

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. 21: WEEK OF MAY 31, 1954

ANTI-COMMUNISM

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 understand you and Senator Douglas recently introduced a bill in the Senate to tighten safeguards against Communist infiltration into labor unions. What is it all about?

SENATOR: Our measure is aimed at closing a loophole in the existing Labor-Management Relations Act resulting from a recent Supreme Court decision, and bringing about more effective enforcement of the Act's non-Communist affidavit provisions. The Supreme Court has ruled that the National Labor Relations Board is now powerless to deal with even the most flagrant abuses of the non-Communist affidavit union leaders are now required to sign. It is to correct that imperfection that we have introduced our bill. The Board should certainly be permitted to recognize the facts for what they are. Whenever a union officer

refuses to testify under oath whether he signed the affidavit, or if he refuses to reaffirm its validity, or if he ~~has~~ in fact been convicted of perjury in connection with such an affidavit, it is clear the Board should have the power to declare that there has not been compliance with the Act.

While our measure is aimed at exposing and ousting any Communist officers of unions, we have tried to provide safeguards against penalizing innocent victims who belong to such unions falling into the hands of Communist leadership. Instead of immediately revoking compliance, therefore, we propose that the board be directed to notify the particular union that compliance will be revoked unless the union officer is unseated from his position within a 30-day period.

< In this vital area affecting our Nation's security and our Nation's labor-management relations, we must understand the American trade union movement has done a most effective job of ridding itself of Communist influence. We must also appreciate that self-discipline is far more desirable in a democracy than imposed discipline. We have learned that exposure and disclosure are pertinent democratic weapons

against Communism. Bringing the facts of Communist domination to American men and women is a certain guarantee that such Communist domination will be undermined.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, weren't you chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations which conducted an extensive study on public policy and Communist domination of certain unions during the 82nd Congress?

SENATOR: That's right, and we recommended at that time that enforcement of the non-Communist affidavit provisions be improved.

Members of our committee were proud of the constructive effort which we made toward understanding and helping to solve the problem of Communist-dominated trade unions. We welcomed the commendation we received from newspaper editorials and responsible labor and management as evidence of our constructive, nonpartisan approach to this problem. We likewise welcomed the criticism we received from the Communist press and Communist trade unions, as reassurance that we were on the

right track. It was, therefore, with real regret that we learned that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee during the 83rd Congress-- the present Congress -- decided not to continue the work which we had begun.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I understand you recently publicly urged trade unions to be on guard against both Communism and corruption.

SENATOR: Yes, I did. In my opinion, free American labor has no room in its midst for either Communism or corruption. In a message to the annual Honor Night Banquet of the Hibbing Central Labor Union recently I warned that America's organized labor must carry forward its historic fight for decency and humanity by continuing its unrelenting battle against Communism and corruption.

Now, I want to be fair and commend the responsible leadership of American labor for its determination to clean its own house of the few who blacken the name of the many.

But the twin evils of Communism and corruption -- the powerful evil forces in the world today -- still relentlessly seek to adulterate

both free government and free unions. We must be ever on guard against these menaces. We must seek to build a society that offers no opportunity for the growth of these twin evils of our time -- Communism and corruption. Wherever we find these forces at work, we must root them out.

SIMMS: Don't you feel, Senator, that organized labor has become more and more responsible in this country?

SENATOR: It certainly has. Organized labor has come of age, and fully recognizes the heavy responsibilities that go with leadership. Responsible labor leaders of today recognize that their power must be used, not abused, for the good of their members and for the good of the Nation.

You know, America and the free world owe a debt of gratitude to the free, organized trade union movement of the United States. In the early history of our country, organized labor fought the battle for decent and humane working conditions, for the elimination of child labor, for the 8-hour day, for improved public health, public

education, and a fair wage for a day's work. Organized labor not only contributed to the social and economic betterment of the workers, but it has strengthened our free competitive economic system. Mass production requires ever increased consumption. Higher wage levels have brought higher living standards. Increased productivity has been shared by management and labor alike -- all for the benefit of the consumer, and the strengthening of the Nation. In recent months organized labor has shown its recognition of the interdependence of our economy, by vigorously supporting efforts for a sound farm program with effective price supports at a minimum of 90 percent of parity.

On the international front, America's free trade movement has been a powerful weapon against the forces of Communist totalitarianism. Along with our great religious forces, the free labor movement of America stands as the strong right arm of democracy in combatting Communism. At home, organized labor has performed an outstanding job of cleaning its house of Communist influence and infiltration.

Now it must carry on the same fight against corruption, by safeguarding union health and welfare funds against abuses and dishonest practices. Abuses have crept into administration of these programs that need to be eliminated, and eliminated swiftly. These abuses have taken the form of shady or outright dishonest practices, engaged in by corrupt insurance company officials, brokers, union officers, and employers. In terms of magnitude of the welfare plans, these shady or illegal practices have been limited to a relatively few situations. That is no excuse, however, for the necessity to crack down on any such abuses.

A sound first step would be to assure an open and public accounting of how every cent of union health and welfare funds is spent. I hope Congress will proceed to formulate legislation affecting these health and welfare funds with intelligence and calm reason, based on experience.

SIMMS: Senator, you mentioned earlier the work of your committee in ridding unions of communist domination. As I recall that was accomplished very effectively without any headline grandstanding. I cannot help but contrast that with some of the spectacles going on in Washington these days in the name of Communist investigations.

