

115 ZAD - LINO

Washington, D.C.
 Sheraton Park Hotel
 August 12, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
 COUNTIES

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

Senator HUMPHREY. It is fashionable today in American politics to look back with a touch of nostalgia to the good old days when the simple life still prevailed in this land. We hear a great deal about the need to recapture the simple and direct approach of our ancestors in solving our contemporary crises and challenges. Many people tingle with anticipation at the thought of reliving those golden days. And this call of the lost horizon possesses a certain appeal to persons weary of their charter membership in the crisis-of-the-week club.

In this stampede to the past it is generally forgotten that every generation has had its share of complex problems and crises. Read any period of our history and the lesson is always the same: Democracy in America is a difficult business. In fact, man's eternal struggle to govern himself is the most demanding of all human endeavors. This is just as true today as it was in the golden days of some unidentified past.

But every generation has heard its false prophets pleading for a return to the glories of yesterday, only thereby to sacrifice their right to participate in the building of today and tomorrow. One hundred years in the future—in the year 2064—I am confident there will be the same fervent pleas to recapture the verities which guided Americans in the early decades of the nuclear and space age. Then we will suddenly become the hardy pioneers whose understanding of virtue and principle will provide the instant solutions to the problems of the interplanetary world of the 21st century. But depend upon it: This message will be just as false then as it is now.

Despite the problems and crises which have always been before us, democracy in America has prevailed. It has prevailed because each generation of Americans has joined in this struggle with the faith and courage displayed by our late President John F. Kennedy when he proclaimed in his inaugural address: “* * * I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation.” And democracy has prevailed because of the faith and courage displayed by our President Lyndon B. Johnson when he addressed a grief-stricken Congress and Nation on November 27, 1963: “This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us * * *”

This affirmation has been proclaimed anew by every generation of Americans. It does not promise prefabricated solutions to the complex problems of democratic Government. It recognizes that the essence of politics is the asking and reasking of the most difficult of all questions: What is justice? What is right? We can never seek these answers and never govern ourselves successfully on the basis of generalities, half-truths, and myths—no matter how superficially appealing they may be.

As one who has served in local government—the mayor of a city of over one-half million people, Minneapolis, Minn.—I believe I have some appreciation of the importance of local government in our federal system. Those of us who have served at the local level come face to face with the tough daily problems of the relationship of government to the people.

And make no mistake about it, when the people think of government, they are primarily thinking of that government which touches their lives—the police and fire departments, the health and transportation services, the education and cultural facilities, and, yes, even the property taxes and the sales tax.

American government is more than Washington. American government is Washington, the State capitol, the county courthouses, the city and village halls, the town meetings, and the thousands of independent separate governmental authorities that range from port authorities to sewage systems, from metropolitan airports commissions to the local school boards.

116 ZAD - LINO

No nation in the world has had as much experience in self-government as ours. If there is one area of human activity in which we can claim superior knowledge and greater experience it is in the field of representative self-government. I salute those public officials—elected and appointed—who serve on the frontline of public service and who all too often go unappreciated and unrewarded.

We are, however, exposed to some of the most remarkable notions about the role of the Federal Government in relation to the States, counties, and localities.

We have heard the shopworn phrases about "Washington's ever-eager fingers of bureaucracy" grabbing responsibilities which supposedly have been defaulted by local governments. We are exposed to the same tired misconceptions of a pitiless Federal Establishment solely "obsessed by the enlargement of its role and its personnel" and trampling over the rights of a helpless populace. We are told of certain unnamed people who "seek solutions only by concentrating more and more power in fewer and fewer hands."

These tired complaints demonstrate a most profound misunderstanding of the dynamics of the American federal system. As professionals in the increasingly difficult task of governing our counties, you know that State, county, and local government is not about to collapse from any merciless onslaught from Washington.

Indeed, the facts demonstrate that in recent years expansion of American government has occurred primarily at the State and local levels as these governments have struggled with the gigantic task of governing America. Financial and employment figures tell much of the story. Since 1946, for example, State, county, and local governments and their budgets have grown more rapidly than the Federal Government despite our national commitments to national defense, space exploration, nuclear development, veterans' benefits, postal service, and welfare programs. While Federal spending has increased 46 percent over this period, State, county, and local expenditures have soared by over 400 percent. Federal taxes per capita have increased almost 75 percent, but State, county, and local taxes have jumped 213 percent. The Federal debt has risen by slightly more than 10 percent in the past 18 years; State, county, and local debt has climbed by more than 400 percent.

This is not criticism; it is a factual analysis that tells the story of a growing and demanding America. The willingness of our State, county, and local governments to assume a greater share of our common burden deserves explicit recognition and commendation. So, let's stop suggesting that the localities have either sold out or caved in to the Federal Government. This is one Senator who considers them very much alive.

To those who say that the Federal Government is taking over our local governments, I can only point out that the number of Federal employees has declined about 10 percent since 1946—while employees of the State, county, and local governments have risen by over 100 percent. Not long ago the ratio of Federal employees was 19 per thousand of the total U.S. population; today that number has fallen to 13 per thousand. Of those 13, 5 are located in the Defense Department, 3 in the Post Office Department, and 1 in the Veterans' Administration. The remainder—about 600,000 employees—comprise about 100,000 persons less than it takes to operate the Bell Telephone System.

Government has indeed grown since World War II—right from the grassroots of America. And why has this remarkable growth taken place? I am sure you know the reason far better than I. Government has grown because America has grown. You see and feel America develop and grow every month—every year.

I came to the U.S. Senate in 1949. Since then, the United States has added people equal to the entire present population of Great Britain and we continue to grow at the rate of 3 million new persons each year. These people have needed roads, housing, jobs, police and fire protection, water and sewer systems, transportation facilities, and the whole range of essential services which comprise good government in the 20th century.

117 ZAD - LINO

The country is now gripped by an industrial and technological revolution which, when coupled with our population growth, requires us to create 300,000 additional jobs each month just to stay even in terms of unemployment percentages. Life expectancy has increased from 49 years in 1900 to 70 years today; 1,000 people per day reach the age of 65. In 1950 there were 2.3 million students in institutions of higher learning; by 1970 there will be 7 million—more than a 300 percent increase. We are still lacking 60,000 classrooms in elementary and secondary schools if we want to eliminate overcrowding. Each year 100,00 qualified high school graduates fail to attend college because they lack the necessary funds. Can responsible government simply ignore these social and economic realities? Of course not.

Those persons who denounce the response of our Federal, State, and local governments to these forces remind me of the Kansas farmers who tried in the 1860's to lynch a weatherman because he correctly predicted a tornado.

I suggest that it is time to talk sense to the American people. It is time to ask this fundamental question: What should be the appropriate roles of the Federal, State, county, and local governments in terms of the social and economic realities of 1964? Can we devise methods and procedures whereby the unique capabilities of each level are used to the fullest? Will each segment of our Federal system be prepared to allocate the human and economic resources necessary to get the job done? These are questions worthy of a free people determined to make democracy work.

In seeking these answers, one fact stands out above all others: The respective levels of government in the American system are partners in a common enterprise. The basis for this truth has been recognized since the dawn of our Republic. Writing in the Federalist papers (No. 46), James Madison noted that "the Federal and State Governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people * * *." In our democracy the people are masters at all levels. If this is true, and I believe it is, it makes little sense to drive a wedge between the people and the government at any level.

Government and people are collaborators in the common cause of securing the national interest, not mutual antagonists contending against one another for power and glory.

Without bothering to wrap all of this up in fancy political theory, we have attained a sound and workable *modus operandi* for our Federal system. No one advocates running everything from Washington. Indeed, the major Federal agencies have devolved an immense amount of decisionmaking to their State and regional offices which are generally run by local individuals. Most Federal programs are administered on terms highly favorable to the States and localities: The Federal Government provides a substantial portion of the money, demands certain minimal standards, and the rest is left to the wisdom and abilities of local officials.

The development of these methods and procedures has proceeded for many decades, during the ascendancy of both major parties, and is about as bipartisan an operation as the observance of the Fourth of July. Beginning with the Kestenbaum Commission in 1954, the Joint Federal-State Action Committee in 1957, and continuing with the permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, established by act of Congress in 1959, the question of Federal relationships has received—and is receiving—detailed and searching re-examination. The Senate and House have subcommittees specifically charged with similar responsibilities. Topics ranging from government in metropolitan areas to periodic reassessments of Federal grant-in-aid programs have recently occupied the Senate subcommittee of which I am proud to be a member. All of these bodies are constantly exploring for ways to improve what is already a remarkably effective system of intergovernmental relations.

As President Johnson proclaimed so eloquently in his address at the University of Michigan on the Great Society:

The solution to these problems does not rest on massive programs in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

118 ZAD - LINO

Let's look at some specific situations. You—as county officials—and I—as a former mayor of Minneapolis—have direct knowledge of the severe limitations on the revenue resources of our local governments.

As many of you know, for many years I have been concerned with the revenue losses accruing to county and municipal governments due to tax-free Federal properties. I have attempted to devise an equitable formula of Federal payments in lieu of taxes. This effort to devise such a formula should be resumed in the 89th Congress.

Consistent with the requirements of national defense, the Federal Government should advocate fiscal and monetary policies and sponsor action programs to increase local tax revenues. The Kennedy-Johnson administration has been doing just this through the tax cut, the investment tax credit, and accelerated depreciation schedules.

These policies have produced the longest sustained period of economic growth in 110 years, a factor which certainly enhances the revenue resources of governments at all levels in our Federal system.

There is, of course, one problem of special urgency and importance now confronting our country. The issue of civil rights and racial justice challenges the wisdom, abilities, and resources of our Federal, State, and local governments to an extent not equaled by any other issue of this century. And its resolution will only be possible through the unique relationship of partnership and cooperation which characterizes the American system.

In passing the civil rights bill we sought to create a framework of law wherein men of good will and reason could attempt to resolve peacefully the difficult and emotional issues of human rights. Passage of the bill certainly did not solve these problems, but it did establish certain channels and procedures to make their solution more probable.

As county officials, you know that most of this burden rests upon the shoulders of our local governmental officials. Only when communities and States are unable to meet their responsibilities set forth in this act is direct Federal action authorized. This is surely within the best traditions of our American system.

Every responsible public official has the obligation to see that civil peace is maintained across this land. No solutions to these terribly difficult problems are possible in the midst of chaos, violence, and disorder. As I have stated on numerous occasions: Civil wrongs do not make civil rights.

But neither can we afford to believe that by driving angry mobs from the street we are touching the festering sores of unemployment, dilapidated and overcrowded housing, drug addiction, and hopelessness which afflict the ghetto areas of our large urban centers.

We speak of restoring civil peace to our cities, and so we must. But let it be a peace with justice. Let us understand that we can no longer postpone the massive problem of restoring our decaying cities in both a material and spiritual sense. We can no longer afford the luxury of pretending that the problem is unreal, or that it will somehow go away, or that the people trapped in these ghettos rather enjoy their misery.

No responsible public official suggests that the States, counties, and cities are prepared to command the financial and human resources needed in this historic job of urban restoration. Without the active cooperation of the Federal Government, we can never achieve the massive programs of academic and vocational education, job training, youth work, mass transportation, slum eradication, recreational and community development which are essential in saving our cities. This is a job we postpone only at our gravest peril.

There is one area of responsibility which is the special task of the Federal Government: Namely, to preserve our national security during these trying years of the cold war.

119 ZAD - LINO

I am shocked that any candidate for the Presidency could stand on this platform and assert that "we are disarming ourselves and demoralizing our allies." I find it difficult to believe that any candidate for high public office could be so tragically misinformed about our defense posture to suggest that "our guard is dropping in every sense."

In an attempt to close the information gap which must have contributed to such misleading statements, let me summarize the facts about the administration's record in bolstering our national defense.

The administration has invested a total of \$30 billion more for fiscal years 1962-65 than would have been spent if we continued at the level of fiscal year 1961, the last year of the Eisenhower administration. What have these additional \$30 billion procured for America's Defense Establishment:

- A 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200-percent increase in total megatonnage in our Strategic Alert Forces.

- A 60-percent increase in the Tactical Nuclear Force in Western Europe.

- A 45-percent increase in the number of combat-ready Army divisions.

- A 44-percent increase in the number of tactical fighter squadrons.

- A 75-percent increase in airlift capability.

- A 100-percent increase in funds for general ship construction and conversion to modernize our fleet.

- An 800-percent increase in the Department of Defense Special Forces trained for counterinsurgency.

Today we have more than 1,100 strategic bombers, 800 fully armed and dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers (30 times the number we had in January 1961), 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 nuclear submarines (compared with 32 missiles available in 2 submarines in January 1961), 16 combat-ready Army divisions (compared to 11), 79 tactical fighter squadrons (compared to 55), and a planned Navy fleet of 883 ships (compared to 817 proposed in the budget in fiscal year 1961).

Funds expended for military research and development have increased by 50 percent over the level prevailing during the last 4 years of the Republican administration.

On June 3, 1964, President Johnson summed up the situation quite succinctly with this statement:

In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world.

It was precisely this massive array of balanced military forces which permitted President Johnson to select the appropriate response to the outrageous attack on our destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. President Kennedy had demonstrated similar firmness and skill during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. But prior to 1961 this Nation lacked a credible limited war capability and thereby ran the grave risk of being unable to muster the type of military response which punished an aggressor but avoided the risks of all-out nuclear war.

Today this Nation is prepared to meet any type of military threat to our national security. Our allies understand this fact—and so do our enemies.

There is one final area—the war on poverty—which cries out for the full involvement and participation of all segments of the American system. The war on poverty is crucial because it involves the meaning of one cherished word—"America." We hear much these days about the need to encourage individualism and self-reliance—and these qualities are important components of the American character. But let us never forget that America has—from its very beginnings—possessed another national trait which sets us apart from all other peoples: A profound sense of obligation to assist the less fortunate in this country and around the world. This is the essence of the word—"America"—and the heart of the democratic faith.

120 ZAD - LINO

The Statue of Liberty standing in New York Harbor symbolized this feeling to the millions of immigrants who came to make a new life on these shores. We now have the opportunity to provide a similar beacon of hope to those 35 million Americans who find themselves aliens in our prosperous and affluent society.

The Congress won the first battle of the war on poverty by passing President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This legislation is founded squarely on the American principles of federalism; all levels of government will have an opportunity to participate in implementing the broad range of programs included in the act. In particular, the community action programs authorized in title II will rely heavily upon the expertise, experience, and skill of our local units of government.

But this legislation is only the beginning. The war on poverty is related intimately to our crusade to build the Great Society which President Johnson described with these words:

The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice * * *. The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents * * *. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community * * *. But most of all, the Great Society is not a safe harbor, a resting place, a final objective, a finished work. It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor.

This is a vision which merits the total commitment of every American. This is a vision worthy of our faith that man does possess the courage, wisdom, charity, and love to govern himself. And—never forget—the Great Society will be a product of all levels of our Federal system, laboring together in pursuit of this common goal. Not Federal against State or county against municipality, but one free people joined in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious word—"America."

Article

News release from the office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

August 14, 1964

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, today introduced a joint congressional resolution which would request President Johnson to establish a White House Conference on Small Business.

The Conference would conduct a study of small business, with special emphasis on determining what is likely to happen in the next 10 years to affect the future of the small business community and its place in our national economy.

Senator Humphrey cited two principal factors which point to the immediate need for such a study:

(1) The powerful thrust which the total economy has developed in the past year and the importance of ascertaining whether or not small business is sharing equitably in this mounting productivity and prosperity; and

(2) The new industrial revolution which promises to result from civilian uses of the immense amount of technical knowledge uncovered by military research and development, and the urgency for assuring that small enterprises are kept abreast and have an opportunity to share in these new developments.

"An effort should be made," Humphrey said—

to establish on a continuing basis an instrumentality for evaluating the small business significance of new materials, new processes, new production techniques, and new distributive methods.

121 ZAD - LINO

The old adage that a pound of prevention is worth a ton of cure has special force in planning the future of small business.

The Senator pointed out that in the 19th century when the economy of the Nation grew at a rate that astonished the world, the Government—

stood by with its arms folded as one industry after another came under the control of one, two, or perhaps three giants.

He noted that it was not until 1890 that the first antitrust laws were adopted and this, he said, was but a half measure.

The Senator said that past mistakes in neglecting the major problems of small business should not be repeated.

"Today, as we stand on the threshold of a new industrial revolution, let us seize the opportunity to assure a place in it for small business," he urged.

Among the major subjects which should be studied, the Senator suggested, are antitrust policy and the emergence of the Negro as a small businessman.

Humphrey cited this statement by Small Business Administrator Eugene P. Foley:

Much has been done to promote better employment opportunities for the Negro. This is as it should be and such efforts will be greatly intensified * * *. But if Negroes are to serve our society with their full potentials they cannot be limited, as they have largely in the past, to the role of workers. Their talents as businessmen must be recognized, encouraged, and developed so as to provide them with a firm base in the economy. Without such a base they cannot secure the political and social rights which belong to them.

Senator Humphrey invited other Senators to join with him in cosponsoring the resolution.

Article

Congressional Record

August 14, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON SMALL BUSINESS PROPOSAL, U.S. SENATE

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should establish a White House Conference on Small Business to conduct a study of small business, with particular emphasis on the future awaiting this vital segment of the economy in the next decade. The need for such a study at this particular time arises from two principal factors.

The first of these factors is to be found in the powerful thrust forward which the economy has experienced in the past year. As the Senate Small Business Committee pointed out in its 14th annual report, transmitted in June, we do not know whether, or to what extent, small business is sharing in this mounting productivity and prosperity. We must find out—and now is the time to do it.

If small business is being left behind, we must be prompt to discover the causes and to devise remedies. Any lag, if permitted to develop, would further weaken the competitive position of small business and lead inexorably to a substantial acceleration in the trend toward concentration. In that event the economic growth we are now experiencing could prove to be more in the nature of a curse than a blessing. The time for action, I repeat, is now.

The second factor to which I refer is the industrial revolution which promises to result as civilian applications are found for the technological knowledge now emanating from military research and development. Perhaps I should not use the future tense in this connection because applications have already been found in some sectors of the economy—for example, mining, agriculture, power generation, and

122 ZAD - LINO

product development in such areas as chemicals, electronics, and pharmaceuticals. However, these are only the vanguard of changes which will effect vast transformations in our use of material and methods of production and which will increase the productivity of both labor and capital.

In other words we are on the verge of a tremendous breakthrough in knowledge which may produce wealth beyond our capacity to imagine today. The economy which evolves from such technological progress will doubtless provide countless opportunities for small business to take root and flourish. No effort must be spared to recognize these opportunities to take full advantage of them as they come into sight. At the same time, these impending changes may create havoc among small concerns which are not prepared for them.

One of the main purposes of the study I am proposing is to explore this aspect of our future, as far as existing knowledge permits, to find what it holds for small business. An effort be made to establish, on a continuing basis, an instrumentality for evaluating the small business significance of new materials, new processes, new production techniques and new distribution methods. The collection and dissemination of such information would serve not only to preserve small business but to strengthen it and to promote its expansion.

The old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure has special force in planning the future of small business. During the 19th century, when the economy of this Nation grew at a rate which astonished the world, the Government neglected to take action to assure the preservation of competitive balance. It stood by with its arms folded as one industry after another came under the control of one, two, or perhaps three giants. Not until 1890 was the first of the antitrust laws adopted. Even this was a negative action, a half measure. And the antitrust laws which have been passed since then have been only partially effective in safeguarding the competitive strength of the small business community. The sad truth is that, had the Government intervened earlier than it did, our economy would now be the healthier. It will be a long time, if ever, before the resulting damage is undone. Let us not repeat this mistake. Today, as we stand on the threshold of a new industrial revolution, let us seize the opportunity to assure a place in it for small business.

These are the principal purposes of the White House Conference I am proposing. But they are by no means the only purposes. However, the study should also identify and investigate the major problems confronting small business which have not yet been fully explored. Although I would leave the selection of these problems to the discretion of the Conference, I am thinking of two which, in my judgment, deserve special attention. One of these is our antitrust laws. Do the antitrust laws promote the interests of small business? I have raised this question before and will not dwell upon it here in detail. These laws should be thoroughly reevaluated to determine whether, and in what respects, they produce undesirable results on the efforts of small business to strengthen their competitive position by combining their resources.

The other subject I have in mind is the emergence of the Negro as a small businessman. On this point I would like to quote my good friend, Gene Foley, the Administrator of SBA:

Much has been done to promote better employment opportunities for the Negro. This is as it should be, and such efforts will be greatly intensified under the bill we are considering. But if Negroes are to serve society with their full potentials, they cannot be limited, as they have largely been in the past, to the role of workers. Their talents as businessmen must be recognized, encouraged, and developed so as to provide them with a firm base in the economy. Without such a base they cannot secure the political and social rights which belong to them.

I would not try to improve on that summarization of the matter. Plans must be made to pave the way for the entrance of Negroes into the small business community.

123 ZAD - LINO

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in its entirety at this point of my remarks, and I also ask that this joint resolution, which I now introduce, lie on the table for 2 days in order that other interested Senators may have an opportunity to add their names to it as cosponsors.

Article
Congressional Record
August 4, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS, U.S. SENATE

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Senate acted on H.R. 11611, an act to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. The House conference members accepted the Senate modifications, so this bill will now become a law. The dispatch with which both Houses acted is gratifying, but I do not think enough attention has been called to the importance of this legislation.

We have known that we are in an age of rapid technological change. We have known that this is effecting production and employment, setting new job requirements and making major types of worker displacement, both technological and economic. We have known also that we needed to have a much deeper study of these problems and of the results of the Federal Government's research and development programs. There are special problems peculiar to geographic areas and to certain industries. These need to be identified, along with unmet needs of both the Nation and of the private economy, in order that proper planning may be done in all sectors to facilitate maximum growth of the economy and full employment of our growing population.

H.R. 11611 will enable the essential fact gathering to take place. Its commission is to include 14 persons from outside the Government, including both labor and management, as well as the heads of major Federal agencies.

I have long been interested in legislation of this kind. I have introduced S. 2427 to establish a Hoover-type commission to work broadly in the area of investigating the impact of automation, technology, and employment. I have also joined in the sponsorship of S. 2274 which focuses primarily on problems in the defense industry. Here shifts in procurement, the results of automation and technology and other advancements, result in economic and social dislocation. The lead-time is dwindling in which we can plan effectively for the best use of our resources and personnel.

In recent testimony on behalf of S. 2274 I was able to dwell at greater length on some of the problems we should be anticipating so that we can have sound and prudent planning. I ask unanimous consent that this testimony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TESTIMONY ON S. 2274 BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA

S. 2274 seeks to bring responsible study and planning to a situation which is becoming increasingly important in our national life. I wish to encourage the concern this proposed legislation presents.

The Department of Defense makes, from time to time, substantial changes in procurement of weapons and material it needs for the military security of the United States. In addition the Department of Defense has found it possible to reduce the overall defense budget of the Nation. Two and one-half billion dollars has been saved in the current budget. The Department of Defense looks forward to even greater reductions in the next several years. That this can be done at the

124 ZAD - LINO

same time that we are provided with the strongest military forces of any nation, either now or ever in the history of the world, is encouraging to all of us. Nevertheless, the situation presents us with both problems and opportunities which require our attention. I will summarize the outstanding facts as I judge them, and amplify briefly on each in turn.

1. Both shifts in DOD procurement, and cutbacks in total procurement do create economic and social dislocation—in some cases severe hardship—for both individuals and communities.

2. We do not have a war economy in the United States. We could absorb both the resources and the personnel released from defense activity, if we planned to do so.

3. The private, civilian economy needs some of the resources and high-level technical skills which may be released from the defense industry, in order to obtain the growth and development the private economy must have for full employment. In addition, there are many unmet needs in America whose achievement is also a part of American security. These too can absorb resources in men and money.

4. The defense industry is a special industry with special problems. It needs the help of various levels of Government, State, local and Federal, and the cooperation of different groups in order to solve the problems of its absorption.

5. While we understand the gross dimensions of the problem, sufficient detailed study has not been made to get all of the facts necessary for sound policy and legislative guidance.

6. The problem is getting urgent and the leadtime for study is dwindling. It is necessary that we make the studies that will permit wise and humane decisions.

When an aircraft plant is shut down because the plane it makes is no longer required, thousands of men may simply be out of work. For example, the projected cutback of 3 of the 9 plutonium-producing reactors at Hanford is due to eliminate 2,000 jobs. Commissioner James T. Ramey of the AEC in testimony before the Joint Atomic Energy Subcommittee of Congress stated that this will have a large effect on the community economy at Hanford.

We have had periodic instances of this just from shifts in procurement. In a period of rising overall defense budgets, the situation was obscured and many people did have the mobility to transfer themselves to other segments of a defense industry. In a situation, however, of cutback on the magnitude of billions we may expect to have many situations such as an NBC documentary illuminated several years ago. The camera then took us into several communities where a defense industry had suffered loss of contracts. There were interviews with workmen, tradesmen, mayors, chambers of commerce, and other people. The universal lament was "we want jobs back." The lament was justifiable. These people had no stake in war. They were interested in the stability of their livelihoods, their homes, communities, and the things which interest us all. We all must be concerned.

Many communities and many thousands of people will be affected in cutbacks which are foreseen. Problems will be accentuated because the defense industry is so heavily concentrated geographically and in a few types of industry. Defense industry is concentrated most heavily in 10 States, and these are largely on the east and west coasts. Twenty-five companies do more than 50 percent of the work and all but two of these are either aircraft or electronic industries.

Our economy is by no manner of means based on defense or war production. Although the defense budget is approximately 50 percent of the total Federal budget, it amounts to approximately 9 percent of the GNP and the labor employed in defense industry amounts to approximately 9 percent of the total labor force. Percentage-wise, we do not have a magnitude of investment in either resources or personnel that

125 ZAD - LINO

could not be absorbed if we planned for it. Moreover, we are not talking about dismantling the entire Defense Establishment. Half of the defense budget would remain if not a single new weapon were procured. Nevertheless, even with contemplated reductions of \$5 to \$10 billion over the next 6 to 8 years, there would be severe problems in many communities if there were no planning by somebody to provide alternative employment.

The problem is further accentuated because the nondefense economy is not operating at a level of full employment. For 6 years the unemployment rate has hovered slightly above 5 percent. By common consent this is too high, and although the economy has grown and the GNP has gone steadily up, the growth rate has only kept us even with the increased numbers coming into the labor pool for the first time and with the steady elimination of jobs due to automation. In fact, very shortly, the economy will have to grow faster to keep even—without eating into our already too high unemployment margin—because the loss of jobs due to automation is accelerating, and because we are yet to bear the full brunt on the labor market of the post-World War II baby crop.

To absorb defense workers into this situation clearly means that there must be an expansion of the private, civilian economy. Major planning must be done to this end.

Fortunately for the dilemma of how to absorb more unemployed in a situation where there are already too many, the release of resources in both men and money from the defense industry may be a key to the stimulation of the private economy that it needs. It will be the key if we plan to exploit the opportunities presented.

There is ample reason to believe that the private economy lags in sufficient growth rate because of insufficient input into basic research and development. This insufficiency is due to the fact that the Federal Government sponsors 75 percent of the R. & D. work done in the Nation. Most of it is in defense, and most of the scientific and technical manpower of the Nation is working there. I am not a critic of that fact. It has given us the superb military superiority that we have—the defense we wanted and needed. It has been necessary also to the guardianship of the free world. Nevertheless it has put some strains on our civilian economy and its needs. It is notorious that unemployment in Europe is much lower than ours, and that many national economies there are growing at a faster rate than ours. But in all those industrial economies a much higher percentage of R. & D. funds is channeled into the civilian economies.

It is a marvelous tribute to the economic strength of America that we have almost had our cake and eaten it too. The defense sector of our economy has been built on top of our normal civilian economy. It has been a surplus production. We are the only society that has had guns and butter. It comes now as a stroke of good fortune, an opportunity we should welcome, to be able to divert some of the defense resources to ease the strains appearing in the civilian economy in its struggle to keep up.

I believe that planning will include, among other things, a diversion of funds from a public defense R. & D. sector to a public nondefense R. & D. sector. High order scientific skills released from defense work, can shift to the R. & D. problems underlying the development of new industries, new plants and products, and new employment.

R. & D. funds can be applied to two broad areas of a nondefense sector. One is in basic industrial research. This would include basic research in medical electronics, wheeled transport, the construction industry, new uses for wood products—to name only a few of a long list of items in which fundamental research is inadequate. The other area of research would meet broad public needs: air and water pollution, urban transport, providing adequate water supply and other conservation of natural resources for a growing population, and more. Again there is a long list.

126 ZAD - LINO

R. & D. has had some spectacular results in defense work. Some of the successes, however, would have been disastrous failures if they had had to be supported by private capital. Companies would have gone broke before they could have sustained development to the point of success. I am not talking about any subsidy to individual firms for the manufacture and distribution of goods and services. Nor am I talking about solving the problems of individual companies or a narrowly oriented group of firms. Rather, I am talking about R. & D. grants to universities and other private research organizations to develop industrial and other areas not initially attractive for private development, notwithstanding the fact that there would be a long-term beneficial effect to the private sector. Research on problems of public needs would likewise improve immensely the quality and strength of our society, while providing the base for much new economic private enterprise.

I am convinced that we are not talking about a large amount of money. At least the magnitude to be directed this way would be considerably less than the anticipated reductions in the defense budget. Most important is a selective and directed use of research talent to employ most profitably the highly skilled personnel that can be released. Many of our most urgent needs in basic industrial research and development, and in design for some broad public needs from transportation to conservation require and may only yield to the systems analysis approach that has proved so necessary to missile and aerospace development.

We are presented, indeed, with a "once-in-a-lifetime opportunity" at Emile Benoit, of Columbia University, one of the most distinguished analysts in this area, has pointed out. We now have the possibility to apply some highly valuable, specialized resources to carefully selected alternative uses where they can contribute some effectively to the highest priority needs of the Nation and at the same time stimulate its private economy.

This, of course, would have to be complemented and completed, by cooperation and initiative on the part of State and local governments to welcome and provide opportunities for new developments in their areas. There will have to be some new entrepreneurship—some new initiative and risk taking—on the part of managements, banks and lending agencies, and other group action necessary to picking up the possibilities for new economic activity and growth. But first we must focus the high order technical talent to make the breakthroughs on that which can be developed.

With a new boost to the private, civilian economy to absorb skilled labor diverted from defense industry, in addition to handling the new workers constantly coming on the manpower market a real new wealth will be created. Our defense requirements will be more easily borne. Further tax cuts might be envisioned, even while basic governmental services are improved.

Our opportunities are golden, but there is a lot of homework to be done before they can be seized. There must be a detailed study of the defense industry and a working with them in terms of their special characteristics.

I have noted that as a whole, the defense industry has been built on top of, or by the side of, a normal economy. That establishes one sense in which reductions in defense mean absorbing the men and money in a civilian economy. But there is another sense also in which we are talking about

127 ZAD - LINO

absorption and not strictly speaking conversion. An air-frame industry may possibly keep all of its personnel and present plant and convert to making prefabricated housing. Other firms however, do not have such a clear, alternative possible market to turn to. The need for study may be illustrated by a brief summary of some pertinent economic characteristics of defense industry:

a. Defense industries make special products. The products are special in the sense that they are of high cost and high precision. The problem presented is necessity for the product, not its cost or market demand. The companies are not oriented to marketing, competitive pricing, or working at the lower profit margins of normal consumer goods.

b. Some defense companies do not make anything at all. The product of some companies is highly specialized. They solve problems. There are various problems we can give them, but until some are, the loss of a defense contract with their only customer, puts their highly specialized manpower out of work.

c. Organizational problems make relocation of personnel difficult. Seniority rules and labor-management agreements lock some jobs in. At a recent conference of defense industry planners, one reported that when it laid off 600 people, there were 3,700 job moves because of bumping. Another industry reported that when it laid off people, a defense division across the street found almost none of these people appropriate for hiring, even for engineers with similar degrees.

d. Defense companies tend to diversify their interests rather than convert their defense division. That is, some companies have desired to cut the degree of their involvement in defense activity. After much effort they have found themselves buying other firms making other things, but the defense division has not been affected.

e. Defense conversion is heavily dependent on Government decision. The Federal Government has established an artificial market (or a nonmarket) for defense goods. Either the Government or somebody else must replace this market or demand, in order to use the people and the skills involved in these industries.

There are still other problems. A large corporation like General Electric, which has only about 25 percent of its total volume in defense sales, will have an easier job in absorbing personnel or in sustaining the research to make new products and use its people in their manufacture. Other companies losing their principal or only customer might well find it easier to close the door and turn the key. The management of a firm sees its first interest in protecting the owner's equity, and secondly in keeping the firm going. These interests are not necessarily the same as the interests of the community in which the firm is located, nor does it insure protection for the employees.

I do not mean to imply that defense contractors are unconcerned. Rather my experience is just the opposite. More and more these contractors are feeling an impact from shifts in procurement and are concerned about cutbacks they anticipate. They would like to keep highly skilled management and technical teams together to serve as the nucleus of new enterprise that would keep people working. But some other needs than weapons must be defined, and some other markets must be found.

We may understand the gross dimensions of the problem fairly enough, but there must be a much more thorough and detailed study than has yet been undertaken. It should be particularly complete in the industries where most cutbacks are contemplated, and in the local areas most affected. Study should go beyond the area of prime contracts and estimate the secondary effects on suppliers, service trades, and other economic activity in a community affected. Areas for basic industrial research or in public needs should be carefully iden-

128 ZAD - LINO

tified. What problems can be given to existing structures and firms? How may universities be used in new research? What new private organizations may be elicited with grants for specific problems? Guidelines need to be established also for the proper relationship between public stimulus and private enterprise. In short there is much to be studied and analyzed before sound policy can be formulated.

Leadtime is dwindling for us in doing this planning in order to avoid hardship on people and communities, and in order to exploit new opportunities. We are caught between the upper and lower millstones of people becoming unemployed through defense industry modification and the unemployment burden already too high in the economy as a whole.

S. 2274 offers an opportunity to start quickly in cooperation between industry and the executive branch of the Government on much of the study and information required. In addition to sponsoring this legislation, I have also introduced S. 2427 to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Automation, Technology, and Employment, for I believe that satisfactory long-term solutions for the economic impact of cuts in defense are part of a larger problem of solving the impact of automation manpower and economic growth. In this connection, I am pleased at the recent passage of H.R. 11611 to establish a Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. This Commission will certainly develop data on a number of the pertinent areas of concern.

I do not believe that S. 2274 and the other bills cited, are mutually exclusive. S. 2274 permits us to make an early start on an essential phase of the problem and I am convinced that the sooner we get started, the better. Time is running out if we are going to make an opportunity instead of a crisis out of a clearly visible problem. Within the next 2 years, we shall have important resources in both personnel and money, released from the defense industry. Neither humanly nor economically, can we permit these resources to be idle.

Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

August 15, 1964

HUMPHREY SAYS WEST WILL REJECT GOP POLICY OF "NO NEW STARTS" BY ELECTING JOHNSON

Senate Majority Whip Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said today the people of the West will reject a return to the Republican policy of "no new starts" by an overwhelming vote for President Johnson and the Democratic ticket this fall.

Humphrey said the people of the West see the Johnson administration as a "symbol of the spirit of the West—prudent, progressive, and courageous."

Humphrey spoke at a Democratic dinner in Salt Lake City, Friday, honoring Senator Frank Moss, of Utah, who is seeking reelection.

Humphrey said that President Johnson—

is a true son of the West who understands its problems and its pioneer spirit. And unlike some sons of the West he is not childishly obsessed with the past, nor does he want to return to the days when you shot from the hip and prepared for an enemy attack by gathering the wagons around in a circle.

President Johnson is a 20th century westerner. He fully understands the needs of today and is concerned about doing something to solve the problems of tomorrow.

President Johnson knows that water is the most serious problem the West faces—

129 ZAD - LINO

Humphrey added.

Furthermore, everyone knows he is a public official who looks upon water as a national concern—not just a problem affecting one particular State.

Humphrey said:

We have in President Johnson a man who understands the urgency of reclaiming our land and developing our natural resources—not just for the benefit of a few, but for all the people.

We have in President Johnson a man of prudence who knows the difference between phony cries of “fiscal responsibility” and the need for wise investment. It is easy to cry “no, no, no.” And it is easy to shout “we can’t afford it.” But the prudent man looks beyond the glib slogans and examines the problem. He knows that we must continue to make investments in developing the resources of our people and our country if we are going to continue moving forward.

This investment for the future is particularly vital here in the West. The people of the West realize that the investments made by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations in land reclamation, irrigation, flood control, water development, and power provided the economic foundation for the booming economy the West now enjoys.

The people of the West realize that they cannot afford to return to another period of Republican control when we had 8 years of the disastrous “no new starts” policy.

And the people of the West realize that the Goldwater policy would be disastrous not only for the West, but for all the Nation. Our late President Kennedy had a habit of drawing on his Navy background to emphasize his points. He was fond of saying that “a rising tide lifts all boats” and he pointed out 4 years ago in Cheyenne:

If we are moving ahead here in the West, if we are moving ahead in agriculture, if we are moving ahead in industry, if we have an administration that looks ahead, then the country prospers. But if one section of the country is strangled, if one section of the country is standing still, then sooner or later a dropping tide drops all the boats * * *.

Humphrey said that the election of the Kennedy-Johnson ticket—brought an end to the policy of no new starts in the West and put in power a can-do administration that sparked a rising tide of prosperity in all of the Nation.

“I am confident,” Humphrey said—

that the people of the West will reject a return to the Republican policy of “no new starts” by giving an overwhelming vote to President Johnson.

I am also confident that the people of Utah will give an overwhelming vote to the “Mr. Water” of the U.S. Senate—Frank Moss.

Humphrey said Moss has played a key role in helping the Kennedy-Johnson administration enact a program of development for the West.

He pointed out that Moss is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Interior Committee—one of the most important water posts in the U.S. Senate. He pointed out Moss also is chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Western Water of the Public Works Committee—a group that has the responsibility of working out long-range programs to insure adequate water supplies for the West.

“Frank Moss is a man who knows the difference between ‘fresh water’ and ‘gold water.’” Humphrey declared.

Humphrey noted that Moss has acquired considerable seniority during his first term as Senator—halfway up the seniority ladder on both the Interior and Public Works Committees. “We have watched Frank Moss grow in the Senate and we look forward to 6 more years of leadership from this able spokesman for the West.”

130 ZAD - LINO

Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

Week of August 16, 1964

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA HAS VITAL ROLE IN FEDERAL PROGRAM TO SOLVE PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYED AND UNSKILLED YOUNG PEOPLE

By Hubert H. Humphrey

The University of Minnesota has a vital role in a Labor Department program that trains counselors and is aimed at easing problems of unemployed and unskilled young people.

Another youth training approach that has great promise is incorporated into the Economic Opportunity Act—which is part of President Johnson's war on poverty. It stresses basic concepts of youth conservation and vocational training that I have been proposing for several years.

The university is assisting in a crash program to train youth counselors, who will be assigned to U.S. Employment Service offices in each of more than 100 labor market areas. They receive 8 weeks of training.

Sixty counselors are being trained at Minnesota. It is 1 of 20 colleges and universities that started the training programs July 13. Funds come from the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The seriousness of the youth employment problem was discussed recently by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, who said between 250,000 and 300,000 boys and girls are added to the human waste heap annually. Unemployment hits young people harder than any other group. There are four times as many unemployed youths as unemployed adults.

Every undereducated and undertrained young person will cost the Nation about \$30,000 in various kinds of welfare payments in his lifetime. As Secretary Wirtz puts it—"Either we support the youths or we support the adult."

The youth counselors being trained will work only with young people—interviewing them, testing them for aptitudes, and advising them. Referrals are expected from schools, draft boards, and social agencies.

Work toward the training approach in the Economic Opportunity Act began in 1957 when I proposed a Youth Conservation Corps modeled on the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. This passed the Senate several times but the House, despite hard work of Congressman John Blatnik, was unwilling to approve it.

Last year support for the legislation was more impressive than ever. Of 61 witnesses at Senate hearings on the youth conservation proposal, only 1 opposed it. Government agencies representing 22 States, counties, and cities expressed strong support.

Approval also was expressed by the National Association of Counties, the American Legion, the VFW, the AFL-CIO, the American Municipal Association, the National Education Association, the National Farmers Union, and the National Committee for the Employment of Youth.

With this support, President Johnson made the Youth Corps a central part of his antipoverty program.

Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act sets up conservation camps and training centers to provide both basic education and vocational training to young people. Another part makes it possible for young people to work part time in training programs while attending school in their home communities.

The war on poverty will be won or lost in the youth sector. All our young people ask, and all they need, is a reasonable opportunity. We can't do less than see that this opportunity is theirs.

131 ZAD - LINO

Sacramento, Calif.
California State Democratic Convention
August 16, 1964

SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. I had hesitated to come out here to California after watching all that carnage at the Cow Palace on my television set last month.

But my friends at the Radiation Laboratory in Livermore told me the political fallout has blown away and it's even safe for a Tommy Kuchel Republican to set foot in California now.

You have to give Barry and his running mate credit—they really started the campaign on a tone of dignity.

I understand a reporter asked Senator Goldwater if he planned to keep his campaign on a high level and Barry shot right back: "Absolutely, you can tell that phony faker in the White House I will never indulge in personalities."

His running mate Bill Miller added a note of grace by saying that "Barry is half-Protestant and half-Jewish and I'm Catholic and anyone who would oppose a ticket like that is a damned bigot."

At any rate, things are working out well for Bill Miller. He had planned to retire this year anyway and devote full time to his law practice.

I understand Barry's boys have worked up a real dandy campaign slogan: "I'd Rather Be Far-Right than President."

It's pretty difficult to figure out just what the Goldwater gang really wants now that they've won him the nomination. Ever since San Francisco all we've had are explanations. All we know for sure is that the Goldwater gang has kidnapped the Republican Party and turned the Grand Old Party into Goldwater's own party. And in the process they've told the followers of Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt to "do it our way or find a new home." Well, we Democrats have always been hospitable folks—the welcome mat is always out.

