

October 1, 1962

to active duty with the Armed Forces, or whose period of duty with the Armed Forces was involuntarily extended, on or after August 1, 1961.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1552) entitled "An act to amend and supplement the laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes"; agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. HRUSKA, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6682) entitled "An act to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12180) entitled "An act to extend for a temporary period the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1658) entitled "An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962.

The Honorable THE SPEAKER,
 House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on September 28, 1962, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 897 entitled "Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Friday, September 28, 1962, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

And on Saturday, September 29, 1962, sign enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House, and enrolled bill of the Senate as follows:

H.R. 310. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of

Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H.R. 2952. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of California to the city of Needles;

H.R. 11887. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of El Paso, Tex;

H.J. Res. 897. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, and for other purposes; and

S. 919. An act to amend section 9(b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities" (the Hatch Political Activities Act) to reduce the requirement that the Civil Service Commission impose no penalty less than 30 days' suspension for any violation of section 9 of the act.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, with amendments of the Senate thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? There being no objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. NATCHER, SANTANGELO, CANNON, RHODES of Arizona, and TABER.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.)

CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL SET FOR WEDNESDAY OR THEREAFTER

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the second request I have is unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time after today to consider the supplemental appropriation bill for 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the report will be filed and printed tonight. In other words, no one will have an opportunity to know what is in the supplemental bill until tomorrow at the earliest, and the gentleman might call up the bill tomorrow afternoon.

I do not want to prolong this session of Congress, but I want to know, and I

think a few Members of the House as well want to know, what is in this supplemental appropriation bill and what you did as a result of action in the full committee only this morning. The calling up of this bill on Wednesday, which is just 1 day short of the 3-day period that would have to elapse otherwise would not be objectionable, but I will not permit, Mr. Speaker, having this bill called up for consideration tomorrow with the Members of the House having only 1 day and 1 night—and we have to operate at night around here as well as day in order to read some of these bills.

If the gentleman will amend his request to call it up not earlier than Wednesday I will not object.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my genial friend from Iowa that I do not see anything unreasonable in his point of view, and we will be glad to comply with his request. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection on the part of committee members, I amend my request that the supplemental appropriation bill be brought up any time on Wednesday or thereafter.

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

There was no objection.

TURKISH COOPERATION IN THE CASE OF CUBAN SHIPMENTS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, our allies are beginning to cooperate. The Turkish Government has announced that it will prohibit future shipments to Cuba. With unusual and decisive action, the Turkish Government also ordered three ships en route to Cuba to put into the nearest port and unload.

Thus, the Turkish Government has become the second allied nation to cooperate. The first was West Germany. Both nations deserve applause from the House of Representatives and the American people.

What of the other nations still trading with the Communists to help build Cuba? They have been among our staunchest allies. Have Britain, Greece, Italy, France, and Norway followed the examples of West German and Turkey? No, these governments still allow their flags to be used in international profiteering. Far more than half of the world's merchant fleet engaged in Communist cargo to Cuba fly the flags of our friends.

Mr. Speaker, several of these nations argue that they do not have adequate legislative authority to take action. Surely they have some administrative power as this Government does. It exists in sections 2022 and 2023 of the Export Control Act. By invoking this authority, the United States could halt U.S. haulage in any vessel engaged in Cuban commerce.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge this action by our Government to buttress the actions taken by our other friends.

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN WALKER

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, after what happened at Oxford in the State of Mississippi last night, I think it is high time that the authorities see to it that former Maj. Gen. Edwin Walker is promptly committed to a lunatic asylum; or, if he is proven to be sane, that he be tried and imprisoned for an interminable period for insurrection. According to a report of the Associated Press, he led a thousand college youths of the University of Mississippi in a charge that fell back but 100 yards from the U.S. marshals. What was he doing on the campus, at all?

TRAGEDY IN MISSISSIPPI

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I beg of you and the Members to be a little lenient with the time and give me a long minute.

With all deference to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] the retired General Walker did not precipitate the rioting. This was done by Attorney General Kennedy's trigger happy marshals.

