

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 13: WEEK OF APRIL 5, 1954

HEALTH

COPY

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.

COPY

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

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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

COPY

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 venereal disease, 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.

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.....

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 13
"HEALTH"

Week of April 5, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Health legislation pending and proposed before the present Congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____
(call letters)
on _____ at _____.
(day) (time)

Senator Humphrey will be interviewed on the status of legislation in the House and Senate affecting hospital construction, financial help for nonprofit health associations, and funds for research and public health work.

The program is another in Senator Humphrey's weekly series, "Your Senator Reports", transcribed in Washington and presented by Station _____ as a public service.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 14: WEEK OF APRIL 12, 1954

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SIMS: 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 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, 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?

SENATOR: Well, I regret to say that the House of Representatives has 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 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.

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 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 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.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, doesn't this action on the student exchange programs seem to reflect a general tendency toward turning more and more toward 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. 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 ~~readily~~ 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 as our educational exchange programs, our Point Four Program, and our 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 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 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.

SIMS: 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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 14
"EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE"
Week of April 12, 1954
"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Wiping out of America's educational exchange program as an arm of our foreign policy will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____
(day)
at _____ over Radio Station _____
(time) (call letters)

Commenting on the recent action of the House of Representatives to reduce funds for the student and teacher exchange program by 40%, Senator Humphrey will tell what it means in terms of halting the good will program at a time when the Soviet/Union is expanding similar programs all over the world.

The need for putting more instead of less emphasis on such constructive efforts to build for peace and world understanding as the student exchange programs, the Point IV program, and use of food to eliminate famine and suffering will be discussed by the Senator in relation to recent revelations about the H-bomb and its destructive power.

The program is another in the series of public service broadcasts presented by Senator Humphrey each week from Washington as a report to the people of Minnesota, through the cooperation of Station _____.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 15: WEEK OF APRIL 19, 1954

SCHOOL LUNCH
PUBLIC HOUSING

COPY

SIMS: 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 in planning the necessary funds for carrying on this important 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%.

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 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.

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

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.

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.

SIMS: 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 27,116 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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

COPY
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.

SIMS: 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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 15

"SCHOOL LUNCH AND PUBLIC HOUSING"
Week of April 19, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Cutbacks in funds for the school lunch program at a time of increasing school enrollment will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey over Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(call letters) (day) (time)

Senator Humphrey, who has urged that the school lunch program be expanded to keep pace with growing school enrollment, will explain why he opposes plans to cut the program by 18%.

Also, on the same program Senator Humphrey will be interviewed on the recent action of the House of Representatives to kill low-income housing, and give a report on what projects it will eliminate for Minnesota.

The program is another in the series of weekly broadcasts presented by Senator Humphrey from Washington as a report to people of Minnesota, through cooperation of Station _____ as a public service.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 16:

WEEK OF APRIL 26, 1954

GOOD GOVERNMENT

COPY

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 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 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.

I am pleased that the Eisenhower Administration has been reported considering inauguration of a new budget system which they claim 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.

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.

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

during his life was one of those who energetically pushed the proposal.
My bill is very much along the lines of his earlier legislative efforts.

Such an item veto is particularly necessary if we are to have a consolidated and uniform appropriation bill, as is being advocated by so many good government organizations.

VOICE: Senator, haven't you also worked for greater coordination of appropriation efforts between Houses of the Congress?

SENATOR: That is right. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of legislation in both the 81st and 82nd Congresses as well as in the present Congress to establish a Joint Committee on the Budget with an appropriate staff designed to coordinate the appropriation process as between the House and the Senate.

VOICE: Senator Humphrey, how do you think people feel about these changes?

SENATOR: I am sure they would approve them overwhelmingly if they really understood them. That is why educational studies such as that conducted by the League of Women Voters are so important. But let me give you another indication. Last September the Gallup Poll conducted a survey, and found 63% of the people questioned are in favor of the Presidential item veto, so I believe there is greater appreciation of the importance of these needed changes than some people realize.

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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 16
"Good Government"
Week of April 26, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspapers.

Good government budgetary procedures for efficiency and economy will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ at _____
(day) (time)
over Station _____.
(call letters)

Senator Humphrey will comment on the studies and recommendations of the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis for improving existing budgetary processes, and outline changes that he has proposed as a member of the Senate's Committee on Government Operations.