SENATOR: You are certainly right...America is getting sick and tired of the present Congressional circus -- and wants to make a "point of order" of its own: that Congress put its own house in order, without further delay. It is high time we call a halt to abuses of committee procedures now bringing disrepute and disrespect down onto the heads of the Congress. We can no longer stand idly by and see the great deliberative bodies of our democracy brought into disrepute and subjected to ridicule throughout the world.

That is why I have joined with Senators Estes Kefauver of Tennessee, Paul Douglas of Illinois, Herbert Lehman of New York, Wayne Morse of Oregon, and several others in sponsoring a resolution in the Senate calling for establishing a new Code of Fair Procedure for Senate Committees.

You know, the Constitution provides that each House of the Congress may determine the rules of its own proceedings. The glaring spectacle of irresponsibility and abuses of power now confronting the Nation as a result of the McCarthy-Army feud should compel the Senate to assert its Constitutional responsibility of providing long-overdue reforms of investigative procedures, based upon accepted American standards of "fair play".

While I still feel the single-committee approach proposed in another bill by Senator Douglas and myself is the best way to protect our internal security without engaging in headline-hunting competition, I have joined with my colleagues in this new move in the hope of getting more immediate action on this pressing problem of bringing order out of chaos of our present investigative side-shows, and protecting the rights of individuals without crippling the effectiveness of the Congress in discharging its responsibilities. It is an absolute disgrace to have such time-wasting distractions diverting attention of the Congress and the country from the

really pressing problems of falling farm income, rising unemployment, and a grave and deteriorating international situation in which we are taking setback after setback.

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. 22

WEEK OF JUNE 7, 1954

BUDGET PROGRESS

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, we have noticed progress is being made on appropriation bills providing funds for public programs and projects. How is Minnesota faring under some of these bills?

SENATOR: Fairly well on some, and still in doubt on others. In the

Hand control, public works
civil functions bill that has passed the Senate, our flood control and navigation projects fared pretty well. In the agricultural appropriations bill just reported out of the appropriations committee and now awaiting action in the Senate, we have also done better than earlier indicated on some of the items Minnesota was particularly interested in. However, we are still waiting decisions on some other federal-state programs such as public health activities, which are included in the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SIMMS: You mentioned the civil functions budget, Senator, which includes funds for the army engineers to carry out flood control work and navigation improvements. How did we come out on our specific Minnesota projects?

SENATOR: I am glad to be able to report that enough money has been assured to make further progress on most of our pending projects, and get surveys started on others that are needed. In flood control work, the Senate provided \$300,000 for further flood control activity on the Red River of the North. Now, that is \$75,000 less than called for in the budget, yet it is enough to make considerable progress. For flood control work at Aitkin, the Senate provided \$450,000. That is \$50,000 below the budget, but the committee believes it will provide enough to complete the project. The Senate also increased considerably, *the* funds earmarked for controlling water levels of the Great Lakes, which involve both flood control and navigation. While the budget only called for \$50,000, the Senate increased that amount to \$125,000.

Then too, Minnesota has a definite interest in the increase voted for flood control ^{*Survey*} examinations and studies, financing the necessary first steps in any flood control projects. The Senate increased the amount for such work from \$550,000 requested to \$1,000,000. Out of that the Corps of Engineers must decide the amounts to be allocated to Minnesota projects, but in any event it means nearly twice as much will be available.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about funds for navigation improvement projects that concern our state?

SENATOR: Well, I am very pleased that we passed the full \$300,000 requested for dredging work in the Duluth-Superior harbor, as well as \$3,200,000 for work on replacing the old Keokuk locks on the Mississippi. For the St. Anthony Falls project on the Mississippi above Minneapolis, the Senate provided \$1,600,000, \$100,000 less than the budget called for but still an increase of \$400,000 over the amount authorized by the House.

SIMMS: That does sound as if Minnesota came out rather well,
Senator Humphrey. Now what about agricultural appropriations?

SENATOR: Of course, we still face Senate action on the funds for
agricultural programs, but the report from the Senate Appropriations
Committee is a good one, restoring many of the cuts that appeared
unwise. I am particularly pleased that most of the drastic slashes
to which I had objected have been changed to avoid seriously crippling
programs in which our state is vitally concerned. I must say that
the Senate committee followed rather closely the example set by the
House committee, making up its own minds as to existing needs and
and not feeling tied down by the
~~frequently ignoring or repudiating the recommendations of the~~
Administration recommendations
~~Eisenhower administration and Secretary Benson.~~

SIMMS: Senator, what happened to the school lunch program, for which
the Administration had asked a cut of \$15,000,000?

SENATOR: Fortunately, the Senate committee agreed with the position many of us had taken that this is no time to cut down on the school lunch program, when our school enrollment is increasing. As a result they restored the \$15,000,000, and have kept the funds at the same level as last year.

- yet not enough - more children -

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I recall the Administration had announced a new policy this year of curtailing the federal government's assistance in federal-state cooperative programs, such as ^{*Payments*} ~~indemnities~~ for tuberculosis control in dairy cattle. What did the appropriation committee do about such cuts?

SENATOR: Again I am pleased at the position the committee took. ^{*It*} ~~They~~ have rejected such slashes in these beneficial disease control programs. While the Committee expressed the feeling that the states and local interests could well share a much larger financial responsibility, they insisted that appropriations for federal activities

should not be reduced, with the danger of crippling the programs, until such time as appropriate agreements are worked out with the states to provide the work will be continued. You know, disease and insect problems cut across state lines and it is really essential that federal programs be maintained until the states are in a position to assume the responsibility. I think most of us realize that we would suffer a severe setback in disease control, if it had been left up to the states. For example, our own Governor had warned that Minnesota would be unable to make up the difference in the tuberculosis and brucellosis eradication programs if federal aid was reduced. But that danger is now passed, as the committee restored funds for these programs.

