

Youth Wants to Know



Founded and Produced by Theodore Granik

VOL. II

SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1954

NO. 31

Youth Wants to Know Presents

SENATOR HUBERT M. HUMPHREY

Democrat of Minnesota.

STEPHEN McCORMICK

Moderator.

The Announcer: The National Broadcasting Company presents "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW," a program dedicated to the principle that the future of America rests with the young people of our nation, and to help them resolve some of the questions in their minds, here is Stephen McCormick, speaking for Theodore Granik, founder and producer of YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW.

Mr. McCormick—

Mr. McCormick: Our guest today on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW is one of the Senators who took a most active part in the Senate talkathon of the past two weeks on the Atomic Energy Bill. He is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, author of several important amendments to the bill.

The subject of the H-bomb is discussed in an article in the current issue of Reader's Digest, America's most widely read magazine. William Hardy's article "The Road Ahead In the Light of the H-Bomb," points out what must be done to reach ultimate peace.

Senator Humphrey, I am sure the young people who participate in our program, under the auspices of the American Legion, have a good many questions for you, regarding the article and what is going on in the Senate today.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is wonderful to be back on this program. It is my favorite.

MISS KREEK: My name is Mary Jeanne Kreek.

Senator Humphrey, why aren't the Democrats taking a united stand in connection with the Flanders Resolution?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, my dear friend, may I say I do not believe this is a partisan question. This is really a matter of each individual Senator's conscience, guided by what information he may have, and a very serious matter.

I am very pleased that it has not become a partisan issue, because a matter of this proportion and seriousness should never become a partisan issue.

Miss KREEK: Is Senator Johnson giving the Democrats any advice on which way they should vote on the resolution?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, his only advice is that it is a matter of personal conscience and your own personal view.

QUESTION: Should the United States Senate be tied up with personalities while such issues as foreign aid and other important issues are awaiting debate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I suppose if it were just tied up with personalities you would say it should be set aside, but I imagine the Flanders Resolution—at least it seems that way to me—should go beyond personalities. There ought not to be a matter of personalities, here. It is a matter of the official conduct in the performance of duties in the Senate.

QUESTION: Do you think that Senator McCarthy will be stripped of his committee chairmanships?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not under this resolution. This resolution is merely directed toward any or all official acts of a particular Senator that may in any way have reflected upon the dignity or responsibility of the United States Senate.

This present resolution does not deal with stripping any Senator—particularly Senator McCarthy—of his chairmanship or of his seat in the Senate.

MR. GARBER: My name is Jim Garber.

Senator Humphrey, will you encourage those Senators who do not have the fortitude to take sides on the Flanders Resolution to vote for it along with yourself?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: In every debate you try to make your own position clearly understood. In this case, again, I say it is a matter of very serious proportions and it is a matter of individual conscience and individual decision. The debate has been excellent thus far and I point out to you that it is of historical proportions and importance. Very seldom does the Senate of the United States take any disciplinary action and I think you do realize that the only body capable of taking disciplinary action over a member of the Senate is the Senate, since we do have immunity from what you might call the outside public, until election day comes. Of course, on election day there can be plenty of disciplinary action.

MR. GARBER: Shouldn't the Senators go ahead and express their views in spite of politics, regardless of how many votes it will win or lose?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: They should, and I am happy to say many are.

MR. CAMP: My name is Billy Camp.

Senator Humphrey, in view of the vigorous support given the Flanders Resolution by the Daily Worker, do you think the censure of Senator McCarthy would aid the Communist Party?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, my friend, I have never believed one should guide his actions by what the Daily Worker does or does not do. There are many people in this country who agree with the Flanders Resolution who are as far away from the Daily Worker as the earth is from Mars. I think we have to judge these issues on their parts. Occasionally the Daily Worker may be right. If not by design, maybe just by conspiracy, but regardless of what its position is, I think we ought to judge each issue on the basis of our own information and the merits of the issue.

MR. CAMP: What interest does the ADA have in the McCarthy controversy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I imagine it has the same sort of interest all interested parties would have pro or con. You might say what interests do other groups have in behalf of Senator McCarthy. I know of no recent official position or recent action by the ADA such as press releases or statements. That is within recent weeks or months. I do know, however, that the Americans For Democratic Action have expressed disapproval of many of the actions of Senator McCarthy, and I want to make it quite clear, we are not talking about whether we like the Senator or dislike him. We are not talking about his personality; we are not talking about any of his personal life.