We have a terrible situation down at home, and we are worried. But we did not make it. This administration made it. The loss of blood and life is not on the hands of Mississippians. We are only the victims.

Last night the officials of the university pleaded with the Department of Justice officials not to make this move in the darkness of night, because in a situation of this kind, nighttime is conducive to a buildup of tension and violence. They were told that students would be pouring into the campus from home and a football weekend and the presence of all of the marshals stationed about the campus in the darkness of night would likely inspire trouble.

The university told the Department that it would issue a special edition of the daily paper for early this morning urging the students to be calm. The statements were also to be carried over the loudspeakers in the student union building.

It committed itself to go on the campus radio with the same urge. It committed itself to make the same appeal with loudspeakers over the campus. It was also pointed out that students would be widely dispersed, attending classes.

But, nay, the Department of Justice was not to be denied. So last night, we regret to say, they insisted on occupying the campus and a Sabbath Day registration.

The chancellor and other reputable officials of the university had assured the Department of Justice the registration would take place this morning. They told the Department of Justice that students were returning, thousands of them, from over the State, and if they

came in on the campus last night with these officers and others in their medieval uniforms, carrying guns and other weapons, that trouble might be possible. But they were not to be denied. They demanded occupancy of the university campus immediately and took over. From all appearances they wanted this occupancy immediately so the President in his forthcoming speech of the evening to the Nation could announce a successful and "peaceful" occupation.

So, last night, in the darkness where trouble was bound to ensue, the first discharge of violence did not come from the students of the university, where, incidentally, my son is now a student. It came from an inexperienced trigger-happy U.S. marshal who fired a tear gas gun straight into a group of kids who were doing nothing more than a little student jeering. A State policeman had them under perfect control. The discharge struck the patrolman in the mid-section, and we understand that he is near death. Several deaths and serious injuries have been reported.

We are sorry it happened. It was not our fault. Ole Miss officials asked that this occupation take place at a time when the students were in class, at a time when officers would have clear vision across the entire campus and be able to spot any display of emotion or unrest.

That is the truth about the situation. The blood is not on our hands. It is upon those of certain officials here in Washington, and as to who they are I leave it to your own conclusion. Obviously, everyone knows.

THE SWEARING IN OF HON. ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AS AN ASSOCIATE U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a keen sense of pride that I come into this well today. This morning there was sworn in as a member of the Supreme Court of the United States one of my constituents, a warm personal friend, a man admired for his ability and accomplishments and loved for his warm human closeness by everyone in the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

Attending the ceremony today was one who had been a member of his law firm, who before that had been the clerk to Mr. Justice Minton in 1951 and 1952 and now is a representative in the General Assembly of Illinois, from our great second district, the Honorable Ab Mikra, one of the young men of our Nation destined for the heights in the law and the forum of statesmanship.

Accompanying others in the party of friends, neighbors and former associates of Mr. Justice Goldberg was Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, who has the rare honor of having been the spiritual guide and mentor both of a member of the Cabinet of a President of the United States and a member of the Supreme Court of the United States. I doubt that few others

if any in God's ministry in the history of our country have had such an honor. I should add, Mr. Speaker, that of course Mrs. Weinstein and Mrs. Mikra were there too, for the admiration and affection in which Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg is held in the community of which he has been a vibrant and intimate part since boyhood is family deep. And the joy in all the homes of the district I have the honor to represent has its source not only in the swearing in today of Arthur Goldberg as a member of the highest court in the world, but also, Mr. Speaker, in the blessing God has given him in a charming and noble wife and a fine family.

Mr. Speaker, today the Second District of Illinois has given to the Nation and to its highest court a great lawyer, a great human being, a great example of the unchanging power of integrity, industry, and in self-abnegation in an ever-changing world. I predict with confidence, and I know I speak for every family in the Second District of Illinois, that Arthur Goldberg, on the record he will make, will be rated in history among the greatest of the many giants of the law and servitors of mankind who have graced the highest tribunal in the world, the Supreme Court of the United States.

