Peace Corps members who serve, in a sense, as American ambassadors overseas. These Peace Corps members promulgate, indirectly rather than as militant propagandists, America's true national character and purpose.

Fisch stated that his program would supplement the second objective of the Peace Corps plan; namely, the presentation of the true American image to the foreigner. His plan, he explained, "is designed for the millions of Americans who were stirred by the President's inspiring call to service, and who are eager to serve, but who either do not possess the technical skills required for service abroad, or who are unable to leave the country."

Fisch's proposal does not require sending additional Americans abroad, but is aimed instead at the hundreds of thousands of foreign visitors who come here to America each year.

"Unfortunately, these foreign visitors see little more of America than its tourist sights, national monuments and museums. A country's true national image is reflected not in marble edifices but in its people and their manner of life. Access to an average American family is rarely available to the visitor from abroad. Because of this, we are failing to utilize our most valuable evidence of America's true image and purpose—our people," he said.

Under Fisch's plan, a foreign visitor would be invited to meet and visit a typical American family with whom the visitor shares a common interest. Basically, the program would operate as follows: Home peace corps offices would be established, under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency or Peace Corps, in major American cities. These offices will maintain files of volunteer Americans who have offered to invite foreign visitors to their homes, listing the professions of these Americans, their educational background, hobbies, etc.

A foreign visitor wishing to avail himself of this service merely contacts a home peace corps office, indicates the intended length of his visit, his background, profession, hobbies, etc. The files will then be examined and an appropriate American family contacted. Arrangements can be handled through the home peace corps office which will contact the foreign visitor, inviting him to visit the American on a particular day. Or the American can contact the foreign visitor himself. In this way, a foreign visitor who, for example, is a teacher by profession, might be invited to meet an American teacher and his family and dine with them at home.

The program need not be limited to merely a dinner invitation, of course, but has unlimited potential. The cost to the American host is completely a matter of his own discretion, as is the amount of time he wishes to allot to a foreign guest. These matters would be part of the information on file in the home peace corps office and would

be checked again when an American host is being selected for a particular foreign applicant. If the volunteer American so chooses, he can take his foreign guest to a concert, to the theater, etc. There are many free attractions and amusements which would have greater appeal to a foreigner if he were in the company of an American. The Greenwich Village outdoor art exhibition, the free concerts at Central Park, and the East River Park Amphitheater, are but a few examples.

The foreigner can also be invited to visit with his American host at work. Thus the foreign teacher can visit a class taught by his American teacher host, the lawyer from abroad can see our courts in session, and the merchant can visit the shop of his American friend. Of course, it need not be a similarity of occupations or educational background which bring the American and foreign visitor together, but perhaps a mutual hobby. It may, therefore, develop that an American office worker is selected to act as host to a physician from abroad because they share a strong interest in amateur photography, or stamp collecting, or Dixieland jazz music, or abstract art.

"The most important advantage of this plan," Fisch declared, "is that it permits direct personal contact and communication between people."

"I am confident," he continued, "of the enthusiastic support for such a plan by Americans who wish to do their share for their country. How many of us would not be willing to invite a foreign visitor to our home for dinner, to meet our family and friends and to discuss matters of mutual concern?"

"The foreign visitors should be afforded an opportunity to see more of America than the Empire State Building, and more of Americans than the tourist guide or hotel clerk. He should be permitted to communicate with our people so that he may return to his country and inform his countrymen of what he has seen. This program would extend to countless average Americans the opportunity to further personally the interest of universal understanding."

Mr. Fisch is a Phi Beta Kappa member of New York State University, a graduate of Harvard Law School, assistant counsel to the New York State Investigation Commission, and chancellor commander of the Albert Einstein Lodge, Knights of Pythias.

Susquehanna River in Pittston Region

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles A. McCarthy, a historian in my congressional district, has written a series of articles on the early history of the Susquehanna River, particularly in the Pittston area. The latest installment in this series appeared in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch on September 9, 1962, and as part of my remarks today I quote the text of that article.

The article follows:

FROM LOCAL HISTORY: SUSQUEHANNA RIVER IN PITTSSTON REGION—PITTSSTON FERRY BRIDGE VICTIM OF WINDS, ICE, AND FLOODS
(By Charles A. McCarthy)

As early as 1858, H. Litts was employed as the tolltaker on the Pittston Ferry Bridge.

A6740

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 11

In February, 1858, a windstorm carried away one-third of the bridge roof. This damage was completely repaired by May 28, 1860.

A contract for a new two-lane, covered bridge was awarded on August 28, 1863, to Kellogg & Canner, contractors from Easton, Pa., by the Pittston Ferry Bridge Co.

The new bridge was to be erected in approximately the same location as the old bridge.

Regarding the old bridge, soon to be replaced, an oldtimer of that era later remarked: "The first bridge became moss and dust covered—dingy, like the old oaken bucket. He stated "Old Hoyt" was the toll-taker at that time.

While the new bridge was being built, temporary ferry service was established. Toll rates on the ferry were: double team, 5 tickets for \$1; one horse and vehicle, 10 tickets for \$1. Many boats were also pressed into service to carry passengers back and forth across the river at this point.

Mr. Phillips' raftload of oak plank, for the bridge's construction was washed away in the high water on Sunday, May 15, 1864.

Harry Polen was the foreman in charge of construction work on the new bridge. Barnet Serfass was a carpenter.

On August 31, 1864, B. F. Snyder and Harry Stetlar, both employed as carpenters, were hit by an overhead crane and were knocked from the bridge into the river, falling 30 feet into 5 feet of water, without serious injury to either of them.

The initial crossing on the new bridge, by teams, took place on the south side of the structure on Saturday, September 17, 1864.

This bridge withstood the high water of St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1865, the biggest flood in Wyoming Valley up to that time. Houses, barns, canalboats, lumber, trees, fences, horses, cattle, chickens, sheep, pigs, and other valuable property were swept away.

Paving of the bridge's east side approach with cobblestones on November 23, 1865, was considered a great improvement and was beneficial to pedestrians and wagons.

PLANKS RELAYED

J. S. Carpenter and several men cleaned and relayed the planks in the bridge roadway, on June 15, 1868. About the same time a director's room was erected on the south side of the Pittston end of the bridge.

Footwalks on the bridge were widened, after January 4, 1869.

It was mentioned on July 14, 1870, that West Pittston Borough Council had built an iron railing on the bridge's west end, at a cost of \$2.50 per foot. Jonah Howell modeled and installed the railing.

Officials of Pittston Ferry Bridge Co., on October 13, 1870, placed hemlock brush and stones around the piers to catch and settle dirt at the pier bases.

FLOODWATERS

Ice and floodwaters, which rose 8 feet in 1 hour devastated the area on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1875, and washed the Ferry Bridge away.

The Lackawanna & Bloomsburg (D.L. & W.) Railroad bridge was wrenched from its moorings by the seething ice gorge and turbulent waters and it floated down the Susquehanna River where it struck and lifted the Ferry Toll Bridge clear of its piers and carried it to a point 3 miles above Wilkes-Barre where remnants of the debris were left on the riverbank.

FINAL CROSSING

The last persons to cross the Ferry Bridge before it was swept away were Mr. and Mrs. John Hurlbut and Mrs. Charles Law. They first rode to the Water Street Bridge in Mr. Hurlbut's wagon but, finding it in a precarious position, they hurried to the Ferry Bridge which they crossed over safely to the west side.

Immediate plans were formulated by Ferry Bridge Co. officials for the construction of a new, iron bridge at the same site.

A contract for the erection of a new, iron bridge was awarded to the King Iron Bridge Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, at a cost of \$71,931.62.

On April 5, 1875, bridge company officials requested permission of Pittston Borough Council to extend and raise the proposed bridge to the level of North Main Street. The borough solicitor, Stark, rendered the opinion that council had the right to grant such a permit. Attorney Ferris, the representative of the regional property holders, took the opposite view. The permit to raise the bridge 15 feet and extend it to connect with North Main Street was granted by Pittston Borough Council on April 15, 1875.

NEW BRIDGE

The new bridge, 1,100 feet in length, was completed within 11 months from the commencement of its erection. It was opened to public traffic on July 1, 1876.

Acting on the authority of borough council, the burgess and borough engineer of Pittston hired E. W. Miller on April 30, 1877, to construct a railing on the wall at Ferry Bridge, on the Pittston end of the structure, at a cost of \$125.

Cuba file
If Red Cuba Was a Threat Before, It's
More So Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 6, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the advantage of contacts with Cuban exiles now living in Florida.

