

1953

COPY

What federal housing programs have meant to Minnesota will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) in a talk _____, over Radio Station K_____

The talk is another in the weekly series transcribed in Washington by Senator Humphrey for broadcast over Station _____, discussing key current issues for Minnesota citizens.

During his housing interview, Senator Humphrey will explain the federal government's participation in the proposed urban redevelopment-slum clearing projects in St. Paul, as well as discuss the extent to which FHA and PHA assistance has spurred housing developments throughout the state.

Minnesota's senator will also present his views on future prospects for public housing activity.

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I understand the Housing and Home Finance Agency has finally given the "green light" for two major urban redevelopment projects in St. Paul in which you were actively interested. Can you tell me what these projects will amount to, and what federal assistance is being provided?

SENATOR: I'll certainly be glad to, because the St. Paul projects are going to be a tremendous improvement of which the entire state of Minnesota can be proud.

Housing and Home Finance Administrator Raymond Foley approved temporary loan allocations totaling \$6,838,711 and capital grant allocations totaling \$4,165,739 for the two projects just before his recent retirement. The approval culminates planning activity in the community for more than two years, along with all the pushing I could do at this end.

SIMMS: Where are the projects located, Senator, and just what is contemplated in the improvements?

SENATOR: The projects are planned for an area adjacent to the Minnesota State Capitol, and are closely related to the Capital Approach Program being ~~undertaken~~ undertaken by the State of Minnesota to provide for an improved circulation of traffic by the rearrangement of streets leading into the Capitol grounds, new buildings, and other improvements. The Eastern and Western projects just approved will mean elimination of a bad slum area, and its replacement ~~at~~ by residential redevelopment along with some commercial and public uses.

SIMMS: Senator, just who will be in charge of the development?

SENATOR: It will be carried out entirely by the Housing and Redevelopment

COPY

Authority of the City of St. Paul. The final federal approval has now been given authorizing execution of contracts for the work with the St. Paul housing group, but the federal funds cannot be made available until the redevelopment plans are finally approved by the St. Paul City Council.

SIMMS: What will these projects cost, Senator Humphrey, and how is the financing shared?

SENATOR: The total gross cost of the two projects is estimated at \$9,372,620. The Eastern project, generally bounded by Jackson and Valley streets and a proposed extension of Twelfth street, consists of approximately 34 acres and will have a gross project cost of \$3,678,589. The Western project, bounded by Western Avenue, Aurora, and Rice Streets and Rondo Parkway, covers about 70 acres and its gross cost is estimated at \$5,694,031.

Since the reuse value of the land in the projects has been estimated at \$2,370,507, the net cost--or deficit--of the two projects will amount to approximately \$7,002,113. Under the Housing Act of 1949, Federal grants may be used to defray up to two-thirds of net project costs. It is for that portion of federal participation that \$4,165,739 has been approved as an outright grant. The city is supplying the remaining \$2,836,374 in local grants-in-aid, including cash donations from funds provided through a special benefit tax set up under the Minnesota Municipal Housing Redevelopment Act, site improvements, and supporting facilities.

The temporary loan funds being provided by the federal government, which are repayable, will assist in acquiring, clearing, and preparing the land for the specified new uses.

SIMMS: What does the residential redevelopment proposal call for when completed?

SENATOR: The residential redevelopment in the two projects is expected to provide

three bedrooms.

COPY

There are approximately 1,600 families now living in the two-areas, 238 of whom are non-white. Under the federal Housing Act, the relocation plans must assure that each family has an opportunity to move into housing facilities which are decent, safe, and sanitary, within their financial reach, and within reasonable distance to their place of employment.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, that sounds like a real major improvement all right. Are any similar projects pending for Minnesota?

SENATOR: Yes, similar plans have been under way for areas in Minneapolis for some time, but they haven't advanced quite as far as the St. Paul projects to date. However, I was informed just the other day that the Housing and Home Finance Administration is now reviewing ~~back~~ an application for an advance of planning funds for ~~Minneapolis~~ the Minneapolis project, so we hope it can be pushed ahead just as rapidly as possible.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about other federal housing programs in Minnesota? Have they provided much additional housing?

SENATOR: They certainly have, both through the backing the Federal Housing Administration has given private contractors and building investors, and the assistance the Public Housing Administration has provided to local housing authorities to build publicly-owned low-rent housing.

As you probably know, the Federal Housing Administration doesn't make loans itself or plan or build housing, but operates chiefly as an aid in private building. What it does is operate insurance programs, by providing insurance against loss on loans for property improvement and repair, and mortgages on several types of housing.

Of course, ~~that insurance of housing loans~~ **COPY** has been what has given the tremendous spurt to our home building, making it possible for thousands of people in the middle-income classes to finance home ownership.

Let me give you an idea what the FHA has meant to Minnesota. The act authorizing such insured housing loans was adopted in 1934. From 1935 through 1951, the latest year for which total figures are available, 28,052 FHA-insured home mortgages were provided for housing in Minnesota, amounting to a total of \$162,323,000.

For 1951 alone, 1,999 mortgage loans were insured for 2,032 residential units in Minnesota amounting to \$17,139,000.

Out of that amount, \$9,738,000 were for 1,153 new units, and the remaining \$7,401,000 was insured financing of existing units.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about the Public Housing Administration? Does it have separate programs in Minnesota?

SENATOR: Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration are basic operating units of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, all under the same top administrator.

The Public Housing Administration's principal program however is government-aided low rent housing, first started under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, and then expanded under the 1949 Housing Act.

Minnesota has 12 of these PHA housing projects providing 2,639 units. Ten projects with 2,506 units are publically-owned low rent housing projects, and the other two projects, with 133 units, are what is known as Veterans' Re-Use Housing Projects--supervision over local management of temporary housing for veterans constructed under the Lanham act.

SIMMS: I can see that federal assistance has been a great help toward improving housing conditions in our state, Senator Humphrey. What about the future for these programs? Are they likely to be continued?

SENATOR: I wish I could answer that one with confidence, but I'm afraid all I can predict is that another battle over the public housing program looms in Congress, with the focal point of the dispute being the number of low-rent public housing construction starts the lawmakers will authorize.

Public housing "starts" in 1951 numbered 71,000 for the entire nation as compared to 57,000 starts in 1952. But the 1952 rate of building activity on such projects was one tenth above that in 1951, because of a large carry-over of work in progress on previous starts.

In his budget for fiscal 1954, former President Truman estimated a need for 75,000 public housing units, asking an increase in the present 35,000 "ceiling" on annual new starts. But in view of past Republican opposition to the Public Housing program, it is most unlikely that the 83rd Congress will grant Mr. Truman's request. In fact, the real question is how far below the present 35,000 "ceiling" they will drop the limit on such construction.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I understand you protested against appointment of former Representative Albert M. Cole of Kansas as new Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

SENATOR: Yes, I did oppose his appointment because of Cole's past record of being consistently opposed to the very programs he is now selected

COPY

to administer. As a general rule, I believe a new President should have a rather free hand in the choice of his aides, despite requirement for senate confirmation. However, when the Congress has adopted a program I feel we are entitled to administrators who at least believe in that program. If the intent is to sabotage the program, it's the wrong way to do it. If the Republicans don't believe we need public housing, they should move to abolish it by act of Congress--not by an administrator who has been one of the leading favorites of the high rent and high-housing cost lobby.

As far as I can see, there is still public demand for low-cost housing that private industry has not met, and the federal government seems the only body that has the resources to provide adequate housing for low-income groups.

The AFL has already said it will oppose any Congressional action to kill public housing legislation, with one of its spokesmen saying just recently that the labor group will support a continued public housing program to help fill the gap where private industry cannot meet the need unaided.

SIMS: Thank you again, Senator Hubert Humphrey. I'm sure our listeners have a better understanding of the various federal housing programs, and will watch with interest what happens to these programs in the future.

1. Williamsburg Inspiration
2. Faith in Democracy
3. International Food Reserves
4. Cancer Fund Appeal

COPY

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, the old world seems a jittery place these days. With such things as Stalin's death, Russian attacks on American and British planes, and new atomic tests out in Nevada, most of us are worried about where we are headed. Maybe we just need a good pep talk. From your vantage point as a member of the important Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator, how do you feel about what lies ahead, about democracy's future?

SENATOR: You couldn't have asked me that at a better time. My own faith in Democracy was given a real inspirational "lift" recently, by a look into the past.

Sometimes it is good for us, in the midst of the pressing problems of our own times, to look back and think back over the obstacles our democracy has had to surmount, and the struggles it has had to endure, to achieve the place we hold today as a bulwark of freedom for the whole world.

It was a simple thing that brought this home to me so emphatically, but I'd like to tell you about it.

Mrs. Humphrey and I took the children to Williamsburg, Virginia, for a recent weekend. I wish I could convey to all my friends what a deep impression that historic spot made upon us. Here in modern America is a community that has been restored to colonial days. You literally step out of one world, into another.

We turned our minds away from the troubles of the present, and lived again in democracy's glories of the past.

We visited the House of Burgesses where Patrick Henry gave his famous oration. We saw the early Capitol building where Thomas Jefferson served as Governor. We attended Bruton Parish church where George Washington, Thomas

Jefferson, Patrick Henry, John Marshall, and many other patriots of early America worshipped.

COPY

You couldn't help but feel that these early patriots really knew the true worth of freedom, and were willing to risk everything to achieve it. And you couldn't help but be inspired with the feeling that we, too, must be willing to risk everything, if necessary, to preserve that freedom.

Every American should see these historical shrines. Such a visit to Williamsburg is good for the spirit. It reaffirms your faith in American democracy.

It reaffirms your faith that the great principles of democracy will live, if we will only live by those principles.

It reaffirms your conviction that we must practice what we preach, whether in international affairs or domestic affairs.

SIMMS: I think I see what you mean, Senator Humphrey; you think the best way we can 'sell' democracy to the uncertain peoples of other lands is to make sure democracy does work for the best interest of all--to prove it by our acts, and not just by our phrases and slogans.

SENATOR: That's right. All of us know that we must keep our ~~gunpowder~~ powder dry and man our defenses with vigilance as long as ruthlesscommunitistic imperialism threatens to engulf the world. But we also know that military might alone will never win the battle for the mind of mankind that lies behind most of the world's terrible unrest today. We must not think in terms of defense alone, but instead we must try to inspire faith and friendship among other peoples by showing them we are concerned about the well-being of all mankind. We must show them that democracy has something better to offer.

We must prove, by our deeds rather than just talk, that democracy offers a way of hope for the world's masses to achieve a dignity of the soul and

a decency of existence that is every man's right.

We must endeavor to wipe out the misery and hunger and starvation that offers such a fertile seedbed for communism in so much of the world today, as well as strike at communism itself.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, isn't that just what you and 21 other Senators were aiming at when you presented a resolution in the Senate calling for creation of an International Food Reserve?

SENATOR: That's right. Whenever we can strike a blow at famine and starvation in the world, we are striking a blow at communism--for that's where it breeds the most rapidly.

In asking the Senate to support the International Food Reserve, I urged such action as a means of serving notice to the whole world that the United States is concerned with empty stomachs, and not just with full cartridge belts.

We are urging that our representatives in the United Nations and the Food and Agricultural Organization take the lead in negotiations toward creating an International Food Reserve as a means of absorbing temporary market surpluses of agricultural products, and making them available wherever they are most needed in the world to prevent famine and starvation.

You know, Communism progresses on empty stomachs and frustrated spirit; it preys upon misery among the masses. The hope of Democracy should be to offer such people a better alternative for eliminating such misery--a better future where hunger and mass starvation need not exist.

In such a struggle, a million dollars for food might equal ten million for ammunition.

We might as well face up to the fact that as long as there are empty stomachs in the world, especially while we are living in abundance even beyond our ability to consume, we'll have to keep our cartridge belts full.

But I am sure ~~most of us pray that in time~~, full stomachs everywhere can replace the full cartridge belts as our greatest defender of democracy.

SIMMS: In view of the unsettled conditions existing since Stalin's death, Senator Humphrey, wouldn't this be an advantageous time to take some such action?

SENATOR: That's what quite a few of us believe. It would be seizing the initiative in the "cold war", and asserting our leadership by bringing a positive, humanitarian force into the world's ideological struggle right at a time when the whole world is tensely waiting to see who will make the next move in this grim conflict between freedom and communism.

And among the masses of underprivileged people in many parts of the world who may eventually sway the balance between freedom and communism, a single positive act of leadership toward a world of plenty will win more friends for all democracy than the armed might we could assemble.

~~SENATOR~~

SIMMS: Senator, I'm sure you're right---and I'm sure the American people would rather see food used to fight for peace than to have their boys do the fighting. Besides, wouldn't such a proposal be of tremendous help to our own farmers in this country?

SENATOR: Yes, it certainly would. It would mean assuring an outlet for our abundant production. It offers us a way to make a positive contribution toward permanent peace, while at the same time protecting the interests of American agriculture. No nation was ever more desirous of having peace and prosperity shared throughout the world, yet the instincts of self-preservation warn us that we must not ignore the welfare of our own people in the process of helping the world. That's why I feel we should welcome such an opportunity as the International Food Reserve offers-- a way to protect our own economic security while making a new contribution

toward a world of plenty. In effect, American food and fiber would be replacing American dollars as part of our contribution toward economic strength in the free world.

SIMMS: Senator, you've made me feel better about the whole world outlook today. I think many others will be glad to know some of their Senators are looking for more positive roads to peace than just full reliance upon a shooting war. Now, Senator, you told me you had a special message you wanted to give to our people in Minnesota.

SENATOR: Yes, I have. It's about another fight on our hands, right here at home.

The long, hard fight on cancer isn't won. There has been a great progress in treatment and diagnosis, but cancer is still a great danger to each of us. Under present rates, one out of every five persons will develop this disease.

The American Cancer Society has brought together the resources of America in a tremendous battle against this killer. Through programs of research, education and service, it is leading the fight for you and those you love.

We can all help that fight. Let's all join the 1953 Crusade of the American Cancer Society. Our contributions are necessary to save ~~the~~ lives and ease human tragedy. When you are asked to contribute to the April Cancer Crusade, give as generously as you can. Give with the confidence that cancer someday will be conquered. Give with the hope that day may not be too far away. Send your gift to Cancer, C-A-N-C-E-R, care of your local post office. And remember--each penny you give is used in a way that helps.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Hubert Humphrey.

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I know you have always been a strong supporter of the school lunch program, and that recently you have been urging distribution of greater quantities of healthy, perishable foods like meat and dairy products through that program. Do many Minnesota schools participate in this program?

SENATOR: They certainly do--about 1,300 of them at the present time, serving nourishing lunches each day to about 240,000 school children.

Minnesota has done a particularly good job of developing the school lunch program, using to good advantage the federal assistance available. The State Department of Education under Commissioner Schweickhard is responsible for the program, with Andrew Taylor as state director. I am sure Minnesotans will be glad to know that in national school lunch circles, our Director Taylor is recognized as one of the foremost leaders in this important field.

SIMMS: As I understand it, Senator, the school lunch program is financed jointly by federal, state, and local funds.

SENATOR: That's right, although the major share is borne by the federal government. Minnesota pays the administrative costs--about \$35,000--and has also provided about \$200,000 in state program funds to help in purchase of foods. The Federal government, however, has allocated Minnesota \$1,250,000 for this year under the National School Lunch Act, all of which will be spent in our own state for various food commodities. Of course, in addition to this cash assistance, the Federal government also makes available large quantities of food from national stockpiles.

SIMMS: That's where you have been urging increased allocations, to make better use of foods now in surplus supply, isn't it Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: You're right, and I'm glad to be able to report we are making progress.

COPY

This year, in cash and food assistance combined, Minnesota will have the greatest allotment of federal aid for its school lunch program since the plan was originated.

While the cash allocation, based upon the number of school children, remains about the same, we're getting about \$1,400,000 worth of additional aid in food supplies compared to about \$589,000 in such extra food distribution in the last school year.

Part of this extra assistance comes from distribution of commodities purchased by the Department of Agriculture under the Department's program for removal of agricultural surpluses, and the rest is out of funds allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture in the National School Lunch Act to buy nationally any especially nutritious foods needed to supplement known deficiencies in the diet.

It's in the distribution of surplus foods where the big increase is being made available to us. During the last school year, Minnesota got only \$244,000 worth of food from this source. But for the present school year, that amount has been stepped up to an estimated \$1,000,000 worth.

I might add that the increased allocation was established for Minnesota before the change-over in national administrations, but I have every confidence the new administration won't cutback this valuable contribution to the health of our school children. Many of us are anxious that the school lunch program continue to be expanded in the future until it serves all of our school children, rather than suffer any cutback. Of course the new administration's views won't be known officially until they present their new budget estimates for 1954. However, that would only affect the next school year, and wouldn't interfere with our increased assistance for this year.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I am sure all of our Parent-Teachers' groups will certainly welcome that news of increased food allocations for the school lunch program this year. Does Minnesota get any other federal assistance for its schools?

SENATOR: Yes, it does, but not as much as I'd like to see--or as much as we need. However, under Public Law 815, which I introduced in the 81st Congress--and now known as the Humphrey School Construction Act--limited financial assistance is provided for construction of school facilities in areas affected by federal activities, such as where increased attendance results from government bases or projects in the area.