I think that is beyond the pale of discussion. What we are really discussing and what we are concerned about in the Flanders Resolution is official actions in the performance of your official responsibilities as

a member of the Senate, and I just want to caution everyone, let's not let this issue become torn apart with emotion. This is a terribly important matter and how it will be resolved, I do not know, but I hope it will be resolved as free people ought to resolve things, with objectivity, with sanity, and without prejudice.

Mr. McCormick: You mentioned that each Senator should vote according to his own conscience. Have you gone on record on how you feel about this?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: In general, yes. I would say the Flanders Resolution has been amended and it will be amended more. It is kind of difficult to keep up in the Senate with just what may happen, but in the main, I have said I felt there were certain official actions of the Junior Senator from Wisconsin that merited disciplinary action by the Senate and I have said in view of that, in the light of what I know, that a censure resolution should receive support.

QUESTION: Do you think that Senator Fulbright was right in saying the Flanders Amendment should have specific charges against Senator McCarthy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I do. I think one of the most significant contributions to this entire discussion was made last evening by Senator Morse.

Senator Morse stated a truism, in so far as I am personally concerned, about any of these matters before the Senate. What he said was that your procedural rights qualify your substantive rights, or vice versa. Yet, your substantive rights, the substance of the issue, is pretty much determined by what the procedural rights are, and what you are now seeing in the Fulbright amendment is a spelling out of specific charges, and those charges will have to be voted upon individually by the members of the Senate.

I do not believe that you should just have some sort of a blanket indictment of a man. If you have something that you believe is wrong, say it, and then bring it to the test of the poll of public opinion in the Senate. By that, I mean by the votes of the members of the Senate. So what Senator Fulbright has done, I think, is spell out five or six specific charges that he believed merits the adoption of a resolution of censure.

Now, we will have to vote on each and every one of those charges. It is going to take some time and it is going to take some courage, and it will take more than that; it should take some very soul-searching, thought-provoking research and understanding on the part of each of us.

MR. HOLMES: My name is Jim Holmes.

Why does the Senate think that it has to simulate court procedures now, in that it has to have a bill of particulars, when most of the Senators, anyhow—probably all of them—know exactly what McCarthy has done; they know his complete record in committee and out of committee. Why do you have to have a bill of particulars, now?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, my friend, one of the charges I think that has been made against Senator McCarthy is that he has, according to some people, at least, abused the fair procedures in the handling of his committee. There is why we have talked so much recently about

the necessity for a new code of rules. A solid and substantial code of rules that cannot be broken that will bind every Senator and every committee. Again, I say the procedural rights are very, very important. I think in the main, most every member of the Senate has his own idea as to what is right and what is wrong, what the Senator has done that they do not like and what he has done that they do like. But what has been made, I think, is a pretty telling and valid point, that this isn't some sort of political mob scene, that this must be a matter of very careful consideration, and if you have charges, you ought to make them, and if you can't substantiate them, then they ought to be dropped. But if you can substantiate them, then they are at least a subject for further action.

MR. HOLMES: Senator, do you think that this debate, no matter who wins, will toll the death knell of McCarthyism and fumbling committees, or what Senator Morse calls political thuggery?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think this whole action, the Flanders Resolution and the debate, has put the Senate on guard. May I say I think sometimes we have become a little bit lax in our responsibility as members of the Congress? The people of the United States have a right to expect that members of the Congress will conduct themselves with dignity and conduct themselves in full responsibility of their duties as members of the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

I am of the opinion that every single member of Congress will learn a lesson, here, that he is to treat people with respect, that he is to fulfill his responsibilities of office with the utmost of honor and integrity and care, and in that way, I think it will be a great lesson for all of us.

MISS O'CONNOR: My name is Claire O'Connor.

What do you think of Senator Smith's resolution, to have an investigation of McCarthyism?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that is more or less a resolution that has been repudiated by Senator McCarthy, himself, as well as others. I don't really believe it gets to the issue.

MISS O'CONNOR: Well, do you think any other resolutions, if the Flanders Resolution—do you think Senator McCarthy will be censured?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I cannot predict whether or not he will be. I can only predict that I think the issue will be drawn and we will vote on that issue and there will be no sidetracking of it.

MR. LANDRY: My name is David Landry.

Do you think Senator Flanders is using the right procedure to censure Senator McCarthy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is very difficult for me to know whether or not Senator Flanders is using the right procedure, or not. I know this is the procedure that is before us and I know there is deep concern in and out of Congress over some of the activities of the Junior Senator from Wisconsin, and I am sure whether anyone likes it or not, this is the resolution and as it may be amended, that we are going to have to vote on. I think there is no escaping that.