Senator Humphrey is the author of the Economy Act of 1953 still before Senate Committee, calling for many of the budgetary reforms advocated by the League of Women Voters, including a consolidated "cash" budget, separation of operating from capital expenditures, requiring roll call votes on all appropriation measures, and giving the President authority to veto individual items without having to veto an entire appropriation bill.

The program is another of Senator Humphrey's weekly series of programs entitled "Your Senator Reports" transcribed in Washington and presented as a public service by Station _____ to keep Minnesota citizens informed on issues before the Congress.

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 an 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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 17
"Vocational Education"
Week of May 3, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

What is happening to Vocational Education Programs in agriculture, industrial trades, and homemaking in present appropriation hearings before the Congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey over Radio Station

_____ on _____ at _____.
(call letters) (day) (time)

Efforts to avert a reduction in Federal assistance to Minnesota for such educational programs will be described by Senator Humphrey, along with an analysis of the progress of such programs in this state.

The Vocational Education Programs are a Federal-state "partnership" to expand educational opportunities aimed at preparing young men and women for future livelihoods. Present recommendations call for a million dollar slash in the program this year, vigorously opposed by the American Vocational Education Association.

The program will be another in the regular weekly series, "Your Senator Reports", transcribed by Senator Humphrey in Washington as a public service and presented through cooperation of Station _____ to keep Minnesota citizens informed.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 18: WEEK OF MAY 10, 1954

AGRICULTURE

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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 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.

SIMS: 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)

SIMS: 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)

SIMS: 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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 18
"Agriculture"
Week of May 10, 1954
"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

The continuing fight in Congress for a more effective farm program will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey over Radio Station _____ (call letters) on _____ at _____.
(day) (time)

Outlook for improvements in farm legislation despite setbacks so far against extending price supports at 90% of parity will be discussed by Senator Humphrey, along with comment on the need for greater attention to wise use of our abundance at home and abroad.

The discussion will be another of Senator Humphrey's weekly radio reports from the Nation's capital, presented by Station _____ as a public service.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 19: WEEK OF MAY 17, 1954

COMBATTING RECESSION

COPY

SIMS: 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.)

SIMS: 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.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 19
"Combatting Recession"
Week of May 17, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Ways of counteracting the recession and restoring full employment and full purchasing power will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
_____ at _____ over Radio Station _____.
(day) (time) (call letters)

The program will be another in Senator Humphrey's weekly reports from the Nation's capital on current affairs in Washington.

"Warning signs" on the economic horizon, and proposals for offsetting them before current adjustments become more severe, will be analyzed by Senator Humphrey during his interview.

The program is another of the regular weekly series recorded in Washington by Senator Humphrey as a public service, and presented in cooperation with Station _____ as part of its public service activities.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 20:

COPY
WEEK OF MAY 24, 1964

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY
WATERSHED BILL

SIMS: 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 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.

SIMS: 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, one of the great satisfactions of being a legislator is seeing enacted into law a measure you have sponsored and fought for. I appreciate 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.

SIMS: 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

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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 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.

SEN. SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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....

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 20
"St. Lawrence Seaway and
Watershed Bill"
Week of May 24, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspapers.

Minnesota's future opportunities as a result of the recent victory in the historic battle for the St. Lawrence Seaway will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ at _____ over radio station
(day) (time)

(call letters)

Senator Humphrey, who co-sponsored the Seaway Bill with Senator Wiley of Wisconsin, was recently the guest of President Eisenhower at formal signing of the legislation into law.

During his radio interview Senator Humphrey will discuss the necessity for deepening connecting channels so Minnesota may get full benefits of the Seaway -- opening a 27-foot channel from Duluth to the Sea.

On the same program Senator Humphrey will explain the fight for the upstream watershed bill in the present Congress, pointing out how Minnesota's recent flood problems again emphasizes the urgent need for greater emphasis on flood prevention starting where the water falls instead of waiting until it is rampaging out of hand.

The program is another of Senator Humphrey's regular public service reports from Washington to citizens of Minnesota.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 21:

WEEK OF MAY 31, 1954

ANTI-COMMUNISM

COPY

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.

COPIY

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.

SIMS: 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.....

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 21
"Anti-Communism"
Week of May 31, 1954
"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Tightening of legislation to prevent Communist infiltration
of unions will be discussed over radio station _____ on _____
call letters day
at _____ by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
time

Senator Humphrey will explain the bill he recently introduced in the Senate to close existing loopholes in the Labor-Management Relations Act, and bring about more effective enforcement of the Act's non-Communist affidavit.

