

[file]
37163

TRANSCRIPT OF HUMPHREY
14 MINUTE TV REPORT TO
MINNESOTA
Week of March 10, 1963

This is Washington and this is Senator Hubert Humphrey reporting to the people of Minnesota. The Majority Whip today will discuss domestic and international problems which now face the Congress. Here is Senator Humphrey.

Well, thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It is just about time that we sort of took inventory of what has been happening here on Capitol Hill and what the prospects are for action here in the 88th Congress. I have a rare privilege that is accorded to very few people in our country - the privilege of every Tuesday morning being with the President of the United States and the Vice President, along with the leaders of the Congress - the Speaker of the House, the Majority Leader of the House, the Majority Whip and my colleague in the Senate, the Majority Leader, Senator Mansfield, and the Secretary to the Conference of the Majority, Senator Smathers and myself, sitting with the President and some of his other advisers for the legislative breakfast. Each Tuesday at 8:45 we have from an hour to an hour and a half of a very frank, informal and confidential discussion on the legislative programs and the international developments. I say this is a rare privilege, because it is at these meetings that much of the policy of our country is formulated and ~~xxxx~~ discussed. It is from these meetings that we go forth to try to accomplish some of the legislative purposes and objectives of the administration. You have heard much in the newspapers and over the television and radio about the so-called delays in the 88th Congress. Now we have had some but this is not unusual. The first month of any Congress, in fact the

first six weeks of any new Congress, is expended in the organization of the Congress itself. This is a big institution with well over 500 members - 537 members. This means that all of these members must be assigned to their working committees. It is my privilege to serve on the ^{Steering} Senate/Committee which makes the assignments of every one of the United States Senators. Now we have established these new committees and made the assignments of the committee members. The committee size reflects, in part, the ratio between Democrats and Republicans here in the United States Senate. There are some exceptions - in the area of foreign policy we do not try to have an accurate reflection or a mathematical reflection of the majority and the minority. We keep it very bi-partisan, because our foreign policy must be supported on a bi-partisan or non-partisan basis. In the field of finance, when we get to taxation for example, I think it is exceedingly important that the committee be composed of men who are experienced in economics and financial matters and that we approach the problems of fiscal policy, financial policy and taxation in a most prudent and careful manner. In the area of appropriations we ^{want to} have people on the appropriations committee that are very much aware of the many programs and policies of the government and also a sense of ~~prudent~~ prudence, yes of conservatism, about the use of the dollar because our budgets today are very big and they are going to continue to be big. I say that because until there can be some peace in this world, and until we can arrive at some understanding with the forces that seek to destroy us, we are going to have to have a strong military establishment, we are going to have to compete in the exploration of outer space and my fellow citizens these costs sky rocket.

Every year the costs of security go up. Every year the costs of the exploration of outer space go up and almost $\frac{1}{2}$ in astronomical proportions. The cost of managing our public debt goes up, but may I just say a word about the public debt, it is very large and it surely is not anything we ought to be proud of - the public debt on a per capita basis is lower today than it has been for, I think, forty years. Or at least over thirty years. I say this because our gross national product is almost six hundred billions of dollars, our population is over 185 million and when you distribute the total amount of public debt over the total population, as well as the earning capacity of the people of this country, you will note that in the post war years the per capital indebtedness of the country has actually not gone up but gone down and the overall indebtedness has gone up much less at the federal level than at the state and local level. Now I don't want to be misunderstood. This is no apology $\frac{1}{2}$ or no rationalization of indebtedness. I merely state that we have an economy that can manage and handle this indebtedness. Now I have heard many people say that what we need in government is good sound business practices. I have heard people say you never heard of a businessman operating a business and hoping to stay in business on a deficit. Well, could I be quite frank with you. We do not build for example, great corporations by the AT&T and General Motors out of current earnings. The AT&T floats bonds and stocks, those are certificates of indebtedness. I once said that if the AT&T had the same budgetary practices as the Federal Government we would still be communicating by smoke signals. The fact of the matter is that the American

corporate structure is built upon debt or upon investment, that is what they call it - investment. But when I buy stock in a company, that is a loan of money to that company and I am hoping that that loan can be redeemed and I am hoping for dividends which is the same as interest. So in many ways we do operate our government somewhat on a businesslike basis, but of course government is not a profit making enterprise, and particularly is it not a profit making enterprise when it has to run has to give much needed services for highways, for example, or for airports or in the field of public health and social security, for a host of activities that relate to business, commerce, consumers and the public in general and then when you get down to having a budget that runs about \$60 billion for national security and that is what it is in terms of our StateDepartment operations, our military operations, our atomic energy operations - all this related to national security - and then add to that the activities in the field of science and in the field of outer space and you get up to about \$70 billion - \$70 billion in round numbers, now, related to the cost of national security and survival. The other \$28 billion that is left in this budget - some \$10 billion is for managing the public debt - interest paid back, of course, to Americans, since we are in debt to ourselves. You can see then, I believe, that the problems of managing the fiscal matters of this government - the monetary matters - are very big ones and we need good people doing it.

Now at the executive level we have some good people - the Secretary of the Treasury - Mr. Dillon - is a businessman of great reputation - by the way he is a Republican, the President of the United States has an excellent budget director, we go over these budgets with meticulous care and I want

to assure you that Congress is going to go over every Administration budget with a fine tooth comb and we always reduce them somewhat. Now I say this because you ought to see the mail I get about spending and I don't blame you people for complaining about spending because this is a costly operation, but I like to be honest with my neighbors and constituents. Until we can have peace in this world the cost of government will continue to grow. Next year the space program will be much larger ~~than~~ ^{best} that this year unless you want to come in second/to the Russians. Next year the cost of defense will be much larger than it is this year unless you want to have the Soviets overwhelm us. You can't be tough on Cuba. You can't be tough about the situation in Berlin. You can't face up to the communist threat in Southeast Asia. You can't try to defeat Castro and Communism in the Western Hemisphere ~~on~~ on bargaincounter prices. It just isn't in the book. So when I hear people talk about w ell we have to cut this and cut that and do this and do that, I say now what do you mean. The major cuts that can be made are in defense - that is if you really want to cut a big hunk out of federal spending, but I am not for doing that because I think this country needs defense and security. I don't think you can demand the ousting of the Russians from Cuba and demand the destruction of Castro and at the same time say that we can do it cheaper. It just can't be done. I don't think you can defeat Communism in the western hemisphere, stop it in Eastern Asia, and stand up to the Russians in Berlin and say that you are going to do it at bargain counter prices. It makes good ^{demagoguery} ~~demagoguery~~ to talk about doing it cheaply, but it doesn't make much sense.

Now can I shift quickly to another matter. These matters of the ^{and} cost of government are surely of prime importance, ~~but~~ I want to come back to you again. I want to give you a pledge that as a member of the Appropriations Committee I will scrutinize and examine carefully every single item that comes in that budget and that committee is made up of prudent and conservative men - keep me out of it for a moment - the overwhelming majority of the men there are conservative gentlemen who carefully examine these budgets so that the tax dollar is going to be watched. By the way, we pay taxes down here too. I have to pay them in Minnesota, down here in the District of Columbia, federal and state income taxes and all the other taxes, and I have a family, so I think I understand a little bit about taxes.

Now one of the great issues before us today of course and the great issue is the matter of our survival as a free people and as a nation. We have a terrible burden but one we cannot avoid of ~~world~~ world leadership. Now ~~we~~ either we lead or the Russians will. There isn't anybody in between. Either we try to keep this world free and extend the frontiers of freedom and democracy or the world will ~~xi~~ be slowly nibbled to death by communism. I believe it is my duty - moral, spiritual and political duty - to do whatever I can as a citizen and as a Senator to see that this world remains free and to see that the United States bears the mantle of ~~xxxx~~ leadership with dignity and with courage, even if there are sacrifices. Now one of the great issues before us of recent date is whether we should prohibit nuclear testing and have an ~~agreement~~ agreement with the Russians. Some people say that you ought not to do this - ought not to have an agreement because if you agree with the Russians you are going to sacrifice your

security. Let's continue to test, say some of the people. Let's continue to explode these bombs in the atmosphere and the danger of radioactive fallout, let's not worry too much about that, say some people.

But Senator Humphrey says that if we can get a safe guarded agreement with international inspection and control for detection and identification of any possible nuclear tests, that we ought to sign it and I will tell you why, because we today have a superiority in nuclear weapons but every day that goes by and every year that goes by we run the risk of losing that superiority. Testing makes possible the improvement of weapons. Once we had a monopoly on nuclear power, we tried to get the Russians to sign a treaty $\frac{1}{2}$ way back in 1946 to _____ the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the Soviets have refused every year. Now if the treaty to prohibit nuclear testing would violate the security of the United States, would weaken us, would threaten our security, then I ask you, why haven't the Russians been willing to sign one? They would like to see us weakened, yet every day in the press and over the television and radio I hear people say "Oh if the United States agrees to ~~xxxx~~ stop nuclear testing it will threaten our security, it will weaken our position. Now I repeat that the best answer to that argument is simply this, that if we would sign a treaty to stop nuclear testing and if the Russians would and if we offered this treaty and it would weaken our security, then why haven't the R^Ussians signed it. I will tell you why they haven't because the R^Ussians do not want to stop nuclear testing, the Soviets want to continue nuclear testing and why? Because they are catching up on us, just by the nature of the art, of the science of nuclear energy and nuclear physics. We need in this Congress today a joint committee on national security.

We can't afford to have all these little separate committees operating individually. We need in the Congress what the President has at the White House - he has a National ~~Security~~ Security Council where everything can be considered at once, relating to national security, we need it here in the Congress. Let's bring Congress up to date before it holds back the progress of this country. Well, next week we/will be with you again and I hope to have a guest. Until then, my good wishes and thank you.

14 Minute TV Report for Minnesota - Taped March 20, 1963. Questioned by Bill Roberts and Carl Coleman of TIME-LIFE Broadcasting.

-----questions and answers and with two veteran newsmen of the calibre of Mr. Roberts and Mr. Coleman, I know we are going to get some good questions. Now we will see about the answers.

First, I turn to you Mr. Roberts and see what you have in mind.

BILL ROBERTS: Well, my first question, Senator, concerns something a lot of people in Washington are asking - when will the Senate actually start doing something.

HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Roberts, I might have expected that you would ask that question because you good newsmen what you really want is a good fight. I said to you the other day that you are real fight promoters. But in all seriousness in response to your question, the Congress is already doing something. In fact, it is doing very much. The Congress does not automatically legislate. The Senate requires, as does the House, that a good deal of Committee action be done. Everything has to start by the presentation of bills, the referral of those bills to Committees, the referral of those bills in Committees to subcommittees, then the bringing together of many witnesses upon key pieces of legislation, the taking of testimony, the marking up of the bill at the subcommittee level, reporting it out of the full committee and then to the Senate Floor. It is a long process and every year it is the same and every year we get the same questions - when are we going to start to do something and the answer is when the bills come from committee. We have already passed a number of bills. They aren't the big measures of the administration program, but soon we will have the Youth Employment

Act before us. It will be voted on before Easter. We will have dairy legislation before us, hearings are on that right now. The feed grains program hearings are now in process and it is ready to be acted upon in the House and soon in the Senate. The tax legislation - the hearings are already started on that, the programs for medical education facilities, for higher education, for the manpower retraining act, all of these matters are now in legislative process. They will be reported to the calendars of the House and the Senate in a very short time.

QUESTION: Is this Youth Opportunities Bill the only one you expect to get out by Easter.

HUMPHREY: Of the President's main program, yes. We would expect that as the main first item. Of course there will be some of the appropriations that will be pretty well along the way. I think we should let our listeners and viewers know that every day we are having hearings on appropriations and I find myself tied in on committee hearings day in and day out.

