

SENATOR'S MINNESOTA RADIO PROGRAMS

Public Service Feature

1954

<u>No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>For Week of</u>
1.	State of the Union Message	January 11th
2.	Farm Program	January 18th
3.	Foreign Policy	January 25th
4.	Taxes and Our Economy	February 1st
5.	Using Our Abundance	February 8th
6.	Social Security and Health	February 15th
7.	Defense Contracts	February 22nd
8.	Security for Aged	March 1st
9.	Dairy Crisis	March 8th
10.	Taxes	March 15th
11.	Housing	March 22nd
12.	Internal Security	March 29th
13.	Health	April 5th
14.	Educational Exchange	April 12th
15.	School Lunch and Public Housing	April 19th
16.	Good Government	April 27th
17.	Vocational Education	May 3rd
18.	Agriculture	May 10th
19.	Combatting Recession	May 17th
20.	St. Lawrence Seaway Watershed Bill	May 24th
21.	Anti-Communism	May 31st

Senator's Minnesota Radio Programs (Cont.)

22.	Budget Progress	June 7th
23.	Schools	June 14th
24.	Women	June 21st
25.	Conservation	June 28th
26.	India	July 5th
27.	Civil Defense	July 12th
28.	Taxes	July 19th
29.	Congress Windup (Social Security, Farm)	July 26th

Radio Script For: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

Program No. 11: WEEK OF MARCH 22, 1954

HOUSING

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's

capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in

cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey what's the situation

in the present Congress in regard to housing legislation?

SENATOR: I'm glad to discuss this subject, because I know home owners,

prospective home owners, and home builders all ^{want} ~~like~~ to keep abreast of

any new developments in legislation concerning housing and financing

of housing construction.

President Eisenhower's housing program was recommended to the Congress in a special message two months ago. In my opinion, it offered some constructive improvements, although it also had some rather obvious weaknesses as far as meeting our Nation's housing problems are concerned.

In the main the President's program followed the outlines of the report of the President's Advisory Commission on Housing. As a result it is

really necessary to consider the Commission's report to fill in some details where the message is lacking in detail. However, so far there has been no legislative action in the Congress carrying out any of the President's recommendations.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, I know you have always been keenly interested in slum clearance and urban redevelopment, and have urged many times recently that now would be a good time to step up such efforts to take up some of the slack in employment. What does the President's program recommend in regard to getting rid of our slum areas?

SENATOR: You're absolutely right about my interest in this vital phase of any housing program. Many of our great cities are literally rotting from within, as a result of neglected slum areas. From strictly an economic standpoint of protecting property values as well as from the social standpoint of getting rid of breeding grounds for disease and delinquency, we should be doing much more about urban redevelopment projects. I'm glad the President recognized this problem to the extent he did, although I don't think he went quite far enough.

The President's message calls for loans and grants for slum renovation and slum elimination. It requested \$700 million for loan funds and \$250 million for capital grant funds. Now in view of the heavy costs involved in most of these projects, we can't get many of them carried to successful completion with that loan limitation. Most of these projects will pay themselves out in time, but cities are just unable to finance them on their own without the assistance of long-term Federal credit. However, what the President has called for is desirable and will help make progress on a tremendous problem.

We all must realize, however, that slum clearance and renovation does not itself add to the supply of housing. In fact, slum clearance, as we all know from experience, creates displaced slum dwellers with the result there is a greater need for a larger housing supply. That's why we must make sure that additional housing is provided as we proceed with slum clearance work.

✓ The President's message also calls for insuring of private loans for rehabilitation purposes through FHA. This is a needed incentive. Again we must remember, however, that building homes in

Mayor
Hoyt
Civic
Center
Development
Assoc.
Pro Army
Training

declining neighborhoods for rehabilitation purposes may not of itself add to the total supply of homes and occasionally adds to the cost of rent of the homes. The President also called for a program of matching grants to do the planning job necessary to arrest the spread of slum conditions. This would call for an appropriation of \$5 million. I am in support of such a program. - *infact urged this while mayor*

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, does the President's program include any encouragement for buying or modernizing existing homes?

SENATOR: Yes, it does. The second major item of the message calls for insured loans and improvement loans on existing houses. The low insurance would be comparable to that for financing new houses. This is excellent. It also calls for increasing the size and term of modernization loans, recognizing higher costs. Under the proposed new program, the maximum loan under Title I for repairing and modernizing single family homes would be increased from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and the maximum term from three to five years. I'm very much in favor of this change to encourage home improvement and modernization. - *Smith*

SIMMS: Senator, didn't the President also discuss some new form of housing assistance to low income families?

SENATOR: Yes, he did, and it is where more of our attention in housing legislation should be concentrated. However, there are serious questions in my mind about how effective the ~~President's~~ proposal would be. His recommendations call for an experimental program of long-term loans for purchase of low-income homes through FHA. Under its terms, low initial payment and low monthly payments would be called for on both new and existing dwellings acquired by low income families. Now, ^{Housing} the ~~President's~~ Advisory Commission had recommended for this purpose 40-year, 100% loans, up to from \$7,600 to \$8,600 per unit. The ~~President's~~ housing bill sent to Congress February 12th contains a \$7,000 limit on the 40-year loans. I have some doubts about that limit. I am afraid it is too low for any practical purposes. I think most of us realize that not much of a house can be built today in the \$7600 to \$8600 range, let alone under \$7,000.

The President's message calls for similar long-term loans limited to those families who must seek other homes as a result of slum rehabilitation, conservation and similar activities. Now it is obvious that there will be only a very limited use for such long-term loans, and they will not add very much to the housing supply. Most people ~~forced to move~~ ^{moving} out of slum areas are in no position to take on long-term loans to build their own homes. What they need is some form of low-rental housing, of higher standards than existed for them in slum areas.

SIMMS: Doesn't that point up a need for continued public housing, Senator?

SENATOR: I believe it does. The President's message also calls for a temporary continuation of public housing, but on a very limited scale. The President recommends construction of 140,000 units during the next four years, at the rate of 35,000 units each year. I am troubled, however, by the fact that the bill in the House of Representatives does not even mention public housing -- despite the President's recommendation.

Even the amount requested by the President is but a drop in the bucket compared to national need. You may recall that the Housing Act of 1949 ^{like Senator Taft co-sponsor} ~~which Senator Taft co-sponsored~~ asked for 135,000 units a year for six years, or a total of 810,000 units.

Realistically speaking, even the small amount of public housing recommended by the President may face tough sledding in the Congress. The President had also recommended 35,000 units in 1953, but his request was defeated in the House of Representatives. I might be pardoned in pointing out that the President's request was supported by 64% of the Democrats in the House, but opposed by 84% of the Republicans.

SIMMS: Senator, were there other future changes indicated in the President's message?

SENATOR: Yes, there were...The President says he will call for a more realistic scale of mortgage ceilings, taking into account the increased cost of building today. The Advisory Commission recommended increasing

the ceiling to \$20,000 for one and two family houses, and \$35,000 for four-family units. This is most desirable insofar as it goes, and will enable moderate and higher income families to carry larger mortgages.