Over the past months I have had reprinted here in the RECORD stories and editorials from Florida so that these ventures would be called to the attention of all Members of Congress and other Government leaders. As a further indication of the feelings of our citizens on these matters, I include the following in the RECORD:

IF RED CUBA WAS A THREAT BEFORE, IT'S
MORE SO NOW

"If the circumstances in 1960 and early 1961 justified decisions by two administrations that a U.S.-sponsored invasion of Cuba was essential, how can the far worse circumstances of today require less? Inaction can be justified at this point only by a no-win policy of paralysis. The longer the United States waits to expel communism from Cuba, the more difficult will be the job."

The inescapable logic of that analysis Sunday by Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, of the situation facing the United States cannot be disputed. The debacle of the Bay of Pigs remains to haunt President Kennedy and those advisers who prevailed upon him to withhold the vital American assistance that the valiant Cuban

freedom fighters needed to make their invasion a success.

Even those who formerly thought that Castro should be let alone to fall eventually to internal forces have changed their thinking. John S. Knight, publisher of the Miami Herald, wrote the other day:

"I am among those who long ago opposed the idea that Castro should be thrown out simply because we did not approve of him. Cuba had a right to have a revolution. * * * But today's situation is totally different. Castro has betrayed the people who supported the revolution. He is a Communist dictator who would spread that insidious ideology throughout Latin America.

"He has collaborated with a foreign power—Russia—to extend its system to the Western Hemisphere. This is a flagrant violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and should be dealt with as such."

Unfortunately, the people who have the President's ear on foreign affairs are the Walt Rostows and the Arthur Schlesingers who are not unfriendly to leftwing dictatorships. In fact, Professor Rostow merely considers communism a "disease of modernization." He holds to the belief that Communist regimes eventually will "mellow."

As far as we can see, the only mellowing that has taken place in recent years has been in the official backbone of the Nation's leadership. We suggest that the President scorn at this time the advice of Messrs. Rostow and Schlesinger, and ask a famous Democrat from Missouri what he would do about Castro. Even Harry Truman's most bitter critic knows that something would have been done long before now if he were still in the White House.

The first thing we think should be done is the setting up, as Senator SMATHERS has suggested, of a Cuban government-in-exile. And then we should take whatever steps are necessary to put it back in power in Havana—regardless of Moscow's threats.

As it is, President Kennedy can always switch his cool-weather vacation spot from Palm Beach to southern California. But we south Floridians must live here and face the daily reality of an ever-stronger Red menace just over the horizon.

We say something should be done to dispose of that menace, and done fast.

President Kennedy's Views on Amending
Constitution Questioned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 11, 1962

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy's recent declaration in apparent support of the process of amending the Constitution by interpretation, has aroused considerable concern.

The President delivered an extemporaneous address at the White House to a group of students in which he discussed the Constitution, and spoke of the need of men to "make it work," in the light of new and changed conditions.

The President told the students:

Well, the American Constitution is an extraordinary document and it is certainly the most extraordinary written Constitution in the history of the world, but it has required men to make it work, and it still does today.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6755

requirements over the salt-water loaded draft of the vessel.

Required channel depth, typical 28,000-deadweight-ton tanker or bulk carrier

	Feet	Inches
Salt water loaded draft-----	33	5
Added draft in fresh water-----		8
"Drag" (trim down at stern)-----	1	8
Open water "squat" at 10 knots-----		7
Added "bottom effect squat"-----	1	8
Total-----	38	0
Minimum safe bottom clearance-----	2	0

Total channel depth required. 40 0

The first item in the above table is the salt water loaded draft of 33 feet 5 inches for a typical 28,000 deadweight tons tanker. This vessel, carrying that load, will sink approximately one-quarter inch additional as she enters fresh water for every foot of draft in salt water, or about 8 additional inches. To improve the vessel's steering characteristics, she is normally loaded so as to set her down at the stern perhaps three inches or a trifle less for each hundred feet of vessel length, or for this vessel about 1 foot 8 inches. The next two items concern squat and I will discuss them later. I will also explain the added 2 feet for minimum safe bottom clearance. Note, however, that in total, our 33½-foot draft, 28,000-ton vessel, requires a 40-foot channel to safely navigate in our fresh water channels.

I will now discuss the matter of squat. Ignoring for the moment any outside disturbance of the water, the vessel sits at a depth determined by the relation between her average density and the density of the water which she displaces. When the vessel begins to move forward, however, water is piled up by the pressure of her bow, and a bow wave starts moving away from the vessel. The vessel itself steadily moves forward into the space from which this bow wave has departed. We can see how the vessel underway typically moves in an artificial wave trough created by her own bow, so that she rides lower than she did when at rest. This effect is greatly exaggerated when the vessel cross-section is a considerable fraction of the channel cross section. When this is the case, the vessel tends to push all the water in the channel ahead of it up or down the stream. Of course this is literally impossible, but in such situations, the water velocities alongside and under the vessel are greatly accelerated with respect to the vessel. These increased velocities, and the flow lines which they follow, interact with the channel bottom and cause a marked increase in squat which we refer to as bottom effect.

There are other effects which add to channel requirements, none of which are considered important once vessels are inside the entrance proper. One of these effects, which indirectly we do take into consideration, is that of roll, or heeling in a sharp turn. A vessel riding level in the water requires less channel depth than the same vessel when rolled or heeled over even as little as 5 degrees. We have achieved a channel alignment on the Columbia and lower Willamette which reduces heeling to a negligible amount.

The 2-foot minimum bottom clearance is needed to avoid damage to ships' screws from every sunken log or other debris which may be carried into the channel, and to minimize displacement of bottom sand by the ships' screws, which might easily scoop out a foot or two of sand and pile it up a short distance away to ground the next passing vessel.

It should be remembered that grounding on the solid sands of the Columbia River is quite a different matter from touching the soft flocculated colloidal muds which make

up the bottom of tidal estuaries in many parts of the country. Touching bottom there may be no cause for concern at all, but nearly every grounding, however slight, in the Columbia calls for a vessel inspection. This is costly even when no repairs whatever are needed.

Safe navigation of large vessels requires that channel width as well as depth be engineered to adequate standards. Vessels passing close to the bank of the channel tend to yaw toward a collision course due to what is commonly called bank suction. Of course this is just another way of expressing the forces exerted by the lines of hydraulic flow around the vessel as they react with the nearby bank.

The bow has water piled up alongside it on the crest of the bow wave and the vessel tends to sheer away from the bank while at the same time the stern is traveling in a trough, which attracts the bank, from which the term bank suction derived. These lines of flow interact as the vessels meet and pass each other. As the bows meet, they repel each other, while when the sterns pass each other, they are mutually attracted.

The formula we and other authorities have adopted for calculating the required width allows the beam of one vessel, or a minimum of 100 feet, between vessel and bank and between vessels. In addition, we allow 180 percent of the vessel beam for each vessel traffic lane, much as the highway engineer allows a 14-foot traffic lane for an 8-foot truck or a 6-foot car.

Totaling these allowances, we come up with a 600-foot channel for two 28,000-ton vessels, or a comparable combination of one larger and one smaller one, which we considered the most demanding situation occurring often enough to be economically justified as a design assumption.

I mentioned at the beginning that this channel improvement is largely an enormous earthmoving job. What I did not say then is that it would be a much greater earthmoving job had we not learned, to at least some degree, to make the river do as much of our earthmoving as possible. Our men have studied sedimentation, measured the particle sizes in the water, and made studies of current velocity and direction.

Authorities on open channel hydraulics of erodible channels generally agree that the tractive force imposed by the stream on the particles varies approximately with the square of the velocity. It can be appreciated, therefore, that even rather minor differences in velocity will markedly affect the erosion and deposition of bottom particles. Although experimental studies and field observations have not yet given engineers any generally accepted correlation between precise particle sizes and the bottom velocities necessary to start them in motion or keep them moving, we have learned quite a bit about helping the river scour itself clean.

I do not want to imply that we have all the answers to sediment transport. Quite the contrary. This is still a relatively new branch of engineering. Design of erodible channels is still as much an art as a science. Men like Bob Hickson, who have spent a lifetime studying this river, have been able to give us some measure of control over the natural processes, but we still have a great deal to learn.

We are placing more emphasis on research. We have under construction at the Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station at Vicksburg, Miss., a complex model of the estuary reach of the Columbia River, up to about river mile 52. Tide generators are included and we hope to learn a good deal about the many baffling habits of the river from this model. It will make it possible for us to try out experimental control measures whose cost would prohibit gambling

on their success in the river itself. We expect this model to save many times its cost over future years.

