

COPY
DISARMAMENT

During the last session of Congress I introduced Senate Resolution 93 to establish a Special Subcommittee on Disarmament. This year, this special bi-partisan subcommittee, of which I am Chairman, began work.

One of the first things we found out was that there were at least eleven agencies, bureaus, commissions and boards of the Executive branch involved in disarmament matters.

Why then, should there also be a Senate committee concerned exclusively with the problem of disarmament?

One big reason was to make sure, that despite all these various agencies and commissions, no gaps are left, no possibility is overlooked. Very important too was the feeling that this subcommittee could increase the flow of information about disarmament matters from the government to our people.

The committee was also to be a device to gather and focus public opinion -- to collect the ideas of our people who are not in the government, but who may have a great deal to contribute to the solution of this critical problem.

Another important function of the committee, too, is to demonstrate to the world the deep interest of the Congress in disarmament. You know, we are in a goldfish bowl here in America. People around the world watch us. They listen --

-2-
COPY

often when we are not really talking to them. We are constantly being overheard. If the Congress were to ignore disarmament, or to treat it casually, the world would take careful note.

There was also in my mind and in the minds of the members of the Senate who voted to set up the strictly bipartisan subcommittee, a fear that the executive branch was getting a little hardening of the arteries on the subject of disarmament.

In matters of disarmament -- as in every area of our foreign policy -- we need both an open mind and an eagerness to explore every possibility to the limit. We need also to be able to "shift gears" when the road changes. We need flexibility. We must be prepared, too, to move swiftly when opportunity comes, to move out ahead, to seize the initiative.

I am not suggesting that we just disarm. Indeed, I deplore the present policy of the Administration to disarm relatively--to permit our heavy bombers and guided missile program, our submarine program to fall behind the Russians. This is nothing but disarmament without controls. It is unilateral disarmament.

At the same time, there is far too much big talk about military pacts, military assistance, military pressure. Bluff and bluster alienate friends; it frightens no enemies.

We have a habit recently of speaking loudly and carrying only a small stick.

COPY

Rather, we should speak softly; we should negotiate; we should discuss.

And we must carry a big stick. We must maintain our defenses — just as long as it takes to develop a workable system of control. Disarmament without controls, of course, is simply an invitation to disaster.

I have only about four minutes to discuss disarmament today. We have been negotiating with the Russians on the matter for ten years.

Let me just remark briefly on what is becoming increasingly clear — that ~~in~~ disarmament, as in every other area of foreign policy, the Russians are moving effectively and rapidly to impress the uncommitted peoples of the world. They are talking peace, they are making dramatic gestures such as their recent announcement of cuts in their army, they are discussing positive, constructive measures — such as providing low-cost atomic power reactors for power-starved countries. They are expanding their efforts to develop trade with the West; they are physically dismantling sections of their iron curtain.

Now it would be folly to take all this at face value — and to cut back our armed forces further.

But it is also foolish to ignore what the Russians are doing. If we have the spotlight of world opinion on us —

-4-
COPY

so do the Russians. And there is strong evidence that the new Russian line is persuading not only the uncommitted peoples of the East, but also our allies in Europe, that the Russians at last are reasonable and peaceful -- and that we are the inflexible, "wooden", rigid, warlike nation.

We must press forward in the area of adequate control of armaments. And equally important, we must convince the world of our sincerity and our perseverance. We have made one dramatic gesture -- the "open skies" proposal of the President. But are we going to rest all our eggs in one basket? Are we going to refuse to recognize that aerial inspection is only a very partial answer to the control problem?

We need also to realize that disarmament cannot be considered in a vacuum. We must recognize that effective disarmament depends largely on the settlement of major political issues. Therefore, we must be prepared to discuss, to talk, to compromise, in every way to try to come to peaceful settlements of specific issues. These discussions can become exhausting and discouraging. But they do not get our young men killed, and our cities bombed -- so long as we maintain our strength at the same time.

Now in the few moments remaining, let me just tell you of our plans to bring the Subcommittee on Disarmament to Minneapolis on Saturday, June 16.

⁻⁵⁻
COPY

This is part of the continuing program by which the Subcommittee hopes to draw upon the resources of educational institutions, scholars and other informed citizens to add to the accumulating store of ideas for disarmament. Too, the meeting, as with all meetings of the Subcommittee, will be open. It is our hope that Minnesotans from every walk of life will attend, and that through the Committee's trip to Minneapolis, they will become more aware of the difficult problems facing our government and our people in dealing with disarmament.

COPY

Recorded: June 6, 1956

For Broadcast: Week of June 8-15

Char

WASHINGTON REPORT NO. 12

by

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow-Minnesotans:

I am just back from a wonderful trip to Minnesota ...

AD LIB ABOUT TWO MINUTES ABOUT TRIP.

You know, a Senator must always remember that, while he must occupy himself a great deal with legislation which affects every American -- social security, housing, school construction, foreign aid, taxation, for example -- he is also a representative of his state, with special responsibilities to his own citizens.

As one of Minnesota's two Senators, I feel that one of my most important tasks is to speak and act for Minnesota, to be its "friend at court", to make sure that when one of Minnesota's state agencies, or one of Minnesota's communities or private organizations takes up a matter with any agency of the Federal Government, the matter will get full, fair and prompt consideration.