A report just issued by the Commissioner of Education shows that eight Minnesota school districts have qualified for such construction assistance, with \$630,711 in federal funds now reserved for allocation to those districts to assist with school expansion projects.

Another \$38,641 has been allocated to ten Minnesota school districts under Public Law 874, under which the federal government also assists toward operation and maintenance of schools where there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as a result of federal activities.

SIMMS: I'm sure that will be a big help to those districts, Senator Humphrey, but isn't there still a tremendous need for further school construction throughout Minnesota?

SENATOR: There certainly is such a need, and I am very concerned about it.

In addition to providing emergency assistance to those communities directly affected by the impact of federal government activity, the Humphrey School Construction Act of the 81st Congress recognized that the school construction problem facing cities and the parents of America extends far beyond the federally impacted areas. We recognized that the federal government has a responsibility to meet local school construction needs wherever they might exist

whenever the local communities are in no financial condition to meet those needs.

COPY

As the first step in that direction, my bill provided for a survey of long range school construction needs, to be undertaken by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency.

They have just reported the results of that study, and it shows a tremendous problem ahead.

It is estimated that for Minnesota alone, a total amount of \$165,959,000 will be needed to meet our ~~maxx~~ requirements. Ninety and a half percent of that amount will be needed for new construction, 7% for remodeling and rehabilitation, 1.5% for school sites, and ~~1.1~~ 1% is needed for school buses.

SIMMS: Can the state and the local school districts meet that huge need?

SENATOR: That's the serious problem we must face. Even should every local school district and our state government appropriate to its total legal capacity, there would remain a deficit of more than \$46,000,000, or 27.8% of the total need.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, is there any chance of additional federal assistance to solve this problem?

SENATOR: I think we must solve it. I can't see how we can justify spending billions trying to save democracy in the rest of the world, then neglect our own school children here at home. I have called this critical problem to the attention of the Senate with introduction of a bill to be known as the School Construction Act of 1953, under which I hope we can formulate a well-formed national plan, based on a firm administrative foundation, and designed to meet the needs of our school children in a continuing, uniform and equitable formula. It provides that state educational agencies will have full control of planning and developing new buildings, and setting up construction priority programs for each state. Allocation

of construction funds, to the extent we can get Congress to appropriate them, would be based on the number of children and the per capita income payments in each state.

SIMMS: I am sure all people interested in education will welcome such constructive action, Senator Humphrey. We're also hearing quite a bit these days about Oil-for-Education, in connection with the offshore oil question. Is there any chance of that providing us an answer to our urgent need for expanded educational facilities?

SENATOR: Yes, that could be a real sound answer, if the people will speak out firm enough to prevent the Congress from giving away our valuable national oil resources in submerged lands off the coasts of several southern and southwestern states.

Four states are now asking Congress to ignore past Supreme Court decisions and give them title to these oil resources which the Court has ruled belong to ALL the people. If that happens, education can't ~~then~~ expect much help from that source.

But if Congress will adopt the alternative offered in the Hill and Anderson amendments, it would earmark the oil revenues for aid to education all over the United States. It is estimated that such aid would amount to at least \$319 for every school child in the country.

For Minnesota, that would mean about \$165,500,000--enough to carry out our school construction program almost entirely, without additional cost to the state's taxpayers.

It certainly doesn't make sense to give something away that could mean so much to American education, and I can assure you I am doing my best to stop the give-away and save this valuable oil revenue for our public schools.

SIMMS: That you very much, Senator Humphrey. I am sure everyone interested in our schools--and that should be all of us--greatly appreciates your efforts in behalf of education.

THEME: Farm Situation

COPY

8
Question & Answer Outline
Radio Discussion by
SENATOR HUMPHREY
Thursday, March 5

QUESTION: Senator Humphrey, I have noticed that on several occasions recently you have expressed concern over a decline in farm prices. Just how serious do you regard the present farm situation?

ANSWER: I'm afraid the situation is much more serious than many people realize, and I'm gravely concerned about it.

Farm prices are already on the skids. Farm income is declining dangerously in relation to income of other segments of economy. Farm share of national income now falling even below 1932.

Figures from Bureau of Agricultural Economics show:

In depressed 1932, farmers got 7.3% of total national income.

By 1946, farmers' share had risen to 10.8%.

But for 1953, now officially estimated by BAE to be only 6.5%.

General rise in income since 1948 is by-passing people on farms, who make up sixth of U.S. population.

Worst of it is, while farmers are getting lower prices, they are having to pay same or even higher prices for things they must buy.

That's what we mean by "parity" position of farmers--the relation of farm prices to farm costs. In 1946, parity relationship was 113 percent of 1910-1914 average. Now its down to 95 percent, and still dropping.

Farmers only get 45 cents out of each food dollar spent today, compared to 53 cents from each dollar in 1946.

Recent issue of U.S. News and World Report summarizes survey of farm conditions by agreeing that farmers are caught in a squeeze, and that a real farm recession is already under way.

QUESTION: That doesn't sound so encouraging for our Minnesota farmers, Senator.

ANSWER: We've got to make people realize that these economic warnings must be heeded, if we are to avert kind of collapse that has plunged us into past depressions.

Confusion and uncertainty over future agricultural policies of government partly responsible for undermining farm economy.

We need immediate, positive, constructive action to bolster economic climate for American agriculture.

I've taken steps in that direction by introducing a bill in the Senate that would clarify the conflicting philosophies now so apparent within the ranks of the new Administration in regard to agriculture; make good the repeated assurances of leaders and platforms of both political parties that economic protection would be continued; and establish such economic protection as basic public policy, fully accepted as in the public's interest, beyond realm of political controversy.

QUESTION: Just what does your new farm bill propose, Senator Humphrey?

ANSWER: My bill will assure American farmers fair returns for answering the nation's call to greater production, and eliminate the threat of economic penalty now hanging over their heads if they produce the abundance the nation now demands to fully meet its domestic and international needs.

I am proposing that the price support level be not less than 90 nor more than 100% of the parity fair return standard--the parity level pledged to the American farmer by President Eisenhower during the campaign.

I am proposing to make mandatory the support of a number of commodities which are now subject to the discretion--or indiscretion--of the Secretary of Agriculture. Flaxseeds, soybeans, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums would be added to the list of commodities protected by mandatory 90 to 100% price supports.

I am asking that dairy products, cattle, hogs and poultry and eggs all be given mandatory price support at 90% of parity.

COPY

I am further proposing to extend the period of firm, mandatory farm price supports through 1957, a year after the new Administration takes office.

I am asking that the present dual parity formula be continued for that same period, instead of requiring the so-called "new formula" to go into effect at the end of next year.

QUESTION: Senator, I notice you have included the major perishable commodities in your proposal for strengthening price supports. Doesn't that raise the question of how such commodities can be supported without heavy waste?

ANSWER: I'm glad you asked me that. I want to see food used, not wasted. Purchase and storage is certainly not the only way of providing price support.

Both political parties promised during campaign to find new and better ways to support perishables without incurring such waste. I think it's time we made good on that promise.

I am purposefully not limiting the Secretary of Agriculture to any one method for support of perishables. I don't want to tie his hands. Instead, I am recommending that he consider the use of any or all of several alternative methods.

We must accomplish price support to the farmers without penalizing consumers by withholding such perishable products from useful, human consumption.

QUESTION: Senator Humphrey, I wonder if you would outline some of the alternative methods you have suggested.

ANSWER: I'd be glad to. We know that our loan-and-storage programs that have worked so well for storable commodities are not practical for most perishables. But there are other ways support can be provided without risking huge wastage of good food.

First of all, I have suggested further consideration be given the use of

COPY

compensatory payments, such as previously included in the 1948 Agricultural Act authored by Senator Aiken, and similar to those still successfully used in the Sugar Act.

I understand Secretary Benson has just recently testified in support of continuing the present Sugar Act that includes such payments, so perhaps he may decide they have merit for support of other commodities. They would certainly seem to make more sense, for example, than to let millions of pounds of butter be kept from consumers just to deteriorate in storage.

Secondly, I have urged expanding the distribution of these perishable products through our school lunch program, through charitable institutions, and through military procurement.

Third, I have urged new methods of more liberal credit for livestock producers that will encourage and permit more orderly marketing.

Fourth, I have proposed that we should consider a domestic food allotment plan similar to that previously proposed by Senator Aiken for low-income families.

Fifth, I have urged development of international programs for making such food supplies available where they are most needed in the world.

And, Sixth, I am suggesting that we use our abundant production to fight communism by improving the diets of South Korean and other allied troops.

QUESTION: All of those ideas sound practical and helpful, Senator Humphrey. But I'm particularly interested in your comment about greater use of American-produced foods throughout the world. Can you tell me more about what you have in mind?

ANSWER: I feel very strongly that it is to our own interest as a nation, and it is in the interest of freedom and humanitarianism all over the world, that we begin to raise our sights and use some imagination so that our agricultural products can be effectively utilized, and our agricultural economy protected.

COPY

It's simply foolish to talk about "unmanageable surpluses" and propose theories for cutting down production as a way to bolster prices, when every recognized study shows the world's total food production is not even keeping pace with its population growth, let alone being capable of providing for the improved diets so badly needed in many parts of the world.

The problem is to make good use of our abundance, not recklessly abolish it by cutting down production.

We should inter into international negotiations through the United Nations to extend the principles of the international wheat agreement, not only for wheat, but for other agricultural commodities.

Millions in the world are undernourished and underfed. They not only can use but need the health-giving strength and life which American farmers produce in their fields.

We should ship our beef to Korea, where South Korean soldiers are suffering from serious malnutrition. Meat, too, can be used in the struggle against Communist imperialism. Hunger among South Korean troops is reducing the effectiveness of their combat units. There is no reason for their having to suffer such hunger.

We can't win friends so badly needed in many parts of the world, if they are going hungry while hearing us complain about having more food than we know what to do with.

QUESTION: I certainly agree with you, Senator. Isn't it true, also, that we may find ourselves faced with food deficits right in this country in years to come unless we can keep on expanding our agricultural production?

ANSWER: That is true, and it's something we should all be thinking about.

Our population has been increasing at the rate of about $2\frac{1}{2}$ million a year--- $2\frac{1}{2}$ million more mouths to be fed each year, 7,400 a day, 300 an hour, five every minute.

COPY

At that rate, to supply each person in 1975 with the same standard of diet as we have been getting will require about $5\frac{1}{2}$ billion more pounds of red meat than were produced in 1950. We will need 10 billion more quarts of milk. We will need an additional $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion dozen eggs.

These figures won't allow for better diets. They provide just for holding our own. And yet all of us hope that by 1975 our standard can be improved.

The American farm is the production plant that must meet these growing requirements. We should all be concerned with keeping that plant strong, instead of risking cutting down its productive capacity by telling the farmer if he can't cope with the hazards of our complex economy he just better get out of business.

QUESTION: I see what you mean, Senator Humphrey. We consumers have a stake in keeping agriculture prosperous and productive, don't we? From that standpoint, wouldn't you say your new bill means "food insurance" for all of us, not just help for farmers?

ANSWER: That's absolutely right. Everyone has a stake in maintaining abundant production, not just the farmer. And I'm concerned about consumers as well as farmers in seeking to strengthen our farm legislation. For abundant agricultural production is the consumer's only safeguard against soaring retail prices, not that price controls are being scuttled.

But how can farmers be expected to go on producing in abundance, if it means they must take less and less.

That's why--to protect the interests of both farmers and consumers--we must maintain fair prices as an incentive to abundance, and then find ways to use that abundance wisely without penalizing the producer.

Both Presidential candidates recognized and accepted that public policy as in the best interest of the entire nation.

Unfortunately, farmers are learning that a sharply conflicting philosophy is

COPY

coming out from hiding from within the ranks high in the councils of the Republican party. The discredited, sliding-scale "starve out" theory of lowering prices to force compulsory adjustments is being brushed off and hauled into public light again.

Such a course would be a direct repudiation of the President's pledge to farmers of this country, and a dangerous tampering with the nation's future food supply.

I'm proud of the American farmer, and his record of meeting the nation's needs in the face of a struggle to survive. I think he can meet the huge needs ahead. But I think we all have a vital stake in helping him meet those needs.

It can't be done by limiting our research activities. It can't be done by weakening our conservation efforts. It can't be done by tightening our credit facilities. And it certainly can't be done by weakening our price support structure, and thereby telling farmers that if they go ahead on a long-range development program of this nature, they do so at their own risk.

We must remove these threats, and give agriculture a green light to go on producing with confidence that a nation needing that production is willing to assure farmers fair returns for producing it.

CONCLUSION: Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey--you have certainly given me a better understanding of the current farm situation, and the importance to all of us that something be done immediately to strengthen farm prices so as to protect those upon whom we depend for our nation's abundance.

PRESS RELEASE
(For use in connection with radio
broadcast by Senator Humphrey)

COPY

Minnesota's school construction problems, and the chances of getting federal assistance toward financing needed expansion of the state's educational facilities, will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) _____ over Radio Station _____.
(date) (time)

The talk will be one of a weekly series Senator Humphrey transcribes in Washington for Station _____, discussing current problems of especial interest to Minnesota citizens.

In the interview on school problems, Senator Humphrey will also discuss the school lunch program, the results of a federal survey on Minnesota school needs, the Humphrey School Construction Act, and the benefits Minnesota might obtain under the Oil-for-Education bill now before the Congress.

COPY PRESS RELEASE
(For use in connection with radio
broadcast by Senator Humphrey)

Democracy's role in the struggle against communism will be
discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) _____
(date) (time)

over Radio Station _____.

In another of a weekly series transcribed for Radio Station _____
in Washington, Senator Humphrey will be interviewed on the current world
situation, as he views it from his vantage point on the Senate Foreign
Relations Committee.

During the interview, Senator Humphrey will explain the proposed
International Food Reserve which he and 21 other Senators recently called
upon the Senate to support as a means of seizing the initiative in the
"cold war" and bringing a "positive, humanitarian force into the world's
ideological struggle".

Radio script for Senator Humphrey--15 minutes
(To Be Recorded April 3)

Subject matter:
Foreign Affairs

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, the news dispatches lately have been full of supposed peace overtures from the Kremlin, and indications that the war-jittery world might have better reason to hope for peace. As a member of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee, what can you tell us about any changing trends on the horizon?

SENATOR: I'll tell you one thing right off the reel--I'm completely ~~skeptical~~ skeptical of anything emanating from the Soviet masters in the Kremlin, and I think it is safer and sounder for all of us to stay skeptical.

Of course, it's only human nature for all of us to grasp eagerly at any straw in the wind that points to peace. Because our goal is peace and we approach that goal in good faith, we are always hopeful others will meet us halfway. None of us want war, and we easily get jubilant over the slightest indication that the threats of all-out war might be easing.

But I'm gravely concerned over the risk of building up false hopes. I think it's safer to be wary.

As far as I'm concerned, all that I'm convinced of so far is that the Kremlin is changing its strategy--not its intent. They are obviously changing their time-tables; but are they changing their real motives, their ultimate aims? That's the \$64 question we must constantly keep before us in this period when we are tempted to think the peril is easing.

SIMMS: Senator, are there any particular reasons that make you think Russia is just shifting its strategy and timing, rather than changing

COPY

their ultimate aims of world conquest by communism?

SENATOR: Yes, quite frankly, there are several reasons. Right now, unification of Europe's defense forces is the greatest potential deterrent to Communist aggression. This month marks the second anniversary of NATO--the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Great strides have been made, but we still have a long way to go in perfecting a solid defense front for the free world. Six western European countries must still ratify the agreement to create a European Defense Force.

What greater blow could Russia strike at our common defenses right now than to disrupt that progress toward unification with a "peace blitz" inviting complacency, and an easing off of defense efforts and defense expenditures?

If any of our European allies can be made to feel that the danger of Soviet aggression is no longer pressing, that the need for united defense action is no longer urgent, the Kremlin will have won a tremendous victory without firing a shot.

~~Ifixixyxxx~~ It's the old "divide and conquer" theory all over again. If Russia can drive a wedge between ourselves and any of our allies, or can even stir up enough differences between our allies to prevent the necessary goal of defense unification, they may well pave the way for greater success in conquest yet to come than they could hope to achieve today.

SIMMS: Senator, are there other dangers from this Soviet peace offensive?

SENATOR: Yes, there certainly are other dangers, and I am very

COPY
concerned about them. They include the danger of our own response to false hopes of peace right in this country. And make no mistake about it, those dangers are very real.

We've made the same mistake before of being in too big a hurry to strip our defenses; we can't risk that happening again. Yet these Russian peace overtures are going to create the very same pressures for a let-up at home in our defense effort, and experience has warned us that they are pressures that are often hard to resist.

Don't underestimate these Soviet rulers. They are ruthless, but they aren't fools. They are slick and cunning. They know how deep the inherent desire for peace is in the heart of most Americans, and they know how restless Americans become during a long-sustained, constant state of half-peace, half-war. They could well be taking a carefully calculated gamble on America's reaction of turning from grim determination to soft complacency.

If so, they have timed their cunning well. They know we have a new Administration that campaigned on a pledge of cutting down expenditures, and of ending the Korean conflict. They know the pressures are growing in this country for cutting taxes. They know they can always count on some of our people being too short-sighted to see the dangers of letting down our guard, when a tempting bait is offered to lessen the threat of war and invite a relaxation of our defense effort.

