

(1)

Interview with Bob Donovan, Los Angeles Times (futuristic related issues)
Washington, D.C. office., 3/22/77

- Sen: Last night after ^{BEING} with you when I went to do that T.V. broadcast, Ursula and I worked on these invitations. You can't believe what we got.
- Betty: Yes, I know. It is so busy.
- B.D.: Speaking of the other night, I had a lot of laughs out of that.
- Sen: That was a great dinner.
- B.D.: I had a lot of laughs.
- Sen: I thought that Carter suprised everybody.
- B.D.: Yes, he did.
- Sen: I figured he would give a little perfunctory * * *
- B.D.: Yes, he was quite funny, but, Mondale was the classic,
- Sen: Fritz, was absolutely marvelous.
- B.D.: There's a rumor that Art Buchwald helped him.
- Sen: I don't know who helped him, but, it was damn good.
- B.D.: Yes, it was. He's doing a great job.
- Sen: I saw him this morning. He's got such a good sense of humor. I said, "Fritz, were you here last night for the dinner?" And, he said, "Yes." You know I slept here last night. The breakfast was in the morning so I just slept in.
- B.D.: As a matter of fact, I heard you at the "New Deal Dinner". I thought that was an awfully interesting night.
- Sen: Very good night.
- B.D.: I thought that you gave a very good speech there. I think that it's a great shame that David Broder nor the President went to the dinner. They didn't even show up. 12.
- Sen: They called me at the very last minute. I just ran over. I didn't have a chance to change a suit or a shirt. I just got in my car went on over. I really had no intention of getting involved.
- B.D.: When I knew I was going to have a chat with you, I was thinking then, "Have all the ideals of that age, -are they all gone?"
- Sen: No, there's a kind of ^{RELIGIOUS} a resurrection. Particularly in this Youth Employment Program, we see some there. Of course building on the Social Services is much further than the New Deal went. The New Deal never went nearly as far as what we've done in Social Services. Child care, aid to education, the training programs, the school lunch program, and all of those things really all had there germination, so to speak, the conception of many of these ideas was in the latter days of the New Deal. If you will take the New Deal right on up to the time of Truman's coming to office. There are many things we're doing today which were only talked about then. We're in an embryonic stage. Obviously, the Social Security program has been expanded and built upon, but, even in the days of Rosevelt, there was talk of a National Health Insurance.
- B.D.: That was originally part of the Social Security package. That commission recommended it. Rosevelt, however, was afraid he would lose everything.
- Sen: Yes, and he most likely would have. He was a pragmatist, of the first order. But, I think that some of the enthusiasm of those early idealists has left us. The New Deal crowd was much more adventurous, much more daring. Rosevelt actually was the more conservative of the crowd. He had to put the breaks on all the time. But, when you stop and think of the ^{LEX FORD} tugwell's,

Tommy Corcoran, and Ben Cohen and you stop and think of the people you had in that regional planning commission. I have forgotten all the names, Delaino and all of that crowd. They were very innovative. Very innovative.

B.D.: In fact the Republicans thought they were so "Pink" that they abolished that outfit.

Sen: They abolished the whole thing. It was a natural resources planning board. They couldn't stand the thought. But, if you look back over those early reports of that commission, which I have done because I've been interested in planning. Much of everything that's being talked about today, that's almost acceptable, was then espoused and, of course, looked upon as a dangerous ideology and dangerous proposal. The one thing that I noticed more than anything in politics today is a ^{urgency} ~~commitity~~. We've got serious domestic problems, in this country, that aren't being challenged, as they ought to be. Structural problems in our economy.

One of the reasons I was late with you was because I was sitting with Dick Bolling today and I spent more time with him than I planned. Because we think that there needs to be a new study of the American economy. There has not been one done. A TNEC. A temporary national economic committee. The TNEC was a major study authorized by the Congress, of the American economy, in the 1930's. There has not been anything like that since then.

B.D.: I read in the Wall Street Journal a piece about that.

Sen: I was presenting today this -- I gave the copy back to my staff man. We want to analyze very carefully what we --

B.D.: When you say we, who do you mean by we?

