

From the Office of
Citizens for Humphrey Committee
1625 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Tuesday a.m.
October 4, 1960

HUMPHREY GOP "REFUSAL TO ACT" ON FARM PROGRAM

WASECA, October 3 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey charged today that the Republican Administration has "callously refused to utilize legislation which would directly benefit the farmers."

The Senator cited as an example his legislation, approved by Congress two years ago, to send 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas for relief purposes.

"If Secretary of Agriculture Benson had acted on this program," Humphrey said, "the market price of soybeans would today be 25 cents a bushel higher than it is."

Humphrey, speaking at a DFL bean feed here, said that if the program had been carried out, national farm income would have been increased \$200 million.

"The boost in Minnesota farm income alone would have amounted to \$12.5," Humphrey said. "In Waseca county alone, more than \$1 million would have come in through the increased market price."

The Senator, a top-ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, said the original request for the Humphrey legislation came from the National Council of Churches.

"The National Council of Churches and other voluntary agencies have appealed to the government repeatedly that some fats and oils be used as part of their relief feeding programs abroad," Humphrey reported.

"Two years ago, Congress approved my legislation authorizing Benson to meet the request of the National Council of Churches," Humphrey said.

"So far, he has simply refused to act, despite the fact that the program would help humanity and the farmers instead of allowing price-supported soybeans to pile up in costly storage.

"The program makes sense to me, even if it doesn't to the Republicans. I am sure a Democratic president will inaugurate such a program, and prove how soybean prices can be bolstered while helping humanity.

Humphrey said the purchase and diversion of the 50,000 tons of soybean oil could be accomplished at a cost of less than \$10 million.

"Most of this cost," he concluded, "would be offset by reduction of losses now involved in the soybean price support program."

From the Office of
Citizens for Humphrey Committee
1625 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Tuesday p.m.
October 4, 1960

HUMPHREY CALLS FOR "MORAL MATURITY" ON RELIGIOUS ISSUE

WINONA, October 4 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today challenged every candidate and citizen to show "moral maturity" on the issue of religion in politics.

"We will be labeled an immature people and a hypocritical people unless we reject the expressions of religious bigotry which are so tragically frequent today," Humphrey said.

The Senator, speaking at a joint meeting of students from St. Mary's College and St. Theresa's College here, said he had been "shocked and shamed by the viciousness of attacks by bigots and political hate-mongers.

"I have been shocked because these attacks continue, despite the forceful statements of the Democratic presidential candidate supporting the concept of separation of church and state," Humphrey said.

"I have been shamed because the proud American traditions of decency, democracy and fair play have been blotched by demagogery," he added.

Humphrey said he was "surprised and saddened" that the religious issue has persisted "so long and so intensely" this year. He added:

"If America expects to endure in the democratic tradition and to lead the free nations toward a world of justice and peace, the people must show moral maturity on matters of race, religion and creed.

"Every American can help by ignoring or rejecting the bigots, and by turning attention to the positive programs of the candidates and the real issues of the campaign."

From the Office of
Citizens for Humphrey Committee
1625 Hennepin Avenue
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Federal 9-0521

For Release: Wednesday a.m.
October 5, 1960

COLD WAR SLOW-DOWN IN AMERICAN ECONOMY HELPS COMMUNISTS, SAYS
HUMPHREY

WINONA, October 4 -- Senator Hubert H. Humphrey warned last night that the slow-down in United States economic growth puts a "strait-jacket" on America's capacity to compete with the Communist nations.

"The Soviet economy has grown 6 to 9 percent a year over the past eight years," Humphrey declared at a DFL Bean Feed here, "but under this Republican Administration the American economy has grown only 2½ percent a year."

Humphrey said authoritative studies by the Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress show Sino-Soviet economic development of heavy industry and power threatens to end American economic supremacy by 1970, if the American economy continues to lag behind its full growth potential.

"The Republican presidential candidate says it is unpatriotic to call attention to the slow-down in our economic growth," Humphrey said. "I say it is unpatriotic and foolish and dangerous to ignore it."