The same thing is true for the Forest Service, where the Administration had proposed drastic cuts both in its own services and in the amount of grants to the states for cooperative programs. The appropriations committee was much more realistic, and provided some \$4,000,000 more than the Administration asked. As a result, it will not be necessary to curtail essential forestry work in our state.

news

good

SIMMS: Senator, how did the Soil Conservation Service come out in the committee's recommendations?

SENATOR: Very good, I am glad to say. The Senate committee not only completely rejected the cuts asked by Benson, but even increased the amounts voted by the House committee. As it now stands, the Senate report calls for \$5,930,000 more for the Soil Conservation Service than the Administration asked, and \$620,000 more than the House provided. Senate increases beyond the House program included \$120,000 more for SCS operations in support of our Soil Conservation Districts, and an additional \$500,000 for flood prevention work.

I was also glad to see that the Senate committee recognized the need for increasing loan authorization for both REA and the Farmers Home Administration.

Now, these are loan funds -- not appropriations. They are just authority for these agencies to make loans that are repaid, with interest.

For the great work of rural electrification, the committee provided an increase of \$45,000,000 in loan authorization above what Secretary Benson and the President's Bureau of the Budget had proposed.

For the Farmers' Home Administration, an increase of \$2,500,000 was recommended in authorization for production and subsistence loans. Even with that increase, the committee's report said, and I am quoting the report: "This small increase will provide but a portion of the demands for farm-operating loans to deserving farmers and stockmen who cannot secure credit from other sources."

SIMMS: Senator, in view of these widespread changes from what the Administration asked, isn't the committee's report rather a strong repudiation of the Benson-Eisenhower farm policies?

SENATOR: Yes, it is being accepted as such -- and you do not have to read between the lines of the Committee's report to find out how critical the committee is of Secretary Benson's weak leadership for

agriculture. The report makes specific criticisms, even after the language was considerably toned down at the insistence of Senate Majority Leader William Knowland.

Let me read you just a few paragraphs from the appropriations committee's report ... here is the first one, about surplus disposal:

"The Committee feels that more positive action should be taken by the Department of Agriculture in disposing of agricultural surplus, both at home and abroad. Up to this time, for example, no significant progress has been made in disposing of dairy surpluses. A butter disposal program, which has been supported by most farm groups, has been under consideration in the Department, but so far, no concrete action is evident. The Committee believes a program for domestic disposal of perishable surpluses is long overdue."

Now, that is what I have been saying for months -- and I am certainly glad to see it echoed so forcefully by the Republican-controlled Senate Appropriations Committee. The Committee was equally critical of Secretary Benson's failure to recommend any specific plan for meeting the diverted acreage problem, saying, in part:

"This Committee is concerned regarding the lack of a specific program for diverted acres. Both the House Committee and the Senate committee asked earnest questions regarding the Department's views with respect to what use will be made of these diverted acres, and particularly as to how the \$250,000,000 ACP payments authorization will be used in this diverted-acres program. By this time, the Department should have been able to better advise the committee as to what portion of the \$250,000,000 will be used on diverted acres, and for what purposes. The committee feels that it cannot properly perform its duties on the appropriation (for the ACP program) without knowledge of the program of the Department for the use of these diverted acres."

That is a direct quote from the committee's report. So you see, I am not the only one down here that is becoming critical of Secretary Benson's failures.

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. 23

WEEK OF JUNE 14, 1954

SCHOOLS

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, you have always

been a leader in the Congress for adequate educational facilities.

What's being done about the problem of some help toward building more
school buildings?

SENATOR: Not as much as should be done, and must be done. However,

more and more people are becoming aware of the problem. At a time

when our nation is spending billions to promote and protect

democracy throughout the world, our children must not not be

prevented from receiving the finest education that democracy can

provide. The needs of American children cannot be met, however, in

crowded schools requiring half-day classes, or in buildings that are

dangerous fire traps.

Back in January of 1953, I introduced two bills designed to help meet the school construction needs of American children. Those bills are S. 536 and S. 537. Hearings have been held just recently on those bills by the subcommittee on school construction of the ~~Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare~~, but no decision has been announced as yet. However, it's an uphill battle, in view of the refusal of the Administration to support any assistance for school construction.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, tell us more about your measures, and what they provide.

SENATOR: Well, first of all let me give you some background to this problem, and my concern with it. You may recall that during the 81st Congress I was chairman of the subcommittee on school construction. Out of the hearings we held at that time we developed a bill, S. 2317, which was enacted into Public Law 815. Title I of Public Law 815

authorized a survey of long-range construction needs to be
undertaken by the Office of Education. The 81st Congress
recognized the fact that the Federal government had a responsibility
to meet school construction needs wherever they exist in the United
States, and where the local communities are in no financial
position to meet those needs. We felt, however, that we needed
a more comprehensive survey before outlining a detailed plan. The
law we passed, therefore, provided for the survey and also
provided for an emergency program for those communities directly
affected by the impact of the Federal government activity. *such as defense plants*

The results of the survey are now available to the
Congress. It remains for us now to act, and to meet the dire need ,
which the survey so well and so scientifically demonstrated. There
is no excuse for further delay. I am terribly disappointed that
the Administration refuses to join our efforts to meet the problem.
Of my bills, S. 537 merely continues assistance to federally-
impacted areas, in other words providing aid for constructing schools

where the increased enrollment has been brought about by federal projects in the area creating problems which the local community itself cannot be expected to meet alone. Congress has already accepted this principle. The other bill, S. 536, is aimed at undertaking a long-range general school construction program with federal participation on a sharing basis with local communities, such as we have done so successfully with hospital construction.