We have prepared an information bulletin to summarize for the general public the principal points covered in our report as it was submitted to Washington for approval. Copies are available from the Portland district office.

I would like to leave these thoughts with you: An estimated 45 million yards of excavation will need to be completed to make this proposed channel a reality. After it is completed, an estimated 14 million yards per year will have to be dredged to maintain it. Even small percentage improvements in our techniques will save large sums of money for the taxpayers. Only extremely low unit costs and sound engineering keep total costs low enough to make feasible such projects as a 40-foot channel from Portland and Vancouver to the sea.

Cuba file
The Cuban Problem
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned with the Cuban situation. None of us want communism or Communists on our doorstep. At the same time, we do not want war, if we can avoid it.

We have heard many proposals and solutions to the Cuban problem. We have heard many accusations, but neither the proposals nor the accusations have produced to date.

In my district I am privileged to have many fine ministers and priests. One in particular has given me suggestions, from time to time, of great value, and he has written to me a letter about the Cuban situation. I have looked the letter over carefully and I thoroughly subscribe to the reasoning contained. I have written to this fine citizen and told him of my intention to bring this to the attention of everyone I could contact, and under leave previously granted me, I include his letter and commend it to the thinking of our leaders and our people as a whole.

The letter is as follows:

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR,
Rock Hill, S.C., September 7, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT HEMPHILL,
The House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am writing to the Senator and congressional Representative whom I count as my friends on a matter that to my mind as a Christian American, and as an officer in the Naval Reserve is of momentous importance.

There is to my mind no doubt but that Soviet Russia is engaged in the process of making Red Cuba into a military base, developing an offensive potential which will be directly aimed at our Nation. There is also in my mind no doubt that the Monroe Doctrine has for some time been violated by this move on Russia's part.

It appears to me that the whole matter has reached a sharply urgent and critical point.

A6756

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 12

Therefore I, as a citizen, offer a proposal which I have been turning over in my mind for some months—a proposal short of actual invasion of war—and yet, I believe, one as effective under the circumstances.

In international law the phrase "pacific blockade" is used, I understand, which describes the sort of maneuver which I have in mind.

I propose a "pacific blockade" with certain variations which I feel will make such an action work, and keep it also within the bounds of the international morality which characterizes the United States' relationships with other sovereignties.

Therefore, let a complete air-sea blockade be thrown around and over Red Cuba, as a unilateral action undertaken by the United States in implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. Let it be sternly and clearly stated to the whole world that we do this out of moral necessity to defend our freedom, and to keep the peace.

Let it be stated with equal clarity and sternness that no ship on or under the sea will be permitted through the blockade either Cuba-bound or outbound; and that no aircraft will be permitted to fly in or out of that country; and that any attempt to run the blockade either by air or sea will result in the ship being sunk or the aircraft shot down; but that no shooting or harassment will be done by our Armed Forces otherwise.

Let it be stated that by airlift and parachute drop we will bring in to Cuba such food and medical supplies as will prevent starvation and epidemic disease on the part of the people of Cuba, oppressed as they are.

Finally, let it be stated that the blockade will continue indefinitely and will be discontinued only at the pleasure of the United States.

As I say, I write this to you with a sense of great urgency, and leave you to implement the idea—or tell me it cannot be done—as you see best.

Most sincerely,

WILLIAM W. LUMPKIN,
Rector.

P.S.—This letter is also being sent to Senator STROM THURMOND.

Speaker Won Pat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 27, 1962

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the Morning Star of Okinawa on the Honorable A. E. Won Pat, speaker of the Legislature of Guam whose frequent visits to Washington when his own legislature is not in session has made him almost one of us. Speaker Won Pat presides over the most farflung legislative body under the Stars and Stripes. The article follows:

DEDICATED SOLON GUIDES GUAM PROGRESS
(By Richard R. Williams)

About 1,200 miles southeast of Okinawa lies a relatively small island that in recent years has come to be known as the "gem of the Pacific."

Back in 1898 the United States accepted the island of Guam, principal island in the Marianas chain, as the spoils of war following the Spanish-American War. At the signing of the Treaty of Paris, U.S. officials

shrugged their shoulders and said, "we'll take the island, but we don't know what we'll do with it."

The U.S. Navy was given the responsibility of administering the island and the some 20,000 Guamanians. The Navy acted with foresight. The first thing the Navy did was move the well known "little American red schoolhouse" to Guam.

So, for more than half a century the Guamanians have been English speaking, American thinking, and probably our most sincere Americans.

Guam has come a long way in a relatively short period of time—50 years. The population is now about 70,000. For most of that 50 years the Guamanians have and had some semblance of a government by and for the people, thanks to the Navy's foresight.

And this brings us to the subject of this story, for this is not a story about Guam. It is a story about a man who has been an integral part of Guam's progress for the past 30 years.

Antonio B. Won Pat, better known as Pat, has been more than an integral part, he has been the hub on the wheel of progress for the newest American citizens.

Pat, speaker of the Guam Legislature, has never been a successful businessman. He has never had time for himself. He has been working for his people since he became a schoolteacher in 1928 at the age of 20.

But he did find time to father eight children with the former Ana Perez, who has encouraged her politician husband through many periods of heartbreaks and victories alike.

The congenial political leader was born in the southern village of Sumay, which was destroyed during World War II. Just 2 days before his 33d birthday Japanese bombers destroyed Pat's home village.

He has been so affirmative for his people that he sometime becomes negative.

Two years after World War II ended one political element started a campaign for a territorial status to get out from under a military government. With a fellow congressman, Eduardo T. Calvo, Pat fought vigorously against such a move. He believed that for the sake of the Guamanian people, the navy government should remain until the island was rehabilitated and the island economy fully recovered.

Debunking harsh criticism brought about by American columnists and bids by other U.S. Government departments for control of the island, all of which brought Guam to the fore in world news, the Guam congress on September 7, 1947, unanimously passed a resolution urging continuation of the naval government.

But, almost immediately Pat took a 380° turn. He started working for a territorial status. He knew it would be a long, hard fight and time was important. By the time Washington could be convinced, Guam would be in a position to handle the new status.

Three years later there was a new era for Guam. The organic act, which Pat helped draft, made Guam a territory of the United States and the Guamanians American citizens.

During that 3 years Pat gained invaluable friends in the U.S. Congress. Through his efforts the organic act provided a free port, the only free port under the American flag today. Anything that is the growth of or manufacture of Guam leaves there duty free and enters any other American ports duty free. In addition, there is not one red penny in export or import duties levied in Guam. One may import or export anything and in any quantity without the burden of duty charges.

Guam was also given a nice deal for the territorial treasury. All U.S. income taxes due the U.S. Government by residents of Guam, U.S. civil service employees, and American servicemen stationed on the island

does not go to the National Treasury. It goes to the Guam treasury. This is in lieu of U.S. Government appropriations to run the territorial government. The more earnings, the more money in the local coffers.

The organic act also provides for a 21-seat, single house legislature, and the legislators are elected at large by the people. The legislature is empowered to enact laws for the territory not inconsistent with national laws. And there are provisions by which the legislature may override the veto power of the Governor.

Since the first Governor was appointed in 1950, Guam has had six Governors. Speaker Won Pat has never been a yes man for any of them. He has fought them with all his resources when it became necessary for the welfare of the people. Under Pat's leadership the Guamanian people have developed a stirring pride in the right and ability to govern themselves.

One of the Governors, Ford Q. Elvidge, of Seattle, left Guam in a huff when he learned the island was not a sleepy little Pacific island without problems. He later wrote a story for a national magazine entitled, "I Ruled Uncle Sam's Problem Child."

Guamanians took a bitter exception to the story. But not the reference to being a problem child. They objected to the inference that Elvidge ruled them. "No one rules us," retorted Won Pat, "we rule ourselves."

But the legislator has also joined forces with the Governors, and even has caused resolutions to be passed commending Governors—when he thought it was deserved or for the welfare of the people.

After more than 50 years under a military government the Guamanians, with the leadership such as that of Pat, it seemed it was time the islanders and their political leaders should be satisfied and feel as though a long, hard battle had been won.

True, it was a big victory, and Guam was jubilant. But Won Pat believes in exploiting your successes. The stabilizing influence of the dedicated Congressman was again felt at home and in Washington.