"It is the duty of Senator Kennedy to criticize the Republican tight-money economic policies which have put a straitjacket on America's capacity to compete in the Cold War," Humphrey declared. "And it is my duty to work for policies which will keep America strong."

Humphrey said the American economy grew an average of 5.5 percent a year from 1933 to 1953. "If this growth rate had continued under the Republican, our national income would now be \$600 billion instead of only \$500 billion -- 20 percent more money for military hardware plus schools and roads and homes and all the items which mean a higher standard of living for the American people," he added.

Ray Hemmingsway — Joe Donovan

FACTS -- NOT SLOGANS -- ON FARM PROGRAMS

Waseca, Minn., Bean Feed
8 p.m., Monday,
Oct. 3, 1960
(Over Radio)

Sandra Carlson
Edwin Carlson
mums

Marty Coughlin
May 62 Tobin
Joe Moore
Henry Gallagher
Gene McCarthy

Geo Shepard
Gov Freeman

L Tonight I speak to you not just
as a Senator, but as a man who knows
and cares about the problems and needs
of America's farmers.

L I speak to you not in generalities,
but in specifics.

L I speak to you not with slogans,
but with facts.

L I come to you not to offer false
promises and vague reassurances, but
to speak the truth about my record
and my party's program for agriculture.

KMMT-
TV
Channel
6
10:30

It is time for all of us to
take a hard look at the recent statements
and programs of the candidates on
agriculture.

Let us first examine the program
outlined by the ~~the~~ Republican presidential
candidate, Mr. Nixon.

now, In a recent campaign speech, ~~he~~ *Mr. Nixon*
has offered what he calls a "new
program" to solve the farm problem.

What does he say the problem is? *First,*
He said the problem is surplus. In
fact, he used the word "surplus" more
than 50 times in just one speech.

And what is his answer to this
"Problem"? He had one word to describe
that answer -- "consume."

Now I take exception to Mr. Nixon's
happy simplification of America's
agricultural situation.

I say that America's food and fiber
supply should be called "agricultural
abundance," not "surplus."

I say that our agricultural abundance
is not a "problem." It is a blessing
and an opportunity.

We have an opportunity to use our
tremendous supply of food and fiber --
as a source of strenght, as a tool of
relief, as an instrument of peace.

Our challenge is to use America's
agricultural abundance to help America

grow and prosper, to relieve misery
and suffering, and to banish hunger from
the face of the world.

The challenge is not, as Mr. Nixon
suggests, to "get rid of the surplus."

If he takes that attitude -- and he
does -- he might as well suggest that
we put a torch to fields of wheat or
dump vast quantities of food and
fiber in the ocean.

*Challenge is
to use it!
for people!*

And while we are discussing
Mr. Nixon's inclination to "get rid of"
things, let me mention one, sad fact.

Last week, in his debate with
Mr. Kennedy, Richard Nixon suffered

Debate

a significant slip of the tongue.

He intended to say the government
has a responsibility to "get rid of the
surplus."

Instead, he said that we must
"get rid of the farmers."

That was a slip of the tongue, to
be fair. ^{if it} But ^{it} was not a slip of the
mind. For Mr. Nixon and others in the
current administration do have it in
mind to get rid of the farmers. They
believe that the solution to all the
problems of American agriculture is
a matter of forcing more farmers off
their lands and out of rural America --
to cut production and thus reduce
"surplus."

In his recent campaign speeches,

Mr. Nixon has given us nothing new.

He has dressed up the same old
Benson programs with cute phrases and
catchy slogans.

"use surplus
to get rid
of surplus"

He has skipped only lightly over
the real problem of American agriculture
today -- low farm income.

What does he suggest? He suggests
that parity of farm income be determined
by the average market prices of products
during the previous year.

Law of
Diminishing
Returns

My friends, this is the essence
of Nixon's program. It is not new.
It is not bold. ^{and} It is not what the
farmers want. It is not the answer
to falling farm prices and the plight

of the farmers.

