



## STEVENSON-KEFAUVER CAMPAIGN

General Headquarters: Dyckman Hotel

27 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis 2

FEderal 8-8796

77

FOR RELEASE: THURSDAY P.M.  
OCTOBER 4, 1956

### GOP FARM AID BASED ON 'VOTE DISASTER', SENATOR HUMPHREY SAYS

Minnesota's farmers have finally learned what Republicans mean by wanting to invoke price support assistance "only at disaster levels", Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, (D, Minn.) declared last night in a nationwide television debate with Senator Karl Mundt, (R., S.D.). (CBS 'Pick the Winner')

"They do not mean disaster for the farmer; they mean disaster for the Republican Party in an election year -- that is why they suddenly show some concern," Senator Humphrey said.

"It apparently was not a 'disaster' threat when egg, turkey, and poultry prices plunged even lower than they are now last year and the year before. Yet this year, with "political disaster" threatened at the polls, the Benson-Eisenhower administration suddenly gets concerned.

"All of us welcome any and all action that can be taken to stave off further farm hardship, but most of us think it is a little late -- about three years late. When we appealed to Benson to buy eggs and turkeys in 1954 and 1955, he would not do it because he was against it on principle. But his principles seem to change in an election year, with political trouble staring him in the face instead of just for the farmer.

"If he thinks he can stop hog prices from falling below \$14.25 now by pork purchases, as he has just announced, why could he not do it last year when Minnesota producers were only getting \$8.50 to \$9.00 per hundredweight. Why did he let them go through the wringer, then suddenly get concerned only at election time? What kind of assurance do farmers have that this belated concern will last after election time?

"The Republicans have preached a lot about using price supports only to 'prevent disaster', without indicating what they thought was disastrous. It is now apparent what they meant. They meant disaster to the Republican Party. Apparently, they have now decided that \$14 hogs are the "disaster" mark for Republican elections in the forthcoming election.

"Farmers are not going to be fooled. \$14.00 hogs are only about 65% of parity, and few farmers can survive on such prices.

"It costs about \$30 to send a pig to market, allowing \$5 in feed cost per pig for the sow between breeding and farrowing time, \$18 for corn, \$6. for concentrate, and \$1 for worming and vaccination.

"When the farmer gets only \$15 per hundredweight for his hogs, he is just breaking even on actual feeding costs without allowing anything for farm overhead and depreciation -- let alone farm living costs or interest on his investment."

The national network farm debate originated from two cities, with Senator Humphrey speaking from Minneapolis before a studio audience of Stevenson boosters and Mundt speaking from Washington before a studio audience of Republicans. While released to the east coast 'live' last night, it will be carried on the rest of the CBS network, including the midwest, on film Sunday because of time differentials.

CBS NEWS & PUBLIC AFFAIRS  
Broadcast House  
Washington 16, D. C.  
EMerson 2-9300

AUTOMATIC RELEASE, 7:30 PM EDT  
Wednesday, October 3, 1956

"PICK THE WINNER"

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

October 3, 1956 - 7:30 to 8:00 PM EDT

CBS Radio Network

October 3, 1956 - 8:30 to 9:00 PM EDT

GUESTS: THE HONORABLE KARL E. MUNDT  
United States Senate  
(Republican of South Dakota)

THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY  
United States Senate  
(Democrat of Minnesota)

MODERATOR: Walter Cronkite

PRODUCER: Ted Ayers

TOPIC: "WHICH PARTY HAS THE MOST TO OFFER  
TO THE AMERICAN FARMER?"

(Note: This program originated in two cities. Senator Humphrey spoke from Station WCCO-TV in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Senator Mundt and Walter Cronkite broadcast from the CBS Studios in Washington, D. C.)

*Sp. File = Oct 3  
Pick the Winner  
mgs.*

MR. CRONKITE: How do you do. This is the fourth of our pre-election series of political discussions again tonight in the tradition of the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates.

Tonight's question is "Which Party has the Most to Offer to the American Farmer". Tonight's guests are both from agricultural states. Both are members of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Both are leading spokesmen for their Party on the farm situation.

Speaking for the Republicans, a former farm operator, a member of the GOP's so-called Truth Squad that is trailing Adlai Stevenson across the country -- in fact he just left it a few hours ago to fly to Washington. He is returning right back to that duty after this broadcast, the Senior Senator from South Dakota, Karl E. Mundt.

For the Democrats, twice a top contender for their vice presidential nomination, a leading Democratic liberal, a man generally considered as one of the rising men in the Party, the Senator from Minnesota, Hubert H. Humphrey.

