MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF MAY 2, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING MAY 6, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

In these weeks of Spring, the thoughts of millions of Americans turn to vacation, and outdoor activities. At the same time, many of our young people in school begin thinking about graduation, and the imminent need to find a job.

These two purposes---outdoor recreation and job-hunting---blend to remind us again of the need for a program I have long advocated---the Youth Conservation Corps.

Right now my bill to establish the Youth Conservation Corps is before the Congress. I am hopeful that both the Senate and the House will act on it soon. The President supports this legislation. And so do educators, juvenile authorities and conservation leaders from all areas of the nation.

There are some who oppose my bill to establish the Youth Conservation Corps. Some call it an idealistic, impractical plan. Some say that the Nation can not afford the costs. Some say that it is not really a bad idea, but that the YCC is not necessary.

Such complaints only remind me of the opposition to another of my efforts which succeeded last year——the Peace Corps. I well remember the short-sighted cries that the Peace Corps would not work, and that it was only an impractical dream.

Those opponents were proved wrong, by the reality of the magnificent success of the Peace Corps in its first year of operation.

I believe the Youth Conservation Corps will also succeed, and that its performance will convince the opponents that a <u>new</u> idea is not automatically an unworkable idea.

What will the Youth Conservation Corps do?

It will put thousands of young men from the ages of 18 through 21 to work in our Nation's great national and state pairs, for ests and other public lands.

It will place these young men under the adult supervision of trained and experienced experts in conservation, including forest rangers.

These young men will be assigned to positive, constructive projects
to build up and improve our natural resources and the facilities on them.

They will expand our reforestration programs, build flood and erosion
control facilities, clear forest trails and fire control areas, and construct
outdoor recreational facilities in national and state parks.

The conservation needs of our nation are continuing and critical. The Youth Conservation Corps will not be just a "make-work" project. It will help to provide the means to preserve and improve our great natural resources in a time when they are threatened by increasing population and urban development.

But a basic purpose of the Youth Conservation Corps is to help solve
a growing problem of unemployment among young men just out of high school.
Thousands of our young high school graduates are unable to find jobs each
June. Too often, their unemployment and inactivity turn to trouble---for

themselves and the communities in which they live. A Youth Conservation Corps could help to turn the tide of youth crime by placing young men into the healthy atmosphere of the outdoors and constructive work, and by training them for responsible action and citizenship.

Our nation, which spends billions each year for weapons of destruction, can surely afford the modest cost of a program to build our national resources and the future of our young men. The strength of the United States can not be measured only in the size and power of our military force. Our military force.

Our nation's power for tomorrow must come from many sources. Our land and our young men are at the top of the list.

That is why I am working for Congressional approval of the Youth Conservation Corps.

#####

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF MAY 2, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING MAY 6, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

In these weeks of Spring, the thoughts of millions of Americans turn to vacation, and outdoor activities. At the same time, many of our young people in school begin thinking about graduation, and the imminent need to find a job.

These two purposes---outdoor recreation and job-hunting---blend to remind us again of the need for a program I have long advocated---the Youth Conservation Corps.

Right now my bill to establish the Youth Conservation Corps is before the Congress. I am hopeful that both the Senate and the House will act on it soon. The President supports this legislation. And so do educators, juvenile authorities and conservation leaders from all areas of the nation.

There are some who oppose my bill to establish the Youth Conservation Corps. Some call it an idealistic, impractical plan. Some say that the Nation can not afford the costs. Some say that it is not really a bad idea, but that the YCC is not necessary.

Such complaints only remind me of the opposition to another of my efforts which succeeded last year—the Peace Corps. I well remember the short-sighted cries that the Peace Corps would not work, and that it was only an impractical dream. It coupt pure your grows of proves a pure a pure a

Those opponents were proved wrong, by the reality of the magnificent success of the Peace Corps in its first year of operation.

Hence Prove Corps at here.

I believe the Youth Conservation Corps will also succeed, and that its performance will convince the opponents that a new idea is not automatically an unworkable idea.

What will the Youth Conservation Corps do?

Ittivil put thousands of young men from the ages of 18 through 21 to work in our Nation's great national and state pakes, forrests and other public lands.

(more)

It will place these young men under the adult supervision of trained and experienced experts in conservation, including forest rangers.

These young men will be assigned to positive, constructive projects
to build up and improve our natural resources and the facilities on them.

They will expand our reforestration programs, build flood and erosion
control facilities, clear forest trails and fire control areas, and construct
outdoor recreational facilities in national and state pairs.

The conservation needs of our nation are continuing and critical. The

Youth Conservation Corps will not be just a "make-work" project. It will

help to provide the means to preserve and improve our great natural resources
in a time when they are threatened by increasing population and urban

development.

But a basic purpose of the Youth Conservation Corps is to help solve a display a growing problem of unemployment among young men just out of high school.

Thousands of our young high school graduates are unable to find jobs each June. Too often, their unemployment and inactivity turn to trouble——for

themselves and the communities in which they live. A Youth Conservation

Corps could help to turn the tide of youth crime by placing young men

into the healthy atmosphere of the outdoors and constructive work and by

training them for responsible action and citizenship.

Our nation, which spends billions each year for weapons of destruction,

can surely afford the modest cost of a program to build our national

resources and the future of our young men. The strength of the United

States can not be measured only in the size and power of our military

force. Our nation's power for tomorrow depoins, in part, on the

Our nation's power for tomorrow must come from many sources. Our land and our young men are at the top of the list.

That is why I am working for Congressional approval of the Youth
Conservation Corps.

Present that Your and American Corps.

mill part or auth

mest year thour of men.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF MAY 8, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING MAY 13, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my Capitol Hill office in Washington, D.C.

As I record this report to you right now, the Senate is preparing to take action on a bi-partisan proposal known as the literacy test bill.

I must admit that the prospects for approval of this legislation are not bright. To call the bill itself up for a vote, the approval of two-thirds of all Senators is required.

This is a reasonable bill. It does <u>not</u> abolish the use of State or local literacy tests as a requirement for voting. It simply establishes a uniform standard to end the use of literacy tests as an unfair barrier to voting by Negro citizens.

The Senate has spent most of the past three weeks debating this bill.

Most of the debate and the Senate speeches will soon be forgotten, no matter what happens when the Senate votes on the issue.

But I will not forget some of the stories about denial of voting rights to Negro citizens as reported by the Attorney General to a Senate Subcommittee.

I will not forget the story of a Negro with a graduate degree who was forced to copy page after page of a State constitution five different times, only to be rejected from voting each time because she ommitted one word or a single punctuation mark.

I will not forget the story of a Negro who could not vote because he could not define and explain "due process of law" to the satisfaction of a southern voting registrar who had little formal education.

