

SUPPLEMENTAL

BEATRICE, NEBRASKA

CONFIDENTIAL: FOR THE PRESS AND RADIO.

FOR RELEASE IN SUNDAY, A. M. NEWSPAPERS, MARCH 14, 1948

AUTHORIZED ADVANCE FOR ADDRESS OF HAROLD E. STASSEN OF MINNESOTA TO A PUBLIC MEETING AT BEATRICE, NEBRASKA, 8:00 P.M., SATURDAY, MARCH 13, 1948

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

As I emphasized at Scottsbluff on Thursday evening, the foundation of a long-range Republican agricultural program should be the positive support of farm prices to insure a fair share of the national income to agriculture in return for producing an abundant supply of farm products.

It is my view that this can best be done by the parity price approach. Building on this foundation, sound long-term agricultural policy should include four principal sections.

First as to the farm land.

Second as to the farm home.

Third as to the farm people, and

Fourth as to the farm community.

America's agricultural land is its most important single resource. It is of greater value than any of our minerals or our oil or our timber. The wasting of this resource is a national weakness. Obviously then, the carrying forward of a long term soil conservation program is of prime importance. It will best be done by combining expert technical advice with an administrative agency established through the farmers themselves from the counties on up to the State level, with Federal supervision over the states.

The reclamation and new development of land resources should also move on. Government funds used for these purposes are not expenditures in the ordinary sense. Rather, they constitute investments in the creation of new wealth. These irrigation and flood control and hydroelectric

projects have a three-fold return to government. The direct revenues received, the prevention of unemployment or need which would otherwise be a governmental burden, and finally the indirect revenues of taxes upon the new incomes created.

Many of the farmers of America have already demonstrated how extremely attractive a farm home can be. Rural electrification and rural telephone service should be carried forward. Rural sanitation and the favorable development of pleasant farm homes should be a definite part of long-term agricultural policy.

This emphasis upon the importance of the farm home in America's future, I believe, also indicates that steps should be taken to check the trend toward large commercialized agriculture, and to maintain the family-sized farm as the predominant agricultural keystone.

It is significant and somewhat alarming to note that in 1920 32% of all farm land was in farms of 100 to 259 acres; in 1940 this percentage had dropped to 26% and in 1945 it had further dropped to 23%.

In 1920 22% of all farm land was in farms of 1000 acres and over; in 1940 it had increased to 34% and in 1945 to 40%.

While some portion of these percentages of large farms reflect the ranch areas where acreage has a different meaning, the trend in all parts of the country toward large commercial units has been quite marked.

The farm income support program and all other phases of our agricultural policy should have the long-term objective of always having more than one-half of American lands farmed on a family basis.

The educational and health facilities available to the people on the farms of America should be improved. This requires sensible and co-operative development of the school and hospital programs in rural areas. A thousand counties now have no hospitals. A half million of the rural children now have inadequate school opportunities.

Finally the farm or rural communities should be recognized as a definite part of long-term farm policy. In this respect more favorable taxation for small and new business and the general encouragement of decentralized industry to smaller cities will assist in developing these centers. A partial industrial base in rural cities is of importance in making it possible to support a stronger rural center with increased community facilities of higher education, churches, and cultural advantages. Coupled with the improvement of highways and roads the contribution to the lives of the people of the countryside will steadily increase.

I emphasize again in closing that the long-term stability of farm income must be the foundation of the entire agricultural program.

NEIGHBORS FOR STASSEN, National Building, Minneapolis 2

For release to the Press and Radio September 19, 1947.

(Authorized Advance of Address of Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota, candidate for the Republican Nomination for President, to the New Hampshire and Massachusetts Press Associations at Hampton Beach, New Hampshire, on September 19, 1947. Address will be delivered without manuscript.)

Mr. Chairman, Members of the New Hampshire Press Association and Guests of the Massachusetts Press:

One of the scenes most vividly inscribed in my memory, which I observed many times on my recent journey in Russia, is the sight of large numbers of poorly clad Russians standing in front of a bulletin board reading a single newspaper mounted for that purpose. It is a scene heavy with meaning. It reflects the results of a system in which the Press is not free, no incentive exists for a newspaper to increase its circulation, and consumer goods and materials are very scarce.

