

A7190

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 20

igation to throw good money after bad. They are abundantly warned that they are inviting a holdup.

Would Drive Family Farmers to the Cities**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John A. Herman, of Willmar, Minn., has provided me with a copy of a letter which he wrote to the editor of the West Central Daily Tribune, of Willmar, Minn., in which he commented on the recently issued 20th Century Fund report, entitled "Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age" by Prof. Edward Higbee of the University of Rhode Island. Mr. Herman requested that I have his letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that his remarks might come to the attention of my colleagues here in the House. I include his letter commenting on the 20th Century Fund report in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point in my remarks: **WOULD DRIVE FAMILY FARMERS TO THE CITIES**

To the Editor:

Many remember the agricultural policy report of the CED, a liberal group whose directors comprise many supporters of the left-wing Committee for an Effective Congress. This report posed a so-called solution for the farm problem. Now another leftwing educational front, the 20th Century Fund, has come up with a report even more devastating called Farms and Farmers in an Urban Age, by Prof. Edward Higbee of the University of Rhode Island. Listed as trustees for the fund are such liberal pundits as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (adviser to J.F.K.), Adolph A. Berle, Francis Biddle, J. Kenneth Galbraith (economic adviser to J.F.K., 1960 campaign), Robert Oppenheimer, and David E. Lilienthal (also a CED trustee. The report contends that, "There is no point in trying to keep alive the old shopworn concept of the family farm."

According to Farm Quarterly, "The central theme of the author is that the usual statement of the farm problem, even the picture of the farmer himself, is largely a hoax contrived by creating a homogenized blend of all farmers who qualify for that name under the loose definition of the Bureau of Census and passing off this fictitious character as the family farmer."

The report says that 44 percent, or 1,640,910 farmers, should move to the city because they and their "undercapitalized farms are obsolete." The next group singled out by the report are the 34 percent of the farmers who gross between \$2,500 and \$10,000 per year. These 1,271,558 farmers who produce 22.8 percent of all farm sales, Higbee says, are on the "fringe of failure," but should be allowed to remain in agriculture and keep their small portion of the market. The other 22 percent of the farmers, the report claims, produce 72 percent of all farm sales.

The report which begins "American agriculture never had it so good," concludes with the statement, "If the welfare of the American family is of real significance to the Nation's policymakers, let them look to the city where most of those families live, instead of backward to the country."

This report, like the CED report, wants to drive the family farmer to the city to join the army of unemployed. From their ivory

towers these liberal intellectuals propose solutions for the problems of rural America. But their solutions would create greater problems than the ones they attempt to solve. Where are those who leave their farms in such great numbers to find employment? What are those who are dependent upon the farmer as a market for goods and services to do?

JOHN A. HERMAN,

WILLMAR, MINN.

Kennedy Tells World We'd Fight for Cuba, But He Didn't Say When**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Miami Herald:

UNITED STATES WILL FIGHT TO PROTECT ANY-ONE REDS THREATEN, J.F.K. PLEDGES HERE—BUT HE DIDN'T SAY WHEN

(By Hal Hendrix)

MIAMI BEACH, November 20.—Two and a half years ago President Kennedy told the American Society of Newspaper Editors the United States would fight against outside Communist penetration in the Western Hemisphere.

His strongly worded declaration was delivered at the American Society of Newspaper Editors convention in Washington, immediately following the disastrous collapse of the U.S.-backed Bay of Pigs invasion attempt.

Two nights ago, addressing the Inter-American Press Association convention here, Mr. Kennedy said the United States would fight for any Western Hemisphere nation the Russians or any other Communists try to take over.

CUBA

Despite those bold pronouncements, the fact remains that between the ASNE and IAPA speeches Russia has clamped complete control on Cuba, militarily, economically, and politically.

So it was not too surprising that the President's renewed anti-Communist protection assurance to the IAPA delegates was received somewhat less than enthusiastically.

Reflecting on Mr. Kennedy's remarks here, the editors and publishers agree he made it clear the United States would help the Cubans only after they have freed themselves.

REBELLION

Some of the news executives shared an opinion that Mr. Kennedy, in effect, had invited the anti-Castro Cubans on the island to launch a rebellion when he said:

"No Cuban need feel trapped between dependence on the broken promises of foreign communism and the hostility of the rest of the hemisphere. For once Cuban sovereignty has been restored, we will extend the hand of friendship and assistance to a Cuba whose political and economic institutions have been shaped by the will of the Cuban people."

This paragraph may have been meant for potential dissident elements in Castro's armed forces as well as for resistance groups in Cuba.