The President also wants the authority to "adjust" housing interest rates. His Commission recommended similar flexibility, but spoke of rates as high as $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ above the current average yield on obligations of the United States having a remaining maturity of 15 years or more. This will likely mean higher interest rates on housing loans -- perhaps up to a full percent. The President also plans to get the government out of secondary mortgage market operations by turning the program known as "Fanny May" over to private enterprise. However, the builders are opposing this on the ground that it will restrict credit and raise rates. I don't believe this is the time to tighten credit and restrict housing, and if this is going to be the effect of the President's proposal I am concerned about it.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, have there been any changes in regard to Veterans Housing or Farm Housing?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, the President's budget message said he would end the Farm Housing Program under Title V of the Housing Act when the law expires June 30 of this year. I am in favor of the Farm Housing Program and opposed to its termination. Since the program was originally enacted by Congress in 1949 -- a program which I helped to sponsor -- 20,000 farmers have built homes with Federal loans. For this program to expire will mean that farm families will have no credit facilities designed for their housing problems. Along with Senator Sparkman, I am going to co-sponsor legislation to extend this program instead of letting it expire.

The President also failed to mention in his housing message or in his budget message the continuance of the direct veterans loan program. This may mean that he intends to have the plan expire on June 30 of this year. You will recall Congress passed this law in 1950 to make sure that veterans in the tightest credit areas could get loans up to \$10,000 to buy homes. The rate was 4% until recently when the new Administration raised it to $4\frac{1}{2}\%$. About 40,000 veterans have taken advantage of this to date. I have supported this program, and I do not like to see it end.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...you have been listening to your Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly radio report from the Nation's capital...This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 12: WEEK OF MARCH 29, 1954

INTERNAL SECURITY

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! We bring you Senator

Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, in another of his weekly series of transcribed reports from the Nation's capital, presented as a public service in cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, with all the charges and counter charges flying around, it might be helpful if you would discuss the Nation's internal security problems and what is being done about them.

SENATOR: I am more than happy to discuss this subject, as it is a very serious one that vitally affects all Americans. Let me make clear right at the start that Communism IS a menace, and we must all be continually alert against its inroads. Unfortunately, however, efforts to protect the Nation's security sometimes get bogged down and distorted into deliberate efforts to promote fear hysteria for personal political gain, playing right into the enemies hands by dividing the American people instead of maintaining the solidarity of purpose we must have to

preserve democracy. As we seek to root out Communism, we must make sure we don't undermine the very basic freedoms of democracy that the Communists seek to destroy. Unless we are ready to admit the failure of democracy -- and I certainly am not -- we must be able to properly protect our internal security without sacrificing individual rights and civil liberties, and without stamping out freedom of thought and expression which have contributed so much to democracy's progress. That is one of the dangers we face today, as a result of abuses of the investigative authority of the Congress.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you think Congress should be investigating Communism, in and out of Government?

SENATOR: By all means -- it is part of our sworn responsibility to protect our country and uphold our Constitution. The only issue is HOW the Congress conducts such investigations, and whether it does it in a statesmanlike manner protecting the rights of the innocent, and protecting the heritage of our great bill of rights.

Our problem has become one of too many conflicting committees more interested in headline-hunting competition than in really protecting our internal security. This is not a partisan matter at all. Loyalty to our country is not a personal possession of any political party. All good Americans put such loyalty above partisan considerations. Democrats and Republicans alike share in the concern over the threat of Communism to freedom in the world, and should ^{and do} work hand in hand to safeguard our country from that threat. Our challenge today is to find better ways of protecting our internal security that don't undermine democracy itself. President Eisenhower has concurred in that belief in calling for specific rules to guide the Congressional investigations. However, he has left the problem up to the Congress itself. And it is to be regretted that the Republican leadership in the Senate apparently hesitates to meet this issue squarely and head-on.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I understand that you and Senator Douglas have proposed establishing a Joint Committee on Internal Security with a code of "fair play" to guide its activities. Can you tell us more about it?

SENATOR: I'm very glad to. It seems to be a more sensible course than we are now following. It is really nothing new -- when I returned to the Congress at the opening of this session I declared publicly that it was time to bring some order out of the chaos of our investigating committees, and establish some standards or ethics for their procedures. I have previously co-sponsored bills aimed at that purpose with Senators Lucas, Morse, and Kefauver. Representative Frelinghuysen of New Jersey has introduced similar legislation in the House. Senator Douglas and I have sought to bring together the most constructive ideas out of all these proposals and included them in a joint resolution introduced in the Senate on March 8. We took this action after the Senate's leadership declined President Eisenhower's own suggestions that something should be done, and left it up to the

very same committees now recklessly abusing their power.

Today a great many of the committees compete for headlines and sensations, while the real purpose of internal security gets lost in the shuffle. Our proposal calls for establishing one centralized joint committee from both the Senate and the House to handle all internal security matters, adequately staffed with experienced and qualified investigators instead of press agents. The proposal to consolidate the investigations of dangers to our security into one strong, legally constituted committee will also save a lot of money, and better employ the limited manpower resources in the Congress.

Furthermore, our proposal would meet President ^{the} ~~Eisenhower~~ ^{'s} suggestion for specific rules to guide the Congressional investigations. ^{yes} We should give a fair trial to those brought before the legislative courts of public opinion.

Our resolution is designed to introduce into our legislative ^{investigations} ~~inquiries~~ the same sense of justice and responsibility which is the foundation of our civil rights, and which guides our courts.

This is necessary to restore the prestige of the Congress, to save it from falling into disrepute, and to strengthen public support for the proper investigative functions of the Congress. Of course, this will also improve our waning prestige abroad -- and prove that democracy really works.

Our legislative investigations should develop a sense of Christian charity and mercy, and apply the principles of fair play and due process of the law.

Don't confuse this with being "soft". Far from it. Justice, compassion and mercy are not signs of softness and flabbiness. They are signs of strength, and the roots of American legal justice. They are the differences between the American way of life, and the Communist or any other totalitarian way.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, will you outline for us some of the specific provisions of the "fair play" code provided under your resolution?

SENATOR: Here are the main provisions of our bill:

1. Hearings would be held only if voted by a majority of the committee and a clear advance statement of the subject of hearings would be required.

2. Witnesses would have the right of counsel and his advice in public hearings, and unless a majority of the committee voted otherwise, in private hearings as well.

3. Witnesses would be permitted to file supplementary material following examination, or make brief oral statements confined to the matters upon which they were questioned.

4. All sessions would be reported stenographically and the record made available for inspection by witness or counsel.

5. Only the majority of the committee would be permitted to authorize the release of statements or documents.

6. A majority of the committee would be required to order executive hearings, and at least two members would be required to be present.

7. Committee testimony would be released only in full text, except in such cases as might compromise national security.

8. No committee reports could be issued unless submitted in advance to the committeemembers and adopted at a committee meeting.

9. Advance notice would be required to be given to persons about whom it is proposed to present derogatory information at a public hearing, and insofar as practicable, such material shall be presented first in executive session to permit the committee to test its reliability and probative value.

10. Persons who believe they were defamed or their reputations damaged by committee testimony made public would be permitted to file a sworn statement refuting such testimony, to appear personally and testify, to obtain witnesses in their behalf if allowed by the committee majority, and to secure the appearance of and cross-examine the adverse witnesses unless the majority should decide otherwise.

11. Witnesses would also be permitted to submit cross-examination questions in writing to the chairman of the committee to be put to other witnesses while giving damaging testimony.

12. A novel provision of the bill requires that a witness who gives testimony reflecting adversely on the character and reputation of another in an open hearing shall be required to disclose his sources of information unless to do so would endanger the national security.

SIMMS: Senator, that certainly seems more in keeping with our traditional democratic processes than many present investigations, and should be a constructive step for the Congress to take.

SENATOR: Yes, I am convinced it is. At the very heart of our resolution is the doctrine that the accused should have an adequate and speedy right to defend his most precious possession -- his reputation.

A man cherishes his reputation more than he cherishes his property and frequently his life. As Shakespeare said:

"Be ye, that filches from me my good name,
Robs me of that, which not enriches him,
And makes me poor indeed."