Senator Humphrey will discuss organized labor's own efforts to wipe out both Communism and corruption from its midst, and emphasize the need for remaining alert to these "twin evil forces of our time".

Senator Humphrey will also discuss reactions to the McCarthy-Army feud, and outline the resolution he is sponsoring along with a group of other Senators to establish a Code of Fair Procedure for Senate Committees "and call a halt to abuses of committee procedures now bringing disrepute and disrespect down onto the heads of the Congress".

RADIO SCRIPT FOR:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 22

COPY

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 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.

COPY

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 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.

COPY

Then too, Minnesota has a definite interest in the increase voted for flood control 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.

SIMS: 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 frequently ignoring or repudiating the recommendations of the 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?

COPY

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.

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 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. 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 respon-

sibility, they insisted that appropriations for federal activities

COPY

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.

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.

COPY

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:

COPY

"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.

- 11 -
COPY

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 . . .

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For Use With
Program No. 22
"Funds for Minnesota"
Week of June 7, 1954
"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

How Minnesota is faring in funds for projects and programs in this session of the Congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ (day) at _____ over radio station _____ (hour) _____ (call letters).

Senator Humphrey will report on funds earmarked for Minnesota flood control and navigation improvement projects under the Civil Functions Bill recently passed by the Senate, and also discuss the agricultural appropriations bill now pending before the Senate with recommendations from the Appropriations Committee rejecting many of the reductions proposed by the Administration.

Outlook for school lunch programs, REA loan authorizations, Soil Conservation Service activities, Forestry programs, and similar topics will be analyzed by the Senator on the basis of the Appropriations Committee's decisions.

The program is another of the weekly public service broadcasts provided by Senator Humphrey as a report to the people of Minnesota, presented through the cooperation of Station _____.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 23

WEEK OF JUNE 14, 1954

SCHOOLS

COPY

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 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.

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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.

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. 356, 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. 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

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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 708,600,000 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 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 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,

COPY

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.

SIMS: 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
COPY
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.

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.

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

*Couldnt some
of the needed
funds have
been provided by the
tidelands oil from the
revenues from
T. Oil.*

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

COPY

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. . . .

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 23
"School Construction"
Week of June 14, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspaper.

Need for Federal assistance for school construction will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ at _____ over Radio Station _____.
(day) (hour) (call letters)

Senator Humphrey, sponsor of legislation to provide Federal assistance to local communities for new school buildings, will explain findings of the Office of Education surveys on school facilities showing urgent need both in Minnesota and throughout the Nation for additional buildings to eliminate overcrowding and get rid of firetraps.

He will explain purposes of his bill for helping local communities meet school construction needs similar to the plan for Federal aid to hospital construction.

The broadcast is one of Senator Humphrey's weekly radio reports to the people of Minnesota, presented as a public service over Station _____.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR:

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO. 24:

WEEK OF JUNE 21, 1954

WOMEN

COPY

SIMS: 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. . . . 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 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.

SIMS: 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 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,

COPY

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

SENATOR: 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

COPY

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 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, 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.

SIMS: 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 ~~Mickey 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.

SIMS: 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 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

COPY

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".

SIMS: 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

COPY

that the Administration wants to reduce by 33% 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.

SIMS: 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. . . .

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 24
"Women"
Week of June 21, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspapers.

Greater use of women in guiding and carrying out America's Point Four program will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey over Radio Station

(call letters) _____ on _____ at _____
(day) (hour)

. In a discussion of issues before the Congress of particular interest to women, Senator Humphrey will outline his views on the contribution women could make toward world peace through becoming Point Four "missionaries", and call attention to the present failure _____ to make use of women in this important work.

Senator Humphrey will also discuss the work being done by the Senate subcommittee on juvenile delinquency to expose the destructive influence of horror and crime comic books, and urge the support of women toward banning such trash literature from circulation.

The program is another of Senator Humphrey's weekly reports to the people of Minnesota, presented as a public service over Station _____.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 25
"Conservation"
Week of June 28, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspapers.

Conservation issues of interest to sportsmen before the present Congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ at _____
(day) (time)
over Radio Station _____.
(call letters)

Senator Humphrey will have as his guest on the program C. R. Gutermuth, Vice President of the Wildlife Management Institute and executive secretary of the Emergency Council on Natural Resources. Minnesota's Senator will interview Gutermuth on legislative recommendations of sportsmen's group before the session of Congress now under way.

