

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2581

The conception, organization, and pursuit of a renewal program demands community leadership and professional and technical talent. It also must pass numerous hurdles—legal and fiscal problems, difficulties in scheduling, fear, opposition, apathy. The Fargo case shows how these problems were met and resolved locally in one upper Midwest community where renewal has been systematically undertaken.

The major responsibility for renewal in Fargo was local. A detailed case history reveals that although the project was federally aided, 88 percent of the money and virtually all of the initiative and effort were locally supplied. Fifty-three percent of the money came from private sources.

A survey of the physical condition of 14 smaller communities indicated that the least blighted are not necessarily those with the highest income or the fastest growth. Much appears to depend upon local resources and effort in these communities, also.

Many smaller communities cannot muster the leadership or the technical staff which Fargo found necessary. They may find the key to successful action in new regional associations of municipalities or in new or expanded services from institutions and organizations already established—extension services of land grant colleges and universities, municipal leagues, associations of counties, and State planning departments.

In some cases, a community may face problems not of its own making whose solutions extend beyond the limits of local resources. The solution to these problems may be of importance to the region and to the Nation and merit State or national assistance.

The United States has entered a period of accelerated urban renewal. This means a higher level of maintenance and a higher rate of replacement and demolition of obsolete and deteriorated structures.

To keep abreast of this increased pace, the upper Midwest must:

1. Continue its relatively high postwar rate of replacement construction.
2. Accelerate the demolition of vacant and obsolete structures.
3. Improve maintenance of aging structures still in use.
4. Better inform the people who occupy substandard homes through a combination of modern housing and building codes, enforcement, and education.

The effort will have to focus on the old and partly evacuated central areas of cities larger than 2,500 to 5,000, and the small agricultural trade centers.

The responsibility for this task can seldom be placed upon one sector of the economy or one level of government. Renewal and responsibility for carrying it out have been complicated by the great mobility of American capital and people. Renewal takes time, and while it moves forward the population and land-use patterns of the Nation continue to shift. As a result, a given renewal problem may be of a local community's own making and capable of independent local solution. Or it may be the result of population and business shifts entirely beyond the community's ability to influence or cope with alone.

Regardless of how renewal is financed—publicly or privately, locally or with outside help—it is still largely a local affair. Successful and continuing renewal demands local initiative, leadership, cooperation, and fiscal support. For example, in the Federal-aided renewal project completed in Fargo, N. Dak., the local community furnished 88 percent of the capital ultimately invested in the project area and virtually all of the initiative and leadership. Many small communities will need outside stimulation and assistance.

It is vitally important that the upper Midwest hold or improve its position in the national renewal picture. When regional

leaders promote national awareness of this region, it is important that they be able to point to an array of communities in excellent physical condition with the community organization, understanding, and leadership to keep them that way.

It's Norway's Constitutional Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the people of Norway observed the 150th anniversary of their Constitution. Thousands of Americans of Norwegian descent also celebrated the occasion.

Yesterday's Tacoma News Tribune published an excellent editorial describing the events leading up to the historic events. I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD.

IT'S NORWAY'S CONSTITUTIONAL SESQUICENTENNIAL

The people of Norway today are observing the 150th anniversary of their Constitution. Signed by the Constituent Assembly at Eidsvoll on May 17, 1814, it is one of the oldest in the world. The sesquicentennial is being commemorated throughout Norway, and Tacomans of Norwegian extraction are having an elaborate program at 2:30 this afternoon at Normanna Hall.

Although Norway's Constitution was signed in 1814, the nation's history goes back to 872 when it was united and founded by King Harald Haarfagre (Harold the Fair Haired).

These roving, seagoing Norsemen in their longboats had, by the middle of the 11th century, conquered Iceland, Greenland, the Faeroes, Orkneys, Hebrides, and Shetlands. Iceland had been discovered in 983 by Norwegian Erik Raude. His son, Leif Erikson, who lived in Greenland, discovered America about 1000.

The Norwegian Constitution of 1814, which laid the groundwork for the country's steady and peaceful progress toward democracy, was born in a period of fierce struggle for the spoils of the Napoleonic empire. For nearly 400 years Norway and Denmark had been united under one sovereign.

During this period, however, Norway was dominated by Denmark. The autocratic king, residing in Copenhagen, ruled Norway with Danish officials. Nevertheless, the hope of achieving ultimate independence was kept alive.

In the 19th century Norway became Denmark's reluctant partner on the French side in the Napoleonic Wars, with Sweden fighting on the opposite side. As hostilities came to an end, the Dano-Norwegian king, Frederik VI, was forced to sign the Treaty of Kiel on January 14, 1814, thereby ceding Norway to Sweden.