MISSISSIPPI

(Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has so well stated, it was not our intention here to make any inflammatory or other remarks on this occasion. We have issued a statement on behalf of our delegation, and we are perfectly willing to let it rest there.

But, Mr. Speaker, under the parliamentary situation we do not have an opportunity to fully present the true picture of the tragedy being enacted in Mississippi. But I want to say to all of you that this tragedy is not confined to Mississippi. It also is a tragic hour in the history of the United States of America when the rights of a sovereign State of this Union are trampled underground by the armed might of a strong centralized government.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi are a patriotic law-abiding people.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Mississippi have a right to construe that the law that was regarded as the law of the land for over 100 years of equal but separate facilities is just as good a law now as it was before this packed Court decided otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to bring about any further inflammatory statements here. But I want to say to the Members of the House that we and the people of Mississippi think that the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States is just as much a part of our law as any other part of that Constitution is the law, and we resent what is going on between the executive and the judiciary.

Our Latin American Policy**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 18, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert several short articles dealing with the current situation regarding Cuba and our Latin American policy in general. These articles have been written by Mr. Fred A. Orleans, noted author and international lawyer of San Antonio, Tex. Some of these were written recently, others over the past year, but they contain some excellent thoughts on the subject which deserve consideration at this time.

They are as follows:

THE LITTLE WARS

(By Fred A. Orleans)

The Communists could hurl rockets at a selected number of U.S. cities from Cuba, and what would we do? Would we retaliate against Russia? Probably not, since that would be wanton aggression insofar as Russia had not attacked us. We would, if we still had the gumption, go against the aggressor—Cuba.

Communists could hurl rockets at another selected number of U.S. cities from British Guiana and what would we do? Again we could not prove that the Russians had anything to do with the attacks against us. After all, they did not originate from Russia, but from aggressive Western Hemisphere nations. How long could this pattern continue?

Although the above may seem to the average person to be pure fiction and not possible, a look at the record will indicate differently. In the many conflicts throughout the world—Korea, Laos, Vietnam—to name but a few, just how many Soviet Russian troops have actually been committed to the battlefields? The Russian procedure is to simply let the United States exhaust itself fighting little wars all over the world. Until now, these little wars have been in remote places, but now the Russians have gotten much bolder and are beginning with Cuba to start the "little" wars here in the Western Hemisphere.

Where will it end? It will end only when the United States realizes that its salvation rests in first expressing its own self-interest. It will end when the United States is prepared to take a firm stand on principle and ceases to be on the defensive and again becomes the vigorous and positive leader of the past, giving definite and firm leadership, and acting with a purpose with policies both fully expounded and backed up. Then, and only then, will our growing international problems diminish and eventually disappear.

NEW IMAGE NEEDED

(By Fred A. Orleans)

A reorientation in the thinking which dictates U.S. foreign policy relating to Latin America is needed.

(1) We cannot continue to unilaterally give away billions to buy insults.

(2) We cannot buy friends in Latin America, and we must eliminate the impression prevalent in Latin American countries that we are trying to buy their friendship to help us combat the menace of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

(3) We must abandon the idea of equating poverty with communism. The error in this

thinking is proven by the fact that communism thrives among well-to-do industrial workers in northern Italy and not in poor, agricultural, southern Italy or Ireland.

(4) We should not emphasize our desire to export revolution, since this is understood in a different concept in Latin America where there is already too much revolution.

(5) We should not attempt to democratize Latin America or make the various countries conform to our concept of democracy, since democracy is arrived at only by the long road of education and literacy. As a result of illiteracy, democracy has never thrived in Latin America.

(6) We should abandon the idea of trying to Americanize Latin America.

(7) We must reestablish our image in Latin America as a nation which refrains from wronging others but which insists that it not be wronged itself. As a nation that wants peace, but a just peace, and wants it because we think it is right and not because we are afraid. As a nation which no weak nation, acting properly, need fear, and no strong power should be allowed to single out for a subject of insolent aggression. In short, as a nation which will take whatever measures are necessary to liberate the people of Cuba from the chains of communism which bind them.