We can have differences, without being disloyal. We can be liberal, without being subversive. We can believe in progress, without being a danger to free institutions. We can grant others the right to be non-conformists, to be inquiring and venturesome, without endangering our national security.

That is the American way -- the way that must be preserved.

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his weekly report from the Nation's capital, presented as a public service in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.....

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 13: WEEK OF APRIL 5, 1954

HEALTH

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey with his weekly report from the Nation's

capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in

cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, what is the

situation in the current Congress with respect to health legislation?

SENATOR: I am glad you asked me to discuss health issues because few things

so directly affect all the American people. Several weeks ago we

commented on the President's message to the Congress outlining his

views on health legislation, most of them constructive views. At the

same time, however, I called attention to the President's budget message

that put quite a damper on the outlook for some of the fine objectives

he outlined for improved health programs and improved health facilities.

Unfortunately, the President's recommendations for funds did not match

his recommendations for accomplishing some of the things that need

to be done. However, Congress has been taking a deep look at some of

these problems and may come up with views of its own.

I hope we can narrow the gulf between what the President says should be done and what his Administration really plans doing. When the President's budget was submitted to the Congress we found that instead of providing for increased research on cancer, heart disease, arthritis and all those other afflictions which are causing millions to suffer and costing our Nation millions of dollars in productivity loss, in fact such research funds were sharply cut. Now, I consider that a dangerous step backward. Moreover, funds for the control of the communicable diseases are less than in the past, and tuberculosis funds were cut by 42 percent. We find, too, that whereas the President's health message had called for expansion of the hospital construction program, the budget funds proposed for the ~~going~~ construction program have been cut down to one-third of the amount authorized in the Act -- the lowest figure in the history of the program. We find, too, that whereas the Presidential health message had spoken in glowing terms of increasing by 40,000 a year the number of disabled Americans restored to gainful employment through an expanded rehabilitation program, in his budget he has slashed the funds for rehabilitation by almost \$4 million.

These are contradictions which I cannot pretend to explain to you. But no matter what the President may say in his message, and no matter what the Bureau of the Budget may recommend, what is actually done in the field of Federal health activity depends primarily on Congressional Committees -- on the actions of the House and Senate Committees which draft health legislation, and on the Appropriations Committees which finally determine in large measure just how much money will be available for whatever programs the Congress approves.

SIMS: Let's turn our attention to those legislative committees, Senator Humphrey. Are they showing more consideration for health legislation?

SENATOR: I am happy to report one new and what I think is an important development. In past years, as you know, most of our health legislation originated in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was in the Senate that the most extensive hearings were held, and I believe I can rightfully say the most intensive attempts were made to investigate

the problems involved. In this Congress, however, under the chairmanship of a Republican, Congressman Wolverton of New Jersey, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been conducting since last October one of the most thorough-going studies on health problems affecting the Nation that has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Starting with an analysis of the measures being taken both by government and the private agencies to find the cause and cure of major diseases, going into the adequacy or inadequacy of health facilities, inquiring into all the various types of health insurance plans now available to the American people, and ending up with a really serious investigation of new proposals made by men in groups actually providing medical care to large groups of people at prices they can afford to pay, the House Committee has done an amazing job. I recommend that those of you who are interested write for a copy of their printed hearings. You will find much of it that is of interest.

SIMMS: Senator, do you expect any new bills to result from the hearings?

SENATOR: Well, out of that activity, and because of Mr. Wolverton's personal interest in the problem and his refusal to kowtow to people who insist that all is right in the world of medicine when the facts on every side show clearly that it is not, I think we can expect some real and progressive action during this session of the Congress. I do not know which of the many bills being studied by that committee will be reported out. The fate of two of them, I am sure, will be of particular interest.

One of these, Congressman Wolverton's bill, H. R. 7700, represents what I think is an interesting proposal put forth by Henry Kaiser with respect to the financing of local hospitals. It could, of course, apply to the financing of group health facilities such as clinics and diagnostic centers as well. In brief, Mr. Kaiser contends that his successful group pre-payment medical care plans came into being only because he was personally able to underwrite the costs of hospital construction. Therefore, Mr. Kaiser has proposed and the Wolverton bill suggests that the Federal government should re-insure local lending agencies which are willing to advance funds for the building of hospital

and related facilities to prepaid, comprehensive health group plans. Much the same as the FHA insured private real estate loans, he would have the government guarantee loans extended to pre-payment groups by local financing agencies. It is a constructive suggestion that we should certainly study with care.

A second Wolverton bill, H. R. 6950, is almost the same as the bills which I introduced in earlier Congresses at the suggestion of our cooperative health association. It would provide long-term low interest loans for the construction and equipping of health service facilities for non-profit health associations. It is broader in its terms than our original co-op bill, but it is essentially sound.

SIMMS: Senator, you have told us of the House activity, but what about the Senate Committees?

SENATOR: As yet little has been done on the part of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the health field. However, hearings have just been held on extension of the hospital construction program which most of us support.

I am pleased that hearings have been set for next week on my co-op health bill providing loans for equipping of health service facilities for non-profit health associations, to which I referred earlier. I might point out that I favor the use of loans, rather than any outright grants such as the Administration now proposes. I will testify at the hearings April 12 in support of my bill.

SIMMS: What hearings will follow, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: Next will be hearings on the President's recommendations for changing the system whereby grants-in-aid are made to the states for local public health activities. In the past the Congress in making those grants has ordinarily stipulated the amounts or percentages which would be allocated to a specific local public health activity such as tuberculosis control or cancer screening programs. The President's new proposal would change that system so as to give the states greater leeway in deciding how much of the total Federal grant they receive should be spent on one or another activity. Insofar as particular disease problems

are not equally important in each of the states, on its face this looks like a good proposal. I am a little bit worried, however, about one intangible but important factor in this proposal.

I am afraid that even though this is not intended it may actually result in lower and lower appropriations for those public health activities. I remember a few years back when the Public Health Service appearing before the appropriations committee said it needed more money for general public health work in the states, and that in order to get it it was willing to take a slight cut in the amounts granted for work in ~~some of the~~ TB-control and a few other categories of public health assistance. The result was that the committee gleefully made the recommended cuts in the specific categories, and when it came to general public health refused to appropriate anything at all. This is simply that well-known devil, human nature, at work again.

If you ask the people if they are against tuberculosis, if they are against heart disease, and if they are willing to spend money to fight those things, they invariably say yes.

But when you fail to mention those specific diseases and just talk about health in general, you get no such reaction. It is the old problem that the preacher has before him constantly. Somehow he finds it extremely hard to get the congregation worked up over his description of heaven, but just let him start talking about fire and brimstone and all the special horrors which may be visited upon the congregation which is unfortunate enough to fall into the clutches of the devil, and he gets an immediate and powerful reaction. I am a little bit afraid that this may be what the new approach to public health appropriations will face. Whereas we have been getting dollars to fight against specific devils, I am afraid we will get pennies if we are only talking about generalities of public health.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about the Administration's proposal to re-insure voluntary health insurance plans which are willing to take on added risks of broadening their services?

SENATOR: Frankly, there isn't much that I can tell you about this proposal because aside from saying that it would be limited and experimental, the Administration has not yet told us what it has in mind. > It has repeatedly promised to send down a bill, but it has not yet done so. I think anyone who has studied the problem at all can see why. This is a most complex and involved problem, and my opinion is that the Administration perhaps spoke too soon, and has since been unable to work out a proposal satisfactory even to itself. When and if it does send such a bill, we certainly will have to examine it with great care. In effect, it is being proposed that the taxpayer's money shall be used to re-insure private health insurance concerns.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey....You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from Washington to the people of Minnesota. This program has been presented as a public service, in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.....