But I can tell you now, in loud and clear terms that the Democratic Party won't hedge or hem and haw with cute answers and delayed responses when asked if we would accept the support of the Ku Klux Klan or the John Birch Society or the Communist Party or any other gang of extremists. We never have and we never will accept such support.

I don't want to get into any academic debate about semantics, but I submit that you don't have to be a language expert to know that there is a vast difference between patriotism and extremism or between wholehearted devotion and extremism. And any political candidate who can't make that distinction isn't worthy of support, regardless of what office he is seeking.

Really, there is only one central issue in this campaign and it's a very simple one: Which man is best equipped—intellectually and emotionally—to lead the free world and maintain American security during the cold war?

Do we want a man who is an experienced leader * * * a man of prudence * * * a man of forbearance and patience who can be trusted to maintain a steady hand during a time of crisis?

Or do we want a man who shoots from the lip * * * a man who reacts emotionally * * * a man who thinks that nearly every problem has a simple Bad Guys and Good Guys answer just like the horse operas we see on television?

The American people know the difference between the makebelieve world of the TV western and the complex atomic world of today when a hasty, nervous decision by the President of the United States could blow us all up.

I am confident the American people will put their trust in Lyndon B. Johnson and give the Democratic Party an overwhelming victory this fall.

Our future as individuals and as a nation demands that we reject the notion that we can have prefabricated answers to our problems or that we can retreat to some nostalgic past—the good old days of McKinley and Harding.

132 ZAD - LINO

There is no future in retreating into the past. Lovely as it may sound we can't make the poet's dream come true:

Backward, flow backward, O time in your flight.
Make me a child again, just for tonight.

My friends, I know the American people are nostalgic and sentimental. But they are also realistic. And they do not want childlike answers to our man-sized problems.

Even if we weren't presented with such a "clear choice" * * * even if we had the assurance that a vote for a Republican President would give us a responsible "echo" in international affairs * * * we Democrats would still have a magnificent opportunity to point out the broad differences between the Goldwaterites and the Democratic Party.

I have served in the Senate long enough to know that there is such a thing as a national consensus—that unless you can demonstrate that there is a national consensus in support of a major bill that piece of legislation doesn't stand a chance.

During the last 4 years there has been a national consensus among both Democrats and Republicans—on four of the most important pieces of legislation enacted by the Kennedy-Johnson Administration.

On all four of these major issues Barry Goldwater stood entirely apart from his own party.

—On civil rights four-fifths of the members of his own party voted for equal opportunities for all Americans. Barry Goldwater voted against.

—On the nuclear test ban treaty, three-fourths of the members of his own party voted to ratify. Barry Goldwater voted against.

—On the Trade Expansion Act, three-fourths of the members of his own party voted for the bill. Barry Goldwater voted against.

—On taxes, two-thirds of the members of his own party voted for a \$12 billion tax cut. Barry Goldwater voted against.

How do you pin a label on a man who—

(1) Votes against a bill that would secure constitutional rights for all Americans;

(2) Votes against an opportunity to slow down the arms race and reduce nuclear fallout;

(3) Votes against a bill designed to increase American trade overseas; and

(4) Votes against the free enterprise system by voting against a tax cut?

Is it any wonder that Republicans like Tommy Kuchel, Nelson Rockefeller, Ken Keating and Jack Javits are all alone these days singing their own campaign song—"Down by the Old Mainstream?"

I wouldn't want to accuse anyone of being antiprosperty. But in many ways this is the implication of the critics who have been crying that Democrats are antibusiness.

Let me cite a few facts. Remember these facts. Be proud of them. They constitute the record of progress and prosperity made by the Democratic administration of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

For the first time in 100 years an administration has been in power for 4 years without a recession or an economic downturn. Quite the contrary, we are compiling a steady record of economic expansion.

Our Nation's gross national product—the value of all goods and services produced—has soared to an annual rate of \$617 billion. Four years ago, before we came to power, the GNP was at the \$500 billion level.

New plant and business expansion this year will total \$44 billion—an all-time record and a 12-percent increase over last year.

The automobile industry will hit a new peak of 8 million new cars this year.

We have added more than 4 million persons to the labor force in the last 4 years and employment is at an all-time high of more than 72 million.

133 ZAD - LINO

The unemployment rate is now showing its first downward trend in 6 years. For the first time in 4 years the rate dropped below 5 percent in July.

Personal income has increased by 17 percent—or more than \$70 billion—during the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

The average pay check of factory workers has jumped from \$89 a week in January of 1961 when President Kennedy took office to nearly \$103 a week now.

Price stability has been maintained with the wholesale price level remaining virtually unchanged in 6 years.

Since early 1961 corporate profits, after taxes, have gone up 43 percent to an all-time peak of \$27.4 billion.

And this year corporate dividends have gone up 10 percent over last year.

All economic indicators are up and experts forecast that the economy will continue in a healthy growth condition.

Despite all this overwhelming evidence I suppose we Democrats can still expect to hear our unthinking critics cry about creeping socialism. Well, I have a better name for our outstanding record of prosperity—I call it leaping capitalism.

We Democrats can be proud of the record we have made during the 4 years of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. But we must not fall into the smug attitude of self-congratulation. We cannot afford to pause or rest.

We have made a beginning. We have responded to the command so nobly set forth by President Kennedy—"Let us begin." Now we must go forward and carry out the command of another great President—Lyndon Johnson—who said "Let us continue."

We would do well to remember the words of the Robert Frost poem that John F. Kennedy always like to quote—"* * * but I have promises to keep and miles to go before I sleep."

We have many unfinished tasks before us. We are living at a time when the most vital force in the world is the unbelievably accelerated pace of scientific advance and technological progress.

These forces have brought profound changes in the way we live. They have provided enormous benefits. But they also have brought the most vexing and challenging of problems.

Whether these forces will be a boon to mankind or the instrument of our destruction will be determined by us—by our wisdom, by our judgment, and our patience.

The Goldwaterites see science and technology mainly as the vehicle for developing new instruments for waging war in a world already armed with weapons so fearful that their use could mean disaster for the human race.

The heavy emphasis in the Republican platform is on the use of science and technology to create new weapons of war, rather than new instruments of peace.

And this platform is the reflection of the attitude of the Republican candidate himself—an attitude that has been described as "looking at the world through a rose-colored bombsight."

Our job is to harness the immense exploding knowledge of our scientific age and convert it into a mighty force of good for all mankind. This imposes on us a heavy responsibility, but we can all take heart in the words of John Kennedy in his stirring inaugural address—"I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it."

This is our Democratic credo. We do not shrink from responsibility. We do not run from problems. We look on them as opportunities.

During the next 4 years we will face staggering challenges. But we can make them opportunities to bring peace, progress, and prosperity to all our people.

We have the opportunity to bring permanent peace to the world.

We have the opportunity to banish hunger throughout the world.

We have the opportunity to make America the land of full citizenship for all our people.

We have the opportunity to make machines the servants and not the masters of men.

134 ZAD - LINO

We have the opportunity to create new jobs and give full economic development to a nation that is growing at the rate of 3 million persons a year and that by 1980 will be a land of 250 million people.

We have the opportunity to make our cities decent places in which to live.

We have the opportunity in America to destroy poverty. As President Johnson said, "The richest nation in the world can afford to win the war against poverty—we cannot afford to lose it."

We have the opportunity to give security and dignity to our elderly. This is not merely an opportunity; it is a moral obligation.

We have the opportunity to improve and expand our educational system so we can train and prepare our youth to live in this age of scientific revolution.

These are the opportunities and the goals President Johnson speaks of when he says we must build a Great Society.

These are the goals of the Democratic Party—a better America where there is opportunity for the young, security for the elderly, compassion for the afflicted, and peace for all mankind.

Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

August 18, 1964

HUMPHREY PROPOSES NEW LOOK AT AGRICULTURE

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said Tuesday the hour is at hand for all of us to take a completely new look at American agriculture as it affects our total position, nationally and internationally.

Humphrey, sponsor of a resolution to establish a bipartisan, blue ribbon commission to examine agricultural policy, emphasized the contribution that American agriculture has made to the Nation and to the rest of the world.

He said the best bargain in the world today is the food basket for the American family. He added, however, that poverty remains a way of life for too many people in rural areas.

"The progress we have made in recent years only sharpens the contrast between what we have accomplished and what remains to be accomplished," Humphrey declared.

"It sharpens our awareness that we have the capacity to insure that a child born in rural America can have the same opportunity in today's world as a child born in the urban areas."

Humphrey said one of the proposed commission's tasks would be to find out how we can harmonize the utilization of the great advantages of the free market and its disciplines with an improving position for our farm families.

Earlier this year Humphrey sponsored legislation providing for compensatory payments to wheatgrowers. He said such payments for some commodities would enable us to provide a fair price to the farmer and at the same time avoid Government interference with the movement of those commodities through the normal channels of trade.

"There are many factors of farming that have convinced this Government that special rules should apply," Humphrey declared. "Food, in reliable quantity, is more vital than any other national resource. Farming therefore is special."

Humphrey said Government programs should not supersede the operation of normal markets. He said a program of compensatory payments would permit the operation of the normal, commercial channels of trade.

"The feed grains program is a good example of how compensatory payments can be effectively applied," Humphrey said. "Without reducing farm income they have brought about less Government cost and a much freer movement of grain both domestically and into world channels."

135 ZAD - LINO

"Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement," he declared, "not to take over but to assist; not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition more just and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the Nation."

Humphrey said "the miracle of American agricultural efficiency is something that staggers the imagination and leaves the imprint of American leadership without question in every area of the globe."

He pointed out that less than 7 million farm operators and workers produce food and fiber for 192 million Americans, satisfy our commercial exports of more than \$4 billion, our food-for-peace program of about \$2 billion, our reserves, and still have some left over.

"In a real sense what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world," Humphrey said. "It's not a laggard; it's not a burden; it is not what's holding America back. It is what's putting America ahead."

"We need to study and we need to know how we can improve in a constructive bipartisan spirit the lot of this numerically and proportionately shrinking group," Humphrey declared. "We need to do these things if for no other reason than the matter of simple justice."

Humphrey praised the food-for-peace program, stating that food has become a very significant form of foreign economic assistance.

He said "each of us should share in the glow of pride to know that the food and fiber from American farms has saved the lives of millions of people."

He pointed out that food and fiber exported under the food-for-peace program and normal commercial exports account for the output of 1 out of 4 acres of farmland and are the source of 15 percent of the income of farmers.

Humphrey also said tribute to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's food distribution programs, which now directly affect the diets of 1 out of every 6 people in the United States.

In addition to this, 3 out of every 4 children now are attending schools which participate in the national school lunch program.

Under the special milk program, Humphrey said, an estimated 2.9 billion half-pints of milk were consumed in schools, day-care centers, orphanages, and summer camps. Over 5 percent of all the fluid milk consumed off farms in this country is due to the school lunch and special milk programs, according to Humphrey.

Humphrey proposed pilot programs initiated with the use of section 32 funds to make fluid milk available to relief families at prices substantially below the prevailing retail price.

He also had praise for the needy family food donation program, under which 5.2 million people benefit, and the food stamp program. Legislation authorizing a continuing and expanded food stamp program passed the Congress this year.

"These programs," Humphrey said, "have received strong bipartisan support because they result in an improvement of the health of the recipients and contribute toward using our unmatched agricultural productivity."

Humphrey said the signs that old landmarks are moving, that tides are changing and moorings shifting are not necessarily ominous signs.

"The first requirement in such times is a willingness to look quickly into all our policies, to inquire searchingly into all our premises," he said.

Article
Congressional Record
August 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CIVIL AIR PATROL, U.S. SENATE

CIVILIAN PATROL INTERNATIONAL AIR CADET EXCHANGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, each year it is any great privilege to discuss for the Record the activities of the international air cadet exchange, sponsored by the Civil Air Patrol. This year's program, as those in the past, must be judged an outstanding success.

136 ZAD - LINO

Twenty-two nations participated in the exchange program this year. A gala banquet honoring the exchange cadets was held on Monday, August 10, 1964, in the Presidential Room of the Statler Hilton Hotel. The distinguished Senator from Nevada, Mr. Bible, and the Honorable Victor L. Anfuso, justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, delivered the principal addresses.

For 17 years, the Civil Air Patrol has arranged for CAP cadets to visit other countries in an exchange program which has brought their counterparts to the United States.

These young men are chosen for their outstanding qualities of leadership, character, and citizenship, and for their academic achievements.

The CAP exchange is effective for many reasons. First, it begins with young men who already have a basic, common area of understanding and interest—aviation. Second, the CAP do not just visit the District of Columbia and New York; they go into all parts of our Nation to visit our great cities and the people in them. Third, the CAP exchange, although conducted with the full cooperation of the U.S. Air Force, is essentially a voluntary and private program strengthened by the support of many individual citizens, organizations, and business firms.

For many years, I have been an active supporter of the CAP international air cadet exchange program. I have worked closely with Col. Barnee Breeskin, who is in charge of arrangements in Washington for the program. Several times I have been privileged to address the cadets in the annual farewell dinner in Washington.

Some of the distinguished guests at this year's banquet include:

Michael Manatos, special assistant to the President; John McNally, White House; Commissioner John B. Duncan; Assistant Postmaster General Ralph Nicholson; Congressman William L. St. Onge, of Connecticut; Maj. Gen. E. B. LeBailly, USAF, Director of Information, Department of the Air Force; Congressman Melvin Price, of Illinois; Col. Roy St. Lewis, CAP Board of Directors; Lt. Col. Shale L. Tulin, commander, USAF Band; Congressman James Morrison, of Louisiana; Col. Joe L. Mason, national commander, CAP; Col. Russell Ireland, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel; Col. Paul Turner, chairman of the board, CAP; Col. Stanhope Lineberry, commander, Middle East region, CAP; Col. Paul A. Fonda, Northrop International, board of directors, CAP; Dr. Robert Ladner, counselor, Austrian Embassy; Deputy Under Secretary for Transportation, Department of Commerce, Lowell K. Bridwell; Henry G. Catucci, vice president, Washington, D.C., Western Union International Inc.; John A. Lang, Jr., administrative assistant, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Air Force; Benjamin W. Fridge, Special Assistant for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve Forces, Department of the Air Force, Office of the Secretary; Patrick P. O'Carroll, Director, Federal Bureau of Narcotics Training School, Treasury Department; Lt. Col. William H. Schullie, chairman, LACE, New York program; Col. Daniel E. Evans, commander, National Capital wing, CAP; Col. Edward M. Kirby, director of public relations, USO, New York; Col. Milton Kronheim; Col. Donald Peck, USAF; Lt. Col. Fred Schleger; Lt. Col. Foley D. Collins, Jr.; Arthur W. Hummel, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs; Congressman John L. McMillan, of South Carolina; Lawrence Wyatt, Director of International Program Relations, HEW; Edward Sylvester, Deputy Administrator of the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, Department of Labor; Glenn B. Eastburn, vice president, New York Airways; Edward F. McGinnis, vice president, Seagram & Sons, Inc., New York; Herbert C. Blunck, vice president and general manager, Statler Hilton; Charles A. Cogliandro, president of the Calabrian Co., New York; Arthur J. Bergman, manager, National Guard Armory; W. Chester Martin, President of the Washington, D.C., Board of Trade; and Col. Barnee Breeskin, Washington, D.C.

Senator Bible delivered a most outstanding address on the vital services which the Civil Air Patrol performs in the United States and the great value of the international exchange program in fostering good will and understanding among the participating nations. His remarks deserve the careful attention of the Senate and all persons interested in the future of aviation.

137 ZAD - LINO

Justice Victor L. Anfuso also delivered a stirring address on the importance of youth in our democratic system of government. The Honorable John B. Duncan, Commissioner, District of Columbia, Michael Manatos, special assistant to President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Mr. Laurence Wyatt, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, also made interesting and timely remarks.

The distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], gave some idea of the value of the international air cadet exchange in a letter to Barnee Breeskin. The State of South Carolina entertained the air cadets from Peru and exposed them to the traditional southern hospitality and friendship.

I ask unanimous consent that these speeches and the letter from Representative McMillan be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speeches and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record.

Congressional Record
August 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, FOOD IN THE GREAT SOCIETY, U.S. SENATE

FOOD IN THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as one who has a healthy interest in the major issues of our time, but who prefers not to be encumbered by all the timeworn agricultural cliches, I think it is time to speak out on agriculture. The hour is at hand for all of us to take a completely new look at agriculture as it affects our Nation—our finances, our defense, our people, our farms, our consumers, our international relations, our politics—our total position, nationally and internationally. Fundamentally, I have come to the conclusion that if our agricultural policy makes sense in all the other areas, it also will be good politics.

Confession is good for the soul. Those of us in public life ought to honestly state that we do not know all the answers; that we should search for those answers. I have had to learn a great deal, and whenever I get to the point where I quit learning, then I think I should not serve the people any longer. What a man needs today more than anything else is to recognize the great flow of information which is available, the new challenges which we face every day. He must be big enough, at least in heart and mind, to acknowledge his own limitations, and be wise enough to seek the counsel of others who may have something to offer. I shall continue to do that in my years of public responsibility.

All too often we have seen the situation where a member of one party introduces a piece of legislation, perhaps one affecting agriculture, and finds there is an automatic negative reaction by the opposite political party. All too often there has been an automatic adverse reaction when one farm organization took one position and another farm organization took an opposite position on agricultural recommendations. All too often the net result of this automatically conditioned reflex action is that the farmers are hurt and the Nation is hurt by failure to get the action that is required to meet a particular situation. Divide and conquer is an old technique used by those who want to do nothing. But cooperation—not coercion—is the essence of affirmative action, and this requires a high degree of tolerance. It requires that we recognize we are not the depository of all wisdom and that none of us has a monopoly on virtue.

The miracle of agriculture

Mr. President, it is time that all the American-people, particularly in the great metropolitan centers, take note of the contribution that American agriculture has made to this Nation and to the rest of the world as well. We have taken this American miracle of agriculture for granted, and we often consider it commonplace. We need to study, and we need to know better the contributions of agriculture to the growth of our economy. We need to study and to know better the

138 ZAD - LINO

extent of the dependence of the rest of this economy on the gallant 8 percent of our population who take the risks of drought and flood, hail and early frost, insects and markets, and all the uncertainties of of the marketplace.

We need to study and we need to know how we can improve in a constructive bipartisan spirit the lot of this numerically and proportionately shrinking group. We need to do these things if for no other reason than the matter of simple justice, and we need to do these things because there are many others in our society who are primarily dependent upon the production of this great basic source of food and fiber.

Right now we are in the midst of a great technological revolution in agriculture, in fact, in every aspect of society, that not only is irreversible—except for temporary adverse weather effects—but is accelerating at jet-age speed. The American consumer now is enjoying food at the lowest cost of any people in the world in terms of human effort expended.

The American consumer not only has the world's richest diet, but also has the world's most nutritious and varied diet.

And the American consumer of food buys the family food basket at a smaller percentage of earned income than any other consumer in the world. The best bargain in the world today is the food basket for the American family, and the American farmer has made that possible.

I would not want to forget to pay my respects to our great system of processing and distribution. The quality of our food and the manner in which it is distributed and marketed and handled is a tribute to this entire industry, to this entire area of our economy. No finer products, none more wholesome and none more well guarded in terms of public health, are to be found anywhere.

At the same time as production in agriculture has been increasing, employment in the agriculture labor force has declined sharply. We now are at a point where it takes less than 7 million farm operators and workers to produce food and fiber for 192 million Americans, and to satisfy our commercial exports, our food-for-peace program, our reserves, and still have some left over.

Let the record be clear. The miracle of American agricultural efficiency is something that staggers the imagination and leaves the imprint of American leadership without question in every area of this globe.

Increase in exports

While the quantity and quality of U.S. food consumption has been upgraded, we also have seen a sharp increase in exports of food and fiber. We are very conscious of exports these days to the world markets. And we need to be, because America can overproduce for its own domestic needs. We now are exporting at the rate of about \$6 billion a year of food and fiber. Over \$4 billion of this is for cash commercial sales—hard currency. Thus our agricultural abundance is greatly aiding our balance-of-payments problem and greatly aiding our position as a great commercial nation in this new world.

The rapidly advancing agricultural technology affords a primary opportunity to help the developing nations to help themselves, and I want all our people to know that our agricultural economy is doing an amazing job in terms of building a better world and helping to build a political, economic, and social structure suited to the aspirations of many nations oriented toward freedom. This will provide strength to the free world and aid in the struggle with the forces of totalitarianism.

I want to point out here that a new day is upon us, and new approaches must be found to solve some of our problems. In a real sense what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world. It is not a laggard; it is not a burden; it is not what is holding America back. It is what is putting America ahead.

I have seen some of the factories behind the Iron Curtain, and some of my colleagues have seen there the achievements in the field of atomic science. We know of sputnik and we know of the astronauts and the cosmonauts, but despite all the genius of Soviet technology and industry, they have never been able to operate a family farm.

139 ZAD - LINO

Collectivism negates human aspiration. Collectivism is contrary to individual liberty, and our Nation must never follow any kind of course that leads to collectivism. We must follow only one course—the one that leads to individualism. Therefore, in our responsibilities as a world leader and to meet the needs of people, we need programs that recognize the breakthrough in agricultural technology and that are designed to meet these worldwide opportunities that I have mentioned.

Food for peace

A part of such a program is the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, known all over the world as Public Law 480.

In 1954 I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when this milestone was passed. I had something to do with bringing about passage of the legislation, along with other members of the committee. The bipartisan support of this legislation and its success should make all of us proud.

This program more recently has become known as the food-for-peace program. Food has become a very significant form of foreign economic assistance. I am tremendously impressed by the single overriding fact that without the farmers' productive capabilities, the entire U.S. foreign assistance program would be much less effective than it is today. In fact, food for peace in many areas of the world is the most effective, and the most worthwhile assistance program. Each of us should share in the glow of pride to know that the food and the fiber from American farms has saved the lives of millions of people. And you should be happy to know that there are millions of boys and girls today, throughout the world, outside of the United States, who are regularly receiving school lunches. There happens to be a bit of the spiritual involved in all of this, at a time when so many people are talking about the destruction of mankind. So I would think that rural families would be reverently grateful as well as genuinely happy that they have been able to save lives.

Does it not make economic sense, as well as moral sense for the United States and other exporting countries to share abundance—God-given abundance—with the millions who are in need of food, rather than to store it in bins or let the land lay idle?

Wheat has played the largest commodity role in this food-for-peace program. Since July of 1954 we have exported under Public Law 480 about 3 billion bushels of wheat. This represents about 63 percent of total wheat exports during this period. It would be well to stop for a moment and think about the economic chaos or explosion which would have occurred in U.S. agriculture if these markets had not been available.

But it should also be noted that more than 70 percent of the U.S. agricultural exports are normal commercial exports, and we have built many new markets by the use of food for peace. In a sense, these commercial exports constitute food for peace at its best—mutually beneficial, multilateral trade using the efficiency of commercial trade channels. The soundest and the simplest way to maintain our balance of payments would be to utilize to the maximum the productive efficiency of our farmers by finding ways to increase our agricultural exports even more.

Export markets are vital to the American farmer. Here we must find future markets for American agriculture. If we are going to maximize our exports—which is a matter of interest to our country—to the Common Market and to the other areas of the world, we must offer, as I have said, the best quality at competitive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad. Therefore, every policy that we pursue must be to try to strengthen what we call the operation of the market—including the market price.

I want to make my position clear: I do not believe Government programs ought to supersede the operation of our normal markets. Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement; not to take over but to assist; not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition more just and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the Nation.

140 ZAD - LINO

Trade Expansion Act

The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 equips the President with a formidable armory of negotiating powers. The objective of the United States is to halt and if possible to roll back the trend toward more agricultural protectionism in these markets.

The United States has declared plainly and repeatedly—and it has done this through the President—that it cannot conclude another round of trade agreements unless its major agricultural export commodities are included in a fair and significant way. To put it in simple language, these negotiations must benefit our farms as well as our factories or we are not going to sign on the dotted line.

I am confident of our ultimate success. No country, however prosperous, can indefinitely afford to keep valuable human and material resources locked up in obsolete and inefficient forms of agriculture. As we push for better trade agreements, we actually help our European friends who are today the victims of their own self-imposed obsolescence. We must, therefore, make sure that they have access to reasonably priced efficiently produced food and fiber. For industrial nations this is an essential factor in maintaining vigorous economic growth and national strength.

I wish to make clear that no agreement should be signed which does not follow the clear intent of the Trade Expansion Act. This emphasizes expansion for agricultural commodities, too. It does not mean haggling again over agricultural tariff bindings for which we have already paid. It means equity to our farmers through opening new markets for which they can compete.

Exports already account for the output of 1 out of 4 acres of farmland—and they are the source of 15 percent of the income of farmers. This is why since 1960 we have moved vigorously to expand farm exports—and have raised them from \$4.8 billion to over \$6 billion a year.

Twentieth century alchemy

The food-for-peace program is a 20th century form of alchemy. Food for peace has provided the means for converting America's agricultural productivity and abundance into schools and textbooks, hospitals, bridges, and roads, the vital ingredients of economic and social growth in the developing nations of the world. This ingenuity of using food as a resource for development has been termed one of the most imaginative instruments ever created for the purpose of sharing agricultural abundance with undernourished people and emerging nations.

We have found in our great abundance of food one of our greatest resources for peace. The food-for-peace program was initiated, in the words of the late President Kennedy, "to narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad."

We are narrowing that critical gap. Food for peace is reaching nearly 100 million people in the world. In 85 countries, food for peace is contributing to the health and nutrition of some 40 million children through school lunch and preschool child feeding programs. In Latin America alone, U.S.-donated food is going to 1 out of 4 children of school age. We expect these school lunch programs in South America to be reaching 1 out of 3 within the next year.

The magic of school the feeding program lies not only in the fact that food means life—and this is magic enough. But in addition, a school lunch often means the difference between a child's going to school or staying at home. And a child who is relieved from the gnawing pangs of hunger is a child who is more alert and receptive to learning.

Joining the U.S. Government in food distribution programs are the American oversea relief agencies, such as CARE, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, and the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee—and the governments of the countries in which the programs are being conducted. Currently, 15 such agencies are distributing U.S.-donated food valued at \$379 million in 228 programs in 113 countries.

But this progress, as good as it is, only begins to meet the needs of the American people. There is much that remains to be done. We will do it.

141 ZAD - LINO

This administration has been guided by a deep humanitarian spirit—to which we must all wish all mankind would dedicate itself. The very first Executive order increased the quantity and quality of food being distributed to needy American families.

Food distribution programs

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's food distribution programs now directly affect the diets of 1 out of every 6 people in the United States. In retail value, these people will have received close to \$1 billion of Federal food assistance during the last fiscal year, and this will be exceeded in the current fiscal year.

Three out of every four children are now attending schools which participate in the national school lunch program. During this school year, some 16 million children ate the nutritionally balanced type A lunch served under this program. About 10 percent of the 2.7 billion type A lunches served this year were served to needy children free or at reduced prices.

This year an estimated 2.9 billion half pints of milk were consumed under the special milk program in schools, day-care centers, orphanages, and summer camps. This is in addition to the 2.7 billion half pints served as a part of the type A lunches. Together, these programs account for over 5 percent of all the fluid milk consumed off farms in this country.

Significant and substantial progress has been made in making federally donated foods available to supplement the diets of low-income families in this country.

In December 1960, the needy family food donation program was operating in 1,142 counties throughout the country. In September 1963, the program was operating in 1,499 counties.

In December 1960, 3.7 million people were benefiting from USDA-donated foods. In September 1963, these foods went to 5.2 million, and other 348,000 needy people were assisted under the pilot food stamp program.

Since mid-1961, the Department of Agriculture has been testing a food stamp program which increases the food-purchasing power of low-income families. This program, now operating in 43 areas in 22 States, has proved effective and feasible. Legislation authorizing a continuing and expanded food stamp program passed the Congress this year.

These programs—the food for peace, the school milk, and the school lunch programs—have received strong bipartisan support because they result in an improvement of the health of the recipients and contribute toward using our unmatched agricultural productivity.

However, poverty remains a way of life for too many people in rural as well as in urban areas. Levels of education, and opportunities for young people growing up in rural America, are still far behind the opportunities available to most cities and suburbs. Public services in rural communities still lag behind those in urban areas. Wages and fringe benefits of farm laborers, including migrants, are far below those of industrial workers in the city.

Thus, the progress we have made in recent years only sharpens the contrast between what we have accomplished and what remains to be accomplished. It sharpens our awareness that we have the capacity to insure that a child born in rural America can have the same opportunity in today's world as a child born in the urban areas.

Some startling figures

I recently asked the Department of Agriculture to give me a report as to the additional amounts of food that would be consumed if the income of all low-income families was brought up to the annual level of \$3,000. Some of the figures I am revealing today for the first time are rather startling.

Per capita consumption of these families of all food would rise by from 10 to 15 percent; meat consumption would rise by about 15 to 20 percent, but the increase would be more than one-fourth for beef, 10 to 15 percent for poultry, and about 5 percent for pork. Consumption of milk products would rise about 7 percent, and fresh fruits and vegetables 15 to 20 percent. Think of the dramatic improvement in the diets and health of these low-income families if we could bring their food consumption up to these levels. Not only would their level of

142 ZAD - LINO

living and outlook be considerably improved, but also this increase in demand would have dramatic effects on prices and income received by farmers.

The President's war on poverty offers us a tremendous challenge—a challenge that only now is beginning to be felt more generally throughout the country. President Johnson recently described the challenge in these words:

The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use the wealth to enrich and elevate our national life—and to advance the quality of American civilization.

I have asked myself many times how to bridge the gap between the need for milk of many impoverished people and their ability to pay for it. We have provided means for the children during the school year. However, there are many families whose children for various reasons do not have access to school milk programs. This could be due to the fact that the children are too young to attend school, or a dropout situation has occurred, and as a result no one in the family is attending school. Adults too need milk.

Proposed pilot programs

In view of these factors, I would like to see a few pilot programs initiated with the use of section 32 funds to make fluid milk available to relief families at prices substantially below the prevailing retail price. Possibly this milk could be distributed through central depots using the labor of some of the people on relief. This would hold down distribution costs. Milk distributors could contract for the handling of the milk on a competitive bid basis. I feel that there is enough ingenuity properly directed to bridge this gap.

At the same time we give recognition to the producers, we must associate with this the miraculously efficient system we have developed for the marketing, distribution, and processing of food. This is a real tribute to what freemen in a free society can do.

The more I have studied our complex society, the more I have recognized the essentiality of maintaining to the maximum extent feasible our free commodity markets—the essential ingredient of a free enterprise system. The second-by-second adjustments of the free market provide us the primary means to advancement at the maximum pace. Commodity markets for important commodities have been established to meet an economic need. The hopes, fears, beliefs, knowledge, and needs pour into these markets. There emerges the most nearly perfect mechanism in the economic world. In a single price—visible to all who would see—there is measured every single factor then extant and communicable.

There is another, and perhaps more penetrating, part of the story which should not be lost from view. It is that the futures trading system, notwithstanding speculative excesses and imperfections, maintains equitable principles of trade. Futures trading on commodity exchanges developed as a highly effective form of free market trading and competitive pricing because it grew up with, and proved adaptable to, our other free institutions. It became an integral part of agricultural marketing because it focused supply and demand forces into a central price picture for one and all to see, because trading was conducted openly, and because anyone with the wherewithal to trade could participate in the market, and in the pricemaking process.

Against this background of the tremendous productivity of agriculture, our ability to utilize our abundance in a manner which is receiving strong bipartisan support, and the basic and fundamental need to help the poor, I have asked myself many times whether in our other areas of agricultural affairs there is a better way.

Multi-billion-dollar investment

The American people have a multi-billion-dollar investment in inventories of a relatively few agricultural commodities. The agricultural budget is high. Is there a better way to utilize these expendi-

143 ZAD - LINO

tures? Could programs be devised which will make more sense, cost less, and receive general approval? Can the Congress free itself from the past sufficiently to come up with more effective programs which farmers, consumers, and taxpayers will not reject or resent?

Fundamentally, we must ask ourselves whether the present programs boost our opportunities to increase efficient production and at the same time expand profitable markets here and abroad. We should reexamine our entire governmental control mechanism to see whether it is helping us to develop a rational agricultural policy. It is time the Congress asked for a complete examination of the commodity program structure.

There are many factors of farming that have convinced this Government that special rules should apply. Weather brings to farming many vagaries that are surmountable in other enterprises. Food, in reliable quantity, is more vital than any other national resource. Farming is therefore special.

Most of us will agree that there are some special programs that are needed for our farmers and ranchers. Are our present programs adequate for the job for the American of the midsixties and the seventies? How can we harmonize the utilization of the great advantages of the free market and its disciplines with an improving position for our farm families? Might it not be desirable for the Congress to determine the maximum amount to be appropriated for agriculture, and just how it should be spent? I do not feel that the spending of Treasury funds entirely on the basis of a man's past history meets in the fullest sense the social and economic requirements of our age. Determining how much can be spent has the advantage of budgetary control rather than the current open end obligation. A rational form of payments might do this essential task for some commodities.

However, the Congress in its relations to the agricultural problem is subject to many commodity group pressures. These are at times in conflict one with the other. We legislate against deadlines and under superheated emergency conditions. We need a better approach.

Bipartisan blue ribbon commission

I happen to believe the road to this better approach can be laid by a bipartisan blue ribbon commission. This commission should be composed of leading economists, farmers, agricultural leaders, financial experts, and consumers. We need to take a good hard look at where we have been, and where we are going. We need to know what is good in our programs and what needs change.

The purpose of this commission would be to examine our past agricultural policies, their adequacy or inadequacy, their effectiveness or ineffectiveness, and their relevancy to the present situation. It also would be the purpose of the commission to look ahead, to go into consideration of the technological revolution in agriculture, the shift in farm population from the rural areas to the cities—this is a tremendous factor today—and what types of programs the Government should engage in relating to the price of agricultural products, in marketing, distribution, and agricultural credit.

I am seeking to release the full power of agriculture, to have Government help and supplement, not take over.

Rural America is changing. As a matter of fact, all of America is changing. We need to take a long look to the future.

As President Johnson recently said:

We need to search for better ways ever responsive to changing conditions—to enable our farmers and ranchers to share more fully in the bounty which they help create. In this endeavor, how can we use the pricing mechanism of the free market with more vitality than presently? In this endeavor, how can we better coordinate the role of Government with the area of the private sector, including farmers' own institutions, in the marketing of farm products? In this endeavor, how can our efficiency in producing and marketing be reflected in fair and open competition in the world's markets? In this endeavor, what should we do to assure ourselves of adequate reserves?

These are questions to which a bipartisan blue ribbon commission can provide answers.

144 ZAD - LINO

We live in times that would have confounded Rome's soothsayers and astrologers; times that by the unpredictability with which history unfolds would have condemned alike those seeking its mysteries in the set of the stars or the entrails of fowl. They are bad times for prophets. All that we can expect with certainty is uncertainty.

The signs that old landmarks are moving, that tides are changing and moorings shifting are not necessarily ominous signs. These alterations may signify good things, if we act with the stream of events. They furnish to the agile, the nimble, and the swift, as well as to the strong, a chance to exert an influence that sometimes cannot be brought to bear effectively when all is rigid, unalterable and inflexible. The first requirement in such times is a willingness to look quickly into all our policies, to inquire searchingly into all our premises.

This generation of farmers knows that the winds of change are blowing strong. However, fortunately we have the leadership which will help shape the forces which will generate the Great Society. One of the challenges to this leadership will be to accommodate our emerging Great Society to an orderly change for the better. As freemen upholding the best traditions of a free society, we can mold that mighty force—the Great Society.

Article
Congressional Record
August 18, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, EXTENSION OF FOOD-
FOR-PEACE PROGRAM, U.S. SENATE

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. A part of such a program is the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, known all over the world as Public Law 480.

In 1954 I was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when this milestone was passed. I had something to do with bringing about passage of the legislation, along with other members of the committee. The bipartisan support of this legislation and its success should make all of us proud.

The program more recently has become known as the food-for-peace program. Food has become a very significant form of foreign economic assistance. I am tremendously impressed by the single overriding fact that without the farmers' productive capabilities, the entire U.S. foreign assistance program would be much less effective than it is today. In fact, food for peace in many areas of the world is the most effective, and the most worthwhile assistance program. Each of us should share in the glow of pride to know that the food and the fiber from American farms has saved the lives of millions of people. And you should be happy to know that there are millions of boys and girls today, throughout the world, outside of the United States, who are regularly receiving school lunches. There happens to be a bit of the spiritual involved in all of this, at a time when so many people are talking about the destruction of mankind. So I would think that rural families would be reverently grateful as well as genuinely happy that they have been able to save lives.

Does it not make economic sense, as well as moral sense, for the United States and other exporting countries to share abundance—God-given abundance—with the millions who are in need of food, rather than to store it in bins or let the land lay idle?

Wheat has played the largest commodity role in this food-for-peace program. Since July of 1954 we have exported under Public Law 480 about 3 billion bushels of wheat. This represents about 63 percent of total wheat exports during this period. It would be well to stop for a moment and think about the economic chaos or explosion which would have occurred in U.S. agriculture if these markets had not been available.

145 ZAD - LINO

But it should also be noted that more than 70 percent of the U.S. agricultural exports are normal commercial exports, and we have built many new markets by the use of food for peace. In a sense, these commercial exports constitute food for peace at its best—mutually beneficial, multilateral trade using the efficiency of commercial trade channels. The soundest and the simplest way to maintain our balance of payments would be to utilize to the maximum the productive efficiency of our farmers by finding ways to increase our agricultural exports even more.

Export markets are vital to the American farmer. Here we must find future markets for American agriculture. If we are going to maximize our exports—which is a matter of interest to our country—to the Common Market and to the other areas of the world, we must offer, as I have said, the best quality at competitive prices. There is no substitute for price and quality when it comes to competing for commercial markets abroad. Therefore, every policy that we pursue must be to try to strengthen what we call the operation of the market—including the market price.

I want to make my position clear. I do not believe Government programs ought to supersede the operation of our normal markets. Government programs should be designed not to supplant but to supplement; not to take over but to assist; not to move in as a competitive force, but to make competition more just and to make it more effective for the farm producer and for the Nation.

Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.
August 19, 1964

SENATOR HUMPHREY SEEKS THOROUGH REVIEW LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE

Senate Majority Whip Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, introduced a resolution today asking a thorough review of local airline service.

The resolution would authorize the Senate Committee on Commerce to review "the national needs for local airline service to all points now served * * *."

Humphrey, in a floor statement, said the future of airline service for American communities urgently needs a new statement of national policy.

"Many complaints from cities, States, and national organizations charge that local airline service is inadequate," Humphrey said.

"Cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten discontinuance or downgrading of service at more than 100 points among some 540 now on the airline map."

The CAB has threatened to cut off service, local service to five Minnesota communities under its "use-it-or-lose-it" rule. They are Winona, Fairmont, Mankato, Thief River Falls, and Worthington.

Humphrey said cities receiving local airline service have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to provide adequate airports with the implied promise they would receive adequate airline service.

"Many feel that the promise is not being kept," he told the Senate. "This is a matter not merely of civic pride but of economic necessity."

Humphrey said cities with good transportation facilities have a great advantage in gaining and holding their share of the Nation's prosperity. He called consideration of reductions or downgradings of service "a step backward."

"Decisions (by the Civil Aeronautics Board) between a restrictive, backward-moving policy and a progressive, forward policy often are reached by a 3 to 2 vote," he said.

"Such a close division on a matter of such importance requires a clear statement of policy which only Congress can provide."

146 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 19, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, EXTENSION OF FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM, U.S. SENATE

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a few general comments in reference to the bill before the Senate, the food-for-peace program. I know that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] has some questions to raise relating to the use of grant funds and the interest rate provisions of the bill.

Public Law 480 has been one of the most effective instruments of American foreign policy, economic policy, and social policy that ever has been legislated by a Congress.

We ought not in any way weaken the program, nor should we burden it with undue restrictions. The funds which are generated under a particular program are of little value unless they are put to use. That is generally true of all forms of capital. Capital has its value when it is used and when it is invested. The currencies which are generated through the sale of food commodities under the terms of Public Law 480 lose their value unless they are readily put to use for constructive purposes. Those purposes have been outlined and detailed through legislative enactment over the years, so that the purposes range all the way from capital improvement or investments in capital structure to social and welfare benefits. There even are programs such as the food-for-work programs, which now is being used in certain other countries. The food-for-work program had a very good beginning in Tunisia and some excellent results were achieved.

Mr. President, I view with considerable concern some of the amendments which have been included in the bill as reported by the Senate committee. It is my view that the one weakness in the food-for-peace program is the lack of prompt and effective utilization of the currencies which accumulate under this program. At the conclusion of my remarks today I will bring to the attention of the Senate a situation that prevails, for example, in India, where vast sums of Indian rupees have accumulated to the account of the Government of the United States. This money has not been invested on a loan basis by the Government of India, nor has it been utilized for social, welfare, educational, or other purposes under the grant section provided for under section 104.

That section relates to a number of activities. One of them involves the use of funds on a grant basis for purposes such as medical research, hospital construction, educational opportunities, and so on.

The Senate version of the bill subjects all grants under section 104 of the act and all uses of interest and principal paid on loans made under title I to the appropriation process. This means that the Appropriations Committee, sitting in Washington, will determine the use of a certain percentage of the funds generated under title I of Public Law 480—funds that are ready, available, and on deposit in the host country. It means, in other words, that the Committee on Appropriations actually takes over much of the administration of the use of the funds that belong in the hands of the executive branch, and particularly those who administer this program.

The so-called soft currencies that arise from title I sales have to be used very carefully. We have a very detailed process of negotiation, that we follow with the countries that purchase our food commodities under title I. Those negotiations must take into consideration the economic situation in the country making the purchase. Those negotiations must take into consideration the limitations that are set down in statute as to the use of the funds for the purposes of the United States. Those negotiations must take into consideration what are called Cooley funds, or funds used for investment in American private enterprise abroad. Those negotiations must take into consideration the general economic well-being, such as matters of inflation or deflation, in any of the countries making purchases.

