

CONGRATULATIONS TO WMIN

COPY

I just want to add my hearty congratulations to the WMIN broadcasting company on its plans for increasing the power of Channel 11 to 316,000 watts. I'm sure that's going to be welcome news for television audiences of the Twin Cities and the widespread surrounding area served by WMIN. The increased power will mean greater range and better viewing for the entire area -- another sign of Minnesota's progress.

You know, I'm quite a television fan myself -- when I can find time to join my wife and four children in enjoying a good T-V show. Of course, with all the public affairs panels and forums and filmed interviews in which a man in public life is asked to participate, it sometimes seems like I spend more time in front of the camera than in front of my own T-V set at home. However, I am sure all of us appreciate the wonderful contribution Television has made to American life, and the educational opportunities it still affords. I know I personally appreciate the chance it often gives me to come right into your homes, so to speak, and discuss public issues with you -- and you are the people that count in our government.

Man? Cym? 1964

COPY

So good luck, ~~WMM~~ -- Minnesota welcomes your progress!

All of us, I'm sure, are looking forward to your expanded power and improved coverage.

wf
COPY
March 3, 1954

Mr. Gordon Roth, Director of Public Relations
Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association
St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Dear Gordon:

Just a quick note to tell you I am taking the liberty of sending along a few more short "tapes" you may be able to make use of as part of your continuing efforts to alert farmers to the battle ahead.

They are as follows:

1. Using Our Abundance -- brief roundup of comment on food stamp efforts, Hill plan to use surplus to feed unemployed, plus Humphrey Dairy Diet Dividend Act to stimulate milk and butter consumption among folks on public assistance -- making point that real effort to make good use of farm abundance is coming from folks favoring high supports, while Administration protesting loudest about surplus is doing nothing constructively about them (2½ minutes). For news value, this has release date of March 8th as that is the day Humphrey is introducing Dairy Diet Dividend bill carrying out idea he talked all last year.
2. Short on outlook for tax reduction in low and middle income brackets. Not strictly a farm issue, but good for us and I suspect welcome to your listeners as general news. (2 minutes)
3. "Black Thursday" release for March 22nd. This is one I would like you folks to consider making a real push on. We propose speech on Senate floor March 22nd calling April 1 "dark day for America's dairy industry", suggesting that dairymen designate it "Black Thursday", and stage economic mourning protest by decorating fence posts, doors, or milk cans going to creamery that day with black crepe paper. Perhaps it sounds like a bit of huckstering, but I think it will catch on and make a good visual protest for pictures, newsreels, television, etc. I just want to be sure there is some follow-through in our own state. Listen to the tape and let me know what you think about it. I want to keep idea under wraps until it can break with good smash, and then be kept alive final week of March, but perhaps word could quietly be spread among some of your people to arrange participation, etc.

I think this idea should appeal to the great fighting spirit of Bill Thatcher, even though your interest is not dairying. I am sure you realize as we do that if they make this dairy cut stick, it will add new pressure to pulling down feed prices.

Sincerely yours,

Hubert H. Humphrey

Five minute recording, No. 2, for ~~GTA~~ (Gordon Roth)
COPY
(Comment on farm legislation needs)

It's now apparent that Congress will have to take in its own hands the formulation of an improved farm program.

The President's message proposed turning backwards at a time when most of us recognize the need to look ahead. Secretary Benson's testimony before the Senate Agriculture Committee made it clear that despite all past promises to the contrary, he believes agriculture should have less help, not more.

Farmers have a right to feel let down, but they won't be left to any such bleak outlook as the President and Secretary Benson propose. I'm sure that farm-state Senators and Congressmen, Republicans and Democrats alike, are going to get enough support from city Senators and Congressmen to see to it that we get a decent farm program, realistic enough to help get agriculture back on its feet.

Many of us are going to insist that we at least keep what protection agriculture now has, and then seek to improve it. We must extend 90% of parity for our basic commodities for the next three years at least, not just provide a stop-gap extension for political expediency. The farmer is entitled to plan further ahead than one year. We need to add oats, rye, barley, soybeans and flax to the list of commodities given mandatory 90% price

support. President Eisenhower promised that once; we aren't going to let him forget it now.