Among topics to be discussed will be diversion of duck stamp funds, the upstream watershed flood prevention bill, and adequate appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The program is another of the regular series of public service reports from Washington made by Senator Humphrey to keep Minnesotans informed on issues before the Congress, and presented through the cooperation of Station _____.

TO RADIO STATIONS:

For use with
Program No. 26
"India"
Week of July 5, 1954

"YOUR SENATOR REPORTS"

Here's a suggested press release calling attention to the next topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in his series of regular weekly broadcasts over your station. As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public service programs, we suggest you copy this release with your call letters and the time of the broadcast inserted, and submit it to your local newspapers.

India's role in the world today will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey _____ at _____ over Radio Station _____.
(day) (time) (call letters)

Guest of Senator Humphrey on the program will be Bishop Pickett of India, head of all Methodist Church mission activities in India and a veteran of more than 40 years service in that country.

Bishop Pickett, now visiting America in the hope of creating better understanding of India's problems and attitudes, will be interviewed by Senator Humphrey regarding India's role in international affairs, her attitude in the struggle between democracies and Communism. Bishop Pickett was instrumental several years ago in working with Senator Humphrey in getting American wheat to relieve famine suffering in India. Because of Senator Humphrey's vital role on the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, Bishop Pickett again consulted with him during his present trip to Washington, and Senator Humphrey in turn invited the Bishop to participate in a radio discussion for the people of Minnesota.

The program is a continuation of Senator Humphrey's regular weekly public service reports from the Nation's capital, presented in cooperation with Station _____.

RADIO SCRIPT FOR: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY SUBJECT:
PROGRAM No. 27 WEEK OF July 12, 1954 Civil Defense

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: American 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

defense 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 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 be 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

COPY
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

COPY

Energy Commission. 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 Humphrey

Program No.28

Subject:
Congress Windup
Taxes
Social Security

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're getting down near the windup of Congress now, and I suppose the big rush of legislative pressure is really on...

SENATOR: That's right, it really is...this is the season of the year when we have long sessions, night sessions, and Saturday sessions trying to get through our scheduled work before the adjournment date. It's unfortunate that so much legislation gets put off until the last minute, because that often means lack of fair consideration of important measures that should be carefully examined. You know, in the race for adjournment it's often easy to slip across unwise measures.

SIMMS: When is adjournment scheduled, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: Well, our Majority Leader, Senator Knowland, has set July 31 as the closing date. But there's still a terrific work load before the Senate, so I don't know if we will reach it or not. You know, sometimes it becomes an Administration tactic to leave bills to the last minute in the hope of jamming them through while everybody is hurrying to get through and get home from the hot weather of Washington.

SIMMS: Senator, at least one of the big issues is out of the way as a result of action on the tax bill,....perhaps you'd like to discuss that fight.

SENATOR: Yes, I would like to discuss it, but don't make the mistake of thinking you might not ~~hear~~ be hearing more of the tax fight. You know, the Senate and the House have adopted different versions of the tax bill, which have to be ironed out in what we call "Conference" between committees of the two Houses. After some

compromise is reached, each house has to gain vote to approve or disapprove it. So if the bill that comes out of Conference doesn't hold rather close to what we voted in the Senate, I think you can expect a new fight against it.

SIMMS: Senator, what are some of the changes the Senate made in the tax bill?

SENATOR: Well, we didn't get all the tax relief for the average person many of us worked for, but at least we did head off a tax benefit hand-out to special privileged groups. I notice the press calls it an Eisenhower victory. Well, he must have got his Humphreys a bit mixed up. The recommendations of his Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey for stock dividend benefits were defeated, and many of the recommendations of this Humphrey were approved.

SIMMS: That's right, you did have several successful amendments to the tax bill, Senator, Would you explain some of them?

SENATOR: Both of my proposals for tax relief for working mothers and for parents aiding their children attending college were included in the Senate bill, as well as my amendment allowing farmers to construct "on the farm" grain storage facilities to write off the cost in one year for tax purposes. Many farm leaders believe this will give construction of farm storage facilities a much needed boost. Then too, I can't forget one that may look small to many people, but means a lot to Minnesota's baseball fans--I managed to get an amendment adopted that eliminates admission taxes to amateur and semi-professional baseball games. Of course, I wanted greater tax relief that would benefit everybody by raising personal exemptions from \$600 to \$700, but we lost our fight by a three-vote margin as a result of the Administration's opposition. You know, I was co-sponsor with Senator George of that amendment.