Sen: The Joint Economic Committee. Actually, at this stage it's between Bolling who is Chairman and myself who is Vice Chairman, this year. We're looking at the possibility of a major study of all aspects of the American economy, now and in its future trends. Looking at the demography and the demographic facts. Looking at the social facts of our time. I wish I had the memorandum here, but, we've been working on it for some time. We don't have a new base line on which to draw ~~or~~ or on which to predicate legislation or governmental action. We have a scattering of facts here and there. The data base of this government is way out of date. Even the census figures are not adequate any longer. I had in here today a group of people who were showing me the difficulties that we're having in statistics in government. ~~Sixxxxx~~ Practically every program we have today is based upon triggering at a certain degree of unemployment. If it's CETA, or if its emergency public works, or if its public service jobs, or if its community development funds. Practically everything depends on what is the economic condition in said community. The data that we have is so faulty, the formulas that are used to gather this data are out of date. There's fought and filled with inadequacies and filled with air. And, I was asking John Stark, of the Joint Economic Staff, who is our statistician over there. The statistics have become a vital part of governmental programs, we never used to think of that before. But we're using everything now--you've got a trigger mechanism whether its countercyclical aid to cities or emergency public works or housing. Just name it. Practically across the board. In one county, in my state they were showing me there are more people drawing unemployment compensation benefits than are even totalled up in the statistics as being unemployed. And yet the average is that 70% of those that are unemployed draw benefits, so that there is a 30% drop out. But we have counties in Minnesota and elsewhere that can show you where the statistics are so much in ~~error~~ ^{error} that it defies any degree of accuracy.

B.D. In this computer age--

Sen: In this computer age. For example you can have a county that has 6% unemployed and a county right beside it that has 5.9% and gets nothing but the 6% gets a big lump of money, right next door. Maybe the county that had the 6% was a little clever in being able to work out its statistical evidence, because your developing skills amongst government

officials as to how to meet the standards. Instead of some uniformity of standards with a formula that has some degree of accuracy and then some administrative flexibility to take a look in case there is some contest. Somebody might come in and say I've been cheated, I didn't get my money. You have a hearing board that can look it over. But, anyway, what I'm getting at is that we're really running behind the tide. We're not catching up if you see what I mean. Our housing statistics are behind. Our employment statistical evidence is faulty. Income statistics are not even all that they should be-- there better, because of your tax collection. That is maybe the best thing that we've got. But, amongst the poor and amongst the minorities you have a very difficult time getting accurate statistical evidence, particularly on the census--because they hide out. So there is another area where we need to really get modernized. We need in this government if we get nothing else, a better data base. Because, the data has to be up to date because of the tremendous mobility of our people. The mobility in this country is incredible. Millions of people are changing vocations, every year. Our data base is out of date. Therefore many of the programs are no longer related to the facts on which they were ~~based~~ predicated.

TNEC ?

B.D. On this T.N.T. Thing, is that something you are seriously getting into?

Sen. Oh yes. We're now looking at it. As a matter of fact we're drawing up a perspective, right now. Dick Bolling (Cong.) is the chairman. He feels that this is very important. Dick had his staff man over.

B.D. And you feel that this has to be on a scale of the old T.N.T. TNEC ?

Sen. Absolutely! It has got to be on that scale.

B.D. Was that approved by Congress?

Sen. That was established by Congress, by a separate^A resolution, that authorized that study and appropriated the money. And it not only included the temporary national economic commission, which is what we mean by the TNEC. Not only included members of Congress, but it included parts of the governments. It included treasury and labor and commerce, and at that time the justice department.

B.D. Would that be this year (that you offered the bill) ?

Sen. Well, we're not sure. But we are contemplating it, hopefully, that we can lay the predicate for it this year. We may have to do some educating around here. Because, as I said to you there is much more of a sense of conservatism in this Congress than ~~the~~ the so called symbols of politics indicate.

B.D. What kind of symbols?