I will not forget the story of a Negro who could not vote because he was rejected on the grounds of misspellings, by an official who misspelled the word "misspelling."

These are not rare examples of the denial of voting rights to Negro

citizens. There are thousands of examples of discriminatory use of literacy tests and other local regulations by voting officials in the south.

It is amazing and shocking that in this modern time there are 16 counties in the south in which Negro citizens of voting age are in a majority but in which not a single Negro is registered to vote.

There are 49 other counties with Negro majorities but less than 5 per cent of them are registered.

Minnesota is a long way from the deep southern counties which I have just mentioned. But the problem of denital of voting rights to Negro citizens is and should be close to every citizen, whether he lives in Mississippi or Minnesota or New York. This is a national problem—one which weakens our moral strength and blemishes our pride as a great Nation.

The 15th Amendment to our Constitution states——and I quote: "the rights of citizens to the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude." The Constitution also says:

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

It is my pledge to continue the effort to assure the enforcement of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution. We can not halt the effort to assure Constitution rights, or civil rights—or what I prefer to call "human rights"—to every citizen. The Kennedy Administration, through the Department of Justice, has taken great steps forward to guarantee basic civil rights to all citizens. Congress must keep pace, to reach the time when <u>full citizenship</u> will be guaranteed to every American. If the effort is not enough this year, then it must be repeated in Congress next year—and every year until America justifies its proud boast of "the land of the free."

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--
This is your senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Around this time each year we read news accounts that Congress is "bogged down" in the legislative process and that the Congressional session probably will not produce much action.

Such reports are not very reliable——and they are a bit amusing.

To criticize Congress in May for a lack of action is like criticizing

a baseball team for not winning a game in the fifth inning, or like

criticizing a housewife for not producing a pie before it is placed in

the oven.

Any judgment of Congress should await the final day of the session.

That day for this Congressional session will come sometime in September—we hope in early September.

And I predict that on the final day of this Congressional session, the record of the 87th Congress will be one of the best since the early 1930's.

This Congress already has acted on more major legislation than any Congressional session in 30 years.

We passed the Area Redevelopment Act, to help economically distressed areas to help themselves to recovery.

We approved the most sweeping housing program since the end of World War II.

We adopted a sound and ambitious Federal Highway Program.

We liberalized the Social Security Act to boost benefits for widows, the elderly, the blind and the disabled.

We authorized a vitally necessary program of grants to help local communities develop water pollution control facilities.

We boosted the minimum wage standard to \$1.25 an hour and extended coverage under this law to millions of additional workers.

We enacted the Humphrey Bill to establish a Peace Corps of young Americans to work overseas helping local citizens help themselves to knowledge and progress.

We established through my legislation the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

And we approved the new and exciting "Allaince for Progress" program for economic development of Latin America.

The job is not done. Right now, several major legislative programs are pending in Congressional committees or in either of the two houses of Congress. By September, I predict that Congress will approve the major provisions of these programs, which include:

Health and hospital insurance for the elderly under the social security system——a program to allow our citizens to have pre-paid hospital and nursing home care without the need for humiliating means tests.

A tax reform bill to provide incentive to business for new investments

and to close loopholes in existing taxes.

A trade program to give the President a better chance to keep America in a healthy, competitive position with foreign markets.

A program of financial aid to higher education in the form of lens for college housing, classrooms, libraries and scholarships.

A <u>public works program</u> for an immediate step up of projects to provide new jobs and for a long-range stand-by authority for the President to order public works projects to fight recession.

A Youth Conservation Corps——this is my bill——to put young men to work in the nation's forests and other public lands.

For those who are impatient about the record of the 87th Congress, I suggest that they study the record this Congress has already made---and check again in September when that record is even more impressive.



help.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF MAY 29, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE 3, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office in Washington, D.C.

The position of United States Senator offers many satisfactions, which quickly justify the long hours, the hard work and the lack of time to spend with family.

Some of the satisfactions are obvious and dramatic. They include the opportunity to be close to the center of decision-making for the nation and the world. They include the weekly meetings at the White House with the President and other legislative leaders. They include such experiences as my term as a delegate to the United Nations.

But the most deeply satisfying part of my job as United States Senator from Minnesota is to be able to help individual citizens who need and deserve

Each week, dozens of Minnesotans write to me for help with problems they have relating to a Federal department or agency. The problems are varied.

An elderly women may ask about a Social Security payment which is overdue.

A businessman may ask to speed up a decision on a local from the Small Business Administration. A farmer may need information from the Department of Agriculture.

These are all priority requests, and, fortunately, I am able to find the solution or the answer in most cases.

Let me tell you about one, individual case which was recently solved.

This is a dramatic example, and will give you an idea of how deeply satisfying my job can be.

It involves a St. Paul man, Mr. Frank H. Boston.

Mr. Boston is 64 years old now. Recently, he was forced to retire from his job as a shipping clerk because of ill health.

A year ago, he wrote to me to ask help with the Navy Department. He

told me this story:

In World War I, Mr. Boston served with distinction in the United States
Navy. He made 18 trips as a Naval seaman, through dangerous submarine zones
of the Atlantic. In 1920, he received an honorable discharge.

A few months later, he re-enlisted. A few months hater, he was charged with being AWOL--- "absent without leave--- from his ship while it was in a California port. He was away from the ship for a total of five days.

In those days, the commander of a ship could summarily order any enlisted man without any review. Although there were extenuating circumstances,

Frank Boston was given a bad conduct with discharge.

Mr. Boston spent the next 30 years as a responsible, reliable and successful citizen. But he worried about the bremish on his record. A year ago, he wrote to me and to the American Legion, asking if something could be done to correct his record.

We went to work. My file on this case is an inch thick, with letters and notes on phone calls to the proper officials in the Navy.

Our efforts succeeded. Recently---and after months of a complete and careful review---the U.S. Navy Board of Correction of Naval Records agreed that Mr. Boston's bad conduct discharge had been a (quote) "severe injustice." The board changed this to a "general discharge, under honorable conditions."

Mr. Boston did not seek to change the record for monetary reasons. He will not receive any special money benefits because of this change. His primary motive was, I think, noble. He wanted the country which he has served so well to record the truth of his service. And he hopes that when he passes away, he will be able to be buried in a National Cemetery.

Mr. Boston's case is an example of one fact which no American should ever forget. That fact is that no matter how big our government xxxxxx agencies or departments become, the individual citizen is still the most important element in our society.

I was glad to be able to prove that fact again in Mr. Boston's case——and to prove it dozens of times a week with other cases involving individual Minnesotans.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 7, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE 10, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office in Washington, D.C.

A little while ago, one of my sons came home from school with a smile on his face and a mid-term report card in his hand.