It is my view that no small part of the superb accomplishments of the American economic, social and political system is due to the existence of a Free Press, free not only to print the news and to comment, but free also to compete and to profit, with incentives for success.

I commend the American Press for the contributions they have made to the maintenance of a Free Press and to the progress of our country.

But I did not accept your kind invitation merely to congratulate you. This critical period in world affairs is not a time for smug satisfaction over past accomplishments. Our country now occupies a position of unusual leadership in the war-torn uneasy post-war world. It is engaged in a fundamental clash and competition with an opposing way of life characterized by a lack of freedom.

In my judgment, major factors in the success of America in meeting this worldwide challenge will be the accuracy with which the Press informs its readers on the issues of the day and the vigor with which it upholds individual freedom for the American people.

I trust that in the years immediately ahead, the American Press, with renewed alertness and vigor, will fight for freedom, not only of the Press, but of the individual citizen under every circumstance.

There are two current questions in which I urge the Press to spotlight the importance of freedom. Both arise in connection with the new labor law.

As you know, I supported the final passage of the Taft-Hartley law. Taken as a whole it is a good law. It will improve labor relations in the nation. It will not injure the workers, but in fact will benefit them through less strikes, less loss of wages, more democracy in unions, and no weakening of the fundamental rights of labor.

But in two respects serious infringements of individual liberty have developed.

The first arises from the ruling of Robert Denham, General Counsel of the Labor Board, that all officers of the general executive board of the AFL and CIO must sign affidavits that they are not Communists before any local union

affiliated with these organizations can qualify for the assistance of the Labor Board or for its rights under the law.

John L. Lewis has specifically refused to sign such an affidavit. Consequently, thousands of local unions and millions of workers are deprived of their rights under the law.

These millions of workers in other AFL unions have no control over John L. Lewis. John L. Lewis has no control over the members of the unions not included in the United Mine Workers. It is un-American and contrary to our basic principles of individual liberty that men should lose their rights in such a manner.

I note that specifically President Dan Tobin of the Drivers Union has signed an affidavit and seeks to comply with the law on behalf of the members of his union, which is one of the largest in the nation. There is no more loyal group of American citizens than the members of the Drivers Union. They have never followed either John Lewis' extreme policies nor the treacherous Communist labor line. They should not be disqualified.

It appears to me that the only sound rule is that the affidavit requirement shall be interpreted to apply in each instance only to those officers who have direct authority over a specific union, including the power to authorize strikes. Thus, if a local union has complete autonomy and makes its own decisions on strikes and other important measures, the affidavits of its own local officers should be sufficient to qualify under the act. If the local union is a part of the parent organization whose approval must be obtained for strikes and other important action, then affidavits of the officers of that parent organization should be required.

The interpretation of the law given by Mr. Denham gives to John Lewis a veto as drastic as the veto used by Mr. Molotov in the United Nations Security Council. It is not consistent with the American approach of individual rights and is unconstitutional.

This interpretation should be promptly overruled by the National Labor Relations Board, or by the Courts, or the law should be amended.

The second invasion of freedom arises from the interpretation given to the clause prohibiting direct or indirect political contributions by unions.

Newspapers published by unions should have inviolate the complete right of freedom of press to print anything they wish on any subject, including politics limited only by the regular laws of libel. To hold otherwise would constitute an opening wedge in an attack on a Free Press. Many of the newspapers of our country are owned by individuals who also have other interests in business or in government. If we permit a classification of newspapers and restrictions on the rights of a Free Press, we fundamentally violate one of the most important liberties of American people.

I urge that even though you disapprove of every word published in every labor union paper in America, you emphatically insist upon their right to publish it.

I present these specific examples because I feel so strongly that the manner in which we safeguard the liberties of each other will measure the true resilience and strength of our precious American system.

The newspapers of New Hampshire and of Massachusetts and of America have been outstanding guardians of the freedom of the individual American citizen.

I am confident that regardless of partisan politics or economic status, they will continue to fill that role in the crucial years immediately ahead.



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