"This is not the time to relax," he said. "On the contrary, the fight has just begun. There is much yet to be done and there will be much to be done from now until eternity. We are on our own and we must make good, not only for ourselves but for our country. Guam is a picture window facing the Bamboo Curtain. We are the closest Americans to that curtain. We must make good under a democratic form of government and at the same time create a favorable atmosphere for our military forces."

Pat has always gotten along with the military commanders better than he has with the Governors. At his instigation a resolution was passed commending the late Rear Admiral William H. Erdmann, commander, naval forces, Marianas. At the time the resolution was passed the Governor and the admiral were not on speaking terms.

Since the Organic Act was passed, Guam has received several Government grants with which to improve medical and educational programs of the island. These and other "favors" were given to Guam through the efforts of Pat's lobbying in Washington.

While the legislature is not in session the speaker is in Washington working for Guam. He receives expense money from the legislature, but this money does not fully cover his expenses in the Nation's Capital. He is continuously digging into his personal funds to make up the difference.

Probably the greatest and most valuable political victory since the passage of the Organic Act was won only recently. Until a year ago there had been an economic stranglehold on Guam in the form of a security clearance required for all persons, including American citizens, entering Guam.

A tourist industry has long been desired there and foreign investments are needed.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6757

But the security clearance requirement scared away potential investors. A year ago the Navy suspended that part of the Presidential Executive order that pertained to American citizens. But aliens still could not enter and the Navy could at any time put the clamps back on for American citizens. As far as enticing investments were concerned, the island was not much better off.

Won Pat joined with Gov. Bill Daniel in lobbying where it would do the most good—in Washington. Last week their efforts paid off. President Kennedy lifted the entire Executive order, throwing Guam open to the world.

The modest lawmaker does not take full credit for concessions that have been gained from the "big brothers" in Washington. "No one man can take credit for anything like that," he says. "My fellow Congressmen, the Governor, and our Navy friends have all had a hand in mapping Guam's future, and they always will have."

"I have been extremely fortunate in finding U.S. Congressmen who are sympathetic with our desires and who have an open mind to problems outside the continental United States."

Pat has been not only a political leader, but active in civic affairs as well. He is a member of the Guam Junior Chamber of Commerce and, in 1947, represented the Guam Junior Chamber of Commerce at the international conclave in Dallas, Tex. He was the first president of the Guam Lions Club and Fraternal Order of Eagles.

He frequently participates in committee hearings in Washington. At home he is constantly being called upon to speak before civic and professional clubs.

The veteran politician was elected speaker of the first Guam Legislature and has held that post ever since, except during the third legislature (1954-56) when there was a revolt on the floor of the legislature by a minority group of independents who failed to abide by an agreement reached during the caucus.

As busy as he is, Pat always has time for his constituents, regardless of their social position. At receptions, which he attends because it is politically necessary, he invariably talks business and listens to complaints and suggestions. He never takes them lightly. Every complaint or suggestion is taken seriously and he always provides an answer to queries.

When Congressman Won Pat visited Okinawa last summer as a guest of the Morning Star his first request was an opportunity to meet with Guamanian servicemen stationed here. He, as all Guamanians are, is proud of the record of Guamanians who have entered the Armed Forces. He never misses an opportunity to pass on words of encouragement and appreciation to Guamanians in uniform.

One of the probabilities in the future for Guamanians is the election of their own Governor. There has been much speculation that Won Pat would throw his hat in the ring. But he scotches these speculations. There is still another probability for Guam's future—a delegate to Congress such as Alaska, Hawaii, and the Philippines at one time enjoyed and such as that now enjoyed by Puerto Rico.

Pat is mum on the subject but it is believed that he is interested in this job. "This is the area in which I can best help my people," he once said. "It would mean leaving my home to live in Washington, but I'm away from home so much now that it would not be much different."

Guam is on the threshold of another new era, and it would be a safe bet that the 54-year-old popular politician will be in there fighting even more vigorously. It's the new eras that prompt Pat to fight harder for his people.

Cuba free
The Menace of Communist Cuba**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States cannot permit the establishment of a Communist slave-state in Cuba.

Mr. William S. White, one of Washington's most knowledgeable writers, has written an article which appeared recently in the Washington Star. Entitled "The Menace of Communist Cuba," the article states the problem and makes certain suggestions for a solution to the matter. Since earliest solution to the problem is demanded, Members will be particularly interested in the proposals Mr. White makes:

THE PASSING SCENE: THE MENACE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

(By William S. White)

The Soviet Union's publicly boasted military penetration of the Western Hemisphere in Castro Cuba is many things, apart from the most insolent menace to the New World that the United States has ever tolerated.

It destroys forever the airy assurances of pseudoliberals that "revolutionary movements" are fine things, indeed—so long as they involve leftwingers and not rightwingers.

It places a terrible responsibility before history upon all those Americans who cheered Fidel Castro on in Cuba long past the point where it was plain that he was transplanting the evil fungus of armed international communism to within 90 miles of our Florida coastline.

UNMASKS COMMUNISM

It bankrupts the whole evangelistic theory, parroted with religious fervor, that communism results from capitalistic injustice, et cetera, and will vanish at once, given the spreading of sufficient welfarism among the masses. Cuba, before Castro, was never half so underprivileged as dozens of other lands which have nevertheless never sought the lethal embrace of Moscow.

It fully supports what has long been fully obvious—that communism, like Hitlerism before it, is a movement of bandit ferocity and cannot be explained by old-lady minds as simply springing from too little milk for the kiddies and too little free land for the workers and peasants.

It brings into the gravest question the practicality of the vast effort being made by the United States through the Alliance for Progress to cure all the ills of Latin America with economic aid. Foreign aid is a sound and splendid thing—when it is given to nations willing and able to use it for freedom's strength and openly and unashamedly against communism.

But the bulk of the more powerful Latin American nations, while avidly ready for our economic aid, repeatedly have refused to follow us in any total quarantine of Castro Cuba. It is fashionable to say that we, the United States, should never force our views upon the recipients of our aid. This is the line even when precisely our views are essential to maintain that freedom from "foreign domination" for which the Latins so endlessly clamor—especially those who have snuggled up closest to international communism.

And brought into question, too, is the very validity of the Organization of American States. This association of the nations of this hemisphere was created to prevent just the kind of foreign penetration which is and long has been so openly involved in Castro Cuba.

But an effective majority of the OAS has thus far been unwilling to take any fully rational step against Castro Cuba. The most ironic of all excuses is given by the nation closest in geography to us, Mexico. She has said that while she would like to help, she just can't find any precedent for it in international practice. There is a sour jest in this—for Mexico, of course, is famous for its scrupulous respect for both law and justice.

COURSE FOR UNITED STATES

So what is now left to the United States? We should try one more time to persuade the Organization of American States to act in honesty and honor against the Soviet cancer in the Caribbean.

Failing this, we should raise a new collective military organization from among the minority who are our real friends in Latin America. Much the same was done in 1949, when we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from within the United Nations when it became clear that the U.N. would do nothing about Soviet aggression in Europe.

And falling this, the United States should act alone to clear the Soviet military apparatus from Castro Cuba, come what might.

Knowles Stockholders To Vote on Liquidation**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, those who have suggested that American industry is safe under the provisions of the new foreign trade bill just recently passed by the House of Representatives should have cause to fear.

Recently in my district, the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., which had been in business in this Nation for 63 years, announced it was closing its doors and liquidating. By this decision, 500 employees have no place to go.

The reason for this decision was that under present tariff policies, wherein imports of foreign made pottery are encouraged, a company could not operate profitably.

Mr. Speaker, if this is so under existing trade policies, I hesitate to think what will be the fate of many like industries after the new foreign trade bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article from the East Liverpool (Ohio) Review which covers the announcement that this company will cease to do business:

KNOWLES STOCKHOLDERS TO VOTE ON LIQUIDATION

Stockholders of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co. have received notice of a special meeting Thursday, September 13 at 2 p.m. in the company's office at Newell to vote on accepting or rejecting a plan for liquidating the corporation.

A6758

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 12

The letter revealed that the shareholders at their annual meeting on March 20 authorized the board of directors to sell the corporation. Unable to secure a purchaser, the board voted unanimously August 21 to recommend to the stockholders that the corporation be dissolved and its assets be liquidated, the letter said.

CONTINUING LOSSES CITED

Continuing operating losses made the action appear desirable because it seems unlikely the operation will become profitable in the foreseeable future, the letter to the stockholders said. It was signed by Roger A. Hall, as secretary of the corporation.