MISS DETTIGAN: My name is Mary Dettigan.

Do you believe McCarthy is qualified to hold a seat in the United States Senate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't want to put myself up as a judge of that. The people of Wisconsin thought he was qualified and I am sure the Senator has ability. I have surely disagreed with him, of his actions, as has been quite evident by my statements.

Mr. McCormick: *Before taking the next question, it is time to announce the winner of this week's thirty-volume set of Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia. The winner this week is Mrs. L. V. Tucker, 7318 Babs Street, Springfield, Virginia. The station named the Americana Station of the week is WNBW, Washington, D. C. For details of the contest, listen to the announcement at the end of the program. Now let's have that winning question.*

QUESTION: "In view of the different elements in each political party, do you think it is time for a realignment?"

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is time for re-enlightenment, I can tell you that. Insofar as your question is concerned, there is always a gradual process of realignment in any political party. I think we see that year after year. For example, we have witnessed the growth of the Progressive Party, the Non-Partisan League—many of these parties. They come and go and they more or less filter away and go into the other major political parties. During the last half century, the Democratic Party has been the inheritor in the midwest and in the central part of the United States. Insofar as any specific realignment, setting off a cut-off date and saying "all liberals into the Democratic Party; all conservatives into the Republican Party," I don't think that is going to happen. Let's remember, America is a big country and while we do not always have exactly the same political views, there is a sort of continuity or a cohesiveness of political philosophy on basic issues in the political party. For example, the Democratic party stands for more or less freer trade or lower tariffs, that is one thing you can say. The Democratic Party has led the field of social welfare legislation. The Democratic Party's agricultural policies are pretty well uniformly accepted by all members of the Democratic Party.

Now there are differences, insofar as sections are concerned, and that is good, rather than being bad. I don't want to see a stereotyped party where everybody in Minnesota has to believe exactly like everybody in Florida or New York or Maine. These degrees of difference add a sort of luster to the party and a healthy tone to it.

QUESTION: Senator Humphrey, to what degree do the CIO and the ADA dictate the policies of the Northern section of the Democratic Party?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Only to such degree as any citizen might have influence or any little group or large group might have influence in a political party. There are a number of people who are members of the ADA who are active in the Democratic Party and there are large numbers active in the Democratic Party who are not. I would hope that there were large numbers of the membership of the CIO who were affiliated with the Democratic Party, and I would also hope that there were large numbers of the League of Women Voters, the Chambers of Commerce and others. They surely do not dominate. As a matter of

fact, sometimes I think they are not given the regard that they may very well justly deserve because of their assistance and because of their program. They are a part of it, but everybody in the labor movement is not a Democrat, sir, I can assure you of that. No labor leader can deliver any vote, nor can the ADA deliver any vote, either. What they can do is make their voices heard, work as hard as they can in the vineyards of democracy and that is about all.

LAVONNE GARABILLIAN: How can the United States get rid of its surplus farm products?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We shouldn't get rid of all our surplus farm products. I should say one of the most overworked issues in this country and one of the subjects of the largest amount of propaganda I have ever seen is the so-called agricultural surpluses. We should thank God that we have surpluses. This is the only country on the face of the earth that goes on a diet voluntarily. All the rest of them are forced to because of a shortage of food and fiber. This surplus keeps prices within reason. The American consumer spends a smaller portion of the income for food than in any other country on the face of the earth. These surpluses tide us over the tough days. For example, a year ago, we had six states that were in drouth. This year, it is 12 to 14 and the drouth is spreading. I am here to predict that many of the surpluses that have been reported as of June 1st and July 1st will not be surpluses come September, October and November. For example, we are already short of protein grains and protein feeds. Soy bean prices have been going up sky high every day. Why? Because we are running out of soybeans and the same thing is going to be true of flax seed and other commodities. We have about a third of a year corn crop in supply.

Mr. McCormick: *Do you feel we should continue on the same basis, then, as we have in the past?*

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Indeed. As a matter of fact, I think our price support program has been a blessing to the consumer, it has been a blessing to America in peace or war. Our agricultural economy has always been prepared, and by the war the cost of that price support program is phenomenally low. It has cost the American people an average of 35 cents per person per year for the last twenty years. That is how much it has cost you as citizens to support agricultural prices. And what have you gotten for this? The finest diet in the world, and an abundance of food for our people at home, an ever-increasing standard of living and besides we have helped feed half the world. I would say food is as big a weapon in the struggle against communism today as bullets. Maybe more so. If you have fuller stomachs, maybe you won't need quite as many full cartridge belts.