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 14: WEEK OF APRIL 12, 1954

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's

capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in

cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, what do you want to

discuss this week?

SENATOR: I would like to call the attention of our people in Minnesota

to what I regard as a very serious ^{mistake} ~~error~~ made by the House of

Representatives. It is something we should all be deeply concerned

about, because it affects the world we live in and our hopes and

dreams of being able to live in peace and neighborly harmony. I am

referring to one of the simplest but most effective and necessary arms

of our foreign policy -- the educational exchange programs. I think

most of us realize that we simply must learn to live as good neighbors

if we ever expect to maintain peace in the world, and one of the most

effective ways to achieve mutual understanding has been through the

educational process of sending young Americans abroad, ^{to study & learn} and bringing young students and teachers from other countries to America to find out how democracy really works.

SIMMS: What has happened to this program, Senator Humphrey?

sent almost no money too small

SENATOR: Well, I regret to say that the House of Representatives has ^{wrecked} virtually ~~emasculated~~ it with a 40% cut in appropriations, playing right into the hands of Soviet Communists just to save \$6,000,000. You do not find the Kremlin cutting down on its efforts to educate and indoctrinate students of other lands with Communist views; they are expanding all the time. Yet right in the midst of our desperate struggle for survival of freedom we refuse to invest an extra six million dollars in "selling" democracy to the rest of the world through these effective student exchange programs. Denial of the funds needed will halt United States educational exchange relationships with two-thirds of the important foreign countries in which the Soviet Union and its bloc are expanding similar activities, and greatly cripple our educational relationships with even more countries.

SIMMS: Senator, can you tell us more specifically just what this reduction voted by the House of Representatives will mean:

SENATOR: Yes, I can -- and I think we all should consider very carefully whether we want to risk such foolish "economy" at the possible expense of our future safety and security. The \$6 million reduction voted by the House will mean these things:

1. Eliminate educational exchanges completely in 46 countries, including all of the South American Republics, Egypt, Turkey, Korea, Indonesia, Iran, and Formosa. In other words, end our student exchanges right in the areas of deepest concern to the world today, the areas where freedom may hang in the balance.

2. Eliminate entirely the ^{ship} so-called leader program in all of the 70 countries with which we have had educational relationships. This is the program that affords us an opportunity to reach the leaders of other nations by sharing with them the spirit of America and the aspirations of our people.

3. Eliminate entirely the teacher exchange programs with all 70 countries.

4. Stop even the small grants-in-aid to American sponsored schools in Latin America.

I must admit I simply cannot understand the motivation of this most short-sighted act of the House. To cut \$6 million from the educational exchange program will in the end prove so costly to us that it will be difficult to measure that loss in terms of dollars. At a time when the Soviet Union is expanding its propaganda and exchange programs with the nations of the world, we are being asked to halt our educational exchange relationships with those same nations.

- Example
Indonesia, Burma, India

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, haven't we had quite a few of these exchange students in Minnesota?

SENATOR: Yes, we have had many of them, and I am sure anyone who has had a chance to talk either with our young people who have enjoyed the opportunity of being "missionaries for democracy" overseas, or with any of the young students from other lands who have studied at our University of Minnesota or gone out to live in American farm homes, will agree with me that this ^{relatively} ~~simple little~~ inexpensive program builds more goodwill and offers more hope for future world peace than all the costly military preparations we could ever make. Rather than curtailing this program, we should be doubling and tripling it. I would far rather have the government of the United States and the people of the United States spend a few million dollars building up good will and democracy, and thus hoping to avoid war, than to spend billions of dollars later trying to remedy the bad effects of our earlier short-sightedness. The Educational Exchange Program seems to me ^{to be} ~~a~~ a wise investment by the people of the United States.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, will an effort be made to restore these funds in the Senate?

SENATOR: It certainly will, and I shall vigorously support it. I am hopeful of course that our Senate Appropriations Committee will put these needed funds back in the appropriations bill that comes over to us from the House, but if the Committee fails to do so an effort will be made directly from the floor to amend the bill and restore full funds for continuing the exchange programs. *of the Sen.* Increase -!

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, doesn't this action on the student exchange programs seem to reflect a general tendency ~~toward~~ ^{of} turning more and more ~~toward~~ ^{to} full dependence on the military for security, with less and less attention given to positive, constructive ways to avoid war?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, I am afraid that is true. I wish I did not have to say that. I feel very deeply we should be looking for ways to build friendship, not just for ways to win wars. Now, of course, I fully support effective military preparedness, and have insisted that we do not sacrifice our preparedness just to save dollars. But the same thing holds true for these other programs such as the educational exchange,

the Point-Four program, use of food to eliminate famine, and similar ideas.

It is a strange thing to me that we are willing to pour billions into being ready to fight a war, yet hesitate to spend a few millions to try and avoid a war.

SIMMS: You mentioned the Point-Four Program, Senator. Isn't that also being somewhat sidetracked at present?

SENATOR: Yes, it is. ^{many} ~~I am afraid much~~ of its original objectives are being lost sight of through its closer and closer integration with military aid, instead of being allowed to stand alone as friendly technical assistance -- offered in the true neighborly spirit of helping people, not just bluntly used to "buy" allegiance or build up our defenses around the world. I think any of us can understand the difference if we just stop to think about it and apply it to ourselves. We are ~~probably~~ real pleased and appreciative if a neighbor drops over and gives us a helping hand in repairing our barn, or brings over a cake just as a

friendly gesture. But we would feel quite differently about it if we thought the neighbor was just trying to curry favor for himself, and wanted something out of us in return -- or if he was treating us like a charity case. International relations are just the same as human relations, and human feelings have to be considered. In my opinion the best international relations we could have would be based upon our own Christian principles and traditions, the Golden Rule in action. If we want respect, we have got to show respect -- not be domineering or stand-offish. If we want friends, we have got to be friendly and considerate. If we want cooperation, we have got to display some cooperation ourselves.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, this discussion that started out over what appeared to be a minor item in the budget certainly brings us right into the heart of the world situation today. Because it is probably uppermost in most of our minds, I wonder if you have any comments about the recent public release of information about the terrific destructive power of the new H-bombs?

SENATOR: Well, one thing I do know for sure -- it should certainly convince all of us that war offers no answer to any of our problems. Modern war would just mean annihilation, the destruction of ourselves as well as our enemies. As we hear about the terrible consequences of H-Bomb explosions it should emphasize all the more the importance and the necessity of doing everything possible to avoid and avert war.

It should make clear the necessity for maintaining and expanding such

~~things~~ ^{activities} as our educational exchange programs, ~~our~~ ^{the} Point Four Program, and

~~our~~ ^{the} use of food to aid underprivileged peoples all over the world. In

other words it should stimulate us to make greater effort to find

constructive ways to restore peace in the world, instead of carelessly

allowing such programs to be eliminated in the name of economy. What are

we going to do with the meager savings, if we are wiped out and destroyed?

All of us have some serious thinking to do. We have only two choices. We

must either learn to live together in this world in true friendliness and

mutual good will, or one of these days we are going to explode into a

conflict that ~~will~~ ^{may} destroy our civilization.

I don't want to sound pessimistic, because I believe we can learn to live in peace and harmony -- if we have the will do do so, and put as much emphasis on constructive ways of achieving that goal as we put on planning, research, and expenditures for the destructive forces of war.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...You have been listening to your Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly radio report from the Nation's capital....This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 15: WEEK OF APRIL 19, 1954

SCHOOL LUNCH
PUBLIC HOUSING

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, I notice that you have been urging expansion of our school lunch program, so perhaps you would comment on that during our discussion.