Sen. Well, we Democrats are always called liberals, big progressives, left of center. Those stereotypes do not reveal what I call the true profile of the Congress. And, obviously ~~some~~ members of Congress are somewhat overwhelmed by the size of the budget. The reaction back home on deficit financing. My feeling is that so many of our programs, while good, lack the sense of unified direction and hopefully Carter will change that in his reorganization effort. We've got programs for example on unemployment, youth unemployment emanate from labor, HEW, ^{EDU} Commerce, and HUD. That's four agencies. And in order to qualify for these programs each agency runs out and does a separate survey and surveys the same people. It's ridiculous.

B.D. I was thinking the other night at the New Deal Dinner that you've retained more of a faith in those ideals . . .

Sen. The ideals, yes, but I think the methodology has to change. I believe in constantly updating your evidence and knowing what your problem really is. There is no use in going to a doctor and bringing in your reports from twenty years ago and say,

"Hey, Doc, here was my trouble twenty years ago-- refill my prescripti
The first thing that they do is take you through and give you a
complete physical checkup and see what your current physical situat
is. That means from there they begin to prescribe. That's what
we've got to do here.

B.D. Of course you can't go back that far--

Sen. But they do. Alot of this stuff is based upon old evidence and old
data. Now to me, I think you have to make up your mind what has
really happened in our economy. The change is not only from rural
to urban, the change is also from small business to big business.
From unorganized to organized labor. And from a relatively stable
and immobile social economy to a highly flexible and mobile economy
Everything is changing all the time. People move, businesses change
technology is upon us in a tremendous flow. There is nothing but
the advent of modern technology. And Congress is, in my judgment,
always trying to catch up but never really getting ahead nor is
the administration getting ahead. There's playing ~~catch up ball~~
That's why I believe there ought to be some kind of coordinating
planning mechanism in the executive branch of the government.
Not planning for a planned society, but rather better planning of
the resources of the Federal Government. Better planning of their
own use. When you've got a budget of over 400 billion dollars and
you're really touching the lives of every citizen in the country.
You ought to have a much better system for directing your resource
to your goals and your targets. This is why I believe that the
President each year should lay out before us not only a state of
the Union message but also a state of the Future message, in a sense
What is coming, what do we need to look at? I just showed the ^{the}
Joint Economic Committee group a brochure from Minnesota called a
"Face of the Future". We have a state planning agency in my state
with a good staff. That state planning agency has prepared demogra-
phic charts, economic projections, social projections for the next
10 to 20 years. And the first three days of the legislative session
are spent upon that planning commission in Joint Session of the
the House and Senate-- going over all the data that is available
today in our state and all the projections of the future so that
when we pass an education program we're looking at what's going to
happen in northern Minnesota, southern Minnesota, Western Minnesota
in the next decade. When you start putting money into schools
you've got to be talking about 25, 30, 40 years, because that school
plant is there for a long time. When you start putting money into
hospitals, when you start putting money into super highways, so that
our legislature today actually when it legislates is legislating
on a base not only what is but what is the projection. Very in-
teresting, and by God they're doing it. They know for example where
the growth areas are. Projections that they see in the growth
areas and where the growth industries are, where they're located.
The planning commission spends months talking to business, finance,
and investment people. Where are you putting your money? Where do
you contemplate expansion? Well now we know that those are the area
that are going to need more social services, infrastructure, the
water, the sewer, the roads, the airports, etc. And we're looking
ahead all the time, we're constantly looking ahead. We're (Congres
trying to catch up. We're trying to figure out how to patch the
holes in the street rather than where ought the next street be
constructed. It's just like the metropolitan subway. The subway is
built on the city as it is now. Nobody ever took a look as to how
this so called metropolitan area is going to grow. Now when America
started interestingly enough, nature took care of that planning.
For example cities we're on rivers. The juncture of a river--
Pittsburgh for example. And the cities we're at seaports, because
communication was the name of the game. Today we know what communic-
ion does because all you need to do is to look at that interstate
highway system. When you put that across the country, or when you
build your airports what happens? Industries flock right near the
airport, they get right near the interstate highway system.
Because it's transportation, it is commerce. Now we've got to have
that kind of projection for the future. That's what I mean about
the lack of adventure here today. Now the New Deal was not only
trying to repair the recession or the depression, which it did,
but it had thinkers for tomorrow. Lots of them. It scared the living
daylights out of people of course. But they had a lot of people who
were thinking down the road. That's what TVA was all about. That's