He was happy because he had boosted his grade in one course from a "C" to a "B". I was pleased, too, for I knew that my boy was capable of far more than a "C" grade. And I knew he had won the better grade by determined effort and hard work.

Instead of merely patting him on the back, I asked him to work harder during the final mid-term period, to try new methods of study and work. For I know he is capable of earning an "A" in the course.

I think my son's situation and the state of the American economy are very much alike. A few years ago, you remember, our Nation was in the midst of a serious recession. Our country was basically strong, but unemployment was going up and business activity was going down.

(more)

The best grade we could have applied to our Nation's economic report card was a mediocre "C"--and I suspect we barely qualified for that.

Since the recession of 1960, our economy has improved as the result of hard work and some new methods. I think we now rate a good, solid and respectable "B" grade for economic health, activity and performance.

Let me tell you why: Since the first quarter of 1961, America's gross national product has increased nine and a half per cent. Corporate profits before taxes have increased one-third. Our labor income rate has risen ten per cent. Unemployment has dropped from 6.9 per cent of the labor force to 5.5 per cent. Industrial production has been up 15 per cent, and it is still rising. The public spent \$20 billion more in the marketplace.

All of this points to a Nation which is basically strong, prosperous and growing.

But we would not be conscientious citizens—or patriotic Americans—if we remained satisfied with merely a "better than average" performance. The tradition of America is excellence. We have never settled for second best. We want to be first.

And as your Senator from Minnesota, I find several areas of our economy which can stand further improvement. Our unemployment rate is still too high. Consumer spending is still too low. Business investment for modernization is still too little. And the nation's economic growth is still too slow.

Last week, I met in New York with officials of the New York Stock

Exchange and other financial leaders. What I learned about the recent

instability of the stock market strenghtened my belief that economic policies

which stimulate growth and expansion are long overdue.

As your Senator, and as an independent member of the Kennedy Administration team in Washington, I propose four actions to strengthen our economy. And I propose they be taken now. These are my proposals:

First, that private industry and government commit themselves to reduce unemployment to no more than four per cent of the work force.

Second, that a stepped up public works program be placed into operation at once.

Third, that we boost our exports through a massive overseas selling program. This requires immediate Congressional approval of the President's foreign trade expansion bill.

And fourth, that corporate income taxes be cut between two and four per cent and that personal income taxes be cut two per cent-and right now.

It is a fact that investment has lagged behind corporate cash flow.

New and increased investment can and must be stimulated by a new and more

liberal tax policy. The tax cuts I recommend now would inject about \$5 billion

of capital into the economy.

These tax cuts and the investment tax credit provisions in the President's tax bill would overcome any obstruction to captial improvement and full economic recovery.

I feel that this is not an age in which we can assure our freedom, our survival and our growth with just a "B"-grade effort and a "things are OK" philosophy. I think we need an A-OK performance, not just from our astronauts, but from all segments of our nation.

We need to strive for full economic health and excellence. We need to earn an "A" for economic prosperity. (END)

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 12, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE 17, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

Recently, the Senate approved by a wide margin the President's foreign aid program for fiscal year 1963.

Today, I want to talk with you about the meaning and the need of the current foreign aid program. And I want to answer some of the questions you have been asking in letters to me.

Some of you have asked why it is still necessary for the United States to expend so much money for foreign aid programs. Some have asked why this Nation has committed itself to continuing foreign aid programs 17 years after the end of World War II. And some have asked why the United States carries such a big share of the costs of foreign aid programs.

I am confident that the American people are willing to pay the necessary costs to secure and extend freedom and peace. And I believe that Americans are willing to face the fact that foreign aid programs will be necessary for years to come. But we know also that our foreign aid policy is centered on the idea of helping other nations to help themselves to security and progress. Through our foreign aid programs, we strive for the day when all areas of the world will follow the example of Western Europe in becoming self-sustaining and strong allies in the fight for freedom.

As a member of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations and as an adviser to the President, it is my job to see that your tax dollars are used efficiently and prudently in our foreign aid programs. And as an American, it is my responsibility to see that we do not retreat from our obligations to work for a stronger free world through foreign aid.

That is why the United States can not rely only on military strength in the present world struggle. We must fight the enemies of freedom not just with guns and the threat of bombs——but also with food, and medicine, and education and technical assistance.

It is difficult to measure the effects of these weapons, but we do have a magnificent example. The aid we extended to the nations of Western Europe in the years after World War II have built a strong, dynamic and thriving area which stands as a solid bulwark and challenge to Communism. Today, we are attempting with our foreign aid programs, to build the same conditions in Asia and Latin American and Africa and the Middle East.

There are some Americans who complain that American foreign aid is simply a "giveaway" or that we are "pouring our tax dollars down the drain." My answer to that is that most of our foreign aid is in the form of loans, which are repaid by the recipient nations. And most of our aid is in the form of goods and services produced in the United States. Foreign aid thus serves to strengthen our own economy.

The basis answer to all these questions is that foreign aid is in our own national interest. The dollars we spend to build the strength of another nation add to our own security, strengthen the forces of freedom and nourish the conditions of peace.

This is no longer a big world of isolated nations. It is a small world in which the conditions in one area directly affect the people of another area. The speed of travel by jet airplane and communication by radio and television has truly made one world in which all people are involved in the problems and the challenges of a critical age.

Sadly, we do not live in a peaceful or secure world. We---and all men who love freedom---are threatened by the forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship.

Those forces thrive on poverty, on hunger, on ignorance. The forces of Communism are strengthened by confusion, and fear, and discontent.

We can not protect our own freedom and extend it to other people unless we fight the basic conditions of misery which grip two-thirds of the world's people.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 21, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE , 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow Minnesotans -This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting
to you from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington,
D. C.

A few weeks ago, I ran across one of the most shocking and disgraceful situations I have observed in my 13 years in Washington.

While walking along our magnificent Capitol grounds, I observed some fine, clean-cut looking students on their way home from school. I also observed the school books they were carrying. They were books so battered and tattered, aged and worn

that they had to be held together with string and rubber bands.

I asked to examine some of them, and found that most had been written and published in the 1930's. In fact, one was printed in 1925 and another in 1916. One science book told how airplanes now are able to fly around the world, although they have to stop occasionally for gas and oil. A physics book told how melting ice chills food in modern refrigerator boxes.

There was, of course, nothing in these books about the space age or nuclear physics. And I wondered how many of our badly needed scientists and engineers and physicists will be coming out of these schools.

Digging into the situation, I soon learned (more)

these obsolescent books, falling apart after years of use, were not isolated examples at all. They are commonplace in Washington, D.C. schools.

Well, I was appalled and then I got angry.

And I determined I was going to do something about such a decrepit and intolerable situation.