QUESTION: Senator, regarding the Youth Opportunities Bill, what happens if Republicans in the House, especially, tack on the civil rights rider on that bill.

HUMPHREY: I wish our Republican friends were as interested in civil rights on every measure as they seem to be on this one. When we have a real civil rights bill up on its own merits, we have a difficult time getting the kind of bipartisan cooperation that we need to put that bill across. In other words, we run into the stubborn resistance of the more or less conservative wing of the Republican Party. Now there has been a

suggestion made in the House, as you have indicated that a so-called civil rights rider be attached to the Youth Conservation Corps. Frankly it is not needed, it is only an obstructionist tactic, we have already all the authority the Federal Government needs to see to it that equal opportunity is provided for people. What is more, the real opportunity that young people need today is the opportunity for wholesome and constructive work and a youth conservation corps offers that chance for a number of young people. I regret that these obstructionist tactics are being used and that is what they are. ~~THESE~~ If such an amendment is offered here in the Senate I shall personally resist it and my record in the field of civil rights legislation I don't think requires any explanation. It is a record of steadfast support. But I know how people like to kill bills around here. This is a hard fought piece of legislation.

QUESTION: This would kill it - a civil rights amendment.

HUMPHREY: I think that it would - at least impair its progress and its passage. First of all, if you bring it up here in the Senate you will have a filibuster and that means that we will get no bill, and that is exactly what some people want to see happen. No bill. Now this - I regret this because I wonder how Senators and Congressmen are going to explain to their constituents that they are really $\frac{1}{2}$ uninterested in youth employment opportunities and that is what this bill provides. It provides opportunities for young people to get an education, school drop outs go back into education providing them an opportunity to work in constructive employment in the fields of conservation, $\frac{1}{2}$ our national parks our state parks, our national and state forests, to do something to help the community

as well as to help themselves. How much are they going to get paid? \$60 a month.

QUESTION: Senator, a few Republicans have raised the question what trade can a young man possibly learn by working in a national forest for six months.

HUMPHREY: Well, he can learn something about forestry. I think he will learn more working in the forest than he will standing on a street corner.

QUESTION: What good would this do him when he returns to the city? There aren't many opportunities for forest work there.

HUMPHREY: Well, everybody doesn't have to work in the city. I want to say that first of all this is a common place opposition argument - that the young man is not going to learn enough in this program. Well, what he will learn first of all is self-respect. He will learn how to take care of himself. He will learn that he owes something to the community as well as to himself and he will be doing gainful work. Plus the fact that the bill I am privileged to sponsor, known as the Youth Employment Act provides a minimum of ten hours per week vocational and technical training to be provided by contract with the local schools in the area where the young man works in the Youth Conservation Corps. Now this isn't as much as I would like, but it is more than we have had before and interestingly enough, the very same people - and it happens to be the Republican opposition here - who are talking about that young people under this program will not get enough vocational training are the same people who knocked out of the manpower retraining bill of two years ago the feature that provided special training for young people. Then they said we don't want it. We mustn't

this young people's vocational training. So they voted en masse against it. Now the argument is made under the Youth Employment Act under the YCC program that not enough is being given to vocational training. I just ask them to make up their minds what they want. I think I know what they want - they want no bill, but I have some news for them - we are going to pass this bill, the public is overwhelmingly in support of this bill. I do not know of a single organization in America that is of a reputable nature that does not support the Youth Employment Act and the provisions of that bill.

QUESTION: Senator, on another subject, you were quoted in Geneva as saying April 1 might be a deadline of sorts for the nuclear test ban talks. We are getting near that now with no progress. Isn't it about time we just called it quits.

HUMPHREY: What I said in Geneva and it is a matter of transcript so there can be no doubt of it - I said that unless considerable progress had been made by some time in April or in spring that I doubted that any progress would be made. And as I said, you can just as well whistle Dixie ^{nothing} that ~~something~~ will really come of these negotiations and I still say that is the case. That unless we see some degree of progress on the nuclear test ban talks by April it is very dubious that there will be any progress that will lend itself toward an agreement. And I think we are sensing that right now - the adamant position of the Russians is very discouraging, the Soviet delegates have been uncompromising, unwilling to consider any proposal, even though we have offered what I think are very constructive suggestions and proposals.

QUESTION: Well in that case, wouldn't it be better simply to call the thing off?

HUMPHREY: No, I don't think so. I think we always have to be in the position of being willing to sit and talk and to work and if need be to wait for progress in slowing down the arms race. Now when I say that, I mean slowing down on the basis where we protect our own national security to make sure that the armament reductions do not leave us in an unfavorable position, that those armament/reductions or controls over arms must be reciprocal and they must have international inspection and there must be controls so that you don't get fooled and this is what, of course, we have provided for in our treaty proposals.

QUESTION: Senator, in the past couple of weeks or so there has been much said and much written about Soviet overflights of our ships on the high seas and also over Alaska. Can we stand for this or what should we do.

HUMPHREY: Well, overflights of our ships on the high seas is one matter and it is entirely different from what I call over our territorial areas - over Alaska. The high seas are high seas. This is open territory and I don't like it but we have to expect that this would happen. But when overflights over our territory which are not accidental but which are pre-mediated the first action on the part of our government is what we have already taken, namely a sharp and strong protest. If that isn't adequate then you will have to send up your pursuit planes to either flush them off and get them out or take even more stern action which has been taken by the Soviet Union itself. The Soviet Union did shoot down a U-2 plane of ours. So did the Cubans shoot down a photography plane. The Soviets

some years ago, you may recall, destroyed or shot down certain planes up in the Baltics that they said had invaded their air space. Now this is very hazardous, I know that, but I believe we have to make it crystal clear to the Soviets that we will not tolerate the violation of our air space by Soviet overflights. We ought to make this clear, as I said first by diplomatic formality, the formal protest. Secondly, I would say stepping this up by seeking to scare off the planes and thirdly, if need be, by the defense of our territorial jurisdiction.

QUESTION: Senator, you mentioned Cuba. Are there any better prospects now for combined Latin American action with us against Castro in any form?

HUMPHREY: Yes, I think so. I really believe that President Kennedy's visit to San Jose, Costa Rica, was a milestone in cooperation between our areas, two areas.

QUESTION: That was only six nations, how about the rest of them?

HUMPHREY: Well, the Caribbean area of course is the most sensitive area and the Presidents of the Republics in the Caribbean area and add to that Venezuela, Colombia and Panama, and you have nine then, and plus ourselves, ten. This represents the most immediately concerned, or the most openly concerned area of the Latin American countries about Cuban infiltration, Castro-Communist infiltration and penetration. This conference took place in San Jose and did mobilize the Caribbean area with the United States. We are taking now counter action. We are taking actions to strengthen the police forces, for example, in the respective nations. We have promised

military aid. We are taking actions to see to it that there is no movement of Castro people or subversive agents into the area by actually controlling the boundaries and the shorelines of the Caribbean countries. I think the President made it quite clear that we are going to isolate Castro. We are going to quarantine Castro. And as he put it, not to build a wall of concrete and brick which is ugly, but a wall of determination of free men and determined not to let this vicious influence of Castro Communism penetrate the Western Hemisphere by activating not only our counter-forces, our forces of resistance, but also by the programs of the Alliance for Progress of a better life in Latin American areas.

QUESTION: Senator, is there time for a quickie?

HUMPHREY: Yes, try it.

QUESTION: I was wondering about the outlook for any more taconite moves up on the Iron Range.

HUMPHREY: Can I first say that on the Communist Castro Latin American question I have just written a long report on my two visits and I believe a very good report if you will pardon me ~~taxapocixixixix~~ for saying so. It is documented very carefully and I outlined there some programs of action. I want our people to write in and ask for it if they care for it I will send it to you.

Secondly, yes we are still working on new taconite developments for Minnesota, contacting different companies, urging them to make investments. I am very happy over the U.S. Steele announcement, the Ford Motor announcement. We hope that we might have some other announcements that are coming and there were others.

QUESTION: ANY hot prospects?

HUMPHREY: Well, I'll see you later on that.

Gentlemen, we have to conclude. Time's out. See you two weeks from now, and thank you for listening and viewing us.

SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR 1 1/2 MINUTE HHH TV REPORT TO MINNESOTA---APRIL 19, 1963

(no guest)

4/20/63

- 1 -- Introduction by Bob Coar.
- 2 -- Opening remark by Humphrey: "I have just returned to Washington after the Easter recess and a week-long visit to Minnesota." Then report details of Minnesota activities. Tell, briefly, about the family get-together on Easter weekend. Then report on the inaugural celebration of Rolvaag as governor, your visits to the local and regional representatives of Federal agencies in the Twin Cities, and some of your other activities and trips while in Minnesota. End with a general comment about the value and usefulness of this trip home, and the renewed contacts with the people and leaders of the State.
- 3 -- Report briefly that you are preparing to attend the Inter-American Development Bank Conference in Venezuela as one of two Congressional representatives. Stress your continuing interest and work in the Latin American area---and why you consider this area so important.
- 4 -- Report on the action and status of Congress so far this year, responding indirectly to the cliché that Congress has been "bogged down." You might summarize briefly the long and careful process through which legislation must pass in Congress---stressing the idea that members of Congress need time for detailed hearings, debate, etc. because they are dealing with decisions affecting public policy and public funds. Mention also that the flow of major legislation tends to come in the later months of the session when the committees have completed their hearings and work.
- 5 -- Report on the legislative achievements of the Senate so far this year, including:
 - 1 -- Youth Employment Act
 - 2 -- Wilderness Bill
 - 3 -- Military Procurement Bill
 - 4 -- Mass Transit Bill
 - 5 -- Extension of the Draft
 - 6 -- \$508 million agriculture supplemental approp.
 - 7 -- Commission on Science and Technology.
- 6 -- Thanks; reference to program "with important guest" two weeks from now.

####

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S TELEVISION PROGRAM 6/12/63

INTRODUCTION: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today, the Senate Majority Whip reports on the most critical issues facing the Congress and the Nation. Now, here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR H. H. HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. Yesterday I want to report on what I believe are three vital and important issues, not only facing the Nation, but, of course, facing the Congress of the United States. The first and the most important of these issues is what we call the issue of civil rights. Others term it Constitutional rights, or human rights. The second issue is the matter of peace and the pursuit of peace by the President of the United States speaking for the people of America, and the process of the achievement of the conditions of peace. And, the third issue before us relates to our national security, and, indeed, to the well-being of not only our own nation but of other people's and nations which seek to live and work in the paths of freedom. I refer to our foreign aid program, or as we call it, our international development program in the field of capital and social improvement. Now, let me just visit with you for a moment about one or two other developments and then we'll get to these three important issues. We have had many important visitors in Washington this past week. The President of the Republic of India has been with us. A distinguished statesman, scholar,

one who has given magnificent leadership to the people of India. He was here to talk to us about mutual problems. Particularly, he talked about the defense of India, as it now relates to the attacks or the threatened attacks of the Chinese communists upon Indian borders. India is a democracy; it has had its problems; we at times have had our disagreements with India, but in this hour of difficulty, and, indeed in this period when Indian freedom is being threatened, it is most interesting to note how we close ranks, how misunderstandings are dispelled, and how they disappear, and how we are able to work more closely together as a team, or nations that have respect for each other. Then we have had in Washington this past week, one of the great international conferences---The World Food Congress. The first conference or congress on the food problem, the problems of diet and, indeed, to put it conversely, the problems of malnutrition, of famine, that first conference was held right after World War II at Hot Springs, Virginia; we referred to it always as the Hot Springs Conference out of which grew the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and many of the programs were designed to improve the level of food production and diet throughout the world. The United States, because of its outstanding leadership in the field of agriculture, the quantity of production, as well as the quality, our leadership in the Food for Peace program. These factors within themselves made the United States a logical choice for the World Food Congress. It was my privilege to sponsor the legislation here in the Congress of the United States, to authorize