Are we going to be suckered into such a course? That's what concerns me. That's what should concern everyone today.

I saw an editorial cartoon in one of the Scripps-Howard newspapers the other day that illustrated this concern very well. It showed Mr. Public lying down on the job, smoking a "peace pipe".

COPY

Out of that pipe came clouds of smoke labelled, "Now we can go back to sleep again!", "Now we can bring the boys home!", "Now we can stop defense spending, and cut taxes!", and "Back to politics and business as usual!". The cartoon was captioned: "Careful--That Peace Pipe May be an Opium Pipe". There's a lot of truth in that for all of us to think about, and think very carefully about.

If we relax for one moment in the building of our defense forces, we are playing right into the Kremlin's hands.

If we start cutting defense expenditures and cutting our foreign aid programs, the Kremlin's peace offensive will be working just about the way they apparently figured it would.

We'll be foolishly lulling ourselves into pleasant dreams of false security, only to face a rude awakening someday soon.

For the Russians aren't letting up for one moment, in their own program of building military might. They may be talking softer for our ears, but all the while they are creating a greater war machine at home.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I'm sure that's a timely warning we all need to heed, in the midst of all the talk about better chances for peace. But what should are answers to Russia be now? Don't we almost have to show we want to try and avoid war if it can be avoided?

SENATOR: Of course we do, but we have to do it with our eyes wide open. We have always been willing to meet Russia more than halfway on any bonafide attempt to settle international discord. We are still willing to. We can't let them convince the rest of the world they want peace, and we are determined on war. We must explore every possible

COPY

chance of easing world tensions, and must welcome any gains that can be made in that direction. But we must do it without once letting down our guard, without once falling into the old trap of complacency. We must convince Russia and the rest of the world that this time we are going to stay prepared, stay strong enough to enforce any new peace agreements. We must show them the American people are not as soft and easily fooled as they apparently think we are--and, I'm afraid, as we've given them some reason to think we are.

SIMMS: Senator, how do you think we can test the good faith of Russia in some of these peace overtures?

SENATOR: For one thing, let's make sure Russia isn't just changing the scenery on us--getting tired of Korea, and wanting to end troubles there just to start something elsewhere.

All of us want to see the shooting ended in Korea just as quickly as honorably possible. But don't forget this--the communist threat is a world-wide threat, not just a threat in Korea. A truce in Korea by no means ends the communist threat to the world. If Russia means what she seems to be saying about wanting to avoid war, let her show it all over the world.

Let me give you four criteria that I want to see met by Russia as evidence of good faith before ^{we} ~~waxgax~~ take this new line of ~~taxxx~~ their's too seriously.

First, they must end the war in Korea; ~~xx~~ a very minimum would be a truce on the terms sponsored in the United Nations by India.

Second, they must let up on the pressures now being exerted on Berlin, and permit free elections instead of creating the tensions

COPY
of an armed camp in that vital outpost of the free world.

Third, they must make good on a treaty for Austria.

Fourth, they must be willing to cease their campaign of anti-semitism now used as a weapon of hate behind the iron curtain, and as a wedge to stir up strife and upheavals in the middle east.

Asia, Western Europe, and the middle east are the three tinderbox areas of the world where the present threat of communist aggression could now erupt at any time into another total war. If the new leaders of the Kremlin mean what they are saying about wanting to preserve peace in the world, they must demonstrate some firm assurances for each of these areas that Soviet policy has changed. Korea is an example of the threat to the rest of Asia. Berlin and Austria are symbols of the peril hanging over the rest of Western Europe. Anti-semitism is obviously part of a conspiracy to divide-and-conquer the middle east by creating new unrest and uprisings, and turning nation against nation. That's why I propose the four criteria I have outlined as a positive yardstick by which we can measure Moscow's true intentions.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, has this sudden shift in Soviet policy caught leaders of our government by surprise, or had there been reason to expect such a course?

SENATOR: It hasn't caught me by surprise, and it shouldn't have caught anybody by surprise. For it hasn't been a sudden shift--it is a carefully calculated move that was fully charted in advance, a deliberate shift in strategy in keeping with the off-and-on war of nerves the Russians have been playing all along.

Our people didn't read or hear much about it, because they were too occupied with our presidential election campaign. But last fall, just before that election--and probably at a time carefully calculated not to create much of a stir in this country--Stalin called a conference of the world's communist leaders in Moscow, called together all his satellite rulers and his own hierarchy of the Soviet. He charted the changing course of communism's struggle against the world at that time, and Malenkov was one of the prime movers in that conference. Out of it came the announced intent of buying time to build up Russia's industrial potential, of seeking to divide the unity of the allies massing against them.

There's been no secret about that conference; it's well documented in our intelligence files. But too little attention was paid to what it portended. Yet every move the Soviet has made since that time could have been predicted out of that gathering, down to the very peace overtures being made today.

That's a sad commentary on our nation today. Committees in Congress spend valuable time and taxpayers money worrying about what some college student wrote in this country during the depression, yet ignore entirely any serious investigation of the course for Russia's future charted by Stalin and Malenkov at that historic conference, even though a complete record of it is available for our study.

Until we learn to really deal with Communism as a world menace rather than as a political plaything at home, we're taking dangerous and unnecessary risks we can ill-afford.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for that very timely discussion on what may lie behind the headlines of Russia's new "peace blitz"

Radio Script for Senator Humphrey
15 minutes: to be Recorded April 3

#12
Subject Matter:

Minnesota Legislature
Employers Association
Simpson Record

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what do you think about the recent action of the Minnesota legislature in memorializing congress to continue farm price supports?

SENATOR: I'm very happy about it, for it shows our state legislature is really alert to farm conditions, and understands the needs of farm people. Both Houses of the legislature are to be congratulated. I have written my congratulations to Governor Anderson, who signed the resolution after it was adopted without a single dissenting vote in either house.

You know, that action is extremely helpful to those of us in Washington who are trying to protect agriculture, regardless of political party. Such united sentiment from a great farm state like Minnesota cannot be easily ignored.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, how do the recommendations of the Minnesota legislature compare with the proposals in your farm bill?

SENATOR: They are substantially the same. I have endeavored to cover all the recommendations in regard to price support, and I believe my bill would provide the very improvements the legislature has asked for, as well as the pledges President Eisenhower made to our farmers ~~last year~~ during his campaign. Incidentally, I'm glad to note that the Minnesota legislature even went beyond price support in asking continuation of other farm programs, calling attention to the necessity of providing adequate long-term low-interest farm credit, continuing the use of democratically-elected farmer committees.

COPY
to carry out the farm programs, encouraging more soil conservation, and providing adequate crop storage facilities. And I shall certainly watch all of those programs very carefully as the new Congress progresses about its work.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you regard this price support fight as a political battle?

SENATOR: No, I don't--it's much more than that. It's an economic battle, a bread-and-butter battle. A powerful bloc of speculators, food brokers, and processors are trying to pull the rug of price supports out from under our farmers. Some of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, are trying desperately to keep that from happening. Republicans with a bonafide interest in the farmer, men like Senator Young of North Dakota for example, share my concern. We're fighting on the same side in this scrap. Unfortunately powerful forces within the Republican party are on the other side of the fence.

SIMMS: Isn't it true, Senator, that you are being made the victim of political attacks as a result of your support for continued economic protection for agriculture, even though some Republicans have voiced the same warnings you have given us?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, that's true. I'm sorry to say that even the Minnesota Employers Association let themselves become a sounding board for such a partisan political attack at their recent annual meeting, when an outside speaker criticized me just because I have endeavored to carry out in good ~~fixx~~ faith the mandate of our own state legislature, and have tried to express the views of our farmers as they have expressed them to

COPY

as they have expressed them to me.

SIMMS: Who was this outsider, Senator? And what is his position on these important farm issues?

SENATOR: I'm glad you asked that, because I think Minnesota farmers will be interested in the background of a man imported into our state to tell our farmers they are all wrong, tell our entire state legislature it's all wrong, and tell me I am all wrong.

He is Congressman Richard M. Simpson of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Republican Congressional campaign committee. Obviously, he's a political hatchetman sent out to attack me.

~~I don't like name-calling~~ As far as I am concerned personally, I don't care about Congressman Simpson's name-calling--that's his job. I think our farmers know a lot more about conditions in Minnesota agriculture than any Pennsylvania carpetbagger does, and I think they have a right to resent such an outsider coming in and trying to tell them their Senator shouldn't be concerned about falling farm prices.

I think there's more to it than just personal politics, however. I think it is all part of the pattern becoming apparent--a pattern of a determined drive to align big business interests against continuing farm price supports. And when an outside congressman comes into our farm state and bids for new alliances against agriculture, then it's time for all of us to get concerned.

Now, I don't want to engage in any such name-calling as Congressman Simpson indulged in. I'd rather let facts speak for me. I'd just like to ask our farm friends to do a little checking into the voting record of this man who presumes to tell Minnesota who it

should send to the United States Senate. ~~Withxxxxxxx~~

I'd never heard of Congressman Simpson doing anything or supporting anything for Agriculture, so I looked up his record.

No wonder he's against improving and extending our farm price supports. He's been consistently against every effort to improve our price support program in the past, and he's been FOR every crippling amendment.

He even voted against the farm support we have now, providing for 90% of parity at least through next year.

He voted against extending price support to cover perishables...he voted against price support for wool...he voted against grain storage authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation...he voted against increasing the CCC's borrowing authority to carry out the price support programs.

But that's not all. His record is consistent on all the farm programs. He has voted consistently to reduce conservation funds. He voted for every attempt to curtail and cripple the Department of Agriculture's services. He even voted for an amendment to curtail the school lunch program.

Just to give you some idea of his regard for farmers, take a look at his voting record on the Rural Electrification Administration. During his time in Congress, he has had 38 opportunities to vote in support of REA cooperatives. On all 31 times that he voted, he was AGAINST REA. The other seven times he was absent. It would have been better for REA if he had been absent more often.

Now that's the kind of man coming into our state to say my farm views are all wrong, that there's nothing for farmers to be concerned about, and that anybody who disagrees with him is a

'left winger'.

COPY

SIMMS: I see what you mean, Senator Humphrey, about such attacks being part of an all-out drive to get rid of farm price supports. Do you think that is a serious threat?

SENATOR: Yes, I do. I'm seriously concerned about it. Despite the good intentions and hopes of some of my Republican colleagues, I can't help notice that the Voice of Big Business is squeezing out the Voice of Agriculture. I'm disturbed at the extent to which these interests with absolutely no concern about the welfare of the individual farmer are suddenly emerging in the forefront in attempts to make over our farm policies. I don't like seeing Wall Street farmers--businessmen and speculators who farm the farmers--attempting to dictate farm policy for this country.

There's too much evidence of that anti-farmer influence at work to be ignored. The middleman seems to have replaced the farmer as the key adviser even for the Department of Agriculture these days.

Meat buyers are invited in for a discussion about whether cattle prices are falling too low. Big city bankers are called to Washington to discuss whether or not farmers have enough credit available. Food dealers and processors are named to various advisory committees--and fewer and fewer farmers.

I'm sure most of our farmers would share my concern if they had read the full-page editorial, "Bravo, Cousin Ezra", in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly--the trade journal for big financial interests--calling for the end of price supports, and the laudatory editorials in the Wall Street Journal recently along the

same vein.

COPY

We musn't fool ourselves. The financial journals now acclaiming new trends in our farm policies aren't very concerned about farmers; their interest lies with those who farm the farmers. And don't kid yourself about the fact that they are out to end ALL farm price supports.

Let me read what the Wall Street Journal, in a spurt of startling frankness, says about that goal: Quote--

"Make no mistake about it; this task will be fought by many farmers, and the Administration will need all the support it can get from wiser heads..but it is a task well begun now." Unquote.

Well, I don't know what some of our farmers will say about that 'wiser heads' part--but I can assure you of one thing: when I want advice and guidance on farm problems, I'm going to get it from our farmers themselves, and not from the Wall Street Journal or any Congressman like Mr.Simpson who has consistently voted against the farmers.

Minnesota's State Legislature has recognized the seriousness of this fight to the entire economy of our state--and I'm proud to be aligned with them on the farmer's side.

SIMMS: I'm sure the farmers of Minnesota, regardless of political party, appreciate the fight you and others are pushing in their behalf, Senator Humphrey. Actually, as I understand it, all that you have asked is that farmers be assured President Eisenhower's ~~SEE~~ campaign pledges aren't repudiated.

SENATOR: That's absolutely right. I have agreed publicly with the

price support improvements President Eisenhower proposed. I have made those suggestions the basis of my farm price support bill. They are the same improvements recommended by the Minnesota State Legislature. They are the same improvements called for by Senator Young and other Republican members of both houses seriously interested in agriculture. Unfortunately, however, other voices are making themselves heard, and other influences are making themselves felt.

I don't want to be critical of a new regime just getting under way. I want to be fair, and constructive. But all of us must stay alert to the forces openly at work to destroy, rather than improve, the government's obligation to seek for American agriculture a fair share of the economic blessings afforded the rest of our economy.

For the sake of the country's progress, any review of our farm policies must be a constructive one undertaken with an attitude of preserving what has proved good and workable out of the past, and improving wherever improvement is needed to make our public policies more effective in the future. That's what the American people have a right to expect, from any administration. That's what America's farmers have a right to expect. All of us want to go forward to a better, brighter future--not retreat backward into the recesses of the past.

SIMMS: Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey. I'm sure Minnesota's farmers are going to heed your warning and stay on guard against attempts to undermine the price support program.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what can you tell us about the Administration's new high-interest policy, and what it might mean to the American people?

SENATOR: I'm very concerned about it as a serious threat to our entire economy--a three-pronged threat that should be carefully scrutinized not only by the Congress but by the people generally.

It contains germs of a new depression. It will saddle taxpayer with a heavy added interest cost burden on the national debt. It will undoubtedly start a rise in interest on the billions of outstanding private debt, and make credit more costly and less available to farmers, home buyers, small business, municipalities and borrowers generally.

I feel it is shocking that the Administration should embark on this new high-interest, dear-money policy without the advice of a Council of Economic Advisors, without any meetings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and without consultation with the House or Senate Banking and Currency Committees. There is no assurance that over-all national economic factors have been adequately considered, although the new money policy confronts all the American people with a triple threat of deflation.

The potential costs of this action to the government and the American people can make puny and insignificant all the economies in the Federal budget--wise or unwise--so far proposed by the Eisenhower Administration.

SIMMS: Senator, just what is it that the Administration is doing to boost interest rates?

SENATOR: They are attempting to refinance the national debt and shift more of it into the hands of insurance companies and other big investor

on a long-term basis, at higher interest rates. Within nine days after taking over responsibility for our government, the new Administration first exposed this intent by offering an exchange of 1-7/8% certificates of indebtedness for 2 1/4% certificates of indebtedness. That should have been a warning to everyone. Some of us saw what was happening, and raised our voices against it. But now the Administration has gone still further and announced a billion-dollar 30-year bond issue at 3 1/4 percent interest--a thirty percent boost.

That new bond issue interest rate is the highest on a straight long-term government obligation since 1933, and can be expected to bring higher commercial interest rates in its wake.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, who will benefit by this interest rate increase?

SENATOR: The principle beneficiaries of this unnecessary and gratuitous 30 percent increase in long-term government interest offerings will be banks and insurance companies, who have no need for such a windfall of additional profits. The large life insurance companies have been seeking such higher rates on long terms since 1947. ~~xxxxxx~~ Another beneficiary will be the group of investment bankers who finance the railroads.

These groups doubtless remember the hard money policy that resulted in the dumping of 4 1/4% Liberty Bonds until they reached about 82 in 1920. Millions of small investors were wiped out while big banks and financiers picked up the Liberty Bonds at bargain basement prices. Perhaps that experience is not so vivid in the minds of the present administrators, who have not consulted with economic or Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress, or had the advice of a Council of Economic Advisors.

You know, the Administration abolished the Council of Economic Advisors, supposedly for economy. Let me just read to you a comment on this situation by Dr. Seymour Harris, one of the country's foremost

economists, Professor of Economics at Harvard University and author of several books accepted as recognized authorities on the National Debt. I'm quoting Dr. Harris---

"The Congress is meticulous about appropriations of even \$50,000 for the pay of economists whose task it is to study the \$350 billion economy as a whole. Yet they allow, without any restriction, full discretion to the managers of the debt even though one policy might cost from 1 to 4 billion dollars a year more than another." Unquoted

SIMMS: Senator, what justification does the Secretary of the Treasury give for this new policy?

SENATOR: It's admittedly intended to be deflationary. The Secretary says he finds the current situation 'a little inflationary', and as a result wants to tighten up on bank credit through discouraging short-term financing.

But the Secretary's judgement that the current situation is 'a little inflationary' should be assessed on the basis, among others, of these facts:

Farm prices have been falling substantially, and are under continuing pressure.

All wholesale prices have been falling steadily since August. Consumer prices peaked out in August.