Perhaps you are wondering why Hubert Humphrey,
a Minnesota Senator, should be bothering himself,
and now you, about this? The answer is for the
simple reason that it is our fault -- mine and yours.

For Washington is my Capitol City, your Capitol City, every American's Capitol City. We are all justly proud of the magnificent buildings, and memorials and monuments in our American Capitol City of Washington.

And so I think we should all be justly shamed (more)

by the incredibly decrepit textbook situation in our Federal City's schools.

What is more, we, the Senators and Congressmen you send to Washington from Minnesota and all the States, rule Our Capitol City. We are the City Council of Washington, D.C. And we, the Congress, have been derelict in our responsibilities.

To give you another example, I also learned that Washington has the worst school library system in the whole country. Washington spends about 70 cents a pupil on school library books. The national standard is \$3 a pupil. The result is that none of Washington's 125 elementary schools has a library at all. Some high schools 10 years old have only the bare bones of a library. And no school has a full-time librarian.

Well, I vowed on the Senate floor the other day that I would wage a one-man crusade until this tragic school book situation is corrected. It's going to take some of my time, and a lot of energy and persuasion and money. But it has to be done.

Minnesotans, I know, would never tolerate a situation like this. And I cannot think of a single problem that is more urgent before the Congress.

The other night, on an interview program, we were talking a bit about the near-impossible 16-hour workday required of a Senator attempting to serve his State conscientiously.

Well, it is true. But in the crush of things,

I think we have forgotten that every member of Congress

Serves two constituencies -- his own State and the Capitol City of Washington, D.C.

I feel the youth of Washington, D.C. deserve the modern, decent, up-to-date textbooks and library books that Minnesota youngsters receive. And I'm not going to quit working until they get them.

It would be a tragedy -- the children's, America's and ours -- if this astonishingly bad situation is not corrected.

I'm sure you agree with me our Nation's Capitol
City, Washington, D.C. should be as much of a showplace
of America as is our wonderful State of Minnesota.

(END)

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 27, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JULY 1, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office in Washington, D.C.

In the past few weeks, thousands of schools throughout the Nation have conducted commencement ceremonies marking the completion of education for their students. More than two million young men and women were graduated from high schools in the United States. In our own State of Minnesota, 40,000 students completed their high school education this June.

This is an appropriate time to comment on the importance of education in America——and to express the hope that many more of our high school graduates will continue their education, broaden their knowledge and improve their skills.

I express this hope not just because the individual American today can do far better in advancing his career and the well-being of his family if he has an advanced education.

My hope is that more and more students will go on to colleges, universities and advanced vocational schools because the Nation as a whole needs the greater skills and knowledge which education can give.

The United States is engaged in a continuing and critical world struggle.

We---and the allies of freedom and peace---are pitted against a powerful,

clever and skilled enemy which would mold the peoples of the world into

slaves of the state.

This struggle requires strength from the United States. It will not be a brief struggle, with a quick and distinct victory in our lifetime. It will be long and demanding.

And we can not win this struggle for freedom and peace with military might alone. We can win it only if the United States in strong and growing economically, socially, technically, politically—and if we are willing to

use our strengths throughout the world wherever totalitarianism threatens to control men.

America's strength in all the areas I mention does not spring automatically from some action of the government. Our strength does not grow because of steps by big business or big unions.

The strength of the United States comes from the skills and knowledge and wisdom of individual Americans—educated to the techniques of the space age and responsive to the social challenges of a world torn by need and conflict.

Perhaps one basic question in the minds of our recent high school graduates——and indeed in the minds of all citizens——is how the individual American can identify himself with the massive problems and challenges of his country. How can the individual American recognize the relation of his efforts and contributions to the housen huge and complex policies and goals of America and the free world?

The answer is that this nation can not progress—and will not survive—unless the individual American has modern skills and is educated to modern challenges. A totalitarian society or a Communist dictatorship may be able to grow and even prosper only with actions of the government and it leaders. But we are a free nation with representative government. Thus, our nation can be strong only through the individual skills and contributions of our free citizens.

That is why I urge our recent high schools graduates to seek a higher education. They must pursue excellence, whether they intend to become scientists or doctors or businessmen or carpenters.

I congratulate the young people of Minnesota who have just been graduated from high school. But I add a challenge to them to go on to learn

NEW

skills and acquire new knowledge. The nation—and the cause of freedom—needs both.

2 P. MU MON.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JULY 2, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JULY 8, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office in Washington, D.C.

A few days ago, I met with a fine Minnesota couple who repeated to me one of the most dramatic and inspiring stories of citizen reponsibility I have ever heard.

Their names are Mr. and Mrs. Paul M. Shaw, of Deer River---up in .

Itasca County.

The Shaws came to Washington so that Mrs. Shaw---Beverly---could

**Lineal Fellic
represent the Deer River Women's Club at a meeting of the National Association
of Women's Clubs.

On behalf of the Deer River Women's Club, Mrs. Shaw accepted the Sears
Foundation Community Service Award---and with it a check for \$1,000.

As Mrs. Shaw said, this award really belongs to <u>all</u> of the people of the Deer River area for their constributions to an unusual and highly successful project.

The project was the planning, financing and construction of a new 20bed hospital in Deer River---without one dollar a State or Federal funds.

The Community Memorial Hospital of Deer River has been in operation for 15 months. It has treated more than 1,000 patients in that time. It continues to serve almost 5,000 people in the area around Deer River. And it stands as a magnificent example of what determined people can do when they join together in a common cause.

The cause started in 1955, when the private hospital in Deer River was condemned.

Mr. and Mrs. Shaw and others in the community quickly learned that neither the State nor the Federal government could provide any help to build a new hospital.

The people of Deer River were not discouraged. They moved ahead on their

(MORE)

own. They were determined to have a hospital in their community to protect the health and the lives of people living in the area.

A committee was formed——representing all areas of the community——and . set to work to raise funds privately for the hospital.

To make a long and complicated story short, the citizens of the Deer River area raised more than \$275,000 in private contributions.

The method of fund raising did not involve any highly professional public relations techniques or pressures for government funds. The people of the Deer River area gave the money themselves. They raised money through cake sales. They worked extra hard and contributed their extra earnings. They used basic imagination and plain hard work, and after four years, they had enough to begin construction.

Much of the actual construction work on the hospital was done by the people themselves, with their own hands. Men and women who could not contribute dollars instead constributed their time and skills and work.

Today, the people of the Deer River area have a modern, well-staffed and well-equipped hospital of which they are justifiably proud. They are proud because they developed, financed and built this hospital themselves. It is--truly--their hospital.

I think that every American community can learn a lesson from the people of Deer River. The lesson is in the basic tradition of America.