It is straight, pure Bensonism. — and bunkum!

It is Benson's program, put in slightly

different language. It is Benson's

castly ~~program~~ "sliding scale" for farm — only more slide

parity. It is nothing more than a

call to continuing drops in farm

income. It is disaster for America's

farmers.

Does the Vice President expect

any farmer to buy his program? Does

he expect any farmer to believe that

income will be improved by gearing price

support programs to the average prices of

the previous year. — ??
1 1

The "sliding scale" -- whether
it is in Benson language or Nixon
language -- means one thing. It
means falling prices. It means falling
income. It means that America's farmers
will be pushed so far down the economic
scale that thousands of them will be
forced off the farms. *Right here*

~~It means success for the Benson-~~
~~Nixon goal: To "get rid of" thousands~~
~~of farmers.~~

Now let us look hard at the program
of Mr. Kennedy, the Democratic presidential
candidate.

Mr. Kennedy does not straddle the
fence or hide from the real problem --

*Nixon
Goal!*

*Kennedy
Program*

*Nixon
Goal
Get farmers
off the land.*

of low farm income.

He knows this is the problem & he attacks it.

He states clearly and forcefully

that he will work and fight for full

parity of income for the American farmer.

And Mr. Kennedy defines ~~distinctly~~ *clearly*

~~and unequivocally~~ what he means by

full parity of income.

Parity of income, he says, is that
income which gives average producers
a return on their invested capital,
labor and management equal to that which
similar, or comparable, resources
earn in non-farm employment.

Parity

This is what American farmers
want and must have if they are to
survive in a growing, expanding nation.

Mr. Kennedy's program strikes to the
heart of the problem of farmers. It
does not concern itself ^{only} ~~solely~~ with
prices -- but with the farmer's net
income. That is the only figure which
means anything in determining his
standard of living -- particularly in
this age of the cost-price squeeze.

Mr. Kennedy says more which is
sound and necessary. He pledges
his work to assure this parity of income
through supply management -- the
adjustment of supply to demand at parity
income prices.

2

The fundamental goal of Mr. Kennedy's

program is not to get rid of the farmers.

It is to achieve a balance between supply
and demand -- and thereby assure prices which
will yeild parity of income and reasonable
prosperity to the farmers.

Let me be blunt. As a ranking member
of the Senate Committee on Agriculture,
as one who has studied the problems of
farmers first-hand, as an American who
is deeply concerned with the survival

of the free-enterprise, family farming

system, ~~I do not see any choice.~~

I see only one choice - Kennedy

Mr. Nixon is vague. Mr. Kennedy is
specific. Mr. Nixon ~~is~~ ^{ignores} ~~of~~ the
real problem. Mr. Kennedy faces the real
problem of farm income. Mr. Nixon wants

to continue the Benson program of

sliding farm prices.

and Agric Recessum

Mr. Kennedy wants to boost and

increase farm prices.

and farm income

Mr. Nixon want to reduce

(next page)

our food and fiber supply by "getting rid of
the surplus" and, indeed, by "getting rid of
the farmers". Mr. Kennedy ^{the Democrat} wants to strengthen
the position and economic well-being of all
farmers and assure the survival of America's
democratic system of family farming.

Now let us turn to another candidate,
and what he says about farm programs.

I speak of my own opponent.

You know, political candidates are advised
that they should never identify their opponent
by name. So let me just say that my opponent's
initials -- and he loves to use them -- stand
for Paltry Knowledge of the problems and needs
of American farmers.

There is little to say about his program,
because there is little program. He toes the
Benson-Nixon line, using the same, old, unworkable

concepts and the same language. *only less convincing*

L He does not speak positively or specifically of what he would do. Instead, he offers vague, negative slogans on agricultural policy.

L He has offered one statement which is all *known*.
Nobody else has ever made the statement.
~~his own~~ *L* Nobody else who has studied the record *he so foolish & reckless* would ~~care~~ to make the statement.