COPY

Further than that, when I see an opportunity for Minnesota, I get out and try to get it for my State. In the friendly competition on Capitol Hill in Washington, what really counts is the ability to get there "fustest with the mostest", as General Nathan Bedford Forest of the Southern Armies once said.

Transportation, for example, is the life of commerce, as we all know. And consequently, I am always watchful for opportunities to improve Minnesota's transportation facilities. That is the reason why I have been pressing so hard in the past weeks with the Army Engineers and the Senate Committee on Public Works to secure approval of the nine-foot navigation channel in the Minnesota River. That is why I have also been working day in and day out with the Corps of Engineers and Minneapolis' fine engineers and city officials to ensure that completion of the Upper Harbor at Minneapolis is approved this month by the Corps of Engineers and the Congress. Both projects will tie Minnesota more firmly and successfully into the great river network

COPY

which stretches from the Alleghenies to the Gulf of Mexico, and north to Minnesota, and along which so much of American industry is established. Both of these projects, I am convinced, will be approved -- with great benefits to Minnesota in terms of new industry, lower costs and higher living standards. For the same reason, I worked hard to push through earlier this year legislation to authorize the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes -- the one barrier which would keep ocean-going vessels from coming up the St. Lawrence Seaway fourteen hundred miles to Minnesota.

Let me emphasize: these projects don't just happen. With so many worthwhile undertakings being advocated, it is critically important to see that Minnesota's interests are protected actively, constantly, and personally.

Flood control is a case in point. Almost every state is subject to floods, and they all want something done about them. So, to make sure that Minnesota's needs along the Red River, the Minnesota,

COPY

the Rainy River, the Mississippi and their tributary streams are considered fairly, I feel it is an important part of my job to study the local needs, to talk over the local situation with leaders in the area, and to represent them in Washington as their spokesman. Through such efforts, year in and year out, we secure Congressional authorization and appropriations for Minnesota flood control projects -- such as the continuing program on the Red River, and the projects recently recommended by the Board of Engineers at Ruffy Brook and Lost River, and at Mankato and North Mankato on the Minnesota River.

During the past several weeks, a great deal of my time and my staff have been devoted to the task of working with the various appropriations subcommittees of the Senate in securing funds for other projects of special interest to Minnesotans.

When the agricultural appropriations bill recently came up, I asked for inclusion of two special projects which I am glad to report were approved -- an item to establish a forest products

COPY

research laboratory at Grand Rapids, and a hydrological laboratory designed to study the water situation in our northern forest areas.

In addition, I asked for special funds to study such problems as the infestation of the gypsy moth, which is doing so much damage throughout the Upper Midwest. Again, I am glad to report that funds for this necessary project were included by the Committee.

Minnesota had good news this week when the Senate passed a record-breaking appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. I had asked the Appropriations Committee to make substantial increases in the Administration's budget request for Federal aid in hospital construction, and for medical research. The big increases in every category mean that if the House of Representatives agrees, Minnesota will receive about 22 percent more Federal aid for general hospital construction next year, amounting to a total of about \$2 million.

COPY

The appropriations voted by the Senate for medical research will mean a tremendous boost for those dedicated men and women who are fighting the long fight against the crippling and killing diseases of cancer and heart disease, arthritis, epilepsy and cerebral palsy, polio and diabetes. The Senate raised the Administration figures by an average of nearly 50 percent for research on all of these terrible diseases, and in addition, increased the research budget for mental illness by 61 percent. As a result, the very promising experiments with the new drugs -- chemotherapy, the medical people call it -- will be substantially expanded.

You know, I'm a taxpayer just as you are. And I want to tell you that I pay my taxes a lot more cheerfully when I know that at least some of them are going to be spent for such fine undertakings as medical research!

Two other major projects which I am seeking for Minnesota are a new Bureau of Mines Minerals Research Laboratory which would center

COPY

the study of Minnesota's great untapped mineral resources -- such as non-magnetic taconite; and a new animal disease research laboratory which the Department of Agriculture wanted to build in Maryland, but which the Senate refused to permit.

Another major project which is a possibility for Minnesota is the proposed multi-million -dollar atomic research facility which the Atomic Energy Commission will build on one of fourteen Midwestern University campuses. Naturally, our great University of Minnesota is a very strong candidate. Since the first week of April, I have been working closely with the University to plan the necessary steps to ensure that the University is given every consideration in the choice to be made eventually by the Atomic Energy Commission.

At President Morrill's request, however, neither I nor Congressman McCarthy nor Congressman Wier have contacted the Atomic Energy Commission in behalf of the University, in order not to jeopardize the extremely delicate negotiations going on among the

COPY

Midwest Universities themselves -- who were to recommend three of their number to the AEC for final consideration. Just as soon as we are informed that our University is among those three, there will be a strong effort made by the entire Minnesota Congressional delegation to secure the big atomic laboratory for Minnesota.

Speaking of atomic energy, the great new development at the Elk River Co-Op has been a project to which a great deal of my efforts have been directed -- beginning in 1954 with my successful amendment of the basic Atomic Energy Act to permit cooperatives and local governments to participate in the development of peacetime atomic power. Through all the months of delay and frustration that followed Elk River's first application for an atomic reactor, I worked closely with the co-op and with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Rural Electrification Administration to overcome the reluctance of those agencies to support Elk River's fine proposal.

COPY

The announcement at long last that the REA would participate in the financing of this historic effort brought to a close two solid years of continuous efforts on my part and on the part of the whole Minnesota delegation to secure this vital project.

cro - June 6, 1956



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