147 ZAD - LINO

A substantial amount of money is loaned out and some of the money is available for grant purposes. That was specified in the act under an amendment adopted in the 1950's. I served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at that time and was very much interested in Public Law 480. I was present at the time it was authorized. I was one of those who supported its adoption. A number of us in the Senate had separate bills. As the result of these being before the committee, a committee bill was reported, and it has been known as Public Law 480. That was, as I recall, in the 83d Congress.

Later the act was amended to add title IV. It was amended to expand the provisions of sections 104 and 106. A number of other amendments have been included in the act, now known by the common name of food for peace.

I hope the Congress of the United States recognizes that in this great food program we have the most effective, the most powerful, the most important instrument of diplomacy, of foreign policy, and of national security that any nation on the face of the earth has today. For us to cripple the program or in any way to restrict it unduly by tying the hands of the administration in the field, as well as those who are responsible for the administration of the law in Washington, seems to me to be unwise.

The main question we shall be asked is: What are we going to do with the four or five hundred million dollars worth of rupees that lie on deposit in New Delhi, India, that are not being used? The Indian Government worries about it, because if those rupees are used foolishly, there may be dire effects upon the fragile Indian economy. But those funds could be put to use, for example, in binational centers that promote much good will. They could be put to use as grants in countries literally fighting for their lives. They could be put to use in education, health, research, translation of scientific documents, and a host of other activities.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Is the Senator from Minnesota aware that in the House version of this bill there was a very carefully worked out provision to deal with the very problem of how we can best handle currencies in excess of U.S. needs in countries where those currencies rest?

The House proposed a provision that an advisory committee should be set up, on which would serve the chairmen of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees, with the ranking minority members, as well as the Secretary of Agriculture, the Administrator of the AID Agency, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I am wondering if the Senator from Minnesota does not think that would be a feasible and practical way of bringing insight to bear on the use of such currencies, giving Congress some voice in their use, and yet providing some flexibility for those who administer the program in finding constructive uses to which these currencies can be put.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope that such a provision will be retained in conference. I believe it was to that provision that the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Fulbright, directed his attention.

One of the really critical problems facing the whole food-for-peace program today is the proper use of the currencies which are generated from title I sales. They are not being properly used. The main reason they are not being properly used is the restriction of the law and the timidity of the Bureau of the Budget.

Quite frankly, the Advisory Committee to which the Senator from South Dakota referred would be very conservative and very restrictive in attitude. There is no reason we should delude ourselves. For example, if we sell 6 million tons of wheat to India for Indian rupees, and we receive Indian currency for that sale, and only half of that currency is reinvested under terms of an economic loan, why do we not face the fact that the balance of it is lying there unused, being eroded by inflation, and losing its value, when the people of India themselves could use that money very effectively in a host of projects.

148 ZAD - LINO

In many countries we have sizable amounts of foreign currencies loaned out as a result of Public Law 480 activity, and we have an equal amount of foreign currencies which lie idle, drawing no interest, losing value through inflation, hanging like a sword over the economy of the country, with no one knowing what will happen to it.

In the meantime, people are in need, schools are inadequate, health facilities are neglected, roads are not being constructed, medical research goes undone or is pursued without any real effort being devoted to it. All this is happening because of the inadequacy of funds available to perform these tasks.

Mr. President, this section of the bill needs to be carefully examined. I recognize the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota, and I know he will make a statement on it. Therefore I shall not dwell on this point any longer. The Senator will wish to make his own statement.

On the matter of repayment of the loans, I must refer to the section of the bill which requires title I loans and title IV credits to bear interest at not less than the cost of the funds to the United States.

We have gone through this battle on foreign aid many times. If we are to insist upon an interest rate on title I loans and title IV credits to be the interest rate that is paid by the U.S. Government on the money it borrows, we shall be making loans which will not be repaid.

The first thing we need is frankness and candor. Title I loans are being made to countries which are in desperate economic straits and circumstances. Sales are being made under title I to help the American agricultural economy, to help fulfill the objectives of American foreign policy and our national security policy. They are made to help friendly countries through a difficult period in their economic development.

Title IV programs are dollar sales on credit. The purpose of the program is to expand sales of agricultural commodities to countries just reaching a point of economic development where they can trade on commercial terms. These credits should be encouraged by modest rates of interest, not discouraged by making the terms so difficult that sales cannot be made.

If we charge 4 or 4 1/4 or 4 1/2 percent interest on Public Law 480 loans, we shall jeopardize the entire structure of Public Law 480.

Therefore I hope these new restrictive provisions relating to interest rates will be left out of the bill in conference.

I recognize that we have a very limited time to deal with this subject. However, I have devoted a great deal of my public life to the question of Public Law 480, including the use of American agricultural products and the development of our foreign and economic policies.

I have given my support to Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program, as an instrument of American generosity, compassion, and kindness. I have looked upon Public Law 480 as a very important and integral part of the total program for American agriculture and, indeed, American industry.

I should like to make the record clear to the effect that Public Law 480 has probably done more to stimulate commercial markets for American industrial products and American agricultural products than any other act passed by Congress.

Today we are finding lucrative markets for soybeans, rice, and cotton, and for American farm machinery, American processed agricultural products, and American fertilizer, as a result of the market development which took place through the use of funds coming from Public Law 480 sales and economic development.

While I am pleased that we shall extend Public Law 480, I am displeased with some of the restrictions which have been incorporated in the Senate bill. I have fought this battle of restrictions time and time again for many years. Each time we defeated them. We now find them trying to creep into the law.

Senators can rest assured that if we tie the hands of the Administrator of the program with restrictive amendments, in a sense we shall be putting chains on the arms and legs of American foreign and economic policy. We shall be diluting and reducing the effectiveness of Public Law 480. We shall not be helping the American agricultural program. We shall be weakening American foreign policy. We may very well be making less effective the Public Law 480 program in the host or recipient countries.

149 ZAD - LINO

The greatest single asset we have today in the world of power politics—and I regret to say it is such a world, but that is a fact—is the power of American food, technology, scientific know-how—the American agricultural abundance and food production. No other country on the face of the earth can even come close to matching this. This is a world in which there is a rapidly expanding population, a world in which the variances of weather and technology leave their impact upon agricultural production. The great abundance that is ours should be guarded carefully and should be made available for the most effective use at all times.

Furthermore, I am not one who believes that we are overproducing for the long run and for the long-term interests of this country. I remind the Senate once again that last fall I brought to the Senate a well-documented speech, upon which I received considerable technical assistance from meteorologists and scientists, indicating the continuance of drought in critical areas of the world and in certain parts of the United States. Many parts of this country have suffered severe drought, and the production of certain agricultural products has been reduced as the result of drought. Many parts of the world are suffering severe drought. The United States ought to take a good look at its agricultural policy in terms of the amount of food and fiber reserves that ought to be available at all times for this great Nation.

It is an old theme of mine, but one which I shall repeat until my dying day: We do not have too much food. We have too little imagination as to how to use it. We do not have too many farmers. We have policies that, regrettably, do not utilize the great capacity of our farmers to produce and to distribute their product. We need a national security reserve in this country, established by law, so we can stop talking about agricultural surpluses. We need a bipartisan blue ribbon agricultural policy commission to examine the entire structure of agricultural policy in America.

Much of what we have on the lawbooks today is the result merely of accumulated amendments. We do not have a coherent or coordinated structure. We need to give much more thought to how we shall integrate our agricultural policy, domestic and foreign, into our overall programs of international security and international diplomacy.

We have stopped talking about food surpluses in some areas, thank goodness. But even when we have referred to the food-for-peace program, we have said only that food for peace was the result of dumping surpluses. This is a poor way and a foolish way to talk about one of our great resources. The food-for-peace program ought not to be dependent only upon the availability of surpluses.

We ought to program American food as we program military items. We do not seek to dump weapons because we have a surplus of them. We base our military assistance program on a schedule of production of certain weapons because they are needed. I wish our civilian administrators were as effective as our generals. Then we would not have much argument over food for peace. Does anyone really believe that if we take part in a major nuclear war, we shall win it and have much left if we win? We might win it for purposes of history; but let us win it for purposes of humanity.

An abundance of food and fiber, if programed, planned, and considered from the standpoint of what really is needed, including policies of purchasing, merchandising, and distribution—instead of limiting it to Public Law 480—would enable us to enter a more extensive area of legislation.

FOOD IS LIFE

Mr. President, since the Pilgrim Fathers celebrated their first Thanksgiving in the New World, we Americans have recognized that food is life to men. In ancient civilizations it was always so—and men gave thanks to their gods for lifegiving food.

But food is more than the staff of life to men; it is the strength of nations. Food produced on American farms is the lifeblood of our Nation. And so it is with the new and emerging nations of the world.

American agricultural abundance—the productivity of our farms and farmers—is one of the brightest chapters in the history of our Nation.

150 ZAD – LINO

Our farms and farmers are the most productive in the world, and their productivity continues to grow. The American farmer's output has increased 140 percent since the end of World War II, almost three times the gain in nonagricultural productivity. Today, 1 American farmer produces enough food and fiber for 29 consumers—4 of whom are overseas. The vigor, productivity, and the strength of American agriculture stands as a model for the rest of the world. The farmers and others in the United States can be justifiably proud of their accomplishment.

More food and better food mean a better life for all Americans. And agriculture and agribusiness are keystones of our economy. But it is evidence that American agriculture has an even greater role to play in this last half of the 20th century—in this shrinking world where all nations and all men are neighbors. The exports of food and fiber from the farms of America are vital to the economy of the United States, and their contribution to our economic strength and prosperity will be critical in the next few decades.

EXPORTS MEAN JOBS

At the present time farm products account for more than one-fourth of our total exports. More than 25 percent of all U.S. farm production is exported—the harvest of 1 out of every 4 acres.

Farm exports mean jobs—about 1 million on U.S. farms, and more jobs in financing, packaging, processing, shipping. This year, for example, our farm exports would fill 4,500 cargo ships—12 shiploads every day of the year.

Only last month President Johnson announced that U.S. agricultural exports for the fiscal year just concluded had reached an alltime high of \$6.1 billion. This is a 20-percent increase over last year's record high, and 35 percent greater than the farm export level of 4 years ago.

Furthermore, this year's increase of \$1 billion over last year's farm exports was virtually all in sales for dollars.

America's agricultural productivity brings us face to face with a moral obligation, an economic opportunity, and a challenge to the ingenuity of man.

President Kennedy met this obligation, this opportunity, and this challenge with the second Executive order of his administration, when he introduced—as a policy of this Government—the concept of using food for peace: "We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad." President Kennedy said:

Humanity and prudence, alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

We seek, through our food-for-peace program, to offer our fellow man throughout the world bread instead of bombs, milk instead of mortars.

We seek to banish hunger from the face of the earth, for a hungry man can never be free.

We seek to use our food as a resource to help men help themselves to a better and more productive life.

A BLESSING—NOT A CURSE

Mr. President, since the enactment of Public Law 480 in 1954, we have endeavored to put our farm surpluses to work throughout the world—to regard and use our agricultural productivity as an asset, rather than a liability—as a blessing, rather than as a curse.

In the past 10 years, we have moved about 130 million tons of food—more than \$12 billion worth—overseas under Public Law 480—3 billion bushels of wheat, 10 million bales of cotton, 100 million bags of rice, 6 billion pounds of vegetable oil, and feed grains, tobacco, and dairy products.

Food for peace feeds the hungry—today more than 100 million men, women, and children in 100 countries throughout the world.

The phrase, "donated by the people of the United States," in more than a dozen languages on food packages distributed in the teeming slums of large cities and in the most remote villages of far-off lands, is one of the most effective statements in our vocabulary of international relations. It says that the people of the United States care about men, women, and children of all nations—and want to share.

151 ZAD - LINO

Our feeding programs throughout the world are made possible by the great American overseas relief agencies supported by the American people who distribute the food—CARE, Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, and many others.

We seek particularly to feed the children, to strengthen the generation that will inherit this world. Today, 40 million children are getting a school lunch every day made possible by food for peace. In Latin America alone, as the result of an intensified child-feeding program—"Operation Niños," launched only a year ago—the number of children benefiting from school lunch programs has increased from 3 to 10 million—1 out of every 4 children of school age.

U.S. FOOD AIDS DISASTER VICTIMS

U.S. food has come to the aid of millions left hungry and homeless by floods, famines, earthquakes, droughts, and plagues—and has been a lifeline to hundreds of thousands of refugees cast adrift without food, shelter, homes—or hope. In the past 10 years, we have sent \$1 billion worth of food overseas to aid victims of disaster.

Our agricultural abundance is one of our most valuable resources in international development.

Food from American farms provides the vital ingredients—the capital and the wages—to help the countries and the people of the free world to help themselves to economic and social progress.

The local currencies generated by the sale of our agricultural commodities are essential to our aid program throughout the world. Nearly two-thirds of all local currencies generated by food-for-peace sales in the past 10 years have been set aside for economic development.

Hospitals, clinics, schools, highways, bridges, railroads, reforestation projects, irrigation projects, flood control, cooperatives, credit unions—all vital institutions and facilities in country development—have been built with U.S. food, with the local currencies—instead of U.S. dollars—generated by sales under the food-for-peace program.

Some 600,000 workers and their more than 2 million dependents in 22 countries today are benefiting from American food used as a partial wage in self-help community development projects. These are real "bootstrap" projects. Able and conscientious—but idle—men and women are working to improve their own communities—to reclaim idle land; to plant forests; to build roads, homes, wells, and reservoirs.

Thus, unemployed and hungry people can earn daily bread for themselves and their families, can earn a partial wage in the currency of their country, and can contribute to the building of important capital improvements in their own community.

These food-for-work projects represent a calculated shift in our food-for-peace program from relief feeding to self-help programs—and they have proved to be enormously successful in every instance.

Food from the farms of America provides capital for private investment in the developing countries.

LOANS TO U.S. FIRMS ABROAD

Under the private enterprise loan provisions of Public Law 480, more than \$180 million in local currencies generated by the sale of agricultural commodities overseas has been loaned to U.S. firms for business development and trade expansion in the developing countries, and to U.S. and local business for expanding markets for U.S. agricultural products abroad.

Ingenuous use of our agricultural abundance has enabled the United States to reduce by millions the outflow of dollars to finance overseas programs in the past 10 years. Since 1954, food for peace has provided more than \$936 million in foreign currency for payment of U.S. expenses abroad, and another \$567 million for the common defense of the United States and friendly nations. Food from the farms of America has contributed to the financing of trade fairs and exhibitions; binational and community centers; international exchange programs; scientific, medical, cultural, and educational programs—and has been bartered for almost \$2 billion worth of strategic materials and equipment.

152 ZAD - LINO

There are no limits to future markets for U.S. farm products.

Food from the farms of America is feeding millions of hungry people throughout the world. It is converted into essential capital for economic development. At the same time that American food answers the human and economic needs of the world, it is opening up vast new markets for future exports and sales of U.S. agricultural products.

There is a limitless need and demand in the world for the food and fiber produced in America. The future markets of the developing countries are incalculable. One of the first needs of the people of the developing countries as we help them to develop is for food and clothing and no other nation in the world is so capable of filling their need as is the United States.

MARKET DEVELOPMENT

The food-for-peace program, through the sale of agricultural commodities overseas, provides the financing for U.S. Department of Agriculture market development activities in 67 countries today. In cooperation with more than 40 U.S. agricultural producers and trade organizations, USDA has in the past 10 years engaged in aggressive food-for-peace-financed programs designed to develop new and expanding markets for U.S. farm products overseas—cotton, soybeans, poultry, wheat, rice, meat, feed grains, and milk. American marketing specialists are overseas teaching foreign buyers to fabricate our cotton, process and package vegetable oil, to mix and blend our wheat. American foods are exhibited at trade fairs and trade centers—all this financed by food-generated local currencies.

These food-for-peace-financed market development programs have played no small part in the 35-percent expansion of farm exports in the last 4 years.

American agricultural capacity is a vast and potent arsenal in times of peace.

The time has come to stop thinking of our agricultural productivity and abundance as a great national problem. We must recognize and use our abundance of food and fiber as one of our most precious resources—more precious often than gold, as we have learned.

When Public Law 480 was passed 10 years ago, it generally was regarded as a device for seeking ways and means of making use of the surplus production of American farms. Our discoveries concerning the use of food in the world today have exceeded our wildest dreams of 10 years ago.

We know that whatever we produce on the farms of America we can use—and use constructively—to feed hungry millions; as capital for development; as a wage to help people help themselves; as capital for capital investment overseas, and as the opening chapter to a future history of vigorous and expanding U.S. agricultural exports throughout the world.

CAPACITY TO ABOLISH HUNGER

President Johnson recently told a Conference on International Rural Development at the White House that:

Since World War II, we have multiplied our capabilities as never before, but we have not put them to the fullest use * * * we have the capacity to abolish hunger * * * we have not put our capabilities to work.

We still have not put our agricultural capacity to work to its full potential. The United States is indeed fortunate that, at a moment in history when the developing nations of the world need food to feed their hungry and for development, we are able to supply that food assistance.

Food for peace is a brilliant concept. Our experience in the past 10 years has proven that American agriculture, the products of the American farm, can make a great contribution to a world of peace, prosperity, and security.

So long as American farms and the American farmer continue their brilliant record of productivity, we must put this capacity to work at home and abroad.

153 ZAD - LINO

We must continue to build with determination and imagination—on the concept and experience of food for peace—to bring new life to men and nations.

FOOD FORTIFICATION

Mr. President, for many years, the problem of malnutrition among the poorer people of the world have been studied—with special emphasis on the children—by the National Institutes of Health, the National Academy of Sciences, the Agricultural Research Service in the Agriculture Department, UNICEF, AID, and a number of other public and private groups. All agree that there are two major problems in overcoming malnutrition. One is the need for more food, a problem we are helping to solve through our food-for-peace effort. The other is the need for nutritional improvement in the food which is being sent—such as the simple addition of vitamins A and D in milk as we have in this country, or the extra enrichment of flour.

A study just completed by nutritionists at NIH tells us that in East Pakistan alone 50,000 infants every year are being subjected to a life of blindness due to vitamin A deficiency. We in the United States have it within our power to prevent this kind of thing from happening. We can do this, at a very minor cost, with the addition of vitamins in the powdered milk we already are providing. We can do it with the further enrichment of flour we are now shipping. And we can do it with other inexpensive means of food fortification.

Aside from the obvious moral concerns related to such a problem, there are also some basic economic considerations. First, our competition abroad in nonfat powdered milk is with countries which do fortify their exported milk. Since the cost factor of the fortification is negligible, we obviously are placed at a disadvantage in our striving for future foreign markets. Second, we must weigh the cost of fortifying our food-for-peace donations against the costs which may result from the consequences if we do not.

In east Pakistan alone we are talking about 50,000 potential invalids, in 1 year, in 1 small part of 1 country who may end up needing some type of major welfare assistance. To the budget of that country—and the budget of this country which through its aid program supports that country—it certainly seems a reasonable investment to spend pennies to prevent this kind of thing from happening.

We ought to find a way to make this minor adjustment in our Public Law 480 program to fortify our donated foods and prevent such vitamin deficiencies. If we do not, it is our own deficiencies to which people in the future can justifiably point.

I am pleased that once again we have an opportunity to speak up for one of the finest programs America ever has designed. I hope that as a result of extending the program, we shall not limit it, but rather improve upon it.

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I said I would bring to the attention of the Senate a situation that prevails in India, where vast sums of Indian rupees have accumulated to the account of the Government of the United States. I now ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record a memorandum prepared by the American Embassy in New Delhi concerning the costly paradox of our American-owned Indian rupees.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article, Congressional Record, August 19, 1964.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to offer a few comments with regard to the pending bill, H.R. 10809.

Of the dozen regular appropriations bills which the Congress considers each year, few, if any, are closer to the heart and the well-being of our people than the particular legislation.

I shall touch on many phases of the bill—both health and non-health.

154 ZAD - LINO

First, I shall turn to nonmedical areas—to day-care services for children; then, to the manpower needs of the National Labor Relations Board.

Thereafter, I shall turn to medical phases. Detailed attention will be devoted to those phases, because, as my colleagues are aware, I have long been deeply interested in health progress. In this connection, I shall submit observations on certain important programs of the U.S. Public Health Service—particularly the National Institutes of Health—as well as of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Food and Drug Administration.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION—APPROPRIATION FOR DAY-CARE SERVICES— PAGES 40-41

I should like to start with one of the most significant elements of the bill, relating to our Nation's greatest resources—its children.

I have reference to the appropriation through the Welfare Administration of grants to States for public assistance, specifically, grants for day-care services.

Generous grants are provided in the pending bill for overall maternal and child welfare. The Nation has reason for gratitude for the Congress' warm understanding of the value of such assistance.

THE 4 MILLION REDUCTION AND THE MATCHING AMENDMENT

But as regards day care, the bill before us reduces \$4 million from the budget estimate. This reduction is applied to the \$8 million sought for grants to the States for day-care services.

The Senate version of the bill has, in addition, added this clause:

Provided further, That none of the funds contained herein shall be used to pay in excess of one-half of the cost of day-care services under section 527(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended.

This 50-percent matching formula might ordinarily, in other connections, serve as a sound basis for Federal-State cooperation. But, in this instance, the immediate—I emphasize immediate—application of the restriction would have a very negative effect. I am, therefore, very pleased to support the amendment which sets the date for the grant-in-aid on a 50-50 basis, on or after April 1965.

STATES CANNOT IMMEDIATELY COMPLY ON MATCHING BASIS

Why? Because of a number of facts.

First. Of the 46 States which have filed day-care plans, only 8 have available specifically earmarked funds for day-care services. And nobody knows to what extent even these eight have individuals funds to match what they would receive under a Federal grant to the individual State.

Second. Many of the State legislatures do not meet until 1965, so they will not have opportunity to assign—promptly—matching funds if the restriction goes into effect immediately.

Third. No one yet knows how many of the States with nonearmarked funds are in a flexible position to transfer general child funds for this purpose, so as not to lose the possibility of a Federal matching grant for day care.

In any event, most existing State funds go to the foster-care program. To take funds away from that vital program for another vital program like this poses a hard choice for State officials.

Let us recall that day-care assistance is relatively new. It was on May 17, 1963, that President Kennedy signed into law the first supplemental appropriation for these services. But, already, 46 States have filed approved State plans.

The program has a fantastically successful catalytic effect—encouraging factfinding surveys, new facilities, better training and higher standards—precisely the goals the Congress had in mind.

Many States have set up day-care centers for the very first time.

155 ZAD - LINO

But, now, how do we stand? The House cut the \$8 million budget estimate to \$6 million. The Senate committee cut it \$2 million more to \$4 million. But, here is the important point, under the matching amendment, it seems almost certain that the States will not now be in a position to match even that \$4 million. Therefore the effective date of on or after April 1, 1965, is most desirable.

VALUE OF DAY CARE

The day-care services are more vital than ever before to vast numbers of working mothers.

Such services are particularly needed at a time when the Nation is preparing to attack poverty. Over and over again in consideration of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there was stressed the relationship of day care to the preparation of a young child who might otherwise become educationally and culturally deprived.

Studies show that, in families where husbands earn less than \$3,000 a year, one out of every four mothers with children under age 6 works to help support her children. In many other families, the mother is the sole support. What will happen if even the present limited day-care services are reduced? Without this help, many of the children will be left without adequate supervision and care while their mothers work.

As these unsupervised children grow up, they will add to the grim numbers whose educational growth was slowed. And they will add to the number of eventual school-dropouts.

State and local welfare and education officials know how crucial day-care assistance is for protecting the young. My own State has an outstanding day-care plan with many excellent projects scheduled in 1964.

Under the \$8 million originally hoped for on a nationwide basis, Minnesota would receive \$161,323. Under \$6 million ceiling set by the House, Minnesota's share would drop to \$120,781. What do these sums—the original or reduced sums—really provide?

THE MINNESOTA PLAN

Under the original 1964 budget, here are a few of the excellent uses to which the funds would be put: strengthened staff for licensing day-care facilities to assure protection to any child receiving day care case-work services for mentally retarded children in day-care centers; day care for children of migrant agricultural workers; a survey for the needs of Indian children; an experimental project to provide day care in certain homes for selected retarded, socially isolated, or mildly disturbed children.

What is the meaning in human terms of these projects? Let me cite a single example. Recently, seven Minnesota families, whose retarded children were on the waiting list for the State institution, were able to remove their youngsters from that list once day care became available and, thus, keep the children at home. No one can assign a significance in financial terms to the meaning of this one act—being able to keep a retarded child at home who might otherwise have to be institutionalized.

This, then, is where we stand. I commend the consideration of these facts to my colleagues.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—PAGE 50 (OF THE BILL)

The pending bill proposes \$24 million for the National Labor Relations Board, the same amount as proposed by the House.

It is a source of regret that the committee did not increase the appropriation to the level of the 1965 budget estimate, \$25,250,000.

As Senate Report No. 1460—page 68—states, the amount which the committee does recommend is, fortunately, an increase of \$1,540,000 over the 1964 appropriation. But this increase merely provides funds to meet mandatory increases in costs and some \$600,000 for program increases.

The reduction of \$1,250,000 below the budget estimates means that NLRB's capacity for the processing of cases will, unfortunately, be reduced by almost 7 percent.

156 ZAD - LINO

Let me point out that the agency's workload which made the budget request necessary is not—I repeat—not within NLRB's control. The cases originate with the parties which file charges of unfair labor practices or petitions with the Board.

It is the Board's task to respond—as it does—to these incoming cases as promptly, as thoroughly, as competently as possible and as its limited resources may permit.

The question is: Will we give it the resources it needs to do the job it is required to do under law? Its job is not static.

Economic activity throughout the Nation is dynamic. Industry is changing, as is employment and, yes, unemployment, because of automation and other problems. Inevitably, cases mount under these circumstances.

By not giving NLRB the manpower it needs to fulfill its statutory responsibility, we deny it the chance to decrease its caseload—backlogged beyond its control—and to provide the timely—I emphasize timely—service which is so crucial to equitable solution of labor relations problems. Therefore the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] restoring \$1,250,000 is fully justified and I support it and join in its sponsorship.

THE MEDICAL PHASES OF THE APPROPRIATION BILL

I should like to turn now to those portions of the bill which relate to health, rehabilitation, and related services.

I shall comment on this subject in detail because, as my colleagues know, it has been my privilege to devote much attention to these subjects, both in the work of the Appropriations Subcommittee and in related work by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman, within the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR HILL

I should like to say, however, that in the area of medical appropriations, the most expert guidance comes this year, as it has for all the many years which he has served with such distinction, from the able chairman of our subcommittee, whom we are all proud and happy to acknowledge as the dean of the Congress health activities, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

To this subject, he has brought not only the wisdom and expertness of his decades of intensive congressional activity, not only the insight, judgment, and dedication which are his heritage from an illustrious physician-father, but the deep compassion and humanity of a man personally consecrated to the well-being of his fellow man.

Whatever I have to say, therefore, I would regard merely as a supplement to the judgment which has already been presented within the committee report, within the Senate and in other public statements by Senator Hill.

As to what I shall say, I would not presume to speak for Senator Hill or anyone. But I feel confident that many, if not all of the views on medical research and other phases, which I will submit parallel his sentiments on the great scientific challenges ahead.

In addition, my judgment on these subjects has been aided by the counsel made available to the committee—orally and in printed and letter form by many physicians, particularly leading specialists, as well as interested laymen.

As in previous years, Mrs. Mary Lasker, and her associates of the National Health Education Committee, have made available expert judgment on the phenomenal achievements of medical research in the past and on the continuing and unfolding needs in the future.

EXPERT ADVICE ACKNOWLEDGED FROM MINNESOTA

Then, too, the abundance of medical talent in my own State has made it possible to get helpful professional judgment on needs for the grass-roots and for the Nation, as a whole.

157 ZAD - LINO

To name but a few of the leading physicians at this point, with whom I have been in contact, I acknowledge the helpful assistance of our State health officer, Robert Barr, M.D.—on continuing Federal-State cooperation for general health services; Gaylord Anderson, M.D., director of the School of Public Health, University of Minnesota—on the needs of the Nation's schools of public health—which are, fortunately, provided for by a \$600,000 Senate increase for formula grants; David T. Carr, M.D., Mayo Clinic—on the Nation's TB control needs—which are, regrettably, not as well provided for; Frederick J. Kottke, M.D., professor and head, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Medical School, University of Minnesota; Paul M. Ellwood, Jr., M.D., executive director, Kenny Rehabilitation Foundation, together with a Minnesotan of whom I shall have more to say, Frank Krusen, M.D., a former president of the Minnesota State Department of Health and now professor and coordinator of physical medicine and rehabilitation at Temple University School of Medicine, after many years as head of the section at Mayo Clinic.

ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS ADD TO THE NATION'S WEALTH

I shall speak, very frankly, of certain specific areas in which we of the Congress might—in this year's appropriations—have provided still more adequately for the health needs of today and tomorrow.

I am not unmindful of either the many excellent provisions of this bill and of the appropriation laws we have enacted in recent years. To the contrary, I am profoundly grateful and proud of present and past contributions we have made.

And I am not unmindful that we have an obligation to be "economical" whenever possible.

But, as I see it, the fundamental fact which should be borne in mind is that when Congress appropriates adequately for human health, we are, in the finest sense, conserving and economizing. We are, in that sense, adding to, not detracting from, the Nation's wealth.

To save a human life is to preserve our greatest capital—the human mind, the human heart, the human body. To lose a life that need not be lost, to abandon to crippling disease a mind or body that could be healed—this is to waste, to squander an irreplaceable resource.

When we provide for more and better patient care, for more and better medical education, for more and even better medical research and rehabilitation, we perform acts of conservation.

We build assets—not debits—on the Nation's financial ledger.

We build the base for future Federal, State, and local taxation. We help to increase the national income and the gross national product. We enrich the Nation with our most precious asset—healthy people.

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—CONTROL OF TUBERCULOSIS—PAGE 24

The committee took a forward step in increasing—if only modestly—the House allowance for tuberculosis control.

But this increase does not begin to fulfill the objective of rapid elimination of this scourge.

I concur in the sentiments which had been presented to the committee by the National Health Education Committee through its able vice chairman, Mrs. Alice Fordyce.

She had soundly pointed out that the Surgeon General's recently published report, "The Future of Tuberculosis Control," made this grim estimate: Even if the task force's recommendations are fulfilled, as of 10 years from now, the number of new and active TB cases will still be 21,600. That figure is intolerably high. We should not be content with such a target. We should accelerate the control program next year.

Ten years from now, we should have largely conquered this disease—using preventive BGG vaccine and other measures.

Otherwise, 10 years from now, hospitalization costs, alone, for TB will cost the Nation—not the \$335 million of 1964—but, incredibly enough, \$376 million.

158 ZAD – LINO

We need not pay that price, provided we take the initiative with a massive counterattack against TB. This will take more funds for the short-term period, but it will save much vaster sums over the long term. And, most important, it will save lives.

NEEDED SUPPORT FOR POSTGRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION

Over a period of many years, I have spoken and written, again and again, on the dynamic needs of postgraduate medical education. Why? Because we live in an age when previously acquired knowledge becomes rapidly obsolete. Both undergraduate and postgraduate education are, of course, fundamentally the responsibility of the dedicated medical profession, itself.

Yet, to his great credit, Surgeon General Terry has responded to the messages of request from the Appropriations Subcommittees and from professionals, generally, by preparing a Public Health Service program which would help to backstop the profession's own plans for enlarged continuing education.

Here is one of the greatest needs of the healing arts. It is tragic that only some practitioners possess the up-to-the-minute insight knowledge and skills which others could likewise use.

It is tragic that a patient living, perhaps, in some great financially endowed metropolis gets the benefit of, say, the latest 1964 discoveries while a patient elsewhere in the country is treated on the basis of outdated knowledge.

We need to provide, as Bernard V. Dryer, M.D., has so well proposed, opportunities for the "physicians' lifetime learning." We need to master the latest techniques—of programed instruction, closed circuit and conventional TV, FM broadcasting, other audiovisual techniques, computerized information. And, yes, perhaps most important of all, we need to know how to arouse strong and sustained professional motivation which will seek the best information that is available, and which will apply it.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE—PAGES 36-37

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for once again advancing the important program of the National Library of Medicine.

The committee flashes a welcome "green light" for extramural programs by the National Library, under section 301 of the Public Health Service Act.

It makes available seven new positions to help realize somewhat more of the vast potential of "medlars"—the computerized medical literature analysis and retrieval system.

Our Senate Reorganization Subcommittee has already used and benefited from medlars. This modern system made available information to us within a few man-machine hours which would otherwise have taken days and would have been far less complete.

But medlars will continue to operate at only a fraction of its capacity unless Congress authorizes still more professionals to work with it.

That means professionals who will—through medlars—help fulfill the urgent information needs of the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the pharmaceutical industry, medical specialty, paramedical and other organizations.

It will be recalled that one of the historic proposals of 1964 has been that of Stafford Warren, M.D., Special Assistant to the President for Mental Retardation. Dr. Warren has proposed a highly automated "National Library of Science System." Such a system would realize many of the coordinated information objectives which, I, for one, have worked for since 1957. The foundation for such a system in the area of biomedicine is, of course, a strengthened National Library of Medicine.

159 ZAD - LINO

In a statement shortly to be published by the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, I will elaborate upon what I heard as the National Library's future role in spearheading computer "networks" for biomedical information throughout the Nation.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH—PAGES 32 FF.

The Appropriations Committee has, once again, well expressed the great opportunity to realize the public good through the National Institutes of Health.

In the whole U.S. Government, there are probably few agencies which can mean more to the personal lives of 190 million Americans—and millions yet unborn—than this great organization, dedicated to solving the mysteries of disease.

The appropriations which the committee has recommended for the 1966 fiscal year for NIH provide considerable and welcome impetus. I am particularly pleased, for example, with the committee's farsighted recommendation of \$10 million for a special program of cancer research; this will, as the report states, "permit the expansion of research on the viral origin of leukemia" and help exploit important new findings in this area.

But let me be very frank. With complete respect for the committee's diligent, overall review, I do not believe that, this year, the committee has fully enabled NIH to build upon the strength of its evolving scientific programs to the extent that many Americans would have wished and hoped.

I am not alone in this sentiment. Leading physicians and laymen had told the committee of vast, unfulfilled research and training needs for each of the major categorical areas—for heart, for cancer, mental health, neurology, arthritis, human development, general medical sciences, and the others.

It is a source of regret to me that the bold but sound recommendations of the Citizens Committee are not incorporated in the bill which we will now send to conference. I know that our able subcommittee chairman received with deepest sympathy and understanding the Citizens Committee recommendations. No one on our committee knows better than he the vistas of scientific discovery which still lie before us.

Dedicated doctors and citizens who support NIH's steady progress are, of course, profoundly grateful for the splendid support which the administration and the Congress have generously given in recent years.

RIISING FINANCIAL NEEDS FOR RESEARCH SUPPORT

But they know—and I know—that, while this support has been most commendable, there is still enormous unmet need. The unalterable fact is that scientific research often brings to light as many baffling problems as it solves. These emerging problems—of biology, of chemistry, of biochemistry, of biophysics, or of clinical medicine—cannot be shunted aside or ignored. They must be resolved, if possible, by providing added resources. So, too, as scientific answers are discovered, they must be capitalized upon, exploited, as in a military breakthrough. Then, too, NIH support of scientific training is not an end in itself; it is a preparation—a beginning—toward facilitating a continuing, lifelong quest. Trained personnel require continued support and, indeed, rising support, if sharpened skills are to be put effectively to work.

Meanwhile, the cost of living is not stationary, nor is the cost of instrumentation or of facilities. A dollar total last year will buy somewhat less science this year. All of these factors make it necessary that we not rest on the laurels of our past levels of support. We should, I believe, view the overall NIH program—dynamically—in terms of the long haul and not as a static, a fixed, a limited program which can be arbitrarily frozen—at some plateau for a year or 2 years or 5 years.

Look at the toll which cancer, for example, still takes—or the toll still taken by heart disease, or by mental illness, among other scourges. Can any of us say that we have done all that we might do—should do—must do—to counterattack these killers and these cripplers—now and for next year?

160 ZAD - LINO

Time, my colleagues are aware, is of the essence. The research investment, the training investment which we make possible in fiscal year 1965 will not "pay off"—cannot possibly "pay off"—until years from now.

Only now—this year—are we getting the "payoff" from prior years of Congress and the administration's foresight and generosity in building NIH to its present potential.

NIH'S ESTEEM IN SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

NIH is not perfect. No organization with its record of growth and its unprecedented scientific mission could be perfect. But it is striving constantly for ever higher administrative and scientific standards. And the supreme fact about NIH remains that its name is a hallmark—a symbol of excellence in the scientific community of the world.

Among the foremost private M.D.'s and Ph. D.'s, among the brightest luminaries of academic and industrial science, NIH is not merely "accepted"; it is praised; it is lauded; it is esteemed; it is respected.

We are getting our money's worth from NIH, more than our money's worth. Dollar for dollar, I know of virtually no area in the vast Federal budget—save in national defense and in education, as such—in which the American taxpayer receives more ample and more continuing "dividends."

INSTRUMENTATION AND COMPUTER CENTERS

Under "General Research and Services"—page 36 of the report—I should like to underline reference to the important work of the Division of Research Facilities and Resources at NIH. I have particular reference to this Division's contributions to biomedical engineering and to computer research and applications.

The Division has an outstanding group of scientists. They know that excellent progress has been made, thanks in large part to initiative and support on Capitol Hill. But they also know how much there is still to be done.

At present, there is—in the entire Nation—but one biomedical engineering center, at Northwestern University. But, as I have pointed out in earlier years, there is urgent need for more such centers—at least 6. These centers would bring together the major talents in engineering, in biological sciences and in mathematics necessary for interdisciplinary research, for training and development.

At present, most NIH support for biomedical engineering is still for relatively routine application of known principles to biological systems. But NIH's experts are eager to be given the opportunity—which means, let us state very frankly, the resources—to develop new transducers, new methods of approach to biological systems, employing bold, innovative approaches.

As regards computers, at present, NIH funds less than a million dollars for the development of computers specifically tailored for biological purposes.

Then, too, I should like to recall that, 7 years ago, the Biology Council of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council recommended a clearinghouse of information on biomedical instrumentation. There is still no such clearinghouse. It is urgently needed. So is a specialized subcenter on biomedical applications of computers.

Three years ago, I secured information for the Congress, for the executive agencies, and the professional community on the need for coordinated activities on medical electronics, as such. Only a few of the goals then envisioned have, as yet, come to pass, unfortunately.

NIH'S INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM

I turn to still another NIH front, the international scene. Once again, this year I renew my recommendation to the Bureau of the Budget—do not allow concern for America's "balance of payments" problem to intrude into a relatively tiny—from a fiscal standpoint—but absolutely crucial—from a medical standpoint—area of NIH contribution. I refer to its support of oversea research, exchange, and training.

161 ZAD - LINO

NIH's Office of International Research—page 37 of the report—is a small but immensely important unit on the scene of world health. Its coordinated “seed” money overseas has already begun to harvest very considerable fruit for the good of mankind.

This Nation is the “light of the world” in medical research; the Russians do not “hold a candle” to us. If the Soviets land a man on the moon tomorrow, it would mean less to the world than what the Salk or Sabin vaccines meant or, infinitely more important, what the cure for a major type of cancer could mean to the 3 billion inhabitants on this planet.

CLEARINGHOUSE ON DRUG AND OTHER INFORMATION

Among other phases, in Senate Report 1460, the committee in commenting on several of the Institutes, points out the splendid progress and further opportunity for drug research. I commend these observations. Chemotherapy will write even brighter chapters in the next decade than we have seen in the war and the postwar period.

It is my hope, however, that the drug research will, at the same time, be accompanied by expanded and accelerated drug communication of the highest accuracy and reliability.

Specifically, I am looking forward to receipt in the 1966 fiscal year presentation of a specific estimate and request—as promised by the former special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—Mr. B. Jones—to lay the operational foundations for a national clearinghouse on drug information.

The Senator from Alabama, Mr. Hill, and I had discussed the need for such a clearinghouse in a colloquy in the Senate last year on the HEW bill.

A clearinghouse is more urgently needed now—next year—and the year after that—than ever before. The Public Health Service needs it, particularly NIH. The Veterans' Administration needs it, the Department of Defense needs it, the Food and Drug Administration needs it. So do industry and the professional community as a whole.

The clearinghouse would serve to link what are now largely disconnected, isolated, fragmented, overlapping and often duplicating efforts.

Insofar as purely private groups are concerned, their participation in it would be entirely voluntary. There would always be ample safeguards for protection of genuinely proprietary or other type information which merits security-type restrictions. So, too, raw, unevaluated drug information—like the adverse reaction reports—would be carefully identified as such.

CONSTRUCTIVE EMPHASIS

Let me reemphasize—the goal is that a drug clearinghouse will communicate more rapidly, more accurately, more reliably than ever before—the facts about drugs, whatever those facts may be.

Hopefully, pharmaceutical science will be more and more productive and creative, so that the information input and output will consist more and more of positive facts, of facts about the merits—not just the disadvantages—of drugs, their safety, their efficacy, their unanticipated favorable—not necessarily, unfavorable—side effects.

The drug clearinghouse is not designed to “accentuate the negative”; far from it; we seek affirmative goals.

We believe in drug science. We want to strengthen it, to enhance it, to raise it to greater heights of achievement.

But whether incoming drug facts prove—what some may regard as positive or negative, encouraging or discouraging, favorable or unfavorable, so long as the facts are scientific, they must be placed in the mainstream of access by the whole scientific community—instead of being lost, as so frequently occurs at present, or almost impossible to find.

CLEARINGHOUSE ON CHILD AND ADULT POISONS

The same should be said of the national clearinghouse on poison control centers. This ongoing system under the U.S. Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention renders invaluable, literally lifesaving service. It provides crucial facts for emergency use—about antidotes and treatment.

162 ZAD - LINO

Thus, it helps save a great many victims of accidents and of suicide attempts.

We still lose too many such victims. We pay a dreadful price in human suffering and loss. Strengthening information services, alone, will not of itself greatly reduce that price, but it would help to do so.