It is a lesson of individual initiative and free-enterprise.

The lesson from the Deer River Community Memorial Hospital is, above all, that people who rely on their own resources and skills can acheive anything they wish.

I hope that more and more American communities will follow the example of the people of Deer River.

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JULY 15, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you from
my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

Today, I want to report two pieces of good news for Minnesota---and particularly for the northeastern section of our State.

Let me say first that the progress and prosperity of Minnesota depends on <u>all</u> of its parts. If one area of the State lags, the whole State is held back. If one area moves ahead, the people of the whole State benefit.

The biggest challenge to Minnesota in recent years has been the economy recovery and progress of Northeastern Minnesota. And that challenge has been met——in part——by two new developments in the past week.

The first was the decision of one of the Nation's major electronics firms to established new plant in the city of Hibbing. The firm is Hoff man Electronics, Inc., an important manufacturer of governmental, industrial and

consumer electronics equipment and the Nation's major supplier of solar cells used to power satellites.

Last February, I met with officials of this firm and started an effort to encourage them to locate a new plant in the Iron Range area of Minnesota.

The effort took much time and energy——and a big selling job to acquaint Hoffman officials with the skills and resources available in Northeastern Minnesota.

The effort paid off, and will continue to pay off with more jobs for workers in the area and an economic stimulus to Northeastern Minnesota.

The new Hoffman plant will open within the next two months, employing at LOCALLY. first 50 workers recruited from the local area. The first major production job for the new Hibbing plant has already been confirmed——a \$3.7 million contract to produce nagigational testing equipment for military aircraft.

The effect of the New Hoffman plant will be immediate, but there is a greater long-range significance.

This will be the first electronics production firm to move into Northeastern

Minnesota. The Hoffman decision also represents the <u>first</u> time in ten years that <u>any</u> major national firm has established a new plant in Northeastern

Minnesota.

And as John O'Brien, Vice President of Hoffman has said, when one firm in a particular industry moves into a new geographical area, others are likely to follow. Thus, I look forward to the time when a major new industry—electronics—expands in Northeastern Minnesota to provide jobs and economic progress for the area.

The second major development of the past week was the announcement by the President that revisions have been ordered for tax depreciation schedules on new equipment invested by industry.

This order will provide a major incentive for economic expansion and development in such areas as Northeastern Minnnesota. I believe it will have a more immediate effect than a straight tax cut.

In the taconite industry, for example, companies which decide on a major investment or expansion in Minnesota will be able to plan a complete tax

write-off of capital equipment costs in just half the time of the old schedule, a reduction from 20 years to ten years on the average.

This tax incentive will mean new industry, greater expansion, more work and more jobs in Northeastern Minnesota and other areas of the State.

The President's announcement came seven months after Senator McCarthy,

Congressman Blatnik and I first urged the Secretary of the Treasurey to con
sider this major tax incentive. Once again, the time and effort we spent on

this project has paid off---and will continue to pay off on a long-range basis

for the people of Minnesota.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JULY 19, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JULY 22, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow Minnesotans-This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D. C.

The Senate Finance Committee this week will start hearings on what I think is the most important bill not only of this session, but of the 1960's.

This is President Kennedy's bold new approach to international trade.

The President's plan has already passed the House by an overwhelming margin. And I am certain it will pass the Senate overwhelmingly.

The reasons the President's trade bill is so important are these:

First, it will enable the United States to trade and

prosper with a new and third economic force in the world -the booming European Common Market.

And, second, I feel it will mean the beginning of the eventual end for international communism.

Let me explain what I mean:

The European Common Market is simply the organization of six European Nations -- West Germany, France, Italy, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg -- to trade together unhindered by tariff barriers.

Since these countries got together four years ago and began trading goods without tariffs -- just as Minnesota ships goods to Wisconsin and vice versa -- they have prospered at an unprecendented rate.

And soon Great Britain will join, and so will seven other European nations. What this will mean ultimately is a thriving United States of Europe, with an economy as

strong as any in the world.

Now, we are a great trading country; in fact, the greatest in the world. Last year, we sold \$20 billion worth of goods abroad, while we imported \$15 billion worth. In other words, we had a favorable balance of trade of \$5 billion.

But if we don't grant the President the means to negotiate away the tariffs -- the barriers -- with Common Market countries, we will lose this favorable balance of trade. For what will happen is this:

A country such as West Germany, for example, would have no desire to buy anything from us that she could get from any other European country -- because there would be a big duty on the American item, but none on the European.

Now let's get back to what I said earlier about the beginning of the eventual end for communism.

Well, just imagine the strength and vitality of a

free trade bloc composed of Western Europe, Britain and her Commonwealth, the U.S., Japan and Latin America, with the communists on the outside looking in.

No wonder Khrushchev attacks the Common Market. In
Hubert Humphrey, Khrushchev
the opinion of is more concerned about it than
about nuclear testing or Berlin.

I feel the President's trade bill is just about the strongest anti-communist measure we can take in the 1960's.

And there's a third reason I support the President's bold new trade approach. Because it will be good for Minnesota.

To give you an idea: In 1960, more than \$176 million worth of manufactured goods from Minnesota were shipped overseas.

These goods were made by some 990 manufacturing firms located in Minnesota. What's more, our grand North Star State produced \$164 million worth of farm products for

shipment abroad.

As the trading economy of the United States and the Common Market will thrive, so will the economy of Minnesota.

My Minnesota friends, America did not become great by ducking challenges. We're proud of our free enterprise system and feel it can compete with any country. Our private industries don't want government subsidies, which are what tariffs are.

A third force in the world is growing, the Western

European Economic Community, a force already more healthy

and vibrant than the Soviet Union.

The United States should be not only the friend, but the full fledged trading partner of that force.

And the trade bill now before the Senate Finance Committee is the first step toward this vital goal.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JULY 25, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JULY 29, 1962

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow Minnesotans-This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

A few days ago, an exciting and momentous event took place before all of our eyes—an event as magical and as thrilling as any in our recent history.

This was Telestar, a satellite fired into orbit which resulted in the first beaming of a <u>live</u> television picture from one continent to another.

And the very moment that President Kennedy spoke to and was seen by dozens of reporters here in Washington, he spoke to and was seen by millions of people in Europe.

I might add, too, that many of these millions were behind the Iron Curtain in East Germany and Yugoslavia.

Sometimes, in the blur of our fast-paced world, we don't stop to appreciate just how tremendous each of these scientific achievements is.

Up until last week's Telestar experiments, the world had been able to send only radio, telephone and telegraph messages from one continent to another.

Now we will soon have instant television communication from any spot in the world to any other, by relaying audio-visual messages from a continent to a number of satellites in orbit, and from there on to another continent.