News of the Kiel Treaty aroused a storm of indignation among patriotic Norwegians. They resented having their country handed from one monarch to another as if it were a private estate. As a result, young Prince Christian Frederik, after discarding the thought to proclaim himself king of Norway, summoned a constituent assembly.

It was comprised of 59 government officials, 37 wealthy farmers, and 16 businessmen and was convened in Eidsvoll, near Oslo, on April 10, 1814. The constitution was approved and signed on May 17, which has been observed ever since.

When the assembly unanimously elected Prince Frederik to be king of Norway, Sweden reacted by launching a military attack. After brief hostilities a truce was negotiated. Under the Convention of Moss, Norway and Sweden became united as separate kingdoms under one monarch. At the same time, King Carl Johan of Sweden agreed to recognize Norway's free constitution. The union lasted until 1905, when it was peacefully dissolved on initiative of Norway's parliament.

The Norwegian Constitution rests on four basic principles: National independence, sovereignty of the people, a division of power, and the inviolable rights of the individual versus the state.

As with the U.S. Constitution, the Norwegian Constitution has been modified from time to time. Among some changes made through the years are these: Parliamentarism was introduced in 1884, universal suffrage for men in 1898, and universal suffrage for women in 1913.

As Foreign Minister Halvard Lange put it in a Constitution Day address, "Democratic government and a state based on law—that is our heritage."

It is a fine heritage, and a fine background for all in Tacoma of Norwegian extraction who today are proudly observing the major holiday—the Independence Day—of our proud, free friend, Norway.

Renewal of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1964

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of May 12, there was a most interesting and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Renewal of Hope," relating to the urban renewal legislation (S. 628) recently ordered reported by the House District Committee. This editorial wholeheartedly supports and indeed compliments the 11 members of the committee who have protested against the so-called safeguards which have been grafted onto an otherwise acceptable piece of legislation. The objections of the six Democratic Members and five Republican Members are contained in a minority report on S. 628 which was filed recently.

In view of the fact that the House may soon be considering this legislation, I strongly urge all Members to read this editorial and further I urge that they weigh carefully the incisive analysis set forth in the minority report. This bipartisan group has concluded that instead of facilitating downtown renewal and development, this legislation as ordered reported will virtually destroy the whole urban renewal program in the District of Columbia, and would impose restrictions on the District of Columbia which are not imposed on any other city in the Nation, regardless of size or location.

It is vitally important that the House pass a good and workable urban renewal bill for the District so that the Nation's Capital may have the same basic legal authority to renew and revitalize its

downtown areas as all other cities throughout the country now have.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, Mr. Rains, an acknowledged expert in the field of housing and urban renewal, said several months ago that the city of Washington deserves the same tools that other cities have in other parts of the country. He went on to say that he "doesn't want a bill for the District that is not in keeping with the bill for the rest of the Nation."

I think that the Members will do well to heed these words of caution from one who has been in this complex field a long, long time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the editorial to which I have referred be inserted in the RECORD.

RENEWAL OF HOPE

When the House District Committee approved its reprehensible version of the Washington urban renewal bill in March, it was apparent that several members were not in accord with the action.

Now the full scope of that disagreement has been disclosed. No less than 11 of the 24 committee members have joined in the strongly worded minority report just released. The number of the group is immensely encouraging; its bipartisan character is more so.

The most impressive aspect of this minority report, however, is its vigorous language. In its details, the 16-page analysis shreds the arguments in favor of the crippling and unnecessary amendments which were added to the original bill under the guise of "safeguards."

Rather than safeguarding anything, these amendments, in the words of the report, "would virtually destroy the whole urban renewal program in the District of Columbia." As to intent, it states forthrightly that the bill as reported seems designed as "a precedent for attacking the whole urban renewal program throughout the country."

These are not new thoughts. Representative SIXK of California expressed them forcefully some weeks ago. We have done so in these columns on numerous occasions, for there has never been the slightest doubt as to the fiction of the amendments as "safeguards." The essential purposes of this bill are to permit urban renewal projects in non-residential areas, and to improve the standards under which these projects would be carried out.

The Senate has passed a bill satisfying these purposes. The amendments added by the House committee attach a number of mischievous and thoroughly unnecessary restrictions. Coincidentally, an excellent analysis of their effects has just been completed and sent to the appropriate congressional committees by the Washington Planning and Housing Association.

The 11-member minority report does not, of course, actually solve anything. The revitalization of Washington's downtown business section is still stymied. It will remain so until the city receives the required authorization to use urban renewal in business areas. That authorization cannot be provided until the bill is called to the House for vote.