I'm not willing to see our farm program ignore perishable commodities that produce the bulk of our farm income. I want to see something done for dairy products and beef cattle, two commodities in serious trouble. I believe we should make support of dairy products mandatory at 90% of parity, and not leave it to the discretion of a Secretary of Agriculture who has already said he planned to lower it. Once again he has upset the market by talking out of turn. I don't think he should be saying things to depress the market before Congress has even had a chance to decide whether we are going to let him decide the fate of our dairymen. All that his threat to lower dairy supports is going to do is to bring down a new deluge of butter on the government, as dealers unload their normal inventories to protect themselves before the April ~~1~~ deadline. Once again Benson's speeches have cost the government a lot of money, and added to our surplus problem than helped it.

I'm also in favor of including beef cattle and hogs under price protection, by one means or another. If we can try the Brannan Plan on wool, what's wrong with trying it on something more important to our economy and to our consumers?

All of these objectives are provided for in my own price support Bill -- S. 1159 -- a bill introduced last February, and still before the Senate Agriculture Committee. I think it comes closer to what

COPY

farmers want and need than what the President has suggested. I hope more farmers write the Senate Agriculture Committee and tell them so. Perhaps then they'll do something about it.

My bill carries out the recommendations unanimously asked by the Minnesota legislature last year -- and makes good the golden promises others now want to forget about.

Of course I am glad that the President has now endorsed the idea of increasing the normal reserve for corn, and has asked for a set-aside of surplus supplies of other commodities to take them off normal markets and stockpile them for emergency use. It's just what I have been asking all last year -- and what I have bills before the Senate Agriculture Committee to accomplish. I'm glad the President agrees with me -- at least on some things.

On other farm issues, I think we must expand and improve conservation assistance, we must have better flood control and upstream flood prevention work, and we must have liberalized farm credit.

But we're not going to get any of it by wishful thinking. The day of hoping is over. The fight is now on. It's not just my fight -- it's your fight, and I'm trying my best to help you win it.

If you want to win it, you will have to help. It's your income that is at stake. I'd suggest starting right in your home community finding out who is on your side, and who isn't. Get your local merchants behind you, get their help in convincing your local paper it should be fighting with you, not against you. And make sure you let the House and Senate Agriculture Committees know just how you feel.

Five minute recording, No. 1, for GFA (Gordon Roth)
(Comment on President's Farm Message)

COPY

I'm sorry to say that our President seems to have broken faith with American agriculture. His "Golden Promise" of the 1952 campaign now looks rather tarnished. As far as I am concerned, his message on farm legislation was an almost complete "dud".

After all the talk of a new and better farm program, all the President is now proposing is the same old disastrous sliding scale idea of 1948-49. Farmers have already disavowed that philosophy. It won't help now to dress it up with a temporary sedative to conceal its eventual impact.

I am disappointed in the lack of imagination toward suggesting any new and better means of price protection, after all the criticisms we have heard and all the study that was supposedly going on for the past year.

What's happened to the campaign promise to do something about perishables? What's happened to the promise to treat oats, barley and rye the same as the basic commodities? What's happened to all the talk of some better program for aiding dairy producers?

The President's recommendations weaken what we already have, rather than improve anything. It is interesting to note that when it comes to tobacco, wool, and sugar, 90 to 100% of parity is approved. But when it comes to corn, wheat and dairy products, 75 to 90% is supposed to be enough. And for beef cattle, nothing is offered at all. Apparently tobacco has a priority over food. For my part, I can't agree. I have nothing against tobacco producers, but I think our Minnesota grain producers are entitled to at least equal treatment.

COPY

After all the howls against it, it was interesting to note that the Brannan plan principle of production payments was accepted by the Administration in its wool support program. If they have nothing better to offer, why not try it on some of the perishables that produce the major part of our farm income?

I'm afraid the Administration's greatly publicized and prolonged study has just been a waste of time.

The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse. All the hulla-balloo of a full-year's study, with a vast array of consultants and hand-picked advisory groups and an advance propaganda barrage about searching for a new farm program now seems to have been for no purpose other than to provide a beautiful stage setting for presenting what Secretary Benson has wanted all along -- leaving farmers to the mercy of the market place, and hoping to reduce production by lowering support prices until some farmers are no longer able to produce and survive.