Senator Mundt tonight is in our Washington studio; Senator Humphrey is in Minneapolis. They meet on this platform through what we like to call the miracle of electronics, and toward the end of our formal debate they will address each other directly in a short question and answer period.

We will begin in just a moment, but first let's watch Westinghouse and Betty Furness.

(A commercial on behalf of Westinghouse.)

MR. CRONKITE: Gentlemen, the rules of formal debate apply here. I will use my gavel to warn you when your period is over at each time fifteen seconds before that time I will give you a single rap like that and I will use the gavel to begin and end each period, of course.

The toss of the coin tonight was won by Senator Mundt, and he prefers to be the last in the debate, so we will open with a two and a half minute statement by Senator Humphrey. Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Walter Cronkite and ladies and gentlemen: The issue is Which Party has the Most to Offer to the American Farmer. I think the answer is obvious. The Democratic Party and the ticket of Adlai Stevenson for President and Estes Kefauver for Vice President, plus a Democratic Congress, both a House and a Senate.

Now, I know the Republicans offered much in 1952 in the promises of Mr. Eisenhower around this country. But I think every farmer knows that they delivered much less than they offered and they promised.

As a matter of fact, the answer to this question, I think, could well be answered, and most likely will be, by the participant on the other end of the line, my friend, Senator Mundt.

Senator Mundt, by his own votes in the 83rd Congress and

the 84th Congress answered this question because he voted against the Eisenhower-Benson Republican Farm Program.

He voted for the Democratic program. He voted for the very Democratic platform that we adopted on agriculture in Chicago at our Convention.

Another answer to this question is in the minds and the hearts of our own farmers. They remember 1920 to 1932 under Republican peace and prosperity that brought disaster and ruin to the American farmer, and they also know what has been happening since 1953 where agricultural income has gone down from \$15,100,000,000 down to a little over \$11 billion; where the farmer's share of the food dollar has gone down from 47 cents to 38 cents; where the farmer has seen ever-increasing surpluses mount in Government hands, and ever-decreasing prices for the farmer.

As a matter of fact, the farmers of America now know that the Republican Party has a triple formula for Republican Agricultural Economics. They ask the farmer to produce less, take less for what he produces, and pay more for what he buys.

Now, on that kind of a formula you can only end up in trouble.

So I respectfully say that the Democratic Party, through its record that every farmer knows, of AAA, REA, Soil Conservation, ever-normal granary farm credit, Farmers Home Administration, every one knows that the Democratic Party has the most to offer.

MR. CRONKITE: Senator Mundt, from Washington for two and a half minutes.

SENATOR MUNDT: Walter and good friends, I would say that not quite everybody knows that because certainly I don't share that conclusion, and I am sure that about 60 per cent of the voters of America on November 6 will not share the conclusion of my distinguished colleague in Minneapolis tonight.

I would say that before we get into the meat of this debate we should stake out, perhaps, some points of reference so that Senator Humphrey and I may see how far we share agreement and how far we disagree.

In the first place, we disagree diametrically on the first conclusion, because I believe sincerely that, along with all other Americans, the farmers of America will fare much better in the next four years under the continued leadership of Dwight Eisenhower and Dick Nixon than they would by making a change at this time to the Democrat candidate.

I would point out, No. 1, that the American farmer is part of our great family of Americans. There is one thing about the American farmer which differentiates him from the farming classes of other countries. He is not a class by himself, not a peasant class, not a political bloc, not an organization as such.

He is part of the great American family and, in my opinion, American farmers are part of the all-American team, and they share



o 2      equally in the benefits of balanced budgets, reduced taxes, and peace in the world, along with all other good Americans.

    The second thing, and on this one I am sure Senator Humphrey and I can agree, is the fact that both parties recognize the farmer is not getting his rightful share of the national income.

    Both major candidates, in my opinion, sincerely want him to do better, and they are trying to propose plans to bring that about.

    Both parties are committed to that program. It is a question of method, it is a question of policy.

    The Eisenhower Administration has introduced two important new concepts into the whole program of American agriculture which, in my opinion, are the most important single things that have happened to the American farmer since the Steagall amendments were passed in 1938.

    The first of those were to switch the target of parity from a few farm products so that instead of trying to get parity by bolstering up a few farm products, the Eisenhower Administration is committed to producing parity for the producer himself, the farmer, and the family and the farm unit operating as a family-type farm.