At present, the system of poison control centers functions in relatively primitive manual form—at a fraction of its potential capacity—with only limited coverage of the open literature, even smaller coverage of unpublished information and next to no systematic links with any advanced system with related, for example, drug information.

At least this clearinghouse is in being—if only in rudimentary form. The same cannot be said of another goal I have long sought—a proposed national clearinghouse on food information, as well as a clearinghouse on cosmetic information and on other chemical information.

NEW PESTICIDE CENTER

Fortunately, thanks to the administration's initiative and the outstanding contributions by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, who has served as acting chairman in the pesticide study by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, there is going to be a Pesticide Information Center.

This Center—which is of vital interest in the Public Health Service—will function under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and, specifically, the National Agricultural Library.

It would not be appropriate at this point to discourse on the latter Library's needs—for more professional manpower, for a new modern building, long planned and for mechanization of its system. Suffice it to say that the National Agricultural Library will not be able to work fully side by side with the two other National Libraries—the National Library of Medicine and the Library of Congress—until the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture makes available increased and sustained resources for the bibliography of agriculture and other NAL activities.

NAL is not just an agricultural resource, a resource for veterinary medicine; it is a resource for the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—for the Public Health Service, for NIH, for FDA, for the National Science Foundation, for other agencies and the scientific community.

PHARMACOLOGY AND TOXICOLOGY NEEDS

What goes into these information resources must be of highest quality. The undeniable fact is that we are not getting highest quality—uniformly—from the Nation's pharmacology efforts.

Skilled manpower is tragically scarce, especially in clinical pharmacology. That is why I had hoped NIH would have requested and we would have approved massive increased support for increased professional training and for increased research facilities for clinical pharmacology, in particular.

We have more and more splendid NIH-supported clinical centers. But where are the clinical pharmacologists to work at these and other centers? Where are the interdisciplinary trained men and women who will perform highest quality double blind and other controlled studies? Where are the scientists who will turn out top quality professional papers to replace the widespread, bias-ridden jumbles of unsubstantiated clinical impressions?

And where—for drug, for pesticide, and for other needs—are the toxicologists and pathologists who are scarcer today than proverbial hen's teeth? When will we have adequate members of these specialties—in 1974—in 1994? That is about what the time schedule looks like as of the limited rate of training in 1964.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

I am delighted that the committee concurs in the House action for full funding of the 1965 budget estimate of \$39.2 million for this vital agency. Senate Report 1460 well states—page 10—that this appropriation is necessary “to meet growing problems of consumer health resulting from the growth of the Nation's economy and population and technological developments,” as well as to implement the 1962 drug law.

163 ZAD - LINO

The Kefauver-Harris law does impose on FDA a massive workload. This workload is only now beginning to be felt in terms of the requirement for FDA's review of the efficacy of thousands of drugs which had been released during the period of 1938 to June 1963, but which had been cleared previously only as to safety, not as to efficacy.

In its overall organization and procedures, FDA has, in recent months, made important progress. I would like to see its momentum maintained.

It is my personal belief that the 1966 fiscal year budget for the Agency will require expanded funds for scientific activities—drugs and pesticides—as well as for communication and other evolving phases of the Agency's program.

FDA needs to be given the resources to develop close ties with university medical schools in a manner similar to that of the National Institutes of Health. FDA needs a two-way flow of ideas, experience, research projects, personnel, and training opportunity—with university departments of clinical pharmacology and other teaching units—throughout the country.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION—PAGES 18-20

The present bill will enable the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to achieve the fine objective of rehabilitating 133,000 disabled people under expanded Federal-State support—up from almost 120,000 this year.

This goal represents another inspiring milestone.

Yet, it is the hope of many of us who have a deep interest in rehabilitation that we might accelerate and expand this program still more rapidly in the years ahead.

In 5 years, we would like to be able to rehabilitate at an annual rate of 200,000 per year. This will not be easy, particularly, as we come to grips with the challenges facing us as regards the several disabled, the mentally retarded, the ex-mentally ill and other hard-core groups.

A backlog of 2½ million disabled faces us as a nation.

VRA stands ready to serve at whatever pace we in the Congress choose to set for it.

VRA has given deep consideration to its future role in the Nation's war against poverty. VRA has long known that a far heavier proportion of the poor are disabled than among other income groups. We must help these disabled poor to help themselves.

In the Great Society which is so well envisioned by President Johnson, VRA can and will play a particularly vital role.

On still another useful front, VRA is giving much thought to a possible National Information Center on Disability and Rehabilitation. This could be a great instrument for serving the information needs of the professional community.

Meanwhile, under the present budget, a Sixth Regional Rehabilitation and Training Center will come into being. Since their very inception, regional centers—as the Senate and House committees have so well stated—have fulfilled their goals of serving as, in effect, beacons of professional excellence for their areas and for the Nation.

MINNESOTA AND NEW YORK UNIVERSITIES

Two of the centers in which I have been particularly interested are those at the University of Minnesota and at New York University—Bellevue. Without in any way detracting from their worthy sister institutions elsewhere, these centers have demonstrated particular capacity for setting the national pace at the frontiers of physical medicine and rehabilitation.

I was delighted to learn, therefore, that VRA recognizes that these centers merit continued strong mandate and support. No fixed or arbitrary ceiling should impair their orderly growth or their evolving program of regional service.

PROPOSAL BY FRANK KRUSEN, M.D.

It has been my pleasure, in messages to my colleagues on the committee, to "second" certain appeals from leading physicians in physical medicine. Regrettably, the bill which is pending before us will not achieve some of the objective which these physicians had in mind.

164 ZAD - LINO

One such appeal which struck, I know, a deep and resonant chord in the heart of our chairman, the Senator from Alabama, Mr. Hill, was that which came from one of the most outstanding leaders in physical medicine, Frank Krusen, M.D. This great leader, who has received about as many honors as a doctor can receive from his admiring colleagues and from community and State, had looked ahead toward the provision of \$1 million to provide "seed funds" which would enable five medical schools to lay the foundation for developing comprehensive medically oriented programs for research and training in rehabilitation of the handicapped.

I unreservedly renew my endorsement of Dr. Krusen's objective and commend it particularly to the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. I earnestly hope that the Bureau will approve in the VRA budget estimate for the 1966 fiscal year specific provision for this "seeding grant" purpose.

THE FORTHCOMING REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION

Fortunately, a constructive national response is forthcoming. By December 31 of the year, we will have the benefit of what I am sure will be an outstanding report by the Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, as appointed by President Johnson.

The Chairman of that Commission is one of the most remarkable cardiovascular surgeons and dynamic physicians in the world, Dr. Michael de Bakey of Baylor College of Medicine.

The membership of the Commission is a "blue ribbon" collection of some of the foremost figures in U.S. medicine and among expert citizen organizations.

The commission is looking at the research problem, the scarcity of professional manpower problem, the research, education, and rehabilitation facility, as well as allied problems. And, yes, it is looking at the communication problem, also—at the matter of applying the medical knowledge which is already known but not fully used.

I must admit that I was particularly gratified that the Commission has been kind enough to acknowledge the interest in this communication phase by the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee.

What is most important, it is my hope and expectation that some of the preliminary thinking of the Commission will receive consideration as part of the planning by the administration of the 1966 fiscal year budget presentation. That means that, in the budget which is in process of preparation at this very time, the Commission's—at least—tentative concepts will receive attention.

Thus, by the time the final report has been prepared and issued, the HEW Department and the Bureau of the Budget will have had the benefit of some of the expert, although tentative judgment of the Commission. By this consultative process, we can, in effect, save a whole fiscal year which might otherwise be lost—in the ultimate review and implementation of those Commission recommendations which receive approval.

The chairmen and members of the Appropriations Subcommittees will, I am sure, continue to be apprised by the Commission, as its vital work proceeds.

PROPOSALS BY ADDITIONAL LEADERS OF AMERICAN MEDICAL FOUNDATIONS

A related meritorious appeal came from physicians who recognize the awesome challenge to provide for the needs of the chronically ill.

The growth of medical service within the past few years has been devoted by and large to the needs of the acutely ill. Yet, America's aging population will more and more require medical services for long-term care and treatment and restoration. Among the leaders speaking for an adequate response to these long-term needs are Dr. Krusen's colleagues in the American Rehabilitation Foundation. Headquartered in Minneapolis, but representing leadership throughout the Nation, ARF urges the Nation to address itself now to strengthening undergraduate and postgraduate medical education, so as to prove adequate to the problems of millions of the chronically ill.

165 ZAD - LINO

CONCLUSION—SERVING THE NEWBORN

I have concluded these comments at the point of service to the men and women of advanced years, men and women who should be enjoying the golden years of their lives.

But as is important as is service of their needs, I would prefer to conclude at the other end of life's spectrum—at the beginning of life—on the needs of the newborn.

The present WA-PHS-NIH-FDA budgets will permit expanded activity to assure the health of the 4 million American babies who will be ushered into life this year, next year, and the years which will follow.

But these agencies' present resources are not enough. Many tasks which they might properly fulfill remain unfulfilled. Let me cite but one example.

For years, there has been an urgent need for Federal support for the private Foundation for Medical Research Perinatal Study which had, in earlier years, received support from the American Medical Association and several philanthropic sources. This is an outstanding physician-run, physician-serving computer system providing up-to-the minute facts on 300,000 births recorded at cooperating hospitals. It has not received a nickel of much-needed Federal assistance for operational activity. And so, it has had to practically close down and function at minimal levels. I offer this example—as but one illustration of the continuing need for expanded and coordinated Federal collaboration with the professional community.

I cite it as an illustration of the horizons of untended health needs.

Mr. President, I shall take only a few additional moments to comment especially on some recommendations by the committee with respect to the Food and Drug Administration. I do this because the subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be the chairman, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organization has for the past 3 or 4 years been looking into the Food and Drug Administration and making recommendations for its reorganization and strengthening.

From time to time I have expressed my deep feeling that this agency was not given the proper support by Congress. The Kefauver-Harris law imposed a new workload upon it, and has required considerably more activity on the part of that agency.

I am pleased that the budget for this year takes recognition of these new obligations, and provides a reasonable amount of money for the FDA to do its job.

I mention this because there has been a great deal of criticism of the Food and Drug Administration. Much of that criticism should be shared by Congress, which regrettably in the past has not always provided the funds that were necessary for this agency of Government.

I also wish to support the action that was taken here by amendment for the National Labor Relations Board, by restoring its budget reduction. That is very essential and much needed. The NLRB has heavy responsibilities and should be permitted to do its job with an adequate staff. This was a vital amendment.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organization of the Committee on Government Operations, under the acting chairmanship of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] conducted a pesticide study. I am pleased that the administration saw fit to institute a center which will go into the matter of the use of pesticides and their relationship to the public health. This is also provided for in the appropriation bill.

I regret to say that much that I had hoped would be accomplished in the field of communication has not been fully supported in the appropriation bill.

I wish to sound one warning note. It is not economy to ignore communications in the drug and medical field. I hope Senators will let this sink in. If medical information from the researcher to the manufacturer to the physician to the pharmacist to the patient is not adequate, we are refusing to recognize the needs of modern society, and inviting the occurrence of another tragedy such as occurred in the

166 ZAD - LINO

thalidomide incident. That tragedy was due to one thing, namely, the fact that in the field of science and medicine there was no exchange of information which was adequate to the flow of scientific information in the medical and drug field.

I have urged repeatedly the establishment of a clearinghouse for medical and drug information. By our failure to establish it we are denying ourselves much needed medical information.

In the main, this is a very helpful appropriation bill. The chairman of the committee is to be commended for his outstanding work. One area in which it does not accomplish what I consider to be essential is in the postgraduate medical education field. As I understand—and the acting chairman of the committee can correct me if I am wrong—only \$500,000 was provided in that area. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars on the National Institutes of Health. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars on research and scientific advances in the field of medicine and drugs, but then we fail to communicate much of this information to the public, to the physician, and to the pharmacist.

We are still 10, 15, or 20 years behind in the communication of medical and drug information. Medicine and drugs are available that can save lives. We appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars for research, and we appropriate pennies for communication. This is false economy. I will raise my voice on this subject whenever I have the opportunity, until something is done about it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the last analysis, the person who suffers is the doctor's patient, not the doctor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have had one example after another in this field. We have also had examples of drugs being used with very harmful effects. The Senate and the House know it. I call this to the attention of the Senate in my rather aggressive manner tonight because it bothers me to know that this information is available and that it could be helpful to millions of people, and it is not getting to them.

Article

Congressional Record

August 19, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, COMMUNISTS AND THE WORLD STRUGGLE

MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DIVERSITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on June 8, Mr. Thomas L. Hughes, Director of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, in addressing a conference of officers of the Latin American armed forces, delivered one of the most clear and incisive addresses on American foreign policy that I have read in recent months. It should be required reading for every American seeking to understand the nature and status of present East-West relations.

Most of the major problems that make our world complex are noted, but what is distinctive is the clear perspective given them taken together. There are the dilemmas of a depolarizing world; the changing character and terms of conflict; the new forms of conflict between Communist nations and the predicament of our seeing a successful policy—containment—become inadequate to the new problems growing out of that success. In short, new dimensions of complexity and variety are confronting both the non-Communist and the Communist worlds, and are requiring major adjustments to the struggle on both sides.

We have reached a major turning point in the cold war. The tide of the cold war has turned clearly in our favor. The Communist world had launched the threat of direct, overt aggression and challenged us to an arms race, in order to attain the raw power to achieve their objectives. We responded with a policy of containment and a program to win that arms race in terms of our having an preponderance of nuclear power with which to deter any aggressor who chose to use such force. The policy of containment has contained. Today the

167 ZAD - LINO

stark and simple confrontation of just two power centers—Russia and the United States—is a picture of the past. We have declined to impose ourselves on anyone. We have made clear we shall suffer no imposition by direct aggression on the free world. Mr. Khrushchev has recognized that a nuclear war with the United States would annihilate his own society. To commit it would be irrational and suicidal. This is not to say absolutely that nuclear war will not happen. It is to say that the danger of it has receded. This is so because the United States is preeminently strong and is determined to remain so. We do this not because we are itching to use this awesome power. We do not hoard megatons like a miser hoards gold. Our determination for peace has been made credible as much by our restraint in the use of force, as by our determination to acquire and maintain an unmatched military force.

But if the world has shifted from the abnormal simplicity of stark nuclear confrontation to the diversity of other forms of struggle, there are and will continue to be many problems. The world struggle has shifted to economic competition, internal subversion, guerrilla, and other forms of paramilitary agitation, and to efforts to manipulate a social discontent bred by conditions of misery and despair. As the threat of major violence by nuclear holocaust recedes, the threat of lesser violence indeed grows. The result is a much more sophisticated kind of struggle in which it is easy, but dangerous, to be frustrated.

Each side in the struggle—non-Communist and Communist worlds—has comparative advantages. The Communist world can manage its economy outside the democratic process. They can tailor their foreign aid program unhindered by extraneous restrictions.

On the other hand, the non-Communist world enjoys advantages, too. There is no disarray among allies here compared to the Sino-Soviet rift, which is reverberating in Communist parties around the world. We also have much more varied power and greater capacity for graduated deterrence. If there is an effort to sting us, as in the Tonkin Gulf, we can strike back with an appropriate force. We do not have to swat a fly with a sledgehammer. We have enough power to afford to keep cool. And we have begun to go beyond the defensiveness of containment. We have begun on the margins to poke holes in the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe and to exploit the nationalistic traits of those countries with expanded trade. These nations have begun to demand and get a longer leash. Mr. Khrushchev has been forced to admit, in granting it, that "they are too big to spank."

In brief, the world is loosening up. It is more fluid and diverse. This is more to the disadvantage of the Communists than it is to us. The so-called disarray of NATO represents the growing pains of the successful development of strength in free nations. The breakup of the Communist monolith is the beginning of defeat for them.

America is not omnipotent in this world. We do have a responsibility for leadership, although we have no power for imposition, and we do not seek to impose either our will or our way on anybody. We have a major, but subtle, role to play in which strength, restraint, resourcefulness, sophistication, patience, and perseverance are called for, if we aim to win without war.

Fear of atomic or other direct aggression once cemented us with our allies. Fear must be replaced by cooperation. We must continue to organize for common defense, but in more complicated terms. We must help in building defenses within a nation that will protect it from subversion within or without, and then go on to build with them a better society of nations.

These are not times for overoptimism, nor for false assumptions. We must resist impulses for cheap victories, short-term results, simple slogans, and easy solutions.

These and many other ideas are elaborated on in this thoughtful, cogent, and very timely address by Mr. Hughes. I ask unanimous consent to have the whole address printed in the Record at this point. I commend it to the attention of Senators.

168 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 20, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NATIONAL POLICY FOR LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE, U.S. SENATE

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR LOCAL AIRLINE SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and ask for its appropriate reference, a resolution authorizing a thorough review by the Committee on Commerce of the national needs for local airline service and expressing the sense of the Senate that pending the outcome of this review the Civil Aeronautics Board shall maintain air service to all points now served.

The future of airline service for American communities urgently requires a new statement of national policy to keep pace with a fast growing nation.

Many complaints from cities, States, and national organizations, such as the Local Airline Service Action Committee, charge that local airline service is inadequate. Cases before the Civil Aeronautics Board threaten discontinuance or downgrading of service at more than 100 points among some 540 now on the airline map.

The cities have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to provide adequate airports with the implied promise, both from the airlines and from the Federal Government, that they would receive adequate airline service. Many feel that the promise is not being kept.

This is a matter not merely of civic pride but of economic necessity. As American industry expands, the cities with good transport facilities are at great advantage in gaining and holding their share of the Nation's prosperity. Those without it are at a grievous disadvantage.

Cities that have lived upon farm income are most dependent upon air transportation to develop new industry, new income, and new employment that will compensate for a loss of farm population to cities.

The Federal Aviation Act was wisely adopted to promote "adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges," and to develop "an air transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States."

It is a step backward even to consider reduction or downgrading of service. The Civil Aeronautics Board disagrees within itself. Decisions between a restrictive, backward-moving policy and a progressive, forward policy often are reached by a 3 to 2 vote.

Such a close division on a matter of such importance requires a clear statement of policy which only Congress can provide.

This is a difficult and controversial area of policy implementation and I believe all interests would be served through a careful review of the situation by the Committee on Commerce. In particular, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Monroney, chairman, Subcommittee on Aviation, for his longstanding concern and interest with this vexing problem. I am confident that his advice and counsel in this area would be extremely beneficial in the development of an equitable and progressive national air service policy.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this resolution be printed at this point in the record, and that the resolution remain at the desk for an additional 3 days so that other interested Senators will have an opportunity to join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet setting forth the details of local communities threatened with loss of scheduled airline service be printed at this point in the record.

169 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 20, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator just what happened to the timber price reporting feature of the Senate bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. That was one of the items which we were not able to retain, I regret to say. I also regret to say that we were unable to retain the full amount on the flower reporting program. This is an industry of \$1.2 billion, a goodly portion of which is centered in my own State. We were not able to get the consent of the House conferees to retain but half of that amount, and we were not able to get their consent to retain any of the item on the timber report.

The conferees, however, request, on page 8 of the conference report:

The conferees request the Forest Service to explore the possibility of using existing cooperative forest services to provide timber price information.

I do not know whether that means much or not. But the timber experts on the conference committee seemed to think they might get the wheels started toward the direction in which the Senator from Minnesota has been interested for so long—I think for 3 or 4 years—and has ardently desired them to start.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. It is my hope that the Department of Agriculture, in its next budget, will include that item, because the timber price reporting service is of great importance to our timber farmers. Timber production is like any other crop, such as cotton, rice, wheat, or feed grains. The farmers need timber pricing information for commodity price marketing purposes, as in the case of any other product. I regret we were not able in the conference, to succeed in obtaining those surveys. I thank the Senator from Florida for his helpfulness in the Senate committee.

I am hopeful, too, that the flower reporting service might also be included next year, because that is a very important area of agricultural production. It ought to be given the same consideration as we give to other commodities. I hesitate to call flowers a commodity because they have a character of their own, but I surely concur with the Senator's hope in that matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Commenting briefly on that point, the flower industry is now an industry which produces \$1,200 million a year. It has asked for very little. It has no price support. The industry is found in many States. Pilot reporting programs are now operating in six States at a very modest cost of \$37,600. My own State of Florida is one of the six major producing States, and therefore has the advantage of that operation. For that reason I was particularly sorry that we could not expand the service to the other 11 States, making 17 in all. They are the major producing States and they were included in the request of the national flower industry. This year the service was requested to be extended to those 11 additional States. However, I am happy to say to the distinguished Senator that we did increase slightly both production and marketing research, by \$150,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do indeed. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to add my voice to that of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] in reference to these new laboratories, particularly insofar as the wheat laboratory is concerned. I believed that those are wise investments. I never have seen a research laboratory yet which could really be called an expenditure. In terms of spending, ultimately more comes back in return than the amount spent. If it were not for research in American agriculture, our whole agricultural structure today would be in shambles.

170 ZAD - LINO

I commend the committees of Congress and the Senators and Representatives who serve on those committees for taking the initiative on these questions. Actually, for many years the executive branch has been less forward in the subject of research than the Congress. I believe the record thus far shows that the initiative taken by the Congress in research facilities has been wise and prudent and naturally has saved money for the taxpayers. It has improved farm income and actually has benefited the entire economy.

I know that the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], now handling the bill, had to take the position that no new laboratories would be included in the appropriation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Except the budgeted ones.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Except the budgeted ones. That is correct. Many of us came in with other suggestions. I came in with some proposals that I thought would be very beneficial not only for the area of the Nation that I am privileged to represent in part, but for the whole Nation. I am hopeful that the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations will be studied by the executive branch so that when the new budget is presented, the case that was made for some of these laboratories can be budgeted, because I know how important it is that we adhere as much as possible to budgeted items, even though I must say, with all due respect to the Bureau of the Budget and the executive department, there are times when we are wise in making our own decision and using the Budget Bureau figures only for guidance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is correct. The conference report covers an appropriation for research into pesticides under the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. Everyone is familiar with what is happening in connection with the pressing question of the effect of pesticides. Also, there is a pressing need in the tobacco industry for research, and there is a sizable program in that field. We will not hesitate to do what the Senator has suggested when there is a pressing need that has not been recommended by the Budget Bureau.

As a member of the committee and as a Senator for his State and the Nation, the Senator from Minnesota has been very diligent. I am only sorry that the committee—and in fact the country—is not able to move along quite so fast as the Senator sometimes would like to see us move. But I think we have moved rather constructively this time, and I hope that the results accomplished will so indicate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I wish to add one word. As the Senator will recall, I was deeply interested in the expansion of the rust laboratory facilities, which are studying rust affecting our wheat production. I have both a sentimental interest and an economic interest. My late uncle, Dr. Harry B. Humphrey, was the chief plant pathologist for the Department of Agriculture for many years. He was the head of the USDA graduate school at the Department of Agriculture. He was one of the pioneers in this whole field of rust control. As a young man and boy, I used to travel with him through the wheatfields of the Midwestern States. I can remember many times looking across the fields. He would spot a place where we could see the wheat sort of dip, and we would know that in that area there was rust or some affliction of the crop.

Our University of Minnesota at St. Paul, on its agriculture campus, has a laboratory facility at the present time exploring into ways and means of controlling this rust infection, because it is an infection, on the wheat stem and finally on the wheat kernel itself.

I am hopeful that next year the Department of Agriculture will see the importance of waging a continuing battle against rust, because there are many variations of it. We correct one only to find another. It is like trying to find the proper type of mycin drug to control a virus in the human body. As a pharmacist of sorts, though no longer really up to date, I know that the mycin family of drugs must be constantly updated. New compounds have to be perfected to combat infection.

So let us hope that the Department of Agriculture will give us a break on the rust laboratory in the appropriation for the next fiscal year. I know that my friend from Florida will be the first to embrace that recommendation. He has been simply magnificent.

171 ZAD - LINO

The Senator from Florida has been magnificent in terms of our agricultural economy and our agricultural appropriations. I would not wish to sit down without paying my respects to him for his diligence, his care, his generosity, and yet for his prudence in the appropriation.

Article
Congressional Record
August 20, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I am happy to yield. I said he was the author of the original bill in 1956. I am happy to repeat that and to pay him tribute for the leadership he gave in this important cause.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful for those kind words. I rise to commend the Senator from New Mexico for the leadership he gave to this measure, and indeed, he made it possible for this bill to be here. I also want to salute the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], for his cooperation, and indeed the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] for his determined and skillful job in managing this bill in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and on the Senate floor.

The bill as finally worked out may not meet all the criteria some persons had in mind for a wilderness preservation program, but in the main I would say it is a great forward step. It will do much not only for today, but for the future. Of all the pieces of legislation that have been passed, in terms of looking to the future, in terms of providing for the recreational needs of our people, in terms of preservation of the great resources of America and the need of a growing population to know something of the great out of doors, untouched and unscathed, nothing is more significant than this piece of legislation. I commend all the members of the committee who have worked so hard. It is a job well done. I am really pleased to be present when this important piece of legislation is being passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only want to say I am glad the Senator did include all the members of the committee. I have been on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee longer than any other member. I never saw members on both sides of the aisle work better than they did on this bill. A great many questions were asked, but a careful bill has been worked out. We owe a debt of gratitude to all who contributed to this effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I add that some of the conservation groups did yeoman labor on this bill. One of their members departed. I refer to Howard Zahniser, of the Citizens' Committee on Natural Resources; and the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart Udall, surely should receive a note of commendation. I cannot help think of that public-spirited citizen who for many many years would be in the galleries when we were considering the wilderness bill. Howard Zahniser gave his life for it. I hope sometime in the future there will be some memorial to him because of his dedication to this important cause.

Mr. President, after 8 years of lengthy debate and partial action by one House of Congress or the other, the wilderness bill is about to become law. This occasion should not pass without a few words of tribute to the countless Americans who did their part to make this effort a successful one.

We have learned in those 8 years that it is one thing to speak out for the preservation of this Nation's precious wilderness areas, and it is quite another thing to enact a sound, fair, and meaningful national policy which makes that preservation possible.

In an age of automation, mechanization, and exploitation of our vast natural resources, the amount of public lands shielded from the onslaught of man's ambition and genius becomes even smaller. Our task in this age has been to stand off and ponder the consequences of that onslaught. I believe that this bill contains our verdict, and I believe that we can all be grateful that the verdict came while we still had wilderness to preserve.

172 ZAD - LINO

During the 85th and 86th Congresses it was my privilege to be the principal sponsor of wilderness legislation. Since that first major wilderness bill was introduced in March 1957, both the Senate and the House have taken thousands of pages of testimony. During the 85th and 86th Congresses we held hearings not only here in Washington but in Oregon, California, Utah, New Mexico, the State of Washington, and Arizona. This pattern continued under the masterful leadership of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson].

In 1961 Senator Anderson guided his wilderness bill to an overwhelming victory of 78 to 8. This margin demonstrated both the skill of the Senator from New Mexico and the soundness of the bill. Unfortunately, of course, the bill did not pass in the other body.

Last year, again under the adroit leadership of Senator Anderson and of the distinguished minority whip, Senator Kuchel, the wilderness bill received a resounding vote of 73 to 12. I salute, too, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] for his determined and skillful job in managing this legislation in the Interior Committee and on the Senate floor.

Similar legislation finally saw the light of day just recently in the House of Representatives when that body approved H.R. 9070 on July 30. Once the bill had reached the floor, the voice of the majority was loud and clear as the bill passed 373 to 1.

Now, finally, a wilderness bill has passed both Houses, it has been thrashed out in conference, and it awaits the final nod from Capitol Hill before going to the President's desk. This is not only another mark of distinction for the 88th Congress, but a milestone in the life-long efforts of many Americans to guard our primitive areas from abuse and ruination.

Those 8 years of legislative struggle have brought many modifications in the specific procedures for identifying and protecting certain wilderness areas. The proposal to establish a permanent national wilderness preservation council has been eliminated. The original definition of a wilderness area has been modified considerably. The regulations for the protection of wilderness areas have been revised and liberalized.

The changes have been many, but they have all been made in the interest of balance between the need for effective wilderness preservation and the need for realistic land-use programs or legitimate economic and commercial use. The bill is not an ideal one for all interests concerned—very few bills are—but neither is it an empty one with acceptability as its only virtue. It will help us to insure that these federally owned wilderness lands—some million acres—will be administered in such a way as to leave them unimpaired. And that is the crucial point, because once an act of destruction occurs in our wilderness areas, it cannot be undone. Prevention, in the form of a clear national policy, is far better than regret.

And so I salute those who made the passage of this bill possible by calling the Nation's attention to the problems it will help us to solve and by working year in and year out to bring about decisive action. There are many names I could cite—too many to mention now—but let me say again that this bill is, in a very real sense, a monument to the untiring work of the late Howard Zahniser, who was executive director of the Wilderness Society. He carried this fight for many years and he never wavered in his firm belief that eventually the wilderness bill would become law. Spencer Smith, Citizens Committee for Natural Resources, has been a stalwart leader in this effort which has required so many years and so much patience and determination. And, as I mentioned earlier, let us not forget the dedicated work of our Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart Udall.

To these men, to my colleagues in the Senate and in the House, and to the many others whose work was so vital, I say "A job well done." As far as our wilderness policy is concerned, Mr. President, we are finally out of the woods.

173 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK FEED PROGRAM, U.S. SENATE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall comment just briefly on S. 400.

This bill in its original form passed the Senate June 25, 1963. At that time it included only the establishment of penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds.

Earlier this year a bill was introduced in the House—H.R. 12118—which established these penalties but also incorporated provisions to facilitate the pricing of feed made available for use in emergency areas. When the House earlier this week took up S. 400, it amended it so that it would be identical to H.R. 12118. In passing S. 400 today we have accepted the House amendments and have included the price-facilitating provisions.

This bill would permit pricing of grain in emergency areas uniformly at not less than 75 percent of the basic county support rate with no adjustment for differences in grain or feed quality. Present law requires calculation of premiums and discounts applicable to the grain sold because of its varying quality.

The bill also gives farmers a choice as to how they will use the grain furnished them by the Department in connection with the livestock feed program. At the present time the Department makes feed available in a disaster area and a farmer is certified by his county office as eligible to receive the feed. He then takes his certificate to the storage site authorized to issue the grain, or the dealer in the county authorized to issue the grain, and picks up his grain. He then takes his grain home and grinds it or takes it to his feed dealer and has it made into a usable feed.

Under this bill, farmers now can either continue to follow the present procedure or obtain their certificates for grain from the county office then take it to their grain dealers and tell them to prepare a feed mix containing the grain. The farmers will, of course, pay the dealers for the supplements added to the feed. The grain dealers then would take the certificates given them by the farmers and replenish the grain they used in the mix from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. This provision will make the program much simpler for the farmer.

Mr. President, this bill is badly needed in Minnesota and other parts of the country where serious drought conditions exist. I am most grateful to my colleagues for the bill's passage. I thank in particular the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], who called it up at my request, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], who I know has an interest in this legislation.

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CREATIVE TEACHING COMPETITION, U.S. SENATE

CREATIVE TEACHING COMPETITION SPONSORED BY MINNESOTA MINING &
MANUFACTURING CO.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a program of unusual merit and significance, the creative teaching competition for teachers in U.S. schools, sponsored by the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

Through this competition, the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. is offering 6 expense-paid summer study programs at the University of the Americas in Mexico City, and an additional 12 educational and cultural 2-week vacations in Mexico. These awards will be presented to teachers from any educational institution who submit a winning series of visuals for overhead projectors which demonstrate a teaching idea or concept.

174 ZAD – LINO

We need creative teaching, and I firmly believe we will not achieve such teaching, to the desired degree, unless it is encouraged. It is particularly gratifying when a private business organization takes the initiative for promoting this cause.

The creative teaching competition has three purposes: First, it will honor those teachers who have demonstrated superior performance. Second, it will bring together a large number of creative teaching ideas which will be made available to all educators. Third, it will give the winners an opportunity for a rewarding experience which will add to their professional growth and development.

In sponsoring this competition Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. is continuing a program of significant import to education and again demonstrating their corporate generosity. Last year the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. sponsored a program to provide each of 500 schools with a \$3,000 visual communications center. I am confident our educational system in the future will demonstrate that we owe a debt of gratitude to the generosity and vision of the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a fact sheet and press release relating to this competition.

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, U.S. SENATE

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at a time when the Judiciary Committees of both the House and Senate are considering immigration reform, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter to the editor of the New York Times from Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. In it, he states with logic and brevity the case for this legislation.

Samuel Gompers, our great American labor leader, once recalled the song which fired his imagination and desire to reach America when he was still a factory laborer in London:

To the West, to the West, to the land of the free
Where mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea
Where a man is a man if he's willing to toil
And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

America was the "golden door," which opened onto the land of the free. And what is freedom but that situation where a man may heed the yearning of his heart—to prove his worth, to affirm his dignity, to grow to the full measure of his manhood without the crippling judgments implicit in discrimination.

America remained the symbol of freedom for many decades. The torch of liberty was a beacon to millions of immigrants who pulled free from their past, from their community, and from their traditions to build and populate a new land.

That light faltered when the national origin quota system announced to the world that opportunity was no longer open to all but rationed according to accidents of birth.

The quota system was adopted four decades ago, in a postwar climate of suspicion and hostility. These fears and prejudices coalesced to bring about restriction of immigration—fear of competition in jobs, pessimism over the possibility of continuing economic growth, and spurious sociological theories concerning the "purity" of certain ethnic groups.

It is to the everlasting credit of President Wilson that he recognized the obligation of his office to lead, not merely reflect, public opinion. In 1921, one of his final acts of office was to veto the quota law. However, it was subsequently signed by President Harding, became law, and our present version went into effect several years later.

175 ZAD – LINO

Even had this law been equitable and wise, it would be well to review whether changing requirements and times, and our changing role in the world community, have not made some of its provisions obsolete. We must ask ourselves whether this law truly fulfills our present needs. Our best interests should not be thwarted by legal anachronisms.

Our present laws cannot be logically justified. The constant adjustments required testify to their inadequacy. We need a new and flexible system which will serve the needs of our Nation, reject discredited racial myths, make humanity and compassion acknowledged objectives of the law, and restore this Nation as a symbol of opportunity and freedom—where man's potential is not restrained by prejudice or rigid class distinctions.

The legislation now before Congress was submitted by President Kennedy. While almost every President has called upon Congress to correct the present deficiencies of the law, this is the most specific and comprehensive legislation yet proposed. It is a conservative proposal despite its strong liberal backing—because the national quota system was and is a radical departure from our traditional belief in freedom of movement and equality among men.

The corrective devices in this bill are rooted firmly in experience. Where our present system has proven inadequate, unfair, or unworkable, S. 1932, the proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, offers practical alternatives. It will not remove the limitation on total numbers. It will admit only so many immigrants as our economy is prepared to absorb without damage to our own workers. It will, however, place emphasis on meeting our manpower needs—giving preference to those special skills, education, and training in demand in the United States. The new frontiers of science and modern technology, among others, are in need of pioneers.

This legislation would also give special attention to the reuniting of families and aid for refugees who have fled oppression or natural disaster. The new law would thus embody compassion, commonsense, and recognition of values such as cohesive family life and political freedom. The proliferation of private and special immigration legislation before each Congress makes it evident that our current system must be constantly adjusted. This bill provides for such adjustments in a practical, efficient, and prompt manner.

In a memorable speech at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, President Johnson set a goal which can serve as inspiration to all of us—the building of a “great society.” A great society is not a closed society; it is open to enriching ideas and contributions of many cultures; it thrives on diversity. Immigration reform means substantial progress toward this goal. If our society sincerely judges its members on worth instead of birth, let us heed Attorney General Kennedy's advice:

The time has come for the quota system to be replaced by the merit system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter and my testimony before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Judiciary Committee be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and testimony were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO THE EDITOR:

In a letter to the editor published August 10, William A. Turner deplores the pending administration bill to eliminate the national origins system from our immigration laws. Mr. Turner says he believes the present system is satisfactory and that in 36 years as a foreign services officer of the State Department he has never heard foreigners criticize the national origins provision of our immigration laws.

It is my firm conviction that this national origins system causes our Nation great harm both at home and abroad, and that it should be eradicated from our law.

176 ZAD - LINO

This national origins system was conceived in a spirit of mistrust of certain racial groups, in southern and eastern Europe and elsewhere. Its original stated purpose was bald discrimination—to preserve what was believed to be the racial and ethnic composition of our population in 1924.

This system is a blot on our relations with other countries. It violates our basic national philosophy because it judges individuals not on their worth, but solely on their place of birth—or even where their ancestors happened to be born. I know from my own experiences abroad how deeply this system hurts us. I have been asked how a country which professes that all men are equal could permit a system which treated immigrants so unequally. It is a difficult criticism to answer.

UNFILLED NEEDS

This system fails to fulfill our own needs at home. An unskilled laborer from a northern European country can come here without delay or difficulty. But a particularly well-qualified scientist, or engineer—or chef—from one of a number of other countries experiences great difficulty and long delay. Thus there are no visas now available for a Korean radiation expert, a Japanese microbiologist, a Greek chemist, a skilled teacher of the deaf from the Philippines—and many others like them. Yet all want to come here, all are needed, and all are wanted. The time has come for us to insist that the quota system be replaced by the merit system.

This system inflicts cruel and unnecessary hardship on the families of many American citizens and resident aliens. Again and again they are deprived of the chance to bring brothers and sisters or other close relatives to this country because quotas in their native countries are oversubscribed. The national origins quota system makes it easier for a man to bring a maid to this country than to bring his mother; a system which can so distort human values must be revised.

Finally—and ironically—the national origins system does not even achieve its own purposes. It assigns an overwhelming number of quota visas to the countries of northern and western Europe—which do not use them all. For example, out of about 83,000 numbers assigned annually to the British Isles, only about 32,000 visas are used.

The 51,000 unused numbers cannot be reassigned; they are lost. Meanwhile, the quotas of many other countries are oversubscribed with the names of thousands of eligible immigrants eager to come to this country. Thus the ratio of immigration sought by the national origins system is not maintained, nor can it be.

SPECIAL LAWS

Further, the pressures which result from this system have forced Congress to enact special laws from time to time in recent years authorizing visas for people waiting in oversubscribed countries. The result is a further departure from the ratio which the national origins system was designed to continue.

This system damages America in the eyes of the world. It deprives us of able immigrants whose contributions we need. It inflicts needless personal cruelty on large numbers of American citizens and residents. And it doesn't work. Certainly, no plainer or more compelling arguments could be made for changing this system.

The administration's pending immigration bill seeks to change that system and establish a system that works in the national interest. It would increase the amount of authorized immigration by only a fraction—from 157,000 to 165,000. But it would, at the same time, gradually eliminate the present system and provide us with the flexibility necessary to deal with problems of fairness and of foreign policy.

177 ZAD - LINO

Both major parties and four successive Presidents have urged a revision of the immigration laws. President Kennedy recommended this legislation to Congress and President Johnson has firmly endorsed it. Every American should support the change.

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

WASHINGTON, August 11, 1964.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, DEMOCRAT, OF MINNESOTA, IN SUPPORT OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND IM- MIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT BEFORE THE SUBCOM- MITTEE ON IMMIGRATION OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COM- MITTEE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to appear today in support of legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I wish to endorse both S. 747 and S. 1932. S. 747 is the bill which Senator Hart introduced and I, along with 32 other Senators, had the honor to cosponsor. S. 1932 is the administration measure based on the recommendations made to Congress by our late and beloved President Kennedy.

There are differences of detail between the two bills, but I believe this is something that can be ironed out by this able subcommittee. Both bills are a long-overdue improvement that would remove a particularly unfortunate skelton from our national closet.

Since 1924 the laws of this Nation have barred immigration from this country upon grounds that have no basis in logic, in fact, or in morality. I refer, of course, to the immigration quota system which seeks to maintain some mythical racial and ethnic purity by apportioning immigration visas among the nations of the world in proportion to the ethnic composition of our 1920 population.

From the days of Plymouth Rock and Jamestown until the early decades of this century, this country was open to immigrants of all nations who met reasonable standards of health and character. Our country became strong, vigorous, and creative as each new wave of immigration reached our shores and contributed to our melting pot its own particular talents, energies, and traditions. I am proud that this is not a country of monolithic conformity; but rather is a country with a vital and vibrant admixture of many peoples, tongues, and talents. These differences, I believe, have contributed to our peculiar genius for invention, for experimentation, for progress, and world leadership.

The Immigration Act of 1924 and its most recent successor, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, renounced the American open door policy toward free immigration. They thus turned this country's back upon one of the wellsprings of its strength and greatness.

The first thing these laws did was to limit the total number of annual immigrants. Let me make clear that I have no quarrel with that basic policy. There is a limit upon our country's capacity to absorb new citizens. While I might disagree as to how high that limit should be, I do not advocate totally unrestricted immigration.

Today our immigration law authorizes the admission of approximately 156,000 quota immigrants from outside the Western Hemisphere is fixed at one-sixth of 1 percent of our 1920 population. Today that is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our population.

But our laws go further. They split up these 156,000 people among the various countries of the world, in proportion to the number of Americans living in 1920 who could trace their origin to a given country. As a result, by far the largest block of quota members, some 65,000 goes to Great Britain, at the expense of practically all the other countries. Particularly hard hit are the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe.

178 ZAD - LINO

Consequently, some of the country quotas like those of Italy and Greece have become heavily oversubscribed while other countries like Great Britain do not even use half of the quota numbers allotted to them. Since under our laws, all unused numbers are declared forfeited, less than 100,000 permits are actually used and 50,000 to 60,000 go begging.

The national quota discrimination against south and south-east Europeans is only part of the unhappy tale. Singled out for special discrimination, are the inhabitants of the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle. Here, in India, Pakistan, China, Japan and neighboring countries, live half of the earth's population. Under our immigration laws, we admit not more than 100 persons per year from each of these nations. Such discrimination is wrong.

The present law is predicated upon the theory of a racial or cultural elite. There is no such elite in those terms. There is no privilege except the privilege of ability, no privilege of race or national origin. The sooner we get rid of the nonsensical, outmoded, and aristocratic notion that some blood is better than other blood, that some skin is better than other skin, we will be better off. That is the curse of this generation, and it is driving us to a very unfortunate position in world affairs.