Well, they could have saved a lot of time, trouble and money by telling us last year they wanted to turn backward, instead of promising the farmer something new and something better.

It looks like all the build-up for these advisory commissions was just window dressing to provide an ingenious but expensive alibi for breaking the golden promise of campaign time.

Actually, we shouldn't be too surprised. It has been apparent from the day Ezra Taft Benson was appointed Secretary of Agriculture that an all-out attempt was going to be made to put across the sliding scale on

COPY

America's farmers. It was made even more clear as announcements of the hand-picked advisory committees rolled off the mimeograph machines. And it should have been apparent to everyone as Ezra Benson crisscrossed the country attacking the existing farm programs, with the President's blessing.

Of course, they misled a lot of people into believing they were going to propose something new and better.

Well, at least now everyone knows why some of us have been trying to warn what was ahead for the farmer.

If this Administration was truly interested in economy, it could have saved all the postage, all the travel money, all the conference expense, all the rest of the overhead which has gone into the preparation of this most colossal -- and most expensive -- of all alibis in political history.

I don't think farmers are going to be very happy about such treatment. And I'm one Senator that is not going to stay quiet about it.

I'm going to fight lower price supports in every way I know how. Too much is at stake, for our agricultural state and the entire nation, to do otherwise.

RADIO RECORDING FOR
FRANK EDWARDS
IMMEDIATE RELEASE
MARCH 3, 1954

COPY

TAXES

Here's good news:

I am greatly encouraged by the prospect for favorable action for reducing taxes in the lower and middle income groups to stimulate purchasing power.

My own bill to raise the exemption limit from \$500 per person to \$800 has gained significant support with introduction of similar legislation by Senator George, senior Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee which handles tax legislation and recognized as the Senate's leading authority on tax and fiscal policies.

The change would save taxpayers about four and a half billion dollars this year, freeing that amount of income to spend and thereby build up a demand for production and employment. While all taxpayers would get a break, the greatest benefit would be where it belongs -- to the lower income groups. Withholding taxes would decrease immediately upon passage of the bill, and many taxpayers would receive a rebate at tax time next year.

I am convinced this tax situation must be regarded as part
of our efforts to meet the internal threat of economic recession.

In addition to raising exemptions and thereby lowering taxes, we
must also decrease taxes on non-luxury items and reduce and perhaps
eliminate excise taxes as much as possible to stimulate business.

I am, also, hopeful on favorable action on my bill or similar bills
from others to provide tax relief to working mothers.

RADIO RECORDING FOR
FRANK EDWARDS
MARCH 8, 1954

COPY

DAIRY DIET DIVIDENDS

For the past year I have insisted that the soundest answer to our dairy problem was stimulating outlets for milk and butter -- not cutting prices to the farmer.

Last August 1st I presented to the Senate a comprehensive study showing the diet deficiencies of millions of Americans in health-giving dairy products, and proposed adoption of a plan to put dairy products within reach of our aged people, dependent children, blind, and others on public assistance.

Because the Department of Agriculture has seemed to lack the initiative to explore such possibilities, I have now introduced in the Senate a bill to provide Dairy Diet Dividends to people on public assistance, recipients of old age or survivors insurance, and the unemployed.

The bill does not call for giving them dairy products outright. Instead, it calls for issuing certificates that would cover part of the cost of such products making their purchasing power for the minimum

COPY
essentials of a correct diet of dairy products equal to the average income groups in this country. It would be simple to do, as already -- established standards would determine eligibility -- and the certificates would be "cashed" through normal retail channels of trade.

Such a plan could increase consumption enough, I am sure, to wipe out any dairy surplus. Even Secretary Benson says there would be no surplus if the American people consumed the amount of milk and butter they should have in their diets. Why not make it possible for them to do so?

That is what my Dairy Diet Dividend Act proposes.

RADIO RECORDING FOR
FRANK EDWARDS
MARCH 22, 1954

COPY

BLACK THURSDAY

April 1st will be a dark day for America's dairy farmers.

The lower prices for manufactured dairy prices ordered into effect that day by Secretary of Agriculture Benson will wipe out from \$600,000,000 to a billion dollars in dairy farm income, according to estimates of the National Milk Producers Federation.