SENATOR: Yes, I have a couple of things I want to report to the people of Minnesota but the school lunch question might as well be the first. I think most of us know about the school lunch program, and the ~~fine contribution it has made to the health of our young people.~~

✓ Youngsters form their eating habits early, and proper nutritional food is so very important during those active years of boyhood and girlhood.

✓ The school lunch program is an excellent example of teamwork between the ~~Federal government, the state government, and local school officials.~~

Costs are shared all the way down the line. Unfortunately, however, lately we seem to be failing to recognize the growth of our school ~~population~~ population in planning the necessary funds for carrying on this important ~~program~~ program.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what does the current budget before the Congress provide for school lunch programs?

SENATOR: Far from enough, I am sorry to say. The Administration is asking for a reduction of \$15,236,197 in school lunch funds, a slash of 18%. *from last yr*
Now, I do not quite agree that the health of our young people is the place to start government economizing. With all the billions we are ~~spending~~ spending for defense, it seems downright silly to try to save \$15,000,000 at the expense of our future citizens. They are America's greatest asset. We must see that they are properly taken care of.

83 to 68
Of course, this \$15 million reduction in the school lunch program is really much worse than it sounds. Actually, just holding ~~the program~~

appropriations at the same level as last year would really be a "reduction" because of the increased number of school children that must be served. We are not going to have a very effective school lunch program if we keep cutting the funds down while the number of pupils increases.

SIMMS: Senator, can you tell us how big a change there has been in school enrollment?

SENATOR: Yes, I can. I have been disturbed by this reduction in school lunch funds at a time when I felt it should be increased so I asked the Office of Education to get together some figures for me to show what is happening to our school enrollment. During 1952-53, we had a total of 25,348,700 children in our elementary schools and 7,028,400 in our secondary schools. During the present school year, 1953-54, we have 26,931,300 children in elementary schools and 7,302,400 in secondary schools. That is an increase of 1,856,600 in our elementary and secondary school population throughout the nation.

31,350,000

34
mill.

And it is going to be even larger. Our school enrollment will increase steadily over the next six years. We know that from census figures ~~on the number of children now in the pre-school age brackets.~~ Now I happen to think that our school lunch program must keep pace with this growth. We are not doing it. We are not even providing as much as ~~we formerly provided for smaller numbers, let alone keep the same amount per student.~~ While our school enrollment is going up nearly two million, we are asked to cut down school lunch funds by 18%. Does that make good sense? Not if you think of the welfare of these children.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about our Minnesota schools? Do we share in this increased enrollment reported throughout the Nation?

SENATOR: We certainly do. Our State Department of Education reports that a recent school census revealed an increase of 27,118 in Minnesota's school-age children last year. Minnesota's school-age figures, also, ~~show that 68,000 more children will become of age to enter school in the next six years, while only from 44,000 to 58,000 will be moving out of the schools.~~

So you can see our school population in Minnesota will be growing steadily for at least six more years. We must plan to take care of that increased enrollment. We can hardly plan proper lunch programs for them with less and less funds available.

From 1950 through this year, national school lunch funds have been held the same at about \$83,000,000 per year. It has meant reductions in school lunch aid, however, because it has been necessary to spread that money thinner and thinner to serve more and more pupils. Now, instead of trying to catch up with our growth by providing more money, this Administration proposes to provide less. I just doubt if ~~our state government will make up the difference.~~ The result will be poorer school lunch programs, probably at higher prices to the youngsters.

SIMMS: Hasn't that already happened to some extent in Minnesota?

SENATOR: Yes, it has. Last year, even though we were given the same allocation for our state as we have had in recent years, it became necessary to increase the price of milk to our school children. Now, it certainly seems wrong to make it harder for our youngsters to get all the milk they want and need at a time when we are also worrying about temporary over-production of dairy products, and wondering what to do about butter. One of the best ways we could help relieve the butter situation is to get children to drink more milk, so less would be made into butter. If we are going to invest public money in protecting our dairy industry, which most of us agree is necessary, isn't it better to use that money to make milk available to school children rather than just to pile up butter in storage?

Actually, an increase of only eight quarts of milk in our annual per capita consumption would completely wipe out our dairy surplus. Now it seems to me the school lunch program would be a good place to encourage that increase, because of the future benefits of the milk-drinking habits that could be encouraged.

SIMMS: Do you think there is still time to do anything to prevent this cut in school lunch funds, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: I am certainly going to try. So far this is still just the recommendation of the Eisenhower Administration. It has not been approved by either the House or the Senate. I just have a feeling Congress will not go along with this cut. Whether or not we can change a cut into the increase we need is doubtful. However, the least we should settle for is the same amount of money we have had in the past for school lunches.

SIMMS: Senator, you mentioned that you had some other topics in mind you wanted to discuss. Because time is running along, suppose we leave school lunches now and hear what else you have to report.

SENATOR: Well, I wish it was better news for Minnesota, but I am afraid it is not. I just wonder how many Minnesota people realize what the House action on low-income housing meant to our state.

As you know, the House rejected even the President's recommendations on low-income housing, as mild as they were.

I just wanted to be sure what this action meant to Minnesota, so I asked the Housing and Home Finance Agency to give us a report on our pending projects.

Here's the answer I got:

Every one of Minnesota's pending projects is wiped out.

This does not mean new projects that have been contemplated, mind you, it means projects already authorized and under preliminary loan contracts. We had projects for 2,054 housing units in that stage, waiting the green light for construction to go ahead. Instead, all of them are now eliminated completely.

SIMMS: That IS bad news, Senator Humphrey. Where were these units proposed for Minnesota?

SENATOR: The greatest part of the authorized low-income housing units that have been eliminated were in Minneapolis -- 816 units in all. In St. Paul, 742 units under preliminary loan contracts have been cut out by the House action, with 300 more eliminated at Duluth, 45 at Hibbing, 85 at Fergus Falls, 50 at Eveleth, and 16 at Chisholm.

You may recall that when we discussed the President's housing message a few weeks ago, I expressed disappointment at the low number of low-income housing units which he proposed, yet warned that even that amount would have a hard time getting through Congress. Well, I don't like to say "I told you so" -- but that is just what has happened.

Of course, we are going to try and restore some of these public housing projects in the Senate, but we certainly cannot get a very effective housing job done without a real push from the Administration itself.

Those who do not have sufficient income to buy new private housing require public housing to secure adequate family shelter. This group is made up of families who have incomes of under \$3,000 and most of them earn less than \$2,500. The latest census figures reveal that in 1951 more than 31% of our non-farm families earned under \$3,000; 23.6% received less than \$2,500. More than ten million American families were in the group earning less than \$3,000 and over eight million received less than \$2,500.

This is the segment of our population whose housing need is the most urgent because it is so largely made up of occupants of sub-standard dwellings. Yet, these are the families whose financial means are the least adequate; for the majority, if new housing is to be obtained, only public housing will provide a reasonable answer. No national housing program is adequate unless it includes at least a return to the 1949 Housing Act's provision for the construction of 135,000 housing units a year, and a top of 200,000 to be invoked under extra-ordinary circumstances such as exist at present.

Public housing is cheaper than slums, urban decay, disease and human blight caused by sub-standard housing conditions -- and it is cheaper by far than the cost of idle factories and idle men.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...You have been listening to your Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly radio report from the Nation's capital...This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 16: WEEK OF APRIL 26, 1954

GOOD GOVERNMENT

VOICE: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator, this is the season of the year when Congress is busy acting on appropriation bills called for to meet the government's budget. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I understand you have done quite a bit of work on Congressional budgetary procedures and have been urging changes that you believe would improve present methods. Perhaps you would like to discuss this issue on our program.