what REA was all about. These were people that were prophets in their own time. They were forecasters. And they said: Here's what we see. And here's where the development can take place. This is what happened with the big hydroelectric dams. You talk about the influence in government. Take a look at what happened in the Columbia river valley. Without the government the Columbia river valley would have been a little quiet country town in the country side. But because of the Bonneville dam, because of the whole system of hydroelectric projects it became a tremendous industrial enterprise. The whole area. TVA revolutionized the south. They talk about today how ~~today~~ industry is moving to the south and the southwest well do you want to know why-- the irrigation project in the southwest. Big transportation and river development in the south. People go where money is, people go where progress is. And you can just see it. Look at the Northeast. They've never harnessed their rivers, they've never created cheap power. Even at a time when they ~~they~~ had a chance for hydroelectric. They were always dominated by the private utilities. And they never kept up on their transportation. And there are a lot of other reasons for it, but I mean the reasons why parts of the country slip. Now you take a look at California. What is California? California's

Bigg biggest asset was its education program. Tremendous education program. College, higher education, technical education that attracted federal funds. Just looking at the per capita investment in California of federal RND funds is fantastic. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

I believe the investment in RND (in California) is something like \$200 dollars per capita. I'd have to check that figure. Yet, you take a state like Arkansas or New Mexico and it would be a tenth that. A tenth of that amount.

B.D.: What moral do you draw from this?

Sen: What I draw from it is, when California put its emphasis upon the University of California. That great system of higher education. Building all those new campuses. Cal. Tech. a fantastic higher education system. It automatically attracted top grade people. It attracted a whole new clientele of scientists, intellectuals, professors, technicians, and technologists. What happened then when Uncle Sam decided you had to invest for the purposes of defense or for the purposes of space or whatever it was--bingo-- they went right to it. We look at Huntsville, ALABAMA. Little old sleepy town of 20,000 people. TVA comes through and pretty soon it's 200,000 people. University of Alabama is there, city orchestra, Ph.D's. It changed the whole climate. Government resources make that difference. That's why you've got to take a look. The use of government resources makes a tremendous difference in what's going to happen in our country. And, I'm not for the wasteful use of those resources to the contrary, I think there is a great deal of slipshod administration simply because of the lack of any pattern. I mean, every committee of Congress has got its own jurisdiction. So if a bill comes in that relates ~~it~~ gets shoved off to the committee on banking, right away. That legislation, if it's banking and housing goes over to HUD. Whatever they pass--the child sends it back to the parent-- or visaversa.

B.D.: Sometimes I wonder if inflation has ended the old liberal era. Inflation has done something--

Sen: Of course the old liberalism has obviously changed from the day of the early populist. There is no doubt about that. And there isn't any doubt that what's happened is that the economy and the nature of the economy has changed

Section missing from tape

Sen fades in on tape:

by that I mean administered prices. It's called oligopoly. Where a handful of dominant industries or a handful of industries that dominate the market have a way of following the lead in pricing. You get a half a dozen companies. I was talking to the Attorney General Sunday and he is taking a good hard look at this. Because the old anti-trust idea was just to look at General Motors or some merger and say that's what it's all about. Well that isn't what it's about either. Price fixing in this country is not simply by one big company which dominates. It is by a number of companies that have such a command on the market place that they set the price. I spoke ~~with the~~ over at the White House not long ago about this, I said that I was born and raised in a Merchants family. When we had poor sales, when we had lack of income we'd put on a sale. We'd cut prices. If we weren't doing enough business in our store we would cut prices. But, what does the steel industry do? When the steel industry is producing at 68% capacity what does it do? It raises prices. It raises prices. It creates its own inflation. Everybody knows that you can not have productivity-- that is increase unit productivity if you are under-utilizing your capacity. If you get the plant capacity of this country to 90%. Lets say ~~you~~ 90% of plant capacity used, 10% vital for rehabilitation--whatever purpose may be--fluctuation in the market place. Then you get maximum production out of your tools.