Think of it: Americans will be able to watch the Olympic Games from Tokyo in 1964, the moment they happen. Europeans will be able to tune in on a United Nations debate the moment it takes place. Africans and Asians will be able to see the real America unfold before their eyes—and so will the Iron Curtain countries.

For there will be no iron, no aurtain strong enough to keep out

Slobel televisios.

Now, Telestar just didn't happen because someone in government snapped his fingers here in Washington--or someone in private industry snapped his fingers in New York.

Telestar took an enormous amount of research, development and just plain hard work on the part of both government and industry.

And it worked because the American Telephone and Telegraph Company was able to develop the satellite, and because the American government was able to develop the rocket system to fire it into orbit.

This was just one more example of the remarkable results achieved by the cooperative efforts of industry and government—just as was the unforgettable flight of Colonel John Glenn.

We could use much more of this cooperative spirit in the United States today.

We are belatedly discovering that private industry must take a more active role in government-initiated programs. Foreign aid is an example.

Our foreign aid has been notably effective over the years, but with more private know-how involved, it could have worked even greater miracles.

What government and industry must realize, your Minnesota Senator

follows is that the job is the important thing—it has got to be done,
and if no one can do it by himself, then the other has got to help out.

This brings me to my second point.

The Senate is now considering the President's communications satellite bill.

Its purpose is to provide for the establishment, ownership and operation of a communications satellite system—in other words, a whole global network of Telestars.

When the bill was drawn, there were two choices: One, to let the government own and pperate it exclusively. Or two, to let private industry do it, under the regulation of the government, or you, the taxpayer.

The President's unhesitating choice, and the bill we are considering now, provides for establishment of a private corporation to do the job.

In backing private enterprise, President Kennedy noted that throughout our history, our entire communications system has been privately run.

Privately run, but government regulated.

The telephone, telegraph, radio and television are all splendid examples of this cooperative effort.

The House of R presentatives has already passed the President's bill and I support it wholeheartedly. The President is now waiting for the Senate to act on it.

That action, I know, will be forthcoming soon and will be favorable.

And America will be on its way, full speed ahead, to creating
the first global TV network—and one that will achieve vital and valuable
educational and political benefits for America and the world for decades to come.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF AUGUST 1, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING AUGUST 5, 1962

Ladies and Gentlemen and Fellow Minnesotans-This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

There is one problem in this world of ours bigger, tougher and more important than any other by far.

That problem is diarmament.

The reason it is bigger, tougher and more important than ever is:this:

Within two or three years, 10 to 15 more nations are going to be able

to send off enough nuclear weapons to blow up the world-each one all by itself.

The immensely costly research job is done. Many nations now possess the how-to-do-it book. The only expense now is to build the weapons and the rockets to send them off.

Think what this means: A dozen small nations, some friendly to the United States and some not-so-friendly, will soon be able to put satellites with nuclear payloads into orbit--to drop whenever and wherever they wish.

And what is even more fantastic: No one would know who did it.

That is why Hubert Humphrey feels the United States, more now than ever before, must press and press hard-must press firmly and press courageously-for at least a beginning toward disarmament.

The only way we can hope to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of dozens of small nations is for the United States, Great Britain, France and the Soviet Union to take the lead and agree to nuclear disarmament themselves.

Believe me, I am not trying to frighten anyone. I am not frightened myself. But I am concerned.

For as more and more nations develop nuclear weapons and the means to launch them, the danger of nuclear war by miscalculation, by accident or by the spreading of a small brushfire into an all-out holocaust increases at a terrible rate.

Now there are some in America who feel that to be concerned about this and to work toward preventing it is to be some kind of sissy and show cowardice.

Well, my friends, I don't feel disarmament is anything at all for sissies to fool with.

It takes more courage to try to prevent nuclear suicide in a hostile world than it does to let everyone arm themselves to the teeth and then sit back and foolishly feel that everyone is safe.

At one time, the safety of a country could be guaranteed by military strength alone. This is no longer true.

That is why we have to press on toward a disarmament treaty, but without relaxing our guard.

And let me stress that--about not relaxing our guard. Anyone who feels America will settle for a disarmament without safeguards which could enable us to detect a cheating nation just doesn't know America--the country famed for plain, good common sense.

Sure, the Communists still want to conquer the world. They haven't changed--or haven't changed enough.

But they can't escape the fact, either, that they have everything to lose from a world on the verge of blowing itself apart.

As you may know, your senior Senator from Minnesota, is chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament.

As chairman, I can report to you that the United States is making good progress toward being able to tell by instruments when and where someone in testing nuclear weapons—anywhere in the world.

When this can be done for certain—and it won't be long—the chances for disarmament will be greatly improved...

Yes, there are, indeed, risks in moving forward toward a disarmament agreement.

But there are more risks in doing absolutely nothing at all, while big and small nations throughout the world develop more and more weapons sufficient to blow it apart 10 times over.

I don't think this will happen. I am an optimist.

And I feel that Americans will rise to this grave challenge of disarmament and will solve this enormous problem before it is too late.

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE FOR WEEK OF AUG. FOR BROADCAST DURING WEEK OF AUG.

Ladies and Gentlemen and Fellow Minnesotans -
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to

from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.

Today I would like to talk to you are about a truly great

American heroine and two lessons I think we might learn grom her

noble deed.

The heroine is Dr. Frances Kelsey, and I am sure you have already heard a good deal about her. She is the mini medical officer of the Food and Drug Administration of our government who saved thousands and the manual of American a rents the heartbreak of a minimum deformed babbe by blocking approval and for more than a year of a tranquilizer—a drug called thalidomide.

Dr. Kelsey, who, by the wayr is a neighbor of ours from South Dakota, refused under great pressure to okay this drug thalidomide--even though it had already become Germany's most popular sleeping tablet.

The reason she did this was her chance reading of a letter to the editor at in a British medical journal which told of a minor side effect of the drug.

She became suspicious - and you probably know the rest.

Dr. Kelsey's insistence on knowing more about the drug
before approving it formser in the White States kept the drug
PROM
out of wide-spread distribution in the United States. And then
it was learned in Europe that thalidomide also caused defermations.

one thing I think should be emphasized is that Dr. Kelsey is typical of the thousands of dedicated loyal and somerful public servants of your government in Washington who generally go unsung, unhonored and unrewarded.

We always hear a good deal of criticism from the same old sources about big bureaucracy thank and big government in Washington.

country -- a great and rapidly growing country -- which is continually faced with new and hig problems; we never had before.

what to do The testing and regulation of thousands of new drugs is just one of those new problems.