There are some specific differences between S. 747 and S. 1932 on how a total quota is to be determined, how allocations are to be administered, and some other details. I believe that the committee can make an appropriate resolution of these. The main point is that both bills eliminate one of the worst inequities and deceptions in the present law by authorizing the reallocation of unused quotas. Under the present law a large portion of the quotas allocated to Great Britain go unused while would-be immigrants from other countries wait years, even decades, before they can come to our shores. Both bills would reallocate unused quotas to other areas.

Neither S. 747 nor S. 1932 will eliminate all of the inequities. President Kennedy noted that in reference to S. 1932 in his message on the subject. These bills, however, do set right the most objectionable feature of our present law. This is the national origins quota system. If we can reform that, we will have made great progress toward correcting an injustice and eliminating the basis for unnecessary and unfortunate criticism of this country by the rest of the world.

I believe that the enactment of a sound bill, embodying the objectives of either of the bills noted, will go a long way toward restoring the image of the United States as a progressive and tolerant member of the international community. Equally important, it would reap great gains by reuniting many families here at home, and it would enrich and invigorate our national life through the infusion of new persons, new cultures, and new ideas.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of these measures. I shall lend all of my energies to their adoption or the adoption of an equally good bill.

179 ZAD - LINO

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, WORLD REFUGEE REPORT, U.S. SENATE

WORLD REFUGEE REPORT—ANNUAL SURVEY ISSUE, 1964-65

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a private citizens committee with whose work many of us are familiar, has recently published its annual survey of the world's refugee problems. This survey, unique of its kind, gives precise information about the various refugee communities around the world and about the efforts of the intergovernmental and American voluntary agencies to meet the needs of these refugees.

To the best of my knowledge, this publication is the only place where this information is available in such useful form. Many of us know of and participate in the work of the American voluntary agencies and we are all proud of the widespread and generous interest of the American public in this most unhappy problem. Many private and public groups find this information to be essential in carrying out their efforts in behalf of refugees.

We all feel a sense of indebtedness to the U.S. Committee for Refugees for their persisting efforts in helping the American public to understand the gravity of the refugee problems around the world. Their work is an encouragement to us all to continue our efforts to solve these refugee problems.

I ask unanimous consent that the World Refugee Report, annual survey issue, 1964-65, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, SEABEE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TEAMS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, U.S. SENATE

THE STAT PROGRAM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every Senator remembers the Seabees from World War II. Their near-epic deeds of construction work across the Pacific theater gave real meaning to their distinctly American motto: "Can Do."

After the war the Seabees, though greatly diminished in numbers, continued to add to their list of accomplishments by digging up and carrying away half of a small mountain in the Philippines to build a runway, by constructing a Marine camp on Okinawa, by rushing to the aid of the battered residents of Guam when virtually the entire island was leveled of its homes by Typhoon Karen in 1962. Most recently, they have rushed to the scene of the Alaskan earthquake to help in relief work. The mayor of Anchorage said "God bless the Seabees" when they left, their mission accomplished. All of these tasks were in addition to their routine tasks of training numerous smaller construction tasks, and the major task of being ready to deploy with the Marines if necessary.

The Seabee effort in Thailand and South Vietnam consists now of Seabee technical assistance teams—STAT, as they are called by the Navy. The 13 men on these teams are high caliber, highly motivated, and highly trained men with years of experience in all the jobs Seabees do.

What do they do? They specialize in community development work. They build bridges, build dams, dig wells, grade roads, build schools, build libraries, and—they can do just about anything else in the line of construction work.

They do this in the outlying districts, in the isolated towns, in the more poverty-stricken areas of Thailand and South Vietnam, areas which are particularly susceptible to the blandishments and terrorism of communism.

180 ZAD - LINO

In Thailand, the STAT is accompanied by a shadow team of Thai men; it is part of the job of our men to teach their shadow team construction skills while both teams are doing the job. This on-the-job training is the most valuable training these Thais have ever gotten. It is, moreover, hoped that this program will be self-regenerative, that is, that these Thai teams will then teach other apprentice Thai teams the skills they have learned from us.

How has this experiment in people-to-people relations turned out? It has been an impressive success. Large numbers of American servicemen are going to work right with the people of the country, rolling up their sleeves with them, working alongside one another, and—most importantly—teaching them something worthwhile, something that will raise their standard of living, in addition to improving the community's health, sanitation, flood control, and so forth.

The STAT has been called the military peace corps and the reasons for that comparison are obvious. Like the Peace Corps, the STAT put something into the country: They develop human resources. Such a contribution is valuable indeed.

Dollar for dollar, the STAT program has been called one of our best overseas investments. These teams have earned praise from high officials of every country involved, even though the program as a whole is still relatively young.

Although this STAT program is not widely known, I believe it is encouraging to learn of this down-to-earth attempt to assist our friends in southeast Asia to build better communities for themselves and their families. The Seabees in the STAT program merit our commendation and thanks.

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, LEIF ERICSON DAY,
U.S. SENATE, AUGUST 21, 1964

OCTOBER 9, LEIF ERICSON DAY

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 393, and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I have full clearance from them for this proposed action.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be slated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 393) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Ericson Day.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Minnesota?

Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, passage by the Senate of the joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim October 9 of each year as Leif Ericson Day will constitute long-overdue recognition of this courageous Norseman who first explored the North American Continent.

For many years there has been considerable controversy surrounding the feats of Ericson and his Vikings. Last year Dr. Helge Ingstad and an expedition supported by the National Geographical Society proved beyond any doubt that Vikings did explore the shore of Newfoundland about A.D. 1000. Radiocarbon dating of the ruins at L'Anse aux Meadows demonstrates that Norsemen did explore and occupy these shores so many centuries ago.

181 ZAD - LINO

This joint resolution acknowledges this historic and courageous achievement by authorizing the President to designate October 9 as Leif Ericson Day and by encouraging its observance by suitable exercises in schools and churches. October 9 has traditionally been observed as Leif Ericson Day by many Scandinavian groups through the years. Its proximity to Columbus Day provides an opportunity for Americans to celebrate simultaneously the heroic explorations of both these great discoverers.

Christopher Columbus and Leif Ericson should be honored and revered for their respective accomplishments. It is noteworthy that the Congress has chosen this year to pass resolutions honoring both these remarkable explorers.

It has been my great privilege to be the principal author of the Senate joint resolution authorizing Leif Ericson Day and a cosponsor of the measure honoring Christopher Columbus.

I am particularly pleased that we have now extended this belated recognition to Leif Ericson for his achievements in exploring the North American Continent about the year A.D. 1000.

Article
Congressional Record
August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY: PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY, U.S. SENATE

LET US CORRECT THE RECORD—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S ACTUAL ACCOMPLISH- MENTS IN GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] recently addressed the Senate on a subject of interest to us all—economy in Government. He viewed with alarm the evidence of administration extravagance which he professed to see in the report on Federal employment in the month of June issued by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. He said that information in that report had led him to doubt the President's real concern and accomplishments in the field of governmental economy.

Specifically, the Senator charged that his reading of the report indicated that:

Between January 1964 and June 1964, the first 6 months of his administration, President Johnson has added a total of 7,948 new employees to the public payroll.

This is an average of 1,300 per month, or 325 per week. This means that the Johnson administration has added an average of 65 new employees to the public payroll for every day it has been in office.

Actually, the joint committee report adds to the growing supply of cold, hard, factual evidence of the success of the President's economy program. I am afraid that the learned Senator was led astray by errors of arithmetic—I can find no other explanation for his figures. If Senators will examine the report, they will find that it shows that:

First. At the end of June, President Johnson had been in office for just over 7 months. Federal employment decreased during that period by 11,885, an average decrease of nearly 1,700 per month, or more than 80 per workday.

Second. If, for some reason, one wanted to confine his study to the figures for the first 6 months of the Johnson administration, he would find that employment dropped during that period by 14,511.

Third. If one were interested only in the 6 months ending with June, he would find that employment fell by 6,362.

Fourth. If one compares total employment at the end of June with the total for June 1963—the most meaningful comparison because it eliminates seasonal distortions—he finds that the 1964 totals is 28,214 lower. In fact, it is 15,001 lower than the total employed in June 1962.

182 ZAD - LINO

Thus, despite the workload increases associated with a growing population, despite constant pressure for more and better public services, and despite the growing complexity of our society and its problems, the President has succeeded in reducing Federal employment not just below last year's level, but below the level of 2 years ago. Even more important, this reduction has been achieved without impairment of essential services.

Mr. President, this is a superb record of management accomplishment. I know that the vast majority of Americans appreciate this. The taxpayers have never had a better friend, when it comes to prudent management in government and to economy in governments, than Lyndon B. Johnson.

Article

Congressional Record

August 21, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS, U.S. SENATE

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9586, an act to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9586) to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], who was very responsible for reporting the Senate bill on this subject from the Senate committee and has been one of the main forces for the bill's passage.

I may add that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who is on duty at the platform committee at Atlantic City, has asked that his support for the bill be once again announced in the Senate.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise at this time to urge passage of H.R. 9586, the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

The bill is a modified version of S. 2379—sponsored by Senator Humphrey and cosponsored by Senators Clark, Cooper, Javits, Long of Missouri, Metcalf, Randolph, Ribicoff, Scott, Kennedy, and myself, as chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts.

Essentially, H.R. 9586 contains title I of S. 2379, which was passed in this Chamber on December 20, 1963.

I very much regret that the House did not see fit to report out and approve the full contents of S. 2379. I regret that title II of our bill, providing for a National Arts Foundation, did not receive endorsement by the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, I feel that the bill we have before us constitutes an important step forward in the bettering of our Nation's cultural vitality.

By establishing a National Council on the Arts, it would in part fulfill our Senate goals in both an historic and constructively enlightened fashion. Because this session is drawing to a close, because little time remains for attempting to alter this legislation by further Senate and House action, because I feel that to attempt such procedures might be to lose what we have thus far won, I submit that we should accept the House version and act on it.

This bill is not as we would have preferred it, but it would set in motion much needed cultural progress, and it would give hope for the future in this significant area of our Nation's life and welfare.

In his appointment of Mr. Roger Stevens, a cultural leader of superlative knowledge and experience, President Johnson has demonstrated his keen interest in our cultural vitality. The White House has endorsed the basic principles of this legislation. Its history goes back as far as 1877, when a bill to create a Federal Arts Council was first introduced, according to the House report on H.R. 9586.

183 ZAD - LINO

In recent times both President Eisenhower and our late President, John F. Kennedy, supported the concepts we are here considering. President Kennedy, especially, took initiative in this field through Executive order.

Mr. President, I would like to pay particular tribute to the dynamic, resourceful, meaningful, and intelligent leadership of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the sponsor of the bill in the Senate—and also to the highly distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], truly a congressional pioneer in legislation pertaining to the enlightenment cultural advancement of our country; and I would extend my admiration, respect, and esteem to those other Senate cosponsors of the bill I have mentioned; to Congressman Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, who introduced the House bill, who conducted the House hearing as chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Labor, and who so masterfully guided this precedent-setting legislation through the House; and to those other House Members—including the distinguished Congressman from my home State of Rhode Island, Congressman John Fogarty—who have taken the lead in legislation dealing with our cultural growth and enhancement.

If this bill is passed, Mr. President, it will be another famous first for the 88th Congress. For the first time on a Federal level we will give recognition to the arts—recognition which has so long been postponed. Further, we will enable President Johnson to appoint a council representing the best cultural and artistic abilities we have in the United States.

As the bill states:

The Nation's prestige and general welfare will be promoted by providing recognition that the arts and the creative spirit which motivates them and which they personify are a valued and essential part of the Nation's resources.

This bill will enable us to develop these resources, by making comprehensive plans for future years so that we may give added inspiration and renewing hope to our Nation's fine artists in all their major fields of accomplishment and purpose.

Mr. President, I endorse this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Rhode Island for his gracious comments about me, but I must say I cannot crow about what has happened.

I join in what he has said, for had it not been for the interest he has shown, as well as that of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and other Senators, we would not have achieved anything, not even the rather brief measure which is only a beginning in what our country needs to do in the field of the arts in its own interest.

I say that in light of the fact that I initiated this effort in 1948, when the first bill was introduced in the House of Representatives. I call attention to the fact that the late Senator from New York, in whose seat I sit, Senator Lehman, sponsored legislation like this 10 years ago. It passed the Senate, but never got anywhere in the House. It was only through the particular skill of one of our colleagues from New Jersey that we even had a program that was operated by the United States with its left hand, out of the State Department, which does little or nothing for our cultural activities.

I say we have gone only a little way up the road because it will be recalled that when the Senate passed the bill at the end of last year, it passed a bill providing also for a National Arts Foundation, with an appropriation of \$10 million a year, which we estimated would have stimulated \$50 million a year in nonprofit activities in those areas of the country not now reached by any cultural activities. This measure should be of great interest to the farm States and to Senators from sparsely populated States, more so than to Senators from States having large cities where there are enormous commercial activities of this kind. Nevertheless, the House saw fit not to go along.

184 ZAD – LINO

Our country is alone in the world in not giving national attention to cultural activities or national encouragement and national leadership to advancement in the arts and in failing as a nation to participate in bringing the arts to areas which are arid in the availability of bands, musical performances, and other live performances; where there are no exhibits of paintings or activities in many other art forms for which our country is responsible and of which it is very proud.

It is always difficult for me and for other Members of this and the other body to understand how our country can lag so far behind when we are being challenged in this very field so strongly by both the Russian and the Chinese Communists.

In any case, the other body has never gone along with this body until now. This measure is much less than it ought to be, but is something. We still lag behind the parade in comparison to what our Canadian and British cousins have done, but at least there is some recognition on the Federal Government level which will act as a national force to the proposed appointment of a council under this bill. So, without cheering or throwing my hat in the air and saying that we have won a great victory—which we have not—I reluctantly join my colleagues in allowing the House bill to be called up and in passing the House bill, notwithstanding the slight progress we are making.

When I say a small distance, I do not necessarily mean in terms of money. Not much money is involved, even if the House had done what we have done in providing some money. I mean in terms of recognition and acceptance of the tremendous national asset which resides in the arts, and the tremendous contribution to national morale which it represents.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have made what I believe is the merest beginning to this approach, and notwithstanding the fact that the National Arts Foundation has been turned down, one thing has gone down the drain which should have been included in the bill, and that is authority in the National Council on the Arts, which is established by the House bill, to accept bequests, gifts, and donations, which could represent a tremendous financing itself. It is entirely possible, I believe, for private citizens, perhaps even those citizens who may be appointed to the Council, to set up a foundation which will receive donations, bequests, and gifts, and will coordinate the projects which it supports with the recommendation of the Council.

I believe the Record should be clear that, as one Senator who sponsored this legislation for such a long time, I would encourage that kind of approach, in order to give the National Council on the Arts which the President will appoint, at least some of the material means with which to carry out a program creditable to the United States.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PELL. The Record should also show that there is no reason why the Cultural Center itself could not set up an account, tax exempt, that could be administered for the benefit of the Arts Council and the objectives of it until some other means is provided.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator is referring to the Kennedy Cultural Center.

Mr. PELL. Yes; which we have authorized.

Yes; which is authorized to receive private donations.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the Senator is filling out the Record with that alternative.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I fully concur with the observation made by the Senator from Rhode Island with reference to the participation of the Kennedy Cultural Center insofar as fulfilling the objectives of H.R. 9586 is concerned, to provide for the establishment of a national council on the arts.

I also wish to say that the Senator from New York has outlined a very feasible means and a very appropriate means of cooperating by private foundations with the National Arts Council.

A private foundation could be set up which could coordinate its activities within the scope of the authority provided in this act, and thereby could accomplish some of the purposes that are included in this particular act.

185 ZAD - LINO

Mr. JAVITS. I may say that for whatever it might be worth, I would be willing myself to lend myself to such a foundation and to the effort to bring material support to the activities of the National Advisory Council on the Arts.

I should like to add further that I shall introduce a measure, as soon as the pending bill becomes law, designed to authorize the Council to accept and receive from public or private sources, by devise, bequest, or otherwise, money or securities, to be held absolutely in trust for the purposes of this work. I would appreciate very much the support of my colleagues for such a proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my proposal may be printed in connection with these remarks. I hope that the administration may agree with it, so that we might do something about the matter when we come back next year.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROPOSAL OF MR. JAVITS

The Council is authorized to accept and receive from public or private sources, by devise, bequest, gift, donation, or otherwise, money and securities and real, personal, or mixed property; to hold the same absolutely or in trust; to invest, reinvest, manage, and dispose of the same; and to apply such money, securities, or property, the proceeds thereof, or the income derived therefrom, to such expenditures and disbursements as the Council shall determine to be necessary or appropriate for the performance of its functions. For the purposes of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, any gift, donation, devise, or bequest accepted by the Council under this subsection shall be deemed to be a gift, donation, devise, or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not believe that the other body would not wish to accept such a provision in the pending bill. I am persuaded that there is the feeling that if such a provision were added, which the other body might accept with or without confidence, we might nonetheless hold the matter up for another year.

I am gratified that at least we have made some progress. We have been so far behind in this that I lend my support to going along with this procedure with my colleagues, in bringing about the creation of this Council, probably a year sooner than it would be if we were to add an amendment.

I have talked with many people, including the heads of trade unions, who are deeply concerned with the arts, and the president of the musician's union. They have urged also that we proceed in this way.

On that basis, and in the expectation that we will at last perfect the powers of the council by giving them the right to receive gifts and donations and bequests, I hope very much the Senate will accept the House bill, so that we may go forward in this matter.

I express also gratification that within the specifications of the bill are included about every art in which the United States could take pride. This includes industrial design and fashion design, which is so important to New York, as well as communications arts, such as motion picture, radio, and television.

Again I wish to express to the deputy majority leader what I believe to be the thanks of the whole country for his leadership. I deeply feel that had he not given it his attention we would not be here today to get something done, even though it is little, but, nonetheless something significant in this great and historic field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

186 ZAD - LINO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before I yield the floor I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from New York for his cooperation. I know of his deep concern about the limitations of the bill which we have passed, and that concern is shared by the senior Senator from Minnesota.

I do feel, however, that the fact that the Government has affirmatively acted in this field is a very good step forward, and the fact that this bill authorizes an appropriation of \$150,000 is the beginning of carrying on the work of the National Council on the Arts. It is a beginning.

I wish to join with the Senator in the bill which he will introduce, to provide adequate means of financing the work of the Council.

I regret that the foundation part of the Senate bill was deleted. I believe that action weakens the measures. But I say with a note of happiness tonight that we waited many long years for the elected representatives of the people of the United States to authorize by statute the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to promote the development of the arts in the United States. This is a great day, it seems to me, for the cultural life of our Nation.

Washington, D.C.
NBC-TV and radio
August 23, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, "MEET THE PRESS"

The National Broadcasting Co. presents: "Meet The Press", America's Press Conference of the Air, produced by Lawrence E. Spivak.

Guests: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (Democrat, Minnesota) and Senator Eugene J. McCarthy (Democrat, Minnesota).

Panel: Benjamin Bradlee, Newsweek magazine; Ray Scherer, NBC News; John Steels, Time and Life magazine; Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent panel member.

Moderator: Edwin Newman.

Mr. NEWMAN. This is Edwin Newman, inviting you to meet the Press. Meet the Press comes to you today from Convention Hall in Atlantic City where the Democratic Convention begins tomorrow. Our guests on this special 1-hour edition of Meet the Press are Senator Hubert Humphrey and Senator Eugene McCarthy, both from the State of Minnesota. One of them, most political observers believe, will be President Johnson's running mate.

The order of their appearance today was decided by the toss of a coin. We will interview Senator McCarthy first.

Now we will have the first question from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the Meet the Press panel.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator McCarthy, I assume that if President Johnson asks you to be his running mate, the answer is still, yes.

What I would like to ask you is, Why are you willing to give up a Senate seat which allows for so much independence for a job that doesn't allow for nearly as much independence?

Senator MCCARTHY. I think the offer of the Vice Presidency by the President of the United States, speaking for your party, is the kind of offer which no person, who has been a member of a party, can really turn down. I think it is a matter of obligation, apart from any personal feelings that one might have, either by way of desiring the office or by way of being particularly happy with the office of U.S. Senator.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you once thought there was need—"to clarify the basic principles and traditions of the Democratic Party and apply them clearly to the problems of today." What do you consider some of the basic principles of the party to be today?

Senator MCCARTHY. That is rather a large order. I have written really two books in which I have attempted to clarify those principles and as a Member of the House of Representatives helped to form what has become the democratic study group in that body, which has been concerned about clarifying principles and going on from that to laying out a basic program, which I thought would accomplish those principles and purposes. I don't think the program of our party is very far from what I would like to see by way of the ideal.

187 ZAD - LINO

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, maybe you can give us a brief answer on this one: You have been in Congress since 1948. What do you consider your own major contributions in the period you have been in Congress?

Senator McCARTHY. I think my major interest has been with the basic economic structure of the country. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee, I have been concerned about the reform of the tax structure of our country so that it would have the greatest possible effect by way of stimulating economic growth in the United States. I think the tax reduction which we approved in this last Congress was by way of a realization of some of the principles which I have been speaking about and talking about and recommending through these many years.

In addition to that, I have been concerned about what might be called the social welfare programs which I think are needed on a national scale today to reflect the fact that this is a single-nation economy. We should have a kind of common market, and we should have a truly national program of retirement as we have in social security. We should have a truly national program of unemployment insurance, which we do not now have, and we should have a truly national program of medical benefits for the aged, which we do not yet have.

Mr. SPIVAK. One more question on the Vice Presidency: You have written a great deal on democracy in your various books. Everyone seems to be agreed that the President of the United States should pick his running mate, who may be the next President. Why should one man, rather than the convention itself, in your judgment, be allowed to select the man who may be the next President of the United States?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't believe that under all circumstances this would be the position of the party people, but I think in this instance it reflects a confidence in President Johnson and a realization that in making his choice he will make the choice which will reflect the overall interests of the party and his good judgment, in which we have confidence, with reference to the kind of man whom he would want to serve with him in the office of Vice President.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator, about this Vice Presidency, do you know anything that we don't?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't know what you know. I know very little about it. It may be that you know more than I do.

Mr. BRADLEE. Have you ever discussed this with President Johnson?

Senator McCARTHY. I have not discussed it with President Johnson in any way.

Mr. BRADLEE. When was the last time that you saw President Johnson?

Senator McCARTHY. I saw the President last week. We were down for the signing of the poverty bill, and he greeted me as I came in, and he greeted me as I left.

Mr. BRADLEE. How do you think that your presence on the Democratic ticket would help elect Lyndon Johnson? What benefit would you bring to the ticket that others might not bring?

Senator McCARTHY. It is rather difficult to say. I think that this is the kind of determination which must be left up to the President himself. I am not really making my case to him. So far as I have been making a case, it has been to try to be as sure as I could that the President had the knowledge of what kind of limited support I had and what my qualifications were, if he were in any doubt. I have assumed that since he has known me during the 16 years that I have been in Congress, he is reasonably well informed.

My approach has been what I think the approach to the office of the Vice-Presidency ought to be, namely, in important decisions—and I think this is an important decision for the President—to try to leave him as free to make the decisions as it is possible for him to be free. This means to give him a reasonable amount of information, that information which is necessary, but not to subject him in any way to any kind of pressure or any kind of special demand.

Mr. BRADLEE. What part of the country do you think would be more liable to vote for Lyndon Johnson if you were Vice President than otherwise?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't know. I think that from whatever the columnists and the commentators have said, there is some indication I would have some support in every part of the country, perhaps not as enthusiastic support in some parts as other candidates might have but a kind of second position in almost every part of the country.

188 ZAD - LINO

Mr. STEELE. Senator, a man named Marshall Smelser, whom I believe is a friend of yours and sometime adviser, wrote recently of you in Harpers, "It might be said he is equidistant from his admired friend President Johnson, from his beau ideal, Adlai Stevenson, and from his respected colleague in chief, the late President Kennedy." That covers an awful lot of real estate.

Could you narrow it down a little bit and tell us what kind of Democrat you are?

Senator McCARTHY. He said "equidistant." He didn't attempt to measure the distance. That could mean that I was very close to each one of them rather than that I was very far away from them, and I don't have any indication of what measurement he was using.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, I would like to ask you where you stand on the fight that is now raging here in the Convention Hall over the seating of the Mississippi delegation. Do you favor seating the regular Mississippi delegation or the so-called freedom party which opposes them?

Senator McCARTHY. It is my opinion that if the regular delegation were to take a loyalty oath on an individual basis, as they are being asked to do, it would be extremely difficult to deny to them a place in this convention. I do think that if that is done, we must somehow insist on action by way of resolution in this convention that when the next convention meets that we shall have assurance that every opportunity has been given to everyone in Mississippi who wished to participate in Democratic caucuses by way of coming to a Democratic convention, that all of their rights have been respected.

Mr. STEELE. Then if this comes down to a rolleall in the convention, you will vote against seating the freedom party?

Senator McCARTHY. I would say that if the regulars have taken a loyalty oath on an individual basis, we would have great difficulty in refusing them under the rules of this convention from being seated at the convention.

Mr. STEELE. So far as I know the rules of the convention don't provide for a loyalty oath. Don't they only provide for State—that a State must—

Senator McCARTHY. This convention is still a going body.

Mr. STEELE. The rules may be changed?

Senator McCARTHY. The rules may be changed; yes.

Mr. SCHERER. Senator, it strikes some of us that you have an embarrassment of riches in Minnesota. There are 49 other States, yet if Mr. Newman's introduction is to be believed, you and your colleague are the two leading candidates. How do you account for this? What is there about Minnesota?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't know as either my colleague or I would say that we are necessarily the leading candidates. Certainly we know that we are not the only ones who are being considered. But I would like to give credit to the politics of my State, which is a very open kind of politics and one in which the competition, at least since 1944, has been rather severe. I would hope that this would continue in our State.

In part, as you know, it has been indicated that there is a great deal of pressure in our State from some of the able younger men, although neither Senator Humphrey nor I consider ourselves elder statesmen—it has been charged there is not enough room at the top in Minnesota. It is not so much pressure; it is rather a kind of open acceptance of what seems to be presented to us that moves us in this case.

Mr. SCHERER. Which other names around the country do you think the President should consider in this matter?

Senator McCARTHY. Oh, I could make out, I think, a rather long list of names that he could consider and probably is considering. Senator Mansfield, certainly, would deserve some consideration. I think that you would have to give some consideration to people like Senator Fulbright, Senator Muskie from Maine, and you could go on listing a number of people from the Northeastern part of our country.

189 ZAD - LINO

Mr. SCHERER. One keeps hearing, Senator McCarthy, that you are more acceptable to the South than your colleague. I am wondering why this might be? Isn't it true that your record on civil rights is very much like his?

Senator McCARTHY. My record on civil rights, I think, as far as the voting record and so far as our statements have been concerned, has been almost identical. I have had no correspondence with the South on this. I would have to leave the determination as to why I may be more acceptable, if this is the case, to others who are taking a position on it.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator McCarthy, you have been quoted as saying that you don't think that Barry Goldwater can be beaten with a high level peace and prosperity theme. Were you accurately quoted?

Senator McCARTHY. I said that he could not be beaten on that theme alone, that I didn't think the issues in this campaign which would ultimately emerge as important would be the traditional ones in which we could speak in all honesty as to the achievements of the Democratic Party with regard to peace and prosperity, that he was attempting to, with some success, really to cast the campaign on a kind of ideological basis in which case the achievements would come to be of somewhat secondary importance, and that we had to be prepared to meet him on the basis upon which he would present an attempt to conduct the campaign. The fact is, in American politics the challengers really more or less determine the nature of the campaign and of the contest.

Mr. SPIVAK. How do you think he can be beaten?

Senator McCARTHY. I think he can be beaten—we do two things, one we talk about the record, certainly, but in addition to that, we have to make very clear the nature of the kind of ideological choice which he is attempting to lay down before the American people. In fact, his approach was made clear, I think, at the Republican Convention when not just liberals but even moderate Republicans were rejected. He is asking the people to make a clear choice between what he says is right and what he says is wrong, between what he says is good and what he says is bad, really, to make a case against the history of the United States and whatever may be wrong or whatever may be bad in it. And I think our approach must be to present to the people what has been the tradition and the record and the achievement of the United States.

If I could just give one example, let's take the matter of foreign policy: The record, I think, is very clear—what we have done, and this is by way of achievement at home, economic growth, by way of what we are doing in the field of civil rights, our action with regard to the test ban, that in effect what we have going now is if I could describe it, I would say that there is the specter, really of—democracy and freedom is really haunting the Communist world, and this is the point we have to make. Not only are we haunting the Communists, but the vision and the dream of democracy and freedom is attracting all of the uncommitted peoples of the world. This is the record which America has made and which it is making, and I would hope that this would be the basis upon which we could cast this campaign and certainly this would be my effort.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I believe you referred to Senator Goldwater as a radical rather than a conservative. By our definition of the word that seems like a strange appellation to give him. How do you justify the use of the word "radical" for him?

Senator McCARTHY. I think it is a proper application in that he is not content with preserving the traditions and the continuity of his own party in the way, for example, that Bob Taft was concerned with preserving that continuity, but rather recommends a rather violent attack upon the traditions and the practices and the very movement of history in the United States. This can be radical whether it is from his point of view or whether it is by way of a kind of extreme attack from those whom we call and have called the left.

Mr. BRADLEE. How about Congressman Miller, he was a colleague of yours for many years. What is your candid assessment of him?

Senator McCARTHY. I served with him in the House for a year or two.

190 ZAD - LINO

My general feeling about Congressman Miller is that he will get better as the campaign goes along. It has been my observation that once a man has been Republican national chairman, there is a period after he leaves that office that he is unfit for civilian life. He is like a war dog. It takes a little bit of time for him to be reconditioned, and I think Bill Miller will be a reasonably responsible candidate as this campaign goes along.

Mr. BRADLEE. He is a Catholic, Senator McCarthy, and so are you. What role do you think religion is going to play in this?

Senator McCARTHY. If we could get them to cancel out the Notre Dame fight song, I would think it would have very little influence on the campaign.

Mr. BRADLEE. He describes himself as a Notre Dame Catholic as against a Harvard Catholic, which President Kennedy was. Do you think there is a viable distinction there?

Senator McCARTHY. That is a new distinction. It is one that I really have never attempted to make, and I have never heard it defined.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator, you have been sparring with the sensation-seeking columnists and they with each other on this question of the Vice-Presidency.

Have you been able in the last 2 months to come up with any new concepts of what this job might mean, what it might be made into?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't think I have any new concepts. I do think that the office has become more important in recent years, principally in the post-war years. You have the constitutional responsibility of presiding over the Senate which of course is a limited responsibility. You have the responsibility of more or less representing and standing for your party. This office, I think, or this responsibility, I think, has become more important since the President now has less time for making party rallies and party dinners. And the third area of responsibility, of course, is that in which the President's determination is all important, and on the record, Vice President Nixon under President Eisenhower, and Vice President Johnson under President Kennedy, were called upon to do many more things than Vice Presidents of earlier years were called upon to do, and I would expect that this might continue after 1964.

Mr. STEELE. Senator McCarthy, you said about a year ago that the idea that Federal deficits can be justified only to control recession is outdated. Indeed you said it was as outdated as Newton's laws of physics.

Aside from meeting recessions and using this kind of financing to meet a recession, is there any excuse for running a Federal deficit?

Senator McCARTHY. I think you have the best example in the current year when by positive decision we increased the deficit through the tax cut, not to prevent a depression but rather to move the economy from a high level to an ever higher level of production. This was an application of a reasoned judgment which if you had accepted that the greatest evil was simply to reduce the deficit or to balance the budget, this action would not have been taken.

Mr. STEELE. Wasn't one of the real purposes of the tax cut bill eventually to bring up Federal revenues and close the deficit?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes, that is right. It may close the deficit or it may not, but the point I made had reference to depressions, and in this case the action was taken not to head off a depression in the classical sense but to lift the economy from a high level to an even higher level, even though this involved additional deficit financing.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, you also wrote that the absolute control of inflation as an economic and moral necessity is a misconception. This is somewhat confusing to me. Don't you see a great danger in inflation?

Senator McCARTHY. I see great danger in uncontrolled inflation and even extreme inflation if it is controlled. But the history of economic growth in the United States is one during which there has been some slight inflation. And my point there is that you should not raise the question of the absolute control of inflation as any kind of moral absolute but pass a reasoned, economic judgment on it. This is all I ask for.

191 ZAD - LINO

Mr. SCHERER. Senator, returning again to the overriding question of this convention, the Vice-Presidency; is it fair to say that the Kennedy assassination has changed the criteria for choosing a Vice president?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't think it has changed the criteria very much, Mr. Scherer. I think the criteria would be essentially the same. The assassination, of course, has drawn more attention to the choice, but it is my opinion that any President or any party charged with making a choice of Vice President should, under any circumstances, use essentially the same criteria that are being applied today.

Mr. SCHERER. What would you say those criteria are?

Senator McCARTHY. I think that President Johnson has pretty well defined them and listed them. I don't see that I could add anything to what he has listed—in terms of knowledge of the problems of government, some experience in government, and beyond that, in certain virtues of prudence and compassion and those that would make for perfection in any man, whether he was the Vice President or President, or in any profession or in any walk of life.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, there have been reports that you are still opposed to Federal aid for parochial schools. Are those reports correct, and if so will you tell us why?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes. On the record, of course, I have voted for aid to public schools. The position I have taken on this is one in which I have held that it was not clearly unconstitutional to provide such aid, since we have done essentially the same thing at the level of higher education, but that the problem is a practical one and that the practical considerations in this case are of such nature that Federal aid to non-public schools is not warranted.

Mr. SPIVAK. Drew Pearson the other day wrote that you are the one Senate liberal who has consistently voted for the big oil companies, because you would not vote to change the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil and gas companies. Would you tell us what your position on that is, today?

Senator McCARTHY. Well, I'll say, I am glad you asked that question. In the case of Drew Pearson, this instance, is one in which he ran true to form—I think he does more good than he does harm—but he would be much more accurate if he would use the telephone once in a while, since the record very clearly shows that, of course, in the House of Representatives, I opposed the tidelands oil proposition and the natural gas bill, and in the Senate, every vote that was taken in the Finance Committee on this question and every vote that was taken on the floor of the Senate, until 1964—and there were, I think, three or four votes in the committee which are votes of record—I voted to cut down the depletion allowance, and I think there were two votes of record on the floor of the Senate. The one he pointed to was one that I missed. I don't think you have to be held responsible for missing a vote once in awhile when the record shows that before that vote and after it you voted to cut down the depletion allowance. But in 1964 when the tax bill was up, we had reduced taxes, or rather, reduced the depletion allowance benefits by \$40 million in the committee, and the administration position was that this was as much as we should ask for and that members of the Finance Committee ought to try to hold the line for two reasons: One, they thought it was a desirable objective, and the other was that they were a little bit afraid that the oil people might gather up their strength if we tried to do more and even take this away from them. So as a member of the Finance Committee, I stood firm with the committee position. This involved some votes against the depletion allowance in the committee and also on the floor of the Senate, but that is the record, and there is no record of consistent voting in support of the oil interests on my part in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. NEWMAN. Gentleman, we have less than 3 minutes, and I would like at this point to read a bulletin just handed to me having to do with the credentials fight here at the convention: Chairman Lawrence of the credentials committee has just announced that the committee decided to seat those members of the Alabama delegation who sign the loyalty oath required of the members of the national committee. The Credentials Committee, after studying the Mississippi contest, has named a subcommittee to study the problem tonight and report to the full committee tomorrow morning.

192 ZAD - LINO

Now, we will continue the questioning with Mr. Bradlee. And questions and answers should be brief at this point.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator Humphrey sponsored the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and you voted for a proposal to strip that agency of its research powers. What was that all about?

Senator McCARTHY. There were several things. One, I do not feel that research in disarmament is a particularly profitable study, since whatever research can be done in that, it seems to me, involves a study of history. At the time I cast that vote, I was recalling what I said about Harold Stassen when he was in charge of disarmament under President Eisenhower, and I remember criticizing him when he sent out letters or asked the public to make recommendations to him with regard to disarmament. And the suggestions I thought might have come to him were of such nature as to recommend something like the Great Wall of China or the Peace of God or the Truce of God which was followed in medieval times.

I could see no point, really, in research in disarmament: It looked to me as though they ought just to take it up as a disarmament project and proceed on that basis. But to come in and say, "We are going to conduct—" this may be the old academic background—when you say, "We are going to do research," you ask the question, "What kind of research are you going to do?"

Mr. STEELE. Senator, you said you saw the President recently, and he said, "Hello," "Goodbye." Did he also say, "I'll see you soon"?

Senator McCARTHY. I don't think he did say, "I'll see you soon." We may have taken that for granted—

Mr. STEELE. Would you regard that as an ominous note?

Senator McCARTHY. No, I don't think I would regard it either as plus or minus.

Mr. SCHERER. Why is there so much talk about Alabama and Mississippi when it is generally supposed they are going to Mr. Goldwater, anyway?

Senator McCARTHY. I think it is a reflection of recognition on the part of the Democrats that these are States which have a long history of support for the Democratic Party and Democratic Presidents and the Democratic programs and also a reflection of the desire on the part of Democrats, all of us, and particularly on the part of the President that he would like to be a President of all of the States. This, I think—or these two considerations, are primarily responsible for our concern.

Mr. NEWMAN. Thank you, Senator McCarthy and gentlemen. I must interrupt, here, because our time for the first interview is up.

You have just heard our panel interview Senator McCarthy. We are now ready to question Senator Humphrey. We will start the questions with Mr. Spivak.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, you have been described as a New Dealer, a left winger and a liberal. What designation do you put on yourself today?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am a Democrat and very proud of it.

Mr. SPIVAK. I am not talking about that. I know you are a Democrat. I am talking in terms of conservatism, moderation, liberalism.

Senator HUMPHREY. I am a good, modern Democrat and see the programs of our party doing great good for our country, finding myself in position of support of the basic programs that have been advanced in these recent years by President Kennedy and President Johnson. I've never really cared much for these tags or these labels. I think you judge people better by their record or their performance than you do by stereotypes.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I recently got a release that came from your office which said, "Professional liberals want the fiery debate. They glory in defeat. The hardest job for a politician today is to have the courage to be moderate."

Do you still consider yourself a liberal or a moderate today?

193 ZAD - LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. What I was attempting to say was, there are those who feel that you must get all or nothing. I have never felt that was very realistic. I think it is well for a person to have goals, goals that reach out a long distance, and to fight for those goals or those objectives, and if you cannot obtain them completely at one time, you make what progress is available at the moment or at that time, and then you proceed to do what you believe is best sometime later. I have never felt that you made a real contribution to your country, your family or your profession by seeking all or nothing. I believe that you do much better by seeking progress.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, I know you don't like tags, but you know one tag that has frequently been put on you is that you are antibusiness. Yet in your recent book entitled "The Cause Is Mankind" you speak in the very friendliest terms of big business. Who has changed, you or big business?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think some people are getting used to Hubert Humphrey, and possibly Hubert Humphrey is getting accustomed to some other people. One of the real problems in public life, as it is in private life, is that of communication, to know one another, to know each other. Of course I believe in business. I believe in the profit system. I come from a business family. I believe that our free enterprise system has the dynamics of great economic and social progress. I believe that in America you need big business as well as small business.

The only question is whether or not it is in the public interest, and we make those judgments as we see the developments in the economic structure.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, in a recent speech you spoke of the importance of "a recognition by Government of the legitimacy of reasonable business profits." Do you think the Government ought to define "reasonable business profits"?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that is quite self-evident, as to what is a reasonable profit. It is generally determined by whether or not there is price fixing, price gouging. There is a way to determining that, both through competition and through regulatory agencies. The doctrine of reason is one that is based upon the assumption that you have reason, that you have the capacity to understand what is reasonable. Our courts make judgments every day as to what is a reasonable profit, as to what is a reasonable set of circumstances, so I don't think this is unusual.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator, you have had more than a casual interest in this credentials fight between the regulars and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Can you tell us just what your role has been in the last few days?

Senator HUMPHREY. My interest is in seeing this Democratic Party of ours grow and expand and to offer an opportunity for wide participation on the part of many people in many walks of life. I think that the Democratic Party is on the road to victory unless it decides to do something to derail itself, and therefore what I have sought to do, as one individual—not as any mastermind, but as one individual—is to seek understanding, to seek harmony that is based upon principle and to seek accommodation.

Mr. BRADLEE. I understand the politics of it, but aren't you derailing, also, the major issue here, of—on one side. It seems to me during this Credentials Committee fight the split between the Democrats has been deeper than the split between the Republicans. On one side you have a Governor who refers to an enormous amount of Democrats as coons and possums and alligators, and on the other side you have these people who want to be seated and who are willing to fight and in some cases die for it. Aren't you burying that fight, that great moral issue?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Bradlee, we don't have much chance to bury it particularly when we have men like yourself who insist on reminding us of it. We are not going to bury it. We have a large number of fight promoters, and I think what we need now are a few people who are peacemakers and will try to make an accommodation based upon what is the standard—what are the standards of our party.

194 ZAD - LINO

One of the gentlemen that you spoke of has already disassociated himself, so to speak, from the national commitments of the Democratic Party, from the platform of our party. The credentials committee is working with this thing, and the credentials committee is chaired by one of the senior statesmen of this party, the former Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, David Lawrence, one of the outstanding public officials of our country.

On that committee are two representatives from each State. They are attempting to work out the credentials problem on the basis of the call of the 1964 convention, which is within the law and within the rules of this party, and I think they are going to do so, and if I can be of any help in that matter, I'd like to be able to offer it.

Mr. BRADLEE. Can you tell us what kind of communication you have had with the President during your efforts to settle this dispute?

Senator HUMPHREY. I haven't been in communication with the President on this matter. I have been in communication with the chairman of the committee, Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence has talked to me about what the position is of the State of Minnesota. He has talked to me about what if anything we thought might be able to be worked out that would be helpful, and I think it will come.