But considering the past record of the Kennedy administration since failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion, many of the editors here wonder whether the United States would

rush to the assistance of rebellious anti-Castro forces or permit them to suffer the same fate as the anti-Communist patriots in Hungary.

Apart from Cuba, the IAPA delegates generally were disappointed in the President's speech.

POLICY ADDRESS

It had been heralded as a major policy address on Latin America. But in the post-mortems by the newsmen, the feeling was nearly unanimous that the address was little more than a rehash of earlier speeches.

It is perhaps significant that Mr. Kennedy injected a distinct dose of criticism of the Latin Americans in his remarks dealing with the problems of the Alliance for Progress.

Some of the most prominent Latin American delegates commented that they were aware of Latin America's shortcomings in moving toward Alliance goals and did not need a lecture from Mr. Kennedy.

They added they recognized many of the platitudes punctuating Mr. Kennedy's address and could only attribute them to his speechwriter.

It was widely assumed that the speech-polishing author was Richard Nathan Goodwin, former self-designated Inter-American Affairs expert for the Kennedy administration.

That Mr. Kennedy recalled Mr. Goodwin for the IAPA speech chore was puzzling to the news executives. They thought he had completely discredited himself on the Latin American scene during the first 2 years of the New Frontier administration.

Mayor John Babiarez of Wilmington, Del., Visits Poland**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mayor John Babiarez of Wilmington, Del., visited Poland together with Mayor Alex Smetka of Rochester, Mayor Walter Waryasz of Poughkeepsie, and Mayor Chester Kowal of Buffalo, N.Y.

Mayor Babiarez, one of Delaware's ablest public officials, told me he was greatly impressed by what he saw in Poland, and the confidence shown by this great people.

The delegation of mayors was enthusiastically received everywhere; the group saw new construction, as well as the historic monuments of the past including the old cathedral in Gniezno, the seat of the primate of Poland.

I can attest to the spirit of hope and confidence shown by the Polish people, for as a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, I traveled to Poland during the 1962 Easter recess. In Poland I had a series of conferences with Ambassador John Cabot, members of the American Embassy staff, representatives of U.S. voluntary organizations conducting programs in Poland, and Polish Government officials. Everywhere I traveled I saw a brave and confident people, a people which has contributed, and will continue to contribute, great things to our culture and to civilization.

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7189

He came to New York, where he had attended Seward Park High School as a youth, taught himself to type and operate a dictaphone and passed a civil service test. As a result he was appointed to a typing job in the welfare department in 1952.

The same year, he married Elba Velez. She had graduated from the University of Puerto Rico in 1949, despite the fact that she had been blind since the age of 5, following an attack of typhoid fever. They have four lively, fully sighted children: Iris, 10 years old; Gilbert, 8; Cynthia, 4; and Ellie, 3.

In 1953, Mr. Ramirez began studying law at night at Brooklyn College. He completed the 4-year evening course in 3 years, passed the bar examination, quit his job as typist, and opened a law office at 140 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, in November 1957.

For the first few days, there were no callers. Then a friend referred a woman who wanted a divorce.

Mr. Ramirez had never been in a courtroom before. "I walked into a dark room, heard mumbling and voices, and called everyone 'Your Honor,' because I didn't know where the judge was, or who the clerks were," he said, with amusement.

Now, with the help of his 7-year-old female German shepherd, Dell, Mr. Ramirez finds his way around courthouses not only in Brooklyn, but also in Manhattan, the Bronx, and Queens.

The Federal Communications Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the trade publication, Broadcasting magazine, recently published an editorial entitled "Who's Boss?"

The editorial summarizes some of the primary issues involved in the controversy surrounding the harassment of the broadcasting industry by the Federal Communications Commission which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial at this point:

Who's Boss?

We make the flat charge that the Federal Communications Commission is not serving the public interest, convenience, and necessity. These are the counts:

It is overcommercializing its regulation of broadcasting, to grab headlines and euvre bigger appropriations.

It is neglecting regulation of telephone, telegraph, and other common carrier services which are more important to the consumer economically but which lack the glamor of broadcasting.

It is squandering taxpayers' funds through "made work," such as the inane hearings in Chicago and Omaha on local programming, the harassment of stations on license renewals, unnecessarily prolonged freezes, and other contrived devices to force stations to bow to its will.

It is defying congressional intent by seeking to arrogate control over broadcast advertising (which is really ratemaking that would transform broadcasting into common carrier status) and by seeking to impose filing fees without legislative authority.

It is spending so much time—an estimated 80 percent—on its broadcast crusades which

it thinks have publicity value that many policy determinations are being relegated to the staff.

It is violating its own fairness doctrine (which is of doubtful legality) by demanding on the one hand that licensees determine their public's programing needs and, on the other, ignoring the views of elected representatives of the public, to wit, Members of Congress.