[From the Mexico City Daily Bulletin, Nov. 28, 1961]

THE STORY OF TWO DAMS

(By Fred A. Orleans)

On September 4, 1961, there appeared in a newspaper two articles side by side, both datelined Washington, D.C. The first, "Amistad Dam Fund Is Okehed" and the other "U.S. to Check Before Big Loan." The article relating to the Amistad Dam indicated that money for further construction on this dam was provided in an appropriation bill signed by President Kennedy. It was indicated that the money, representing a new installment in the U.S. share for the water storage project on the United States-Mexican border river, was contained in a \$13,173,000 fund which had been approved for the International Boundary and Water Commission. The allocated sum represents a \$2 million cut in the original request for the Commission. It was indicated in Washington that there was some uncertainty as to how the cut in funds would be spread.

The other article stated that President Kennedy would send a high-ranking U.S. mission to Ghana for a last minute check before the United States gave final approval to the \$130 million loan for the big Volta Dam project in Ghana and that G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African affairs was slated to head the U.S. team.

The Amistad Dam was widely heralded and publicized as another example of United States-Mexican friendship when President Eisenhower met with President Lopez Mateos at Acuña a year ago. At that time, it was stressed that this prospective dam represented another example of how neighboring countries could cooperate in developing projects which would mutually benefit the citizens of both countries. The Amistad Dam, as the Falcon Dam before it, will be constructed jointly by the United States and Mexico, with each country paying its share, and with the citizens of both countries who live in areas bordering the dam, utilizing the waters which will be stored therein.

Here's an example of a project which will not only potentially help to better United States-Mexican relations, but also is one in which U.S. citizens can materially benefit through visible and definite means.

How the people of the United States can conceivably benefit through giving \$130 million to Ghana has never been satisfactorily

explained nor demonstrated by those who are engaged in shaping the U.S. foreign policy.

The President of Ghana is known to be most definitely pro-Communist and has been a staunch supporter of the Communist line and has acted literally as a puppet of the Moscow rulers of the Red bloc. It is claimed that U.S. aid to Ghana in the past was excusable because the leanings of the ruler of that country were not too well defined so that a question existed as to whether he was truly a neutralist or a pro-Communist. All that was required in order to have determined the true situation relating to this matter was a careful study of the facts at hand by any impartial person, conscientiously and diligently seeking the truth. The truth is always easy to find by those who wish to find it and there is never an excuse for stupidly following any policy or program which can give aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

The time arrived many years ago for the United States to choose between its friends and enemies and an attempt to deal impartially with those who are dedicated to the preservation of Western civilization and with those who are dedicated to its ultimate destruction, is little short of insanity.

There can only be one end to the story of the two dams, and that is, for the United States to most emphatically decline the privilege of aiding in the establishment of communism in Ghana, and to direct all efforts toward the speedy completion of Amistad Dam as well as additional joint projects which can both materially benefit the people of the United States and Mexico as well as further strengthen the foundation upon which the friendship between these two neighbors rest.

[From the Mexico City Daily Bulletin, Nov. 24, 1961]

ANALYSIS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS AGREEMENT

(By Fred A. Orleans)

To the average American, "The Alliance for Progress," which was embodied in recent Inter-American Conference at Punta del Este, represents the mere giving away of billions of dollars of the American taxpayer's money to the countries of the Americas. This impression can be attributed to the lack of explicit information regarding the significance of the conference at Punta del Este and the real meaning of the resultant agreement, known as the Punta del Este Charter.

This charter, in its preamble, states that the American Republics proclaim their decision to become associated in a common effort to achieve more rapid economic progress and greater social justice for their people, respecting human dignity and political liberty. Based on this association in a common effort, the charter sets forth both the objectives of the "Alliance for Progress" and outlines goals and the course to be pursued in bringing about both rapid as well as sustained economic and social development; regional economic integration and provision for sufficient expansion of trade based on basic exports. The final two objectives complement the initial one in their aim of attempting to lift Latin America out of its present submerged economic and social position.