this great international meeting. The meeting has been attended by delegates from one hundred and five nations (105), with over 1,500 delegates from these 105 nations. And, you really see the very world parading before your eyes. People from distant lands, wearing strange to us, yes, their own native costumes. People that are well educated, people of every race, color and creed that have one common objective---how can we better improve the standard of living, of God's finest creation, human life, people. And I am happy to say the our government, starting with our President, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, and members of Congress, and members of other offices of the executive department who have been giving marvelous leadership to this World Food Congress. Dr. Senn, the executive director or the director general of the Food and Agriculture Organization with its headquarters in Rome, Italy, has been with us. In fact, just this past week, I have had the privilege of spending several hours with the delegates of the World Food Congress, and being with Dr. Senn, whom I have known for many years. He was once the Agricultural Minister of the Republic of India. Today he is a great international public servant. There will be resolutions and there'll be recommendations come from the World Food Congress, and I am sure that some of those ^{who} will deal with how the nations/produce an excess~~oof~~ of food over their own requirements can better work together to help overcome poverty and hunger in the world. We live in very strange times, don't we? When some of the people are overfed, and other people literally suffer

from malnutrition and lack of food. Surely, the same humankind that expects to be able to conquer outer-space, to launch space platforms, to go to the moon, and stay there if need be, and then leave the moon and come back to the earth. Surely, people of this brilliant intelligence and scientific genius and ingenuity ought to be able to find a way to distribute food without destroying the normal markets, and at the same time, utilizing food as a great force for peace. In presenting certain members of Congress to these delegates, which it was my privilege to do, since I was a host at a great reception in Washington, I pointed out that food is strength in this world. Food is power, and it is power for good, and food is hope, hope for people that live on the border of starvation. And, food, of course, is life, because without it, there is no life. And, food is peace, because hungry people lend themselves to all of the plans and all of the evil-doings of dictators and tyranny. And, food is freedom, because without food, without healthy bodies and without people that feel that there is at least some hope in the world, there is no freedom.

Well, now let me go back to these three great important issues for a moment. I said the most critical issue facing us today, and when I say us, I mean all of us, everyone, whether we are in the North or the South, or the East or the West, or whether we live in the city or in the rural community, the most important issue facing the American people today is the issue of human rights. Our Constitutional rights.

This is a moral issue, and, it is indeed a political issue. Political in the sense that we have only one kind of citizenship under our constitution, and that's American citizenship. And the American Negro is a citizen of this country, and he has been since the inception of this republic. It was Abraham Lincoln who in 1863 proclaimed what we call the Emancipation Proclamation. He emancipated the slaves from their bondage. But the process of emancipation has been going on for a hundred years, where the Negro has been aspiring for his full place and his rightful place in American society. He has been patient. Many of us are mindful of all of the difficulties that the Negro has faced in many communities, and our political and social and economic life. But as the Vice President said recently in a memorable address at Gettysburg Battlefield in Pennsylvania, and it was one of the great speeches of our time. He said the American Negro has run out of patience. He wants action. He wants his own place in American society. And he is going to get it. Therefore, we see manifestations today of this determination to gain full citizenship, the full rights under the Constitution for every American regardless of his color, his race, his ethnic background, his origin, or his religion. And this is right. It is morally right, and in terms of our political tradition, it is politically right, and there isn't any force that can stop the fulfillment of this goal of full citizenship. The privileges and the duties, the responsibilities and all of the opportunities of full citizenship. The American people are angry today, and indeed they are

discouraged and disgusted when they see for example, police brutality upon Americans who seek only the right to vote, the right to dine in a dining room, the right to parade in a general store, or department store, the right to be free people, and as President Kennedy said, you cannot have a free America until all Americans enjoy freedom. And we can't export freedom until all Americans enjoy freedom. So we are seeing violence in our streets, and we are seeing acts of brutality, dogs set upon innocent people by police, and the Americans are demanding an end to it. They are demanding now that the Courts take action. The Courts have been great, strong and courageous in this whole issue of civil and constitutional rights. Not only that our President take action, and he's done a fine and commendable and courageous job, but at last the Congress must act, because the Congress represents the people, and this means a civil rights program before Congress, and it will be here, and I want to tell you now that we are going to carry through on this program even if we have to stay here all year. And we maybe ought to plan our business as a year-around business in the Congress. I'll ^{have} responsibility in this area and I want to pledge here and now that whatever the consequences may be, no matter how bitter the battle, no matter how long the fight we are going to pass the basic necessary legislation, to see to it that these issues of human rights and civil rights are not settled in the streets by force and violence, but rather can be handled by courts of law, can handled within due process of law, and people guaranteed their

rights. Now this isn't just a matter for the Federal government, it is your problem too. Everyone of us has this weighing heavily on his conscience. And we must as individuals and citizens speak out against bigotry and discrimination and prejudice and we must be willing to accept the fact that every American is entitled to equal rights under the Constitution and under the law. No less than that. This means that local government and state government must cooperate, and that local officials and state officials must cooperate, and it means that the spiritual leaders of our nation must speak up for that equality which is to be found in man as a creature of Divine Providence; it means that educators must speak up, and that citizens leaders must speak up. The time of condoning discrimination and prejudice is over. We can't afford it any longer. It is already far too late.

Now, one other issue that we heard this week was the issue of war and peace. Our President made a tremendous address at the American University here in Washington, D. C. Calling upon the peoples of the world to search relentlessly for the ways to peace, that peace is not just one single act; there are many things which bring it about. Many that can destroy it. And he reminded us that peace is a process. You build towards peace. He reminded us that it takes as much courage and maybe even more to be the peacemaker than it does the warrior. And he again said that America was ready to abandon nuclear tests in the atmosphere, on our own, without any treaty, without any guarantees, as long as the Soviet Union

did the same. We would take the initiative, and we can do this safely because there is no danger of cheating here, because we have ways and means of knowing whether or not someone violates the pledge. And we're sending a high level negotiating group to Moscow to see if we cannot at long last find some way to put the lid on this arms race, and to turn it down instead of letting it spiral up; because the arms race, in itself, is a danger. And now finally, we have before us in the Congress a foreign aid program. And I just want to say this about it. Foreign aid to some people may be distasteful. But it is a part of our security. It is a part of the burden we must bear as a leader in the free world, and it has had memorable success--the Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps and in the days ahead the Alliance for Progress. And let me just say in conclusion, that foreign aid is not unpopular. It is necessary. And it is backed by the American people.

Well I'll be back with you in two weeks with a guest, and we'll talk more about these vital issues.

TV SCRIPT

JUNE 26, 1963

Bob Coar: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, the Assistant Majority Leader of the United States Senate reporting to the people of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. Today I am going to take the opportunity that is afforded me to tell you how a program is constructed, or how it is designed by the President, and then presented to the Congress. And, I believe that we have a good case in point in the Civil rights program presented by President Kennedy recently to the Congress of the U. S. Now, from time to time, I have shared with you the discussions that have taken place at the White House in what we term our personal legislative meetings with the President. As you know, we regularly meet with President Kennedy every Tuesday morning for our breakfast meeting, a brief breakfast and sometimes a rather long discussion on issues that face the country and on the programs that are to be presented to the Congress or are now before the Congress. These meetings are attended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the House, and the Majority Whip; they are attended by the Majority Leader, Senator Mansfield of the Senate, the Secretary to the Democratic Congress in Senate, Senator Smathers, and myself as Majority Whip or Assistant Majority Leader. And at these meetings with the President and the Vice President we try to plan out a program of action before the Congress and indeed share our thoughts with the President on matters

of international concern and of domestic importance. Now, let's just discuss the creation of the Civil Rights Program. Well, we know of one thing that the whole issue of Civil rights came into sharp focus by the many demonstrations that have taken place in our community throughout the nation. The problems in Birmingham and Oxford and Jackson; the racial tensions we have witnessed in Boston and New York and Chicago and Detroit and yes, in Minnesota in Minneapolis. All of this has brought the country to a recognition, to a realization that something more needed to be done to guarantee civil rights for every American and to protect the human rights that a free citizen in a free democratic nation has and is entitled to by his citizenship, and by his very person. Let me first of all set the definition straight. By civil rights we mean legal rights, rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution of the U. S., rights that are guaranteed by our Bill of Rights, rights of citizenship, that there shall be equal chance, equal privileges, and equality before the law. This is a constitutional provision and a constitutional declaration and right. Now those constitutional provisions are carried out by statutory law, by the Congress, by, of course, state legislatures, by the President in his executive capacity, and then by the courts. In recent years, the courts have been the protectors of constitutional rights or civil rights and then the executive branch of our government has taken positive and affirmative action. For example, there is no discrimination in the Armed Services; men and women in the Armed Services are treated equally, they are treated without any regard to race color or creed. They en-

joy equal privileges, equal responsibilities within their respective or within their respective activity. Now when you get down to the issue of human rights, however, you^{are} talking not about the constitutional problem, but a moral issue. Because human rights are what are declared in our own Declaration of Independence when we say that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. And we list them as: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. The Declaration goes on to say that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights. Now human rights are in a sense not only moral but spiritual, because each individual is equal in the eyes of our Maker and in a free society, in a democratic society that is predicated upon certain spiritual tenets, certain ideals and convictions such as human dignity and freedom of conscience and brotherhood of man. Then human rights take on the moral aspect. So we put civil rights as legal and constitutional and human rights as moral, and in a real sense spiritual. And there can be no argument it seems to me that every individual is entitled to the full realization and fulfillment of those rights. So the President of the United States has given us leadership--both moral and political now--on this great fundamental issue of our constitutional civil rights and our human rights. How did this message of his, this powerful message, this dramatic message, how did it come into being? What happened, how was it formulated? What took place in the many weeks prior to its presentation to the Congress of the United States. I am sure that you heard and you read that for several in advance of this great message of the President and the program that he presented to

us, that something was going to happen here in Washington that the President was going to act, that a message was forthcoming. Well, I sat in on those deliberations, and I can tell you that every aspect of that message every paragraph every single item in the message was discussed in detail by the President and his advisers, by the executive branch as well as those of us here in the legislative branch. I was one of those who urged upon our president the

Well this particular telecast film that is coming to you had to be interrupted just a moment ago because I was required to go to the Senate Floor at once to cast a vote on the Area Redevelopment Legislation and the extension of the Area Redevelopment Program, and the vote was 67 to 30. This is a piece of legislation by the way that is the Administration sponsored, one that I have been privileged to co-sponsor. The Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas was the floor leader on this bill and did an admirable, and many of our Minnesotans remember our Mr. Douglas very well. Well, AR is good news for many of our Minnesotans, particularly up in NE Minnesota, and it means new employment opportunities, it means new economic progress for our state. I am very happy.

Now let me get back to this civil rights matter, and just try to tie it down for you for a moment. I was talking about the process of how we, the process of preparing a message and a legislative program.