QUESTION: How and why does America sell surplus farm products to foreign countries at a price less than that paid by the American housewife in stores?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: They do, in some instances where we have a large over-supply. One of the main reasons is that we have a different standard of living in this country. For example, our agricultural producers, it costs much more for them to produce a pound of butter, for example, or a quart of milk, than it does a producer in

other lands. We have tariffs, for example, to offset differences between some manufactured American commodities and those that could be imported, thereby lowering costs. Why? To maintain the difference between, or to adjust the difference between our cost of production and those abroad. I think that is a fair basis for making adjustments. But in the main, we don't export too much of our agricultural commodities, and I say that it is a whole lot better to export what we may have in excess at a lower price than it is to let it waste. There are many areas of the world where this food is desperately needed and in the meantime what have we done by maintaining reasonable farm prices at home for the producer? We have increased the sale of automobiles, we have increased the sale of homes, of radios, of television, of clothing, of all the things we produce in our factories. The greatest incentive and the best help for American business is a good farm program. The farmer is really a big user of commodities as well as a producer of commodities.

QUESTION: Aren't many of the surpluses you mentioned that are needed in the world also needed in the United States?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, some of them are and some of us have proposed programs to see that they are used.

For example, I have a program called "Dairy Diet Dividends," that I have been proposing for two years. What would this program do? With every old age recipient, all people on Old Age Assistance getting an average of \$45.00 a month pension, we would include with that some food stamps, let us say to the tune of about \$10.00 a month. What could those food stamps be used for? The recipient could go right into the grocery store and purchase butter, cheese, milk or any other surplus agricultural commodity with those food stamps. The grocer would cash them in at his bank like legal tender or currency. It would cost the Government something, to be sure, but it would help the recipients of old age assistance and the needy. We can do this with our school lunch program. We can extend many of those programs. Actually there is no surplus of food, not even in America, if it were properly used. And surely in this world where over fifty per cent of the people go to bed every night hungry, there is no surplus. I leave you this thought: No matter how many treaties and alliances we draw up, how many guns we send abroad, as long as hunger and destitution and frustration and sickness are prevalent throughout huge areas of the world, you are going to find those areas breeding grounds for communism. I say that this use of food offers a wonderful opportunity for a frontal attack against the seedbeds of communism, to clean out their hopelessness and frustration.

QUESTION: Now that we have about a year's supply of wheat, don't you think it would be to our advantage to reduce the amount of wheat being grown on these marginal lands that are only good for a few crops a decade, so that when we have a lot of them now and we reduce our surplus, we can again use these marginal lands when we need them?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Now let me talk to you about marginal lands: On marginal lands live people, and people need income. People

have families. They have investments. Now what we have done is to reduce our acreage of wheat almost thirty per cent because of the large abundance of wheat that we have. Now that is a tremendous reduction in wheat acreage. And I remind you that if you go into a period of drought in this Country, that wheat will disappear just like water before the hot sun on a hot pavement, because the world consumes a tremendous quantity of wheat and so do the American people. I think that wheat is one of those products that can be stored. You know the old Biblical admonition, I think it is a story of Joseph, isn't it, in the seven long years, store up for the seven lean? I wish we would remember that as we sometimes pray in our piety. We have had seven long years in America, and I tell you that the indications are we may have some lean ones. For example, in my part of the Country, today, there is an invasion of army worms wrecking the crops. A new kind of rust that attacks the stem and the seed of the grain, making the crop worthless. We are beginning to have grasshoppers. There are twelve to fourteen States in drought. I will be complaining when we find we don't have enough to eat. I say again and I say it with all sincerity and all respect, Thank God that we have the abundance that we have and I think it is rather disgraceful that the American people complain about having too much in a world of the poor and of the hungry. We must be setting up some terrible tensions in the world. Here we are, complaining day after day because we have surpluses. Imagine what people think who do not have a meal for their children.

Mr. McCormick: There are many questions.

QUESTION: Are the Republicans pushing bills through Congress now because of the fall elections?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am sure there is a great desire to whip through the program as fast as possible. That was tried with the Atomic Energy Bill, but if you will permit me to say, we put the brakes on that one for a little while, because it needed to be thoroughly discussed. I want to see the President's program given a chance before the Congress and much of that program, a good deal of it, I have personally supported, but I do not believe there is any one day that you have to say Congress is going to adjourn. We have a full-time job down here in Washington and if we have to stay here until Christmas in order to get the public's business done, then we should stay.