The Secretary's apprehension about the danger of increasing inflation-creating bank credit through short-term financing is not well founded. When money supply is related to the current volume of business, as reflected in the gross national product, we find that the ratio is now about the same as the ratio which prevailed during the pre-World War II period.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, just what will this new policy mean in terms of cost to the Government itself?

SENATOR

SENATOR: The ultimate rise in the Government's long-term borrowing cost incurred by this single Administration action can be enormous.

On the \$1 billion issue now proposed, interest has been increased over the last comparable long-term government borrowing from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{1}{4}$ percent. On this issue alone, the extra cost to taxpayers will be \$7,500,000 per year. Over the 30-year-term, that will mean \$225,000,000-----close to a quarter of a billion dollars.

But the Administration does not intend to stop there. It is proposed to shift a large part of our short-term, low-interest debt into long-term intermediates and long-term issues. The effect of raising the average annual rate three-fourths of one percent, and establishing the pre-war ratio of bonds to short-term debts, will be to increase the total value of bonds maturing in five years or more from \$40 billions to \$63 billions. This latter amount, refinanced at the higher rate, will increase the annual interest cost of government by \$470 millions annually--close to a half billion dollars each year.

That's just the direct cost to the government. What about the resulting cost to the American people on private debt?

Let me read you a quote from the New York Times of April 9, which said: Quote--

"The real significance of the Treasury move will be found in the generally deflationary effect it is expected to produce throughout the entire economy. The new $3\frac{1}{4}\%$ rate virtually guarantees an increase in the cost of borrowing, with an automatic increase in the cost of mortgage financing and so-called call money on short term corporate financing." Unquote.

With U.S. Long-terms up, the rate on business and other private borrowing is sure to follow, as the Times predicts. Private debt now totals approximately \$330 billions. An adjustment upward of even $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% in the interest on this debt would cost borrowers $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion

dollars annually.

SIMMS: And that burden would fall on everybody who needs to make use of credit, for their farms or businesses or other purposes, wouldn't it Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: It certainly would. It might be difficult for everyone to understand all the complexities of managing the national debt, but they can certainly understand increases in their own interest rates.

I'm particularly concerned about its adverse effect on agriculture. Coupled with the fall in farm prices, increasing farm debt and the urgent need for further borrowing to modernize and establish sound soil conservation practices, the increase of interest ~~xxx~~ rates and tightening of credit availability is especially menacing. Many of us have already been concerned about existing credit problems in agriculture. Yet this new blow would be a road block to liberal credit needed in agriculture, further worsening the situation of the farmer who still remembers--all too clearly--how a 50% increase in Federal Reserve rediscount rates in 1920 started him on the road to ruin.

Small business, like farmers, will feel the stringency of funds and their increasing costliness, at a time when their survival may be under severe test. General rise in interest rates on home mortgages, which is bound to follow the U.S. long-term rise, will diminish the amount of new residential construction by raising monthly payments beyond the means of many current prospects for home-buying. In addition, the effect will be to increase the general level of residential rents.

SIMMS: That's certainly a dismal picture, Senator Humphrey. Is any attempt being made to head-off this high-interest policy?

SENATOR: Well, some of us are trying to do what we can. I have joined

with a group of fellow senators in asking the Secretary of the Treasury to withdraw the Administration's new higher-interest billion-dollar bond offering, at least until he has thoroughly reviewed the enormous prospective cost of this new high-interest financing to the government and the taxpayers, until he has thoroughly surveyed the probable consequences of this Administration action on the national economy, and until the Administration has advised and consulted with the policy-making branch of the Government--the Congress--and there has been public disclosure of facts and open debate of such a drastic change in our fiscal policy.

There appears little if any basis in fact for the reasons given as necessitating this boost in long-term interest rates.

It will cost the government enormous sums, at a time when the people are being asked to forego essential services to permit relatively minor economies.

It will cost the taxpayers equally large additional sums on private borrowings.

It will be a drastically deflationary step by Administrative action, at a time when there are increasing evidences that deflationary and not inflationary forces are the current economic problem.

The American people are aware that similar hard-money policies were adopted preceding the serious recession of the twenties, the depression after 1929, and the recession after 1937.

They are entitled to assurance, which can be given only by thorough study and open debate, that this momentous economic policy-making decision, which smacks so much of the Mellon-Hoover era, has not been made by a few self-interested men in privacy.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for that timely explanation of the new higher-interest policy might mean.

To Radio Stations: Here is a suggested press release calling attention to the topic to be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey in the next of his regular weekly series of broadcasts over your station, entitled "Your Senator Speaks". As a means of encouraging listener-interest in these public-service discussions, we suggest you copy this with your call letters and the time of the broadcast added and submit it to your local newspaper.

(For use with
Program #13)

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) will discuss the Administration's new higher-interest policy _____ at _____
(day) (time)
over Station _____.

The program will be another of the weekly series entitled 'Your Senator Speaks', transcribed in Washington by Senator Humphrey as a report to Minnesota citizens. It is carried regularly on Station _____ as a public service.

Senator Humphrey will outline his views on what the higher-interest rate policy of refinancing the national debt will mean in increased costs to the government, and discuss the probable effect it will have on other interest rates on private debt, including a general tightening of ~~credit~~ bank credit.

Senator Humphrey is interviewed each week on timely topics of public interest, particularly those of direct concern to Minnesota.

(Follow heading used with Program No.13)

The job that remains to be done in providing adequate rural electrical service in Minnesota will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) _____ at _____ over Station _____
(day) (time)
Senator Humphrey will discuss the REA program in this state in commenting on the problems that will confront Anchor Nelson, ~~former~~ Minnesota's former Lieutenant Governor who was recently appointed new REA Administrator in Washington.

Among the problems Senator Humphrey will discuss are reduction in costs of power to REA co-ops, ^{construction} ~~completion~~ of a high-voltage transmission line bringing Missouri valley power into Minnesota, completion of area electrical coverage for Minnesota, adequate financing for "heavying up" existing REA co-op lines, and accelerating the rural telephone program.

The broadcast will be another of the weekly series entitled "Your Senator Speaks", transcribed in Washington by Senator Humphrey as a report to Minnesota citizens. It is carried regularly on Station _____ as a public service.

No.14--release week of April 27

REA's Job Ahead

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I know you have always been a staunch supporter of the Rural Electrification Administration. Now that Minnesota's former lieutenant governor ^{MR ANCHER Nelson} has been appointed head of the REA in the Department of Agriculture, perhaps you might like to discuss what that program has meant to Minnesota, as well as some of the tasks that remain unfinished.

SENATOR: Yes, I certainly would like to talk about the REA. It has made one of the greatest contributions to rural progress in our entire history. It has not only raised the living standards of our farm people--it has also helped revolutionize farm production. But what has always interested me most about the REA was its basic approach to solving a major national problem--an outstanding example of what our people can do for themselves through their Government, an example of democracy really at work.

You know, there is still a lot of misunderstanding about the Government's role in our great rural electrification program. Actually, it hasn't been the government that has achieved the remarkable record of rural electrification progress--it has been the farm people themselves, through their own rural electric cooperatives. All the Government has done has been made the necessary credit available, making it possible for the people to band together and provide themselves with electric service.

REA itself operates no rural electric or telephone facilities, and the program involves no grants or subsidies. REA serves principally as a banker. Its main functions are to lend money and to give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrowers' facilities. REA borrowers repay loans, with interest, from their operating revenues. You know, I've always regarded REA as a very good example of what Abraham Lincoln meant when he said the role of

Government should be to help our people do for themselves together what they could not do alone, or do as well alone.

SIMMS: I see what you mean, Senator Humphrey. How successful has REA been in getting its big job done?

SENATOR: Tremendously successful! It's almost difficult today to realize that when REA was established in 1935, only around 10 percent of America's farms had access to electric service. In contrast, the number of electrified farms had increased to 88 percent of the total by June 30 of last year. Our record in Minnesota is even more impressive. Back in 1935--and that's not so very long ago--less than seven percent of our farms had electric service. Now, more than 92 percent of our farms are electrified.

SIMMS: What about the financial side of this program, Senator Humphrey. Are the REA borrowers paying back the government's loans?

SENATOR: They certainly are--and ahead of schedule, too. Take our own state, for example. All of Minnesota's REA co-ops are paying their own way. As of last year, they had paid about 22½ million dollars in principal and interest on their REA loans--including nearly three million paid on principal ahead of schedule. And that's true for the entire nation, too. The entire program has been a good investment, on the government's part.

Of course the total benefits to our economy from such electrification is multiplied beyond that original investment so manyfold that it is impossible to fully calculate. Look at it entirely apart from the improved living standards and comfort and convenience of rural people. Look at it entirely apart from the tremendous increases it has made possible in the farmer's efficiency, his ability to produce. Look at it from the standpoint of the rest of our economy alone--the workingman in our factories, the businessman in Main street. Just think what a

tremendous new market this has opened up for washing machines, for radios, for television sets, for all kinds of household electrical appliances, for electric milking machines, and for other electrified farm production equipment. Think that that has meant in jobs--and in business--to the nation as a whole. That's all part of the Government's extra return on its investment in REA--an investment that is being paid back with interest by the farm borrowers.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about the future? In view of the figures you have given us, is the job pretty well completed--or is there much yet to be done?

SENATOR: I'm glad you asked that, because there's been considerable misunderstanding on that score. There's much more yet to be done before we can even begin to think about REA's job as being anywhere near finished. It's true that we are nearing the goal of complete area coverage for service. That's the first job that has to be finished. But there's another continuing job, too--that's the job of improving the service, and expanding the facilities to keep pace with the increased use farmers are making of electricity. You know, when electric service was first provided in rural areas almost all of it went for farm household use. Now, even greater potentials are opening up in the use of electricity in farm production. And as farmers demand more and more electrical energy, it means heavying up the lines of existing electric co-ops to carry the increased loads. Financing is necessary for such expansion, just as it was to start the service in the first place. Such financing of expansion is just as good an investment for the government as the original loans, and just as economically sound. Then, too, the tremendous growth of rural electrification has made it necessary for us to look for new and cheaper sources of power, to bring it down within reach of the farmer's pocketbook so he can

make full use of such energy in his farm production. We're going to need high voltage transmission lines to move electrical energy from areas where it is available in abundance at low cost, to areas where costs are now relatively high. And then of course there's also the rural telephone program that really is just getting under way.

SIMMS: I suppose those are some of the responsibilities that will confront Anchor Nelson as REA's new administrator?

SENATOR: That's right, and I called his attention to their vital importance to Minnesota in a recent letter extending my congratulations to Administrator Nelson on his appointment. He has a tremendous opportunity to be of real service to the farmers of Minnesota and the Nation. It is my my hope that the farmers of Minnesota and the nation can depend upon his vigorous support against efforts to cripple or curtail REA activities that have meant so much to the progress of agriculture.

I have urged Administrator Nelson to press vigorously for what I regard as five pressing needs now confronting rural electric cooperatives in Minnesota. They include reduction in the relatively high costs of energy to Minnesota cooperatives, construction of the long-urged 230,000 volt transmission line to bring Missouri valley power into Minnesota, completion of Minnesota's rural area electrical coverage, adequate financing for "heavying up" existing REA co-op lines, and acceleration of the rural telephone program.

SIMMS: Senator, I'm sure those policies would be most welcome among all REA cooperatives in the country, not just in Minnesota. But just how does the cost of energy to REA co-ops in Minnesota compare with other areas?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, the cost of power to our co-ops is still too high. Last year, the average cost to Minnesota co-ops for electric energy

was a cent and a quarter per kilowatt hour for the bulk of power supplied by private commercial power companies, and one and a third cents for the energy purchased from municipal generating systems. That's far above the national average. For the nation as a whole, average cost to REA co-ops ~~mk~~ for energy purchased from private commercial companies was 8.6 mills per kilowatt hour--less than one cent. Average cost of power supplied from publically-owned sources, such as Bureau of Reclamation projects--was even cheaper--5.9 mills, or only a little more than a half-cent per kilowatt hour.

It seems obvious that Minnesota urgently needs access to new sources of lower-cost power, such as the proposed high-voltage transmission line from the Garrison dam in North Dakota through Western Minnesota would provide.

Earlier this month, representatives of twenty rural electric co-ops and three private power companies from Minnesota urged a House appropriations committee to provide at least four million dollars to get the project under way. I have urged Anchor Nelson to vigorously support that request. You know, the earlier Truman budget proposals had called for appropriating the entire 17 million dollars needed to complete the job. Now, however, we're facing a battle to even get enough funds for a start on the project.

SIMMS: Suppose Congress refuses to appropriate the funds to the Bureau of Reclamation for the transmission line, Senator. Is there any other way it could be obtained?

SENATOR: Yes, there is another alternative, and I have also called it to Administrator Nelson's attention. If no action is taken on the Bureau's request, Nelson now has the authority to make REA loans directly to the interested cooperatives and power companies to run the line themselves.

I'm sure it could be worked out as a joint project, if the new administrator will take the initiative to do it.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, hasn't Secretary of Agriculture Benson recommended sharp reductions in REA loan funds for the year ahead?

SENATOR: Yes, he has---and many of us are quite concerned about the effect it might have on REA's future. Many co-op leaders from Minnesota have expressed such concern to me.

Of course, these proposed budget slashes were recommended before Anchor Nelson was named administrator. However, I have urged him to carefully consider the needs ahead and see if he can't use his influence in his new position to prevent undermining the great work of REA cooperatives. I have urged him not to be misled by the false economy advocates who ignore the fact that all REA loans are self-liquidating and interest bearing. Perhaps it looks good for the record to say millions are slashed from a budget, but it doesn't mean a cent has been saved when such reductions are only in loan funds that would be fully repayable. I'm as interested in economy as anyone else, but I don't want to risk crippling our rural electric service just to build a paper record of economy.

SIMMS: What about the rural telephone program, Senator Humphrey? Isn't it faced with a similar cut-back in loan funds?

SENATOR: Yes, it is, I'm very sorry to say. I want to discuss the rural telephone program more at length some other time, because I believe it is tremendously important. It's one challenging job that can't be ignored much longer. There's talk now of a "stretch-out" in the rural phone program, and I'm afraid that could undermine the economic soundness of the entire effort to extend telephone service to all rural areas of America.

That's another of the problems for which Anchor Nelson will be responsible, and I have warned him of the dangers of upsetting the good start that has already been made.

I'm sure all of us hope that with a Minnesota man at the helm, Minnesota's vital interest in REA will not be ignored. And I can certainly assure you of one thing--I'm going to keep on fighting for improved rural electrification until one-cent power is available to all of our farmers, and every farm home that wants it can have a telephone.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for that interview on the job still ahead for the REA in Minnesota.

Recorded April 21--No.15, release week of May 4

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS! 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.

Senator Humphrey, I understand you have expressed concern about famine conditions in Pakistan, and recent news dispatches have told us about a government crisis there as a result of a wheat crop failure. What can you tell us about it?

SENATOR: I can tell you one thing--I don't think the American people want to see any people starving, anywhere in the world, while we have huge food reserves beyond our needs.

I'm concerned about the situation in Pakistan, both as a humanitarian problem, and as a problem in international relations that could directly effect the current "cold war". You know, Pakistan is providing us with a concrete example of how important food can be in strengthening the free world, and helping to combat communism.

SIMMS: Just how do you mean, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: It's this way--any time there is hunger in the world, an opportunity is provided for the communists to move in and create unrest. And when hunger becomes so acute as to threaten the stability of a government, the opportunities for communist infiltration are that much greater. So whenever we can help avert hunger by alleviating famine, we are not only strengthening a weak link in the chain of common goodwill that binds the free world together--we are actually wiping out opportunity for the Soviet to make new inroads of internal aggression.

That's how I regard the situation in Pakistan. Rather than

consider it as another problem to worry about, we should actually regard it as an opportunity to make good use of our abundance, and show our humane concern for the well-being of free peoples everywhere, an opportunity to checkmate any chance of new communist uprisings or political demonstrations.

SIMMS: Senator, how serious does the famine threat appear to be in Pakistan?

SENATOR: From all evidence we have had so far, it is very serious. While the situation is reported most immediately acute in western Pakistan, the entire population of 75,000,000 people in that country are confronted with serious famine unless at least 1,500,000 tons of wheat can be obtained for its fast-emptying granaries, to replace the failure of its own crops.

Prime Minister Nazimuddin, before the collapse of his government, said the situation was so desperate that some people have been driven to living on wild vegetation.

Before Prime Minister Nazimuddin's government regime fell, I urged our State Department, our Department of Agriculture, and our Mutual Security Administration to take whatever steps necessary to assure Pakistan this country could not stand by while its people starved--particularly when we have over 500 bushels of wheat in storage and a big bumper crop coming on that is posing us with disposal problems.

However, before we could obtain any action in Washington, the unrest had reached such a point in Pakistan that the crisis-ridden government of Premier Nazimuddin has fallen. Fortunately, pro-American Mohammed Ali, Pakistan's ambassador to the United States, has been called home to form a new government. It is to our own security interests to give him all the help we can. He will still face the same problems of feeding a

wheat-eating people, without any wheat. We have wheat to spare. What we do about it will certainly be watched by many peoples throughout Asia, not just in Pakistan alone.

SIMMS: What do you think this country should do, Senator--give them the wheat, or advance it as a loan?