    The other one, of course, is the great new soil bank program which farmers are accepting so wholeheartedly all over the country because it provides them with a system of compensation,

ao 3

it provides them a system of curtailing the surpluses, it provides them a method for conserving natural resources.

MR. CRONKITE: And now, gentlemen, rebuttal for three and one-half minutes each. First, Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you very much, Walter. I surely want to enjoy this opportunity to do a little rebutting. I am somewhat, let me say, confused by what Senator Mundt says when he says that he thinks that the farmers will do much better under Ike and Nixon in the next four years.

I trust that that must be sheer hope because it can't be based on facts.

Senator Nixon -- Senator Mundt knows that in November, 1952 farm parity was 100. He knows that every month and every year that it has gone down under the Republican Administration. He knows that farm income has gone down over 25 per cent, and he knows that farm prices are down.

(3)

Now, Senator Mundt says he wants the farmers to be a part of the American team. Yes, they have been a part of it, Senator, but I am afraid that the Eisenhower team has let the farmer carry the water bucket rather than really be on the team.

He has been getting last place on this American team far too long.

This Administration has seen to it, through its policies, that corporation profits are up net 35 per cent; U. S. Steel 158 per cent, General Motors 113 per cent, money lenders' income



up 28 per cent, stocks are up on the New York market over 70 per cent and, Senator, the trouble is that the farmer on this Eisenhower team just isn't in the play. He has been forgotten; he has been left out.

Now, you said one other thing, for example, here that you thought the soil bank was a great new concept. I agree. But you know better than I, Senator Mundt, that the Eisenhower Administration fought the soil bank, repudiated the soil bank, argued against the soil bank until they were finally driven to it, and I am going to have a question or two to ask you about that soil bank.

One other point I would like to make, Senator, is that when this Administration came into power things were not half bad, and since they have been in, wheat stocks have increased seven times, corn stocks have increased two and a half times, cotton stocks have increased 25 times, stocks of milk and dairy products have increased 14 times, stocks of barley 21 times, stocks of oats 15 times.

As a matter of fact, this Administration has expended three and a half times as much money or owns three and a half times as many commodities in dollar purchases as was available in the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1952, December 31.

Now, that is the mess that this Administration has given to the American farmer. They have asked the farmer, I repeat, to produce less, to take less for what they produce and to pay

ao 5

more for what they buy. This Administration has spent more money on agriculture and got fewer results than any Administration in American history. The only thing comparable to it in terms of the inadequacy and failure is the Hoover Administration. And I would recall to our listeners that the Republican Party has vetoed practically every farm measure that has ever been before it, and I want Senator Mundt to tell me how he justifies his argument today, when the very bill that he voted for in the United States Senate was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

I want him to tell me whether or not his farmers out home agree with his position of supporting the Democratic bill or with Eisenhower's position of vetoing it.

MR. CRONKITE: Thank you, Senator Humphrey. I hope out there in Minneapolis I didn't confuse you with a false cue of one rap on the gavel. My mistake in timing.

Now, Senator Mundt, your chance for three and a half minutes' rebuttal.

SENATOR MUNDT: Thank you.

And, in the first place, I would like to point out what all the good farmers know, that there is no such thing, and was no such thing, in the last Congress as a Democrat bill or a Republican bill. You had two bipartisan bills in which farmers on both farm organizations in all sections of the country were divided, in which the members of the Republican and Democratic Party were divided, and the country generally was divided, and

that was based on a concept which developed in 1938, eighteen years ago, a good concept of meeting the situation confronting the farmers by a price support mechanism.

But as time came along and war came along, it was discovered that neither that mechanism nor anything resembling it was good enough for the American farmers. We spent for eighteen years most of our time trying to decide how high the price supports should be, how many crops they should cover and how much crop reduction you should provide. And the higher the price supports got the more curtailment was, and so instead of having 90 per cent, we had 90 per cent times a 60 per cent cropping of the farm, giving a farmer about 54 per cent of parity.

Now, there is one thing I want to make clear in this debate. I do not accuse and am not going to accuse the Democrat Administration of starting the Korean war and being a war party. Unless my colleague wants to accept that as a thesis in simple fairness he cannot accept wartime prosperity attached to the Korean war and make that a comparison with peacetime statistics. I will give him some statistics under the Republican Administration; I will give him some statistics under the Democrat peacetime Administration.

1938, 1939 and 1940 were the last three peace years under a Democrat Administration. What was parity under a peacetime Democrat Administration that averaged 78.7 per cent?

What has parity been for the American farmer under three peacetime years administrative years of Eisenhower, '53, '54 and '55? It has averaged 88.3 per cent, and today is still 82 per cent, almost five points higher than the average under the Democrats in their peacetime years.