The consultation that has taken place. And it was my privilege to sit in on those consultations as I told you. I was one of those that urged that the President take plenty of time to develop this message, that item could be gone over carefully. I have urged and recommended that a consultation be broadened not only to the members of Congress and to the executive branch but to the private sector, the public itself. And you know our President is met with the great spiritual leaders, the lawyers, the labor leaders, the educators and many others to ask their participation in the fulfillment of the promise of human rights. Their help in the designing of legislation, the problems of human rights, and their help in the designing of legislation. And I believe that one of the most encouraging developments thus far is that so many of these leaders and the private sector of our economy, in education, in labor, in business, and in all the many other areas have taken the initiative in their home towns, in their respective groups to see to it that any form of discrimination is done away with and that new opportunities are being opened for people of every race creed and color in our country. Well, this legislative program was developed day by day, week by week; we had many conferences, every time I returned from Minnesota I would be called to sit in on a meeting at the White House. Many, many hours went into it. And I am happy to say that the program that was finally presented to the Congress was a comprehensive program that will do great good if we can adopt, and we are determined to pass it. The President's message was a masterpiece, it was not only a great moral document, and that it was, but it was an effective political document.

in the sense that it laid out a legislative program of action as well as a community program of action. The President recommended to us the extension of the Civil Rights Commission to hear these civil rights matters, to do honest objective probing into them. He recommended new protection of voting rights, and every American ought to be entitled to that vote. How can you deny a man a right to vote when you ask him to serve his country in war, when you ask him to pay taxes, and yet so many Americans were denied that right. There is a presumption of literacy, for example, if you have a sixth grade education. There was another part of the message that placed right cases that go to court at the head of the docket in the courts so they wouldn't be delayed because justice delayed is justice denied. And then there was the community services program, instead of trying to settle everything by law, by edict and by court order, we have a kind of conciliation service to work with the agreed parties, to try to settle these differences between the races and the problems at the community level. And then there was the over-all ban on discrimination wherever Federal funds are used on every Federal project. I strongly recommended this, and I was happy to see the President accept my recommendation. And finally there was this matter of the public accommodations to see to it that certain public and private facilities that people are not denied access to those facilities, like department stores, and drug stores, and lunch counters, and restaurants, and motels and hotels, not denied access because of race and because of color. Now we've got to close this citizenship gap in our country.

You can't afford to have any free nation that tries to lead the whole world in the paths of decency and freedom second-class citizens for certain people. There is only one kind of citizenship in American states, and that is first-class citizenship. And let's keep it that way, make it that way. Now this means more than just legal rights though. It means jobs too, and one of the best parts of the civil rights program and one that I personally worked on and I'm sure I've talked to you about it before was this huge program of training education of vocational and technical education, for the large number of people, and many of them Negroes, people of Negro decent who have had little or no training, that this program go to them to upgrade their skills to give them skills so that they can fit into the industrialized urbanized society. Thousands, yes hundreds of thousands of these people came from rural areas where there is little or no education no experience in the industrialized life. This was included in the program. Now I want to race along for just a moment, because another matter is closer at hand and at heart. The President has had a triumphant tour in Europe---particularly into Germany. This is good for America. The President has established once again his leadership as a world statesman, many people said he shouldn't go, there are always those timid souls, they said what good will it do if he goes? He is walking into trouble. My answer to this is that the world is filled with trouble, and if you are going to have to live in this world, you are going to have to do something. And I think that President Kennedy has done something about it. His statement, his message at Frankfurt Germany was a tremendous document. It was a great document. Pleading

for Atlantic unity, and reminding the Europeans that freedom is indivisible, that if Europe becomes divided from the U. S. it will only weaken the U. S. and Europe. That we face a powerful enemy in the totalitarian communist forces, that we must be united. I think this message was a ringing answer to the critics of the President's trip, and more than that it was a positive statement and approbation of American leadership for the Atlantic Community to build a great free area of the world, that is invincible not only in power but invincible in terms of ideals and its democratic tradition. The President is doing a great job and representing our country in the chancellories of the world. And there is another good piece of news. The elections took place in Peru. I am so pleased because this means good things for the Alliance for Progress. You may recall a year ago the military set aside those election results. This time the elections have taken place and a democratic a democrat that begins with a small "d" a man that believes in freedom has been elected to president of Peru. This is a good sign for the Alliance for Progress. Now these are some of the developments of recent date, I'll see you two weeks from now and I hope to have with me a guest that will be of interest to you. Thank you.

JUNE 29, 1963

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGES IN THE U. S. AND NEW MANPOWER NEEDS

BOB COAR: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today the Assistant Majority Leader reports on a significant and critical challenge facing the U. S. Now here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. And, yes, there is a very significant and critical challenge facing the United States, and at the same time it is a great opportunity, just as some people interpret it as a serious problem. What do I refer to? I refer to the growth of our population, I refer to the impact upon our economy, and upon the population of a technological and scientific advances. We call this automation when it comes to manufacturing and to production of goods and services, and I refer, of course to the whole meaning of economic growth, and what economic growth means in terms of job opportunities, and economic advance and prosperity for our country.

Now this isn't the kind of topic that you can deal with in just a very few moments, that is in depth. But you can at least skim the surface, one can get a sort of picture of what is going on if you just spend a few minutes in observation and study of the certain key statistics.

Now, just let's take a look and see what's happening. One, our country is a growing country population-wise. Each year better than a million new workers come into the labor force. Now if we didn't have any changes at all in terms of our technology, and if there were no effects from scientific progress, we still have to find about 1,200,000 jobs a year. But in the meantime, we have changes in our technology. Everybody knows that workers are being displaced by machines. Production is being increased and expanded by machines. There is a high degree of obsolescence in machines. There is a constant change in the production methods; not long ago during some hearings that I was conducting on this whole subject of the impact of science and technology on our economy and on the individual lives, I heard some startling testimony. And I am going to share some of that with you today in the hopes that it might bring home some of the challenges that we face for the future and why we simply must look ahead and make some plans. We cannot afford the luxury any longer of just hoping that everything will come out alright. Things are moving too rapidly, there is far too much interdependence in our economy to permit things to run haphazardly. What effects one part of America, will effect all of it. So we need to take a good look ahead. Furthermore, we Americans and this nation must stay strong economically, politically, morally in order to provide the leadership the free world needs in these critical days, yes, these critical years for the foreseeable future.

Well, I'm going to refer to some notes now, because when you deal with statistical evidence you ought to be accurate. And I have testimony from Dr. Wolfbein of the Department of Labor, the United States Government, as well as from some of the outstanding economists of our great university. We have been holding, as I said, a remarkable hearing, very very interesting. Regretably very little publicity about this, I guess it's because we have ~~not~~ not accused anybody of anything. We have more or less been studying, and when you go into an area of scholarship or study, it all too often doesn't make the news. But here is some startling news, just look at this! We're going to have to have starting 1970, 300,000 new jobs every month. Now that's a lot of new jobs. Automation will effect 22,000,000 jobs by 1970. Now that means about 2,200,000 jobs every year in the 10 year period between 1960 and 1970. Then you add on to that the population growth and you get a figure that comes up around the 34-35,000,000 of jobs. This is what we have to provide in this ten year period. Here's another way of putting it, and I want to just quote from what was in the testimony. "This year technology is affecting all areas of our national life. Fewer people are needed to produce what our people need--the most staggering and awesome result in the number of jobs and the types of jobs we will have to have to create for a rising population and for people thrown out of work by automation. Right now, we need 300,000 jobs every month, and by 1970 we will need to create an additional 35,000,000 jobs. We find, for example, that we're able to produce by 1970 all

that we need; or let us put it this way, we will be able to produce as much in 1970 with 22,000,000 fewer workers than we used in 1960. Now the emphasis is on jobs and becomes very very important. Now let me just relate this to another aspect of our economy---agriculture, because this is close to us out home in Minnesota. In 1870, one farmer or farm worker produced enough food for $5\frac{1}{2}$ people. By 1940, one farm worker produced enough food for 10-11 people. Now that was a substantial increase which about doubled in that 70 year period. Now get this in 1960, one farm worker produced enough food for twenty-seven people. Technology, science, fertilizer, yes, and machinery and food methods of production, education, research, all of this had an impact so that in the period from 1870 to 1940 a 70 year period you doubled food production per worker. Between 1940 and 1960 in the war years and the immediate post-war years you went from $10\frac{1}{2}$ workers, $10\frac{1}{2}$ persons up to $27\frac{1}{2}$ persons for one farm worker. Now, the one farm worker could feed that many. This is the most fabulous pace in production that the world has ever known. Each month, I should say each year, there are approximately 200,000 farm men and women, or men and women from our farms going into the city. This is due primarily to technological changes. Now, so you're getting an urbanite society. And you are getting an automated society, and you're getting a society that is under the heavy impact of science and technology. Now all of this ought to be for the good, but it poses some real problems.

Of course, it advances our standard of living, but it has left us with a hard core of unemployment which regrettably seems to be growing each year. And it faces us with problems in the immediate future that are staggering. Let me give you an example: the war babies are becoming of age now. This year there were over 1,000,000 16 year olds, there was one million more 16 year olds than any other time in our past history. This was the crop of babies born in 1947. And next year there will be more. And the rate of unemployment amongst our young people is going up. This is a serious problem. You cannot afford to have these restless, energetic young people without gainful work, without a place to use their efforts, and their energy. Now this get right back to a subject that has been close to my heart all the time, because the statistics reveal the truth of what I am about to say, namely; that education is the answer. America ~~NEEDS~~ doesn't just need muscle power any more, we need brainpower. The number of unskilled workers required today is diminishing. The number of workers on farms is diminishing. What we need is a sort of updated, upgraded skilled and semi-skilled, and professional persons. And education is the answer. Let me show what I mean. Two out of every three people presently unemployed have less than an high school education. And the number of unemployed college-trained people is really insignificant. It's so small that it is hard to describe it in statistical terms. Let me just put it this way. The unemployment rate in April of 1963 was 12.9 or about 13 per cent for unskilled workers, and 1.7 that is 1 and 7/10 per cent for

professional personnel. The unskilled labor rate was $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as high as the corresponding rate for skilled craftsmen. It all boils down simply to this---that if you don't have an education, you're behind before you get started. And it all settles down to something else, America must improve its educational structure. Higher education---colleges, universities, we are going to have tremendous numbers of young people coming into our schools. We are going to have to improve on what we call our secondary education, our high schools, and our elementary, and above all our vocational and technical educational ~~EDUCATIONAL~~ system must be updated. There is something wrong with American education when we have so many school dropouts; when we have approximately 1,000,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 20 who are school dropouts, who are unemployed. There is something wrong. And I think that educators had better re-examine their educational structure. And we who are parents and public servants had better take another look at it. Education has to provide something more now than just academic training. It must provide a work experience, it must provide a kind of work discipline. Young people don't have the chance any more to work in their father's drugstore, or on their father's farm, or in their father's garage, or in their father's department store. It's a different day and age, and therefore, it is imperative that the educational structure not only train the mind and enrich the spirit, but also that it keeps some habits of work, and work discipline, and responsibility, and reliability and skills and

semi-skills, because we are beginning to need more and more people in the "white collar" class, in the services, beginning to need more and more skilled people, and fewer unskilled. Here was a figure the other day that was quite important---in 1900 85 per cent of the young people, of what we call the high school age, they had no high school education. You didn't go to high school in 1900, in 1960 eighty-five per cent of the young people did have a high school education. A high school education is the minimum and I don't mean just getting into a high school, I mean a good high school education, and as I speak to you now let me say that every one of us has an obligation to see to it that every young man and woman that has the desire for higher education, or college, junior college, community college, four-year course, professional courses, that these young people get these courses. Why? Not just to help the young people, but to help the whole nation. If we are going to be able to deal with results of science and technology and we are way out in front in sciences and technology, we are going to have to have sharper people, we are going to have to have people who are more accustomed to urban life that can work with the achievements of science and technology and can contribute to them. And this means brainpower, investment in education. Let's take a look just in this last moment here at this whole picture of civil rights, and the abuse of civil rights. What's happening? Thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens---Negro Americans---have come from the farms of the

TRIP TO MOSCOW

Bob Coar: This is Washington, and this is Senator Humphrey. As you know, Senator Humphrey has just returned from a very important trip to Moscow, and here he is to report to you the people of his state.