For Minnesota alone, the loss is conservatively estimated at \$2,500,000 per month.

That's too drastic a blow to toss at any industry. It is more than our important dairy industry can stand.

At a time when our economy is already slipping, it is a foolish mistake to deliberately create new downward pressures on America's economy by wiping out millions in farm purchasing power.

Appropriately enough, Secretary Benson has chosen April Fool's day to invoke this blow. But he is not fooling many farmers about what it means -- the forerunner of lower prices for all farm products, unless his action is checked by the Congress.

April 1st is a Thursday. I have just suggested on the Senate floor that America's dairymen designate it "Black Thursday", and make it a day of economic mourning. Perhaps they can demonstrate their protest by hanging black crepe paper on their doors, their gateposts, their mailboxes, or by draping their milk cans going to the creamery.

"Black Thursday" should be made the rallying day for farmers to speak out against the threat confronting them, in any way they can.

Consumers should not be fooled. It is going to hurt, rather than help, all of them in the long run. Everybody suffers if we touch off a farm-led depression.

RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
(BY HARRY FLANNERY FOR FRANK EDWARDS SHOW)
MARCH 29, 1954

COPY

FLANNERY: Senator Humphrey, have you any comments about what Congress is doing or failing to do to check increasing unemployment?

SENATOR: I will be happy to, Harry, but first of all I want to congratulate you on adding station WDCY of Minnesota to your network.

Now, about this unemployment situation. I was shocked recently when the Secretary of the Treasury showed such little concern about unemployment as to brush aside the prospect of 4,000,000 jobless as "relatively low". Some people forget the human side of statistics, the hardship of those who happen to be among the jobless. But the real concern to me is the failure to do anything constructive about checking this trend before it gets even worse.

Actually, this failure to face facts is fanning the fire of unemployment. Take, for example, the House action on low income group housing, repudiating President Eisenhower's recommendations and slashing the heart out of what was only a limited approach to a great national

problem. Isn't that going to mean less jobs instead of more?

COPY

We need more housing and that will bring more jobs. It makes sense to increasing our housing program. But, once again, it is the Republicans who have sabotaged the President's recommendations, and it is the Democrats who are fighting today to save it.

If we will get busy and do some of the things that need to be done anyhow, I am sure the unemployment increase can be checked. All of us know we need more hospitals and more schools. Why don't we build them? Isn't it a strange time for the Administration to be recommending a huge slash in funds for Federal aid to hospital construction, after the President himself says we need more hospitals? That's what I mean when I say the fires of unemployment are being fanned instead of checked. We are letting ourselves drift backwards, instead of forging ahead.

It is time we changed our course. It is time we put the full force of government behind more homes, more hospitals, more schools, more slum clearance. If we do we can pull ourselves out of this recession and get the country back on an even keel where it belongs.

SCRIPT FOR TELEVISION PROGRAM
BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
FILMED MARCH 31, 1954

COPY

LOW INCOME HOUSING

Minnesota people should know what Congress is doing to the
low income housing program.

As a result of the House of Representatives' action on the
housing program, all pending projects in Minnesota are wiped out.

I have just talked with the Housing and Home Finance Agency,
and asked just what the House action means as far as Minnesota is
concerned. Here is what they told me:

Out of 3,264 units of low income housing previously authorized
for Minnesota, only 1,210 have been completed.

The remaining 2,054 have been under preliminary loan contracts
in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Duluth, Hibbing, Fergus Falls, Eveleth, and
Chisholm.

But now they are cut out entirely.

For Minneapolis, it means cancelling out 816 units under
preliminary contract. For St. Paul, it means cancelling out 742 more
units.

Duluth loses 100 units, Hibbing will lose 45. Fergus Falls,

where 85 units had been authorized, and Eveleth, where 50 units had been authorized, will lose the entire amount -- they will get none at all. Chisholm loses 16 units now under preliminary contract.

Virginia and Winona are the only two cities in Minnesota fortunate enough to have already completed their housing projects, so they can escape this deliberate backing down from previous authorizations by the Congress.

Whatever you read about the President's housing program, this is what it really means to Minnesota: We not only get no new low-income housing -- we lose all of our projects already under preliminary contract.

I deeply regret this blow to our state's housing needs.



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