*Aggravation
issue*

Now is time to Act
~~It was this intent for which our previous survey of needs was undertaken. It doesn't do much good to study the needs, if we aren't going to do anything about them.~~

SIMMS: Senator, I know how strongly you feel about this issue because you have always been a strong booster for good schools.

SENATOR: That's right. . . . the issue of school construction is one that is really close to my heart. My interest dates back to my period of service as Mayor of Minneapolis, and my own teaching days

prior to that. School construction legislation was one of my first activities in the Senate. As a parent of four children who attend the public schools, I have been constantly and continually alert to the serious threat which our school building shortage represents to our future as a nation. I have urged passage of S. 536 because I know that during the 81st Congress its provisions met with the approval of our educational groups and government agencies concerned with the subject. Of course, I don't really care if the committee in its wisdom decides to alter or modify my bill, or produce a new one under a Republican sponsorship, as long as it gets something done. I have assured them of my complete support. The parentage of a bill interests me less than the substance of the bill.

SIMMS: Senator, what did the survey show about needs for school construction in our country?

SENATOR: Some of these figures may shock people, but they are all based on solid fact.

Dr. Earl G. McGrath, former United States Commissioner of Education, in making public the results of the survey said:

“Additional floor space equal to a one-story building, 52 feet wide, extending from New York City to San Francisco, California, is needed adequately to house the nation's public elementary and secondary school population.” He reported that the survey indicates a need now for about 708,000,000 additional square feet of school building space for nearly 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ million pupils in public elementary and secondary schools.

The significance of these figures is that they do not provide for increased enrollment next year and in succeeding years.

It is clearly evident that this increase beginning next September will be sizeable. The statistics show an expected school enrollment of more than 31,000,000 in 1956 and 32,000,000 in 1958.

Unless the Congress acts to meet this crisis, the mothers and fathers

of our young children will have a right to feel that their children and their children's education has been neglected by the Congress.

SIMMS: What about our own needs in Minnesota, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: It is now estimated that a total amount of \$165,959,000 will be needed to meet our present school construction needs in Minnesota. ~~Seven percent of that is for remodeling and rehabilitation.~~
90.5% is for new construction. 1.5% is for sites, and 1.1% is for buses.

Now, even if every local school district in Minnesota and our state government appropriate^{money} to its total legal capacity for school needs, there would remain a deficit of more than \$46,000,000, or 27.8% of the total need. It is estimated that more than 32 percent of the school buildings in Minnesota at present are unsatisfactory.

SIMMS: And is the situation equally serious nationwide?

SENATOR: It certainly is. The results of the survey show that more than 325,000 instruction rooms and related facilities are currently needed this year to relieve overcrowding and to replace obsolete facilities. To relieve present overcrowding alone, 155,000 additional classrooms are required today. To replace obsolete facilities another 170,000 should be provided.

Now, these are more than just statistics. ~~The facts~~ that approximately one-third of our nation's public elementary and secondary school children are attending classes in buildings *declared* ~~the fire hazards~~ *whose safety against fire is questionable.* About 18% of our school children are attending classes in school houses that do not meet fire safety conditions.

It is clear to me, as a result of these facts, that our so-called emergency problem has become a nation-wide problem and is forming a national pattern. It is, therefore, essential that we turn our thoughts not only to developing and extending our assistance to those schools in federally-impacted districts,

W. J. P. H.

but also that we formulate a well-formed national plan, based on a firm administrative foundation, designed to meet the needs of our school children in a continuing, uniform and equitable formula. That's all that I am trying to do.

SIMMS: Senator, does your bill still leave most of the responsibility for deciding where and how funds are to be used in state hands?

SENATOR: That's right -- I do not propose taking away any of the prerogatives of the states. My bill provides that State Educational Agencies will have full control of planning and developing new buildings, and in setting up construction priority programs for each state. Allocation of funds is based on the number of children and the per capita income payments in each state. The bill would establish a sound administrative pattern within which the Federal government could fulfill its responsibility for housing the

growing school attendance without interference with State administration. The actual amount of money to be made available would be decided by the Congress each year, depending upon the immediate need and the over-all budget requirements.

*off. show
bill.*

It is estimated that the cost for building the necessary schools is 10.7 billion dollars. There is no question but that the preliminary responsibility for meeting this financial need lies with the state and local governments, but the laws and methods for voting bond issues or raising funds through assessments on property can only bring 5.8 billion dollars from states and local school districts. This leaves a deficit of 4.9 billion dollars that must be provided in some other way.

SIMMS: Senator, wasn't that one of the reasons you fought against the tidelands oil giveaway -- to save that revenue for school construction?

SENATOR: That's right -- and let me add one other fact for you.

The estimated amount of royalties lost by Minnesota from the oil on these tidelands was \$165,500,000. Now compare that with the figures I have given on Minnesota's needs, and you will see that it would have been enough to meet virtually all of our existing school construction problems.

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. 24: WEEK OF JUNE 21, 1954 WOMEN

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'm sure we have lots of Minnesota women listening to these reports . . . are there any particular issues of concern to women that you'd like to discuss?