SENATOR: Well, it's just as I told Secretary Benson, Secretary Dulles, and Mutual Security Administrator Stassen--we must find a way to help, one way or another. Certainly between them they should be able to work out a plan--whether it is a long-term loan, whether it's barter, whether it's sale at special concession prices, or whether it's an outright gift. Secretary Benson has responsibility for our huge reserves of wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and certainly should be seeking such outlets for its useful consumption wherever and whenever they present themselves. Mutual Security Administrator Stassen has the responsibility for economic aid to Pakistan, and Secretary Dulles should certainly be concerned about the situation too. After all, if we don't do something about getting wheat to Pakistan, they might have to turn to Russia for it. Russia has the wheat to give--but I think all of us know the kind of conditions the Kremlin would impose on a weak and struggling country needing such assistance.

SIMMS: I can see, Senator Humphrey, that it gets squarely into the realm of our foreign policy, doesn't it?

SENATOR: Yes, it certainly does. The world knows we have an abundance of wheat--a surplus of wheat. How we react to a struggling country in distress could win or lose us friends throughout the world. And you can be sure that Russia will make the most of any hesitancy we show toward

extending the helping hand of friendship we are always talking about.

Of course, my first consideration is the humanitarian one that I think all of us feel. We don't want to see anybody starve. But it certainly seems in this instance that more than humanitarian considerations are involved. Our attitude toward underprivileged people everywhere is now a matter of our foreign relations, and of our being alert to the psychological advantages ~~of~~ any such humane gesture could mean in the cold war.

But I think we have even further considerations in such emergencies, and that is as a matter of our agricultural policy. I have always urged that we extend greater efforts to make good use throughout the world of our agriculture's ability to produce. We hear complaints about surpluses, yet how can there be real surpluses if people are starving for lack of the same commodities? We hear talk of plans for restricting wheat production, but we don't hear enough about finding ways of using our wheat and other surpluses when an actual need is apparent.

It doesn't necessarily mean giving it away, even though it would be better to take a loss for such purposes than just to have our food products sit in storage. But our country is already providing economic aid in various forms to Pakistan, and I think the Agricultural Department should be ~~wake~~ on its toes in a case like this to see that wheat, rather

than money, is included in the aid extended--thereby benefitting American farmers as well as the people of Pakistan. That's why I have urged Secretary Benson to get busy at once working out some plan with Mr. Sassen and Mr. Dulles. If they need additional legislation, I have asked them to let me know so the Congress can be asked to provide it.

SDMS: I would think Secretary Benson would certainly push for such an opportunity to unload some of our extra wheat, Senator. Aren't we still faced with lower imports even under the new wheat agreement?

SENATOR: That's right---the long negotiations for a new wheat agreement have finally ended with a price agreement among the exporting countries, but it is at a level that has squeezed Great Britain out of the pact this year as the largest importing country. I'm glad to see the wheat agreement renewed for orderly world marketing, but I'm afraid our concern over narrowing the gap of export subsidies we might have to pay may eventually cause us more difficulties by narrowing our export market tremendously.

SIMMS: What are the terms of the new wheat agreement, as far as price is concerned?

SENATOR: All of the exporting nations--the United States, Canada, Australia, and France, have affixed their signatures on the new pact which provides a top world price of \$2.05....25 cents per bushel higher than under the expiring agreement. Enough importing countries, without Britain have accepted to make it effective. The current world market price for wheat is \$2.20 per bushel, but in view of big stocks Britain is gambling that prices will fall, even below the \$2.05 figure. Her representatives had announced they were unwilling to go any higher than \$2 per bushel, and our representatives were unwilling to drop that low even though it was only \$1.80 under the old agreement, with a subsidy to meet the difference to growers up to the price support level.

SIMMS: What effect will Britain's holding out have on the agreement, Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR: That's hard to predict, but most of our officials close to the situation say that it won't wreck the agreement. However, it certainly won't help it be very effective either. Britain has been buying 177 million bushels of wheat a year under the agreement. In view of the bumper crop and big reserves in most exporting countries, she has a good case

arguing for a lower price--plus the fact that she just doesn't have the dollar exchange to buy at a higher price. Presumably, she will have to t and get the wheat she needs from Canada, outside of its commitments under the wheat agreement. All of the export quotas will be smaller with Britain's requirements subtracted, and Canada will apparently have enough remaining to deal with Britain through barter between individual British buyers and individual Canadian sellers. However, that isn't much help to American producers who are losing out on the British export mark for their wheat.

SIMMS: Speaking of Britain's ability to buy American farm products, Senator, what effect is our present foreign trade policy having on that situation?

SENATOR: Unfortunately, a very depressing effect. Let me give you one good example. Perhaps wheat growers didn't think about it that way, or other farmers either--but they should have been concerned recently when they read that Secretary of Defense Wilson had rejected a British bid for producing more than \$6,000,000 worth of electrical equipment wanted by our Defense department, even though Great Britain was low bidder by almost a million dollars, and would have paid an additional \$600,000 in customs duties.

If Britain can't sell any products in the United States, it can't get American dollars to buy American farm products.

That rejection of a British bid on transformers and generator meant more than an additional cost of \$1,600,000 to American taxpayers for those defense items--it meant a loss of \$6,000,000 in potential British markets for wheat and other American farm products.

That's why I am so concerned with the entire growing high-tariff "protectionist" tendency in Congress, a trend back to the

Smoot-Hawley days of restricting rather than expanding international trade, and a trend directly contrary to President Eisenhower's announced aim of encouraging trade rather than aid to bolster economic strength of the free world.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey.....You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capital. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

Radio Script for SENATOR HUMPHREY

No. 16, for release week of May 30
(Recorded May 6)

COPY

Subject Matter:

Trade and Defense

SIMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS! 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, the defense situation seems to be uppermost in the mind of most people these days. What can you tell us about the latest trends developing on the international scene?

SENATOR: Just as I predicted when Russia's new peace blitz was started, we're beginning to see just how phoney the Soviet peace overtures really are. Perhaps some people may have been fooled ~~back then~~ for a little while, but they certainly shouldn't be fooled now. There's too much evidence of what Russia is really up to.

Soviet Russia is just shifting its emphasis from military to economic warfare, seeking to buy time to promote disunity and strife among the non-communist nations while it builds up its own military and economic strength.

Watch the financial and economic headlines for a while, instead of just the military headlines, and you'll see more evidence of the new Soviet line. Russia is trying to wean trade away from the western world. It's now evident that our trade restrictions have been hurting the iron curtain area, badly. To make good its industrial and military expansion goals by 1955--the date the Kremlin has fixed for doubling its military strength--Russia and its satellites need trade and resources from outside their own boundaries. Watch the trade concessions Russia is offering various areas of the world. Watch particularly Russia's effort to split off and neutralize some of the most productive areas on the fringes of the free world--Germany and Japan--by encouraging them to trade

with Russia and the east. That's what is happening in the world today--and Russia hopes to gain more by it than just the obvious advantages of trade to build up its own strength.

SIMMS: What else do you think lies behind this Soviet "trade war" strategy, Senator?

SENATOR: Russia is gangling on the western powers getting into a fight among themselves over world trade, breaking up the solid front of the free world. And you can be sure the Kremlin is going to do everything it can to stir up such troubles between nations of the free world, if they don't develop anyhow.

SIMMS: Isn't that what Marxist theory has always taught?

SENATOR: Yes, it is, but even more significant is the fact that the late Premier Stalin re-emphasized that Marxist theory in the last article he wrote and published before his death. It was an article prepared for the Communist Party Congress last October, actually charting the course of Communist strategy now being followed. Stalin hinted at the temporary peace offensive, by saying war was not inevitable, immediately. He said communism could still look for competition for markets between the capitalist nations, and for trade wars and shooting wars to follow this competition. Stalin's second point was that Soviet foreign policy should seek to aggravate the economic differences of the western world, in order to split off certain areas from it. The areas which Stalin mentioned specifically were Western Europe and Japan.

SIMMS: If that is Russia's approach, America's trade policies become directly involved in foreign policy and national defense, don't they Senator?

SENATOR: They most certainly do, although unfortunately some people are failing to grasp the full significance of that fact. Some people are still concerned only with the immediate materialistic benefits of trade restrictions or high tariffs, and overlook entirely what such barriers mean in terms of the present world

struggle. That's why President Eisenhower has had to urge Congress to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, and warn of the dangers involved in tampering with that legislation. Unfortunately, however, high tariff advocates have found the most sympathetic ears in the House, and Republican Representative Richard M. Simpson of Pennsylvania is pushing a high-tariff bill completely contrary to what President Eisenhower has asked. In fact, the Simpson bill has so alarmed the President that he rushed five of the Administration's top officials up to House hearings to try and head off the effort to completely destroy the reciprocal trade act. The simple truth is that while the Administration has talked about "Trade, not Aid", its own supposed supporters in the Congress are recklessly busy undermining free trade.

SIMMS: Senator, if we start erecting new trade barriers won't other countries retaliate, and start just the kind of economic warfare Russia is hoping to create?

SENATOR: That's absolutely right. Right now, the realm of world trade ~~is there~~ offers the most serious challenge to America's leadership of the free world. The conviction is growing abroad that the United States is moving in the direction of economic isolationism, rather than trade liberalization. Reports from overseas tell almost daily of business and government leaders who are concluding that this country is not sincerely concerned with the development of two-way trade. If that opinion persists, the damage to American foreign policy will be almost impossible to overcome. Our self-interest has dictated a policy by this country in support of "European unity. For years we have urged the removal of trade and currency restrictions, that have made the continent a hodgepodge of conflicting nationalisms instead of a bulwark of freedom. Yet, when barriers are raised here at home, we help defeat the integrated European system we have supported with our blood and our dollars. A return to high tariffs by the United States would play havoc with the European economies. On the other hand, a further liberalization of American

COPY

trade practices would be a fresh and powerful impetus to Europeans to break down their own trade barriers still further.

SIMMS: Senator, if we close our doors to trade with our allies, aren't we driving them right into Russia's hands?

SENATOR: That's just what will happen, and just what Russia is gambling on happening. Stories from Europe already tell of the overtures the Russians are making with respect to products on which American tariffs are high. The Russians are showing an apparent willingness to take whatever western European countries will export, as long as they can divert trade from us. The Washington Post, in a recent editorial, called this a form of ~~the~~ psychological wedge-driving which is of potentially great concern to this country. The Europeans must gain part of their living by trade, the Post comments, and if they cannot sell to the United States they will eventually turn east.

Perhaps the strongest warning against restrictive trade policies was voiced by Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, former head of the Central Intelligence Agency, in a very blunt address recently to the United States Chamber of Commerce. General Smith told the businessmen our entire national security is at stake in trade relationships. He warned that tariff barriers would mean losing some of our allies, and weakening the free world.

"We can't have it both ways," General Smith said. "We can't tell Japan to trade with us and not with Communist China, and then make trade with us more and more difficult".

SIMMS: Senator, aside from the importance of our trade relations to our foreign relations, don't we also need this foreign trade for the sake of our own economy?

SENATOR: Of course we do. Trade restrictions to protect special groups have always

COPY

been examples of cutting off our nose to spite our face. From 1914 to the end of 1952, the excess of United States exports over imports was 120 billion ~~million~~ dollars. Foreign markets are important to us. Agriculture particularly needs foreign markets. Exports of American farm products declined in value in February for the eighth consecutive month. The dollar value of farm exports in February was 19 percent below January, and 43 percent below February of 1952. Farm exports for all of 1952 were 15 percent under exports in 1941. Is there any wonder then that farmers are so concerned with crop surpluses and falling prices. Consumers abroad need American farm products, but they do not have dollars with which to buy them. Would Congressman Simpson and his colleagues who want to scuttle the reciprocal trade program prefer to raise taxes, and hand over dollars to foreign countries with which to buy the products of our farms? I can't help but mention that this Congressman Simpson--who is threatening to upset the Administration's foreign policy through his high-tariff bill protecting special interests--is the same Congressman Simpson who spoke before the Minnesota Employers Association not long ago, and criticized me for not giving the new administration a fair chance. Well, it doesn't take much checking of the record to see who is supporting and who is opposing President Eisenhower's foreign policies and trade policies. All of his troubles are coming from within his own party. President Eisenhower is fully alive to the significance of two-way trade, but he does not appear to be fully aware of the forces arrayed against his trade policy proposals. Fine words from the White House are not going to be enough to win the battle against those who would like to make mincemeat of the President's trade program.

SIMMS: Speaking of words from the White House, Senator, would you care to comment on President Eisenhower's recent foreign policy address?

SENATOR: I felt it was a memorable address, and made clear to Russia that our purpose is humane, not conquest. I wired my approval and support to President

COPY

Eisenhower after his address, and received a warm letter of thanks from the President in reply. We needed such a firm statement of America's position to counter the Kremlin's recent phoney "peace blitz". The President's speech, calling for deeds and not just words, was a fine presentation of our objectives as a nation.

Of course, now the job before Congress is to give some expression to those objectives. Congress must give meaning to the President's words, and not undercut the President by falling into the cunning Soviet trap of stirring up trade conflicts between western nations. That trap is depending upon the greed of special interest groups as bait. We must not let any materialistic greed endanger our entire national security.

Congress must awaken to the seriousness of its responsibilities, and start showing some real statesmanship instead of acting like jackals quarreling over the prey.

Communism is at war with freedom, whether that war be hot or cold. The weapons may be guns in one instance, or an olive branch concealing a dagger in the other. We must be prepared for either approach. We must recognize how closely our trade policies are involved. We must make sure such policies don't aid and abet the Kremlin's new strategy, as General Smith has warned us the Simpson bill would do.

Russia's military expansion is timed to reach its peak in 1955. Our mobilization goal was aimed at hitting its full stride that same year. Now, however, there's new talk about "stretching out" our preparedness over a longer time, and of narrowing the mobilization base. Are such policies based on wishful thinking, or can they be supported by facts? We'd better make sure we're not again playing into the Kremlin's hands, just as Congress is now threatening to do by driving foreign trade away from the United States, and turning it over to Russia.

COPY

STMS:Thank you, Senator Humphrey....You have been listening to Senator Hubert H.Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capitol. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

Program No. 14 (Standard heading, with note to radio stations)

America's trade ~~policy~~ policies in relation to our foreign policy and the nation's defense will be discussed by Senator Hubert H.

Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____ on _____ at _____./
(day and time)

Warning that the Kremlin is shifting from military to economic warfare as part of its strategy, seeking to buy time to promote disunity and stride among the non-communist nations while it builds up its own strength, Senator Humphrey will discuss the close relationship between international trade and defense of the free world, and comment upon the dangers ~~confronting~~ confronting this country as a result of the attitude of many in Congress against supporting President Eisenhower's request for extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act without crippling amendments.

The broadcast will be another in the regular weekly series entitled "Your Senator Reports", transcribed by Senator Humphrey in Washington as a personal report to Minnesota citizens, and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

No. ~~16~~ for release week of May ~~11~~ 18
(Recorded May 6)

COPY

SIMMS: YOUR SENATOR REPORTS! 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.

Senator Humphrey, what's happening in the economy drive in Congress? Is the new administration going to balance the budget?

SENATOR: I'm afraid it's a matter of simple arithmetic that Congress won't balance the budget this year any more than it did last year, unless it is willing to assume the dangerous risk of slashing our defense funds far below safe levels. That's where the great portion of our tax dollar has been going, and where it will have to keep on going as long as the threat of Communist aggression continues. We hear lots of talk and see lots of newspaper headlines about supposedly huge slashes in non-defense appropriations, but actually they are only a drop in the bucket so far as total government expenditures are concerned. Furthermore, I seriously question the wisdom of some of this supposed "economy". I am certainly heartily in favor of trimming any fat out of government expenditures, but we should think twice before recklessly cutting into the lean meat of essential government services. I want wise economy, not reckless economy just to build a political record on paper.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you think some of the cuts proposed so far are unwise? Do you think some of them come under your description of reckless economy?

SENATOR: Yes, I certainly do. You know, our most ardent economy advocates have always said huge savings could be made just through elimination of waste and inefficiency. They said it wouldn't be necessary to actually cut or curtail government services to the people.

COPY

Well, now that they have the job to do, it's another story. They've found there just isn't as much waste and inefficiency as they imagined. So to make good on promises of savings, they are whacking away at programs and services. Some members of the new cabinet are so anxious to make a record of economy they are recommending dangerous cuts in their own programs that they'll come to regret later, when they learn more about their responsibilities. You know, there's usually pressure groups with other interests than just "economy" who like to see government activity whittled down in various fields. They're the people who insist its "economy" for the government to nullify huge public investments by giving away its synthetic rubber plants, and its experimental synthetic fuel plants.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, can you give us some examples of the economy proposals that you feel are reckless or unwise.

SENATOR: Yes, I certainly can. All of us want economy wherever possible, but I doubt very much if we want to achieve that economy at the expense of our school children. And I doubt if its wise for the future safety and progress of our country for us to cut back on education, just to say we are cutting down the cost of government. For the first time in our history, we now have a Department of Health, Welfare, and Education. Many of us were pleased at elevation of the Federal Security Agency to cabinet status, to give proper emphasis to the necessity for public concern with health, welfare, and education. But I must say I have felt quite different about it since seeing what Secretary Olveta Culp Hobby has proposed doing to the Office of Education. Her budget recommendations would slash its funds 68% under what was available last year, reducing the agency to figurehead status in the Department and rendering it virtually useless to American education.