L His statement is that Humphrey has done nothing for the farmers.

L I suggest that he find out just how alone he is in making that statement.

L I suggest that he get out and talk with Minnesota's farmers to learn what Humphrey has done for them.

I invite him to come to my office and read the thousands of "thank-you" notes from farmers and the hundreds of letters from outstanding farm experts and farm bloc leaders

Good time to look at the Record

Natl Milk Producers Assoc
Missouri Farmers Assoc
Nat Catholic Rural Life Conference
Natl Council of Churches

-15-

expressing appreciation and support for

Humphrey's work and accomplishments for farmers.

And, above all, I advise him to look at
the record and study the facts of ^{Senator} Humphrey's
efforts and successes on behalf of American
agriculture.

Why, I will even help him. This is a
long, full record of which I speak, and if my
opponent took the time to study it, he would
not have any time for campaigning. That would
not be fair.

So here are the facts of Humphrey's
record for the farmers, step by step and
summarized for easy understanding by those who
do not know much about farming or agricultural
economy.

The Humphrey record on agriculture goes back further than 1948, when I was first elected to the Senate.

It goes back to the farm depression in South Dakota in the 1930's, and a deep personal concern for the welfare of farm families. It goes back to 1933, and an understanding of what could be done by an Administration determined to restore an agricultural economy to health.

my service as Mayor → My record includes the sponsorship and hard work necessary to push five comprehensive farm bills through Congress. Each of those bills met the problem ^{our} on the farms -- low income. Each of those bills would have meant millions of dollars more income for the farmers of Minnesota and all America, ^{and less costly to taxpayer} Each of those bills was supported by the nation's farmers. Each of those bills was approved by the Democratic majority in Congress.

And every one of those comprehensive
farm bills was vetoed by the Republican
President and killed by the Republican
minority in Congress.

Vetoed

What was the first Humphrey bill
to be introduced in the Senate?

It was Senate Bill 881 -- a
farm bill, a bill concerned with the
level of dairy price supports *to*

1949 also

Was that nothing?

And in 1949, a high point of the Humphrey record was the successful sponsorship with the late Senator Langer of legislation authorizing the REA Rural Telephone System.

Was that nothing?

In 1951 - and it is in the record - your Senator sponsored and passed called for the shipment of surplus wheat to relieve misery and hunger in India - a proposal ~~later~~ accepted by two administrations. — Emergency Aid To India

Was that nothing?

1949+ you said
In 1952, Humphrey lived up to his pledge to the farmers to work for 90 percent of parity support programs.

It is in the record. I was one of the leaders of the successful fight to extend 90 percent of parity for basic commodities for two years.

Was that nothing? It was not. In Minnesota

alone, extension of 90 percent of parity meant the

safeguarding of \$90 million of income a year for

Minnesota farmers.

90 million
a year

The real fight began in 1953, when Ezra Taft

Benson assumed power over the welfare of America's

farmers.

His executive orders were often outside the
authority of Congress, but of more than 100 Benson
attempts which required legislation, we defeated all

but 16.

Was that nothing?

In 1953, I introduced Senate Bill 2102, an

conservation
agricultural reserve bill which was not accepted

until 1956 when the Nixon-Benson Administration

needed an election year farm proposal and picked up
the soil-bank idea. ← Republicans distort it.

Was that nothing?

Also in 1953, Humphrey urged the creation of
an International Food Reserve - a sort of world food
bank. This idea was not supported by the Republican
Party until this year.

W.H.
TOOD
+
FIBER

Was that nothing?

In 1954 - and every year since - Benson has
attempted to reduce funds for the school lunch program,
the Rural Electrification Administration and the A.C.P.
Each year, I have helped to defeat these attempts.

School
lunch
REA
Conserv

Was that nothing?

Also in 1954, the first proposals to allow REA
cooperatives to enter the atomic-power field were put
forward by Humphrey. The proposals were later accepted,
and today the first REA nuclear power plant is standing

at Elk River, Minnesota.

Was that nothing?