SENATOR: Yes, there are quite a few questions of public policy that I'd like to talk over with women. ^{to your state} . . . but let me make it quite clear that I feel women take their responsibilities of citizenship quite seriously, and as a result are interested in ALL public issues. I've always felt that women exert a wholesome and constructive influence on government, an influence that certainly should be encouraged. Housewives and mothers are concerned about current problems as well as looking to the future for the sake of their children. They have always been interested in good, clean

government . . . in trying to maintain peace in the world, and
in the ^{moral} ~~Christian~~ approach to all of our problems. But of course
there are some issues which particularly appeal to them as women,
and about which they hold rather firm opinions that must be
respected.

SIMMS: That's what I had in mind, Senator . . . perhaps you would
discuss some of these specific questions involving women.

SENATOR: Well, one of them that I'm particularly concerned about
is why we don't make more use of women in our Point Four program.
~~Now~~, I know ^{that} women are great boosters for the Point Four program;
they understand the value of being a good neighbor. They approve
this constructive approach to world peace -- but I think they have
a right to ask why our government doesn't make more use of the
women's viewpoint in carrying out these programs. I've talked
this over with some of the leaders of the Business and Professional

Women's Clubs and the American Association of University Women,

*League of
Women
Nations*

and I know they feel rather strongly that women have been neglected

stuff
in choosing Point Four missions. I think they have a right to

complain. We're not making as good use of America's womanhood as

we can and should be doing. Women have been largely left out of

the Point Four program, both in an advisory capacity and among the

technicians we send abroad to help influence people in other lands.

SIMMS: You mean you feel women should be sent into these under-developed areas of the world, to help guide them to improved ways of doing things?

SENATOR: That's right -- we're missing a good bet not to use more women in such a way. Remember, some of our best missionaries have been women. Never under-estimate the constructive job they can do. I think there would be less red tape and more done to actually help people of other lands if every Point Four mission overseas

included women in responsible roles. I've noticed that when other countries send leaders to the United States to observe and study our methods under the various exchange programs, they include quite a few women among them. They know that these women can have a powerful influence when they return home. We should be thinking in the same way about what American women can do overseas to advance education, encourage farm home improvement and stimulate understanding and good will.

Why not recognize that women have achieved equal competence with men in almost every technical field, and send some women health experts, nutrition experts, and child care experts with our Point Four teams? After all, the influence of women all over the world can be the greatest influence for peace. I've never heard of ^{mothers} women anywhere wanting to send their sons to war.

Simms: Well, Senator, do we have women experts that could provide technical assistance to other countries?

SENATOR: Of course we do . . . experts in almost any field you can mention. Why not get the advice of such women as Catherine Stinson, president of the Society of Women Engineers, for example, or Dr. Louise Pearce, former head of a woman's medical college in Philadelphia and one of our foremost experts on tropical diseases? Why not call in the heads of our women's organizations, to discuss the role women can play in carrying the concept of Point Four to the rest of the world? We consult with the NAM, the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, and Labor and Farm organizations about technicians to send abroad, and about the type of programs to carry on. Why leave out the women, why not consult with such women's organizations as the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the American Association of University Women, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, ^{Ligue 7 women clubs} and the women's division of our farm organizations? I feel rather strongly about this, and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I plan to ask Foreign Operations Administrator Harold Stassen about it the next time he comes before our Committee.

I think we are missing a good bet, in not putting the power of American womanhood to work for freedom in the world.

SIMMS: That's really interesting, Senator, and I agree it offers real opportunities. What other issues come to your mind in which women should be interested?

SENATOR: Well, I'm sure they are interested in the work of Senator Hendrickson's juvenile delinquency subcommittee in trying to expose the impact of crime and horror comic books on teen-agers. Most of us who are parents have had a look at some of the things that pass for comic books these days, and agree most heartily that its time for a clean up of the filth that gets circulated among children. Senator Hendrickson is doing a constructive job of trying to prove the relationship between some comic books and juvenile misbehavior, to see what laws we need to tighten the safeguards to protect American youth. I've talked this over with Senator Hendrickson, and pledged him my strong support.

None of us want to wipe out Micky Mouse or Superman or Donald Duck, as some critics claim, but we are trying to do something about the so-called horror and crime variety of books which have disturbed literally millions of parents.

The thing we should be concerned about is the extent to which the vested interests in the comic book publishing business is throwing up a smokescreen in trying to halt such inquiries, instead of cooperating in protecting our children.

Now, I think it's time mothers of America speak up, and let Congress know that it wants such trash exposed and driven off the news stands. Much of the responsibility rests with those who publish and distribute such material, but all of us have a responsibility of putting a stop to circulation of material unfit and harmful for children to read. Now that the Senate is trying to do something about it, I think women should get behind the move and not let this effort be sidetracked by pressures of the publishing business.

SIMMS: I'm sure most women in Minnesota will agree, Senator, for quite a bit of interest has been shown in this issue out in our state.