May I say I think we are going to have some good news for you, that this great split that some people prophesied, will not come to pass. I think we will have unity.

Mr. STEELE. Senator Humphrey, following up Mr. Bradlee's question for a moment, there has been a considerable number of reports that you undertook a mission for the President last week in trying to, as you put it, cool this thing down, by asking northern delegations to go along with a move to seat the regular Mississippi delegation. Is that correct?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is not correct, Mr. Steele.

Mr. STEELE. What kind of a mission did you undertake for—

Senator HUMPHREY. I did not undertake any mission for the President of the United States. He has been in touch with the chairman, I gather, of the committee, Mr. Lawrence. Mr. Lawrence is the chairman of the committee, and Mr. Lawrence doesn't need really any advice from Hubert Humphrey. He is an experienced man in these matters. My concern is that people who sit in this convention shall be people who are loyal to our party, people who will support the President of the United States as the nominee of our party and will see that his name is on the ballot—the President and his Vice-Presidential running mate and the electors pledged thereto, on the ballot in each State under the symbol and under the label of the Democratic Party.

I had something to do years back, with Governor Battle of Virginia, in working out what we called the loyalty oath for our party. I am very familiar with it. And the prime consideration here should be to see to it that people who serve in this convention—or that are delegates to this convention—are true Democrats and are willing to support this party and its nominees.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, you did have an hour with the President alone this week.

Senator HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. STEELE. Twice?

Senator HUMPHREY. I said, "Oh, yes."

Mr. STEELE. Did the matter of the Vice-Presidency come up?

Senator HUMPHREY. No; it did not. My colleague, Senator McCarthy, and I have had much the same experience. The President has not discussed with me the matter of the Vice-Presidency. He has had an opportunity to discuss—I have had an opportunity to discuss with him legislative problems and some of the problems that relate to our party in general, but not the Vice-Presidency.

Mr. STEELE. Senator, it seems odd, at least to an outsider such as I am, that two such outstanding Senators as yourself and your colleague, could visit the White House repeatedly, campaigns could be started to get the Vice-Presidency for them, but nothing is ever said. Hasn't the President indicated to you some qualifications or some problems that he has in connection with the Vice-Presidency?

195 ZAD - LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Steele, it may seem odd, but this decision is in the hands of the President of the United States, and that is where it properly belongs, and I am sure the President knows Senator Humphrey. Like my colleague I have known the President for 16 years. I have served in the Congress with the President. I doubt that there is really anything I could tell the President about Hubert Humphrey that he doesn't already know, and I don't believe that it is really necessary for the President to sit down and discuss the qualities or lack or qualities of Hubert Humphrey with the President of the United States.

Mr. SCHERER. On that point, Senator, if there was a clear consensus running at the convention for one man, would you think a President with sensitive political antennas would want to override it?

Senator HUMPHREY. I am sure the President will take into consideration all the factors that relate to this important office. One of them would be the factor that you have mentioned. There are others. Above all what I am sure of is the President of the United States is a patriot. He loves his country. He is a President who seeks a great national consensus and national unity. He is the President of all of our people. He understands the importance of the Office of President and of Vice President. I am sure what he is going to do when he makes his selection is to choose the man that he believes is best qualified in every area of political life of America, as well as to meet some of the needs of the party from whence that candidate would be drawn.

Mr. SCHERER. On the more personal aspect of things, what kind of loyalty, what kind of man would make the ideal Vice President for a strong personality like Mr. Johnson?

Senator HUMPHREY. The President himself has outlined what he considers to be the qualifications for a Vice President. One of you good newsmen said to me one time, "Don't you believe those qualifications are the standards for a saint?" and I said, "If that is the case, then I have to withdraw, because I can't qualify under that."

The President of the United States is the man that will determine whether or not we have these qualifications, and I would say from there on that what the Vice President does, if the ticket is elected, is again very much determined by the will of the President and what the President feels the Vice President should do in behalf of the country and the administration.

Mr. SCHERER. What do you see as the role of a Vice President in the world of 1965?

Senator HUMPHREY. The Vice President has three constitutional duties. First of all, he is the Presiding Officer of the Senate. That is the link between the executive and the legislative branch.

Secondly, he is permitted to vote in case of a tie in the Senate to break that vote, and thirdly, if anything should befall our President and he should be struck down, the Vice President succeeds the President. That is all the Constitution says. From there on out what the Vice President does is based upon precedent, upon law where, for example, the Vice President is a member of the National Security Council by law, and upon the will of the President.

Vice Presidents at one time did little or nothing, literally nothing. It was an office of very little consequence. But since 1920, if my memory is correct, we have had three Vice Presidents that have succeeded Presidents as a result of the death of Presidents. So the office is important. The duties of the Vice President are pretty well determined by what the President wishes the Vice President to do. The late Alben Barkley, for example, one of the great men, I think, of American politics, served as a good-will ambassador for President Truman. He did a good deal of the political work in the domestic and in the American political scene. He had close connections and good contact with the legislative branch because of his long experience in the Senate and the House.

Richard Nixon served very important functions for President Eisenhower and was sent abroad, as you recall, into Latin America, into Europe, into the Soviet Union. He also did a good deal of the political work. He served on the Security Council in the Cabinet.

196 ZAD - LINO

Then I think the real dimension of the Vice-Presidency was developed by President Kennedy in his relationship with Vice President Johnson. There the President and the Vice President actually worked together formulating policy and program for the Congress and the administration. And Vice President Johnson, as you know, was sent to many areas of the world by the President of the United States.

I summarize it by saying, a Vice President will be and is what the President wants him to be, and above all a Vice President must be loyal. He must have a quality of fidelity, a willingness literally to give himself to his President, to be what the President wants him to be, a loyal, faithful friend and servant.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator Joseph Clark, your colleague in the Senate, recently said that you were too valuable in the Senate to be exiled to the Vice Presidency. How do you feel about that?

Senator HUMPHREY. That is a high compliment.

Mr. SPIVAK. Why would you want to give up the very powerful place you have in the Senate to run as the Vice President?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think that was answered in 1960 when the most powerful and influential man in the Congress of the United States and one of the most effective leaders of the Senate that America has ever known since the beginning of this Republic gave up being majority leader to become the Vice President with John F. Kennedy, and that man was Lyndon Johnson. He knew what he was doing. He recognized the importance of the decision that he was making, and I surely do not feel that my importance in the U.S. Senate has ever equaled the importance of Lyndon Johnson as majority leader.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, after the Civil Rights bill was signed by the President last month you were quoted as saying "What used to be an albatross is now perhaps my greatest political asset."

How has that become your greatest political asset, particularly in the South?

Senator HUMPHREY. I don't recall saying it, but I suppose I did. Let me just say this, that I looked upon my work in the field of civil rights not particularly as a political asset but rather as a commitment of conscience. It has never really been a political asset for me to carry the label of Mr. Civil Rights, as some people have tried to call me, but I do know this, that it was right. I know that what I did and what the majority of us did in the Congress in passing the Civil Rights bill was morally right, and I think in the long run it will be politically right. Therefore I am very happy about it, and I am pleased that I had an opportunity to serve in a capacity of leadership when the Civil Rights bill was before the Senate and we did pass it. A successful achievement such as this, I believe, is something that one can at least have a moment of pride about—humble pride.

Mr. SPIVAK. Do you think we have reached a stage of public opinion in the South, particularly, where it would not do the ticket any harm if you ran as Vice President?

Senator HUMPHREY. It is very difficult for me to make that judgment because that is a subjective judgment, but I will say this, that the people are really going to vote for President of the United States, and I can not imagine the people of the South turning their backs upon President Lyndon Johnson, who has been a friend not only of the South but of every other part of America. He understands the South, he understands their needs, the attitudes of the people, and I am convinced that President Johnson will receive great majorities in the South because he truly represents the legitimate interests of the entire Nation and surely represents the needs and the aspirations of a South that is growing and prospering.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator, let's talk about the politics. What State would you help Lyndon Johnson carry that he wouldn't carry anyway, and conversely in what States do you feel that you might make his majority less?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Bradlee, you are assuming, apparently that I shall be—

Mr. BRADLEE. I said "would."

Senator HUMPHREY. That I would have that privilege, and I shall go along with that assumption only for the purposes of this dialogue because that decision is ultimately the President's.

197 ZAD - LINO

I do believe that whoever is the vice-presidential nominee will have a responsibility to carry a good deal of the burden of this campaign, because the President will be needed in Washington a good deal of the time. We have grave problems facing our country, and I also believe that the people of America are going to want their President in the White House during much of this campaign. They are going to be so tired of some of the noise and clatter, of charges and counter-charges, that a quiet, calm, steady voice from the White House will give them assurance, and not only the people at home reassurance but the people abroad.

Therefore it is my view that whoever is the nominee of this party—and there are several who surely could carry this responsibility—the nominee for Vice President—if I were that man, I would feel that I could be of help to the President of the United States in taking on some of the duties and a good deal of the duties of carrying on the program of campaigning of education to every area in this Nation.

Mr. BRADLEE. Senator Goldwater said that the States that he thinks the election will be decided on are across the middle of the country there—particularly Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—do you feel that you have qualifications to help President Johnson carry that State that are markedly superior to any other candidate?

Senator HUMPHREY. I wouldn't want to say that. That would be very boastful. But I believe there are several of us who know the issues, both domestic and foreign, that are capable of articulating those issues and of doing a creditable job. I would just note for this telecast that the President seems to have considerable strength, even if he didn't have a vice-presidential candidate. The recent Gallup poll which I saw today shows that the President now runs at an average of 68 percent in the Nation compared to 32 for his opponent. He has gained some 4 percent here in just the last 4 weeks.

Our task, it seems to me, is to consolidate that support, to maintain it as best we can, and then to make this campaign more than just a noisy recitation of political promises and political platitudes, to make it an educational effort so that the American people will know more about their Government, know more about the policies and the programs of their administration—yes, and for the opposition to outline its plans for whatever future it may have for America.

Mr. STEELE. Senator Humphrey, did you ever think that maybe the President won't be able to make up his mind with all these candidates that you have named, and maybe he will throw it to the convention?

Senator HUMPHREY. He could make that choice.

Mr. STEELE. If he does, will you get in and fight for it?

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Steele, why don't you come around and see me if that matter develops, and I will be more than happy to confide in you.

Mr. STEELE. It is a date.

Senator, in your recent book "The Cause Is Mankind" you wrote that "I believe that any policy, foreign and domestic, based solely on anticommunism is an edifice built on sand."

Yet how do you square that with your very strong support of the Marshall Plan and NATO?

Senator HUMPHREY. I consider the Marshall plan and NATO to be more than just an attack upon communism. Don't misunderstand me. Communism is an evil. Communism is an enemy, and communism is a virus that could infect the entire earth, that is, a political and social virus.

I don't think, however, that you combat it by just proclaiming against it. I think that you combat it not only with national security and defense and military power and alliances but also with economic programs such as the Marshall plan, also with social programs and educational programs that we have going throughout the world—foreign aid for example. And NATO surely is in line with what I have said, because it is not only a military alliance, it is also an association of free peoples and free nations.

Mr. SCHERER. Senator, on civil rights, Negroes lean strongly toward the Democrats. Is it possible that they are hurting their own cause—that is to say, the Democratic cause—by taking their struggle into the streets of Harlem and Rochester, Paterson, Chicago, and all those places?

198 ZAD - LINO

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Scherer, none of us can condone violence or disorder. Enforcement of law and the maintenance of civil peace is the first responsibility of local government and of State government, of mayors and of Governors, and we all deplore the fact that these demonstrations, which at one time were peaceful and nonviolent, have become in all too many instances violent. But I would also want people to know that in many of these areas these demonstrations are not conducted by the vast majority of the Negro citizens or the American citizen of Negro ancestry. It is a minority. There were less than 1,000 in Harlem, out of 250,000 who lived in an area of $3\frac{1}{2}$ square miles. And just on the way here to this broadcast and telecast, I read something that told me a little bit about the dimensions of this problem. There are 250,000 people in an area of $3\frac{1}{2}$ square miles in Harlem. You could put the entire population of the United States in three boroughs in New York City if the same density were to be applied across those three boroughs. This kind of social tension, Mr. Scherer, lends itself to trouble. So we have to do something about better housing, better education, better health and at the same time enforce the law.

Mr. SPIVAK. Senator, some people have been critical of the Democratic administration because they sent troops into Mississippi to protect one Negro but did not send troops into Harlem to protect hundreds of Negroes and hundreds of whites.

What is your explanation for that?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think there is a great deal of difference. In one area there was open defiance of the law by the constituted authorities. In another area, such as in Harlem and in Rochester, the constituted authorities from the Governor to the mayor and the chief of police, sought to bring about law enforcement, sought to bring about domestic peace, and used all the power at their command to do that.

Futhermore, in the instance of Mississippi there was a defiance of a Federal court order, and the President of the United States has the responsibility to enforce the court orders.

Mr. BRADLEE. What single issue is Senator Goldwater most vulnerable on?

Senator HUMPHREY. I think it is the issue of, Which of these two gentlemen is best equipped by temperament, by experience, by background to give this Nation leadership in the years ahead.

Mr. NEWMAN. Our time is up.

Thank you, Senator Humphrey, and thank you Senator McCarthy, for being with us on this special 1-hour edition of "Meet the Press" from Convention Hall in Atlantic City.

Atlantic City, N.J.

Democratic National Convention,
August 27, 1964

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Senator HUMPHREY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, my fellow Democrats, my fellow Americans, I proudly and humbly accept your nomination. Will we ever be able to forget this unbelievable, this moving, this beautiful, this wonderful evening? What a challenge to every person in this land to live up to the goals and the ideals of those who have gone before us, and have charted the course of our action.

I was deeply moved last night. I received a singular tribute from a friend and a great President, a tribute that I shall never forget, and I pray to Almighty God that I shall have the strength and the wisdom to measure up to the confidence and the trust that has been placed in me. And please let me say thank you, my fellow Democrats.

I believe that I know President Johnson as well as any man. So let me tell you about him. I have known for 16 years his courage, his wisdom, his tact, and his persuasion, his judgment and his leadership.

But I shall never forget those hours and those days of tragedy and crisis last November that we once again relived tonight, when a dear and wonderful friend and a great President was taken from us. And another stepped forward without a falter, without a moment of hesitation or a moment of doubt.

199 ZAD - LINO

I was among those that he called to his side. He asked us, we, the people, Republicans and Democrats alike—Americans all—for our help. And I say thank God that John Fitzgerald Kennedy was the patriot that he was, that he had the foresight that day in Los Angeles to provide for his country.

Thank God for this country and for the peace of the world—that President Kennedy had the wisdom to choose a Lyndon Johnson as his Vice President. [Applause.]

I am sure you remember these words: "Let us continue." Those simple and direct words of President Johnson reached the hearts of our people. Those words rallied them, lifted them, and unified them.

In this world, disaster is ever but a step away. There is no margin for error. The leader of the free world, the leader of the American Democracy, holds in his hands the destinies not only of his people, but holds in his hands the destinies of all mankind.

Yes, the President of the United States must be a man of calm and deep assurance who knows his country and knows his people. Above all, he must be a man of clear mind and sound judgment, a man who can lead, a man who can decide, a man of purpose and conviction. And Lyndon Johnson is that man. [Applause.]

He is a man with the instincts of a teacher, who would rather persuade than compel, who would rather unite than divide.

President Johnson is respectful of the traditions of the Presidency, and he understands the compelling need for restraint in the use of the greatest power ever assembled by man.

In President Johnson's hands, our people know that our power is for justice, and in his hands our people know that our power is for freedom.

President Johnson has helped to make the Democratic Party the only truly national party. And this very convention demonstrates our strong and our abiding unity and brotherhood. [Applause.]

And what a contrast—what a contrast with the shambles at the Cow Palace in San Francisco. What a contrast with that incredible spectacle of bitterness, of hostility, of personal attack.

The American people have seen the contrast. The American people do have a clear choice, and I predict their choice will be Lyndon Johnson in November. [Applause.]

Ralph Waldo Emerson once spoke of "The two parties which divide the states"—the party of hope and the party of memory, my fellow Democrats. They renew their rivalry, he said, from generation to generation.

This contest, between the party of hope and the party of memory lies at the very heart of this campaign.

During the last few weeks, shrill voices have tried to lay claim to the great spirit of the American past. But they long for a past that never was. In their recklessness and in their radicalism, they distort the American conservative tradition.

Yes, those who have kidnaped the Republican Party have made it this year not a party of memory and sentiment, but one of stridency, of unrestrained passion, of extreme and radical language. [Applause.]

And by contrast, which is clear to all, under the leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the Democratic Party stands today as the champion of great causes, as the party of purpose and conviction, as the party of national unity, and as the party of hope for all mankind. [Applause.]

Now let me document my case. Above all, the contrast is between the Democratic leadership and that of the Goldwater party is sharp and decisive on the question of peace and security. For 25 years, my fellow Americans, both parties have held the conviction that politics should stop at the water's edge, that we must be united in the face of our enemies, and we must be united in support of our allies and our friends.

And I say here tonight, to every American, to every friend of freedom, woe to that party or that spokesman that turns its back upon bipartisan foreign policy. Woe to those who are willing to divide this Nation, and beware of those who cast false doubts upon our great strength. [Applause.]

200 ZAD - LINO I-RAC-L

What great problems there are to solve: Problems to control the awesome power of the nuclear age, to strengthen the grand alliance with Europe.

To continue the task of building a strong and prosperous and united hemisphere under the Alliance for Progress.

To assist our friends in Asia and Africa in preserving their freedom and promoting their progress.

And to defend and extend freedom throughout the world.

Now, my fellow Americans, these urgent problems demand reasoned solutions, not empty slogans. Childlike answers cannot solve man-sized problems.

These problems demand leadership that is prudent, restrained, responsible. They require a President who knows that Rome was not built in a day, but who also knows that the great edifice of Western civilization can be brought down in ruins in 1 hour.

The American Presidency is not a place for a man who is impetuous at one moment, and indecisive the next; [applause] nor is it a place for one who is violently for something one day and violently opposed to it on the next, [applause] nor is it an office where statements on matters of major policy are so confusing and so contradictory that neither friend nor foe knows where he stands.

And my fellow Americans, it is of the highest importance that both friend and foe know that the American President means what he says and says what he means. [Applause.]

The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party [applause] yes, the temporary Republican spokesman is not only out of tune with the great majority of his countrymen; he is even out of step with his own party.

In the last 3½ years, most Democrats and Republicans have agreed on the great decisions our Nation has made. But not the Republican spokesman, not Senator Goldwater. He has been facing backward, against the mainstream of American history. Most Democrats and most Republicans in the U.S. Senate, for example, voted for the nuclear test ban treaty. But not the temporary Republican spokesman. [Applause.]

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate voted for an eleven and a half billion dollar tax cut for the American citizens and American business. But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, in fact four-fifths of the members of his own party, voted for the Civil Rights Act. But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Democrats and Republicans in the Senate voted for the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that seeks to slow down the nuclear arms race among the nations. But not the temporary Republican spokesman.

Most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted last year for an expanded medical education program. But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted for the education legislation. But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted for the National Defense Education Act. But not Senator Goldwater.

And my fellow Americans, most Democrats and most Republicans in the Senate voted to help the United Nations in its peacekeeping functions when it was in financial difficulty. But not Senator Goldwater.

Yes, my fellow Americans, it is a fact that the temporary Republican spokesman is not in the mainstream of his party. In fact, he has not even touched the shore. [Applause.]

I believe in the two-party system, but there must be two responsible parties, and there must be men who are equipped to lead a great Nation as the standard bearers of the two parties. It is imperative that the leadership of the great parties move within the mainstream of American thought and philosophy.

2—RAC—L

I pledge to this convention, I pledge to our great President, to all the American people, my complete devotion to this task: To prove once again that the Democratic Party deserves America's affections, and that we are indeed the party of hope for the American people. [Applause.]

So tonight let us here and now pledge that the campaign that we will wage will be worthy of our great President Johnson, and, my fellow Americans, let us hereby resolve and pledge tonight that that campaign will be worthy of the memory of the late and beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy. [Applause.]

While others may appeal to passions and prejudices, and appeal to fear and bitterness, we of the Democratic Party call upon all Americans to join us in making our country: a land of opportunity for our young; a home of security and dignity for our elderly; and a place of compassion and care for our afflicted.

I say to those responsible and forward-looking Republicans who put our country above their party—and there are thousands of them—we welcome you to the banner of Lyndon Baines Johnson. We welcome your support. [Applause.]

Yes, we extend the hand of fellowship. We ask you to join us tonight, for this President, my fellow Americans, is the President of all of the American people. He is the President in the great American tradition—for labor and for business; no class conflict; for the farm family that will receive the unending attention and care of this President; and for the city worker; for North and for the South; for East and for the West. This is our President. [Applause.]

President Lyndon Johnson represents—in fact he is the embodiment of the spirit of national unity, the embodiment of national purpose, the man in whose hands we place our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

I am proud to be the friend of this great President. I am very proud that he has asked this convention to select me as his running mate. [Applause.]

And I ask, you my fellow Americans—I ask you—to walk with us, to work with us, to march forward with us—to help President Johnson build the Great Society for America of the future.

Yes, let us continue. Let us, fellow Democrats and fellow Americans, go forward. Let us take those giant steps forward to which the President has called us, to end the shame of poverty, to end the injustice of prejudice and the denial of opportunity, to build the Great Society and to secure the freedom of man and the peace of the world. We can do no less, and to this, tonight, let us resolve to pledge our every effort.

Thank you.

[Standing ovation.]

Article

Congressional Record

August 31, 1934

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, APPRECIATION FOR TRIBUTES ON VICE-PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION, U.S. SENATE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana. To be quite frank, the eulogy to the living this morning, as was said earlier today, is much appreciated, yet unexpected.

First, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, who is a college classmate from the great University of Louisiana, for his kind words and his long friendship. I am honored by that friendship and by his good nature, tolerance, and understanding of me.

I wish to express my appreciation to every one of my colleagues who has spoken on this occasion. What could be finer, more meaningful, or more touching than the friendship and the good words of fellowship of one's colleagues in the U.S. Senate? This is a unique body. It is more like home than a legislative assembly, because we live here with one another almost as closely as we do with our own families. I have had the privilege of knowing my colleagues in the

3—RAC—L

Senate with the same feeling of intimacy one exhibits toward his loved ones in his own family circle. One of the most rewarding experiences of my life has been the privilege of knowing my colleagues in the Senate on both sides of the aisle and having the opportunity to be in their fellowship and in their circle of friendship.

It is not appropriate for me to comment upon the remarks of each of my colleagues. I am gratified to know, however, that my Democratic colleagues have been out on the hustings earlier, campaigning. There is no substitute for hard work; and there is nothing that will lend greater certainty to the victory that will be ours than the hard work that Democratic Senators are putting in now back home with our constituents.

I am honored beyond words by the comments of those who were willing to place my name in nomination, especially my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and others who were seconders. This was an honor that was really undeserved, but one that was ever appreciated. I express to them now my personal thanks, as I shall do privately and individually in the days ahead.

We had a good convention. As Democrats, we had our troubles. We would not have wanted to disappoint our friends on the other side of the aisle—nor did we. We did not even disappoint ourselves. We had a happy convention. One of the characteristics of the Democratic Party is that it has an aura of happiness and a sense of joy and exuberance. I believe that characteristic is contagious, and that the Nation will be a part of this great happiness that was so evident in the convention in Atlantic City.

I am highly honored to be the running mate of the President of the United States. I have known him long and well. I am particularly honored that the candidates of both parties come from Congress.

I must say with all fairness and respect that it has been my privilege to share in the friendship of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. I intend to respect him as a fine human being, as a good citizen, as a patriot, and as a man of conviction.

I have not had the privilege of knowing so well the gentleman from New York, the vice presidential candidate on the Republican ticket, but I know he is a man of considerable ability. He has a distinguished record. He has a fine family. I am certain that he is an articulate, effective spokesman for his cause.

Our President is a giant among men.

I know of his personality, of his drive, of his sense of commitment, of his deep dedication to the cause of democracy, freedom, and peace. I only hope that in some way, somehow, I may be able to ease his burden a little, and be of some genuine help in the months ahead in the campaign; and, if victory crowns our efforts, to be of help to him as his Vice President.

We are going to have a good campaign. I suppose, in a sense, it has really started. Nothing would please me more than to know that my esteemed and beloved friend from Illinois would, on occasion, extend his warm hand of good fellowship, even as he levels those body blows of Republican oratory upon me.

If I am ever to be the victim of a trouncing in political debate, I hope it will come from the Senator from Illinois, because in debate he is so masterly.

(At this point Mr. Dirksen walked across the aisle and shook hands with Mr. Humphrey, accompanied by applause from Senators and occupants of the galleries.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I know of no greater joy in the Senate than occasionally having to tussle with this eloquent, effusive, and excellent orator from the State of Illinois. He is a master of the art of debate and a superman in the use of the English language.

Would that he only had a better cause, he would be unbeatable; but even with less than a worthy cause, he is difficult—he is a firm adversary.

(At this point Mr. Salinger took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the words of friendship which have been spoken here today by the minority leader—and by all my other friends on the majority side. I can pledge to the minority leader that while the battle may be hard fought, we shall adhere to the standards to which he and the majority leader have adhered in the Senate.

Humphrey—

X X

4—RAC—L

If we will remember those standards, we shall encounter no difficulty.

In the past, wherever there should be cooperation, there was. There was always respect. Where the battleline had to be drawn, it was drawn sharply and cleanly. The battle was always fought fairly, so that whoever was the victor could say that he won with honor, and whoever was the loser could say that he lost with dignity.

If we can adhere to that line of conduct, America will be the better for it, the processes of democracy will have been well served and strengthened, and the relationships between men of good will will endure and will indeed be all the better.

I thank my colleagues very much for their words of encouragement. I also thank those who are not so willing to encourage as they are to more or less massage whatever aching body there may be.

Let me assure the minority leader that, one way or another, I shall be back in the Senate on that day in January soon to come. I would prefer, however, that I might always be in a position where my eyes could be cast upon the countenances of both the majority and minority leaders. I know of no better place to do so than in the chair now occupied by the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger].

I thank my colleagues. [Applause.]

Article
Congressional Record
September 3, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, MEDICAL CARE FOR OLDER PERSONS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY, U.S. SENATE

DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment would liberalize the Federal disability insurance program for persons who are now blind—and, perhaps even of greater importance—it would make disability insurance payments more readily available to more persons who become blind at the time when blindness occurs.

My amendment would do the following:

First. It would incorporate the generally recognized and widely used definition of blindness into the provisions of the disability insurance law; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20 degrees.

Second. It would allow any person who meets this definition in visual loss, and who has worked in social security covered employment for a year and a half—six quarters—to qualify for disability cash benefits.

Third. It would allow persons who meet the above requirements in measurable sightlessness and length of time in covered employment to draw disability benefits, and to continue to draw them, so long as they remain blind—and irrespective of their income or earnings, if they are fortunate enough to be employed.

This amendment seeks to make the disability insurance program a true insurance program against the economic catastrophe of blindness, against the economic disadvantages which result when blindness occurs in the life of a workingman.

Under present law, a person who is blind and unable to secure social security covered work for 5 years, cannot qualify for disability insurance payments. Reducing the present requirement from 20 to 6 quarters would be a much more reasonable and realistic requirement for people who, though oftentimes well qualified for gainful work, still encounter much difficulty in obtaining any work at all.

Under existing law, a worker who becomes blind but has not worked for 5 years in covered employment is denied the sustaining support of disability insurance payments at a time when his whole world has collapsed, when disaster has terminated his earnings and diminished his earning power, and he is faced with surrendering dignity and self-

5—RAC—L

pride and applying for public or private charity—hardly a sound basis upon which to rebuild a shattered life; hardly the basis for instilling self-confidence and reviving hope—so essential as the first step in rehabilitation and restoration to normal life and productive livelihood.

Under existing law, a person who is blind and earns but the meagerest of income, is denied disability insurance payments on the ground that even the meagerest earnings indicate such person is not disabled—or sufficiently disabled in the eyes of the law—to qualify for disability payments.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the economic consequences of blindness exist, and they continue to exist, even though a blind person is employed and earning, and these economic consequences are expensive to the blind person who has the will and the courage to compete in a profession or a business with sighted people, who must live and work in a society structured for sighted people.

Adoption of this amendment would provide a minimum floor of financial security to the person who must live and work without sight, who must pay a price in dollars and cents for wanting and daring to function in equality with sighted men.

I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from Louisiana. I hope he will take it to conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we are willing to have it considered in conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. From what source does this particular standard come?

Mr. HUMPHREY. From medical sources; the Institute for the Blind.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Institute for the Blind recommends that this standard be used?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Article

Our Foreign Policy

September 3, 1964

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—The following article, published in two parts, was written for the North American Newspaper Alliance. The first half appeared in the Washington Evening Star on September 3, the second on September 4.)

OUR FOREIGN POLICY: HUMPHREY SEES POWER SHIFT

Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota, the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, discusses U.S. policy toward Europe in this first of two articles from North American Newspaper Alliance. Tomorrow he gives his views on southeast Asia.

(By Hubert H. Humphrey, Democratic vice-presidential candidate)

One of the central facts of this decade is the change from a world dominated by two great powers toward a world characterized by a plurality of power centers. It is within this context that the free world must shape its foreign policy.

After the Second World War, the United States and the Soviet Union were the only dominant world powers; the decade of the 1950's saw the gradual diffusion of two-power control.

In the decade ahead, I believe the diffusion will continue and the plurality will become even more clearly defined.

As an example, I see no prospect of an early rapprochement between Moscow and Peiping. The "monolithic unity" of the Communist bloc is an archaic myth to which no one even bothers to pay lipservice any more. The Eastern European satellites are showing increasing independence and individuality.

6—RAC—L

As colonial issues recede in importance, the uncommitted nations will respond more and more to their individual national and regional interests.

There is no question that the underdeveloped areas of the world must experience a decade of development—a rise in the standard of living.

In the developed world, a revived Europe has come into its own as an equal partner of the United States. The challenge to Western statesmen will be to show that the fundamental unity of the Western nations will be strengthened, rather than weakened, by the broadening of independent strength in the West.

Our late President Kennedy, in a historic address on the Fourth of July in 1962 at Independence Hall, expressed the conviction that "Atlantic unity represents the true course of history. And the United States is determined to fulfill that destiny."

President Kennedy warned that "building the Atlantic partnership will not be cheaply or easily finished. But," he declared:

I will say here and now that the United States will be ready for a declaration of interdependence—that we will be prepared to discuss with a united Europe the ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partnership.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the NATO Alliance on April 3, 1964, echoed this theme in an address he titled, "Toward a Common Partnership":

The ways of our growing partnership are not easy. Though the union of Europe is her manifest destiny, the building of that unity is a long, hard job. But we, for our part, will never turn back to separated insecurity.

ALLIES WELCOME

We welcome the new strength of our transatlantic allies. We find no contradiction between national self-respect and interdependent mutual reliance. We are eager to share with the new Europe at every level of responsibility. We aim to share the lead in the search for new and stronger patterns of cooperation.

President Kennedy indicated over 2 years ago, that the United States is prepared to consider changes in the arrangements for defending the security of Europe, changes warranted by Europe's new economic and military strength.

I believe that we are today still prepared to discuss modifications in our joint defense system that a united Europe might propose.

But the question is asked: "Is there a contradiction between our expressed desire for a closer unity with our Atlantic Allies and the strong current trends toward plurality of power?"

I do not think so. For we in the United States, above all others, understand the principles of "unity with diversity" upon which our country was built.

DE GAULLE POSITION

There has been much talk of the disarray of the allies, and there are those who appear to take pleasure in predicting the early demise of both NATO and the Atlantic alliance. These Cassandra's, like others who prematurely wrote off Europe after World War II, will find that the reports of its death have been greatly exaggerated.

It would be foolish to pretend that life would not be somewhat simpler for us in the United States if President Charles de Gaulle shared our vision of a United Europe, its strength broadly based on the community of all its nations and joined with the English-speaking countries on both sides of the Atlantic.

Nevertheless, the difference in policy, no matter how inconvenient, should not prevent the United States from recognizing the emergence of a Western Europe that has changed from an ailing continent into a strong, vital force. And this, of course, includes the resurgence of France.

7—RAC—L

In our present concern about Europe, we should remember that France in the postwar era was the fountainhead of the movement toward European unity—unity in both the economic and political dimensions.

General de Gaulle made his outstanding contribution to the restoration of his country by ending the Algerian war and grappling effectively with economics and political instability at home.

He was a staunch ally of the United States during the Cuban crisis and has proven impervious to the rocket rattling of Kremlin leadership. No one will underestimate these positive contributions.

To be sure, we regret that the resurgence of French nationalism has cooled her ardor for NATO and European multilateralism.

Although the present French policy impairs progress toward European unity, we must remember that in the long run, no lasting united Europe can be achieved that does not involve the active participation of France.

FRANCE AND THE WORLD

It is natural to expect that France would want to reassert her leadership in world affairs. She has already asserted it in the postwar economic and technical renaissance of Europe.

Just as revolutionary France changed the face of autocratic Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries, I hope that the republican idealism of modern France will make the positive contribution of which it is capable in many parts of the world.

France and Britain have for years borne a heavy burden of foreign aid. In recent years Germany, Belgium, and Italy have begun to expand their activities in the less developed countries.

We welcome this growing participation by Europe in programs of foreign assistance to the developing regions of the world. Now that independence has been largely achieved in Africa, we can appreciate more and more the great contribution that Europe has made to the development of this continent.

And I am confident that the continued assumption by Europe of the primary responsibility for insuring the development and stability of Africa will have a sympathetic response in this country.

But Europe's role need not be limited to one continent. In discussing our own primary commitment to Latin America, I have always emphasized the large role which European countries can and should play.

Our concept of hemispheric unity should not be defined in any exclusive sense that would discourage a greater Western European contribution to the social, economic, and cultural development of Latin America.

Indeed, we should actively encourage Europe to expand its involvement in Latin America, both in terms of long-term development assistance and expansion of existing cultural and educational programs.

So I would hope that the new Europe will be outward looking, not inward looking, and that it will struggle to meet the problems and needs of the presently underdeveloped areas, which in many instances it understands better than does the United States.

That is why the European contribution to our joint efforts for world betterment is of such transcendent importance in the years ahead. I believe the task can be performed more effectively by a united Europe than by a Europe whose powers are dissipated by superfluous nationalism.

I believe that President Johnson shares this concern about Atlantic partnership, about the role of the Atlantic alliance in world affairs.

In the face of recurring difficulties, he has remained calm, patient, and resolute in his determination "to move onward to that closer partnership which is so plainly in our common interest."

OUR FOREIGN POLICY: PROBLEM IS COMPLEX IN VIETNAM

In recent weeks, the United States has been challenged to match deeds with words in responding to an unprovoked attack by North Vietnamese PT boats in the Gulf of Tonkin.

President Johnson's prompt and decisive response to this naked aggression should demonstrate to our friends everywhere that our power remains pre-eminent and our devotion to freedom firm, and to our foes that the United States is no "Paper Tiger."

8—RAC—L

At the same time, our friends should be reassured that this measured response to the attack proves that we are prepared to meet aggression in whatever form, that we shall not be forced to choose between humiliation and holocaust, and that the firmness of our response in no way diminishes our devotion to peace.

Our action in the Gulf of Tonkin is a part of the continuing struggle which the American people must be prepared to wage if we are to preserve free civilization as we know it and resist the expansion of Communist power.

RETAIN LEADING ROLE

It is a further indication that the breakup of the bipolar world which has characterized the international relations of the past two decades and the easing of tensions between East and West following the nuclear test ban may have changed the pattern of U.S. involvement in world affairs, but it has not diminished it.

We retain the role of leader of the free world that we inherited at the end of World War II, and in that role our responsibilities remain worldwide.

In that role, our responsibility to freedom extends to distant Asia as well as to countries on our doorstep.

To those critics, friends and foe alike, who ask what we are doing in southeast Asia, our reply in the simplest terms possible is that we are there to prevent the Communists from imposing their power on the people of South Vietnam, to assist the South Vietnamese people to prevent local Communist forces—directed and controlled from North Vietnam and backed by the support of Communist China—from taking over the country.

AGREEMENTS CLEAR

The present crisis would not confront us today if the Hanoi and Peiping regimes had abided by the letter and spirit of the Geneva agreements of 1954 on Indochina, which established a truce line dividing North and South Vietnam at the 17th parallel and the neutrality of both sections.

The Communists were to withdraw to the north and the non-Communists to the south. Neither country was to be used as a military base for the resumption of fighting or to carry out an aggressive policy.

The agreements were clearly intended to guarantee the independence of each zone from intrusion or interference by the other. Each part of the divided country would be left alone to solve its own domestic problems in peace.

From the start, the Communists failed to live up to the letter or spirit of the agreements—in other words, “they violated the intended “neutrality,” guaranteed by the 1954 Geneva agreements. What new guarantees could a 1964 promise of neutrality offer?

Three American Presidents, one Republican and two Democrats—Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have considered the defense of this area to be essential to American vital interests.

It is not a matter of partisan difference. This was demonstrated once again when the overwhelming majority of both parties in the Congress backed the joint resolution in support of the President's action in the Gulf of Tonkin.

What happened in the waters off South Vietnam should be of interest and a lesson to all of our friends and allies. President Johnson has reminded us that “aggression unchecked is aggression unleashed.”

At the same time, the President, speaking before the American Bar Association, concluded:

It has never been the policy of an American President to systematically place in hazard the life of this Nation by threatening nuclear war. No American President has ever pursued so irresponsible a course. Our firmness at moments of crisis, has always been matched by restraint; our determination by care.

9—RAC—L

NO EASY VICTORY

The independence and security of South Vietnam therefore will be achieved only in a hard, costly, complex struggle—which will be waged chiefly in South Vietnam.

One would hope that discussion here at home during an electoral campaign would not lead to misunderstanding abroad. It would be a tragedy if rash words here at home were to inspire rash actions in southeast Asia.

The Vietnamese people—who have tirelessly and courageously borne the “long twilight struggle” for so long—know full well that there is no quick or easy victory to be won.

The struggle in Vietnam is as much a political and social struggle as a military one. What has been needed in Vietnam is a cause for which to fight, a program for which the people of Vietnam will sacrifice and die.

What has been needed in Vietnam is a government that can inspire hope, embodying the aspirations of both the educated elite in the cities and the peasant masses in the countryside.

WELFARE IS CONCERN

What has been needed is a government in which the people of Vietnam have a stake. For the peasant who has known only the sacrifices and ravages of war for nearly 20 years, and never the benefits of modern civilization, government is no longer a burden to be patiently borne, but an oppressor to be cast off.

What has been needed is not just guns and tanks, but schools and hospitals, pig production, clean water, land reform, and administrative reform.

What has been needed is a government that is deeply concerned about the welfare of the peasants and that holds a high regard for their lives and fortunes.

The task of government leaders in helping the people is enormous.

Victory will not come only from training armies or increasing economic production and improving the material lot of the masses. What is equally important is the problem of inspiring hope, of commanding the intellectual and emotional allegiance of those who will shape the society—which includes both the elite groups and the peasant leaders.

DOOR ALWAYS OPEN

While our task in Vietnam is clearly to make aggression seem hopeless, the President has said:

The door is always open to any settlement which assures the independence of South Vietnam, and its freedom to seek help for its protection. No negotiated settlement is possible as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force.”

The outcome of the conflict in southeast Asia will have repercussions for the free world in other areas of the world. Our actions are being watched in Moscow and Peiping.

The technique of war by externally supported insurgency remains a favored instrument in the Communist arsenal. If we prove that this kind of war can be defeated, we will be contributing to the achievement of peace not only in Vietnam and in Asia, but throughout the world.

Minneapolis, Minn.
Northrup Auditorium
September 5, 1964

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, OPENING CAMPAIGN, THE
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Tonight marks the opening of my campaign—as the Democratic Party's candidate for Vice President—to keep Lyndon B. Johnson in the White House for 4 more years as President of the United States. I accept this assignment with humility, determination, and enthusiasm.

I intend to carry this message to every corner of America: The Democratic Party has a winning candidate for President and a winning program for the people.

10—RAC—L

We have nominated for President a man possessing those rare qualities of leadership and experience which these critical times so clearly demand in the leader of the United States. And, as a party, we have compiled a record of accomplishment—unparalleled in modern times—which we intend to take to the people of America with pride and confidence.

Let me state the proposition clearly: the Democrats have the ingredients for victory in November! We know it. The Republicans know it. Even the Goldwaterites know it.

This homecoming leaves me with only one conclusion: the Democratic Party—under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson—is on the victory trail.

But, my friends, let me add that we face a difficult and challenging campaign in the weeks ahead. We must take nothing for granted. We must wage the most intensive campaign in American history. And we must set before the American people—in all sections of this land—specific facts on why a Democratic victory is so essential to the continued peace, prosperity and progress of the United States. And these things we surely intend to do.

You can count on one thing: the Democratic Party is going to earn the overwhelming vote of confidence which will be ours on election day.

There is one major issue we intend to bring before the American people: Which candidate—President Lyndon B. Johnson or Senator Barry Goldwater—is best equipped intellectually and emotionally to assume the responsibility of leading this Nation and the free world for the next 4 years?

Why is this decision of such fundamental importance to the future of America? In a very real sense, the Presidency is the heart of this great Republic. It is the President who provides the energy and commitment which motivate the other branches of our Government. And it is the President who gives definition and meaning to America's sense of national purpose.

The President must be a true leader—not only in the sense of being an able executive, but also in the sense of being an educator and teacher. He must be a man who sees opportunities rather than obstacles. And he must be a man who wills achievement and possesses the energy and spirit to achieve that which he wills.

In this election the choice for President involves the peace and security of this Nation and the entire world in the nuclear age. And this choice surely involves the continued prosperity and progress of our citizens here at home.

The American people know it takes a giant of a man to be President of the United States. They know the Presidency calls for unbounded strength and courage—the kind Lyndon B. Johnson displayed during those tragic and agonizing days last November, when our beloved John F. Kennedy was taken from us.