SIMMS: Just how are these drastic reductions in the Office of Education's budget going to be made, Senator Humphrey?

COPY

SENATOR: That's another point I want to emphasize for our taxpayers at home. You know, it wouldn't be so bad if this economy program meant just cutting out some bureaucrats in Washington. But that isn't it at all. That's what they'd like to have people think, but it's just not the case. The Department of Agriculture, for example, had 1,000 more employees in March than it had in February. Actually, in the case of the Office of Education, 99% of the proposed reduction comes out of funds usually provided for local school programs and facilities--grants to states and school districts, such as for the great vocational education programs. Would you call the vocational agricultural courses and home economics courses in our high schools "wasteful" and "bungling"? I don't think so. Most of us agree that such vocational training has been one of the great educational contributions to American life, preparing our young people for making their own way in the years ahead. Yet the new Office of Education budget calls for cutting vocational education allocations to states by one-fourth. Do you know what that means? It means local taxpayers are going to have to make up the difference, if they want these vital school programs to continue.

Let me also mention school construction. Everyone realizes the seriousness of our school building shortage. Curtailment of construction during war years, while our population was taking a big upward jump, has caught us in a serious squeeze. Yet the new Office of Education budget has eliminated entirely any funds for aiding in school construction, in areas where federal activity is responsible for increased enrollment of students--pushing the burden back onto local taxpayers. It's hardly a saving, when you just pass the buck for somebody else to pay the bill.

SIMMS: What are some of the other economy proposals that worry you, Senator?

SENATOR: Well, I'm concerned about quite a few of the slashes proposed in the

Department of Agriculture Budget, primarily those proposed in our great conservation work. I question very seriously the "economy" of slowing down conservation progress, and curtailing aid to our Soil Conservation Districts. You know, saving money by eliminating conservation work is about like trying to save at home by giving up your fire insurance. You might be ahead on paper--until the house burns down. We'll be in the same shape if we neglect conservation of our resources--and that goes for all of our natural resources, as well as agricultural resources.

SIMMS: Are some of these proposed budget cuts doing to have a direct effect on Minnesota?

SENATOR: They certainly are. It's going to mean curtailed services to Minnesota people, retarding of vital Minnesota development progress, and heavier local tax costs upon Minnesota citizens--without any compensating reduction in federal taxes.

Let me give you a few examples of setbacks for Minnesota progress as a result of the reckless economy drive. The Bureau of Mines asked for funds for an experimental plant at Minneapolis, for studies on taconite ore. Such studies are of great economic importance to our future mineral and industrial development. They are even more vitally important, however, to our national defense. Yet Secretary of Interior McKay has vetoed the request, and the House has gone along with him in eliminating the necessary funds. I hope to get them restored in the Senate, if possible.

Of course, even more people are concerned with the setback given hopes for lower-cost power in western Minnesota. For quite a while we've been fighting for a high voltage transmission line to bring Minnesota power from Missouri Basin hydroelectric projects. Funds for the line were included in the Truman budget. They were eliminated in Secretary McKay's new recommendations for the Bureau of

COPY

Reclamation, and House concurred in the turn down. That means we don't get even a start on the transmission line, unless we can get the Senate to restore some transmission line funds.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I've also heard you mention that some of the supposed economics were only "paper savings", not real savings at all. What do you mean by that?

SENATOR: It just means that a lot of bookkeeping sculduggery has gone into some of these economy claims. For example, there was a lot of newspaper talk about the House cutting \$400 million off President Eisenhower's budget requests in the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill. What some people don't know, however, is that the federal government's annual contribution of \$368 million to the Civil Service Retirement Fund, to match employees' payments, was eliminated completely, on the grounds that Congress can always make it up later. In other words, Congress merely postponed the government's payment. Sometime in the future we will have to appropriate this \$368 million, so I fail to see any economy involved.

Then again, I don't like claims of "economy" when loan funds, such as for the REA, are reduced. Reduction in such loan funds accounts for much of the "economy" claimed in the Department of Agriculture. Yet these loan funds are fully repayable, with interest. They don't cost the government a red cent in the long run. Curtailing such loan funds may sound like economy, but they really mean a setback in rural development that costs us money in the end.

SIMMS: Senator, what are the prospects for defense and foreign aid funds?

SENATOR: Congress is just beginning to study the President's recommendations, and I hope they proceed with caution. I have respect for President Eisenhower's military judgement. He has warned that he has already cut his recommendations

COPY

just as severely as he believes possible, without taking dangerous risks. Yet already we hear many reckless statements in Congress about cutting military expenditures and foreign aid much more heavily. That's what they will try to do, if they follow the reckless examples set on some of our domestic appropriations. I hope we can avoid such risks. We can survive setbacks in domestic programs, as unwise as they may be. But we might not survive foolish and reckless slashes in defense funds, by people with their eyes on the ballot box rather than the nation's security.

SIMMS: Senator, haven't you introduced an economy act of your own aimed at encouraging a sounder approach to curtailing federal ~~expenditures~~ expenditures?

SENATOR: Yes, I have...and the methods I suggest have been approved by many Republican and Democratic observers alike as the most practical way to achieve economy. My bill would require roll call votes on all appropriation measures, and would authorize "item veto" by the President, so he could weed out pork barrel appropriations, without having to tie up all government operating funds.

I want to add just one other comment on all the "economy talk" in Congress. I hope it doesn't fool the public into overlooking some of the other things going on.

For example, the cost to the public of higher interest rates on the government debt, on veterans loans, on home loans, on business and farm loans, and on all private financing is going to far exceed any savings proposed by these slashes in government functions. People might put up with loss of important public services, if it meant a real saving. But I doubt if they can see why they should go without such services, just to have ~~higher~~ interest rates voluntarily raised by the government so that it must pay more for its own debt, and force its citizens to do likewise on all their private debts.

COPY

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...you have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capitol. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

~~Copy~~

COPY

Program No. 17 (Standard ~~xxxxx~~ Heading with Note to Radio Stations)

The economy drive in Congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____ on _____ at _____ day and time .
Reckless economy vs. sound economy will be the theme of Senator Humphrey's discussion, during which he will cite numerous examples of what he describes as false economy. Included in the ~~interview~~ interview will be comment upon the effect of many budget slashes upon Minnesota projects, including the Bureau of Mines experimental plant in Minneapolis, the high voltage transmission line into Western Minnesota, and conservation work in the state.

He will also comment on proposed drastic cuts in the vocational education programs, and elimination of funds for school construction aid.

The broadcast will be another in the weekly series entitled "Your Senator Reports", transcribed in Washington by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens, and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

No. 18, for release week of May 25
(Recorded May 19)

St. Lawrence Seaway
Duluth Harbor
Transmission Line

COPY

SIMMS: REPORT 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.

Senator Humphrey, what are the prospects for the great St. Lawrence Seaway project about which we have been hearing so much for many years?

SENATOR: After a long struggle, I am happy to be able to report, the prospects are very encouraging. It now looks like we are closer than ever to opening up our great inland waterway to the sea.

You know, I am a member of the Foreign Relations subcommittee of the Senate now conducting hearings on the seaway project. I'm glad that I'm in such an advantageous position to work for realization of this great development dream that means so much to the entire nation, but ^{especially} particularly so much to the upper midwest.

We have been very much encouraged by President Eisenhower's recent declaration of his approval for at least the opening phase of the St. Lawrence Seaway, putting the full support of the Administration behind action at this session of the Congress.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, does the Administration's Seaway plan extend the development all the way to Minnesota?

SENATOR: ^{I'm sorry today} Unfortunately, it does not. However, it does provide for the essential opening steps of this great project. Our job is to see that deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels goes hand in hand with other St. Lawrence Seaway developments. For Minnesota and the upper midwest to share in the benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project, these connecting channels must be deepened

sufficiently to carry sea-going vessels.

COPY

It certainly would be unthinkable to long deny Minnesota and the great middle west access to ocean shipping, once the St. Lawrence Seaway is opened. Duluth-Superior is already the second largest port in the nation, in terms of tonnage handled, Minnesota produces many products for world trade. We need and deserve our own ocean ports.

Construction of the Seaway and the deepening of the channels will take a number of years to complete, of course. They should go hand in hand. We ought to begin now making sure the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway can be realized. We need the channel deepening improvements for our own lake shipping now, regardless of progress on the seaway. But we're going to need such work all the more when the Seaway is achieved, as I am confident it eventually will be, and we shall be caught unprepared unless we start not on the channel deepening improvements.

SIMMS: Senator, haven't the Public Works Committees of Congress acted favorably on going forward with the channel deepening project?

SENATOR: Yes, they have. The Senate Public Works Committee approved the resolution I submitted calling for the Army Engineers' Board of Rivers and Harbors to conduct necessary new studies and prepare new costs estimates preparatory to deepening the channels to a depth of 27 feet. Similar action was taken in the House. The next task is to get funds appropriated for the Army Engineers to start on this authorized work, and that's what we are endeavoring to do at the present time. The engineers estimate that \$125,000 would be required for such work during the coming fiscal year, but no funds are earmarked for this project in the Administration's budgets on which hearings are now being held. I have asked both the Senate and House civil functions subcommittees on appropriations to include that amount, however, and I have emphasized the vital importance of the channel work to the eventual completion of the Seaway. I am hopeful we can get the necessary funds provided.

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I understand you have urged the civil functions committee to restore funds for some other Minnesota projects that had been eliminated from the revised budget estimates. Can you tell us something about them?

SENATOR: That's right, and I'm glad to discuss them because they are of great importance. I'm ^{VERY} particularly concerned over the proposed budget's elimination of \$615,000 that had earlier been earmarked for much-needed harbor work at Duluth, and elimination of \$550,000 needed to continue work on the St. Anthony Falls project in Minneapolis. I have presented evidence in support of both projects, as have others from Minnesota.

I'm convinced the Duluth-Superior harbor work is essential to our national defense, as well as of vital importance to Duluth commerce. Necessity for the harbor improvements was recognized during the closing days of the 82nd Congress when Public Law 568 was passed, authorizing the work for which we are now seeking funds. The project calls for deepening the harbor channel to permit deep-draft vessels to move between Duluth and Superior harbor basins when one of the two entries is blocked. You know, the existing Superior front channel presents a definite bottleneck to all carriers. With certain ice conditions, the Duluth entrance may be closed and vessels entering and leaving the harbor must do so with reduced carrying capacity because of the lower channel depths along the Superior front. Such work is economically justified, and from the standpoint of national defense is vitally necessary in order that a continuous flow of iron ore be maintained via vessels between Duluth-Superior Harbor and the Lower Lakes ports through the navigation season.

Along with City Engineer Hugo Erickson of Minneapolis and other witnesses, I have endeavored to convince the civil functions Committee that there would be no real economy in suspending work on the St. Anthony Falls project. It would cost as much to terminate present construction and protect the work already done,

COPY

as it would to go forward with this continuing project aimed at giving Minneapolis access to the pool above the Falls of St. Anthony for river terminal facilities. My friend Arthur Strong, secretary of the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, was among the other witnesses effectively advocating funds for this and other navigation projects of importance to Minnesota. I'm still hopeful we can get the funds from this session of Congress, despite the fact that they were temporarily cut out of the revised "economy" budget.

SIMMS: I'm sure Minnesota citizens will be glad to know a fight is being made to protect these development projects, Senator Humphrey. Are there any other proposals before the civil functions subcommittee on appropriations, in which Minnesota has a stake?

SENATOR: Yes, there are....two of them in particular. We in Minnesota have a vital stake in construction of the new Keokuk Lock on the Mississippi in Iowa, to replace the present obsolete 39-year-old lock. If the present lock should fail, shipping up the Mississippi would be cut off. Minnesota is now heavily dependent upon river shipping for its supplies of fuel oil and coal. While funds for this project have been trimmed in the revised estimates, the Bureau of the Budget has wisely recognized the importance of this work being carried out. I have urged the Committee to retain funds for this project, and not cut them any further.

Then, of course, Minnesota is also keenly interested in the proposed appropriation of \$925,000 for flood control work along the Red River of the North. Our flood losses in the Red River Basin in 1950, 1951, and 1952 have been counted in the Millions. All of us, I'm sure, are anxious to avoid further human suffering and financial loss by providing adequate funds to the Corps of Engineers for construction of necessary flood protection works along the river. So far, there has been no indication that this estimate will be cut. I have strongly urged that the

full amount be retained. I have also urged that additional funds be provided ~~by~~ for flood survey work by the engineers, so that we can make further progress on other projects in Minnesota.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, while we're talking about Minnesota development projects, what's the situation in regard to the high voltage transmission line our state has been seeking to bring us lower cost power from the Missouri basin?

SENATOR: I'm glad you brought that up. It's another case of where we are having to make a determined fight, to protect Minnesota's interests. You know, funds for the transmission line were included in the original Truman budget. But under the economy drive pressures of the new Administration, it was eliminated in the revised budget estimates submitted to Congress. The House has already ^{passed} ~~acted favorably upon~~ the Interior appropriations bill, without including funds for the Minnesota transmission loop. Now it's up to the Senate.

I have sought to impress upon our Senate appropriations committee the importance of this project to our state, and many others from Minnesota have joined in making clear our need.

As I have told the appropriations committee, this is not a partisan fight, nor even a fight involving the controversial question of public vs. private power. It is a fight for development and progress, in which our state is not united. Spokesmen for both the private utilities of Minnesota and the great network of rural electric cooperatives in our state have joined in support of the transmission line, endeavoring to convince Congress of the urgent need for additional sources of power for Minnesota. The National Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives has supported us. Paul Richter of Wadena, P.J.E. Peterson of St. James, Simon Lundquist of Wheaton, Leroy Sabie of Pipestone, Clarence Peterson of Pelican Rapids, and C.L. Palmertson of Mankato have been among Minnesota's rural electric ~~some~~ co-op ~~members~~ leaders who have come to Washington in support of the transmission line, emphasizing

COPY

its necessity for the great rural electrification program.

I think we may yet get favorable action. If we do, it will probably be the result of the teamwork displayed in behalf of this project, with public and private power interests working together toward offering our state the best power service possible at the most reasonable costs that can be achieved.

If it is the desire of Congress to encourage such harmony between cooperative power users and private power distributors, rather than drive them into hostile camps, I certainly believe Minnesota's united request should be heeded and funds provided for bringing realization to the high voltage line project upon which these groups have worked so closely together.

Any other course will be a setback to Minnesota. It will be a setback to the rural electric cooperatives, to the private power companies, and to the municipal power systems. But even more important--it will be a setback to the ultimate power consumers in Minnesota, now confronted with power costs among the highest in our country.

I'm trying to keep those setbacks from happening.

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey....You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capitol. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

Program No.18, Week of May 25

Minnesota development projects now before the Congress
will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____
on _____ at _____.
(day and time)

The St. Lawrence Seaway, Duluth-Superior Harbor improvements, the St. Anthony Falls project, and construction of the new Keokuk Lock on the Mississippi in Iowa will be among the navigation projects Senator Humphrey will discuss, reporting on progress of hearings and the fight for appropriations to carry on these projects in which Minnesota has a big stake.

Senator Humphrey will also comment on the Red River of the North flood control project, and discuss the latest developments in the fight to get a high voltage transmission line to bring Missouri basin electric power into western Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey is a member of the subcommittee holding hearings on the St. Lawrence Seaway, and has been meeting with various appropriation committees in support of the other Minnesota projects.

The broadcast will be another in the weekly series entitled "Report from Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

(Reserve tape) #19 - 3me1

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I'd like to discuss Good Government with you today. During election campaigns we always hear lots of discussion about the need for improvement and reforms in various political processes and government operations, but then it seems to fade out of the public eye. You are a member of the Committee on Government Operations. What, if anything, is being done toward improving the structure and operation of our government and its political processes?

SENATOR: I'm always glad to discuss better government. I realize, of course, that more controversial and pressing problems usually catch the headlines. But I do feel several important proposals are before this Congress that could contribute considerably to better government. I have introduced several of them myself.

I'm very pleased that President Eisenhower has recently approved one of them. He has indicated his support for establishing a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, to improve the relations between our federal, state, and local governments. That's a very broad and complex field, but it is highly important to sound government.

During the 81st Congress I was chairman of a Senate Subcommittee which recommended such a Commission. I again introduced a bill in the present session of Congress calling for such action, and naturally I am quite happy that President Eisenhower is supporting my proposal. I am hopeful that we are going to get some results.

Another one of my bills to strengthen local governments, by returning to them some of the tax revenue they have lost in recent years by the federal government's increased activities, has been supported by President Eisenhower's Bureau of the Budget.

I am convinced that we must begin to strengthen our local governments and prevent undue centralization if we are to strengthen our democracy, and if our federal system of government is to serve the needs of our people.

SIMMS: Senator, what is being done about encouraging more dependence on the merit system, and less upon political patronage, in public service?

SENATOR: That's a very timely question, because I regret to say current pressures seem to be in the other direction. Of course, I suppose it is only human nature to find tremendous pressures for political patronage in a new administration. There is room for the argument that political patronage is important in a policy-making government position, but there can be no legitimate excuse for patronage in other agencies of government. I was for the merit system when the Democrats were the majority party, and I remain for the merit system now that the Republicans are in power.