1954

The same year, I was the first to propose

that America's agricultural abundance be used as an instrument of foreign policy. This was the beginning of my Food for Peace program, long opposed by the Republican leadership but now given lip service by their candidates.

I ask you. Is my Food for Peace program

"nothing?"

During the 84th Congress, in 1955 and 1956, *as your Senate*

~~Humphrey~~ continued to fight Benson policies and worked

for a better dairy support program, for more adequate

credit sources for farmers, for fair national acreage

allotment on corn, for incentive payments for marketing

hogs at lighter weights.

Can these programs be called "nothing?"

In 1957, I introduced bills providing for a
food-stamp program to use our abundance to feed the

(Passed)

needy at home, and for extension and enlargement of

the Public Law 480 program to relieve hunger overseas.

(Passed)

I sponsored legislation for a national milk sanitation

~~to add Midwest milk producers~~
program and for the humane slaughter of livestock.

(Passed)

Can anyone say that these programs meant

"nothing" to farm families.

In 1958, I opposed the Benson move to reduce

dairy price supports below \$3.25 per hundredweight

and co-sponsored with ~~Senator~~ ^{Cong} Johnson a plan to

passed

enable dairy producers to stabilize their prices at

vetoed

a reasonable level.

Was that nothing?

1958 - sponsored & Passed
a Resol. to prevent any
further Price Support
cuts.

And In the 86th Congress, both houses approved the
Humphrey bill to establish ^{permanent} the school milk program *(Passed)*

permanently. The program now and every year helps
stabilize dairy prices and improves the nutrition
of America's school children.

No man could honestly call that accomplishment
"nothing."

L The Public Law 480 program was extended, and
with it Congress agreed to my proposal for a food-stamp
program. Benson refused to act on the food-stamp
legislation, so I have since sponsored legislation
requiring him to do so.

*Food
Stamp*

Is it "nothing" to help our farmers and help
the hungry by using our agricultural abundance for
humanitarian purposes?

Here are other parts of *your Senators* ~~the Humphrey~~ record

for the farmer from just this year:

A proposal for the establishment of a new
commission to study problems of the rural community.

Introduction of the hog-payment bill and
development of a national poultry stabilization act.

*Poultry
inspection
Act.*

Pressure on the Department of Agriculture which
resulted in the reinstatement of USDA purchase of
dried whole egg solids. — *up egg prices*

I am proud of my fight for Senate Bill 144,
a bill to restore loan-making authority to the REA
administrator. The President vetoed the bill, the
Senate overrode his veto and the House failed to
override by just four votes.

REA

* * * * *

Now let me talk with you about the important,
the real, the dollars-and-cents results of my work

and the work of other liberal legislators on behalf of farmers.

^ The dairy price support bill, sponsored by myself and Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, may be short-term and modest, but it will bring direct benefits to farmers.

It raises dairy price supports to \$3.22 per hundredweight on milk and 59.6 cents per pound on butterfat. Congress approved this bill, and -- under election year pressure -- it was signed into law by the President.

^ A 16 cent increase per hundred pounds of milk or three cents more per pound of butterfat will amount to an increase of \$11,500,000 for the farmers in Minnesota alone, and \$100 million for farmers nationally.

\$ 11 1/2 million

Is that "nothing?"

It is not Humphrey and other liberal farm-bloc senators who are guilty of "doing nothing" for the farmers.

The current administration and Benson-Republican policies are guilty not only of "doing nothing" to help the farmers. By its callous refusal to utilize legislation which would directly benefit the farmers, it has hurt them.

Let me give you a specific, factual example.

Two years ago, I introduced legislation to send 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas for relief purposes.

That legislation was introduced after the National Council of Churches and voluntary agencies appealed to the government repeatedly that some fats and oils be used as part of our efforts to feed the hungry in underdeveloped lands.

Both houses of Congress approved my legislation for that purpose. The President and the Secretary of Agriculture thus had the authority to put the program into action.