"This action is deemed desirable and necessary by the board of directors because of the continuing operating losses being suffered by the corporation," the letter said.

"Due to the present tariff policies which encourage increasing imports of foreign pottery produced with low labor costs, it does not seem possible for the operation of the company to become profitable in the foreseeable future."

The 63-year-old company employs approximately 400 to 500. It was established at Chester about 1900 by Edwin M. Knowles, a son of Isaac Watt Knowles, founder of the Knowles, Taylor & Knowles Co.

PRODUCT OF QUALITY

He erected a six-kiln plant in Chester, which he named the Edwin M. Knowles China Co., and "soon won fame for the quality of his product," according to contemporary newspaper accounts.

In 1913, Knowles erected a 15-kiln factory at Newell. The Chester plant was sold about 1930 to the Harker Pottery Co.

Here's the text of the letter sent to the stockholders:

"You are hereby notified that a special meeting of the shareholders of the Edwin M. Knowles China Co. will be held at the office of the corporation at Newell on September 13, 1962, at 2 p.m. to consider and approve or disapprove a plan of liquidation of the corporation and the subsequent dissolution of the corporation. A copy of the proposed plan of liquidation is enclosed herewith.

SALE IS AUTHORIZED

"At the annual meeting of the shareholders on March 20, 1962, the Board of Directors was authorized and directed to sell the corporation. The Board of Directors and officers have been unable to secure a purchaser for the corporation, and at a special meeting of the Board of Directors held on Tuesday, Aug. 21, 1962, the board unanimously decided to recommend to the shareholders that the corporation be liquidated and dissolved.

"This action is deemed desirable and necessary by the Board of Directors because of the continuing operating losses being suffered by the corporation. Due to the present tariff policies, which encourage increasing imports of foreign dinnerware produced with low labor costs, it does not seem possible for the operation of the company to become profitable in the foreseeable future.

SIXTY-PERCENT VOTE REQUIRED

"For the plan of liquidation and the dissolution of the corporation to become effective, a favorable vote of at least 60 percent of the outstanding shares of the corporation is required. If you cannot attend the meeting in person, you are urged to promptly sign and return the enclosed proxy in the enclosed envelope.

"An executed proxy, upon which no approval or disapproval is noted, will be voted by the proxies named therein for approval of the plan of liquidation and in favor of the dissolution of the corporation. Any proxy may be revoked by a shareholder at any time

prior to the meeting upon notice in writing delivered to the secretary of the corporation."

FOUR STEPS PROVIDED

The proposed plan of liquidation sets forth four steps. It would authorize the corporation's officers, if they deem it advisable, to seek the advice of consultants "knowledgeable in such matters" concerning the various steps to be followed in the liquidation.

It would authorize the officers to take necessary action to (1) dispose of the present inventories in a manner most advantageous to the corporation; (2) terminate all manufacturing operations as rapidly as possible consistent with the greatest possible realization of cash from the inventories and (3) collect the accounts receivable.

DISPOSE OF ASSETS

Upon liquidation of the current assets, the plan would authorize the board to dispose of the fixed assets in the manner which would be most beneficial to the corporation, either by a negotiated sale or sales or by the employment of a professional liquidator.

The plan would authorize the board to satisfy all debts and liabilities of the corporation and distribute the remaining assets to the shareholders.

The Spurious Trade Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 12, 1962

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as action on the trade bill, H.R. 11970, approaches in the other body, we in this body should not forget that the tariff and trade question is still a very live issue.

It is true that this body passed the bill late in June; but the bill came up under a closed rule and the House membership was not able to work its will on amendments, important amendments, that might have been adopted had the opportunity presented itself.

The trade bill as passed by this body was therefore the bill as it came out of committee. Numerous bills under an open rule are amended on the floor. This is not regarded as a reflection on the committee that reported such legislation but a reflection of the will of the House.

It is therefore not too much to say that had the trade bill been open to amendment on the floor some much-needed amendments might have been adopted. The escape clause, instead of being weakened by gutting it, might have been strengthened. The peril point, instead of being thrown overboard, might have been reinstated. Other important changes might have been made.

The bill has some very objectionable features and much of the endless propaganda that was poured out in its support by the White House, various governmental departments, and numerous other Government officials was misleading. No other bill has perhaps been more thoroughly oversold than this one. The public is beginning to sense this and questions are being asked that must be

most embarrassing to the official propagandists.

A searching analysis of the bill and what has been claimed for it in the form of larger exports of both industrial and farm products, was recently made by Mr. O. R. Strackbein, whose intimate familiarity with the trade program and the legislation relating to it needs no affirmation by me.

I would hope that those who disagree with Mr. Strackbein's conclusions would show, not by simple assertion, but by a factual presentation, where he is wrong if they so regard his statement, in whole or in part. There has been no reply. I feel that the absence of a refutation in so controversial a field, itself is strong evidence that none can be made.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I offer the analysis made by Mr. Strackbein and presented over TV channel 5 on August 22:

THE SPURIOUS TRADE BILL

(By O. R. Strackbein)

A few weeks ago I spoke on the subject of the trade bill that will shortly come before the Senate.

This legislation has been described on numerous occasions as the most important to come before the Congress during this session. I would say that its importance extends beyond that, and believe that you will agree as we go along.

The original Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934, or 28 years ago. Under it the President was authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements with the purpose of reducing our tariffs and other trade barriers in return for similar action by other countries.

The first act was for a 3-year period and there have been 11 extensions of it since 1934, usually for a 1-, 2-, or 3-year period. The last extension, passed in 1958, was for 4 years.

Previously the tariff was written by the Congress itself, as provided in our Constitution. However, this became a laborious and highly technical process. The new system of changing tariff rates through trade agreements was substituted by a limited delegation of authority to the President in 1934. Today a much broader authority is sought.

Since 1934 we have negotiated many trade agreements and have brought down the protection afforded by our tariff from an average of a little over 50 percent on dutiable items to about 11 percent. This represented a decline of 80 percent. Beyond that, well over a third of our imports are admitted free of duty. If these are included in the calculation, the average tariff on our total imports would be equivalent to only about 6 percent.

The upshot is that the United States is now one of the low-tariff countries of the world. Moreover, we impose fewer other import restrictions, such as import quotas, import licenses, special taxes, etc., than most others of the leading trading nations.

This is the record and I do not think that anyone will gainsay it.

Why then the vastly overdrawn campaign to strip away nearly all of what is left of the tariff? It has all the earmarks of a diversionary campaign.

Consider that few other countries have matched us in this type of economic disarmament; that few have gone as far as we, and that therefore few have as liberal a form of trade as we; consider that we are four-fifths of the way to free trade and that we have no import quotas on any industrial product and have only two on mineral products and a few on farm products; keep in

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18137

munist must not become a token of barter for another cold-war hotspot. The people of America will not tolerate this type of rationale which might predicate the trade of a Communist base in Cuba for a rightful U.S. position in some other area of the world such as Berlin. Our position to protect the security of the Nation in this hemisphere must not be diverted to inaction because some alleged action might be taken by the Communists elsewhere.

The need for action is urgent. The United States must seize the opportunity to reaffirm its tradition for the leadership of freemen. Hopefully, America will expel its unrealistic course and address itself with the same confidence which has made it great.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Florida on a perfectly magnificent statement. I think one of the most dangerous situations confronting the free world today is the lack of an appreciation on the part of the people generally of what the real menace of communism is. The gentleman, as usual, is making a very fine contribution to that great fight in which we are engaged.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks. Certainly his leadership in this fight against communism is recognized by all of us in the Congress and by the people of the United States. Again, I am most grateful for his comments.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman for the excellent statement he is making here today. He and I and other members of the Florida delegation have watched this situation develop and have tried to alert the Members of Congress and the people of the United States to what is really going on. I think the American people and perhaps the Congress and the executive branch of our Government have forgotten one thing. Cuba enjoyed freedom only because of the spilling of American blood, which gave them that freedom. We as American citizens, I think, had an obligation to see to it that Cuba remained a free and independent nation. We had a great responsibility to see to it that the Cuban people remained free, and certainly we should have been alert to the changing situation a long time ago. I know that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and I and all other members of the Florida delegation have urged firm, strong action. That is what was needed 3 years ago, 3 months ago, and what is needed now to get rid of this cancerous growth in Cuba. It is the only way.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I ap-

preciate all the efforts he has made along these lines.

CUBA

(Mr. HIESTAND (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the Nation again has been shocked with the news of the buildup of Communist military strength. This time in Cuba, 90 miles off our shores.