I have introduced a bill to extend the blue ribbon merit system in our Government. It would require Collectors of Customs, United States Attorneys and United States Marshalls to be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws, rather than be political plums. It provides further for the elimination, once and for all, of political patronage in the appointment of Postmasters in first, second, and third class Post Offices.

There's nothing new about my position on such jobs. I have been an advocate of the blue ribbon merit system as an essential step in the development of a clean government program ever since I have been a member of the Senate. You may recall my active support in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, eliminating political patronage from

the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I likewise supported the Reorganization Plans to eliminate political patronage in the remaining agencies of our government. Unfortunately, the Senate did not see fit to agree with all of those Reorganization plans during the 82nd Congress. It is my hope that they may now agree to enact legislation to carry out such vital objectives of good and meritorious government. The spoils system should be eliminated--and my bill will go far to end it.

SIMMS: I'm sure everyone interested in better government service will watch with interest what happens to that bill of yours, Senator Humphrey. Now let me ask you something else that's always bothered me. A lot of us are confused over the cumbersome electoral college system by which we now elect our President and Vice President. Is anything being done about changing it?

SENATOR: Well, I hope something will be done about it. I have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment to abolish the ~~skinnerak~~ electoral college, and establish in its place the direct popular election of President and Vice President. The way it works now the electoral college is really an obstacle in the path of democracy. It means the votes of some citizens are worth twice, five times, or even ten times as much as others due to their geographic distribution.

~~There are an estimated 37 million qualified people in the United States who don't vote at all. I think part of that voter apathy in presidential elections can be blamed on the confusion of the electoral college system.~~

Voter apathy is one of the worst obstacles to good government--government that is really responsib to the people. There are an estimated 37 million qualified people in the United States who don't vote at all. I'm convinced our antiquated electoral college system contributes to

such apathy because of the confusion it creates, and because under it millions of votes are not counted at all in every Presidential election.

There certainly seems no excuse in a democracy for a system which allows a man to be elected President of the United States, even though more Americans may have voted for his opponent. That has actually happened three times in the short history of our country, and could happen again unless the electoral college is abolished.

SIMMS: Senator, how is it possible for a President to be chosen by an electoral college over another candidate with a larger vote?

SENATOR: There are three factors that contribute to such a situation.

First, under the electoral college system, it makes no difference whether a candidate wins a state by a narrow margin or by a sweeping majority---all the electoral votes for the state are cast for the candidate who polls the greatest number of votes in the state. As a result, the votes cast for the losing candidate might just as well not have been cast at all--they are not counted in the national results.

Second, each state, under the present system, is given a bonus of two electoral votes regardless of its population. This means that individual votes cast in large states don't count as much as those from the smaller states. For example, the ten largest states, with 6 million more people than the 38 other states, have 56 fewer electoral votes.

Third, under the electoral college system, a state casts the same number of electoral votes regardless of the number of people who turn out to vote. In the 1952 election, one electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes, while one electoral vote in Minnesota represented more than 125,000 votes.

Does that seem fair? I'm sure we all revere and respect the

Mississippi voter, but there are few among us who will maintain that his judgement concerning who should be President is more than three times as astute as that of the Minnesota or Massachusetts voter.

That gives you some idea of how unbalanced the electoral college system becomes, and how it can distort a real majority voice of the American people.

SIMMS: Even after a state has voted to cast its electoral votes for one candidate, there's nothing binding upon the electors to vote that way, is there Senator?

SENATOR: No, there's not. An elector could legally refuse to vote as instructed by the voters of his own state. We get to regarding the electoral college process as mere formality, and don't think it very likely electors would vote other than their state has instructed them. But don't forget--that actually has happened. And there's nothing in the law now to prevent it happening again. Under our present electoral college system, a whole state's citizenry could be disenfranchised by the action of a handful of men.

Does it make good sense to cling to such an outmoded system? Does it seem wise to leave such loopholes making it possible to repudiate the expressed will of the American people?

I certainly don't think so, and that's why I have proposed a constitutional amendment to change it. My amendment would be right in line with the traditions of the 14th, 15th, and 19th amendments, removing restrictions on the suffrage. It would be the final step in the constitutional evolution which began with the Declaration that all men are created equal, and continued with the assertion that no man or woman may be denied the right to vote for arbitrary reasons.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, I think most folks will agree with you--I don't

think any of us like the thought that our vote might not be as important as the next fellow's. But haven't you also introduced another constitutional amendment in regard to voting?

SENATOR: Yes, I have--I have proposed amending the Constitution to permit 18-year-olds to vote. I feel such action would broaden and extend the base of our democracy, and help make further inroads against voter apathy.

Encouraging the participation of young people at an age when they are enthusiastic and interested in government and politics would make a genuine, far-reaching, and long-term attack on this problem of the discouragingly small percentage of Americans exercising their right to vote. There is no better civic training than the exercise of the right to vote. Without the vote, in fact, all other forms of civic training are lacking in meaning and effectiveness.

I'm convinced young people would be more than mere passive voters--they could well be a catalytic and informative force in American politics, and make a definite contribution to American political life. We must remember the great strides America has made in education in recent generations--the average 18-year-old of today has had more educational background to qualify him for the responsibilities of citizenship than the 21-year-olds of a few generations ago.

SIMMS: Hasn't one state already extended this right to vote to its 18-year-olds?

SENATOR: Yes, it has already been done in Georgia, and with marked success. The young people there have shown a tremendous interest in public affairs.

My attitude on this question is about like President Eisenhower's. You may recall his comment last summer that "if they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to vote".

The whole trend of this tense period of international affairs is to throw increasing responsibilities upon 18-year-olds, and to threaten interruption of their careers as well as jeopardy to life itself. Surely we have small right to place this uncertain future before our youth, and at the same time ask them to forego the rights and duties of citizenship that would include helping to shape that future.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey...this has been a very enlightening discussion on some of the constructive proposals before the Congress for encouraging better government, improving our electoral processes, and combatting the apathy of voters.

(Follow heading used with Program No.13)

#19-2mel

Better Government measures pending before the present congress will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.)

_____ at _____ over Station _____.
(Day) (time)

Senator Humphrey will comment on proposals for encouraging better government, improving our electoral processes, and combatting the apathy of voters, including explanation of the bills he has introduced to create ~~xxxxxx~~ a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, extend the blue ribbon merit system in public service, abolish the electoral college and replace it with direct popular presidential elections, and granting the right of vote to 18-year-olds.

The broadcast will be another in a weekly series entitled "Your Senator Speaks", transcribed in Washington by Senator Humphrey as a report to Minnesota citizens and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

Radio Script for: SENATOR HUMPHREY

Subject matter:

NO. 20, Monday, June 8, 1953

Farm Prices
The Consumer's Dollar
Abundance vs. Scarcity

SIMMS: REPORT 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, earlier this year you expressed concern about farm prices, and the outlook for farm income this year. Has that situation improved any?

SENATOR: I'm very sorry to say that it hasn't improved much; in fact, in some respects the situation has been getting worse, instead of better. The prices farmers receive have still been going down on most commodities, with little change in the prices farmers must pay. During April farm prices fell another five points or two percent, bringing the parity index — the index of the relation between what the farmer gets, and what he has to pay — down to 93 points. That's the lowest it has been since before World War II. Prices received made a slight recovery in May, moving the index back to 94. The parity index broke under 100 for the first time in recent years last November, and has been slipping downward ever since. Farm prices are now $10\frac{1}{2}$ percent below a year ago, and down 8 percent since last November.

SIMMS: Senator, I would think such a drop must be putting the squeeze on farm purchasing power. Is it being felt in Minnesota?

COPY

SENATOR: It certainly is. You can ask almost any rural merchant or farm equipment dealer and he'll tell you farmers just aren't able to buy right now, or are afraid to buy, in view of the depressed outlook. It's easy to understand why. During January and February, for example, cash receipts from marketings of livestock and livestock products alone in Minnesota were down \$21,420,000 from the same two months of last year. That's a lot of money to be missing from farmers' pockets -- and it means a lot of money missing from Main street wash registers, too.

SIMMS: Are these lower prices for farm products being passed along to the consumer, Senator, in the form of lower retail prices?

SENATOR: That's one of the sad facts we have to face. Bad news for the farmer doesn't necessarily mean good news for the consumer, in way of lower prices. Actually, the consumer seldom feels anywhere near the price fluctuation that hits the farmer -- too much of it is eaten up in the spread in between, the "middle-man" spread of marketing and transportation charges.

Let me illustrate that by some figures just recently announced by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Retail prices of foods produced on United States farms averaged 3 percent lower in the first quarter of this year than in the same period of 1952. At the same time, marketing charges were three percent higher. Farm prices of these foods, however, dropped almost 10 percent -- reflecting the decrease in retail prices plus the increase in marketing charges. As a result, farmers received only 46 cents out of each

COPY

dollar consumers spent for farm-produced food products, three cents less than the farmer's share a year earlier.

That's how it usually works. When farm prices plunge downward, the middleman usually takes a bigger bite and only passes a very small part of the decline along to consumers. That's why it is sometimes difficult to make city folks realize how seriously farmers are hit by falling prices. People don't find prices very much lower in the retail markets, and don't often stop to think about how far the spread is widening between the farmer and the consumer. That's where most of your food dollar goes these days. And that's why even when the consumer pays more, the farmer is often getting less. As a matter of fact, between 1951 and 1952, the average family food bill went up by \$18, but the farmer got \$7 less for the farm products that went into that average family market basket, according to the latest Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures.

Here are a few more interesting illustrations from that BAE report:

In 1952, compared with 1951, consumers paid 1% more per pound for beef, but the farmer received 5% per pound less. The middlemen's fees, however, were 17 percent more.

Try it on bread. The consumer paid 3% more, yet the farmer got 2% less. Again, the middleman got 4% more.

I don't like to use too many figures, they're often confusing. But I could cite many more commodities where the same trend holds true — the increasing spread between farmer and consumer accounts for retail costs failing to reflect the sharp drop in farm prices.

COPY

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, wasn't some plan under way for the Federal Trade Commission to study where the consumer dollar goes, so we would know more about these big spreads between the producer and the consumer?

SENATOR: You are right, there WAS such a plan, but I'm afraid some people didn't like the idea. Last September, President Truman directed the Federal Trade Commission to find the answer to this producer-consumer spread. And in his January draft of the new budget estimates, he asked \$186,000 be provided for such a study by the FTC, to cover price spreads on bread, flour, milk, butter, cigarettes, and fertilizer.

But of course, things have changed a bit around Washington. The Congress has not only eliminated the \$186,000 proposed for such a study, but has actually forbidden the FTC to undertake any consumer dollar study. The House of Representatives cut the Federal Trade Commission's budget 24 percent under what President Truman had proposed, and even 7% under what President Eisenhower requested. Then it also added a "rider" to the funds bill prohibiting the FTC from undertaking any study of where the consumer's dollar goes. We tried to get that rider eliminated in the Senate, but without success.

SIMMS: That's rather amazing, Senator -- you mean as it now stands the Federal Trade Commission is actually forbidden to investigate this price taking spread, prohibited from ~~take~~ a look at what becomes of the greater part of the consumer's dollar?

COPY

SENATOR: That's absolutely right, and I don't blame you for being a bit amazed. I think most of us will conclude that the determined effort to prevent such a study is the best evidence that one is sorely needed. My friend Senator Kilgore of West Virginia has labelled the FTC appropriation "rider" as the "Food Profiteer's Rider", and I suspect he's about right. Let me read you what Senator Kilgore said about this strange action:

"Certain powerful interests, food processors and middlemen, have been getting more and more of the consumer's dollar, while the farmer has been getting less and less. Obviously, none of these special interests wants the public to know precisely how much of the consumer's dollar he is getting."

Senator Langer led the fight against this "profiteer's rider." Senator Gillette of Iowa was another of my colleagues urging restoration of the FTC appropriation. You know, Senator Gillette has been trying in vain to have created a Congressional Committee on Consumer Interest. It looked to me like the proposed FTC study would have served the interests of both producers and consumers by helping to narrow the present gap between them.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you think actual costs of handling food products are causing this bigger spread, or do you think it's just a case of bigger profits all along the line?

SENATOR: Well, I'd imagine it's some of both -- but that's just what we wanted the Federal Trade Commission to help find out. Of course, food

COPY

processors would like to make us believe all the increases in marketing costs are paid out in labor and similar charges. The facts, however, don't seem to bear that out.

The net earnings -- after taxes -- of the food processing industry; and by that I mean manufacturers engaged in such fields as production of meat products, dairy products, canned and preserved fruits and vegetables, grain mill products, bakery products, beverages and other food products -- the net earnings after taxes of this food processing industry were up 11 percent between the last half of 1951 and the last half of 1952. In other words, the food handlers were making more money out of farm products at the very same time the farmers who produce them were making less.

SIMMS: While you're commenting on the farm situation, Senator Humphrey, could you tell us something about the new suggestion you advanced in the Senate recently as a possible alternative to acreage allotments and marketing quotas for wheat and corn?

SENATOR: I'll be very glad to, because I think it fits right into what we have been talking about -- the relation between producers and consumers. I've been fighting vigorously and will keep ^{on} fighting vigorously to protect our producers from economic disaster. Yet I certainly don't want to see the consumer taken advantage of either, and I don't think our farmers want to take advantage of their customers.

COPY

That's why I have always urged a philosophy of abundance, instead of a philosophy of scarcity. You know, a lot of people in high places are again talking about the necessity for cutting down farm production. Any restrictive philosophy that curtails production penalizes consumers, and in the end usually hurts the farmer too.

The Secretary of Agriculture is now required to invoke acreage allotments and proclaim marketing quotas whenever supplies exceed a fixed percentage of the "normal supply", with a formula established in the law for determining "normal supply". Secretary Benson has said he expects to invoke such acreage allotments, which mean telling the farmer he can't go on producing as much as he is capable of and would like to do.

I hope we can avoid that. I've suggested that new consideration be given to what should be regarded as "normal" for wheat and corn reserves, under present world conditions. I have asked that the Administration's farm leaders take a new look at what should constitute a normal supply in light of increased dependence upon America's food reserves to back up our foreign policy. It's time we quit thinking about our food carryovers in storage simply as unwanted surpluses, and started thinking about them as our margin of safety against any possible food shortages, not only here, but anywhere in the world. I've suggested increasing the percentage designated for safe reserves, as a sounder alternative to invoking production curbs.

In my opinion, world food needs, not just domestic markets, will eventually be the controlling factor in American farm production. We would

COPY

be short-sighted indeed to tailor our production to restricted markets, when there exists such a tremendous human need for food in the world. Many of us have proposed creation of an International Food Reserve with just such ideas in mind as making fuller use of our ability to produce, rather than shut off the spigot of our agricultural knowledge and technological ability.

I hope the Administration's leadership will initiate such action along the lines I have outlined, so that farmers will be encouraged to produce, and consumers will be assured of abundance, instead of turning backward to a philosophy of scarcity.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey . . . You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capital. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

60 - June 8
Program No. 19, Week of May 25

The widening price spread between what the consumer pays and what the farmer gets for his products will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(day and time)

Senator Humphrey will comment on recent reports indicating farmers are getting less and consumers are paying more at the same time as a result of increasing marketing and transportation charges--a bigger "middleman's share".

Action of the House of Representatives in seeking to prevent the Federal Trade Commission from studying what happens to the consumer's dollar will be ~~announced~~ protested by Senator Humphrey during the radio interview.

The broadcast will be another in the weekly series entitled "Report from Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens, and carried on station _____ as a public service.

Radio Script: For Senator Humphrey

Subject:

No. 21, for broadcast week of June 15.

Social Security -
Aid to Senior Citizens

COPY

SIMMS: REPORT 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.

Senator Humphrey, I would like to ask you to tell us about your efforts to improve the Social Security System, and increase the aid to our senior citizens. I understand you have recently introduced several bills for this purpose.

SENATOR: Yes, I have -- and I hope to do even more in this direction. You know, it is high time more attention is given to the increasingly difficult financial plight of our older people -- our senior citizens. They have not shared in the benefits of higher salaries and higher profits others have realized in recent years. Instead, they have been caught in a financial squeeze by the rising costs of living, because most of them have only very limited fixed incomes of one kind or another.

There are more than 13 million men and women past 65 years of age in the United States -- and less than one-third of them are able to find employment, despite the fact we are in a period of relatively high employment opportunity. As for the rest -- the two-thirds without work -- a fortunate minority have savings and individual incomes. Some are also fortunate enough to still own their own homes, in which they can rent rooms. Some are partially supported by their adult children, and other relatives. Most older men and women, however, must look to Social Security insurance or public old-age assistance as their chief sources of dependable income.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, isn't it true we have more aged people in our population today than we did in other generations?

SENATOR: That is right, and that is one of the reasons we must be more concerned about what happens to these senior citizens. The number of persons aged 65 years and over has increased tremendously between 1900 and 1950 and is still growing. The net increase is about 325,000 a year -- an increase of about 1,000 every single day.