(4)

1 My colleague said something about the farmer's share of the food dollar. What was the farmer's share of the food dollar under the peacetime Democrat years of 1938, '39 and '40, because you can't compare a war year unless those who select it as a target also take it as a responsibility as part of the policy of their party.

So I think the peace years 1938, '39 and '40, the average share which the farmer received of the dollars was 39 cents, the farmer shared 39 cents out of the dollar.

In 1950 he received 54 and 55. Under the Eisenhower Administration the average share of the consumer dollar received by the farmer was 43 cents, up four cents; and so I point out to my distinguished colleague that you can't mix up these statistics by trying to claim for the Democrats wartime prosperity unless you assume the responsibility also for wartime misery.

The Eisenhower Administration, recognizing that neither the program for which Senator Humphrey and I voted, nor the program submitted by the other side in that preliminary debate of flexible versus fixed price support was good enough for the farmer because it wasn't giving him parity; it wasn't giving him equity, came up with a new program, the Soil Bank Program, incidentally also for which both Senator Humphrey and I voted, a program that does provide the beginning of a long-term solution to the farm problem, a program that does provide a

w2 farmer a chance to get a fair share of the national income, a program which, working with a dozen other factors in the overall Republican program has parity for the farmer as its ultimate goal.

MR. CRONKITE: Now, gentlemen, time for cross examination. Before your closing rebuttal, you may address questions directly to each other. We have set aside this period for that.

May I remind you, though, that time is short. The more concise your questions and replies, the more questions we shall have time for, the more replies, too, of course.

Since Senator Humphrey had the advantage of the opening statement in the debate, Senator Mundt will ask the first question in cross examination.

Senator Mundt.

SENATOR MUNDT: I would like to start out and satisfy the audience that my statement about my colleague was correct. And let me ask you as an easy question, Senator Humphrey, is it not correct that you, along with me, supported the Soil Bank Program as we have it today in the United States, country?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, of course, that is correct. I not only supported it in the Senate, I tried to help educate Secretary Benson to be for it. He was rather reluctant, may I say, and finally around in February, 1956 we got him to come along for it, even though as late as April he doubted that it would be too effective.

I think you will agree with me, Senator, that the Administration opposed the soil bank, called it unworkable, unmanageable, too costly, and about everything else they could call it the year before we adopted it.

SENATOR MUNDT: They called it those things the year before it was put before us in the form of a bill which was acceptable economically and workable, and which the farm organizations themselves would support after the hearings which you and I shared out through the Mid-West of the Senate Agriculture Committee, in which some of the bugs of the earlier proposals were erased, and it was made into a sound and workable program, at which time Secretary Benson and the whole Administration team testified many long hours in support of the soil bank program.

MR. CRONKITE: Now, Senator Humphrey, if you would like to address a question to Senator Mundt.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, indeed I would.

Senator, you have selected certain peacetime years. Isn't it true, Senator, that the peacetime years of 1946, '47, '48, '49,



up to June 30, 1950, peacetime years, mind you, were the most prosperous peacetime years for American agriculture in the history of the nation?

SENATOR MUNDT: The difficulty was the years you have selected comprise a thin skein of time between two wars under two different Democrat Presidents.

You chose a time after the conclusion of World War No. II when the world was still seething and boiling, and we had 30,000 American troops in Trieste; we had other troops scattered around in spots where they were likely to be shot at, and while settling and readjusting from that war, preparing for the contingencies which ultimately exploded in the Korean war. So I picked a peacetime period, the best peacetime years in the Democrat Administration prior to this series of wars, World War II and the Korean war.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator, you also picked the years right after, may I say, the Republican Party under Coolidge, Harding and Hoover had literally left the American farmer flat on his face, and I want to remind you that it was after a great world depression.

SENATOR MUNDT: Furthermore, I should like to add the years '38, '39 and '40, which was quite a while after we had a Republican President, far too long, I think, and most Americans feel that way, too.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I say to my friend, the Senator

from South Dakota, that this Administration still has approximately 3,000,000 men under arms, it is spending over \$40 billion a year on national security and defense, and while you may call it peacetime, it is anything but peace in Korea, anything but peace in Indo-China, anything but peace in the Middle East, anything but peace any place in the world.

The military expenditures today are only one other year higher in American history since World War II, and I think this is a factor that the American people ought to know; and yet farm prices have gone down.