Senator Humphrey: Well, thank you, it is a real pleasure to report to you after an eventful and most interesting journey on an official mission for our government, to Moscow, the USSR, the Soviet Union. First of all, I was one of several Senatorial delegates sent by President Kennedy to the signing ceremonies of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, Monday, August 6, in Moscow. The Senators who journeyed to Moscow were Senators Fulbright (Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee), Pastore (Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy), Sparkman (Chairman of the Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee) and Humphrey (Chairman on the Subcommittee on Arms Control and Disarmament of the Foreign Relations Committee). These were the four Democratic members; the two Republican members were Senator Saltonstall (Senior Republican in the Senate, and the ranking Minority member of the Armed Services Committee) and Senator George Aiken (one of the Senior Republicans in the U. S. S. and a ranking member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee). This was a bi-partisan committee as it well should be, because the treaty ratification should not be a partisan matter. This

is something that must be considered on its merits, without regard to partisanship. And the ultimate decision as to Senate action must be based upon what we believe to be in our national interests, and our national security.

The delegation that was dispatched to Moscow left Washington, D. C. at 11:30 on Friday night, August 2. That delegation flew to Moscow via Copenhagen, Denmark with our first stop. We went into the large new presidential jet which was an experience within itself. Other members of the party included the Secretary of State and Mrs. Rusk, our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, the Director and Administrator of the Arms Control Agency, William C. Foster and Mrs. Foster, former chief negotiator for the U. S. Government at Geneva and in Korea, both for President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, Arthur Dean and Mrs. Dean, (Mr. Dean being one of the outstanding lawyers of our country); there were a number of professionals from the Department of State, and then, of course, there were the regular secretarial and secret service people who were included.

 Saturday in
We spent/Moscow and spent Saturday evening, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday in Moscow and left Moscow at 10:30 A.M. Wednesday morning. And, believe it or not, I was back here in the U. S. S., Wednesday afternoon voting on the Appropriations Bill for Health, Education, and Welfare activities. We left at 10:30 A.M., we stopped in New York City to permit Ambassador Stevenson to go directly to the United Nations and then journeyed to Washington, D. C.

arriving here at approximately 4:45 in the afternoon. What an amazing world we live in! The rapidity and speed of communication is dazzling, it is almost overpowering. Imagine being able to have breakfast in Moscow, lunch in Copenhagen, and dinner in Washington, D. C., and at the same time participate in the debates of the U.S.S. and cast two votes on roll call votes, and being present for final passage of an important Appropriations Bill.

Well, that's sort of a travelogue, but it gives you some idea of what can be done over one weekend. Now the treaty signing was on Monday, prior to the treaty signing in Moscow, we had an early morning of our delegation at the U. S. Embassy in Moscow with our Ambassador, Mr. Foy Kohler, and with our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. Then we had a meeting at the Foreign Ministry office of the Soviet Union with Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Union's Foreign Minister, and at 11: o'clock we met for one hour with the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. Nikita Khrushchev. I hadn't seen Mr. K. since 1958, he recalled our visit, he was pleasant, the entire proceeding was rather informal, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers looked well, spirited, vigorous. He was getting ready to take his vacation at the Black Sea summer home. He invited all of us to come as his guests, but those of us in the Senate knew that we needed to return here for our official duties. The Secretary of State, however, and the Director of Arms Control remained over to discuss some important questions with the Soviet Union Prime Minister or Chairman. Those discussions have been going on during the week, and the days

after the Senatorial delegation returned to Washington.

At 1:30 P.M. on Monday, we had an elaborate luncheon in the Kremlin, prior to that having visited the areas of the Kremlin, which is a tremendous structure. We were taken into the Museum areas, ^{living} the/quarters of the late Czar, the fantastic display of gifts that had been bought or brought to the Czars. Really, this is one of the most elaborate, the most luxurious, the unbelievably rich and expensive accumulation of gifts and articles relating to a Nation that I have ever witnessed. The Kremlin has been completely redone, it's very beautiful. And our luncheon was at 1:30 in a beautiful old room, the earliest room, the first room having been constructed in about the 15th century. And then in the afternoon at about 4:00 we had the signing ceremonies with the three foreign ministers, the British F M, the U. S. Secretary of State, and the Soviet F M, standing at a large long table signing in their respective languages, or signing I should say the treaty in three languages, French, English, Russian. Back behind these three foreign ministers were the delegates and the officials that were privileged to be present for the ceremony. By the way, the Secretary General of the U. N., U Thant, was also present. He was invited because the agreement had been under the auspices of the United Nations. I think this was particularly significant, and U Thant made one of the most remarkable addresses of all on the occasion of the

signing ceremonies. Those ceremonies were in a very beautiful hall in the Kremlin with magnificent chandeliers lighting the entire area. And for the first time, the American television cameras were permitted in the Kremlin to witness such an important ceremony, otherwise ordinarily it would ^{be} the Soviet television that would make the film available to our cameramen, but we insisted this time that our newspaper people, photographers and television operators be permitted to be there in their own right. And that insistence was granted for the first time in the Kremlin. There were several firsts, of course; you know, one of interesting developments at that ceremony was the toasting that goes on by the Soviet officials on the occasion of each signature. The President of the U. S. being toasted, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain or I should say the Queen of England as the head of state and the President of the Soviet Union. With each signature, this little social ceremony went on. That evening there was a tremendous reception in the Kremlin. Present were all of the Ambassadors at the Soviet Union. I met many old friends, people that I knew in the United Nations, and the heads of all the different departments of the Soviet Government, as well as the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church and the chief Rabbi in Moscow. Here was another first, for the first time the head of the Church, of the Russian Orthodox Church and the chief Rabbi were present at the ceremony, and Mr. Khrushchev went over to greet them as did our Secretary of State. I went also to greet them. I thought this was rather significant, because each of these

things has some hidden, and sometimes ^{obvious} ~~hidden~~ meaning. Well, I thought that I just give you a little of the background. Now, let me tell you something of the importance of the treaty.

Everyone knows that it is a significant treaty to ban nuclear tests in the atmosphere, underwater, and outer space. I shan't go into the provisions of the treaty, because I did that when Mr. William C. Foster was a guest on this telecast. By the way, that telecast was made prior to the initialing and the signing of the treaty, and we were of the opinion that the negotiations would be successful, so we took the chance and made the telecast on film.

The treaty, as each of the foreign secretaries indicated, is a first step in the reduction of the arms race, or in the lessening of the tensions in the international arena. From here on out, we'll have to proceed with caution, of course, but we must proceed to explore the possibilities of easing these international tensions. We ought not to assume that there will be a quick and sudden chance. We ought to remember that the Soviets, the Communists, still want to dominate this world and we must be on guard. But we ought to recognize also that we have great strength, and that that strength is not merely in weapons, or in bombs, but I saw how our strength really measures compared to the Soviet Union in my visit to Moscow. Our economic structure is so much more vital, so much more flexible so much more alive, there isn't any comparison between our economic system and theirs. They are so much behind despite the advances

they have made. But, I must say that in 1958, my previous visit, and in 1963, there have been marked changes, marked improvements in the area around Moscow, many new homes, the people look better, they are better dressed, shops are filled with good foods and reasonably good supplies, but prices are scandalously high. How would you like to pay \$345 for an ordinary suit of clothes, I mean, for an ordinary television---17 " television---that's the average price. \$150 - 175 for a suit like I have on which I paid \$59 for, here in the United States. The Russian worker works a month and a half for one suit of clothes. The Russian worker would have to work three to four months for one television set. Prices are high. Goods are scarce, and yet the people are demanding more of the consumer goods, and I think that this is going to have an impact upon Soviet policy, because Mr. Khrushchev is not immune from public pressures, nor is anybody in this day and age. So I happen to believe that if we tried to muster the real strength of our nation, we can win any conflict, any contest. If Mr. K. wants competitive co-existence, then let's compete, but let's compete in other areas besides just the weaponry. He can build the big bombs, he can build rockets, and sputniks, they have the capacity to do, but they are not able to build all of the bombs and all of the sputniks, and the rockets, and the housing that they need, and the schools, and the clothing, and the food and the automobiles, and all the other things that we need for decent living. Therefore, I want for us to explore other

possibilities, how can we engage in the trade, for example, in this area, to our advantage as well as theirs. Why don't we press more for our cultural exchanges, more students to go abroad, more tourists, because everytime a Russian sees a Western European or an American, he knows that there is a better life to be found somewhere else. He knows that there are better clothes, and there are better clothes, and better foods, and he becomes restless, and he asks more of his government. Well, this trip was rewarding to me and Mrs. Humphrey who journeyed with me, we visited with hundreds of Russian people, we found them to be like we are---interested in peace, interested in a better life, but regrettably so ill-informed because they live in a society that is a closed society in more areas and most instances. I am hopeful that in the days ahead that we will be able to penetrate that society with our ideas of freedom and opportunity. This is our challenge.

Thank you.

TV SCRIPT - SENATOR HUMPHREY ON CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION
TEST BAN, CIVIL RIGHTS

BOB COAR: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today, the Senate Majority Whip reports on the most important issues facing the country.

Here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR: Well, thank you. First I want to report to you what has been a topic of discussion here in the nation's capitol. Namely, that this session of Congress will be a full session. Jokingly, and yet very seriously, we say that "plan your Christmas dinner in Washington." Now, some people will say that this is because there has been stalling, and there has been procrastination in the Congress, but possibly there is a deeper meaning to it all than just politics. It seems to me that the time is long overdue for our recognizing that the business of the Congress is a full-time, year-round, all-the-time business. We are victims in these institutions of government, and social structure of what we call tradition. And because over the many years and in fact decades and generations, we have looked upon Congress, or sessions of Congress as being less than a year, or in the earlier days being two or three months, twenty-five ~~MM~~ years ago, let's say just five or six months. We have gotten into the habit of talking about Congress as if it ought to adjourn somewhere around the first of July

or the middle of the summer. Now this hasn't happened since 1940, that's 23 years. It seems to me that after at least 20 years of a practice and experience which is contrary to all of the fiction and all of the tradition, that we would begin to think in terms of reality. So I say that the Congress should plan its work for 12 months, not for 10, not for 8, not for just a few weeks, but we have a big job to do in these days of emergency and international tension and we ought to be here on the job. Now this doesn't mean that we can't plan some time away, like ordinary people ought to have. Some time with family, a few week s vacation in order to get back to your constituents, with your loved ones. This is done in factories, in every business house in the nation, and it surely ought to be possible for the members of Congress to work out the program of their work or their schedule, but there is some time to live a relatively normal life. I say "relatively" because, speaking of my own experience, my work keeps me on the job, 10 to 14 to 16 hours a day. I do not expect to have a really normal existence. Weekends that we have are either spent in travel, or if you come back to your home state, it means meetings; so that you don't really plan on a comfortable weekend out in the boat in the lake, you know. What you plan on is a little change of pace. Therefore, I recommend that not only should we revise the procedures of

the Congress so that the procedures are designed for modern-day government responsibilities, we should also revise and re-schedule the term of Congress. A full year term, and let's quit kidding ourselves. We have to be here, and we are going to be here. Just out of necessity. Now, speaking of other changes that have to take place, and changes that I think ought to take place, just let me cite one or two other examples. Right now, we are ^{having} hearings on the so-called nuclear test ban treaty. I went to Moscow along with several other Senators and the Secretary of State to be present for the signing of that important treaty. It was a very historic and important occasion, and the visit to Moscow gave me an opportunity, once again, to see developments in the Soviet Union. But when we came back, the President sent the treaty to the Congress, and under the rules of the Congress, that is the rules established in the 1940's, this treaty is supposed to go to the Foreign Relations Committee. And we are supposed to have on that Committee, and I serve on it, we are supposed to have complete jurisdiction over the hearings and over the testimony, and over the processing of this treaty, and then report it back to the Senate. Are we doing that? Of course not. And why not? Because the developments in weaponry, the developments in terms of National Security require that other committees of the Congress be brought into play, be brought into the act so to speak. Therefore, we have a meeting right now; the three committees, Foreign