There are twelve major goals which are enumerated in the first part of the Punta del Este Charter and these are of paramount importance: The participating republics thereby formally promise to work toward a substantial growth in per capita income in Latin America; improve the distribution of national income; achieve a balanced diversification of their economies; accelerate the industrialization process; increase productivity and agricultural production; promote agrarian reforms; eliminate illiteracy; improve individual and collective health; aid in

solving the pressing problem of housing; maintain stable price levels; strengthen existing agreements; develop cooperative programs in connection with the Latin American export trade.

The above-indicated goals will prove extremely difficult to accomplish in view of existing conditions in the Western Hemisphere, and the difficulty in accomplishing same will be further increased through the absolute necessity of injecting at least the \$20 billion indicated, into the economies of the countries of the Americas. The attainment of these goals, would in addition, be dependent on the United States participating in multilateral price stabilizing agreements on basic Latin American exports, as coffee, etc., support of the creation of an international fund for stabilizing export earnings of Latin American countries and from the Latin American side of the picture, a prompt implementing of substantial development programs covering broad reforms of an agrarian nature, tax systems, public administration, etc.

The Punta del Este Charter specifically indicates that each government will formulate its own goals, priorities and reforms within their own national development programs, and does not provide for any specific cooperation between countries through which the program of each can be integration on a regional basis, ultimately leading to a Western Hemisphere common market, as that which has resulted in the fabulous boom now taking place in Europe. Much too little was accomplished at the Punta del Este Conference toward the establishment of a common market, despite the many references in the charter relating to the desirability and need for this type of regional economic integration.

The Alliance for Progress agreement will prove to be particularly meaningless to the countries of the Americas unless it leads to an economic integration between the various countries of the Americas in the near future.

POWER OF THE PRESS (By Fred A. Orleans)

The battle for Latin America is taking place on the newsstands of every city and every remote village in all the countries of the Americas. The Communists are spending an acknowledged \$100 million a year to flood Latin America with well-written, well-illustrated, and well-prepared books and magazines which are given away free or sold for a mere pittance.

With an expenditure of approximately \$7 million in 1960 for propaganda in Latin America, it is very clear to those who seek the true answers, why the United States is definitely losing the battle for Latin America despite promises of practically unlimited aid through the Alliance for Progress. If we do not get our message through to the people, we cannot hope to meet the challenge of an enemy who makes extensive use of the propaganda mediums we seem so reluctant to employ.

The publishing industry of the United States can easily overwhelm the Red propaganda in Latin America, if given the chance. The time has long since passed when the United States should have turned on its printing presses and flooded Latin America newsstands with the superior publications which they are capable of producing.

The United States must take the offensive in the field of psychological warfare, utilizing the techniques of mass communications, of which it acknowledgeably is the world leader, to tell its story to the people of Latin America, so that these people will not be conquered by the Communists in the fight for men's minds without a single shot being fired in the defense of democracy.

Twentieth Anniversary of the First Flight of an American Jetplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is the 20th anniversary of the first flight of an American jet which was built by the Bell Aircraft Corp., in Buffalo, N.Y., known as the city of good neighbors.

The Niagara Frontier industrialists and labor contributed a great deal of many first to the betterment of our country and the American people.

The P-59, the first American jetplane, was built under the utmost secrecy in the Old Ford Motor Co. assembly plant on Main Street at Rodney, Buffalo, N.Y. The windows were welded shut, the lower panes painted, and all entrances to the building were guarded 24 hours a day.

Construction of the plane was completed on September 12, 1942. Crated and canvas-covered parts were shipped by rail to California for flight tests on Muroc Dry Lake on the Mojave Desert.

When heavy rains flooded the dry lake where test flights were being made, the plane had to be moved over the highway to another location. To hide the jet's identity, it was wrapped in canvas to camouflage its unusual configuration, and a dummy propeller was attached to the front.