SENATOR: That's right, and I'm pleased to see progress being made. I want to congratulate Minnesota's Druggists for going on record opposed to such comic books, and agreeing to keep of their newstands literature unfit for children. But it will take alert mothers to help enforce this voluntary ban. I'm also glad to have this chance to commend the fine work in this direction being done by Judge Vincent Hollaren of Worthington, who has been ~~almost fighting a one-man battle~~ *leading the fight* in Minnesota against filth in the form of comic books. I'm sure any women's groups interested in further information or material on this question for a club meeting can get it by writing to Judge Hollaren at Worthington. Also, I'd suggest that they get copy of the book, "Seduction of the Innocent", by Dr. Fredric Wertham. It is one of the best diagnosis

of the case of Comics vs. Youth to be found. Into it has gone thousands of clinical cases, much court work with juveniles, and good common sense. Dr. Wertham also wrote a fine article on this subject for the Ladies Home Journal last November, entitled "What Parents don't Know About Comic Books".

SIMMS: Senator, I'm sure our women are also keenly interested in what Congress does about education and public health programs.

SENATOR: I'm sure they are, and I'm sure they can be very effective in helping to get action where it is needed. We discussed efforts to get federal assistance for school construction last week, and I hope to discuss at more length in the future some of the problems of our public health activities. All of us must be concerned with these vital topics, but women are especially interested because they affect the future lives of their children. And I think women certainly won't welcome word

that the Administration wants to reduce by 53% the funds for tuberculosis control, for example, wiping out a great part of the X-ray case finding that permits early detection of tuberculosis and makes possible more chances of complete cure. The same thing is true for most of the reductions proposed in other health programs, and for health research. Fortunately, we've managed to avoid the proposed cut in school lunch funds that enable children to have health-giving hot lunches in our schools, and it looks like we are going to be able to halt the proposed cuts in funds for vocational education. Women can help in these efforts to keep health and education from being neglected in these times of concern over international problems, by reminding members of Congress that it won't do much good to save democracy if we neglect the citizens of the future.

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: CONSERVATION

WEEK OF: June 28, 1954

No copy available.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY SUBJECT: INDIA

WEEK OF: July 5, 1954

No copy available.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Copy
SUBJECT: *Civil Defense*

PROGRAM NO.

WEEK OF *July 12, 1954*

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, not many weeks ago sirens wailed across the country in what was America's first nation-wide air-raid test of the atomic age. Do you think this vital rehearsal in civil defense was a success?

Senator: America passed some aspects of this test of her atomic defenses with flying colors. In some other respects we failed. Of course the results of this mock attack should have brought home to the American people just what the dangers are. In this "dry run" it was supposed that some 425 enemy planes had been launched against about 64 cities within the continental United States. Only about 30% of the planes were assumed to be intercepted and shot down. The remaining 70% that penetrated our defenses were supposed to have caused 8,983,000 deaths and an additional 4,053,000 injuries. The drill demonstrated that in

many areas the organizational cadres established for civil defense -- fire fighters, rescue and medical squads, auxiliary police, mutual aid, and so on -- were soundly blueprinted and fairly well trained.

In addition the warning system worked well and the sirens were

~~usually~~ ^{usually} audible.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, in what ways would you say the test failed?

SENATOR: There have been many criticisms of the performance of the drill. For instance the Federal Civil Defense Administration, here in Washington, noted that there were very great delays in reporting through the "chain of command" from city and county organizations to state, regional and Federal staffs. The drill demonstrated a shortage of anywhere from 12 million to 15 million civil defense workers. However, to my mind the most striking shortcoming was the general apathy . . . bordering on boredom . . . which gripped most people as they went through their paces.

SIMMS: To what do you attribute this general lack of concern about the eventuality of an atomic attack, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: I think the root of the problem lies in the fact that the public has not been given full information as to what our civil defense plans really are. Like the dinosaur we have been lulled into a false sense of security by being constantly reminded of our capacity for massive retaliation. The mighty dinosaur gave no thought to measures of self defense either. As you know, the dinosaur is extinct. The public must have all the information intelligent security measures will permit. For in the last analysis civil defense is a public responsibility and the public will have to act in its own civil defense. An eminent psychologist, Dwight W. Chapman, put it this way in the BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, "The federal government has a unique role in providing authoritative information. Whether the individual will act wisely or foolishly during an attack will depend on what he knows and does now. If no proper precautions are made, the already

certain casualties and physical damage will be compounded by foolish actions verging on panic."

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, is there any other reason for informing the public on civil defense matters, aside from enabling them to better take care of themselves during an emergency?

SENATOR: Yes there is. The public should constantly be advised of civil defense policy so that it will not be unduly subordinated to other aspects of our defense policy. Let me give one illustration of this problem -- it concerns the matter of early warning. More than a year and a half ago a group of scientists known as the Lincoln Summer Study Group concluded that the chief defect in our defense system was the absence of an early warning system against enemy attacks. Today, with the adoption of a civil defense policy calling for the evacuation of our larger cities, an early warning system has become an absolute necessity. However, at the time the policy of early warning was resisted by the Air Force. Among

other things they charged that it would not be practical and it would cost too much to set up an early warning belt in the Arctic. As things have now turned out, our government has finally joined with Canada in the construction of a belt of just such stations. This was done a year and a half after the necessity of these stations first became clear. During that year and a half we have been without an adequate warning system -- and according to the Civil Defense Administration we are still without one. I believe that more adequate public discussion of this problem in the fall of 1952 might have resulted in a defense policy which took more account of the needs of civil defense.

SIMMS: But Senator Humphrey, what with the monies being allocated by state and local governments, hasn't the Federal government appropriated enough to take care of our civil defense needs?