They did not use the authority. They refused to act. They ignored this program -- despite the fact that it would help humanity and the farmers instead of allowing price-supported soybeans to pile up in costly storage.

If Secretary of Agriculture Benson had acted on this program, the market price of soybeans would today be 25 cents a bushel higher than it is. Yes, the diversion of 50,000 tons of soybean oil overseas would have boosted the market price per bushel by 25 cents.

That would have meant national farm income would have been increased by \$200 million.

Minnesota farm income would have been boosted

\$12.5 million.

And in Waseca ~~County alone~~, more than ^{Trading Area \$2} 2 million

extra in income would have come in through the increased
market price of soybeans.

This program authorized by my bill and requested
by the National Council of Churches makes sense to me,

even if it does not to the Republican candidates.

I am convinced that a Democratic President will inaugurate
such a program, and prove how soybean prices can be
bolstered at the same time we are helping humanity.

The Administration's refusal to put this program
to work was a setback - a tragic setback - for the efforts
of those of us who are working to help the farmer and to
use our agricultural abundance for the good of mankind.

We have suffered many other setbacks, but we have
been able to preserve much legislation which is vital
to the farm economy.

7 million Bushels
Soybeans
program
this Area!

Catholic Church
Lutheran
would

If we had not worked and fought for the farmers throughout the past eight years, their problems would be far more critical today.

Agricultural experts estimate that gross farm income is 10 percent higher today than it would be if so-called "free market" policies of the Benson administration had been allowed to prevail.

At this rate, Minnesota's gross farm income this year is about \$170 million higher than if Benson had been allowed to have his way -- if Humphrey and others had not fought his policies at all.

If America today had an Administration and a Congress willing to act to restore parity prices, the farm economy would be far more healthy and prosperous.

Reliable estimates indicate that if current farm production were keyed to full parity prices, the typical Minnesota farm county would enjoy about \$5 million a year more in farm income.

Restoration of full parity prices on current levels of production would mean an income gain of almost \$400 million a year for the State of Minnesota.

These are the facts. These are the specific details about my record, the program of my party and the inadequacies of Benson-Nixon farm policies.

The facts stand for themselves. Study them and remember them. After you have, you will have no trouble deciding who has done something for the farmers of Minnesota and America and who has done nothing.

We who see America's agricultural abundance as a blessing -- and not a problem -- will continue to work for the farmer's interest in Washington.

We who want to preserve the free-enterprise, family farm system -- and not "get rid of the farmers" -- will continue to fight for a healthy, agricultural economy.

Humphrey and others do not concern themselves with the interests of the farmer only because they are friends of the farmer and understand his problems and needs.

We seek a stronger America, a growing America, an efficient America. We seek an America which leads the free world toward victory in the war against collectivization and totalitarianism. We seek an America which has the wisdom, the strength and the compassion to banish hunger from the world and help

every nation to develop in an orderly, democratic way.

These are our purposes. We know they can not be achieved unless American agriculture is a strong, healthy, prosperous force in our Nation.

We know that our own nation and the free world can not long endure if the American farmer is forced off of his lands by declining income.

We know that rural America is a key to the strength of all America, and that rural America must have a greater share of opportunity, a greater share of prosperity, a greater share of the vitality and vigor within our Nation.

10/2/60

MORAL MATURITY ON THE RELIGIOUS ISSUE

St. Mary's College, Winona, Minn.
4 p.m., Tuesday, October 4, 1960

College of St. Theresa

L This has been a long political year
for me.

Long year

L Do not misunderstand. My first
obligation and responsibility (and, I
might add, pleasure) ~~have~~ *has* been my work
as a United States Senator, serving the
people of Minnesota

L But I have done a bit of traveling
too.

L This year has taken me across the length
and breadth of our land.

It has taken me to the political
hustings in the harsh winter of Wisconsin
and the warm sun of Puerto Rico.

It has taken me to green,
springtime mountains of West Virginia
and the summer heat of the East Coast.

And now it has brought me home
to Minnesota for the fall.