I will never forget President Johnson's stirring words in this moment of national grief: "This is our challenge—not to hesitate, not to pause, not to turn about and linger over this evil moment, but to continue on our course so that we may fulfill the destiny that history has set for us."

Lyndon Johnson comforted us, inspired us, and led us through this crisis—and on to new heights of accomplishment and glory.

At the heart of the Kennedy-Johnson administration has been one word—responsibility. And the American people know that the Presidency demands the highest exercise of responsibility—at all times and in all places.

In his historic inaugural address, our martyred and beloved President Kennedy proclaimed: "* * * I do not shrink from this responsibility—I welcome it * * *"

This young President—this giant of a President—saved this Nation from the horrors of nuclear war when he ordered the Soviet Union to remove the missiles from Cuba. And President Johnson—with the greatest restraint, precision, and determination—ordered that the bases sheltering the enemy torpedo boats in the Gulf of Tonkin be destroyed, but he also made it crystal clear that the United States planned no further attacks if the aggression ceased. This is what responsibility means when you are President of the United States.

11—RAC—L

But the American people also understand what responsibility is not. It is not the deliberate advocacy and support of extremism—however, it may be defined or explained and/or reexplained. Nor is responsibility a seemingly endless stream of confusing and contradictory public statements which only leave Republicans and Democrats equally befuddled. And responsibility surely is not the use of meaningless generalities, empty slogans, and impetuous schemes to resolve the awesome problems and crises of our age.

Such behavior, in fact, is the very repudiation of responsibility. And such actions could never be countenanced in a President of this country.

The Presidency requires a leader with vision and determination, a man who understands the challenges of the age and who proposes effective responses to these challenges. President Johnson demonstrated this leadership, this vision, and this determination when he said to the Nation upon the death of our late President: "Today in this moment of new resolve, I would say to all my fellow Americans, let us continue."

Leadership is more than words—and deeds are more revealing than rhetoric. After that ghastly day in November, President Johnson stepped in boldly and led the Congress and the Nation through the 10 most productive months in our history.

Listen to this rollcall of major bills enacted during President Johnson's brief tenure in office: the college aid bill, the vocational education bill, the tax cut and reform bill, the cotton and wheat bill, the civil rights bill, the mass transportation bill, the wilderness bill, the antipoverty bill, the Food for Peace Act, the land and water conservation fund bill, the Nurses Training Act, the Housing and Urban Renewal Act, the food stamp bill, and aid to higher education.

This week the Senate approved a program of hospital care for the elderly under social security, and we believe it will become law this session.

This is the record of a "can do" President striving to secure the blessings of peace, prosperity and progress for every American family. This is a record of deeds—when other candidates must rely solely on words.

Leadership in the Presidency is also the ability to bring together men of conflicting views, so that their differences may be resolved in a spirit of mutual understanding and respect. This Nation needs a President who seeks to bind our people together, who strives to build a just and joyful community of men and who creates unity from division and consensus from conflict.

President Johnson refers frequently to his favorite scriptural passage from Isaiah: "Come, let us reason together." But the President not only knows the verse of scripture, he applies this wisdom in the conduct of his Office.

What this country does not need is a man who specializes in driving away those with whom he disagrees, who scorns the path of moderation and accommodation, and who sows the seeds of disunity and discord even within his own party.

The American people also know that their President must possess the qualities of compassion and human understanding. They look for his advocacy of those policies and programs which create equality of opportunity, which bring the blessings of prosperity to the less fortunate, and which seek to include all Americans in the abundant and rewards of this great land.

Listen to the words of President Johnson as he describes his vision of the Great Society:

The Great Society rests on abundance and liberty for all. It demands an end to poverty and racial injustice * * * The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents * * * It is a challenge constantly renewed, beckoning us toward a destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor.

12--RAC--L

President Johnson is a man who understands that compassion is not cowardice and that concern for others is not weakness. He realizes that, without an opportunity to participate fully in the fruits of this society, no man can experience the joy and satisfaction which comes from creative self-fulfillment.

President Johnson is also a man who understands the human and material needs of a dynamic and growing America: teachers and schools, engineers and factories, doctors, nurses and hospitals, skilled workers and modernized industrial plants, rebuilt cities, clean rivers, expanded recreational facilities, and countless other necessities for a happy and satisfying life.

He knows that these needs establish responsibilities which can only be met by the combined efforts of all segments of American society—both public and private laboring together in pursuit of these common objectives. Not the Federal Government against the States, or counties against the municipalities, but one free people joined in common cause to give new and richer meaning to that glorious word—America.

In this election of 1964 the people of America will evaluate the respective candidates for President in terms of strength, courage, responsibility, leadership, compassion and vision. There can be only one choice: Lyndon B. Johnson. This is the man for America.

As the people elect Lyndon B. Johnson as President of the United States, I am confident they will also carry the Democratic Party to victory in all sections of American. For this is a party of all the people—not a party of business or labor, or the rich or the poor. Nor is it a party of the North or the South or the East or the West. As President Johnson said last week in his acceptance speech, it is the all-American party for all Americans.

It is the party which takes seriously the responsibility for advocating and executing those policies which promote the progress of our people at home and which protect the interests of the United States overseas.

And the overwhelming majority of the American people know this, even if certain candidates for public office do not.

For example, most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—know that the Democratic administration initiated those policies which produced 42 months of sustained economic expansion—the longest period of peacetime growth in history.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—know that the Democratic administration reduced the unemployment rate in this country from almost 7 percent in 1961 to 5 percent today.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—know that President Kennedy and President Johnson have built our military strength until it exceeds the military might of all nations, in all wars, in the history of this planet.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—rejoiced at President Kennedy's successful campaign to ban nuclear tests from the atmosphere, thereby reducing the dangers of a nuclear arms race and lowering the amount of radioactive fallout in the air we breathe.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—have joined in President Johnson's call for a war on poverty and share his inspiring vision of a Great Society.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And, finally, most Americans—both Democrats and Republicans—were greatly heartened by the Senate's decision this week to provide hospital care for the elderly under the social security system.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Most Americans, in short, have supported those policies and decisions of the Kennedy-Johnson administration which have called forth the greatness of America and her people. And under the leadership of the Democratic Party, this Nation has reached the goal which John F. Kennedy set before us only 4 years ago: America is moving forward again. We are meeting our responsibilities of the present and preparing for the challenges of the future.

13--RAC--L

There is one special responsibility which every candidate for public office bears in this presidential campaign. We must—above all else—conduct ourselves in a fashion which advances the cause of democracy in America and around the world.

Making democracy work is the most challenging task facing every American—whether Democrat, Republican, or Independent. The history of man's unsuccessful attempts to govern himself demonstrates that an operating system of democracy is never an accident. America is able to count herself blessed among the nations of the world because generations of our citizens have possessed the courage, faith, wisdom, and determination to preserve democracy on these shores.

Let us accept this legacy of freedom proudly. Let us pledge ourselves to conduct a campaign worthy of our country, worthy of our party, and worthy of a great people.

I pledge that my campaign for the office of Vice President will be conducted with dignity, courtesy, forthrightness, and respect for honest differences of opinion. The perpetuation of democracy in America is too important to ourselves and to all mankind to permit standards of conduct any less stringent than these.

Above the Ionic pillars of this great auditorium—above the name of Cyrus Northrup, for whom this auditorium was named—there is an inscription that has always inspired me ever since my early days on this campus. That inscription reads:

The University of Minnesota

Founded in the faith that men are ennobled by understanding
Dedicated to the advancement of learning and the search for
truth

Devoted to the instruction of youth and the welfare of the
State.

If I were asked to summarize my philosophy, I could hardly improve on those words.

And if I were asked to state what we seek to do in the campaign of 1964, I would reply that we will try to carry to the American people these same inspiring thoughts, these same ideals, these same goals.

For, my friends, these are the goals of my party. These are the ideals of our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson.

And these are the thoughts that will inspire us as we march to victory in November.

Barberton, Ohio
Labor Day
September 7, 1964

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

This is the most important Labor Day in America in many years—one of the most important since a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress first established Labor Day as a national holiday in 1894.

Traditionally, Labor Day opens the presidential campaign every 4 years.

Traditionally, the candidates of both major parties declare themselves for strong and progressive trade unionism in America.

But not this year.

Normally, on Labor Day, each candidate promises the help of the Government to every American to secure a decent neighborhood.

But not this year.

Every Labor Day past, both candidates have said that government should care about a decent living for farmers, a good education for all children, and equal opportunity for all Americans.

But not this year.

These traditional goals have had bipartisan support in this great and rich Nation.

But not this year.

Senator Goldwater rejects these goals. We in the Democratic Party, however, still support them. Lyndon Baines Johnson gave that pledge in his acceptance speech in Atlantic City when he said:

"These are the goals toward which I will lead if the American people choose to follow."

14—RAC—L

In this election of 1964 the American voters have a clear choice—between vigor or vacuum, between progress or retreat, between responsibility or rashness.

I can testify that the Republican candidate is a man of his word. And I fear that he would fulfill his promises to lead this Nation taillong into the 19th century.

And I can testify that Lyndon Baines Johnson is also a man of his word. I know he will keep his promise to lead this country forward.

We have the record to prove it.

Four years ago, John F. Kennedy pointed to an economy suffering its fourth postwar recession—the last three of which were in a Republican administration. He pointed to a decline of 8 percent in industrial production in the previous year. He talked of an economy that was stagnant because its retail sales were down more than \$1 billion a month—business investment had declined \$2.5 billion, and corporate profits before taxes had dropped over \$9 billion at an annual rate. Unemployment had reached almost 7 percent of the labor force.

John F. Kennedy spoke facts, not generalities—and the facts in 1960, after 8 Republican years, were bad.

But the Democratic Party made promises—to do something about the economic stagnation of a great country. You have a right to ask: What has been done about those promises? You have a right to ask: What are the facts today?

In 1961, the gross national product—the sum total of what the entire economy produces—was \$501.4 billion. Today it is \$618.6 billion. That is an increase of \$117 billion, or more than 23 percent.

Industrial production has risen more than 28 percent.

Retail sales have increased more than \$4 billion a month or more than \$48 billion a year.

Business investment has increased more than 30 percent—corporate profits rose 46 percent before taxes, and more than 60 percent after taxes.

Total employment in the last 3 years has increased 5.7 million and is now at an alltime high of 72 million persons.

In July 1964, the unemployment rate was pushed below 5 percent for the first time in more than 4 years.

Total income after taxes—that is, spendable income—of the average American family of four rose over \$1,200 or more than 15 percent.

This has been accomplished in a climate of relatively stable prices. In fact, wholesale prices are slightly lower than 4 years ago. The price record in the last 4 years in America is better than that of any industrial period of economic growth in our history and the end is not in sight. In 1965 the gross national product will exceed \$650 billion.

These achievements are no accident. Your Government, under Democratic leadership, made coordinated and deliberate use of all policy instruments available to eliminate recession and promote economic growth.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration stepped up its expenditures, stimulated housing, bolstered unemployment compensation systems, and made credit more plentiful.

And as economic recovery became evident, your Government, under Democratic leadership, geared the Nation's fiscal and monetary policies to promote higher levels of income, more production, and greater employment. It did not choke off business by increasing interest rates needlessly or by curtailing essential Federal programs.

Your Democratic administration also began to push legislation to establish even greater economic independence for our people and to keep the economy growing.

The largest tax cut in history was enacted—to put more money in the pockets of people and to stimulate business investment.

We recognized the problem of economically depressed areas and enacted legislation for area redevelopment—to restore these regions and the people in them to economic health.

We understood that men were standing in line for jobs which had been eliminated by machines so we launched a manpower development and training program.

Your Democratic administration knew that we were in the midst of a technological and scientific revolution which was changing the whole manpower and employment market.

15—RAC—L

And we knew that education was the key to the problem. So we began to overhaul vocational education, to provide for technical education, to make it possible for our young people to have the education they will need to participate fully in today's industrialized economy.

The Democratic Party takes pride in this record of keeping its word to the American people. John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson kept the promises they made in 1960. They got this country moving again.

Yes, this great and strong Nation, this rich and prosperous land is on the move today. It is going forward to new levels of achievement. But no party asking for the responsibility of guiding this Nation in the future can claim that the job is complete.

There are still challenges before us. You remember President Kennedy's favorite lines from the pen of Robert Frost:

The woods are lovely, dark, and deep,
But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

We will walk those miles. We will keep those promises.

Our population is growing faster than ever before. It will double by the end of this century. We must build at least 2 million homes a year. We must build more schools, more hospitals, more highways, and all other facilities—equal in amount to all the facilities that have been built in the United States since it was first settled. And we must do this in the next 40 years.

There must be a job for every American who wants work and can work. There are still too many unemployed. The postwar baby crop is just now hitting the labor market. This, plus the impact of automation, requires us to find 300,000 jobs per month—as many new jobs each month as there are people in Akron.

Sixty-nine million children have been born since 1949. Most of them are still in school. Today we do not have enough classrooms or enough teachers. And within the next 10 years we will face another baby boom.

This is a scientific and technological age. We must see to it that man is the master of the machine not its servant. As President Johnson has said, machines must be made "a boon not a bane" to humanity.

Each day 1,000 Americans reach the age of 65. By 1980 there will be 26 million people over 65 years of age. We have a moral obligation to honor the Biblical command: "Honor thy father and mother."

There must be no poverty in a land as rich in human and material resources as America.

And there must be no second-class citizenship in America.

In short—this must be a land of opportunity for all, for the word "opportunity" is at the heart of America.

The years ahead can be the most glorious years in American history—economically, politically, socially, spiritually. As President Johnson has said, "We are on the edge of an abundance which can tower over all the gains of the past. We can build a nation which will enlarge and enrich the life of every citizen."

We can do it. We have the wit and the wisdom. We have the resources and the skill. The only question is whether we have the will, the heart, the vision, and the moral determination to succeed.

This is a big country. It takes a big man to be President of the United States. It takes a man with a warm heart and a creative mind. In 1964, that man is Lyndon B. Johnson.

He is a man who welcomes the challenges of America and the responsibilities of leadership toward that "destiny where the meaning of our lives matches the marvelous products of our labor."

Lyndon Johnson is a man who understands the needs and the aspirations of the American people—a man who does not stand apart from the men and women of America.

I believe that most men and women of America welcomed the tax cut and the economic stimulus it provided.

But not Senator Goldwater.

I believe that most men and women of America welcomed a minimum wage of \$1.25 and the extended coverage provided by our Kennedy-Johnson administration.

16—RAC—L

But not Senator Goldwater.

I believe that most men and women of America welcomed the programs of area redevelopment, manpower training, and antipoverty.

But not Senator Goldwater.

I believe that most men and women of America welcomed expanding the facilities of higher education, providing more loans for students to go to college, and increasing medical training facilities, and loans for medical students.

But not Senator Goldwater.

I believe that most men and women of America welcomed our passage of a program to employ and train jobless young men and women in a youth conservation corps and a job training corps.

But not Senator Goldwater.

And I believe that most men and women of America want to see our elderly citizens live their golden years in dignity—protected by a hospital insurance program financed under social security.

But not Senator Goldwater.

Never in the history of America have we witnessed such a record of protest against progress by the candidate of a major political party. The temporary Republican spokesman does, however, offer this country a choice:

A choice between action and reaction.

A choice between progress and retreat.

A choice between hope and despair.

A choice between giving your brother bread or a stone when he asks for help.

And the temporary Republican spokesman also offers this country an echo: When Senator Goldwater attacked the vote on medicare last week, he used words from a dead past when earlier Republicans attacked Franklin D. Roosevelt for establishing the social security system.

There is, then, in this election both a choice and an echo. But what a choice. What an echo.

I am confident that the American people will make known their choice in terms both loud and clear. They will vote for progress. They will vote for Lyndon B. Johnson and the Democratic Party.

America needs a President with vision—not an agent of division.

America requires leadership based on trust—not the chaos resulting from distrust.

America seeks a voice which urges us to go forward—not the disconsolate and dreary sounds of “no, no, no.”

President Johnson has called on us to stand tall and to do more than we have done. He has pledged that he will be at our side. But he has also asked for our help.

I believe that most Americans will be at the side of President Johnson this November. He will have our help.

Article

News release from office of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Washington, D.C.

September 9, 1964

PRESS RELEASE OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

HUMPHREY RAPS MILLER ON IMMIGRATION “NONSENSE”; SAYS GOP CANDIDATE LACKS “FAITH IN AMERICA”

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey today assailed as “patently false and nonsense” the claim by Representative William E. Miller that President Johnson’s immigration bill would triple immigration and cause unemployment.

Noting that “we are a nation of immigrants,” Humphrey asked: “When did Congressman Miller lose faith in America.”

The Democratic vice-presidential nominee pointed out that if present laws were effective 100 years ago Senator Barry Goldwater’s grandfather “possibly could not have come to the United States.”

Miller, in a speech on Monday in South Bend, Ind., said that if the administration bill passed, “the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold.”

17—RAC—L

Following is the text of Senator Humphrey's statement:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

First of all, Congressman Miller has his facts wrong. He states that if President Johnson's immigration bill is passed, "the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold." Now, of course, that is patently false and nonsense. The present law allows 155,500 persons to enter the United States each year. The President's immigration bill increases this by only 14,500. Now that surely doesn't mean a threefold increase. That kind of arithmetic just doesn't make sense.

But the important question is: When did Congressman Miller lose faith in America? Why, we are a nation of immigrants. Not 6 weeks ago Senator Dirksen, Republican leader in the Senate, offered in nomination a man whom he described as "the grandson of a peddler, a proud, honorable, and spirited man who left his ancestral home in Europe at an early age and came to this land a century ago." Now it is a fact that for the past 40 years our immigration law has in effect, discriminated against some peoples because of race, creed, or national origin. In fact, if the present law had been in effect 100 years ago Senator Goldwater's grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

Now this is an area of discrimination in our national life that we have not yet brought into line with the rest of our laws and we ought to change that pattern of law. If Congressman Miller is against the change that's his business. But we are for it and the people can make their choice on November 3.

Article
Congressional Record
September 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, THE CATTLE SITUATION, U.S. SENATE

THE CATTLE SITUATION

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in my years in the U.S. Senate I believe I have demonstrated a deep and abiding interest in the affairs of American agriculture. I have shared the deep concern of the American farmer and the American rancher when he has been faced with the difficulties of climatic conditions and market price over which he has no control.

I have consistently sponsored and supported legislation and other governmental action designed to improve the position of the American farmer and rancher in the marketplace. Many times I have taken this floor to discuss in detail the problems of that segment of our farm economy that is considered basic in our present farm laws. Today, however, I rise to discuss a facet of our agricultural economy that is not covered in the so-called basics but is, in fact, really basic to American agriculture and indeed to our economy.

It is a fundamental fact that in our agricultural economy the production of cattle and calves is the most important single source of American agriculture cash income. Farmers and ranchers on 1.5 million farms receive more than \$8 billion annually of our total agricultural income from the sale of their meat animals. This accounts for about 22 percent of our annual cash farm income. In my own State of Minnesota the sale of cattle and calves from our farms and feedlots amounts to \$337 million, which is 23 percent of all farm commodity sales.

The production and sale of beef animals directly affects a great majority of those engaged in American farming. Cattle feeding in America consumes a tremendous amount of our grain; and the vast production of grass and forage on our farms and ranges is consumed by livestock which when processed provides abundant supplies of

18—RAC—L

meat and dairy products. In the exciting drama of the revolution in American agriculture, nothing is quite so dramatic or has contributed ~~American agriculture, nothing is quite so dramatic or has contributed~~ fattened in our feedlots.

deleted line

X

Beef synonymous with prosperity

Mr. President, beef on the table of American is synonymous with the prosperity of our own people. But this has developed because of the God-given wealth of our range and farm land, the ingenuity and ability of our farmers and ranchers, and the outstanding distributive system of our Nation.

These past several months, however, I have shared the deep concern of the cattlemen, who have been faced with the results of the abundance they have produced. During these months I have met with representatives of all segments of the meat and livestock industry. I have discussed with them the basic underlying economic factors that brought about their difficulties.

I have discussed this matter in detail with all the agencies of Government concerned with agricultural problems. And I have spent considerable time discussing the problem with President Johnson, a cattleman in his own right, who is sympathetic to and understands the problems of the cattle raisers and feeders.

I must admit, Mr. President, that I have been attempting to get better educated on the problems of the beef industry. The President of the United States, with his intimate knowledge of ranching and his further understanding of the other facets of the beef producing mechanism of American agriculture, has been an apt teacher.

We must realize that this beef industry of ours is an immense, a tremendous, a far-reaching mechanism that touches practically every segment of our agricultural economy. Nor is it a business that is confined to the Western States. Neither is it a business that is confined to the Corn Belt States.

An individual business

The production of beef and beef animals is part and parcel of our agricultural economy in practically every State of the Union. It is an individual business, whether it be a small cow and calf outfit in western Texas or northern Montana, or a feedlot in the sugarbeet area of Colorado or Nebraska, or a huge farm feedlot in the State of Minnesota or California. It is a business that of necessity is tied to the land but calls on our total agricultural economy, from the purchase or sale of feeder calves, to the purchase of corn and other feed grains, to the financing of a feedlot, to the shipment and final sale.

It is a dramatic business. It is a challenging business. I wish to report to the men and women who are engaged in this great cattle and beef industry the situation they face and what this administration is doing about it.

I want them to know that I am aware of their problem and am determined to be of aid to them in the tradition they so often have espoused and so valiantly advocated; namely, that Government should be an aid, not a hindrance; that, basically, the cowmen of America in the years I have been in the Senate have told me time after time that they believe firmly in a free market, that they want only fairplay to do the job they do so well of producing beef for the American people.

Mr. President, I have put together the facts as they relate today to the beef and cattle industry in the United States. I shall not attempt either to add to or detract from them, but merely ask that the following be accepted as an honest analysis of the situation and then I will add my own comments.

First. Beef cattle consume about 15 percent of all our feed grains.

Second. Many rural towns, particularly in the West, depend largely on cattle income to support schools and other community services. Commercial as well as farm feedlots operate simply as manufacturing plants, utilizing grain and forage to feed cattle to market weights, producing our high-quality fed beef.

Third. Beef and veal are major foods in the U.S. diet. Consumers count on adequate supplies at reasonable prices. Over a sixth of consumer food expenditures go to purchase beef, veal, and related products.

Jobs and incomes generated

Fourth. The marketing bill for beef—between the ranch and the table—is almost \$6 billion each year. This total generates jobs and incomes for many thousands of people in over 30,000 packinghouses, auction markets, and similar facilities, and in over 200,000 retail stores which handle meat products, and in transportation firms which move feed, cattle, beef, and products of the slaughtering industry in all areas.

Fifth. The cattle industry depends heavily on banks and other financial organizations to finance its operations. Cattle feeders typically depend on commercial credit to finance both cattle and feed purchases. Turnover is high and credit needs amount to many billions of dollars each year.

Sixth. We already export important quantities of animal products, although as yet beef exports have not reached major proportions. In 1963, exports of livestock and livestock products were valued at \$364 million, including \$54 million in meat products—mostly variety meats and pork. The remainder was largely tallow, hides and skins, and lard. Imports of beef and veal amounted to \$354 million in 1963.

Seventh. We have established the principle that the trade negotiations on agricultural and industrial products must proceed at the same time. As Governor Herter has put it:

The United States will enter into no ultimate agreement unless significant progress is registered toward trade liberalization in agricultural as well as industrial products.

Agricultural exports from the United States make up about 26 percent of total exports. They will be valued at more than \$6 billion this year. Nearly three-fourths of these sales are for dollars and they represent a key contribution to our balance of payments.

U.S. imports down

Eighth. The major exporting countries have reduced their shipments of beef and veal to the United States. During the first 7 months of this year U.S. imports of beef and veal from all countries were 19 percent lower than in the same period of 1963. In the rest of the year, imports are expected to be down about 40 percent, a drop of more than 25 percent for the year as a whole. For example, imports of boneless beef were down in July of 1964 to 39,909,850 pounds from 95,311,665 pounds a year ago. Imports in July 1964, of all beef and veal were only 46 percent as great as in July 1963.

The drought and other factors in central Europe and Argentina have reduced supplies of beef in Western Europe, at the same time that the Western European demand for beef is showing strong increases because of a growing population and rising incomes.

Ninth. The cowherd on January 1, 1964, was 32 million head as compared with only 24 million in 1958—an increase of one-third. The number of cattle on feed continued to increase sharply, and the number on feed in January 1964 was almost 9 million head, or over 30 percent higher than in 1958.

Average market weights continued to increase, and by the early spring of 1964 were some 70 pounds per animal higher than in 1958. As a result of larger marketings at heavier weights, beef slaughter in 1963 exceeded that in 1962 by 8 percent. Slaughter during the first 6 months of 1964 was 13 percent above that in the first 6 months of 1963. The production of meats competitive with beef also increased. Pork production in 1963 was the largest since 1944. Broiler production in 1963 reached an alltime high. Because of the nature of our population increase, U.S. consumers can be expected to increase their total consumption of beef by 3 to 4 percent from 1 year to the next without putting any downward pressure on prices.

Tenth. Imports of beef and veal reached an alltime high in 1963 and accounted for 9 percent of the beef and veal consumed in the United States last year. When live cattle imports are included, this figure is just over 10 percent. Most imported meat is of manufacturing quality and is used largely in the production of sausage, hamburger, and similar manufactured products.

20—RAC—L

Constructive action demanded

These are the facts. It is obvious that no single action by the Government, by an individual State, or by farmers and ranchers acting individually or collectively, can solve the problems of this industry. As delicate and as vast and as all embracing as this industry is, it demands constructive action on several fronts, bearing in mind always that our objective is a sound, constructive future for this great industry.

I am proud to report that this administration has taken several actions that are constructive and positive and aimed at one goal—to improve the price level without interfering with the free market. This administration has taken the following positive steps to help the cattlemen of America:

First. Special merchandising and promotion programs. So far this year the USDA in cooperation with the food and livestock industries has conducted the most intensive effort ever undertaken to increase consumer purchases of beef. The response has been amazing. Major food chains report increased beef sales of 8 to 20 percent this year compared with last year.

Second. Since March, the Government has conducted a special beef purchase program to procure supplies of beef for the school lunch program and to feed needy families. Purchases of both frozen and canned beef are being made and expenditures thus far exceed \$120 million. The frozen beef purchased is in the form of roasts and ground beef and the canned beef purchased consists of both choice and lower grades. The purchase program is being continued on a week-to-week basis so that purchases may be directed to do the most good for the cattle industry and the general public.

The Defense Department has increased its beef purchases in order to build up supplies. The Defense Department also is buying up to 3 million pounds of beef a month in the United States for its overseas commissary needs. It has switched from overseas purchases to buying U.S. produced beef.

Changes in world meat trade

Third. Voluntary agreements were negotiated with Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, and Mexico early this year which limit their shipments of beef and veal to the United States. These agreements call for a reduction in shipments of about 6 percent below 1963. In addition, strong consumer demand for meat in Europe, as well as the Near East and Japan, combined with the short fall in production in Eastern Europe and Argentina, have brought about—at least for the months immediately ahead—a number of changes in the world's meat trade. Chief among these are the temporary easing of import restrictions by a number of countries—particularly the Common Market countries and Japan—and their search for new sources of imports. In view of this situation we have urged Australia and New Zealand to ship their beef to countries where additional supplies are needed, especially the Western European countries, which temporarily have reduced some of their import restrictions.

In addition, the United States is making a strenuous and vigorous effort before the Meats Group of GATT to create more liberal conditions of entry for beef in Western Europe and other markets. Other GATT countries have been forcefully advised that the United States does not propose to continue indefinitely to import unlimited quantities of beef.

Fourth. The administration is making a major effort to stimulate exports of beef. A presidential mission investigated export possibilities in Europe in May. More recently a promotion and development contract has been negotiated with the American Meat Institute to intensively develop foreign market possibilities for beef. A similar arrangement with respect to the exportation of live cattle and calves is now under consideration. Live cattle already have been exported both by ship and air. Neither product nor transportation has been subsidized.

Advisory committee for export promotion

Individual U.S. packing firms are being encouraged to develop export markets. There are prospects for increasing exports for the European hotel and restaurant trade. The American Meat Institute

21—RAC—L

has very wisely created a broad advisory committee including representatives of all major farm organizations and other producer groups to work with the packing firms in effective export promotion. Members of this advisory committee are:

Jay Taylor, cattleman, Amarillo, Tex.

Kenneth Anderson, of Emporia, Kans., president of the American Cattle Co.

Aled P. Davies, American Meat Institute vice president.

John Guthrie, of Porterville, Calif., first vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

Don Magdanz, of Omaha, Nebr., secretary of the National Livestock Feeders Association.

C. W. McMillan, of Denver, Colo., executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

All were members of the presidential beef mission to Europe in May.

Also serving on the committee are:

John A. Killick and Floyd Segel, National Independent Meat Packers Association.

L. Blaine Liljenquist, Western States Meat Packers Association.

James G. Patton, National Farmers Union.

Herschel D. Newsom, the National Grange.

Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Brooks J. Keogh, American National Cattlemen's Association.

Erwin E. Dubbert, National Livestock Feeders Association.

Don Walker, representing John Armstrong, National Live Stock and Meat Board.

P. O. Wilson, National Live Stock Producers' Association.

Norris Carnes, Central Livestock Association, Inc.

Charles Jennings, American Stock Yards Association.

Robert Sadler, National Livestock Exchange.

C. T. Sanders, Certified Livestock Markets Association.

Sydney M. Washer, Meat Importers Council, Inc.

Feed grain prices higher

Fifth. Actions by the Department of Agriculture have moved feed grain prices over the past 2 years 10 percent above 1960 levels. This helped discourage excessive fattening of cattle. By utilizing the normal channels of trade we have strengthened the feed grain market.

In addition, new legislation will provide a longer term increase in demand for this essential source of protein—beef. This includes:

First. The nationwide food stamp program legislation, which President Johnson signed on September 1, 1964, will boost the food-buying power of low-income families for beef and other diet improving foods.

Second. The antipoverty program has considerable long-term implications for cattlemen.

I asked the U.S. Department of Agriculture economists to analyze the potential increase in the demand for beef of low-income families if the income level of all families with incomes below \$3,000 were raised to that level. The answer came back, "more than a fourth for beef." On a total food consumption basis, this would increase beef consumption by 3½ percent, and is much more significant in terms of price and income.

Third. President Johnson recommended and the Congress approved the establishment of a bipartisan Food Marketing Commission to look into marketing practices and submit recommendations as to improvements that can be made for the long-term benefit of cattlemen—as well as other producers—and consumers.

Fourth. The tax cut is leaving more purchasing power in the hands of the individual consumer—power which the housewife will utilize to some extent at the beef counter. In addition, this tax cut is helping to expand employment, a basic underpinning for beef demand.

Improvements in cattle markets

Major improvements have taken place in our domestic cattle markets since May 1964. Despite heavy runs, the market for cows has strengthened. Fed steer prices at Chicago now are near \$26 per hundredweight, or more than \$5 per hundredweight above the May level. The improvements in market prices of fed steers and cows have increased net incomes of cattlemen, brought about better price relationships among cattle of different types, and restored satisfactory profit

22—RAC—L

margins to cattle feeders. The continuing publicity given to retail prices of beef also has helped keep retail prices in line with changing prices of slaughter cattle.

Exports of livestock and livestock products also are increasing. Comparing the January-June period of 1964 with the same period of 1963, these substantial increases have been shown: Lard exports have increased from 251,748,000 pounds to 382,486,000; tallow exports have been increased from 929,351,000 to 1,244,231,000 pounds; beef and veal exports have in fact doubled—from 11,379,000 pounds to 22,635,000 pounds; pork exports have gone up from 67,694,000 pounds to 91,723,000 pounds; export of variety meats has increased from 79,007,000 pounds to 107,743,000 pounds. Export of cattle hides has increased from 3,510,000 pieces between January and June of 1963 to 5,409,000 pieces from January to June of 1964. Live cattle exports have shown the largest increase, jumping from 9,155 head in the first 6 months of 1963 to 40,223 in the first 6 months of 1964.

This does not mean that we are out of the woods. Cattle numbers are expected to increase by about 2 million head this year. Feeders should avoid marketing cattle at heavy weights, and should watch the markets carefully to avoid bunching. Much progress has been made in reducing market weights, which now are averaging more than 30 pounds under last spring.

Actions have had impact

Mr. President, cattlemen are realists. They have to be to survive. They cannot depend on conversation and empty promises. I do not intend to waste their time or mine in mouthing empty promises of a pie in the sky and a bonanza that is theirs for the asking. Rather I would say to them that this administration intends to continue along the road of helping to developing a market for their product while preserving the maximum of freedom in the marketplace for them.

First. We intend to continue our cooperation with members of the cattle and beef industry in every feasible way—to consult with them; to make available to them the services of the Government, in the field of research, marketing and regulatory activities, and to continue to preserve fair competition in the marketing of livestock.

Second. The conservation programs of the Department of Agriculture and other agencies will be designed to preserve our forests and public lands and gain the maximum grazing conditions consistent with sound conservation practices.

Third. This administration will utilize every authority to maximize aid to cattlemen in need of credit, consistent with sound business practices. We are determined to use the regular facilities of the Government so that cattlemen can work out their problems.

Free market for livestock

Fourth. Consistent with the principles enunciated so often by cattlemen, we do not propose or support any direct price support programs, control programs, or subsidy payment programs—domestic or export—for beef cattle. We will support the cattlemen of America in their determination that there be a free market for livestock.

Fifth. With consultation and the aid of the cattle and beef industry we will continue to use the facilities of the Government to encourage beef promotion, purchases for school lunch and needy persons, export market development, and other actions designed to aid the profitable marketing of livestock and livestock products.

Sixth. The United States will continue to urge in negotiations in GATT that European and Japanese markets be open to all. We are interested in helping beef exporting nations find expanding markets outside the continental United States to relieve the pressure on our own people.

Seventh. The import quota legislation recently enacted into law and signed by the President now is the law of the land. This will be used when necessary, taking into full consideration the needs of the domestic cattle industry, the American consumer, and the stake of American agriculture in world markets.

Mr. President, the American cattleman is the guardian of a proud heritage. Like his father before him, he deals in the elements—birth and death, drought and storm, cold and heat. He believes in the free market and he is willing today, as his forebears, to raise the calves and

23—RAC—L

feed the cattle that put beef on our tables. The only thing he asks, and rightly so, is to share, as do other segments of our population, in the regular services of a government dedicated to a free agriculture. We will continue to help him help himself through this period of adjustment.

Never in the history of the world has more beef been produced and consumed in as short a period. We are determined to continue to build markets, because the future of beef, as is true of all agricultural commodities, is in increased markets at fair prices.

Article
Congressional Record
September 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, CLOTURE PETITION AND REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES, U.S. SENATE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] may be added to amendment No. 1234, proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] and myself as a substitute for the so-called Dirksen-Mansfield amendment, amendment No. 1215, to the foreign aid bill now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Minnesota for joining us in this effort which I regard as a most constructive way to deal with the reapportionment problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his initiative in this matter and also commend the initiative that my colleague from Minnesota has taken with the Senator from New York. I studied very carefully today the Senator's proposed amendment as a substitute for the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment. As the Senator knows, tomorrow the Senate will vote on the cloture motion. It is my hope that it will be defeated. I shall vote against it. Then it would be my hope that the Senator from New York might, on behalf of the two Senators from Minnesota—and I am sure there will be many others who will be equally interested—offer his substitute, expressing the sense of the Congress.

That substitute gets at every point about which we have deep concern. It asks the courts to take into consideration the time needed for legislatures to carry out effective reapportionment under the terms of the Court order. It also provides a request for time for preparation of a constitutional amendment if such is desired.

I think it goes a long way, but we must get "off the hook" on which we are now caught in the Senate so we can proceed with the business of the Senate.

I have serious doubt about the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment, not only as to its constitutionality, although I believe lawyers have said it is constitutional. I believe it works like some of the new drugs we hear about, which are designed for a cure, but the side effects of which are sometimes worse than the conditions at which they are directed.

I have listened to the debate and have read the Record. I have been considerably disturbed about the difference in interpretation as to the meaning of the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment. That is why I have joined the Senator in what I think is a clear-cut proposal. I do not think there is any doubt about what the Senator's proposal is. It gets to the point. It is not ambiguous. I think it will serve the interests of constitutional government and the interests of the States deeply concerned over the impact of the Supreme Court ruling. It will be fair and judicious. I am sure no one will ever want to ignore a resolution of the Congress.

24—RAC—L

Article
Congressional Record
September 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF POPE PAUL VI, U.S. SENATE

POPE PAUL VI'S FIRST ENCYCLICAL LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on August 10, Pope Paul VI gave out his first encyclical letter. Although Pope Paul modestly proclaimed a simple "conversational style" for a "fraternal and informal message," it is a letter rich in substance in many areas. And further, although the encyclical entitled "His Church" was primarily addressed to the Catholic world, there were the words and spirit reminiscent of his beloved predecessor, Pope John XXIII, when Pope Paul said he was opening his heart "not only to all of the faithful of the Church of God, but especially to those whom our voice can reach beyond the wide limits of the flock of Christ." All men of good will are invited to listen, and they should.

Pope Paul's call to the church to renew itself from within, to renew its "interior life," is advice that every mortal can heed. His urge that the world be engaged with dialog in a spirit of charity is certainly the only way in which there is any hope of redeeming it. Although acknowledging the extreme difficulty of carrying on a dialog with regimes which suppress freedom of thought and action, Pope Paul said simply that we must try. As the Pope stated it:

For the lover of truth, discussion is always possible.

Pope Paul acknowledged that world peace was "the great and universal question." He pledged his personal ministry and that of his office to work with any and all, wherever "an opportunity presents itself" in order to foster "rational and civilized agreements for peaceful relations between nations."

If this encyclical is given the thoughtful reflection it deserves, men of various faiths, and of none, will be enriched by it and fortified in the patience and perseverance necessary to solve the problems of the great tensions and transformations of our times.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the encyclical "Ecclesiam Suam" inserted in the record at this point.

Article
Congressional Record
September 9, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, UAW AGREEMENT WITH CHRYSLER CORP., U.S. SENATE

AGREEMENT BY CHRYSLER CORP. AND UNITED AUTO WORKERS ON A NATIONAL CONTRACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have had brought to my attention in the past few minutes by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] a news flash from Detroit which bodes well for the good of our country and for the ever-expanding economy which has been our blessing in the past 42 or 43 months. The bulletin reads as follows:

DETROIT.—Chrysler Corp. and the United Auto Workers Union announced agreement today on a national contract, avoiding the threat of a nationwide strike by some 74,000 workers.

The announcement came less than 1 hour before the 11 a.m. strike deadline.

UAW President Walter Reuther termed the contract agreement "the most historic agreement in the history of the American labor movement."

Reuther told newsmen the settlement included a pension plan calling for up to \$400 a month payment in benefits at the age of 60 years for workers with 30 years service.

25—RAC—L

There have been many prophets of doom and gloom concerning our labor-management picture. I have read story after story of late, even as late as yesterday, that indicated that the negotiations which were being carried on between management and the union would falter and fail, and that a strike would take place. I am happy to say that just as Labor Day was a great day for the American people and was grounded by a great speech by a great President, so this day, this Wednesday, is great for the American people. Once again the processes of free collective bargaining have proved to be effective. Responsible management and responsible unionism have been able to reach agreement on a responsible and just settlement.

I compliment the officers of Chrysler Corp., a great company that has made a tremendous comeback in terms of its production, its profits, and its economic gains. I compliment a great union and a great union leader who has a sense of civic, social, economic, and political responsibility—Mr. Walter Reuther. He has been abused many a time on many a platform. He serves one of the greatest unions in America. In this instance, in this particular negotiation, he has once again demonstrated his qualities of leadership, which commend him to thoughtful and fair-minded Americans as a statesman in the field of labor-management negotiations.

This is a good day for our country. I only hope that the negotiations which are now underway with the giants of the automobile industry—General Motors and Ford, and, of course, others, including American Motors—will be equally successful. I have reason to believe that they will be, because management and labor in the great industries of mass production in America have come to understand their responsibility not only to their stockholders and their members, but also to the people of the United States and the economic well being of the people of the United States.

So this agreement bodes well for the future. I express my note of happiness and of commendation.

Article
Congressional Record
September 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ESTABLISHING A
PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY STAFF ON SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION MANAGE-
MENT, U.S. SENATE

THE PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY STAFF ON SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for the establishment of an agency in the Executive Office of the President to be known as the President's Advisory Staff on Scientific Information Management.

Today, the United States of America broadly rides the crest of an unprecedented wave of social, economic, technological, and political achievement, the very magnitude and complexity of the elements which give rise to the preeminence threaten to destroy it.

This strange paradox arises from the fact that since World War II our Nation has been thrust forward into a new environment of revolutionary, scientific, and technological change, with corresponding social and economic stresses and changes. The rapid rate of change, the breadth and depth of new knowledge, and the complexity and interdependence of today's sociological, technological, economic, and governmental factors, has exceeded the normal capacity of the human mind for assimilation on a scale equal to the demands of this new environment. Many of the best techniques for organizing, storing, retrieving, integrating, analyzing, and testing data in a rational decisionmaking process are totally inadequate for the new demands placed upon responsible decisionmakers in government and industry.

26—RAC—L

There is an urgent need in industry and Government alike for new techniques and systems for managing information and assisting officials responsible for the crucial policies and decisions of our society. Upon the discovery and use of such new techniques and systems depends not only the solution of many current problems but our continued status as a world leader.

I am introducing this joint resolution so that we may begin immediately to discover and apply new information management and decision-aiding techniques to the major unsolved problems of our society. This resolution is an outgrowth of hearings held by my subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business. From these hearings it became abundantly clear that many of the current and impending problems of our society will remain insolvable until we discover and adopt information management and decision-aiding techniques which are commensurate with the changes which have occurred and will occur in our national and international environment. We were fortunate to have appear before our subcommittee many of the Nation's leading authorities from Government, industry, universities, private and public foundations. From the aggregate of their testimony it appears evident that we have many serious unsolved problems which exceed in scope and complexity present information management and problem-solving structures. The organization of our present information management and decision-aiding structures represents the dichotomy of a past era when operation of the social, technological, economic, and political sectors of our society could be treated relatively independently, and problems could be analyzed and solved separately.