SENATOR: Not nearly enough. In the first place state and local appropriations for civil defense have been "marginal" -- often

non-existent. In most cases these jurisdictions simply do not have the means to raise revenue for these purposes. The President's budget message defined the job of the Civil Defense Administration as follows: "It will be the Federal responsibility, as reflected in this budget, to provide warning of impending attacks, and to stockpile medical supplies. The Federal Government will not assume the responsibilities which belong to the local governments and volunteer forces, but will supplement state and local resources, provide necessary information on weapons effects and advise and assist States and localities." Yet only \$68 million were asked to carry out these purposes. On such a relatively small figure the Federal government cannot be construing these words very broadly.

SIMMS: Well then, Senator, in your opinion who does have the responsibility for adequate civil defense? The Federal government? Local government? or both?

SENATOR: I think it is clear that the destruction of a large American city is a federal responsibility; not merely a local one. Any of our large cities is part of an industrial, governmental, and commercial complex in which the whole nation is involved. The Federal government, not local governments, is the one which operates our military defense, and it is the only one that can see that civil defense is properly integrated with our military defense. However, adequate civil defense programs require some sacrifices from American communities. There are, for example, economic sacrifices involved in industrial plant dispersal. These sacrifices will have to be shared as widely and generally as possible. This means that the Federal government will have to take on the job of formulating policy and actively assisting the localities to carry out that policy. To do this, the Federal budget must recognize the primary, though not exclusive, responsibility of the Federal government for civil defense.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you have any recommendations as to

what Congress can do to improve our civil defense set up?

SENATOR: Yes, I would like to make briefly a few suggestions for possible Congressional action. First, we can make sure that the Civil Defense Administration gets a budget big enough so that it can do its job. We can encourage population dispersal under such measures as the Public Housing Act and through credit contract and tax policies. This would do much to decrease our vulnerability. I would also suggest that any programs advanced to meet the dangers of recession, such as public works programs, be planned in accord with our defense and dispersal needs. We also ought to have on the books legislation providing for such things as emergency government credit facilities, the duplication of essential government and business records, for succession to vital elected and appointive offices, for the declaration of bank holidays, and whatever other economic measures are necessary to sustain our economy after the disruptive violence of a hydrogen blast.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what do you consider our top priority need as far as Congressional action on civil defense is concerned?

SENATOR" What we need, first of all, is the information on which to act. I would therefore propose the creation of a commission to look into the civil defense picture. This commission would tell Congress what has been done so far, report on the administration's plans for the future, alert the public to the problems of civil defense, and propose legislation to meet these problems. A high level commission would be the ideal device to bring this problem forcefully to the attention of those who should know about it -- to make the kind of impartial study the problem and our national safety deserves. Once the commission has reported, Congress could keep constantly in touch with the civil defense picture by setting up a civil defense subcommittee of the Atomic Energy Committee. This subcommittee would serve as a force for the integration of civil defense with our over-all defense policy. It would serve as a spokesman for civil defense urging

programs and research in the executive branch. It would inform Congress of the effects of new developments on civil defense and alert all of us to the role we must play in protecting ourselves and our nation. Our best insurance for the peace we all want is preparedness against any of the aggressor's attacks.

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. 28

WEEK OF July 19th

Taxes

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS -- FROM WASHINGTON! Again we bring you Senator Hubert H. Humphrey with his weekly report from the Nation's Capitol. This program is brought to you as a public service in cooperation with this station. Perhaps no Congressional action is followed more closely by the American public than tax legislation. It effects practically every citizen where he can feel it -- in his pocketbook. Senator, do you feel that the tax bill recently passed by the Senate is a fair and equitable measure?

SENATOR: No, I do not. The bill as it has been passed provides most relief for the few most able to carry the burden of taxation while it substantially ignores the plight of the lower income groups. To paraphrase the war-time slogan of Sir Winston Churchill, "Never have so many, paid so much, to preserve the privileges of so few." At the very beginning of the year, I introduced legislation which would have raised personal exemptions from \$600 to \$800. This would

have been of particular benefit to low and middle income groups.

Twice during the Senate fight on the tax bill I worked and voted

for general tax relief. *one* ~~Case~~ was in support of the George Amendment

to raise individual exemptions from \$600 to \$700. This would have

represented a cut in taxes of about \$20 for each taxpayer and each

of his dependents. When this amendment was beaten by a three vote

margin, 46 to 49, I gave my support and vote to the Long Amendment.

Lucas Casperson of the
This would have given a flat \$20 reduction in taxes to each tax-

payer regardless of the number of his dependents. But even this

effort for broad tax relief was beaten down by a vote of 33 to 50.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, why have you fought so hard for tax

relief to the low and middle income groups rather than to the more

well-to-do?

SENATOR: There are two fundamental reasons for my tax stand.

First, I believe that taxation should be a flexible tool used in

the best interests of our national economy. Right now, there are

signs that our economy is off balance -- not seriously so, perhaps, but seriously enough to threaten 4 to 5 million jobs this year.

There is every reason to believe that the release of about \$1½ billion in purchasing power would redress the imbalance in our economy.

Our immediate problem is not with investment but with consumption

and the great mass of consumers in our country is found in the

lower and middle income brackets. Secondly, I believe that the

tax structure of our nation should be a progressive tax structure

as a matter of simple fairness. The conduct of the cold war and

the other necessary functions of our government represent an

immense financial strain on the American taxpayer. Whenever the

burden can be reduced, it ought to be reduced progressively so that

those in the lower income brackets will not be forced to pay a

disproportionate share of the cost in our defense of the free world.

SIMMS: When the tax bill was reported to the Senate from the Finance

Committee it contained a great deal of relief for stock-holders.