SIMMS: What's the current topic before the Congress, Senator? ✓

SENATOR: Right now we're trying to improve the social security bill--expanding the coverage and increasing the benefits. In fact, by the time some of our Minnesota audience hears this program we may have completed action one way or another. At least I'm sure they'll be interested in knowing how I feel, and how I intend voting. This is one issue ~~in~~ on which I am supporting the President's recommendations. Our senior citizens are entitled to better consideration. Present meager allowances for our old age assistance cases completely ignore present high living costs. This is one instance where it's easy for me to vigorously uphold the Administration, because for the most part its recommendations are the very thing I have been working for all along.

SIMMS - What improvements do you suggest?

In fact, when the House Ways and Means Committee opened a special subcommittee hearings last November I called for the following points as minimum improvements in the present program:

1. Extension of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Coverage to those not now covered by the program.
2. Increasing the amount of old age insurance benefits.
3. Increasing the amount of insurance benefits for widows and orphans.
4. Liberalizing the retirement test from the present \$75 a month to at least \$1200 a year.
5. Reducing the retirement age from 65 to 55 for persons who have to retire prematurely due to physical disability.
6. Providing for the rehabilitation of persons who are physically disabled.
7. Providing for hospital insurance for all persons age 65 and over.
8. Continuing the \$5 a month increase to old age assistance recipients.

When President Eisenhower made his recommendations to Congress, he endorsed

most of those points in principle, although not quite as specifically. As a result the bill we now have before us is not quite all that I would like to see, and not quite all that our old folks are entitled to. However, it is still an improvement, and I shall support it.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, didn't you already have bills in the Congress to accomplish those same purposes before President Eisenhower made his recommendations?

SENATOR: That's right--I introduced six bills last May to provide such improvements. But the important thing now is not who gets the credit--it is to make sure we get the best possible bill, and get the benefits to the old folks who need them. If you ever tried living on \$45 a month, you'd realize how badly we need to bring our old age assistance programs up to date to meet modern conditions and modern living costs. This measure is only a starter, but it is a step in the right direction.

21 M 4.5 -

(Supplemental material from releases, as needed)

Farm and Social Security Bill

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for this discussion of ~~taxes and~~ social security ~~and the Farm Bill --~~ two of the important issues before the Congress during these final days of the present session. You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from Washington ~~xxx~~ to the people of Minnesota. This program has been ~~brought~~ 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. 28

WEEK OF July 19th

Taxes

SIMS: 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 affects 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. Once 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. This would have given a flat \$20 reduction in taxes to each taxpayer 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.

ask write off
SIMS: 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.

SIMS: 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.....;

COPY

UNUSED

RADIO SCRIPT FOR:

COPY
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

SUBJECT:

PROGRAM NO.

SIMS: 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 deeply concerned with veterans problems. This June marked the tenth year that the GI Bill of Rights has been in operation. Do you think this program has been a success:

SENATOR: The GI Bill has been a great success. It has been a success in all three of its major aspects -- in its program for readjustment allowances for periods of unemployment, in education and training at government expense, and in guaranteed loans for homes, farms and businesses. Though the average veteran was on the readjustment allowance rolls for only 6 weeks, that program helped millions successfully weather the difficult transition from military to civilian life.

Government assisted education and training have made World

War II veterans the best educated group in the history of the United States. GI loans have enabled veterans to build thousands of badly needed homes and inject thousands of vital new enterprises into the stream of American business.

SIMMS: These programs sound very beneficial, Senator Humphrey, but haven't they cost a lot of money? Has the taxpayer received any financial return on his investment?

SENATOR: The answer to that question is most apparent in the record of veterans' repayment of home and business loans. It is a record of repayment which the Veterans Administration says is unmatched. Over the past decade, 650,000 GI loans, amounting to 3 billion dollars have been repaid in full. Defaulted loans -- on which the VA has made good the guaranteed portions to private lenders have amounted to less than 1% of all loans received.

Because of their training under the GI Bill veterans have

raised their incomes to the point where they are paying an extra billion dollars of income taxes. At this rate the entire 15 billion dollar cost of the education and training program will be paid off within the next 15 years. The provision for readjustment allowances for veterans was not generally abused, either. Only 900,000 veterans or 10% of the total exhausted their full rights to this benefit.