I don't think we will have to, but I see no reason to try to feel that you have to be through on the 10th day of August, or on the 31st day of July. That is just nonsense. What we should do is to do a conscientious job of legislating as long as there is the need.

QUESTION: I don't think you will stay until Christmas, but when do you think you will adjourn?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say maybe in a couple of weeks. Maybe the 15th of August, somewhere around that time.

MISS KREEK: Senator Humphrey, do you believe you will be reelected?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course, you want me to be an optimist. I hope that I shall. I will put my record before the people of Min-

nesota, and I hope that record will merit their respect and confidence for a return to the Senate of the United States.

May I say the people of my state have been very good to me and I have tried to be a good public servant for them. If they see fit, I will be back here and I would love to be on this program.

MISS GONDA: Would you make a prediction on the prospects of the Democratic Party in the coming elections?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I am an optimist, and of course, I suppose I might just as well admit I am a partisan when you ask a question like that. I think the prospects look fairly well. I am sure they do in the agricultural area. The agricultural areas have suffered a good deal and they feel the Administration has broken faith with the farm people in respect to the promises made to the people in '52. In certain other areas, I am sure you will see a pick-up in the Democratic representation.

Yes, I feel quite good about that and look not for any phenomenal success, but I would say substantial gains.

QUESTION: Senator, can we still hope for a peaceful co-existence while Red planes are shooting British planes and United States planes are shooting Red planes?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish I had the answer to that question. All I can say is that we must be strong. I don't think you can have peaceful coexistence if you are going to appease. If you are living in a sort of a fool's paradise thinking, everything is going to be all right — I think we have to know what we want in this world, be willing to pay the price for it, be strong at home and abroad, build strong allies, and then have the kind of program that puts us on the political offensive. And I want to leave this thought with you: We must get on the political offensive. We can't constantly be counterchecking Communist moves. So when we were talking about the use of this food a while ago, just think what that means to the world, to hungry people. Why do we always have to wait for them to tell us something — meaning the Communists — and then we have to say no. Let them say no for a while to our proposals. Let them say no to our desire for liberation of people, for realization of their national sovereignty, for better opportunities for people.

Mr. McCormick: *In looking at the clock, I notice our time is up. We certainly thank you, Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota, for helping provide the answers that YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, especially after that hard day you have had on the Senate Floor, for coming down here and talking with us tonight.*

Thank you very much, and I hope you will come back and see us again very soon.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you.

Mr. McCormick: *Next week we will have as our guest on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW another nationally known personality, and we invite you to join us at that time.*

Now, this is Stephen McCormick, speaking for Theodore Granik and bidding you goodbye.

The Announcer: *Would you like to submit a question and have it answered by the guest speaker on YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW?*

If your entry is chosen as the most provocative, timely question of the week, the producer of YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, in cooperation with the Editors of the Encyclopedia Americana, America's first and oldest encyclopedia, will award you a 30-volume set of the Encyclopedia Americana, and name your local radio or television station the Americana Station of the Week.

To participate, simply mail your question to YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW, NBC, Washington 8, D. C.

In case of duplicate entries, the one bearing the earliest postmark will be chosen.

Contest entries should be postmarked no later than Thursday of each week.

*The Encyclopedia of
"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"
is known to be one of the most
important documents of the
American people. It is a
valuable source of information
on the history and development
of the American people.*

*PUBLISHED BY
RANDOLPH INC.
810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.
Washington 18, D. C.
(When necessary, please refer to this address.)*

*The Encyclopedia of "YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW" is a
valuable source of information on the history and
development of the American people. It is a
valuable source of information on the history and
development of the American people.*



The Proceedings of
"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"

as telecast over the coast to coast network of the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed, and a limited number are distributed free to further the public interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare.

PRINTERS

by
RANSDELL INC.

PUBLISHERS

810 Rhode Island Avenue, N. E.

Washington 18, D. C.

(When requesting copies by mail, enclose ten cents to cover mailing)

The proceedings of "Youth Wants to Know" are held every Saturday evening from 7:00-7:30 P. M., EDT., on the National Broadcasting Company Television Network in the Continental Room of the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. The program is presented in cooperation with the National Public Relations Division of the American Legion who arrange with the schools to have the youths in attendance.

17  17
J-27968



Minnesota Historical Society

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org