Relations, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Armed Services committee, listening to the witnesses taking testimony, cross-examining witnesses on one of the most vital issues ever before the Congress---a treaty or with the Soviet Union relating to the limitations ~~of~~ the prohibition of further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. Now I mention this to you because it only shows how out-of-step and out-of-date you can get, and it also shows the reluctance of the Congress to change when it ought to change. At the executive level of government, we have what we call the National Security Council. This is the body that advises the President on national security matters, in fact, the President sits with the security council and determines foreign policy, and defense policy, military policy, for our government and our nation. The National Security Council ~~doesn't~~ doesn't just consist of the President and his generals; it consists of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of the military services, and others. Because even the financing of a program has something to do with our capacity to defend ourselves. Now, if the President needs a National Security Council to advise him and through which he can work to come to a judgment and a decision relating to the very security and survival of this nation, then, don't you think the Congress needs something similar? Why should we expect a Secretary of

Defense, or the Secretary of State to run around the Halls of Congress? Like he was playing hop-scotch or skip-and-jump from one Committee to another. Therefore, Senator Humphrey has proposed that we establish a Joint Committee on National Security, consisting of representatives of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the fields of foreign policy, foreign relations, atomic energy, the armed services, and appropriations. A sort of super cabinet, if you please, for the Congress, where the Secretary of State can come and talk and consult and receive advice and exchange views. I think that this is absolutely required. Now I am hopeful that you'll take an interest in it too, because this is modernizing the machinery of the Congress, and I am rather surprised that there hasn't been more interest in this proposal. Oh yes, some of the professional people in public administration, in the national security agencies that are interested. But the American people ought to know that if the Congress is to have any hand at all in national security matters and foreign policy, it has to modernize its machinery to participate. You can't participate in the space age with a Model-T Ford. And you can't participate in the atomic age with firecrackers, and Congress cannot participate in the great decisions, that is participate effectively, in the great decisions affecting this nation. Decisions which ultimately must be carried out by the President of the United States. Unless the Congress equips itself to do so. So I say, let's stay to work full time, let's modernize the machinery of Congress so that we can do our job. And speaking of that

I have made a second proposal, and it relates to trade. The Joint Committee on Foreign Trade. Yes, putting the two Houses of Congress together, instead of pretending that we're enemies or separate bodies, why don't we act as if we are a representative body. Foreign trade is vital to the national welfare. Foreign trade is involved in our national prosperity or its involved in unemployment if we don't have it. And foreign trade is the difference between a deficit in our balance of payments, an outflow of gold, or it may mean a surplus in our balance of payment, and an inflow of gold. Foreign trade today in the Congress, where do you find any responsibility for it? I have been here for 15 years, and I must say that it's like the best-kept secret. You don't know which committee or what committee has jurisdiction. Where are we supposed to go to find out what Congress thinks about these matters? The Committee on Finance that handles taxation, well now that is perfectly obvious, its perfectly obvious to me at least that the Committee that handles the tax problems of Congress has something more to do than just look at foreign trade. I better put it another way, that foreign trade is sort out of its jurisdiction or frame of reference. Because tariffs in the early days were so important and because tariffs were revenue-raising measures, and tariffs were a kind of import tax. The Finance and the Ways and Means Committees took jurisdiction over foreign trade. But foreign trade today effects our military security, it affects our economic policy, our foreign economic policy, it affects our foreign relations,

and I think we better modernize the machinery of Congress in this aspect too. If we are going to have any foreign trade, and if we are going to have the people back home properly represented in the Congress and in this government by the members of Congress on issues of foreign trade. Now, let me jump quickly to this test ban matter. We have just a few minutes left.

You know, this treaty that we have been holding hearings on is one of the most important treaties that we have signed in many a decade. ^{it} If/ is ratified, it will be the first significant treaty that the Soviet Union has signed for many years. Now, we are not relying upon trust or the good will of the Russians in this treaty. We can't do that, you know that. We are relying on our detection system, on our own national security system to see to it that this treaty is enforced and to see that there is no evasion of the treaty and no violation. If there is violation we can withdraw immediately. If the Russians should start to test nuclear weapons, we can start to test immediately. The President has told you that we are going to be in a state of ready alert with all of our testing facilities, our laboratories geared up ready to go, including our scientists. The teams of scientists are held together. We all continue to do underground testing, we will continue to try to improve our system of detection and identification. This is a significant treaty. It could be the turning point in our relationship with the Soviet Union. It could and I say could lead to better and further developments. But it may not. We ought not to expect too much. But we can say that at

least this treaty can and will slow down the nuclear arms race. Would it leave us in a bad position, or we would never have signed it? Does it mean that we will have no defense against missiles? Not indeed, the testimony proves to the contrary. Does it mean that it will leave us in an inferior position with the Russians? The answer is no, the answer is positively "no". What does it mean? It means that it has advantages on both sides, it permits a better use of resources, e.g. economic resources. And I think one of the reasons the Russians signed this treaty is that the Russians need money and they need the economic resources for domestic development, for their agriculture for example. I think another^{reason}/the Russians signed this treaty is because they saw that we would fight, and with nuclear weapons, if need be, like last October in the Cuban crisis. Premier Khrushchev had to look nuclear war right in the eye, and what he saw, he didn't like. And I think that Mr. K. realizes today that his major enemy and opponent is in China, Communist China. And he is worried about the fact that the Chinese Communists may get nuclear information, and nuclear weapons. I think that he also knows that we have massive power, and that we can outstrip him in power. And this administration, has by the way, added to the power of this country. The military power, the economic power, and I would say, yes, the moral power of the United States throughout the world. So you see, there are good reasons for the signing treaty and for it being brought to a vote for ratification. Unless other developments come about, the developments that I can't foresee now, I'm

going to vote for this treaty. ^And I am going to do it because that it is in our best national interest.

Now finally, we are going to have to act and pass this session the Civil rights legislation, the tax legislation. Many people have said "well, one ought to come before the other." All that I want to say is that they are tied together. One of the most important rights a man has is a right to a job. And the civil rights issue will always be a top issue as long as there is unemployment. We can help both the economy and our people by passing these important bills in civil rights and tax reduction. I shall support them.

Thank you very much.

TV Script - October 31, 1963

BOB COAR: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. Now here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. And today I want to talk to you about our foreign aid program with particular emphasis upon the Alliance for Progress. The cooperative or mutual assistance program that we have with our friends in the Latin American republic. Just a word about foreign aid, since it always seems to be a rather controversial issue in the American public. We in the Congress have been studying this foreign aid program for several. The President having sent us the foreign aid message in the late spring--May or June. We held many days of hearings, and we have carefully scrutinized and examined every single ^{item}/country by country of the Administration's proposal for foreign aid. You may also recall that General Lucius Clay headed up a committee of distinguished citizens that examined the current foreign aid program, its substance, its administration, and then looked into foreign aid in past, present, and future. The result of that study was that certain recommendations were made which have been in the main or a large part incorporated into the present foreign aid bill that is now before the United States Senate. Actually, you may recall General Clay advocated a reduction in the foreign aid amount. That reduction was passed on to the Congress by the President, and we here in the Senate have made further reductions of some 300 millions of dollars. So that we have before the Senate

today a bill that has been carefully scrutinized by two committees of the Congress that has been examined by the Clay Commission that reviewed all foreign aid, that had a reduction first of all by the recommendations of General Clay, and secondly, a reduction of about 300 million dollars by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. So the bill that's before us is one that has been, I think it is fair to say, worked over. Now, let's just take a look at foreign aid, what is it? what is its purpose?

Well, we have had a program for assistance or mutual assistance or foreign aid ever since World War II. In fact, I think Lend Lease during and just prior to World War II might well have been called Foreign Aid, because it was a way of sharing the strength of the U. S. with the forces of freedom and the free nations around the world. Lend Lease was designed in the war days for our benefit to protect America. Foreign aid in the postwar years has as its primary purpose the strengthening and the protection of our national security. And foreign aid has had solid public support. The American people realize that national security today is not merely in our Air Force, or in our Marine Corps, or Navy, or Army, or in our Defense establishment, important as that is, but it is in a totality^{of our} program that relates to economic assistance, technical assistance, the financing of development in countries where without such development there would be revolution and violence and an opportunity for

Communist takeover. Therefore, the purpose of foreign aid, while it benefits the countries to which it is directed, is primarily beneficial to the United States, by making it possible for this nation to live in a world that is more tranquil, more peaceful, and to live in a world where more and more people have an opportunity to enjoy the benefits of modern science and technology. We as the greatest productive nation in the world as the richest nation and the strongest nation, as a people with our capacity to produce in factories and shops and in farms we have a big stake. Yes, a very big stake in having a world in which people are consumers in which there is a higher degree of prosperity and a higher level of economic performance. And therefore the foreign aid program is a mixture of three factors: military assistance, yes today we help make stronger some 3½ million troops who guard the ramparts of freedom in western Europe and other parts of the world, exclusive of our own, through military assistance. Military assistance to aid those people to face up to the constant aggression and attack of world communism; secondly, there is technical assistance to train people how to do things. To train them to use modern tools, to train people in the field of agriculture, in health, in industry, in public administration, so they can do a better job; thirdly, economic assistance, most of which in fact 95% of which is loans. Loans that are repayable in dollars. Loans that are repayable with interest in dollars. Now, I think this program is therefore worthy of merit and support. The American

think so too. Because, as I noticed here just prior to preparing for this telecast, the recent Gallup poll reported that a decisive majority of Americans support foreign aid. And that poll also reported that the percentage of support for foreign aid has been increasing steadily during the last nine years. Now, down here in Congress, many times you hear people talk as if foreign aid had no public support, no public understanding. The fact of the matter it has a great deal of support. Just like strong defense has strong support, and I repeat that our foreign aid program is vital to the security of the United States and to the strength of the free world as the military equipment and the trained military manpower that guards the ramparts of freedom of this world. Let me just look at foreign aid for or through a different set of glasses for a moment. I have said that it is vital to our national security, and I don't think there is any doubt about that. Our foreign aid in Greece and Turkey for example, where hundreds of thousands of troops have been trained and are supplied with foodstuffs and military^{defense equipment;} and through our military assistance and military support which is a part of foreign aid. As a matter of fact, that is the big part of it. Surely you would agree with me that this was important to the defense of freedom. But there is something else about foreign aid that many people don't understand. It helps to strengthen the United States' economy. For example, 80% of the foreign aid monies, all of the funds, are spent right here in the United States for goods and services that are purchased here for American factories, for American producers

of American materials, and then made available on the basis of loans or credits in the main to the recipient countries. I want to stress this point, we give very little in terms of grants. Very little. We give some in health, yes, some in education, but when it comes to building factories, and when it comes to agrarian reform, when it comes to matters of tools and equipment, these things are purchased on the part of the country that receives a loan from the development loan fund of the A I D administration. And those loans are being repaid with interest. So this is business as well as good national security. A I D purchases account for over $\frac{1}{2}$ million jobs in America and some of those jobs are right out in Minnesota because we supply a good deal of equipment for our foreign aid program. This foreign aid creates new markets for United States products, because people get used to using our products. They become accustomed to our trademark. And when machinery goes, farm machinery, trucks, tractors, earth-moving equipment goes from American factories under the foreign aid program to another country, spare parts, replacement parts, have to be purchased back here in the United States. I noticed for example in a report that we received in the Committee on Foreign Relations, that in 1962, the agency for International Development, that's our A I D agency, financed 25% of all the United States iron and steel mill product exports. $\frac{1}{3}$ of all of our steel exports come out of financing by foreign aid. This financing is paid. You don't generally lose money loaning it at interest. That is why banks generally have

profit. 38% of our export of fertilizer and locomotives are financed by foreign aid. Over 50 million dollars in foreign purchases of U.S. manufactured electrical appliances, and 10% of all of the trucks and all of the buses that are exported by the U. S. are financed by the foreign aid. One billion 200 million dollars worth of military goods produced in the U. S. have been made available to the U. S. financed by foreign aid, jobs for Americans, work for Americans, business for American/business firms is involved in foreign aid.