B.D.: You can't have maximum productivity if you are going at less--

Sen: That raises the unit cost. Because what happens is in this kind of an economy is that when the "big boys" the automobile industry sees the market dropping it doesn't cut the price it raises it. The only thing it cuts on is these little cars, because they want to get rid of them. So what are they going to do-- they're not going to make them any more. They cut out the line. But, we've got industry after industry that defies what we call the law of supply and demand. There is no demand push. ~~There~~ isn't that. That's not what's raising prices. It's not demand. What's raising prices is prices. They're just raising prices. Traditional conventional inflation, the kind you and I knew as a young boy, was that there was a shortage of supply-- the price went up. That's what happens on fruits and vegetables because that's not a controlled market. You get a frost, you get a plant infestation, there's a shortage of oranges and grapefruit or carrots or peas-- and the price goes up. If you have a surplus the price goes down. The automobile industry has a surplus of cars and the price goes up. So, what I'm getting at is ~~that~~ we've got to know more about the economy than we have in the past. It has changed. My judgment is for example that if you have in this country today a greatly increased production. Lets say for example that the Carter stimulus package works. And I think it will be helpful. Let's say that you can get growth and GNP (gross national product) by 6 or 7 percent per year-- that's big. Will it absorb our unemployed. The answer is no. You're not going to absorb the youth in this country. The youth unemployment. There isn't a single witness that will come before any committee and tell you that you can absorb the youth unemployment in this country, under conventional economic stimulus. Therefore you've got to look at what you should do with it. First of all, they've had no work experience no training, no work discipline, and they become accustomed not to have it. That's the most important thing. So you've got to really start all over with them again. They don't get the chance to work in Mama and Papa's store. They're not working on Daddy's farm. They're children of the street most of them. These unemployed youth. They've got to be off the streets and in some form of work. Some people would call it "make-work". Not at all, it's work that needs to be done, in the community, in the national domain, and also in the private sector. Recognizing that the employer can't employ these people at regular wages and make any money. He has either got to have a wage subsidy or some kind of assistance from the government to take these people on. At least for a period of time when they learn work. Work skills and work habits. So when you look at the unemployment figures, Bob, half of them are youth. Half of the unemployment in this country is youth.

B.D.: And it is just not going to solve itself.

Sen: It's not going to solve itself. I don't even know what all the answer is but I say that you've got to experiment. You've got to be willing to take a look at it. You can't let this infection remain in this body politic, because that's exactly what it is.

B.D.: Do you see, and you would be the best to see, any new guiding political philosophies forming? Or are we just going along. Is there anything crystalizing like the New Deal?

Sen: No. I must say what you are seeing is first of all a demand that government be more efficient. And, I think Carter will do that. I'm sure that he is dedicated to it..That's going to be helpful, that means that you're going to get a little better response out of government. Government is going to be able to respond more effectively with the resources that it has. I think that's been driven home. We lack many things in our economy. By the way governments not a bit different from the private sector. Government grew too fast just like business grew too fast. Over-expansion of plant capacity in private enterprise, over-expansion of programs without adequate financing and adequate personnel. We just grew too fast. Now there is a period that comes in ~~up~~ that you call settling down, rationalizing or tightening up on the operations of government. Now that's one thing that's here. That's going to be good for us. And it's going to cause some commotion, because people don't like that. Because you've got vested interests all over this country that every little program for itself administered by its people for its purposes. The second thing that's got to come into government is some sense of direction--some sense of priorities. And that's why I have been advocating that there be (whatever you wish to call it) either a coordination board or a planning and efficiency board--call it what you will. That can utilize vast public resources for benefit of our economy and our social structure. Not how we utilize it today but how we utilize it five years down the road. Just looking ahead. Giving us some indication of what we are going to face down the road. We've just got to do it.

look at how to

B.D.: It's incredible that we don't have.