In the final Senate bill these benefits were sharply reduced, almost eliminated. Senator Humphrey what were your reasons in joining the overwhelming majority of the Senate that rejected these provisions?

SENATOR: I did not think that the reduction in stock dividends could be defended either as a matter of simple justice or sound economics. With so many of the benefits of the new tax bill already going to those with high incomes, I felt that any further relief should go to those in the lower brackets. I am glad the Senate did not lose sight of the fact that only 8% of all American families own stock and only 4% of all taxpayers received 76% of all dividend income. This was clearly another measure that would largely have been of benefit to the wealthy few. As you may know, the Senate tax bill now goes into what we call "conference". Here a Committee from the House of Representatives and a Committee from the Senate will iron out whatever differences there are between the House and Senate measures. I sincerely hope that the Committee

members from the House of Representatives will abide by the overwhelming decision of the Senate and not give great tax benefits to stockholders while the general public receives no reduction at all.

✓
SIMMS: But, Senator Humphrey, I have heard it said in some quarters that such a measure is necessary in order to spur private investment.

SENATOR: It has been the policy of this Administration right along to provide incentives to private investors. Now there has been a great deal of tearing of the hair and rending of the flesh about an alleged trend away from equity capital and toward corporate borrowing. Professor Alvin Hansen gave the facts on this matter in testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. Unfortunately, this has not put a stop to the piteous petitions about the plight of the poor private investor. Professor Hansen pointed out that bond issues made up about 75% of all new corporate issues in the years 1922 to 1927, which is about the same share as now. Furthermore, we have no assurance that the funds released through stock

relief to stockholders would go into useful investment. It might very well be held as savings and contribute further to economic stagnation. Relief for America's lower income groups would go into raised standards of living and the added consumption of life's necessities.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, we all realize that to a very great extent the soundness of our whole economy depends on the prosperity of agriculture. Do you think the American farmer got a fair break in the new tax bill?

SENATOR: Under the new tax bill corporations are receiving what only can be termed mammoth reductions in the form of greatly increased depreciation deductions. Yet when I joined Senator Douglas in sponsoring an amendment which would have allowed accelerated amortization, for tax purposes, on new farm machinery the measure was defeated. I saw this amendment as being particularly helpful to the smaller, family-size farm operators who are facing low

prices, short credit, aging farm equipment and the need for more productive farming methods. The adoption of the measure also would have cut down the rising unemployment in the farm equipment and machinery industry. This strikes close to home when we consider that thousands of people are out of work in the Twin City area because of the loss of jobs in that industry. No, at this moment I think the farmers of America are a long way from receiving equitable treatment under the tax laws of our land.

SIMMS: But, Senator Humphrey, another measure you sponsored, the Amendment to grant accelerated amortization rates to farmers who construct storage facilities on their land, that was approved by the Senate, wasn't it?

SENATOR: Yes, and I'm very glad it was. Actually, by stimulating the construction of private storage facilities it will remedy the present shortage and save the government money. These facilities ought to be ready for this year's fall grain crop. Under the

amendment the entire cost of constructing the storage facilities can be written off against taxes immediately. In many instances these new storage facilities will represent the difference between getting a parity price and taking a bad loss for many farmers.

SIMMS: What were some of the other more worthwhile provisions of the new tax bill, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: I was particularly pleased to see that the new bill contained tax relief for working mothers in the form of greater deductions for child-care. Assistance was also given to students working their way through college. I think this was a step in the right direction toward giving all of America's youngsters a more equal opportunity for a college education. But an indication of the fact that America's young men want exercise for the body as well as the mind, is the great number of amateur and semi-professional baseball leagues that are growing steadily in Minnesota. These leagues offer our young men healthy recreation, and all the benefits

of participation in competitive sport. They are the training grounds for the professional baseball stars of tomorrow. I hope that the game of baseball, a truly national sport, will be further encouraged both in Minnesota and the country, will be further encouraged now that the Senate has adopted my amendment for the removal of admission taxes to these amateur and semi-professional games.

SIMMS: But, Senator Humphrey, wouldn't all these benefits which you are supporting cost the Federal Treasury a lot of money? How are we going to balance the budget?

SENATOR: During previous tax debates, it was always my position that the National government's budget must be balanced. With signs of recession, however, the desire to balance the budget must be coupled with the equally vital national good of stimulating consumer purchasing power. That is why even as we strenuously continue our efforts to balance the budget we must introduce tax

reductions to help the small businessmen, farmers, and workers.

Tax benefits for those groups increases their real income and

allows them to spend more money in the marketplace. It

reinvigorates our whole economy. Any losses to the Federal

Treasury can be more than made up by eliminating the tax loopholes

through which billions fall into the laps of special interest and

upper income groups.] ~~I have seen estimates which put the loss to~~

~~the Federal Treasury from the increased depreciation allowances~~

~~for corporations in the current tax bill at anywhere from \$21 to~~

~~\$40 billion dollars.~~ How many billions more are lost each year

through devices like corporation spin-offs? Loose family

partnerships? Excessive depletion allowances on everything from

oil to clam shells? The new tax bill makes it virtually impossible

to touch large inherited fortunes through estate taxes. I am

genuinely sorry that it is necessary to tax high incomes as steeply

as we do. However, it is both the best thing for the national

economy and only fair that we put the major burden of these taxes

on these best able to bear it and the bulk of the relief with those

who stand most in need of it.

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

WEEK OF: July 26, 1954

No copy available

RADIO SCRIPTS FOR:

August, 1954

No Copies Available



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