I think we also tend to forget sometimes that the federal government and aggregations is our government, composed of people just like us who are working, like Dr. Kelsey, so diligently in our behalf. And I might add, at much smaller pay than some would be able to make in private an practice.

for us is the tragic tack or coordination between governments --- and even perween agencies of our own government, on drug information

Your Minnesota Senator had the good for sume the other day, I COUDULTED to home a man Senate subcommittee hearing on the exchange of drug information, at which Dr. Kelsey testified.

What struck me is that Dr. Kelsey's courageous action depended on her chance reading of a British medical journal -- one of the world's 4000 medical * journals.

Here was a drug in common use in Germany, which we the British had observed to he have suspicious side affects-Germany
yet was this wasn't known; in Relian or the United States.

What we need today is faster, more complete, better indextd and up-to-date evaluated information on all new drugs-information that will be instantly accessible in any area of any part of the world.

This problem of scientific information and coordination is one I have been studying for more than four years.

As our knowledge of the world and our solutions to problems increases by leaps and bounds, it becomes in reasingly harder to keep abreast of the developments—and to be able to lay our hands immediately on the right information.

As chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Reforganization,

I have suggested new legislation to assure thorough control

by the Food and Drug Administration of the testing of

drugs on human beings.

I have also suggested that, through the lead of the United States, the World Heath Organization provide for the exchange of up-to-the minute date of drugs in all countries.

I feel such actions will minimize the chance of a drug like thalidomide ever being sold or used in the United States.

The health of our people - and particularly our newly-born - --

Releave full Wirm spessly for Wed A, or, Francis top exit. Fan derviding John Bootoy Warren Mayren

will be at mercy of a stronge EEC com wht aren i Fir sugar plin Pret to 100 in strong a effections for any,

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF AUGUST 7, 1962 FOR BROADCAST DURING WEEK OF AUGUST 12

Ladies and Gentlemen and Fellow Minnesotans -
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D. C.

Today I would like to talk to you about a truly great American heroine and two lessons I think we might learn from her noble deed.

The heroine is Dr. Frances Kelsey. I am sure you have already heard a good deal about her. She is the medical officer of the Food and Drug Administration of our government who saved thousands of American parents the heartbreak of a deformed baby by blocking approval for more than a year of a drug called thalidomide.

Dr. Kelsey, who, by the way, is a neighbor of ours

from South Dakota, refused under great pressure to okay this drug thalidomide -- even though it had already become Germany's most popular sleeping tablet.

The reason she did this was her chance reading of a letter to the editor in a British medical journal which told of a minor side effect of the drug.

Dr. Kelsey's insistence on knowing more about the drug before approving it kept the drug from wide-spread distribution in the United States. And then it was learned in Europe that thalidomide also caused deformed babies.

Dr. Kelsey is typical of thousands of dedicated and loyal public servants of your government in Washington who generally go unsung, unhonored and unrewarded.

We always hear a good deal of criticism from the same old sources about big bureaucracy and big government

in Washington.

What they forget is that this is a big country -a great and rapidly growing country -- which is
continually faced with new and big problems we never
had before.

The testing and regulation of thousands of modern new drugs is just one of those new problems.

The second thing Dr. Kelsey's noble performance illustrates for us is the tragic lack of coordination between governments -- and even between agencies of our own government -- on drug information.

The other day, I conducted a Senate subcommittee hearing on the exchange of drug information, at which Dr. Kelsey testified.

What struck me is that Dr. Kelsey's courageous action depended on her chance reading of a British

medical journal -- one of the world's 4000 medical journals.

Here was a drug in common use in Germany, which the British had observed to have suspicious side affects -- yet this wasn't known in Germany or the United States.

What we need today is faster, more complete, better indexed and up-to-date evaluated information on all new drugs -- information that will be instantly accessible in any area of any part of the world.

This problem of scientific information and coordination is one I have been studying for more than four years.

As our knowledge of the world and our solutions to problems increases by leaps and bounds, it becomes increasingly harder to keep abreast of the developments --

and to be able to lay our hands immediately on the right information.

As chairman of the Senate subcommittee on Reorganization, I have suggested new legislation to assure thorough control by the Food and Drug Administration of the testing of drugs on human beings.

I have also suggested that, through the lead of the United States, the World Health Organization provide for the exchange of up-to-the minute data of drugs in all countries.

Such actions will minimize the chance of a drug like thalidomide ever being sold or used in the United States.

The health of our people -- and particularly our newly-born -- must be fully protected.

1) Com Lat bill on 2) Then aquinos of to mercials of Barre admin plan

Line the model of the state of to sold at the sold of the so fied grannstoners Cany 2 interestant day Duy lightuling Mars immunizating completed in ansnit fut white Lade bill aheard of tas bill in henote. Wouth Employ Jopp Bill

Fax aut Filory die lock resport in Congress, XXX - July reports support out more than fune reports ila do dolivermofai benevieve edeb#01-ya mp-aexcuni House leaders think com get ant of rules must tos cralit Sept 10-15 Conquer adjournes. Those preame larry of the state dept -bet. West should conduct veget spec needs of feel got for enfor

tenances control an of non-noting stock ' every can very Bd of Firest - Mayby me addit, member appt by Rundent 4 It member at chair Pres would have one more director than private firm. trady bull aught to be out of Fin Engley lost week of augustina i mater au mater de la material de la companya de la com

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF AUGUST 15, 1962 FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING AUGUST 19

gin

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office in Washington, D.C.

Today I want to talk with you about the so-called "space-race," and the most recent achievement--by the Soviets---of orbiting two men in separate capsules around the earth at the same time.

Let's face it. This was a spectacular and impressive scientific achievement.

It was significant in many ways.

First---and most important---the two capsules, traveling 18,000 miles an hour 130 miles above the earth, were able to rendevous in space. At one

point, they apparently were in sight of each other. This achievement represents a major breakthrough in space travel.

Second, the two Soviet space capsules---one up for three days and the other four days---orbited the earth a total of 106 times. Their combined mileage was equal to more than five round-trips to the moon.

Third, the effort and the success of the dual space flights by the Soviets prove that they are determined to reach the moon—and are capable of doing so—in the near future.

Where does the United States stand now in this "space race"?

President Kennedy has given us an honest answer to that question. We are behind, but we too have built a solid record of space achievement through the flights of Colonel John Glenn and others and the successful orbiting of Tel-Star, the communications satellite.

And we do not intend to lag behind the Soviet achievements any longer.

Today, we are pouring our funds, our energies and our best scientific minds into an effective effort to explore the mysteries of the universe.

Many Americans may ask: "Why are we doing it? Why are we expending so much to send men and machines into outer-space?"

The answer does not just involve propaganda, or an effort to match or

DEVELOP

wissions.

And the answer---for the United States---joes not just involve military

CONSIDERATIONS.

Conditions. We seek to make outer-space a laboratory of peace, not a

nuclear battleground.