Sen: Well because the word planning has been stigmatized. Now we're the only industrialized society in the entire world that doesn't have some form of forecasting. Call it planning or forecasting or efficiency modeling -- whatever you wish to call it. You've got to have something that gives you first of all a reliable statistical data base--that's number one - number two you've got to have something in your government that will look ahead as to what the demography of the country indicates. What does the demography of this nation indicate-- not only how many people we have, but, where are they going to live? How old are they? ~~How many are in their 80's?~~ What are their age groups? My God, that has got everything to do with what we're talking about. Because in this country for example there would be a period of time in which there will be fewer youth and then there will be another period of time when it will be a larger number of youth. And, there will be a larger, growing older population. Now, what is the United States of America going to do with an older population? We're not looking ahead at that, all we're doing is complaining about the cost of Social Security. So that within itself is one of the human equations we've got to deal with. Then another question comes in--What about the big cities? Can they really be rehabilitated? We've got to take a look at it.

B.D.: If they can't we're in a mess.

Sen: Do we have a plan of action? I don't think you've got one at all. I think all we've got is that each time we try to bail out each emergency. There is no design for what you might call urban and metropolitan America. We are still talking in terms of the traditional old boundaries which ~~no longer~~ no longer relate to the economic base of the community.

-- Boy, if I get into that we're off for another month. But, this is one that really frightens you. Let me give you another example. We know that the food problems in this world are going to grow. And, we know America is going to be one of the great food reserve countries. Are we looking ahead? Are we looking at where ~~water~~ water table is? Are we looking at how much land we really ought to put into production? Have we any idea what it's going to take to irrigate vast areas of America. Because, by the way as your metropolitan areas grow and spread you use up valuable agricultural land. We lose millions of acres every year because of production, every year. -----

Now, we know therefore that if we're going to be the reliable food reserve that the world needs both in terms of our commercial needs as well as humanitarian, we're going to have to have more land. It doesn't do any good to talk about land, because we've got to talk about water. You've got to talk about what kind of crops. Where the markets are going to be. What's your competition going to be? ~~out here~~ For example, this year Brazil went into the soybean market, ~~so~~ today Brazil is one of the major competitors of the U.S. for soy beans. This may change the whole complexity of ~~the~~ American Agriculture. Brazil has such unlimited possibilities ~~for~~ for the production of soybeans and cheap labor, perfect climate for it. It is entirely possible that our agricultural base that is based on the cash crop of soy beans may very well be changed. It may be diminished. What's the impact of that on rural America? What's the impact of that on our balance of payments? What's the substitute crop that we have? Nobody's looking. When I say nobody I don't mean nobody because I'm talking about it.

B.D.: What would your part be in this TNT thing?

Sen: Well if we get into it I would be part of it because I'm a member of the Joint Economic Committee. At this stage of the game my involvement is primarily trying to structure it. What we need right now and what should be the areas in which we need to look.

SBD: It would give you a vast thing to do up here.

Sen: Of course you have to have a competent staff to get this done. A man like myself has to be a generalist ~~as I can~~.

B.D.: Yes, I understand but someone has to lead these things.

Sen: Well, Cong. Bolling is a very creative fellow and he is "hip" on this. We know what can be done because it was done before. It isn't as if it isn't manageable. It is just a question of getting at it and getting the professionals that we need. But, above all outlining the parameter. What's the area that you really want to talk about?

B.D.: The TNEC went into that whole monopoly situation.

Sen: They went into that, they went into the structure of credit,

B.D. Then the war came along and blew everything to pieces,

Sen. Well, it changed the whole world. That's my point. We've got all sorts of information and just a matter of pulling it all together. CRS, The Federal Trade Commission, Justice Department, Federal Reserve Board, Council of Economic Advisors, God only knows what else

B.D.: It was very nice to talk to you, I enjoyed it very much. You look great, honestly,