SENATOR: The veterans program certainly seems to have been a good risk, Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR: You are right. But it has been more than a good risk. It has been an absolute necessity. Without investments like these in the future of a growing America, our Nation would stagnate. Yesterday we put some cash on the line; our only collateral was our faith in America's veterans. Today we are getting the return on our investment in terms of better educated citizens with greater earning power, in

COPY

terms of healthy families who live in decent homes instead of hovels, in terms of businesses which are producing new wealth, new jobs, and new products for all of us. It is this same kind of faith in the future that has led us to make investments in Rural Electrification and TVA. As long as America is unafraid to make this kind of investment, our country will continue to grow, prosper, and remain the greatest in the world.

SIMS: Currently there are many veterans who come under the provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, better known as the GI Bill of Rights for Korean veterans. As co-sponsor of that bill, Senator Humphrey, I can scarcely think of anyone more competent to comment on some of its more important provisions.

SENATOR: Thank you. Under the Korean GI Bill one and a half days of education and training are granted for each day of service on or after June 27, 1950 regardless of where the service was

COPY

performed up to a maximum period limited to 36 calendar months or the equivalent of a four year academic college course. This is important, the program of education or training must be started on or before August 2, 1954 or within two years of discharge, whichever is later. With specific exceptions, courses must have been in existence for 2 years prior to the enrollment of veterans. In the case of private schools offering non-accredited courses below the college levels, enrollments must include at least 15% non-veterans in each course. This figure is an improvement over the House measure which set the figure at 25%. However, I am afraid even the lower figure passed by the Senate will hurt many trade schools. Many trade schools were set up after World War II to give vocational education to veterans. They have done a fine service in aiding the veteran to secure interesting and profitable vocations. However, since they have depended on veteran attendance I fear many of them will be forced out of business.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, what are the provisions for House ^{ing} and Unemployment Compensation under the Korean GI Bill.

COPY

SENATOR: The Act authorizes the same housing benefits for veterans serving on or after June 27, 1950 as presently enjoyed by World War II veterans. That is, guaranty of home loans up to 60% with a maximum guaranty of \$7500; business loan guarantees up to \$2000; and direct home and farmhouse loans in non-metropolitan areas where private financing is not available, up to \$10,000. In all cases interest rates are not to exceed 4%. As for unemployment compensation the bill authorizes payments of \$26 per week for 26 weeks, by and through agreements with the states.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, I know that you have voted for practically every piece of legislation designed to give veterans and servicemen a better break. However, would you comment on some of this legislation that you personally introduced.

SENATOR: Because I feel that a man cannot be a good soldier unless he knows that his loved ones are being adequately cared for, I proposed the establishment of a program of grants-in-aid which would assist the

COPY

states in providing maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted men. In another bill I asked for increased allowances for enlisted men's dependents. I was also glad to be co-sponsor of Senate Bill 891, 1st Session, 82nd Congress. This bill sought to provide additional income tax exemptions for men on active duty.

In that same session of Congress I also introduced Senate Bill 1185 which sought to provide for the distribution of waterproof information cards to members of the Armed Forces on Active Duty.

These cards were to advise our men as to the requirements for proving the incurrence of service connected disabilities. It was also to provide for the preparation and immediate forwarding to the United States of duplicate copies of medical records with respect to service connected injuries or diseases.

SIMS: I realize, Senator Humphrey, that these are just a few of the bills you have introduced. But what do you think of some people's complaint that too much is being done for the veterans?

SENATOR: I don't think any American would consider pensions for the war blind, aid to the families of those killed in the line of duty, or automobiles for the disabled -- doing too much for the veterans. As for those who have returned from service unscarred except, perhaps, for memories -- these men too have made a sacrifice -- the sacrifice of years away from loved ones, curtailed incomes, and deferred success in their chosen field of work.

I am proud of the stand I have taken on veterans legislation. I was glad to receive a certificate of merit from the AMVETS and a citation from the Marine Corps League which reads, "For meritorious service in the field of legislation on rehabilitation of Marine Corps personnel and Marine Corps veterans." These men do not ask for special privileges. They only want the same opportunities they would have had if their country had not asked for years of duty in her defense. They deserve no less than this and I would say much more from a grateful Nation's bounty.

SIMS: 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