That our Government has allowed this further aggression and insult is a further shock to the American people. Over a year ago at the time our State Department and CIA induced the President to withhold air support to a patriotic band of 1,100 Cubans attacking Castro in the Bay of Pigs, I addressed this House warning that our position was playing right into the hands of the Communist conspiracy.

Today, I have introduced a measure reaffirming the principle known as the Monroe Doctrine declaring that with respect to the individual nations of the Western Hemisphere, the United States will review any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them or controlling their destiny as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge early action on this resolution. The time is now. Russia has publicly reaffirmed its policy of military aid and buildup and has frankly warned that any interference with her operations in Cuba will call for reprisal.

A year ago I urged a blockade of Castro's Cuba to prevent this very landing of arms, ammunition, tanks, guns, planes, and missiles. Now it is happening.

During this year we have continued to ship Castro's government food supplies. How many of the 7,000 Russian soldiers known as "technicians" we are feeding is not known but certainly Cubans who could be raising food are working under forced draft to militarize the island.

A year ago the Pentagon told me we could take over the island in 18 hours. A few months from now it would be only at a bloody cost and long siege. We have no desire to take over the island except to free the beleaguered Cuban people, to let them set up a free government, which is not a threat to the Western Hemisphere. Mr. Speaker, I urge the early adoption of this measure.

IS KATANGA ON THE AUCTION BLOCK?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. BRUCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, first I want to take a moment to congratulate

the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], who preceded me, for his excellent presentation.

I would like to preface my remarks today with an expression of my appreciation for the research and translation which was done by the staff of the Library of Congress during the past year. Without their invaluable help this presentation today would not have been possible and I wish to thank everyone at the Library for their cooperation and help.

I wish also to express my gratitude to my assistant, Nicholas Nonnenmacher, who has worked day and night for months in researching this case. Also George Armstrong, of my staff, who was most diligent; and the girls on the staff who did double duty in this work.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Albert Schweitzer, revered throughout the world as Africa's heroic scientist-humanitarian, recipient of the Nobel Prize for his life of service to the people of that great continent, has expressed his profound concern with the tragedy of the United Nations operations in the Congo.

Dr. Schweitzer declared in a statement to the Swiss journalist, M. Jean de Ziegler, of Geneva, on August 28, 1961:

The policy of the U.N. in the former Belgian Congo causes me great anxiety because it proceeds from a total ignorance of the country's problems. It is a grave error to try and unite by force people so profoundly divided among themselves. If Katanga is unwilling to be reunited with the Congo, the U.N. should respect its wishes and not try to impose its own will at any cost.

To its everlasting shame, the United States of America has backed to the hilt the policy of the United Nations that Albert Schweitzer deplures.

Mr. Speaker, does anyone in this Chamber really know what is behind our incredible policy in the Congo?

Bishop Fulton J. Sheen spelled out the background for this tragedy in his column April 15, 1961. Let me quote him in the Brooklyn Tablet of that date:

Behind the minor political struggles in the Congo is the implacable war of the Communists against the church. Here are the inside facts of the Congo story:

Russia plans to Sovietize central Africa.

For 2 years the Soviets gave Lumumba \$400,000 a month to buy followers and provide them with cars.

Lumumba set up a Communist organization among his fellow tribesmen, the Bateelas, making them believe he was the incarnation of his ancestors.

During the elections, Lumumba's troops destroyed most of the ballot boxes of the other candidates. But only 23 percent of the population voted because of their opposition to him; in other regions 85 percent voted.

The plans for the Communist revolution in the Congo were prepared in Prague and in the first 3 months Lumumba carried out the first three points: (1) organize mutiny in the army; (2) put the blame on the Belgians; (3) organize a terrorist regime.

The resentment of the Soviets against the death of Lumumba reveals their disappointment in not taking over the Congo. (The Soviets could astonish the world by telling their part in his death. Remember Lumumba falled them.) But the Soviets have a substitute for Lumumba in Gizenga, the Communist dictator in Stanleyville who was educated in Moscow and Prague. Others are

Kashauka who visited Peiping and Dayal who works under Communist orders.

The Communists have planted two advisers in Washington, both of whom were thrown out of Louvanium University in the Congo for their Communist activities.

Seventy percent of Léopoldville's population are unemployed. Communists have introduced moral degeneration to the youth of the city. Some 90 percent of the boys smoke hemp; immorality is encouraged; attendance at mass has declined to 10 percent of the men, 7 percent of the women.

Missionaries have been persecuted beyond description—priests mutilated, nuns tortured and ravished.

There, Mr. Speaker, is the naked truth about the situation in the Congo—presented by a most highly respected clergyman whose lifework is to know the problems of the people and the areas in which the missionaries of his church labor throughout the world. There are the facts of the situation that helped decide Moïse Tshombe to lead his Province of Katanga out of chaos and into sanity as an independent country—yet establishing in the new Katangan Constitution the intention to join with a soundly constituted confederation of the Congo Provinces.

That Constitution stated in article 1:

Katanga is an independent, sovereign, and constitutional state.

The Constitution shall not be suspended either in part or as a whole.

The State of Katanga adheres to the principle of association with the other regions of the former Belgian Congo provided they themselves are politically organized with respect to law and order. It shall open negotiations to constitute with the same a confederation based only upon the equality of its partners.

President Tshombe, with decision and statesmanship, brought Katanga from the disorder and horror described by Bishop Sheen to order and peace within a matter of days.

Katanga would have remained that way—but we brought terror and chaos back to Katanga—with the policy condemned by the man who may be Africa's finest authority, Dr. Albert Schweitzer.

President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Rusk, Under Secretary George Ball, officials down the line in this administration have lauded that policy, have insisted on the wisdom of that policy, and today ask us to vote \$100 million to pay for the costs of that policy effected by the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, is there a man in this Chamber who will rise to show credentials establishing himself as a greater authority on Africa than Nobel Prize-winner Albert Schweitzer. Is there a man in this Chamber who can rise and prove Bishop Sheen in error as he described the conditions from which Tshombe seceded?

Is there a man in this Chamber who can rise and prove that Katanga's Constitution required that that state had to be bullied and bombed by the United Nations to restore unity to the Congo?

Mr. Speaker, then I repeat, Does anyone in this Chamber really know what is behind our incredible policy in the Congo? A policy that has sought to destroy Katanga.

For months I have pondered the question—and sought the answer.

It was best put by a European writer:

Despite warning, Mr. Kennedy's entourage has not modified its irrational policy in relation to the Congo.

Why this obstinacy in pursuing an erroneous course?

Mr. Speaker, that writer gave a startling answer. He said the reason was that American business interests have launched into profitable ventures in Léopoldville and elsewhere in the Congo.

I have looked into this possibility, and have turned up what many of you may well consider to be supporting evidence for that provocative answer to that persistent, gnawing question. Why?

Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today I stood in this Chamber and demanded an investigation into the policy of our Government in the Congo. With the facts in my possession at that time about the State Department's irresponsible policy I knew we were headed for disaster in that area.

On September 12, 1961, I cried out from this very spot to my colleagues:

I beg the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives—I beg anyone and everyone in this Chamber to lend their influence toward raising a cry that an investigation, not necessarily of subversion but of a repetition of failure of policy, be carried out right now in regard to the Congo. It cannot wait until next year. The time for action is now, not when it is too late. I beg my colleagues to listen—now.

Mr. Speaker, here it is next year—1 year to the day since my call for an investigation, a call that tragically has been ignored.

Since the U.S. Congress failed to undertake an investigation into our policy—which has supported that of the U.N. in the Congo, many innocent human beings, men, women, and children have died tragically—and millions of dollars in destruction has been wrought in Katanga by the United Nations by planes, bombs, and mortars in action paid for by your tax money and mine.

What a ghastly performance. Think of it in the light of the words of Dr. Albert Schweitzer:

If Katanga is unwilling to be reunited with the Congo, the U.N. should respect its wishes and not try to impose its own will at any cost.

What a cost. What a tragedy. Because we did not investigate our fantastic policy, it has been allowed to continue for 12 additional months—long months and costly ones—in treasure, and lives, in brutality and horror, in maimed bodies and broken hearts. And all of this in the satanic hypocrisy that cries to Heaven for revenge—in the name of peace, committed by man's great hope, the United Nations, endorsed by our elected and appointed leaders—in your name and mine.

Mr. Speaker, I am only one Congressman. I have no investigating committee at my call. I have only a small staff. But I felt it my duty to try to get to the bottom of it all—to find the why behind a policy persisted in despite the condemnations of so many Americans like

Herbert Hoover, Senator Thomas Dodd, and countless others.