SENATOR: Yes, I certainly would. You know I have been a student of government for many years, and since coming to Washington as United States

Senator from Minnesota I have tried to work constantly for improved *budget*
procedures *Legislature reform*
~~government~~, ~~good government~~, and economical government where economy was sound.

One of the first things about which I became concerned in the Congress was the methods Congress uses in taking action on the budget. I have been trying to do something about it ever since. I was very encouraged recently to learn that the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis has shown a similar concern, and has been studying this subject. Mrs. S. C. Gale, President of the League, has written me that the League believes this is an excellent time for Congress to take action on improving its methods of operation. I certainly agree with them. Improving our budgetary procedures would be a big step towards increasing the efficiency and economy of our government, a matter in which we are all interested.

VOICE: Senator Humphrey, just what changes do the League of Women Voters advocate?

SENATOR: Pretty much the same things I have been working for ever since I have been in the Congress. Most of them are incorporated in the Economy Act of 1953 which I introduced on February 18th of last year.

That bill is still before the Committee on Government Operations and is very much alive. Support by such groups as the League ^{of Women Voters} could be very effective in helping to move the bill forward toward legislative action. Basically, it calls for the establishment of a consolidated cash budget, the separation of operating from capital expenditures, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, the establishment of a rule under which roll call votes would be required on appropriation measures, and recognition of the need for Presidential authority for item veto.

VOICE: Senator, perhaps you had better explain those points in more detail. Budget processes are a bit complicated for most of us, although we realize their importance in good government.

SENATOR: I recognize that, and it is one of the reasons that it has been difficult to make constructive progress with such legislation. But one thing we should all be able to understand: the present budget practices of the Federal government are more than 30 years old. A lot has changed in that time. They need to be revitalized to bring about efficient economy in government.

consideration is now being
I am pleased that the ~~Eisenhower Administration~~ has been
given to
~~reported considering inauguration of~~ a new budget system which ~~they~~ *the Bureau of the Budget*

proposed
claimⁿ would make possible a bookkeeping saving of \$3,250,000,000. This
new system they ~~propose~~ is based on the adoption of a consolidated cash
budget -- exactly the proposal that I have been making since the 81st
Congress.

*all money in
all money out*
In my opinion, a consolidated cash budget is the only way in
which the national fiscal picture can be presented to the American
people truly and accurately. This type of budget shows the actual flow of
money between the government and the people, and has been in the past
strongly supported by the Committee for Economic Development. Such
a "cash budget" would be a true measure of the impact of the budget on
our economy. It would afford a realistic basis for relating the budget
to the economic environment, and permit intelligent debate on the
budget.

VOICE: Just what do you mean, Senator, by separation of operating
from capital expenditures?

SENATOR: Every business concern makes a clear distinction in its fiscal operations between operating expenses, and capital expenditures. | *Improvements*

We need the same approach for good government, so we will know the difference between operating costs and money spent for permanent improvements. Our proposal in this regard is consistent with one of the central recommendations of the Hoover Commission in making such a distinction in the Federal budget between these expenditures.

VOICE: Senator, you mention the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures. Just what do you have in mind?

SENATOR: Careful consideration of the budget is possible only if there is an opportunity for judicious handling of appropriations in the Congress. This provision would provide for the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress to work with the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to establish and then to adhere to a specific schedule for handling appropriation bills. In recent years, appropriation measures

have rarely been enacted in time for the beginning of the fiscal year.

The uncertainties and waste arising from this delay should be avoided.

VOICE: I see what you mean. And you feel that roll call votes are also needed on these appropriation measures, or money bills?

SENATOR: I most certainly do. Yea and Nay votes should be recorded on every appropriation measure. That is not being done at present. In a democracy the voters have a right to know how their representatives have been acting on crucial appropriation measures. I believe this would do more to encourage economy than almost any other single change. It is an effective way for members of Congress to be counted on issues affecting economy. Of course, it does create problems. I fully appreciate that in order for this to be effective it would probably be necessary for the Congress to perhaps adopt a system of electric automatic voting, particularly in the light of the many amendments that reach the House of Representatives and the long period of time it takes for members of the House to vote by roll call. Such electric voting, however, is desirable on its own merits and I am for such a change if that

change will make Congressional voting behaviour more efficient, and more responsive to the public will.

VOICE: Senator, can you tell us more about your insistence that the President should have item veto power?

SENATOR: I am glad to, because a Presidential item veto is essential in an overall program for economy. It curtails the possibility of pork-barrel items being included in the appropriation bills, and is an effective barrier against log-rolling and legislative riders. All that it means is that the President may veto particular items out of an appropriation measure, without vetoing the entire bill. The item veto is standard practice today in 39 states. Congress has approved this principle in the past in authorizing the Chief Executive of the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico to veto individual items in appropriation bills. Our proposal is designed to establish that provision within constitutional limitations. You may know that Senator Vandenberg

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 17: WEEK OF MAY 3, 1954

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

VOICE: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, what would you like to discuss this week?

SENATOR: Well, I am still concerned about making young people victims of some of our so-called economy moves these days. In recent weeks we have talked about the proposed slashes in the school lunch program and the cutback in the Educational Exchange Program. Now I think it is time to speak out against what the Administration proposes doing to our great Vocational Education Programs.

My feelings about vocational education are certainly no secret. I have championed this important educational program in and out of the Senate. To me it is an essential part of our Nation's program for education.

It prepares our young men and women for full participation in society, and offers a special training necessary to meet the high school needs of a complicated, integrated industrial economy. It is a vital part of training for citizenship.

My interest in vocational education is for the Nation as a whole, although I want to talk more specifically about programs in our own State. I have always believed that the vocational education programs sponsored by the Congress through the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and the George-Barden Act of 1946, have made an important contribution to the growth and progress of our country. For that reason I have constantly and energetically supported a full appropriation every year for our vocational education program. I regret to say it looks like we are going to have to put up a fight again to keep these programs effective.

VOICE: Senator Humphrey, what has the Administration recommended for these programs?

SENATOR: I am sorry to report that the President's Bureau of the Budget has recommended that the appropriation under the George-Barden Act be cut by approximately \$1 million. Such a cut comes in the face of increased school enrollment and increased needs for these programs. In my judgment, the full George-Barden Act appropriation of \$29 million ought to be forthcoming. This proposed budget cut is inadvisable, and an example of false economy. Its effect is to reduce the productiveness of the American people and the American economy. Such a productive decrease is expensive.

VOICE: Senator, what can you tell us about the status of these Vocational Education Programs in Minnesota?

SENATOR: Well, let me just illustrate the need for a full program of vocational education through relating the program's effectiveness in our own State. The 1953 report of the Minnesota Commission on Vocational and Higher Education has this to say:

"In Minnesota, of the 446 school districts maintaining accredited secondary schools in 1951-52, only 3.8 percent made available all four of the major approved reimbursable services: agriculture, distributive, homemaking, and trade and industrial education. Only 6.9 percent offered as many as three of these services, only 29.1 percent as many as two, and only 59.1 percent had even one of these services."

This report clearly demonstrates that the program of vocational education in our state has not developed to the point where there is no further need for additional programs. In fact, there is a clear need for additional growth. In the school year 1952-53, only 221 secondary schools out of 446 accredited secondary schools maintained approved agricultural departments. This is 49 percent of the total number of schools. Now, our State is a great agricultural state. In an agricultural state such as ours at least 25 percent additional secondary schools should establish agricultural departments. They are not likely to do it if we cut still further the amount of Federal assistance available.