Today, the impact of change has drawn sectors of our society together into a status of closed interdependents, and the problems of one sector are inextricably connected to and interwoven with the problems of another sector. Consequently, the major problems of our society cut across sector lines and demand that information management and decision-aiding techniques be structured to permit an interdisciplinary approach on an intersector basis.

To deal forthright with the problem of evaluating, developing, and operating properly structured information management and decision-aiding systems this resolution provides for the establishment of a President's Advisory Staff on Scientific Information Management—PASSIM. Positioned at the Presidential level the staff of PASSIM will be permitted to necessary overview of information management practices within Government, and will be better situated to develop and organize data and decision-aiding systems on an interdisciplinary and interagency, intergovernmental, interindustry, or intersector basis.

The use of interdisciplinary, multistructured organizations for information management, research and decision-aiding systems as applied to the large intersector problems of our society would appear to be validated by the successes of such techniques in our military and space programs. As Assistant Secretary of Defense, John H. Rubel, pointed out to our subcommittee:

The techniques of organizing and directing vast team efforts on an interdisciplinary, multi-industry base has emerged as a new power, a new social instrument, out of the military and space programs of the past two decades. Perhaps this new-found ability to combine a great diversity of scientific and technical skills and disciplines to make a massive assault on very large-scale problems will turn out to be a social innovation of even greater consequence in the long run than the scientific and technical innovation on which most of our attention is generally focused. The question remains open: How can this new social invention be used outside the space and defense sector to which it is presently so largely confined?

The limitation of present information management and decision-aiding structures for dealing with our major problems was voiced by Dr. Milton Harris, vice president of research, the Gillette Co.

27—RAC—L

Dr. Harris indicated that we are not well equipped to approach many of our major problems:

It has been a policy to call committees together to evaluate needs. These are knowledgeable, sincere, able people, but they are busy and they will generally sit together—and I have been on many such committees—for perhaps a half day or a day a month, and in 3 months come out with a report.

What do we say? We look back at past experiences. We say, "In a given area in 1940 we spent \$5 million for research; in 1950 we spent \$60 million; and in 1960, we spent \$100 million; ergo by 1970 we are going to spend a billion dollars."

They do this sincerely. Nobody looks into this thing in depth and says: "In 1970, some of these things will be outmoded."

You know these extrapolations won't hold, because if we carry out these extrapolations we get the amusing conclusions that by year 2000, or before, every man, woman, and child is going to have a Ph. D. in the physical sciences, and our research budget is going to equal the gross national product. We know this is not going to happen.

The question must be asked, "Where should this level out? What should we be doing more of? What have we been doing wrong? This we have not done. We have not coordinated the thinking of the sophisticated industrial researcher, the sophisticated government science man, the sophisticated economist, and so forth."

It is currently evident that the traditional, one-shot, short-lived, ad hoc committee is an anachronism when faced with many of our serious space age problems. We must develop and use structures and methods of managing information and organizing decision-making which will provide the penetration and continuity commensurate with the magnitude and complexity of the major problems of our society.

The absence of adequate information management structures in our society has led to information deficiencies, and to policy and decision-making voids. During our subcommittee hearings the lack of information for analyzing, interpreting, and understanding large-scale problems brought forward such recurring responses as: "we do not now possess the factual data on which to reach sound judgments"; "the result of our past accomplishments has been an avalanche of noncritical statistics and clichés about future expectations"; "I suspect that the statistics available to us conceal or fail to reveal some important facts"; "I doubt that these arguments can be resolved by quoting statistics, at least not the kind of statistics to which we are presently limited. We need statistics that are more detailed."

I believe Dr. James R. Killian, chairman of the corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, underscored the informational deficiencies relating to major problems when he responded to my question concerning adaptation of our economy from military aspects to civilian aspects in the event of partial disarmament or reduction in our defense budget:

I do feel that we are in a period now—and this bears directly upon the point that you have made—where national decisions, Federal Government decisions that tend to move great masses of people, particularly professional people, scientists, and engineers, must be decisions now and henceforth made with an understanding of what the effects are going to be. That when we embark on a great new technological program, a space program in the future that requires thousands of engineers, we must recognize that we may pay a price for that over in the civilian economy, and we ought to have better facts than we now have in order to arrive at sound decisions in regard to policy questions of that kind.

I don't feel that we have the information now to make these decisions to have large-scale effects.

28—RAC—L

I predict that substantial information voids will be filled if we adopt the philosophy of this resolution, and establish broadly structured information management and decision-aiding systems which utilize an interdisciplinary, intersector approach. There is a strong correlation between the structural aspects of our information systems and the degree and type of information which is made available to our decision-makers. Dr. Jesse P. Hobson, vice president, Southern Methodist University, made this evident to our subcommittee when he stated:

On a national basis we need to make studies of the relationship between science, research, and economic development.

At the level I think that should be made, I think it is very appropriate for the Federal Government to undertake them and to sponsor such studies.

I would like to see some of the best universities involved in such studies: A combination of economic, social, scientific, and technical studies. I think they are very, very important.

We need to know a lot more about these relationships. I think our good economists, sociologists, and scientists can develop some of these fundamental relationships.

The kind of studies we have usually made have been limited studies on a particular situation, or a particular company, or a par-

Urgently needed along with the establishment of newly structured information systems are decision-aiding techniques which directly assist decisionmakers in assimilating, analyzing, and upgrading large bodies of data, in understanding the complex interrelationship between the static and dynamic factors of an operation, and in pretesting and predicting the validity and effect of a policy or decision. Such techniques are of particular importance in dealing with the large-scale problems where a policy or decision can have far-reaching effects on all segments of our society. Both the accelerated rate of change and the close interdependence of all segments of our society make it imperative that we develop and apply new analytical and predicted techniques to major problems.

Beginning with World War II a new approach to the problems of decisionmakers was started with the application of operations research and scientific management techniques to military problems. Operations research techniques indicate that we can apply the methodology of the physical sciences to operations, and through such analysis abstract the fundamental cause and effect mechanism and determine the underlying relationship of such factors. Once the physicist developed an adequate theory of the atom, he was able to predict and discover unknown elements, predict and bring about the energy release of the atom through atomic fission. Once the underlying mechanism of an operation is understood, the decisionmakers also have a powerful new tool for developing new information and predicting the impact of policies and decisions.

Since World War II efforts have been made to utilize a scientific approach to management and to develop new techniques to aid decisionmakers in our environment of increasing complexity in rapid change. Some of these new techniques make substantial use of mathematics and the computer sciences—mathematical programming, mathematical simulation, econometrics.

The purpose of this resolution is not to make a wholesale endorsement of all such techniques. It is the goal of this measure to assemble an extremely high-caliber staff of economists, sociologists, mathematicians, and scientists as the nucleus staff of PASSIM, and to have such staff systematically evaluate, and develop scientific decision-aiding systems for use of Government and newly established information management structures, and in particular, to provide for the application of such decision-aiding techniques to the large-scale problems of our society.

The magnitude of our large-scale problems and the potential techniques for aiding in the development of policy and decision dealing with large-scale problems of our society are historically unique. Consequently, it is difficult to precisely communicate a full understanding of this subject without stretching the semantical meaning of traditional words, or without engaging in untried neologisms. However, two examples drawn from the subcommittee investigation serve to highlight the potential of such decision-aiding techniques.

line deleted?

X

29—RAC—L

One example which I am particularly proud to relate concerns a Minnesota-based company—Honeywell, Inc. Back in the days when I was mayor of Minneapolis this company was known as Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. Today with production ranging from thermostats to computers, and with operations extending from the east coast to the west coast, as well as abroad, they have dropped the geographical limitation of their name and changed it to Honeywell, Inc.

Honeywell, Inc., is one of the leaders in American industry to both recognize the serious problem of increasing complexity in management decisionmaking, and to invent a new procedure to help solve this problem.

Honeywell officials have explained the problem of modern decisionmaking in this context. The human mind has difficulty in considering more than 10 or 20 factors at the same time in making decisions. Yet decisionmaking problems of the space age may require thousands or hundreds of thousands of factors and subfactors to be considered. During the past two decades of rapid change the human mind has remained relatively static in its capability, while the complexity of decisionmaking at certain levels of Government and industry has increased a thousandfold or more. The solution, therefore, rests with developing new techniques which will permit the decisionmaker to successfully deal with problems involving thousands of factors, but limits the number of factors which must be simultaneously considered to the limited capacity of the human mind.

The new technique developed by Honeywell is called pattern—an anachronism for planning assistance through technical evaluation of relevance numbers. Honeywell's pattern is definitely a milestone in the development of procedures for integrating and analyzing our complex body of knowledge, and for organizing an involved decisionmaking process into quantities which are manageable by the human mind. Briefly explained, pattern provides for the organization of complex subject matter into a series of simpler subdecisions. The subject matter of each subdecision can then be handled by many experts, each in his own field of expertise. The subdecisions are reduced to numbers which in turn permits the many subdecisions to be integrated into the ultimate decision. Thus, subsequent arithmetic operations performed on the subdecision numbers can reveal relationships which would be too complex to evaluate by a traditional intuitive mental practice. Because the subdecisions are reduced to numbers, these arithmetic operations can be mechanized on a computer, permitting problems of great magnitude and complexity to be handled by the pattern technique.

Honeywell's pattern technique permits the use of an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving. Although not employed on a massive interindustry scale, the first application of pattern in 1963 by Honeywell utilized such diverse disciplines as history and political science, economics, mathematics, science, and engineering, to incorporate into the decision-aiding techniques factors of equal diversity.

Another example of data management decision-aiding techniques is one developed by the Office of Emergency Planning. This technique is called PARM—program analysis for research management—and was developed primarily to support emergency preparedness planning. PARM is a system of analytical models for simulating mathematically very detailed operations of the total U.S. economy, using modern computer-type computational and display equipment. For such emergency preparedness purposes, it represents a dynamic system of analytical models capable of tracing the time phase effects on the economy of various emergency situations over a 2-year period. By changing data input and various conditions of the mathematical model, PARM can be used to simulate the effects of either real or hypothetical courses of action on the economy.

I am happy to report that in response to recommendations contained in a report of my subcommittee entitled "The Impact of Defense Spending on Labor Surplus Areas," dated August 19, 1963, OEP officials are seeking to expand the application of PARM techniques be-

30—RAC—L

yond the scope of emergency planning and nuclear disaster problems. As an input-output mathematical model, PARM exceeds any previously known effort at mathematical simulation, and should find a great range of applicability to many problems of government, labor, industry, and other public and private groups.

For example, the industry classification of PARM includes over 300 production sectors, and has associated with it a large data bank at the National Resource Planning Center. PARM can be made flexible or adaptable for many applications since its mathematical structure permits the introduction of leadtime, capital coefficients, capital constraints, autonomous creations of new capacity, and conversion between similar industries. Since it is a computer phased system it has the capacity to deal with such an enormous subject matter as the detailed impact on every industry resulting from changes in Federal, State, and local governmental expenditure programs; business investments; and of changes in consumer expenditures, as related to disposable income and population factors.

These are just two examples of the new kind of techniques which must be developed and applied on a much greater scale in government, industry, and other segments of our society if we are to successfully cope with the problems of our space age. There is still a vast chasm between what new techniques are being applied and what must be done to bring order out of impending chaos, and to reorient our data management, information management, analytical, and decision-aiding procedure to deal with the scope and complexity of our space age problems.

It should be emphasized that such decision-aiding techniques are only to aid decisionmakers by providing them with the type of information which will, along with other factors, including their own judgment and experience, assist them in establishing sound policies and in making meaningful decisions. Thus the Advisory Staff provided for in this resolution can be a valuable accessory to the democratic process of Government. Traditionally, in American democracy we fix the responsibility for policy and decisionmaking in certain elected and appointed offices, and American citizens seek to hold such officeholder responsible for their policies and decisions. However, when the operations of an office become overwhelmed with a large number of decisions and a myriad of unmanaged information, the resultant congestion may cause the responsible decisionmaker to be unconsciously expropriated by others in the amorphous process, and both the situs of the decision becomes lost and the point of responsibility diluted. This growing problem was alluded to by Secretary of State Dean Rush recently when he stated:

Decisions that 15 years ago were made by an Assistant Secretary of State are now made by desk officers.

Even in Congress, the avalanche of information and flood of material which we must digest, and the increasingly large number of requests, decisions, and policies for which we must assume responsibility, are becoming an almost unmanageable burden.

The benefits to Members of Congress, as well as to other Government and private officials, will be substantial if Project PASSIM can assist in developing for our major problems the critical information necessary to avoid ill-conceived programs, inefficiency, and waste, which are the inevitable products of poorly managed information and decisionmaking systems.

If, from the efforts of Project PASSIM, we help to solve only one perplexing problem, the need to provide a sustained economic growth commensurate with the needs of our society, this project will be extremely worthwhile. This has been one of the serious problems considered by our subcommittee, and a problem which has many unknowns and a substantial information deficiency. For example, our economic growth must during this decade of 1960 to 1970 provide employment for 22 million workers whose jobs are expected to be replaced by automation and technology. At the same time another 12½ million new jobs must be created for young people entering the labor force for the first time. During this same period the exodus of workers from the agricultural sector will continue at the rate of 200,000 per year.

31—RAC—L

Yet we do not fully understand the interrelating factors which bring about economic growth. How important is research and development to economic growth? Does the fact that 70 percent of the Nation's research dollars are spent by the Federal Government have an adverse effect on economic growth? What percentage of our top scientists and engineers have been drawn into military programs? Has this eroded growth in the private sector of our economy by stagnating civilian research and development? Have we overemphasized research and development? What effect and what interrelationship do other factors have on our economic growth rate—such as taxes, monetary policies, capital constraints, trends in wage and labor management agreements, the size and integration of plants and industries? Or is it true, as one authority indicated, it is very difficult and there is very little that we can do to accelerate our rate of growth? If we cannot accelerate our rate of growth, what are the social and economic consequences? These are only a small number of unanswered questions about economic growth which require concerted action of government, labor, and industry, sociologists, economists, and scientists in operating in new information management structures with new decision-aiding tools.

However, since one important purpose of Project PASSIM is to develop information structures and decision-aiding techniques which discover and define the complex interrelationships between the major problems of our society, consideration of economic problems would not ignore information deficiencies for sociological problems and the need to integrate information and decision-aiding techniques to cover all sectors of our society. The need to correlate technological, scientific, economic, and other sociological factors is implicit in the statement which Dr. Nathan Koffsky gave to our subcommittee:

It is clear that research in the social sciences has not had the kind of support given the physical sciences. In agriculture, rapid technological advance has created severe problems of adjustment—to maintain incomes of those who produce our food and fiber so efficiently and to make possible new employment opportunities for those who cannot find a satisfactory living in farming. The research and development necessary to show how to alleviate and solve the low income and employment problems of agriculture and rural areas still remains largely for the future. This constitutes one of the major challenges facing us today.

Dr. Koffsky's statement has reference to the rapid changes produced in particular by the replacement of animal power with mechanical power, and the adaption of chemistry to agriculture. As a result, in the past 25 years the productivity of the farmworker has increased threefold. In 1940, 1 farmworker supplied farm products for about 10½ persons, today 1 farmworker supplies products for almost 30 persons. This in turn has released workers from agriculture. During the past 40 years about 28 million people have been released from agriculture to seek employment in the nonagricultural sector of our economy. While we are still seeking solutions to provide for those who have already made an exodus from agriculture, 200,000 additional people leave agriculture each year. At the same time the average age of the farmer has increased. It is now 50 years, and at this age, with low income, the surviving farmer still faces the unsolved problem of finding additional financial resources so that he can continue to adapt to the very rapid technological changes. While the average age of the farmer continues to increase, there is yet the unsolved problem of providing adequate financial resources for the young people who might get into agriculture to replace the retiring farmers. If this problem is not solved, agriculture will continue to be made up of older and older people, and one day agriculture as we know it today will finally die out.

Project PASSIM is not proposed as an instant pain killer for all of our perplexing problems, those which we recognize and those which we do not recognize. Project PASSIM is a beginning. Its purpose is to make a beginning by bringing together for information manage-

32—RAC—L

ment and decision-aiding techniques the top minds of our country, just as two decades ago we brought together our top scientists to harness the atom. I shudder to think of how the court of history might have changed if two decades ago we had not started the Manhattan project. It is my hope that Members of Congress will be equally alert to assess both the need and the great advantages which may ensue to our country through the establishment of Project PASSIM. The failure to deal effectively with our new environment can have far-reaching implications for the United States on both a short-term and long-term projection.

We are all familiar with the cyclical movement of history: the birth, growth, climax, decline, and death of past nations and civilizations. Whether the United States of America, having reached a climax of achievement, will now begin the process of decline and death may depend to a great extent upon our capacity to assist the responsible decisionmakers of Government and industry in assimilating and utilizing our new knowledge to achieve the goals of our democratic society.

If we cannot develop new techniques to master the new knowledge, to better perceive the ultimate nature of our changing institutions, and to assist our policy and decisionmakers in performing their responsibilities, we may be turned down the dusty road to ruin, a road cluttered with the rubble of dim sighted decisions and poorly programed policies.

We need not be reminded that several nations stand ready to take our place, and in fact are actively seeking to displace the United States from its position of preeminence. Nikita Khrushchev has promised to bury us. It is a matter of serious concern that several achievements of the Russians during the past 5 years now show evidence of a highly developed and highly sophisticated technique for assisting their decisionmakers in analyzing and managing data, and in organizing operations.

The development of new techniques to aid our decisionmakers, is therefore, as much a part of the competition between the United States and the Communist world, as the space race, or the development of sophisticated military systems, and is more crucial to the ultimate success of our democratic mission in the world.

It is my fervent hope, therefore, that all Members of Congress will assess the urgency of this joint resolution I am today introducing, and will join in a bipartisan effort to support Project PASSIM and to encourage the participation of all sectors of our society. The close interdependence between social, economic, scientific, technological, and political factors is a phenomenon of our new environment. It is a fact which demands new attitudes and requires a partnership for progress between Government and industry, labor and management, agriculture and nonagriculture, public and private institutions, if we are to sustain our position of domestic and international preeminence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text to the joint resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

Article
Congressional Record
September 10, 1964

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, AMA AND FDA COOPERATION ON "DRUG ALERT," U.S. SENATE

COMMENDATION OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION ON THEIR TEAMWORK TOWARD A NATIONAL "DRUG ALERT" SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, August 19, I commented in the Senate on the tremendous importance of strengthening medical communication, particularly communication on thousands of drugs.

On August 20, the Wall Street Journal published an excellent article on welcome progress on this very front. The article described a splendid new program of drug cooperation between the American Medical Association and the Food and Drug Administration. Together, these two great organizations will create what will amount, in effect, to a new nationwide "Drug Alert" network.

33—RAC—L

AMA-FDA partnership welcome

I express my warmest commendation of this AMA-FDA teamwork. Their technical partnership is gratifying to the Congress, to the healing arts, and to the American public.

A helpful release, recently issued by the AMA, and reported in the Wall Street Journal article, symbolizes, I believe, a new era of closer working relationship between the AMA and the FDA. Such a relationship, as both know, hinges on mutual trust and confidence. Contributing greatly to such trust and confidence is the able new medical director of FDA, a distinguished physician, Dr. Joseph Sadusk.

AMA-FDA cooperation is especially gratifying to members of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and, in particular, to its Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am privileged to be chairman.

Six years of hearings and reports urged improvements

Why? Because, over a period of 6 years, we have held hearing after hearing and we have issued over 20 publications—hearing-exhibit volumes, committee prints, reports, and Senate documents stressing the need for improved scientific—including drug—communication.

In all this time, we have acted unanimously in our recommendations to the Senate.

It was in May 1958 that I held our first subcommittee hearing with medical experts, on the problem of managing the rising "flood" of medical literature.

Six months later—in November 1958—I visited in Paris with leaders of the Excerpta Medica Foundation. We discussed, for example, the problem of central indexing of the over 1 million abstracts of medical articles which that organization, alone, had sponsored and printed in the postwar period.

From Paris, I proceeded to Geneva, Stockholm, Helsinki, Moscow, and London, discussing with medical leaders ways and means of improving communication in all areas of medicine, particularly the health of the newborn. Findings from that trip were presented to the Senate and the Nation in a series of reports and statements.

In the half dozen years which have followed, I have kept at this task. It has been a "labor of love." I have written literally hundreds of letters to Federal agencies, to drug companies, to physicians, to researchers, and to documentalists, urging that drug communication be modernized.

What point, I asked, is there to discovering some great new drug, unless that information is put promptly into the hands of those who can manufacture, prescribe, and dispense it?

On the other side of the coin, what point is there in learning about some unexpected side effect, if this information becomes lost like a "needle in a haystack"?

Fortunately, the message has now taken hold, inside and outside of Government.

Always, I have stressed that, in our American system, it is not Government, but the private professional community, which properly bears the fundamental responsibility in this area.

Professional unity needed in "the Great Society"

In the past, there have been differences between the AMA and the FDA on certain issues of broad policy. Such differences may persist. But that does not prevent agreement at the working level in countless scientific areas in which there can be complete, professional unity.

I recall here the inspiring words from the Good Book which President Johnson has so soundly recalled on the many occasions when he has urged partnership in the Great Society:

Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.

There is far more basis for agreement than there is for disagreement on man's health.

34—RAC —L

The goal of every physician in the United States is healthy patients. The goal of the great organization which represents physicians, the AMA, is excellence in preventive, in diagnostic, in curative, and in restorative medicine.

The goal of the FDA is to assure the purity, the safety, and the efficacy of drugs.

The goal of the dynamic drug industry is to make available the finest possible medications for our own people and other peoples.

The goal of Congress is to serve the well-being of America by writing sound laws, by overseeing sound administration, and by encouraging sound public-private cooperation.

Article touches upon 12 areas of our subcommittee's activity

As to Congress' role, many committees and subcommittees and individual legislators have been active.

As to our own subcommittee, the Wall Street Journal article mentions well over a dozen subjects in which, as public records show, our Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has been active.

The overall progress which the article reflects did not happen by accident. Many sources served as a catalyst. We have factual reason to believe that our subcommittee was one.

To what extent did we, in particular, serve? How big a role did we play? Answers to those questions can best be made by others, not by ourselves.

Subcommittee praised by publications for "information" revolution

It is, however, merely to state a fact to observe that medical and trade publications have been kind enough to credit our subcommittee with having started a constructive "revolution" in scientific information, including in drug communication.

But let the record speak for itself. Here are the facts.

Three background materials to be published

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record:

First. The fine Wall Street Journal article by Jonathan Spivak;

Second. Excerpts from my comments and questions in the subcommittee's drug hearings of August 1962, together with a few of the answers we received, indicating how unsatisfactory the communication situation was 2 years ago; and

Third. A summary, showing for 12 of the areas of drug cooperation touched upon in the Wall Street Journal article some background facts as to what our subcommittee sought and what progress has since occurred.

There being no objection, the article, excerpts, and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SENATOR HUMPHREY'S QUESTIONS AND
COMMENTS ON THE WEAKNESSES OF DRUG COMMUNICA-
TION DURING THE SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS OF AUGUST
1962

* * * * *

(On the international thalidomide tragedy)

Senator HUMPHREY. We do feel that the problem here is one of communication. I think at least the immediate evidence that we have, the surface evidence, indicates that there was a lag, if not a total inadequacy, at least a lag of communication between the West German manufacturer to the British manufacturer, and to the American licensee.

IMPROVING INTERNATIONAL FLOW OF DRUG INFORMATION

And apparently no interchange of information between official bodies, such as the World Health Organization, or other international organizations, nor, according to the testimony thus far, has Commissioner Larrick or yourself indicated that either the British or the German Government presented any information to the Government of the United States, to the Food and Drug Administration.

35—RAC—L

Is that a correct statement, Commissioner Larrick?

Commissioner LARRICK. That is correct.

Senator HUMPHREY. Would you suggest that it might be a good idea for the Congress to look into the possibility of improving this international communication on an official basis?

Commissioner LARRICK. Yes. I think it would be well to look into it. I do not know how much of it could be done under present law or how much more law would be indicated.

Senator HUMPHREY. What has been somewhat disturbing to me is the fact that, despite all of the international activities we have, and the exchange of information in a host of fields, with this new technology, what one might call the new breakthrough in miracle drugs, and all sorts of new drug compounds, there has not been a more determined effort to make all of this information available as to the testing of the drugs.

Now, you, Mr. Commissioner, said yourself in your opening statement that one of the reasons we have this problem we are dealing with now is because there are so many new drugs, and there is such a tremendous advance in the field of pharmaceuticals, which is true. And may I say that our country has led the world in a very real sense in terms of the perfection and the improvement of new drugs and pharmaceuticals which have been a blessing to mankind.

Nevertheless, with these breakthroughs, and with this literal "busting out all over" of new drugs, does it not appear that one of the great needs today for the scientific community and the pharmaceutical community and the medical community is communication, coordination, the indexing of the effects of drugs, the coordination between countries and manufacturers, the translation from foreign languages into English and vice versa, and the retrieval of information.

* * * * *
Senator HUMPHREY. Sometimes we get to thinking in this Government in terms of agencies, rather than in terms of the Government.

Now, you have NIH, which is under the U.S. Public Health Service, but has a rather autonomous standing. You have the U.S. Public Health hospitals, excellent hospitals. Then over here, you have the Department of Defense. They are running a show, too. And they have hospitals: Army, Navy, Air Force hospitals. And then way off over here you have this vast medical program; the greatest clinical program in the world—the Veterans' Administration medical program—it is huge and costs hundreds of millions of dollars.

Now, what I am getting at is, is there a system that has been prescribed by an interagency committee, or by the President of the United States, or by somebody, or some organization—is there a system that requires interchange of information so that if a layman like Senator Humphrey or an expert like my friend, Senator Mundt, wanted to find out what had really happened in terms of thalidomide, in all of the many medical facilities of the Federal Government, there would be one place you could go to, and on one machine you get this information?

ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING AT AIR FORCE BASE

Now, let me assure you, when I was at Offutt Air Force Base, they had a machine down there that had collated all of the information from thousands of people on any one particular intelligence problem. There was no problem at all. The Defense Department has the machine. They just push the button, and things start to happen—about how you can kill people. It is right there.

36—RAC—L

In fact, they told me that the machine was a little too slow. It took one-hundredth of a second to get something; they are going to speed it up to one-thousandth of a second. So they are going to spend a hundred million dollars to get new machines.

Now, what kind of machines do you have to collate all the information on experimental drugs out of all the Federal Government establishments? I think the State and local governments ought to be brought in, and then the private agencies ought to be brought in.

Do you have any such gadgets?

Commissioner LARRICK. No, we do not.

* * * * *

THE 12 OF THE AREAS IN WHICH SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AND THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS HAVE BEEN ACTIVE ON BEHALF OF DRUG PROGRESS

1. Governmentwide drug cooperation.
2. NIH-FDA communication.
3. Drug clearinghouse.
4. Computer information for FDA.
5. Postgraduate medical education on drugs.
6. FDA communication to physicians.
7. Mailbox form for physicians.
8. Specific AMA-FDA cooperation.
9. Outside medical advisers for FDA.
10. Impartial drug evaluation.
11. Better coverage of the world literature.
12. Strengthened international drug cooperation.

THE UNSATISFACTORY COMMUNICATION SITUATION IN 1962 AND IN EARLIER YEARS AND THE IMPROVED SITUATION TODAY

1. Governmentwide drug cooperation: The Wall Street Journal article mentions current teamwork on drug activities of the Federal agencies.

In August 1962, we of the subcommittee published the first evidence that no such teamwork existed at that time. For example, not a single Veterans' Administration or Department of Defense hospital bothered, then, to report adverse drug reactions to FDA. Only 8 of the 15 U.S. Public Health Service hospitals reported (sporadically) to FDA. I summarized this lack of cooperation in a letter of December 1962, to Dr. Jerome Wiesner, President Kennedy's Science Adviser.

Progress: Many of the types of cooperation, mentioned by the Wall Street Journal, have occurred:

(a) As I had urged, the President's Office of Science and Technology established top-level review of interagency drug (and, later, pesticide) issues.

(b) An Interagency Procurement Advisory Council on Drugs (IPAD) was organized. At our direct suggestion, the charter of the Council was later broadened to cover—not only coordinated policy in annual purchase of around \$100 million in drugs, but coordinated exchange of drug information.

(c) Thus, every Federal hospital is now included in a uniform adverse reaction reporting program.

(d) IPAD, again, at our suggestion, acted to extend interagency coordination to related areas, involving hundreds of millions of dollars of medical equipment and materiel.

2. NIH-FDA communication: I pointed out in 1961 and again in 1962 that intra-agency communication, i.e., within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—was weak, not to mention the problems between Departments. The Government's great medical research arm, the National Institutes of Health, had little relationship to or communication with an almost completely "separate" arm, the Food and Drug Administration.

37—RAC—L

Progress: One month after our first hearing, at a third hearing—which we held in September 1962—the Director of the National Institutes of Health announced reforms—a new 11-point program to improve all types of medical communication.

In May 1963 there became effective a formal agreement for NIH-FDA cooperation. The agreement provides for interagency consultation, for joint conferences, joint representation on technical groups, two-way flow of information, etc.

3. Drug clearinghouse: In January 1958 I introduced—with Senator John L. McClellan and Senator Ralph Yarborough, the first bill ever to be offered for a coordinated, Government Center for Scientific and Technical Information. In the hearings and reports which followed, the intolerable nature of the status quo was pointed out and the essential nature of information reform was stressed: The Federal Government was crippled with dozens of unsatisfactory, separate, overlapping, duplicating, uncoordinated information systems. (NIH, alone, then had eight separate, unrelated systems, few of which mentioned drugs in any detail.)

The result, we proved, was practically information chaos, from a Government-wide standpoint. No agency had effective access to what any other agency was doing or had done.

Technology was, moreover, primitive. Manual systems had to be replaced by electronic systems. Over and over, I urged a high-speed system of agency systems, an electronic-based clearinghouse or network. This would extend across not only the physical (e.g., space-military) sciences, but the biomedical, including the pharmaceutical, sciences.

Progress: Step by step, the agencies came around to the committee's and the subcommittee's way of thinking. Our major victory was the gradual acceptance of the underlying concept of integration of uncoordinated systems, through compatible or convertible indexing. Thus:

(a) In January 1963 the historic Weinberg report of the President's Science Advisory Committee accepted this idea.

(b) Even earlier, we had won support by the Crawford task force, in its report to the President's Science Adviser.

(c) We repeatedly recommended a special drug clearinghouse. Our idea won backing at the November 1962 Conference on Health Communication.

(d) We kept repeating our requests. In March 1963, the Surgeon General's able Assistant for Scientific Communication, F. Ellis Kelsey, responded with an outstanding statement on behalf of this goal.

(e) But still, there were skeptics and doubters in the agencies. They urged more "study" of Dr. Kelsey's and our suggestion. The study was made; and, once again, it vindicated our position. An October 1963 report to the U.S. Public Health Service brilliantly analyzed weaknesses in drug information. This report (coauthored by a former secretary of the AMA Council on Drugs) urged a Chemical and Biological Information Network (CABIN).

(f) Still, some Agency resistance continued. Finally, in response to our repeated demands came a firm promise: At the subcommittee's May 28, 1964, hearing of the Reorganization Subcommittee, the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, committed the Agency to include in the 1966 fiscal year appropriation the first funds for, specifically, a drug information clearinghouse.

4. Computer information for FDA: I emphasized in many statements that the U.S. Government could not have a modern interagency system of systems, unless there were first modern intraagency systems. In 1962, FDA had no such system, not even a plan, hope, or expectation of such a system for its

38—RAC—L

Bureau of Medicine, much less for its other Bureaus. I pointed out that, meanwhile, the agency was "bursting at the seams" (and in an extra warehouse) with valuable files containing masses of virtually irretrievable information on over 13,000 drugs. And, I showed that, externally, the National Library of Medicine had not bothered to consult with FDA about the Library's plans for a bold, new computer system.

Progress:

(a) With more resources provided by the Congress, FDA has responded. It has begun to establish a modern data processing system through what is known as project RAPID (retrieval and automatic processing of information on drugs).

(b) The Arthur D. Little Co. is making an analysis of FDA's total information needs.

(c) A National Library of Medicine-FDA formal agreement on drug information was signed and is being implemented. The Library's high speed electronic Medlars (medical literature analysis and retrieval system) is assisting in meeting FDA's awesome information needs.

5. Postgraduate medical education on drugs: Throughout the hearings, it was pointed out that the drugs which the physician learned about in his undergraduate days or as an intern or resident have been rapidly replaced by a vast number of complex, potent new medications. The physician needs to have available postgraduate medical education resources of the very highest professional quality. At the subcommittee's hearing of September 1962, the Surgeon General was urged to take the initiative toward this and related goals.

Progress: Two months afterward, the Surgeon General did precisely that. A Conference on Health Communications was held at Airlie House. The conference agreed on major recommendations for strengthening postgraduate medical education.

Two years afterward, the Surgeon General was asked for a progress report. He replied in July 1964 that the Public Health Service had taken certain key steps. More steps will become possible, thanks to a favorable ruling by the Comptroller General that medical research appropriations can be used to support communication studies. This would include support of pioneering efforts in closed circuit medical television, in FM broadcasting, programmed learning, and so forth.

6. FDA communication to physicians: Throughout the hearings, it was urged that FDA find some better means to get across its drug messages to American practitioners. The postman brings to the physician deluges of direct mail, drug samples, journals, medical newspapers, etc. Crucial, high priority messages, such as drug warning letters from individual companies can and do get lost in this deluge.

Progress: FDA sent out its own first drug warning letter. (This was on steroid ophthalmics—which are made by so many companies that many such letters on their part would otherwise have been necessary.) FDA is considering other actions to improve direct communication to practitioners, for example, the possibility of a medical letter to physicians, containing the latest, high priority FDA drug news.

7. Mailbox form for physician reporting: At the August 9, 1962, hearing, an expert witness, Harold Aaron, M.D., editor, the Medical Letter, urged that American physicians be provided with a convenient mailing form. In this way, they could drop into the corner mailbox information about effects of drugs which they might otherwise not find the time to transmit.

Progress: On April 27, 1964, the Journal of the American Medical Association published a convenient mailing form which physicians can fill in and send to the AMA Registry on Adverse Reactions.

(On May 4, 1964, the British Committee on Safety of Drugs likewise circulated a mailing form to practitioners in the United Kingdom.)

39—RAC—L

8. Specific AMA-FDA cooperation: In March, May and June 1963, the AMA was invited by subcommittee letters to prepare testimony for our forthcoming hearing. Among specific points mentioned in the letters were possible plans for AMA-FDA cooperation on strengthened postgraduate medical education, on coordination of the separate adverse drug reaction reporting programs, etc.

(It should be noted that, for years, respected publications in the drug trade had factually reported wide "gaps" as having developed between the two organizations, on not only high-level policy issues, but on technical working areas.)

At the hearing of June 26, 1963, AMA witnesses did not mention any specific plans for coordination with FDA.

Progress: 11½ months after the hearing, on August 7, 1963, a private FDA-AMA meeting was held in Chicago. The meeting was headlined by a trade publication as "Closing Gap." The publication described the meeting as including "initial discussions on establishing a closer working relationship between FDA and AMA," particularly on FDA's administering of the 1962 law.

In August 1964, a press release was issued by the AMA (Data Processing Machines Will Speed Latest Drug Information to Doctors). The release confirms that very substantial progress has been made in AMA-FDA cooperation.

9. Outside medical advisers for FDA: FDA can never hope to have enough in-house professional experts to decide all its complex problems in dozens of drug specialty areas. Evidence compiled by the subcommittee in 1963 showed that, as far back as 1955, a report by the First Citizens Advisory Committee on FDA had urged establishment of continuing (not merely ad hoc) Medical Advisory Panels by the Food and Drug Administration. Appeal after appeal for the same action by FDA was made by other sources—unsuccessfully—for 7 years thereafter.

The subcommittee urged FDA, therefore, to act on the appeals and to set up outside panels, representing the best talent of the profession.

(Reasonable caution was, of course, necessary in setting up such panels to avoid conflicts of interest or interference with FDA's statutory responsibilities.)

Progress: An FDA Advisory Group on Investigational Drugs was established and has served effectively. An FDA Medical Advisory Board will soon be established. A Drug Research Board under the universally esteemed National Academy of Science-National Research Council has been established.

10. Impartial drug evaluation: Throughout 2 years of hearings and correspondence, we pointed out that what busy practitioners (especially general practitioners) need is not merely an accurate, careful package circular (which they may never see), but a handy, impartial evaluation of available drugs by leading authorities.

Authorities can judge masses of often conflicting drug evidence and can objectively compare a new drug with older drugs and with other types of therapy. Average busy practitioners find it almost impossible to choose—single handedly—among 30 or 40 or 50 drugs on the market for the very same purpose. The timing of evaluation of drugs was also indicated as essential. (For example, by the time the expert AMA Council on Drugs had published its warning on the anticholesterol drug, MER/29, 18 months had elapsed and 400,000 patients had received it.)

Progress: The AMA Council on Drugs—which is rightly esteemed as the world's foremost such group—has been given more resources and has speeded up its valued evaluation service. Meanwhile, improvements are being made in the AMA's helpful volume of accumulated monographs, "New and Non-Official Drugs."

40—RAC—L

(A different type of book, a "Handbook on Drugs"—which the AMA had contemplated in July 1961, is still urged by many physicians as the sort of definitive guide which they need.)

11. Better coverage of world literature: I have repeatedly pointed out wasteful duplication of effort as many sources try to keep up with adverse reaction reports from all over the world. Thus, they repeat each other's efforts by reading, abstracting and indexing the very same medical journals over and over again. Meanwhile, no source, whatsoever, has the resources to cover literally thousands of other journals. For example, in Washington, the Public Health Service's Poison Control Center reads a mere 15 of the world's 5,000 medical journals for its particular purpose. In Chicago, the AMA covers one-tenth of the world's literature—500 journals—for overall adverse reaction reports. In Washington, FDA covers only 300 journals. At Bethesda, the National Library of Medicine indexes 2,000 journals (but it covers the titles of articles only). In Amsterdam and elsewhere, Excerpta Medica abstracts many, but far from all, of the world's journals. Meanwhile, too, individual drug companies, depending on their size, duplicate many of these other efforts by trying to cover as many journals as they, individually, can.

Progress: A number of proposals have been made for an agreement among the various sources on a better division of labor in prompt coverage of the world's literature. The expert, private Institute for Scientific Information (which was responsible for an important advance—citation indexing) has made one such proposal. Other private sources—like Mr. Paul de Haen, a consultant to industry—have submitted others. Agreement has yet to be reached, however, on any one public or private proposal. So, present limited efforts to cover the global literature continue to go their separate, disuniform ways.

12. Strengthened international cooperation: In November 1958, at a meeting in Geneva with the Director-General of the World Health Organization, I urged the goal of establishing an "early warning network" on epidemics, as well as on drug and other medical problems.

Three and three-fourths years later, in August 1962, the subcommittee heard evidence of the worldwide tragedy of thousands of babies who had been deformed because their pregnant mothers had taken a "harmless sedative," thalidomide. Babies continued to be deformed—in Brazil, in Japan, and elsewhere—long after West Germany had discovered that thalidomide was to blame. Part of the problem was confusion over hundreds of different names for the very same drug in various countries.

Progress: On September 27, 1963, President John F. Kennedy adopted my suggestion for a world center. In an address before the United Nations General Assembly, the President urged establishment of a "World Center for Health Communication" at WHO.

Meanwhile, WHO has taken at least limited action to improve and speed international exchange of information on drug effects. Some limited action has also been taken toward minimizing confusion over foreign drug names.

Jamesburg, N.J.

Middlesex County Democratic Dinner, Forsgate Farms

September 10, 1964

SPEECH BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY

"CITIES IN THE GREAT SOCIETY"

In the opening speech of my campaign for the Vice-Presidency, I set forth the one major issue confronting the American people in this election: which candidate—*President Lyndon B. Johnson or Senator Barry Goldwater*—possesses the intellectual and emotional capacity to assume the awesome responsibility of leading America and the free world for the next 4 years?

41—RAC—L

This question has special significance to Americans living in this great metropolitan complex which stretches along the Atlantic seaboard from south of Washington, D.C., to north of Boston. Residents of the Atlantic seaboard have a right to ask: Will our next President understand the mammoth task we face in remaking and preparing our cities to assume their place in the Great Society?

Will our next President understand that between 1960 and 2000 we must build the equivalent of 3,000 cities with a population of 50,000 each just to absorb our population growth?

Will our next President comprehend the urgency of preparing America for the problems of the year 2000 when four-fifths of our 400 million citizens will reside in urban areas?

Will our next President know that we can only solve the problems associated with this population expansion and this population shift to the cities through the active cooperation and participation of the Federal Government with State, county, and local authorities?

These are questions you have a responsibility to ask. And these questions the candidates have a duty to answer.

The record of President Johnson and the Democratic Party is clear. In the legislation submitted to Congress, in the President's leadership of Congress, in his acceptance speech, and—most significantly—in his vision of the Great Society, President Johnson has demonstrated a profound understanding of the challenge the problems of urban America present to this country:

Better housing for persons of all ages and incomes:

Improved mass transportation facilities.

Expanded recreational areas and open spaces.

Cleaner air and water.

Improved schools.

More efficient sanitary and health facilities, and the countless other necessities which contribute to a happy and rewarding life.

The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party has also answered these questions. Of course, he personally discusses these issues only on rare occasions. I can recall only three:

Once he observed that the Federal Government had no business participating in urban renewal;

Once he declared that housing needs of the elderly can be met solely by their churches and their children; and

Once he suggested that we saw off the Eastern seaboard and let it float out to sea!

But while the leader of the Goldwater faction seldom discusses these issues, he *has* through a consistent pattern of votes clarified his ability to deal with the challenge of urban America in the 20th century.

In 1958 most Senators voted to increase funds for Federal loans to communities for planning and public facilities.

But not Senator Goldwater.



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