I have spent every possible moment researching this area, interviewing people who come from the Congo and folks who have visited there, reading reports and books about that area, and I have had members of my staff do likewise.

It was perhaps not politically expedient for me, for Katanga has no votes in the 11th District of Indiana.

But because I sincerely believe our Nation's honor and dignity and therefore that of the people of my district, have been despoiled as never before in our history, I felt the compulsion to press forward within the limitations of time and size of staff toward the end that justice be done in Katanga. History will record us among the ranks of the world's great hypocrites unless we right the wrongs we have perpetrated in the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, during the past year, and of course, before that, I have sought out reports on the Congo in the press of Africa, Europe, and America. From time to time I would come across an isolated item that pointed toward the possibility of something other than stupidity, which long since must be written off as the why behind our policy, something other than Communist influence on our policy—which ever remains a daily goal of our enemies in Moscow, and which could be the case. These items pointed toward international avarice.

In fact, flat charges were made in the international press that this was the case. I tried to track down these charges. Today I bring them to your attention.

Mr. Speaker, I as one man, am in no position to verify these charges or show their falsity. I have, however, determined many parts of these charges to be true. In fact, I might say, I have determined all the charges are true except proof of intention, proof of motivation.

These charges are such, and the unassailable facts I have developed are such, that this Congress has no other course than to establish immediately a bipartisan committee to investigate in the most exhaustive manner the matter I shall now present to you in detail.

Here are some of the headlines to the stories I have referred to:

In a Swiss newspaper: "The Intense Rivalry for Katangese Copper—the Strange Role of Mr. H's Brother."

In a British fortnightly: "L'Union Minière and American Copper Interests."

In an American newspaper: "What Was Dag's Congo Motive?"

In a French magazine: "American Big Business in Katanga and the U.N."

In a Paris newspaper: "Katanga on the Auction Block—I. Tribalism and High Finance; II. The War of the Lobbies."

Mr. Speaker, in that last item, by the very titles of its two part series that appeared in January of this year, the French anti-Tshombe Parisian newspaper, *Le Monde*, highly respected in liberal circles, indicated that Union Minière—which is all we have heard about in this country—was not the only financial interest involved in the Katan-

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18161

WHAT MILITARY RECOMMENDED

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Nation's top military experts, had no part in the actual military operations. Those military leaders had recommended early that, to insure success, some U.S. Armed Forces should take part in any invasion, and that air cover and support should be supplied by the United States.

The recommendations of the military leaders were rejected. It was the Central Intelligence Agency and the White House that finally ran the show and fixed the terms on which the anti-Castro Cubans could fight.

The fateful decision was a political decision—not a military decision.

One civilian official who was close to the whole invasion operation now makes this judgment:

"In retrospect, the political decision was wrong."

A military man, also close to the operation, said this:

"If you go back to that time and look at the whole problem, you find that this country faced one fundamental question: Can we permit a Communist country in this Western Hemisphere? Now, if the answer is 'yes,' then you do one thing. If the answer is 'no,' you do another.

"But if you weasel on that answer, start compromising, then you wind up in confusion—with no real answer. One thing we should have learned from this Cuban fiasco is this: You can't run a military operation that way."

Cuba file

SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP IN CUBA

(Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the news of a Soviet military buildup in Cuba, which is now admitted by the administration, is serious indeed.

It is incredible to me that President Kennedy would allow the Soviet to make good on Khrushchev's statement of 1961, that "the only thing left to do with the Monroe Doctrine is bury it." Because no action was taken to protect what has been a cornerstone of our hemispheric policy since 1823, communism has invaded this hemisphere in defiance of the Monroe Doctrine. No amount of word juggling can call that a "defensive" action. This is not the type of leadership which has thrilled readers of U.S. history.

While I fully believe it is proper for members of both parties to criticize the Kennedy administration's handling of the Cuban situation, just as Senator Kennedy made it a campaign issue in 1960, I do not care to dwell on the past. I would rather talk about the future.

I fully believe the President should order and openly announce daily U-2 flights over Cuba. I believe the pilots of these planes should be ordered to photograph every square inch of Cuba at regular intervals.

Second, I believe that several ocean-going ships should be fitted with short wave television transmitters and should operate in international waters off the coast of Cuba. These ships would broadcast actual pictures taken by our U-2 planes to Cubans and all Latin Americans. They should reveal the truth about Soviet military penetration into Cuba.

No. 164—15

Next, I believe the administration should order a complete blockade against strategic and military shipments to Cuba.

And as a fourth step, I sincerely believe that the administration should recognize a Cuban government in exile and furnish it with military assistance in an amount sufficient to win. Never again should this country be a party to another Bay of Pigs fiasco.

I do not believe these actions will result in war with Russia. Russia is much too practical to use a blockade as justification for a war which she would be forced to fight at the end of a 5,000-mile supply line.

Unless the United States this firm action now, Khrushchev will continue to bluff for all he can get. Now, as always, a firm U.S. position is all that will stop the Communists.

I am confident that U.S. citizens will support the President in these actions and I am confident that the Republican Party will support him. I also believe that the rest of the world will respect us for taking these actions and will gain hope when we take them.

THE POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF DEEP AID CUTS

(Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an address by Hon. Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator for Operations, Agency for International Development. Mr. Coffin is a former colleague who served as a very able member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has provided a very clear presentation of the policy implications of deep cuts in our foreign aid program. As we will be considering the foreign assistance appropriation bill next week, I hope that all Members will read this address and give careful thought to what Mr. Coffin says about the situation:

THE POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF DEEP AID CUTS (Remarks by Hon. Frank M. Coffin, Deputy Administrator for Operations, Agency for International Development, at a meeting of the Point IV Information Committee, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, September 11, 1962)

This is the season of the year when the policy debates centering about the Foreign Assistance Act have faded in memory although they took place only 2 months ago. Now, in the waning days of this Congress come the committee actions and debates on the vital question of the amount of money to appropriate to carry out the policies.

With time pressing and patience strained, there is now particularly a need for perspective and deliberateness. There is a need by all to be aware of deep and broad policy issues which, consciously or unconsciously, are decided by votes on line items in the upcoming foreign assistance appropriation bill. There is always a temptation to accept any round-looking number as an appropriate figure for a cut—to relieve our frustration over our balance-of-payments problem, or what we deem irresponsible acts of foreign governments. But so to act is like determining our policy on Berlin on the basis

of the latest remarks of Gromyko or Khrushchev.

The round-looking number which I want to discuss today is the figure of \$1 billion which has been written about as the possible magic figure for an aid cut. It doubly deserves to be called round, for it is pregnant with many policy decisions.

THE FORGOTTEN FACTS

These decisions, unless we make an effort, will be made in isolation, as if no history had been written, as if no one else existed, as if we were alone in the world. Let me suggest some forgotten facts which we would do well to remember.

There is the fact of tension. As we read of a quickening pulse on the Berlin issue and in Cuba, of the atmosphere of mingled hope and apprehension in Laos, the Congo, West Irian, and Algeria, of the violence in South Vietnam, we know that this is a time of tension. And we know also that those who would have us relax in a time of tension must bear the burden of persuasion.

The second factor is that of amount. What is now being requested of Congress is—apart from funds sought not for expenditure but to replenish reserves for new investment guarantees—approximately at the same level of what was appropriated last year, including the Alliance for Progress appropriation in the spring of 1962. In short, even a cut of several hundred million dollars will reduce our aid program below last year's. A more massive cut is not only a cut of this year's request; it is a cutback.

The third fact is that of ability to pay. Our memory is short. We are surprised to learn that in the days of the Marshall plan our aid was three times the percentage of our GNP that it is now, and the absolute burden on each American citizen was twice as much then as now.

The fourth is that of partnership. We are no longer the only nation extending aid. How many of us realize that, counting Western Europe, the United States, Japan, and Canada, our partners in aid have 40 percent of the total gross national product and contribute 42.5 percent of total official aid? Last year saw a greater percentage increase in their official aid (23.7 percent) than in ours (20.7 percent), a doubling of their loans calling for a repayment period of over 20 years. If the United States at this point were to adopt the policy decisions implicit in a drastic cut, the effect on these other nations would be both dramatic and negative.