Sen. My job down here is to think ahead. It makes not sense spending a lot of time on just minutia (?) of the day, even though I spend a lot of time---see there's a schedule. This gives you an idea of what my schedule looks like. But, in between this I demand that my staff and people that I rely on around here, give me thoughts for tomorrow. Here's what I tell my staff. You fellows think ahead. You let me make the judgments as to whether or not what you're talking about and writing about is worthy of consideration. Don't try to out-guess me politically. I don't need a lot of conservatives around me, because I'm a political man and I'm conservative enough. I have some idea of what is possible and what is plausible. I'd like to have my staff give me what they think is impossible. And, then I'll take a look at it. Let them think. They're bright and young and educated. They don't have to worry every day about the constituents like I do, I want them to come up with ideas and if they're not smarter than I am then I don't want them around here. That's true. I tell them every day that....Where am I suppose to get the ideas? I mean I am working on a food reserve program right now. I've got one worked out pretty well both international and domestic, but as I told my staff man, I said wait a minute we're going to go over that one very carefully, because it is full of landmines. We can't afford to go out here and get

knocked off before we get started. Sometimes you have to wiggle your way in. YOU cant sometimes charge in--you've got to find your way-- get a base. It is sort of like a beach-head. The boys that hit Normandy didn't go very far that first day but at least they were there. They got a base. And then after you get a base to operate from you start your work. I've always believed that. I make people believe when I want to the millenium, I settle for an inch or two, in order to get started. Because once you get started you can prove your case. If you've got anything. You take the school lunch program--I mean the Food Stamp Program. We started that out in this country with six counties. Lenore Sullivan, of Missouri, and Hubert Humphrey and George Aiken in the Senate. Six little counties. ~~I don't know how~~ *Now* the Food Stamp Program is a massive program--it's almost gotten out of hand. Now we're trying to bring it back into where I consider it to have some relationship to the facts of our time. But, you've got to be-- the same thing is true of many things I put my hand to-- that you just-- you get women's feeding programs. Women, infants, and children was the little pioneer program that we have for people of low income. We know for example that women of low income with poor diets frequently will have children that are less than healthy both physically and mentally. Now we know what to do about it. There is no reason for this. We know that they have to have diets, minerals, proteins. So Humphrey came up with a little program that we got going in the hospitals. We got it from St. Jude's hospital in Memphis, the Dearborn hospital in Michigan, Johns Hopkins hospital in Maryland. We ~~we~~ got a grant from a foundation. We ~~we~~ proved that it will work. I brought it into Congress. I got the tiniest little piece of it passed. Today it issa \$200million dollar program. And, it is working and its saving livs. And, instead of producing children that are going to be a misfit. That are going to be physically and mentally disabled it is producing healthy children. Now look at the money that will save this government. Because nothing is more costly than sickness. You see, this is another thing that I'm working on.

We dont have any health protection program in this country. We've got a sickness program in America. You've got to get sick before you get anything. Now, We do have great research efforts, that diagnose desease and how to treat it. But, Humphrey wants to have a program that diagnosis how to prevent desease not just how to cure it, But how to prevent it. And, that goes into environment it goes into nutrition. Particularly into nutrition. It goes into ~~enology~~ ^{immunology}. A whole new emphasis on medical--what we call "health Care". We don't have health care--we have sickness care. You've got to get like me you've got to get sick as hell. Then they'll say oooHHHHH--what are we going to do for him. When in fact if we'd start out with aour children with early diagnosis instead of Medicare for Grandma and Grandpa--We ought to have "kiddicare" for the little ones. Starting out with women in their pregnancy. And, the children in the first few years of their life. With diagnosis and proper environment. Proper nutrition and proper personal hygiene, which we can teach. We would cut the medical bills in this country aegreat deal. There is, quite honestly, unless we do this, Idoubt we'll have money to pay for good medical care. I mean there is no end to it. It's just a self-fulfillin business all the time. Every time you go to a hospita they want to take a blood test on you and they want to slap you around a little bit. The main thing that you've got to do is to prevent them from getting to the hospital.

B.D.: What has become of our old friend McNamara?

Sen: I haven't seen him. Gosh, he was in Minnesota the last I heard. I don't know what he is doing.

B.D.: I've lost all track of him.



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