VOICE: Senator, perhaps I am wrong but I thought this Administration was saying we had to rely more on education to solve agriculture's problems.

SENATOR: No, you are not wrong -- that is just one of the perplexities of this Administration that says one thing, then does another. Just like on housing, hospital aid, public health programs, school construction, and other issues, there is a big gap between what they talk about and what they propose in the budget. It is money that talks! You have every right to be confused, however, because the proposal by the Bureau of the Budget to cut further the vocational education program, which will in turn cut our state program of agricultural education, comes at a time when the Administration through the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, is calling on farmers to increase their training efficiency and science. The same Administration which is cutting vocational education funds is also telling the farmers not to rely on Federal price supports, but to rely more on agricultural education efficiency and modern methods of farming -- and yet it is cutting the funds to provide the training for modern agricultural methods.

VOICE: Senator Humphrey, what do you estimate this reduction will mean in terms of dollars to Minnesota?

SENATOR: The President's proposal to cut vocational education by \$1 million over the Nation will probably cost Minnesota nearly \$50,000 a year for agricultural, industrial, and home economics education. This will inevitably mean that the Minnesota Department of Education and similar state agencies all over the country will have to cut their vocational education programs. As a result, the American Vocational Education Association recently issued a statement which said that the cut, and I quote, "is an attempt to destroy our Nation's program of vocational education by inches rather than by yards". That is not my charge -- it is the charge of the American Vocational Education Association. However, it is a viewpoint that I share, and share with great concern.

VOICE: Senator Humphrey, I think most people are familiar with the Future Farmer phase of vocational education in the agricultural field, but perhaps they are not so familiar with the other forms of vocational

training involved. What is the status of some of these other programs in Minnesota?

SENATOR: I am glad you brought that up because the record supports the need for further vocational education in other major fields besides agriculture. In the school year 1952-53, only 41 percent of the total number of secondary schools in our State maintained approved homemaking departments. Our state authorities estimate that homemaking education should definitely be established in an additional 30 percent of our schools. In the 1952-53 school year only 10 percent of the total number of schools in our state maintained trade and industrial vocational departments. I might just add that in our state, according to the 1950 census, there has been an increase by 60 percent in the number of skilled tradesmen employed by industry from 1940 to 1950. Every logic calls for an increase of at least 25 percent in the industrial trade program for Minnesota.

But let's also look at the distributive occupations -- the retail and service trades. Only 5 percent of our schools maintain approved programs in this field. Yet there has been a 52 percent increase in the number of managers, proprietors, and sales persons over the last ten years in Minnesota.

VOICE: How much assistance does Minnesota normally get from the Federal government for these educational programs, Senator?

SENATOR: In the past year the State of Minnesota received about \$600,000 in Federal assistance for vocational education. We need this Federal aid program, to meet our responsibilities. Our local communities are now bearing the brunt of a tremendous school construction program. They are not in a position to carry this vocational education load without full help from the Federal government. Our state and other states have attempted to do their share in supplement^{ing}/Federal aid with state funds. In 1953, for example, our state provided \$1,250,000 for vocational education compared to \$700,000 in 1949. All of this has

been designed to make our Vocational Education program more effective.

Yet we still are not keeping pace with the needs, with the growing demands and increasing school enrollment. Our program, and every program in the Nation, would suffer a grievous blow if Federal funds were curtailed as now being proposed. I want Minnesota to know that I am going to vigorously oppose such reductions, and seek to maintain our educational standards.

VOICE: Thank you, Senator Humphrey....You have been listening to your Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly radio report from the Nation's capital...This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your Station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 18: WEEK OF MAY 10, 1954

AGRICULTURE

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring

you Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator Humphrey, what is the situation now with regard to farm legislation:

SENATOR: Well, we have taken one setback -- but the fight is still going on for an improved and strengthened farm program -- one that will offer more effective protection for farm prices and farm income than proposed by the present Administration.

As most of our listeners know, an attempt was made on the Wool Bill to add amendments extending 90% price supports on basic commodities for another year, and restoring dairy supports to that level with the provision they could not be lowered in the future any more than 5 percent in any one year. We needed five more votes to win the extension of 90% price supports, but it was not a clear-cut test.

Administration threats of vetoing the Wool Bill led some Wool state Senators to shy away from the idea of adding support for other commodities to the Wool Bill. However, as many of us pointed out on the floor, nothing was gained for wool growers. The House Agriculture Committee has already decided it will keep all price support in [^] [^] one package bill, and as a result the Wool Bill passed by the Senate is now pigeonholed. If we had been able to expand it to include other commodities, we might have got speedier House approval. As it stands, the Senate committee is trying to give us bits of farm legislation one at a time so the Administration can approve what it likes, and veto what it does not like. The House Committee intends putting all the measures it believes belongs in a good farm program into one "package", so the President will have to approve or reject the entire group. I just hope we do not get deadlocked between the House and Senate, and come out with nothing as a result.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what are some of the things you believe should be included in any general farm bill coming out of this session?

SENATOR: I think we must include food distribution and use along with protection for the farmers. In other words, I would like to see extension of 90% price supports but added with it both a food stamp plan for domestic food distribution and an overseas disposal program to make use of our abundance to combat famine and strengthen our foreign policy. Then, too, I think an effective program must also include some provision *where acreage control* for using diverted acres for conservation practices, such as I have proposed in my Soil Fertility Bank Bill, and provide for set-asides of special strategic reserves held off the market for emergency uses.

REA. conservation - credit - Storage
RTA

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, you mentioned one of your bills. Don't you have a number of farm measures covering these very objectives?

SENATOR: Yes, I do -- I have tried to present a balanced program for agriculture. I call my program "Equality for Agriculture", for that is the objective of all measures I have sponsored or co-sponsored in the Senate. Let me run down a few of them for you --

(Ad lib and read from Equality for Agriculture program)

SIMMS: Yes, that is an impressive program, Senator Humphrey, and would go a long way toward meeting some of our current farm problems. Senator, I know you are particularly interested in seeing that good use is made of our abundance. Along that line you made some comments in the Senate recently criticizing use of powdered milk to feed animals when human need for it exists in many parts of the world. Would you care to comment further on that?

SENATOR: Yes, I would.....(Ad lib on Philippine situation, African kids, Italian Communists)

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...I think all of us will agree we want to see our food abundance used for the good of the world, not regarded as a millstone around our necks. You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital....This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your Station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 19: WEEK OF MAY 17, 1954

COMBATTING RECESSION

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator, many people are voicing concern about some of the trends in our economy. What do you think about conditions today, and what could or should be done about them?

SENATOR: Well, that is a mighty big order but I am glad to talk about

it. First of all let me express my confidence in this country's

ability to meet any challenge, economic or otherwise. If we have

the will and determination, we can overcome any obstacles. I am an

optimist, not a pessimist. But I am a realist, too, and want to

face facts. I have great faith in our country and in our economic

strength, but I want to keep that faith founded on deeds, not on words

alone. So it is with that attitude I try to watch carefully for warning

signs that should be heeded. It does not help just to go around with

our heads in the clouds promising each other things will be better by and by.

You do not fix a hole in your roof by refusing to look at it. The thing to do is climb up there and put a patch on it before it gets any bigger. My appeal now is not to ignore the warning symptoms in our economy. I think we should face them squarely, with confidence, then get busy doing whatever needs to be done to improve our situation, to restore full employment and full purchasing power.

SIMMS: Senator, what are some of the things you feel are necessary to put our economy on a stronger footing?

SENATOR: (Ad lib from anti-Recession press release)

SIMMS: That sounds like a constructive program, Senator Humphrey. I think most people would welcome such steps to avert any chance of a depression.