Other people have been doing well, Senator, but farm prices have gone down, and peacetime or no peacetime, under the Republican Administration after World War I, and since 1952, farmers are taking a licking.

SENATOR MUNDT: I should point out that farm prices have been going up in the main part since 1956 as the impact of the new program and many other programs associated with it have come into being because such programs as the St. Lawrence Seaway, such programs as tax reduction, such programs as providing a tax refund for the American farmer, such programs as providing for the small water shed project, such programs as providing for the transfer of American agricultural attaches from the State Department to the Department of Agriculture, increasing our exports tremendously -- I picked up the morning copy of the Herald-Tribune I bought in New York City this morning, "U. S. Farm exports in 22 per cent gain," because the momentum is there for a final solution to the farm program and, Senator, let us recognize the problem that is there and choose the problem ahead.

Farm prices have been headed upward this year.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are one month behind, Senator. Other than that, your figures are right; they went down the last month.

SENATOR MUNDT: Not the total for the year.

MR. CRONKITE: Gentlemen, I think we fairly apportioned the time in direct examination, and now time for your closing statements of one and a half minutes each. Senator Humphrey will lead.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say that

I noticed the other day that Secretary Benson announced that he thought that hog prices out here in the Midwest ought not to go down below \$14.50 a hundred weight.

How I wish he had said that last year when Minnesota farmers, because of an average price between \$9 and \$10 a hundred weight in the marketing season lost over \$25 million.

Of course, this Administration said that it believed that the price support program ought to be for disasters. I think the disaster that they are worried about is the Republican political disaster which is about to take place in this country.

This \$14.50 a hundred weight on hogs, Senator, is only 65 per cent of parity. You and I know that \$18 a hundred weight would be a fair price, and I repeat that if you can buy hogs now in an election year, and if you can buy eggs and turkeys in an election year and buy some beef, why didn't you do it in '54 and in '55?

And, speaking of feed, may I just add that the American farmer has taken a licking on that, too, and there were no great surpluses. As a matter of fact, the number of beef cattle are down 12 per cent, and cash supplies or cash income down a billion dollars.

This Administration has been too costly, Senator, for agriculture. The Administration has been too costly for the country.

We just had to lay off another 1500 to 2,000 workers here

in Minneapolis at the Minneapolis Moline Farm Tractor Company.

Why? Farm income down, no farm purchases. Thank you.

MR. CRONKITE: Senator Mundt for a minute and a half.

SENATOR MUNDT: I would like to refer my distinguished colleague, first of all, that none of the farmers of America and none of us need to worry about that political disaster he was worrying about because America is not going to vote for Adlai in November 6, 1956.

Having freed ourselves from any fear of that disaster, let me point out, as I said earlier, that the American farmer is going to support this fine administrative team of Eisenhower and Nixon because it is an American farm family that is involved. American farmers, no less than other Americans, are proud of the fact that Eisenhower's great leadership not only took us out of the war in which he found himself when he became President, but was able to preserve the peace, able to solve other problems which might have inflamed the world in war.

I am surprised that my distinguished opponent complains because we are buying some hogs to shore prices up. We did that also in 1953 and we did it in '54 and we did it in '55, moving in that direction as hog prices fell.

I think he should rejoice with me that beef prices are so high today that none of the beef producers are even complaining, as wool prices have been holding up.

There are segments of the farm problem which are beginning to indicate a permanent solution. But he and I agree there is more that needs to be done.

The American farmer is entitled to a greater share of the

farm income, and Dwight Eisenhower, who has never failed to keep a promise he has made, will protect the American farmer in that connection, you can be sure of that when he is elected overwhelmingly, along with Dick Nixon and a Republican Congress on the 6th day of November this year.

MR. CRONKITE: Thank you, gentlemen. Time is up.

I will be back in a moment, but right now let's watch Westinghouse and Betty Furness.

(Commercial for Westinghouse.)

MR. CRONKITE: Our debaters tonight from Minneapolis representing the Democratic Party, whose symbol was interpreted this week by Roy Justice, political cartoonist of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota.

Speaking for the Republicans, whose elephant was also drawn by Mr. Justice, Senator Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota, speaking from Washington.

Incidentally, Mr. Justice is in our Minneapolis audience tonight.

Next week at the same time "Pick The Winner" will present two of the nation's most prominent Governors, Republican Governor Goodwin J. Knight of California, and Democratic Governor Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey.

Again I will be in the middle with the gavel from Washington. This is Walter Cronkite reminding you in many states you



cannot vote unless you register, and time is running out.  
Register before your deadline, and vote on November 6.

- - -



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)