Since Chairman E. William Henry's "huckster" barrage in New York 2 weeks ago, three influential legislators have spoken. Chairman OREN HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the House Commerce Committee, Chairman WALTER ROGERS, Democrat, of Texas, of the House Communications Subcommittee, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, of the Senate Appropriations Committee have challenged the FCC's authority to place limitations on advertising, and to otherwise interfere with control over programing and business management of stations.

The commercial time issue is one on which all stations, large and small, and the networks, see eye to eye. This has stimulated more activity through State associations and by individual broadcasters with Congress than any other regulatory issue in recent memory.

Two bills, introduced by Representative ROGERS—to prohibit the FCC from making rules on broadcast advertising and to prohibit it from assessing filing fees—are in the hopper. Mr. ROGERS wants hearings "as soon as practicable."

We suggest that, in the absence of immediate action by the FCC withdrawing the commercial time rulemaking and postponing indefinitely from the January 1 effective date the filing fee rules, broadcasters encourage Mr. ROGERS and his committee to convene hearings forthwith.

Meanwhile, it would seem prudent for Mr. Henry and his like-minded "give-em-hell" colleagues to take a new look at the law and the congressional intent and not accept as gospel that which the staff masterminds serve up to them.

Congress created the FCC nearly 30 years ago. It can, if it wishes, abolish the seven-man Commission and create a new one of three, five, or nine men. Unless the present FCC sees the light glaring red from Capitol Hill, we predict the Congress will take strong measures to bring the FCC back under control.

The Other Check

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 20, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, another great triumph for the spineless foreign policy of the Kennedy administration is seen as we witness the failure of the State Department to protect legitimate American investments in the Argentina oil industry.

I place into the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune entitled "The Other Check," which effectively points up the basic errors of the New Frontier in international relations.

It would be well for us to face the facts of life—that coexistence with communism and retreat behind unwarranted

activities of nations in any part of the world against the United States bring international disrespect for our country and have reduced our foreign relations to complete chaos.

THE OTHER CHECK

President Kennedy at Miami affirmed that the United States will take no retaliatory action against Argentina because of its revocation of contracts with 12 privately owned oil companies, 8 of them American. Mr. Kennedy's pronouncement made it clear that he intends to persist in the pursuit of his twin fetishes of foreign aid and the so-called Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

The Argentine Government technically stopped short of outright expropriation of the \$227 million worth of American-owned properties, but the effect is substantially the same. While there is vague talk about compensation, the foreign companies are to be required first to hand back any profits of the last 5 years and to be accountable for "damages" for taxes waived under the previous contracts and for "irrational expropriation" of Argentine resources.

The Government's decrees were couched in insulting terms and took no account of contentions that American contributions had enabled Argentina to triple production in 4 years and virtually to attain self-sufficiency in petroleum. The jingolistic language of the decrees served as a further irritant to Members of the U.S. Senate, who had just been through a long wrangle over the continuation of foreign aid to ingrate nations.

At Miami, however, Mr. Kennedy refused to heed their demands that economic aid be suspended. He professed still to be hopeful of the eventual success of the Alliance for Progress, stating that this \$20 billion aid program, largely to be financed by the United States, does not dictate to any member nation how it must organize its economic affairs.

"No country," said Mr. Kennedy, "can tell another how it must order its economy."

Yet, when the Alliance for Progress was proclaimed in August 1961, the text of the declaration, under American inspiration, laid down a series of specific contractual obligations which were to condition the receipt of U.S. aid. These provided not only rules to order Latin American economies, but also the political and social organization of Central and South American states.

These countries were to formulate "national programs for the development of their economies"; to foster "agrarian reform" in order to eliminate "unjust structures of land tenure and use"; to "reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, punishing tax evasion severely"; to "stimulate private investment," etc., etc.

If these draft conditions submitted by the United States were not plainly designed to tell other countries how they must order their economies, what were they? Yet Mr. Kennedy now misrepresents, if he has not forgotten, the fundamental precepts of his Alliance for Progress. He ignores his earlier demand that the Latin American countries encourage private investment and, in fact, condones what amounts to the robbery of private American enterprises which are to be stripped of their interests.

As usual, Mr. Kennedy chooses to play from weakness. After submitting to Castro's uncompensated raids on American holdings in Cuba, to Brazil's seizure of the American telephone system in that country, he offers encouragement to more Latin American brigandage. And, after \$371 million in economic aid pumped into Argentina already, he intends to follow up \$78 million in hand-outs given to Argentina last year with similar amounts this year and next.

If the administration is capable of this folly, U.S. private investors are under no ob-