The following article concerning the first jet appeared in one of our leading newspapers, the Buffalo Evening News, on September 29, 1962:

AMERICA'S FIRST JETPLANE BUILT HERE 20 YEARS AGO

There is a touch of irony in Buffalo being among the last of the big American cities to make its airport big enough for the operation of jet airplanes.

There is likewise a touch of irony in the controversy stirred up by suburbanites north and east of the city objecting to Greater Buffalo International Airport being converted into a jet airport.

These things are ironic because Buffalo is the birthplace of the American jetplane.

Building the first American jet was one of a long string of "firsts" for the old Bell Aircraft Corp., now the Bell Aerosystems Co. And it was a development that opened up a new chapter in aviation history that is still being written.

Monday will be the 20th anniversary of the first flight by that first American jet, which Bell had put together in the former Ford assembly plant at Main and Rodney Streets that is now a Trico plant.

Although jets are common enough these days, the first one was one of the most secret developments in the history of aviation.

The story of Buffalo's role in this urgent development had its beginnings on September 5, 1941, 3 months before Pearl Harbor.

The late Lawrence D. Bell, president of Bell Aircraft, and his chief engineer, Harland W. Poyer, had been summoned to Washington for a conference with General Hap Arnold, then commanding general of the Army Air Corps.

The Bell executives were told that a new kind of plane had been developed by Group Capt. Frank Whittle of Britain's RAF and was flying in England.

The General Electric Co., under a special agreement between the United States and Britain, had been assigned to build a jet engine in this country. Larry Bell was asked to design and build the fighter plane that would be powered by the GE turbojets.

Work on the design of this revolutionary new plane began immediately upon return of Mr. Bell and Mr. Poyer to Buffalo. Mr. Bell called a small group of key engineers to his office, swore them to secrecy, and assigned them to design the first jet-propelled plane.

Because this was an entirely new concept of aircraft propulsion, there was little precedent which the design group could use.

Edgar P. Rhodes, now Bell's assistant chief engineer of aerospace design, was among the engineers summoned to Mr. Bell's office. He was designated project engineer.

"All we had to work with at the start was a frehand sketch of the General Electric engine on 8½-by-11-inch paper," Mr. Rhodes recalled. "But six of us, working under extreme security measures, explored various configurations and put together a complete proposal and a one-twentieth scale model for Mr. Bell to submit for approval."

The Army Air Corps awarded Bell a contract on September 30, 1941, to design and build three jet-propelled fighter planes—the forerunners of a whole new breed of military and commercial aircraft.

As the engineering group was expanded, Bell leased space in the old Ford assembly plant at Main and Rodney Streets. Windows of the building were welded shut and, although high above street level, the lower panes were painted to prevent transparency. All entrances were guarded around the clock and a special system of employee identification was set up.

Engineering work progressed and, within 6 months of receiving the go-ahead, the design was finished. Manufacturing began on January 9, 1942.

On August 4, 1942, the first of two turbojet engines arrived in Buffalo from the General Electric plant at Lynn, Mass. Military police guarded the unit, living in the railroad car in which it had been shipped to Buffalo.

At the Bell plant, the engine remained under 24-hour guard.

It was decided to conduct all flight tests at the Army bombing and gunnery range (now called Edwards Air Force Base) at Muroc Dry Lake in California's Mojave Desert.

Construction of America's first jet plane was completed on September 12, 1942—a little more than a year after General Arnold held that first conference with Larry Bell in Washington. The XP-59A was disassembled for shipment to California.

Because sections of the plane were too big for the doors of the Main Street factory building, a hole was knocked in the brick wall. The plane sections, crated or wrapped in canvas, were lowered by crane to waiting railroad cars.

An officer and five enlisted men, with orders to guard the plane (later named the Airacomet) with their lives, made a cross-country trip with the XP-59A. A huge compressor fed air through the jet engines to keep them turning slowly throughout the entire trip. This was done because the engineers feared the bearings might be damaged by the constant pounding of the train along the rails.

The XP-59A, still in good shape, arrived at Muroc on September 19. Workmen immediately began to put the plane together. It took a week.

The jet engines were run up for the first time in the plane on September 26. The