The final forgotten fact is that of congressional action. We should not forget, first, that last year Congress approved in principle, by its authorization, a general level of lending—subject to yearly scrutiny—of \$1.6 billion a year for the next 4 years. Secondly, we should not forget that 2 months ago it saw fit to authorize lending of \$1.250 billion for 3 regions of the world and \$500 million more for Latin America. In other words, Congress not only ratified but enlarged last year's authority. To reverse these decisions by a massive cut in appropriations at this time is to engage in an adventure in policymaking without policy debate, and, indeed, contrary to the policy decisions which have taken place both this year and last, after full debate.

These, then, are the perspectives for decision.

A CUT AGAINST WHAT?

How deep is a cut of a billion dollars? That depends on what is being cut. What is at stake in the aid battle is not the total \$7 billion package being presented to the Congress. For this includes not only our economic and military aid programs, but also such items as \$2 billion in loans to the International Monetary Fund, the Peace Corps,

administrative expenses for the Export-Import Bank, contributions to the International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank, administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and sums for refugees and migrants programs.

Against such an omnibus total a cut of \$700 million would appear to be only 10 percent, a cut of \$1 billion, 14 percent. But we are not dealing with a \$7 billion aid program. We are dealing with an economic aid request of \$3.252 billion and a military aid request of \$1.5 billion, or a total of \$4.752 billion.

Against this amount a cut of \$1 billion is one-fifth, or 21 percent. It is almost three times last year's final percentage cut.

In the past the House has several times shown its reluctance to slash military assistance. If this item is left largely untouched, then a cut of \$1 billion would really be a 31-percent cut in the total economic aid program.

If it were felt that the Alliance for Progress had more articulate defenders, this item might be spared major surgery. Under these circumstances the brunt of a billion dollar cut would fall on the other 30 countries and would be almost a 40-percent cut in our program outside of Latin America.

But, whether it were 21, 31, or 40 percent, any such cut means several major policy decisions for this country.

WHAT WOULD BE THE POLICY DECISIONS?

We are facing decisions on six major parts of the aid program: development loans, development grants for technical assistance, Alliance for Progress, guarantees for private investment overseas, and, for the hard needs of the cold war, supporting assistance and the contingency fund, and military assistance. Any cut approaching a billion dollars in magnitude would have to affect all of these programs. Here are the kinds of distinct decisions we would be making. This is not, I assure you, the to-be-expected plea of an administration spokesman. This is the result of hard thinking based on a realistic allocation of the kind of deep cut we have been hearing about.

1. Development lending would be cut down and narrowly confined as a tool of our foreign policy. A cut of several hundred million dollars—as much as \$500 million—might be allocated to this program. What is left for development loans would be substantially absorbed in fulfilling tentative commitments to six major countries alone. What about all the other countries in desperate need of capital assistance?

We would be shackled in responding to the very real development needs of such countries as Greece, Taiwan, Iran, Thailand, Liberia, and Israel. Our ability to consider projects in at least 10 other countries would be effectively wiped out—countries where programs and planning are going forward with a fair degree of success. We would be hamstringed in trying to get other countries off a dole basis and increasingly onto a developmental basis. As for the \$200 million of projects nearly ready for approval as of June 1962, work would be effectively halted except in a few top priority cases.

Such a cut would therefore be a decision that development lending was no longer a vital tool of foreign policy. Nations would know there would be little capacity to meet new situations. This decision would not be lost on the other developed nations which we have urged to increase their lending on liberal terms.

2. Any significant reduction in the \$600 million for Latin America would be a body blow to the Alliance before the end of the first round.

This would be interpreted as a decision that we were writing off Latin America after less than a year of serious effort. Fifteen years ago we freely wagered \$13 billion on

20 European nations in 4 years of the Marshall plan. Now we face a vastly more difficult set of problems closer to home and have set out to venture \$2.4 billion, less than one sixth, over 4 years for 20 Latin American nations.

This past year has been one of planning and of reviewing plans and proposals. This was done with faith on both sides of the Rio Grande that there was a premium placed on deliberations, that we meant what we said in talking about a decade of progress for the Alliance. Today loan programs foreseen for six countries alone total \$360 million.

We are talking about a Western Hemisphere loan program costing us 1 percent of the Defense Department budget. We are talking about an amount that is 10 percent of our budget this year for outer space. Is not this investment in our neighbors to the south worth at least this fraction?

Any decision to forfeit orderly development in this space is of the utmost gravity.

3. A substantial cut in the \$300 million development grant request is a decision for no new activities in health, education, agriculture, community development, land, tax, and governmental reform, cooperatives, free trade unions, savings and loan associations, and development banks. Our request is almost identical with what was actually appropriated last year.

Since Africa is the area where our aid activity is new and concentrated in this type of assistance, a major percentage cut would be a decision that our posture toward this vast continent in its formative period would be a negative one.

4. Failure to provide reserves for our investment guarantee program—\$180 million is requested—would be a decision to deny to the United States the material help and know-how which American enterprise can bring to developing countries. Not only is this money not spent, in the absence of catastrophe, but it would activate four times as much resources for assisting development, without taxing the American citizen.

5. Even a relatively small cut in the items of supporting assistance and the contingency fund is a drastic decision to reduce our defense capacity in the most troubled areas of the world.

I say this because our request for supporting assistance this year (\$415 million) is about one-half of our appropriation for 1961. Let me show you how hard core a figure that is. We requested \$481.5 million. This has already been cut to \$415 million. Three-quarters of our request was slated for four countries—Vietnam, Korea, Laos, Turkey. Three hundred forty-nine million dollars was slated for the Far East alone. If a cut of as much as \$75 million is made we would face the hard choice of maintaining our efforts in critical areas of the Far East only at the cost of lowering our guard everywhere else. This would mean inability to respond or join other nations in responding to a financial crisis; inability to offer aid to a country becoming disenchanted with the bloc; inability to strengthen a nation threatened by bloc "liberation" efforts; inability to give needed assistance to a newly independent country during a critically formative period; less ability to assure certain base rights.

What I have said also applies to the contingency fund. Last year \$275 million was appropriated. The actual uses amounted to something over this as some funds had to be transferred from the Department of Defense. It is unrealistic to suppose any easier situation confronting the United States this year when we consider the possibilities of these turbulent times—the unrest throughout the Far East, the problems of the new government in Laos, the strife in Vietnam, the problems and opportunities posed by the new Algeria, the uncertainties of the Congo, the entire Middle East, the Caribbean, all

of Latin America, the range of natural disasters such as the earthquake in Iran. * * *

A large cut here, then, is a policy decision in advance that the U.S. interest is best served by not giving the President the resources and the flexibility with which to act in any of these situations.

6. A cut in military assistance is, to its extent, a decision to reduce our defense overseas. It is a policy decision for unilateral disarmament without having considered the implications.

The request for military assistance (\$1,500 million) is already \$100 million less than last year's appropriation. One-half of this goes to 5 countries—Greece, Turkey, Korea, Vietnam, and Taiwan. Eighty-eight percent goes to five countries—Greece, Turkey, Korea, has been made that a cut of several hundred million might be attempted. Secretary McNamara has urged that we think of this as not just a cut in what was authorized—but as important as if our defense budget itself were to be cut by the same percent.

About a billion of this is for past commitments, fixed charges, and maintenance. A cut of 20 percent would more than cut force improvement in half, for we have already seen new needs in southeast Asia exceeding our original planning by over \$100 million, which will have to come from other parts of the program.

The appropriations process is an invaluable one to spotlight waste and inefficiency, to keep the executive department on its toes. But there is a point when cuts in appropriations become policy decisions of the most sweeping kind. Such would be any cuts of the magnitude suggested. In a time of accelerating tensions over Berlin, Cuba, and other cold war hotspots, these are grave decisions.

If a patient has scalp wounds, a lobotomy is not the wise approach.

CONFLICT IN ADMINISTRATION'S URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (at the request of Mrs. MAY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a serious conflict in the administration's urban renewal program. High officials within the administration are speaking out of both sides of their mouths. They are saying on the one hand, that the urban renewal program is a local program that is operated under local controls. At the same time, they are issuing orders which have but one ultimate purpose, and that is, insuring complete dominance and control over the program by the Federal Government.

From the earliest time the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs began, certain Members of the House kept insisting that the urban renewal program was a local program, locally conceived and locally operated. Strong denials were made that there is any invasion of State or local authority by the Federal Government. But I submit that while this sounds impressive and overwhelming, the facts bear out a contrary position. Perhaps the wording of the laws themselves cannot be construed to contradict their claims that there is no danger of usurpation of local prerogatives, but it is the entire system, and the administrative implementation of all the laws pertaining to urban renewal