When this eventually occurs, however, the prospects for passage of an adequate and equitable bill will have been enhanced immeasurably by the incisive and timely minority report. Its signers were Representatives SIXK, DAWSON, COHELAN, ST GERMAIN, TRIMBLE, and DIGGS, Democrats; and Republican Representatives AUCHINCLOSS, NELSEN, O'KONSKI, MATHIAS, and HORTON. To them all, the community owes a vote of thanks.

Academy of American Poets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 22, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Academy of American Poets is an organization that does much to advance the cause of American poetry. It is worthy of much wider notice.

In many other countries much is done by society to promote young poets and to spread the richness of poetry among all the citizens. In the United States poetry has never been given proper recognition. In 1934 the Academy of American Poets was established in order to rectify this situation. Its founder is Mrs. Hugh Bullock who, born in France of American parents, was struck by American poets' lack of recognition and recurring financial crises. With the aid of the late Edwin Arlington Robinson and Louis Ledoux, poets themselves, and a great many others who were interested, Mrs. Bullock began developing plans to help poets, out of which finally evolved the idea for the Academy of American Poets. The five founder members were Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Auslander, Mrs. Bullock, Messrs. Ridgely Torrence and Charles Hanson Towne.

The purpose of the academy is stated in article II of the charter as follows:

To encourage, stimulate and foster the production of American poetry by providing fellowships for poets of proven merit, by granting scholarships, awards and prizes for poetic achievement, and by such other means as the board of director with the approval of the board of chancellors may from time to time devise and determine.

The academy has been of very specific and practical help to poets and poetry. In the years between 1946 and 1963 \$5,000 poetry fellowships were awarded to the following:

Edgar Lee Masters, 1946; Ridgely Torrence, 1947; Percy MacKaye, 1948; Frost 1953; Louise Townsend Nicholl, 1954; Dr. Oliver St. John Gogarty, 1954; Rolfe Humphries, 1955; Dr. William Carlos Williams, 1956; Conrad Alken, 1957; Robinson Jeffers, 1958; Louise Bogan, 1959; Leonie Adams, 1959; Jesse Stuart, 1960; Horace Gregory, 1961; John Crowe Ransom, 1962; Ezra Pound, 1963; Allen Tate, 1963.

In addition, the academy insures publication of winning manuscripts of poetry by contracting to purchase a thousand copies of what is known as Lamont Poetry Selection. This was made possible by a bequest by the late Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont.

In the last 10 years the Lamont poetry selections have been the following:

Constance Carrier, "The Middle Voice," Alan Swallow, 1954; Donald Hall, "Exiles and Marriages," the Viking Press, 1955; Philip Booth, "Letter from a Distant Land," the Viking Press, 1956; Daniel Berrigan, S. J., "Time Without Number," the Macmillan Co., 1957; Ned

O'Gorman, "The Night of the Hammer," Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958; Donald Justice, "The Summer Anniversaries," Wesleyan University Press, 1959; Robert Mezey, "The Lovemaker," the Cumming-ton Press, 1959; X. J. Kennedy, "Nude Descending a Staircase," Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961; Edward Field, "Stand Up, Friend, With Me," Grove Press, Inc., 1962; no award, 1963.

In addition to all of this, the academy has been sponsoring other kinds of awards, made possible by the bequests of interested persons and through these bequests various colleges and universities have been the beneficiaries. Poetry readings have been sponsored. Most recently an interesting poetry reading took place at the Guggenheim Museum in New York.

The Academy of American Poets is an organization worthy of support, and I am delighted that it is founded and chiefly sponsored by many of my constituents and friends. I salute them for their contribution to the American scene and for the advancement of a most important cause in the United States. A vote of thanks is owed most especially to Mrs. Hugh Bullock, the driving force behind the whole adventure.

Cuba Brazil's Break With Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 14, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, credit is due the new Government of Brazil for ending diplomatic relations with the Communist regime of Cuba.

This action taken by the Brazilians is a great victory in the struggle for freedom in this hemisphere. Brazil is one of Latin America's largest and most influential nations. Prior to the fall of leftist Joao Goulart's regime this nation witnessed Brazil pursuing a path which seemed to be taking it away from the democratic community of this hemisphere. The United States and the other nations of this hemisphere were all greatly relieved when Goulart's government fell, and was replaced with the new regime of President Umberto Castello-Branco.

Now that another nation of our sister continent has had the foresight to end its relations with Castro, other nations yet maintaining recognition of Cuba should follow Brazil's example. Those nations which still dignify Castro by extending him recognition are Chile, Bolivia, Mexico, and Uruguay.

I urge that stepped-up measures be taken by this Nation in the OAS as well as unilaterally in order that these four remaining Latin American countries may do as Brazil has done and end recognition of Castro. To do so will further isolate Communist Cuba in this hemisphere.