Aid financed almost 1/10 of the total amount in exports to under-developed countries in 1962. And that was a little over 7½ billion dollars worth of exports. So, no matter how you look at it, aid is good business for the United States. Well, now there are other good points that I could cite you for a moment. The Marshall Plan was foreign aid and did it work? I'll say so. The Marshall Plan went to western Europe. Loans and credit being repaid now to our country, several countries way ahead of their payments---such as France, and today western Europe is strong and prosperous. It's in fact a giant of industrial activity. The Point Four Program---technical assistance, a phenomenal success, all over the world, The Food for Peace Program, this is foreign aid. Tremendous success, and a great help to American agriculture. And the Peace Corps, one of the most popular programs, one of the most important programs ever conceived by a Government and accepted by those countries

where the help is needed. The Peace Corps is doing great things. In training, helping other people throughout the world. Now the Alliance for Progress has it been doing things? I'll say so, it's our effort in Latin America. We only put in a small amount compared to the total program. We put in for example the total amount would be about \$2 for every \$8. Our \$2 for \$8---let's say our \$2 million dollars for \$8 million put up by the Latin American Countries. And under this program, in less than two years, taking just the first year to get ready for it, and the second year to get on the job after countries have prepared their plans, after projects have been carefully reviewed, 140 thousand new housing units in Latin America. 4 million schoolbooks have been prepared and distributed for the first time modern schoolbooks. Not filled with communist propaganda, but with the spirit of democracy. Over 8,200,000 new schoolhouses have been built. 700 new community water systems have been established providing potable, clean water. More than 9 million children in 18 countries have been receiving school lunches through the Food for Peace Program under the Alliance for Progress. It's a marvelous record.

Now, I have just a moment or two left, and I want to show you something. Here's the way in Venezuela that they used to farm. I hope that our camera can see that. Here you see the oxen and the old wooden plow, productivity and agriculture down to little or nothing. Here's what happened when A I D got into the picture---the foreign aid program. Foreign aid you get tractors, American tractors increasing agricultural production by 200%. Here's in Brazil, here's the kind of slum conditions you see in Brazil. Terrible slums.

A seedbed, a natural setting for communist activity. And here's what happens under A I D. Houses built to sell for less than \$700. 15 years to pay for them. Low rates of interest, and workers that never had clean housing. Running water. Sanitation for the first time. And then you take a look here in Central America and you see the kind of pitiful conditions that maybe exist in some of the homes and health conditions that are unbelievable. Poor health. And here you see the mobile health unit. Hundreds of these mobile health units working in Latin America to bring better health to the people. What's the story then of the foreign aid program. It's sharing, it's helping, and above all it's strengthening the forces of freedom. And this is good for America, good politically, good economically, and its good morals as well.

Thank you.

EDD

TV Script - PEACE CORPS, with Sargent Shriver as guest.

November 7, 1963

BOB COAR: This is Washington and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today, the Senate Majority Whip has with him a distinguished guest. To introduce that guest here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. Yes, our distinguished guest today is one who is well-known, not only to the people of Minnesota, but to the people of the United States, and more and more so to all of the people of the world. I am very happy to have as my guest, Sargent Shriver, Mr. Shriver is the Director of the Peace Corps. And the Peace Corps is celebrating about its second birthday now. It just presented its Second Annual Report to the Congress, and by the way, I want you to see a copy of that report because it is available to you. The law requires that Mr. Shriver present to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House an annual report of the activities of the Peace Corps. Members of Congress can get this report and send it out to you. It is filled with illustrations and a truly dramatic story of the achievements and the work of the Peace Corps. Well, Mr. Shriver, I'm not going to take

the time. You're the expert on the Peace Corps and we're just anxious to get a word or two from you as to how you think it's going and how you like your job?

SARGENT SHRIVER: Well, answering the second question first, I like my job.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Fine.

SARGENT SHRIVER: Answering the first one about how the Peace Corps is going, I think it is going exceptionally well.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: How many people in it now?

SARGENT SHRIVER: We have 7,200 people now, and we are working in 46 different countries, mostly in Latin America; Africa, and Asia. But the thing which has been most encouraging to me about it is the extraordinary number of Americans who come forward and the great skill that many of them have. We have over 400 registered nurses, for example in the Peace Corps. We have 20 or 30 M.D.'s, fully-fledged doctors.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: How much do they earn per month?

SARGENT SHRIVER: \$75 dollars a month.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: \$75 dollars a month, and the nurses?

SARGENT SHRIVER: As a matter of fact, everybody in the Peace Corps gets the same pay. Except the Directors, you know I only get a dollar a year. But everybody who is a volunteer gets \$75 dollars a month. That's kept for them back here in the United States. They don't get that to spend abroad. It's kept for them payable upon their return. But if you are 18, 19 year old farmer, a 4-H worker, or a Ph.D., you get the same amount.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And you need both types of workers, don't you?

SARGENT SHRIVER: We certainly do.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We in Minnesota have particular interests in the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver. As I recall, our university does a little work for you, doesn't it?

SARGENT SHRIVER: The University of Minnesota has trained several Peace Corps groups, one the most recent one going to Pakistan. And they've done a fine job for us. Some people don't realize that the Peace Corps volunteers always need specialized training for the countries to which they are sent. We just don't send somebody over to Asia because he wants to go to India or Pakistan. He has to go, for example, to the University of Minnesota for three months. He learns the language of the country, he learns about the economical, agricultural, geographical and social history. He learns about America, his own country, so that he

qualified to answer questions that are asked him about the United States.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And you have an intensive training program each year and then you take that training program out into the field. Is that correct?

SARGENT SHRIVER: ~~Is-that-correct~~ Yes, it is.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have presented to me by your office, Mr. Shriver, a list of Minnesotans, volunteers overseas. And by the way, I am mighty proud of it. We have over 200 Minnesotans that are presently in the Peace Corps.

SARGENT SHRIVER: Well, we are proud of that too. Actually Minnesota is one of the top ten states in the Union in supplying Peace Corps volunteers. In fact, I think, on a per capita basis, Minnesota is either first or second of all the States in the Union in supplying Peace Corps volunteer. We

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I want to make it quite clear that we would like to be first. I hope that this program will motivate some of the people who want to volunteer for the Peace Corps. What do you need? I mean, what kind of skills do you need right now? Why

SARGENT SHRIVER: Well, you need everything. The demand for

Peace Corps volunteers has gotten so great that we do really need teachers from elementary school through university. Farmers of all kinds, ^{animal} husbandry people, veterinarians, corn hog farmers, wheat farmers, rice farmers, people from the medical profession, not just doctors or nurses, but lab technicians; we need skilled craftsmen, carpenters, electricians, plumbers, diesel mechanics, automobile mechanics. We need lawyers.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You don't need any senators, though, do you?

SARGENT SHRIVER: We do need politicians, we do need people who have a sense of other people, who can work with other people. That's one of the most important qualities that a man needs in the Peace Corps, or a woman.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: By the way, Mr. Shriver, in looking over the list of Minnesotans, I noticed the name of Mr. Oscar P. Wholgan, mechanic, and Mr. Arthur Wholgan, of Argyle, Minnesota. Now isn't Mr. Wholgan the one -- well, we often look upon the Peace Corps as for just young people. How old is Mr. Wholgan?

SARGENT SHRIVER: Mr. Wholgan was 70 a few months ago. He celebrated his 70th birthday in the Peace Corps, at work in the city of Tunis, in Tunisia, North Africa. Arthur Wholgan is an expert diesel mechanic, and he is over there working in diesel repair shops for the Peace Corps in Tunisia.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: So what you really need is to be young at heart. Isn't that correct?

SARGENT SHRIVER: We even have little pamphlet--I was looking for one here for all the people in the Peace Corps. Here's one right here. It tells older people the kind of work they are best specifically best-qualified to do in the Peace Corps. We have over 400 people more than 50 years of age in the Peace Corps now.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: By the way, I was just going to hold these pamphlets so that the camera might be able to get a glimpse of them. We have pamphlets here on trade and Technical School graduates in the Peace Corps. Geology in the Peace Corps, American labor, you need people in the labor movement, don't you? Health professions?

SARGENT SHRIVER: Definitely.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The Community Development opportunities for junior college graduates in the Peace Corps, and here's the registered nurses in the Peace Corps, engineering, political, medical professions, women in the Peace Corps, librarians, you just name it, the Peace Corps really covers the whole gamut of social organizations.

SARGENT SHRIVER: Well, the truth is, that as of today, we have over 400 different jobs on file in Washington which we have been asked to fill by foreign countries. Anybody who has the

right health, the right attitude, the right character, and good intelligence, should be able to serve their country successfully through the Peace Corps overseas.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I noticed that you said the University of Minnesota trained for Pakistan and in this Second Annual Report there is a wonderful picture here in the very back of the Report. I don't suppose that will reflect very well in our camera, but this picture shows the young lady 27 years of age, she is from Kansas City, as I recall, who is the, what is her profession, here?

SERGEANT SHRIVER: She is a psychiatric nurse. She is the only one in the entire country of Pakistan. She takes care of a whole hospital of 500 women patients part of the day, and the rest of the time, she is working in another hospital for men. She is an extraordinary woman. Well, Senator, since you are calling attention to this particular pamphlet, I'd like to call your attention to the front of the same pamphlet. Here on the front is a description, a short description of the work being done in Caracas, Venezuela, by a boy named Jerome Paige, he's 28 years old. I know why you are smiling, but the reason the Senator is smiling is that he visited in Caracas and met Mr. Paige; because of Senator Humphrey's interest lots of baseball equipment and athletic equipment and other types of equipment were sent to Jerome Paige working in the

slums of Caracas, of Venezuela, has helped him to become a tremendous success. Here in the picture, you can see on the wall of the building CUBA SI, YANKEES NO! That's where he is working, right in that environment, with the people up 'til now who have said CUBA SI, YANKEES NO, but Jerome Paige, with the help you have given him, has turned out to be a great success, in these slums where he is working.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I was delighted to see those pictures of Jerry Paige, he is a remarkable young man, he is working in the field of recreation, and I recall going up to that slum area, the most unbelievable, broken-down, area that I have ever witnessed. In fact, there wasn't even a road going up there at first. You had to carve it out of the dirt, and the building of the playgrounds there and how at first the Communists actually torn down the back-ball stop of the baseball field.

SARGENT SHRIVER: That's right.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And by the way, they love baseball in Latin America. And I wish those Minnesota Twins, by the way, would go down, and we've got a few Latin Americans on our baseball team, go down there and play some games. It would be a good idea, because they love American baseball. Speaking now of the work of the Peace Corps, I want to just show a few photographs that you have made available through your splendid organization, I think tells a wonderful

story. You mentioned something about doctors. Now here is a photograph, from Togo. And tell us a little bit about that, Mr. Shriver.