The answer is basically the same as was given to the skeptics who wondered why Columbus sailed away from the comfortable shores of Spain toward an unknown destination. It is the same as the answer given to those who questioned the voyages of those who sailed to establish the first

American settlemen at Jamestown. It is the same as the answer given to those

WERE DUBIOUS ABOUT THE PIONEERS WHO

who pushed West in this country as pioneers to open a vast and rich continent.

Whenever and whereever men have explored new frontiers and dared to travel to unknown areas, they, their nations and mankind have profited.

They have found new resources to spur mankind's material progress and---often--new opportunities for freedom and the good life.

We do not know now precisely what we will find in outer space. We are not fully familiar with the danger and the riches which await us in the unknown frontiers of the universe.

But we must continue and expand our effort. We must pioneer and explore and learn, because——as Americans——we are not willing to sit still and let others take the lead.

(END)

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF AUGUST 23, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING AUGUST 27

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans-
This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office in Washington, D.C.

Today I want to spend a few moments with you to set the record straight on a matter of United States policy.

In recent months, some political figures in this country have charged repeatedly that the United States is pursuing what they call a "no-win" policy internationally. Flests goved polit, parting policy internationally. Preprint talk talk took at facts.

The impression they seek to build is that the United States today has abandoned a goal of victory over communism. They seek to spread doubt about the motives of our foreign policy. They imply that the United States and this Administration should pursue policies which will bring victory over communism now. And they implies more than hour, lay, year at but ill-informed

This political approach to our international policy is irresonsible and

demogogic. This charge of a "no-win" policy is utter nonsense. does not repres mater - polit respinsibil. At a time when the threat of communism requires a resolute and united determined colm America, the politicians who cry about a "no-win" policy seek to build doubts and division in our country. At a time when responsible leaders of both political parties support the foreign policies of President Kennedy, those & make it a polit slag. who cry for "victory now" seek to place our foreign policy on a partisan amer for policy to tensitive to made alog I believe the American people are too smart to swallow this nonsense about a "no-win" policy. I am confident that most Americans are intelligent enough to see through the superficial slogans and the headline-getting phrases designed to stir up opposition to the President's and the Nation's policies. supported sender several administrations Those who whine about a "no-win" policy underestimate the American people. We are a people who are capable of sacrifice and struggle and longterm effort to reach our goals. We are a people who realize that freedom is nor cheap to be purchased on targen table not easily won or extended to new areas of the world. We are a people who are willing to accept the need for continuing hard work for a precious goal.

Our goal is, of course, vistory over communism. But that is not out only goal enough. We are not just concerned about a world divided by freedom and communism. We are concerned about a world divided by wealth and misery.

It will the former of communism our constitutions of communism.

Our goal is not just a world mid of the forces of communism. Our goal is a new world, in which all nations share the blessings of freedom, justice, peace and the opportunities for presperity.

America's founding fathers did not limit their goal for this nation when they wrote the Declaration of Independence and the other great documents leading to America's birth and development. They did not just mention the formula fully free and Montagian need to end tyrannical rule over the American colonies. They reached for more, and by setting standards of sacrifice and long effort won for America the blessings of freedom and the good life.

The real enemy of free men today is not just communism. The forces of communism are like the tip of an iceberg. Under the surface is the real enemy. It has several names: poverty, ignorance, illiteracy, hunger, social injustice.

all bring for deposaly chaos then musicher in Communica

No nation -- including the United States -- can be secure in its freedom until these enemies are vanquished throughout the world.

To those who complain that the United States is pursuing a "no-win"

Line Laughful

policy, I offer a challenge: Join the responsible and vital effort to win

victory not just over the surface forces of communism, but also the conditions

of misery which spawn and noursih communism, and other farments forms of

tyranny, and totaliterianism.

Paul lash lay we can

your

Our victory will not be tomorrow. Our goal will not be achieved this year. But it will be won, and when it is mankind will live in a world which is truly secure and free.

a would belied to make.

Enduring a trule rule of the contractions of the

(END)

Alleane of Joy Minnesota Radio T. FOR BROADCAST WEEK

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF AUGUST 30, 1962

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 2

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans--This is your Senator, Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office in Washington, D.C.

Let me first offer all of you my best wishes for the period of this

Labor Day holiday. This is a time when the Nation observes the great record

and achievements of America's working men and women, and the progress of

the labor movement. Labor Day is a proud time for us—and a pleasant time,

too, in which we have a chance to relax and enjoy what is susually the

last warm, three-day weekend of the year.

At this time, I wish to amounce a proposal which I intend to press with the appropriate officials and agencies of the government.

My suggestion is for a new, national holiday—Farmers Day. American farmers also have built a mangificent record of achievement and progress for the nation, and their vital role in contributing to the strength of our

(meye)

nation and the health of our people deserves, I believe, national attention and an annual observance.

I intend to announce additional details on this proposal in the near future. But just let me say now that Farmers Day should be an official, national holiday, greeted with observances and ceremonies comparable to Labor Day. My idea is that Farmers Day would be most appropriate for the first Monday in Spring each year—a time when the land begins to turn green and the Nation's farmers turn to the new work of planting the crops for the year.

I would appreicate your comments or suggestions on this proposal.

Let me turn now briefly to the most important, recent development in Washington affecting America's farmers.

The Senate has approved the Administration's farm program for this year.

This is a good program, and a victory for the Kennedy Administration, the Nation's farmers and the country as a whole. As approved by the Senate,

this is what the new farm program provides:

First, a permanent wheat program which, if approved by producers in a referendum, will establish a realistic program of supply management and distribution while protecting income.

Second, the program gives us the beginning of what can be a comprehensive effort to utilize land and water resources not needed in food production to answer the growing need for outdoor recreation.

Third, the program expands our opportunity to utilize our magnificent food abundance for helping friends of freedom in other lands through Public Law 480.

Fourth, the program continues the emergency feed grains program for another year.

President Kennedy and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman deserve high praise for their work on this year's farm program. They have displayed true political courage in seeking permanent farm programs at a time when some of the temporary programs have been highly popular. This approach is a refreshing change from the patchwork remodeling and repair which in the past

too often marked action on the farm legislation front.

This program which was just approved is a step ahead, but it is not by any means perfect.

We still need a <u>permanent</u> feed grains program, and I expect that will we will be able to win approval for one in the next Congress.

And, most important, we need new and affective legislation for a dairy program. Income of dairy farmers is far from adequate. Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota and I have thus introduced an amendment which provides for a voluntary program designed to increase the net income of the average dairy farmer and to cut down on government costs and government held surpluses. And our amendment would provide the basis for vitally needed, permanent legislation in the dairy field.

Thank you.

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.