I do not hide my purpose in
these campaigns. I know and you
know that I am out to win support,
to win votes, to win re-election.

But there is another basic purpose
to my work in these campaigns.

That purpose is to attempt to
inform -- if I may say -- to educate
the citizens of Minnesota and America
on the issues.

Told by Nixon - now not the
Time to Debate For Policy
Help Krusch

What is wrong? Ambassador
Planning - Staffing - money
Foreign Policy that offers New Hope,
Heart, and Help! - Educ!!

My hope, my dream, my goal are
not limited to winning cheers and gathering
votes. My quest and my purpose are
to help elevate the level of politics
and the level of political thinking in
America.

I was a teacher once, and I have
not lost the sense of mission which
every teacher must have -- to inspire
intelligent, rational independent thought.

There is one level of thought --
one low, bigoted level of thought --
which has deeply disturbed me this year.

I have been surprised and saddened
that the religious issue in this campaign
has persisted so long and so intensely,
~~this year.~~

I have been shocked and shamed
by the viciousness of attacks by
bigots and political hate-mongers ---
---- Shocked because these attacks
continue, despite the forceful statements
of the Democratic presidential candidate
supporting the concept of separation of
church and state.
----Shamed because the proud traditions
of decency, democracy and fair play
have been blotched by demagoguery.

If America expects to endure in
the democratic tradition and lead the
free nations toward a world of justice
and peace, ^{then} every candidate and every
citizen must show moral maturity on
matters of race, creed and religion.

The world is covered with diverse
peoples, diverse thought, diverse
religions. Millions elsewhere will
label us immature and hypocritical unless
we reject the expressions of religious
^{intolerance}
bigotry which are so tragically frequent
today.

↳ The spirit and strength of America
cannot endure if we allow the decay
of demagoguery to spread.

↳ Each of us can help -- by ignoring
or rejecting the bigots and by turning
our attention to the positive programs
of the candidates and the real issues
of the campaign.

Each man must be judged on the
basis of his intelligence, his knowledge,

his experience, his skill, his integrity
as an American and a human being.

Let us concern ourselves with those
qualities. Let us strive to blot
out prejudice and bigotry by informing,
by educating, by teaching.

####

150
John Mc Gill
Joseph Reece

Cy Crawford
Dwight Peterson

Mary Beth Shafer

SLOW-DOWN IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

Winona DFL Bean Feed

7 p.m., Tuesday

October 4, 1960

St Marys St. Theresa's, Winona State College

Under Franklin Roosevelt and Harry
Truman, the American economy grew at an
average rate of $5\frac{1}{2}$ percent a year.

Under this Republican Administration,
the American economy has grown only $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent
a year.

Meanwhile, the Soviet economy has grown
by 6 to 9 percent a year over the past eight
years -- two to three times as fast as
economic growth here under the Republicans.

Careful, objective non-partisan reports
by the Director of our Central Intelligence

Agency and by the Joint Economic

Committee of Congress show that the brutally

fast, forced economic development of heavy

industry and power in the Soviet Union and

Communist China will threaten the economic

supremacy of the United States by 1970 if

our country lags behind its full economic

potential.

✓ The Republican presidential

candidate, Mr. Nixon, says it is

unpatriotic to call attention to the

slow-down in our economic growth.

✓ I say it is unpatriotic and foolish

and dangerous to ignore it.

✓ It is the duty of Senator Kennedy to

criticize the Republican tight-money

policies and penny-wise, pound-foolish

*Don't Discuss
Foreign Policy*

fiscal policies which have put a straitjacket
on America's capacity to compete in the
Cold War.

L And it is my duty to work for policies
which will keep America strong.

L If the Republicans had continued the
Roosevelt-Truman growth rate, our national
income would now be \$600 billion instead
of \$500 billion.

Look
\$600B

That would mean we would have 20 percent
more money for schools and roads -- 20 percent
more money for housing and automobiles and
all the other items in the family market
basket which provide a higher standard of
living for the American people.

Here's
how to
pay!

####



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