SERGEANT SHRIVER: Well, I think this man in the picture is an extraordinary man, an extraordinary American. He is a doctor, he has his national boards in Pediatrics and in Internal medicine. He is about 33 years old. He has gone to Togo along with 6 other American doctors and 20 American nurses and they on behalf of the Peace Corps are running a full scale hospital up country in Africa, in a place called Sokotee, that's about 500 miles up into central Africa. That's the only hospital in an area where they serve about 500,000 Togoese. Now Togoese, I want to make clear, is in charge of the hospital, we only work for the people. But most of the people and the staff are Americans, Peace Corps volunteers.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, now we have another -- that's a remarkable story, that's a beautiful picture too, a doctor taking care of that little child -- here is a photograph, as I recall from West Pakistan. This is a Peace Corps, American Peace Corps workers with apparently some of the young farmers. Is that correct?

SERGEANT SHRIVER: That's correct. We do quite a bit of agricultural work with farmers such as are shown in this picture. Our men are doing 4-H Club work, agricultural economics, various types of agronomy, animal husbandry, and we need lots of them. The great

tragedy today is that this country, our country, the United States has performed the greatest miracle of agricultural production, food production, in the world, but we don't have enough Americans who are willing to go overseas and tell the rest of the world how to do it. This

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is desperately needed in under-developed areas. Now here is a remarkable picture of a young American Peace Corpsman down in El Salvador, in Central America. What's he doing?

SARGENT SHRIVER: Well, down there, we're trying to help the El Salvadorians to develop little local industries so that they can get some cash of their own. They can't afford to continue to live from hand-to-mouth. Now in this case, he has helped this woman create a little cookie business, and as you can see he has just brought out into the market-place a big basket of cookies, and you can see the customers are pretty pleased with what she's got.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, indeed. By the way, ^{don't} the Peace Corpsmen even teach people how to build homes.

SARGENT SHRIVER: Yes.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I noticed there was a pilot project down in the Puerto Rico or Virgin Islands, I think it was in the Virgin Islands or one of these areas where there was a little home-building

program.

SAMUEL SHRIVER: Actually, Senator, in most cases we are just training, but when we actually go out, for example, the Dominican Republic, we do build homes and schools and other structures.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: By the way, we have time for about one more photograph which tells a marvelous story. Here is the photograph from Malaya, and what, needless to say you can tell us what's going on, but why don't you tell us what's happening in Malaya.

SAMUEL SHRIVER: Well, we have 35 nurses in Malaya. This is one of them. They work in maternity centers, and so for all over Malaya. The Minister of Health said that this was the sort of thing which moved Malaya ahead a whole generation in medical services. Our nurses out there have done a magnificent job, we have about 200 volunteers in that country, in addition to the nurses.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That's amazing, and what a wonderful picture. By the way, I hope that you good friends and neighbors will write in information on the Peace Corps and I appeal to our fellow Minnesotans and all persons in our upper midwest area to give real thoughtful consideration to volunteering for the Peace Corps. I think this is the finest expression of American life and the export of American ideas and know-how abroad. You know, I'm going to conclude on this note with you Mr. Shriver. All the things I've had a hand in in Congress, I know of none which has pleased me more than the Peace Corps, and of all the Administrators we have in

Washington, I know of none of whom I am more proud than you, sir. You have made a remarkable record. And what do you think of the prospects for the future?

SARGENT SHREVER: Well, we are very optimistic. People are volunteering for the Peace Corps now three times the rate they did when we first started. The House just last week approved \$102,000,000 for us for next year. I hope the Senate goes along.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We're going to do it.

SARGENT SHREVER: And with that amount of money, and with the continued support of the people in Congress, I think we can make a growing success of this work.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I can tell you that this "child" so to speak of two years will have a chance to grow to full maturity. I am happy to be with you in this program, and to have had a share in it, and I am delightful that you told us this story.

KID

From the Office of:
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

FOR RELEASE: MONDAY A. M.
DECEMBER 2, 1963

THE FOLLOWING IS A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF A STATEMENT
BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D., MINN.) FOR HIS REGULAR TELEVISION
REPORT TO THE MINNESOTA AREA. THE PROGRAM WAS FILMED ON WEDNESDAY,
NOVEMBER 27:

Since my last report to you, America has suffered a great
tragedy. America has lost a truly great man and a great President,
the world has lost a courageous leader, and I have lost a very dear
and personal friend. Yes, our beloved late President, John Fitzgerald
Kennedy, has departed from this earthly existence.

Today, in the few moments that we have together, I want to
reflect with you for a moment or two on some of my experiences
with this fine, good man, particularly those experiences of just
the week before he was taken from us. It was on Friday, November
22, that our President was struck down by the assassin's bullet
in Texas. But it was Wednesday of that same week that we were
together at the White House for our legislative leaders weekly

breakfast with President Kennedy. And what an active session it was! The President had been traveling the week before, and over the period of Veteran's Day. We didn't have our regular legislative meeting, so there was much to talk about on that Wednesday of this tragic week. We discussed the legislative program. We discussed the President's visits---the temper and the mood of the people. The President always came back from those visits to other parts of the country filled with the love of life, and with a sense of optimism about the future of our country. I remember him saying something to the effect that whenever he became discouraged, all he needed to do was to go to the people, and to renew his faith and his strength by being with the people, and then he could come back to the Nation's capitol to undertake the burdens of office and the responsibilities that were ever present. After that Wednesday morning breakfast, the last breakfast that I was privileged to have with the President, we walked from the Executive Mansion, the White House, out to the gardens in the White House grounds, and walked back in that narrow corridor alongside the Rose Garden to the Executive Offices. And on this morning, I am happy to recall, President Kennedy said: "Hubert, come walk with me, I want to talk to you."

We visited about matters in the mid-West, the economic problems. We talked, for example, of the development in the upper Great Lakes, and I spoke to him about the necessity of additional emphasis to that area of America. We spoke about the development of atomic energy programs in the mid-West, and we spoke also about

his visits to the mid-West. It was a friendly meeting, it was a happy one, and I can recall it so vividly.

So when I say I have lost a friend, this is to put it very gently and mildly. I suppose never before in the history of our country have we gone through such a period of consummate grief and sorrow as we have experienced these past few days. I have tried to jot down here on paper, a few notes on my reactions and reflections, because it is very difficult to properly express oneself at a moment like this. I am not ashamed to say that I was grief-stricken, that I simply couldn't believe what had happened. It all seemed like an ugly dream. And during those days of the memorial services, when we were paying our last respects to this fine and good man, it was almost more than one could bear. There were so many, so many things that happened that touched one's heart.

I remember being in my office on Friday night, late, after the President's body had been returned to Washington, after we had visited with the incoming President, President Johnson. The legislative leaders were with him for some 45 minutes to an hour discussing the future of our country and reassuring President Johnson of our faith and our loyalty and our cooperation. Following that, I went back to my office, and I sat there alone. I wanted to be alone. I just wanted to meditate. And to be silent. And as I sat there the phone would ring, and it was a long distance call. There were

several of these long distance calls well after 10 o'clock in Washington, D. C., and most of them were from home---out in Minnesota. And I had people on the phone who were workers, business people, a schoolteacher, a taxi cab driver, a mother, just calling me to ask me to convey to Mrs. Kennedy, to Jacqueline Kennedy, their sorrow, their sympathy, their understanding, and their love. And I am sure as they witnessed this fine good lady, Mrs. Kennedy, during these difficult days for her and for the Nation, everyone of our constituents, everyone of our neighbors have been very proud of her.

Last Monday, while the body of the late President rested in those final hours of the morning in the Rotunda of the Capitol, a policeman was standing near the entrance of the Capitol building, and a young man came walking up the stairs and the policeman visited with him awhile as he was standing in line. The policeman said: "Where are you from?" "Where are you going?" The young man answered, "I've come to pay my respects to President Kennedy, and when I'm through here I'm going to go to my church, and then I want to go home to be with my family, and tomorrow I will go back to work." Now this young man sums up the feelings and the emotions of most of us. We sought to express, in some way, our respect for President Kennedy and our sorrow because of his death, our desire to seek an understanding with our God, and to seek comfort. And our desire, of course, in these moments of crisis and tragedy to be with our

loved ones. And then---as the President would have wanted it, as this young man of vigor and vitality and boldness would have wanted it---to go to work, to continue the daily activities of our lives and to carry on with the new business.

Well, that little story---and it's a true one---I think tells us a great deal about what's been going on here the last few days. We are back at work now, both as individuals and as a Nation. But we are not the same. Something has departed from us, something has left us, there is a spirit that is gone, there is a sense that life itself has been diminished. And it all happened because of that incredible and ghastly act of the assassin on Friday, November 22.

It's very difficult, as I have said, for me to properly describe my own thoughts even now. Words come like cold pebbles thrown into a sea of my emotion. But I seek to comprehend and communicate my understanding and the meaning of John Fitzgerald's life and his death. Quietly: he gave his life, he gave of himself to this Nation, completely and totally. He gave in wartime and he gave in peacetime. And he also gave in death. As President, he gave of his courage, his intelligence, his energy and his strength to this Nation. His life was a constant portrayal of a Profile of Courage. The result of that life not only as President but all through his life, is an America more firmly on the path to peace, an America more dedicated to the cause of freedom and

human equality, and an America that is more beautiful and more just. This is the legacy. This is John Fitzgerald's contribution, his gift to the history of this great republic. And in death, he continued to give. Because out of the shock of his assassination, and the deep sorrow of his death, the people of this Nation have emerged with new courage, new strength, new unity. There has been some soul-searching, some asking of forgiveness, some seeking of better understanding. I don't recall that ever before in our history have the people of the U. S. been so moved. You witnessed it on your television, you heard it on your radio, you saw it in your press, and you also experienced it as you stood with your neighbors, or even as you stood alone. Never before has there been such a total involvement by all the people in any one event. Never before have so many Americans joined together so immediately and intimately to express respect for a man and his work. So there is a kind of new unity that is forged out of sorrow and grief, and possibly, as I have said out of soul-searching of our own iniquities and injustices. This unity that came out of the President's death is a gift to American youth. I don't believe it's going to fade, but rather that the U. S. will be stronger, will move ahead to a greater unity than it has ever known. Yes, we are truly: "... One Nation under God, indivisible ..."

And then to Mrs. Kennedy, Mrs. John Fitzgerald Kennedy, affectionately known as "Jackie" Kennedy, and to all the members of the late President's family we offer our prayers and our hearts.

Mrs. Kennedy, in particular, gave us an unforgettable demonstration of courage and of grace and of dignity. And that was exactly what this Nation needed in such time of travail and such sorrow.

Can I just say in conclusion a word about our new President, whom I've known well, President Lyndon B. Johnson? I've known him during all of my days in the Senate. I knew him as Senator, as Majority Leader, as personal friend, and knew his lovely wife, Mrs. Johnson. Their family has been close to us. And I have watched President Johnson as the Vice President to President Kennedy grow in stature and understanding and knowledge of the world in which we live and work. I saw him not as a political ally but as an intimate friend of President Kennedy. I want to make it quite clear that President Johnson will carry on the Administration of President Kennedy. He will carry forward the commitments and the programs of President Kennedy. He will work closely with the Congress that he knows so well. Very few men have come into public office as well equipped for the heavy responsibilities as President Johnson. He is an experienced man in the work of political life. He is educated. He has a natural talent for political organization and for political achievement. He knows the legislative process and as Vice President he was brought into intimate contact with this troubled world of ours. I predict he will be a great President. He will be active, he will be forceful and he will be resourceful. But he needs our help, and he needs the confidence and the understanding and the support of the American people during these perilous days. In any way that we can show it, we should indicate to President Johnson that we want to help him to carry on the unfinished work

- 8 -

of the man that is our fallen leader, President Kennedy. We have work to do. The Nation's business must go on. The Republic is in good hands, and the institutions of our democracy survive.

Thank you.

END



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