SENATOR: We just cannot afford a depression, in this country. The price is too high, both in human misery and actual cash costs. We have contracted tremendous defense obligations during a period of an expanding economy. We cannot pay off these bills during a period of a drastic economic slowdown, a period of tight money.

SIMMS: I am glad you mentioned the burden of our defense expenditures, Senator. Is it true that our "adjustment" or "recession" is the result of cutting down on this defense spending?

SENATOR: No, that is not true -- even though most people think it is.

(ad lib from figures in press release, mentioning time lag between appropriations and actual spending.)

SIMMS: I don't think most people realized that, Senator. It seems to emphasize the need for taking steps now to offset these future reductions in defense spending, to keep them from creating even further unemployment. But some folks still insist, Senator, that business generally in the Nation won't be much worse than last year.

SENATOR: That is an important point that I want to expand upon. It is another case of a great deal of misunderstanding. Almost as good as last year is not good enough. Whether we like it or not, we have to do better than last year -- better than any last years. You see, we are still a growing Nation. Our national income and our national production must increase each year to create new opportunities for new people. Even if we just stood still -- held the same levels of jobs and income and business as last year -- we would really be slipping backwards. Our gross national product must be continually expanding to create new opportunities, new jobs, new income.

(Ad lib on full employment philosophy.)

SIMMS: Thank you Senator Humphrey. You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your Station announcer.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 20: WEEK OF MAY 24, 1954

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY
WATERSHED BILL

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station. Senator, I know you must have been extremely pleased at the recent victory for the St. Lawrence Seaway project....

SENATOR: I certainly was! You know, it was my privilege to co-sponsor the Seaway Bill with Senator Wiley of Wisconsin. All of us from Minnesota have been greatly elated over ^{the} victory in our long fight for the Seaway, which will eventually open the great midwest to vast new economic development by providing an outlet to the sea for low-cost transportation.

SIMMS: Senator, I am sure you must have felt a great deal of satisfaction out of seeing President Eisenhower sign the Seaway Bill.

SENATOR: I must admit it was a great thrill. You know, ^{quietly} One of the great satisfactions of being a legislator is seeing enacted into law a measure you have sponsored and fought for. I appreciated the invitation of President Eisenhower to participate in the White House ceremony marking the signing of this important measure that will mean so much to our state. However, we must remember that the job is not yet finished.

SIMMS: How is that, Senator?

SENATOR: Minnesota cannot get the fullest benefit from the Seaway when it is completed five years from now, unless the connecting channels at the Soo and near Detroit are deepened to provide a 27-foot channel from Montreal, all the way to Duluth. We must make sure deepening of these channels is pushed ahead so they will be completed by the time the Seaway itself is in operation.

Fortunately, last year I secured passage of a resolution authorizing the Corps of Army Engineers to survey the connecting channels as a necessary first-step in this channel-deepening project. Field work on the survey report is now 75% complete, with 46 miles remaining to be covered. The basic design has been completed. Economic studies are now 90% complete, and cost estimates will be 50% complete by June 15. The Army Engineers assure me they now expect to have the survey report ready for us by this October, clearing the way for action on our link to the Seaway.

However, the entire \$70,000 appropriated July 1 of last year for this survey work has been expended or allocated. Additional funds may be needed through a supplemental appropriation this July -- around \$19,000, I understand. We must now make sure these funds are provided, to avoid any delays.

SIMMS: That report certainly sounds encouraging, Senator Humphrey. Apparently what we need now is the same kind of united push behind deepening of the channels as we had behind the rest of the Seaway project.

SENATOR: That is right..and I want to say right now public opinion had a lot to do with getting favorable action on the Seaway. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation to the thousands of people in Minnesota who have helped support this great development project, either individually or through their organizations.... helping to mobilize the public support at the grass roots that was so necessary to gain final approval. I think all of us also owe a vote of thanks to the Seaway pioneers of yesteryears who had the vision of this great inland waterway linked to the ocean. Let us not forget that our recent victory was only the final chapter in nearly a half century of Seaway history. I feel it a great privilege to have~~been~~ able to serve my state successfully in the culmination of this historic fight.

SIMMS: I would like to change the subject a bit now, Senator -- although the topic is related, in a way. It is still about water. What about the recent floods Minnesota has been having?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, we have again been plagued with hardship and damage and financial loss by spring floods. Year after year we have been paying a heavy price from these floods, a human price as well as a financial price -- for you have to be through one to know the devastation they can cause to a home or a farm. Only a few weeks before this year's floods hit several of our fine Minnesota communities I had appealed to the Senate Civil Functions Subcommittee to provide more adequate funds for increasing flood protection work in Minnesota. The floods that followed were a grim reminder to the Senate committee that we must have such help in Minnesota, help I have been fighting for ever since I have been in Congress. Of course, we have had some results and are making some progress -- but not enough. It is a long, slow, uphill battle to harness ~~rampaging~~ ^{flood waters} water.

However, I am convinced that flood protective works such as downstream dams and dykes are not alone the answer. Our flood problems again emphasize, to me, the urgent need for greater upstream watershed work toward flood prevention. We must learn to start where the water falls, instead of waiting until it is rampaging out of hand. I have been preaching this for a long time, and I am glad to see greater

acceptance each year of the role conservation farming and reforestation
can play in preventing floods. We need more small upstream checkdams.
We need overall watershed planning, and we need coordination of local,
state, and Federal efforts in this direction.

SIMMS: Isn't there an upstream watershed bill before the present Congress?

SENATOR: Yes, there is, and it has my vigorous support. It is already approved by the House, but unfortunately it has been bottled up in the Senate Agriculture Committee where attempts have been made to tie crippling amendments to it. I am trying to help force action on this bill, so we can get it through the Senate without crippling amendments. If it does not come out of the Senate Committee in the proper shape, I plan trying to get the House language substituted by an amendment on the floor, so this watershed program can get going in full swing.

You know, our Minnesota Association of Soil Conservation Districts is strongly backing this constructive measure. They have just had a watershed conference here, sponsored by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, to focus interest on the need for upstream watershed work toward preventing floods. Alf Larson of Hayfield, Secretary of our State Soil Conservation District Association and Area Vice President of the National Association, was a recent visitor in Washington and I had the pleasure of quite a discussion with him on these problems.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, haven't I heard that the Izaak Walton League of America has been opening a campaign to sponsor watershed development projects?

SENATOR: That is right, and they are certainly to be congratulated.

I am proud to hear that our Minnesota chapters of the League are taking hold of this new campaign, under which each chapter is being urged to adopt a watershed project to stimulate and encourage land-owners to adopt soil conservation plans for their farms, and to stimulate the

active interest of all citizens in sound management of our soil, water, woods and wildlife resources. It is really encouraging to see how well all of our conservation groups are working together toward common objectives. Down here in Washington all of the major national wildlife and conservation groups are solidly backing the watershed program of the soil conservation districts. And in our state, formation of the Minnesota Conservation Federation under the leadership of Cliff Sakry at Hopkins is an excellent move to coordinate local conservation groups with state and national conservation efforts. We have a tremendous stake in these conservation activities in Minnesota. We are a great outdoor state -- a sportsman's paradise, a great forestry state and great agricultural state. Our tourist and resort trade alone brings a tremendous income into our state each year. Yet we must learn to protect and preserve our natural resources, if we expect to enjoy the privilege of having them in the years to come. All of our sportsmen's clubs and conservation groups are making a valuable contribution toward that objective.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the Nation's capital. This is a public service program, presented in cooperation with this station. This is Washington, returning you to your Station announcer....



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