And not only is the number of our aged increasing, but the proportion of old persons in our population is also increasing. In 1900, the aged were only 4 percent of the total population. Today, they are 8 percent. In about 20 years, the proportion will have increased to about 10 percent, and will still be climbing. We must make provision for useful, productive enjoyment of these later years in the lives of our senior citizens. It doesn't do much good to lengthen life's span, if we are going to relegate our senior citizens into the discard, or deprive them of adequate means of decent existence. That is why Social Security benefits are so vitally important to the welfare of an increasing number of Americans.

SIMMS: Senator, how does the number of persons receiving Social Security benefits compare with those receiving public old age assistance?

SENATOR: I'm glad to say that Social Security insurance is taking over a larger and larger share of the senior citizen problem, leaving less people dependent upon public old age assistance. The number of persons drawing insurance benefits today is four million. That is about $1\frac{1}{2}$ million more than on old age assistance. It is encouraging that the number of persons receiving old-age assistance has been steadily but slowly decreasing every month for the past $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. At the

present time, the needy aged are less than 20 percent of the total aged population. But that doesn't mean that the 4,000,000 getting Social Security insurance and the 2,600,000 needy aged persons drawing assistance payments aren't all having a difficult struggle making ends meet.

In the face of the highest cost of living in our Nation's history, benefits under Social Security insurance average only about \$50 per month. The average payment for public assistance to the needy aged is about the same -- \$49 per month.

That is equivalent to only about \$26 at the 1935-39 price level, which is about \$4 less than the \$30 a month which was assumed to be the average assistance payment at the time the law was enacted. Not counting luxuries, not counting doctor and hospital bills, not counting even shoes and clothing, I wonder if anyone can truthfully say that \$50 per month is enough to live on today?

SIMMS: Well, I know I would hate to try it, Senator. What changes do you propose in your bills to help ease this situation?

SENATOR: First of all, I have asked that we increase from \$75 to \$100 the monthly amount which may be earned in covered employment without loss of Social Security benefits. It certainly is wrong to discourage persons over 65 years from working at whatever part-time jobs they can find. There may have been merit at one time for such a provision, but it does not exist today. It is obvious that our Social Security payments are inadequate to meet the needs of our senior citizens when they reach the age of 65. To prohibit them from earning more than \$75 a month, at the rate of losing their Social

COPY
Security benefits, is both unwise and inhumane. In fact, I would rather see the earning ceilings completely eliminated, but I am realistic enough to know the Congress is not prepared to go that far at this time. The least we can do however, is to increase the work clause amount to a more reasonable figure, so when it is added to the meager Social Security benefits, our aged are in a position to sustain themselves without being a burden on the rest of the community.

I have also asked for very modest increases in family benefits under the federal old age and survivors insurance program, including increasing the benefit of a wife from 50 to 75 percent of her husband's benefit and increasing the widow's benefit from 75 to 100 percent. At the present time, if a retired man receives \$60 per month, his wife receives an additional 50% or \$30, for a total of \$90. If the man dies, his widow now receives 75% of his benefit, or \$45 a month. Under the bill which I have introduced, the insurance benefits for the wife in the illustration I have just given, would be increased from \$30 to ~~\$33~~ \$45, and her widow's benefit would be increased from \$45 to \$60 a month.

These modest increases will greatly help to make our insurance program more adequate. They will help millions of families and widows whose benefits are not sufficient for them to live on.

SIMS: Did you also introduce a bill to extend for another two years increased federal allocations to states for aid to the needy aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children?

SENATOR: That is right. Last year, the Congress increased the Federal Government's share of state old age assistance to a maximum of \$35. The provision was enacted for only a two year period, which expires at the end of September, 1954. Unless Congress takes further action, the law reverts to the previous federal maximum payment of \$30 per month. All this temporary increase amounted to for the individual was \$5 per month for old age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the totally disabled, and \$3 for aid to dependent children.

The same considerations which led Congress to enact this improvement in 1952 are certainly present today, and should in all humaneness lead Congress to renew the increase for another two years while further studies are underway to improve the entire Social Security program. The cost of living is still high. The need is still great. These considerations should lead us to increase assistance benefits, not decrease them.

I do hope the Congress will act favorably on this measure in the very near future. All of us prefer to have the American people protected by insurance rather than assistance, but until the insurance program is improved and extended, and so long as people are on assistance, those benefits must be humane and adequate.

SIMS: That certainly seems true, Senator Humphrey. What about hospital care for these senior citizens -- did I read where you were also sponsoring a bill on this subject?

SENATOR: Yes, that is one more improvement I hope we can make. Along with Senator Murray of Montana and Senator Lehman of New York, I am co-sponsoring a bill designed to expand the Social Security benefits to include up to 60 days

of pre-paid hospitalization per year for everyone eligible for insurance benefits - senior citizens, widows, and orphans.

You know, I have always felt one of the glaring loopholes in our Social Security system has been the failure to provide for the predictable hazards of illness and injury. This would plug that gap, while in no way affecting the practice of medicine or the doctor-patient relationship.

This passage will mean whenever a physician, freely chosen by the patient, or the family, believes the insured person needs to go to a hospital, he will be able to go to the hospital of his choice secure in the knowledge that his hospital bill will be paid in full not from charity, but from the Social Security funds to which he himself has contributed during his working years.

SIMS: Senator, would that mean we would have to increase our Social Security contributions?

SENATOR: No, it would not. The plan we have proposed would not call for one cent in new taxes, nor for any increase in Social Security insurance benefits now or in the foreseeable future. These new insurance benefits would add only a very small fraction to the costs of the insurance system -- one tenth or two-tenths of one percent of payroll. Our Social Security program has worked out financially well to date. The contributions now in the law and the reserves in the trust fund will probably be sufficient to pay the entire cost of the program we propose.

SIMS: What effect would this idea have on voluntary hospitalization insurance plans?

SENATOR: It should greatly stimulate the spread and coverage of voluntary non-profit hospital insurance plans. Most of these plans do little or nothing now, to cover elderly people. But if they do, they have to increase rates or reduce services to the bulk of their memberships because of the higher hospitalization rates which occur among older people. Then too, the plan as we had laid it ~~before~~ before Congress calls for carrying out this program through the State Department of Public Health, with explicit provision for the States to contract with voluntary, non-profit health insurance plans like the Blue Cross, if they choose to do so, to take on the job of administering payments to the hospitals. So the Social Security hospitalization plan should help, not hurt, other private hospitalization programs.

Of course, the bills I have proposed do not provide the complete answers to all of the Social Security problems. There is still considerably more that needs to be done -- some of them minor changes, some more extensive. Included among my bills are provisions for extending Social Security coverage to ministers and employees of institutions of higher learning, if they desire to take advantage of the program, and extension of Social Security credit for young men called from civilian life to serve in the armed forces. However, I believe the Social Security program must eventually be extended to cover everyone, and that the benefits should still be made more adequate. I am working on another bill which will offer some further improvements in a new direction, and perhaps, ease the cost of living squeeze on our elderly citizens. You can count on one thing -- I shall continue to support such proposals designed to improve Social Security benefits for all of the American people.

COPY

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey. You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capitol. May we thank this station for its cooperation. Senator Humphrey will be with you next week at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

Program No.21

The plight of "senior citizens" caught in a financial squeeze by high costs of living will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(Day and time)

Senator Humphrey will outline recently measures he has introduced in Congress to improve the Social Security System and increase the amount of aid to the aged, both those under social security insurance and those receiving public old age assistance.

Included in the discussion will be an explanation of the plan for including 60 days annual hospitalization among benefits to which social security recipients are eligible--senior citizens, widows, and orphans.

The broadcast will be another in the weekly series entitled "Report from Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

Radio Script for: SENATOR HUMPHREY

Subject Matter:
Health and Education

COPY

No. 22 - for release week of June 22

SIMMS: REPORT 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.

Senator Humphrey, I know you have always been especially interested in health and education -- let's talk about those subjects today. How are they faring in the current Congress?

SENATOR: I'm always glad to discuss health and education matters, because I firmly believe they are tremendously vital to our nation's future progress. I only wish I could bring the folks in Minnesota a more optimistic report indicating new progress in these fields, but I'm afraid we're just not headed in that direction at the present time. Much to my regret, the economy yardstick has been rather recklessly used to curtail health services and educational assistance without due regard to the greater costs the nation may face in years to come as a result of such lack of foresight. You know, we could probably save a lot of money by closing the doors of our schools entirely -- but I'd hate to think what would happen to the future of this country if we ever took such a backward step. The same thing is true in essential health services. Of course nobody has gone to that extreme, but we do risk future troubles by the cutbacks being invoked for both health and education in the new federal budget. It isn't really economy -- it is passing

COPY

the buck. For much of the reductions proposed are in grants-in-aid to the states, which in turn will have to be made up by increased local and state taxes for schools and health services. I don't call shifting tax burdens from the federal level to the local level "economy" at all -- it's just passing the buck. And we're going to feel the effects of it in Minnesota, too.

SIMMS: What about school construction funds, Senator -- is Minnesota going to get all the funds previously planned for aiding in new school construction?

SENATOR: I'm sorry to say the outlook is not very promising. No funds are provided in the present budget for school construction -- not at all. I've protested that Congress will be reneging on a \$95 million obligation to school districts of the country, and imposing an unfair burden upon local taxpayers, if it fails to appropriate that amount to make good its commitments under Public Law 815 by which it agreed to bear part of the cost of constructing school facilities in areas where federal activities are responsible for increased enrollment. Minnesota is entitled to \$184,073 of this unfilled obligation. I've urged the Senate appropriations committee not to sell our school children short, and not to pass this burden back to local taxpayers. Recently President Eisenhower added his approval to such aid for local school districts facing increased burdens as a result of federal activity, but so far no provision has been made for the necessary funds. It's performance that counts --

not promises. You know, I'm beginning to get a little tired of lip service to every worthy objective from Administration spokesmen, while they sit on their hands and do nothing toward carrying out such objectives.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey some time ago you protested against the Administration's recommendation that grants to the states for vocational education be slashed by one-fourth. Has that situation changed?

SENATOR: Yes, it has -- fortunately. Plenty of other Senators and Congressmen agreed with me that cutting down on vocational education -- agricultural education, home economics, and training in trades and industries; the kind of practical education needed by our young people to help them earn a living -- was a foolish place to start economizing. The House of Representatives restored the slash recommended by the Administration. However, under its formula of distribution of such funds, the vocational agriculture and home economics programs would still have taken a slash to permit use of more funds for training in the distributive occupations. I have since urged the Senate appropriations committee to continue the vocational agriculture and home economics allotments on the same basis as in the previous year, and I'm hopeful the Senate will go along. Under the ~~new~~ House bill -- which as I mentioned is considerably increased from what the Administration asked -- Minnesota would get \$32,000 less for vocational education than under the recommendations I have made.

Of course, I've also wanted to save the school lunch program from further reductions. It doesn't make sense to cut down on hot school lunches, especially when we have so many surplus agricultural commodities. The House of Representatives ignored the Administration's economy proposals, and refused to slash the school lunch funds. I'm happy that the Senate did the same.

SIMMS: What about public health services, Senator Humphrey -- how will the proposed reductions affect Minnesota.

SENATOR: It's going to mean a sharp curtailment of health protection and disease prevention work in our state, just as it will throughout the nation. I'm afraid such reductions are a very shortsighted and dangerous way to seek economy. All of us are interested in real economy, but we know from experience that it usually costs less to carry on preventive health work than it does to care in the future for victims of tuberculosis, heart disease, cancer, and other ailments.

Public health precautions and chronic disease case-finding programs have saved this country money, not cost us money. For every dollar of taxpayers money spent in such work, more dollars have been saved in cutting down the number of disease victims to eventually become public charges.

Just to give you some idea what these so-called economy moves will mean to our own state, I'd like to read a few paragraphs from a recent letter from Irene Donovan of St. Paul, president of the Minnesota Public Health Conference:

"We as members of an organization interested in the protection and promotion of the public health in Minnesota are greatly disturbed by the House-voted reductions in the grants-in-aid to states for general and categorical health purposes, under the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau allotment. While everyone is interested in economy, we do sincerely feel that with these days of mounting international tensions and crises, now is not the time to relax our public health efforts which are so greatly a part of, and so extremely essential to, the nation's total defense preparation.

"We are observing with dismay and concern the retrenchment being forced upon the State Board of Health, in attempting to conform budgets to the Federal figures now being released from Washington as the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare progresses. We understand money for general health purposes will mean to Minnesota, under the House version, a slash of nearly 25%, reducing the General Health resources from \$246,000 to \$189,000. While actual data is not in our possession, it appears that the reductions in the categorical grant programs vary from 50% to 70%, and in the case of the venereal disease program practically eliminates this aid.

"These sizeable decreases in operating monies will mean that all basic activities of the State Board will be trimmed down to a dangerously low operating level. The Board will abandon its tuberculosis and chronic disease X-ray case-finding programs which have been most valuable in searching out the existence of undetected and undiagnosed disease conditions, thereby enabling early control and treatment to be instituted. Its heart disease and cancer control program will be sharply curtailed . . .

Water supply and sewage disposal work and other sanitation activities will receive attention far short of actual needs . . ."

All of these comments are quotes from a letter from the Minnesota Public Health Conference, graphically describing what these health service reductions will mean to health work in Minnesota.

I certainly concur in objecting to this setback in vital public health work, and have protested most vigorously against the budget reductions.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, what about funds for research into cancer and other diseases -- haven't they been slashed, too?

SENATOR: Yes, that's right. You know, a few years ago we created the National Institutes of Health, a sound program welcomed by the American people as a wise investment in preventive research to avoid future burdens of chronic disease victims. These Institutes were established to direct research into the causes and cures of cancer, mental health, blindness, heart disease, dental ailments, arthritis, and neurological diseases, in the belief that we could eventually save money as well as lives by cutting down the annual toll of these human ailments. ^{Now} ~~These~~ funds for such work have been drastically slashed. It will mean suspending much of the research. And when you suspend research projects that are already under way, it often means the complete loss of all that has already been invested in such studies, just because the work can't be carried to some conclusion. As far as I am concerned, investment of public money in such research work is intelligent economy; reckless

slashing of such funds, however, can only be classed as dangerous and false economy.

COPY

SIMS: Senator, hasn't the economy axe also hit hard at hospital construction?

SENATOR: Yes, it has. You know, under the Hill-Burton program the federal government has cooperated with states and local communities in financing new hospital facilities. We've taken good advantage of that act in Minnesota, and have been making good strides in hospital improvements. But while the Act is still in effect through 1955, Congress now threatens to curtail the federal government's participation. The cut proposed in hospital construction funds would mean that each state would get approximately one-third less than contemplated for the year ahead, upsetting financing of projects already under construction and others for which plans have been prepared. That could be very serious for many of our Minnesota communities which have been counting on the Federal government fulfilling its offer of financial assistance, as long as the communities and states put up their share. We've certainly complied in good faith. During the last six years \$73,000,000 has been spent in Minnesota on new hospital facilities, of which only \$12,000,000 has been in federal funds. Now even that limited assistance is threatened. Reduction in these appropriations could have serious effect on pending hospital projects, creating undeserved local hardship.

SIMMS: Senator your report has indicated quite a setback for health and education at this session of Congress. Are there any new proposals before it that might point in the other direction?

SENATOR: Well, there are a few suggested improvements in the health field, including some bills of my own. I hope we can get action on some of them. I have introduced legislation to close loopholes in the Food and Drug Act, and the American Medical Association has endorsed my bill. Only recently the Administration voiced its approval for the same objective. I have also introduced a bill to carry out one of the recommendations of the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation. It is designed to assist voluntary non-profit organizations offering pre-paid health service programs to secure necessary facilities and equipment, through long-term interest bearing loans. Then, too, I have joined with other sponsors in proposing prepaid hospitalization for qualified recipients of social security benefits -- in other words, including hospitalization benefits in the old age insurance program. I hope we can make some progress toward improved health care and improved health facilities at this session of the Congress, rather than just turn backwards through reduced investment in public health services and facilities as now appears likely.

SIMMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey, for this discussion of health and education problems. You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capitol. Senator Humphrey will be with you again next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

Program No. 20

Health and education issues before the present Congress will
be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Station _____

on _____ at _____
(day and time)

Senator Humphrey will explain the effect of economy reductions
on programs for school construction, vocational education, public health
services, hospital construction, and research into disease prevention through
the National Institutes of Health, and outline his own stand on appropriations
for these services, particularly grants-in-aid to states.

His radio report will include breakdowns as to what such economy
reductions will mean in loss of services or transferred cost burdens to the
state of Minnesota.

The broadcast is another in the weekly series entitled "Report from
Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota
citizens and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

COPY
Radio Script for SENATOR HUMPHREY

No. 23, for release week of June 29

Subject Matter:
Rural Telephones
Family Farming

SIMS: REPORT 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.

Senator Humphrey, a few weeks ago when we were discussing the REA you promised to tell us more about the rural telephone program sometime in the future. I wonder if you would care to comment on that subject today.

SENATOR: I'll be glad to. I hope to see the day when all of our rural families have access to modern telephone service. I'm glad that the Senate has increased to some extent the amount of loan funds voted by the House of Representatives for the telephone program, even though I would have liked to see an even larger amount made available. You know, these loans aren't anything the government is giving away -- it's just a sound business proposition, with the government making the credit available to either private companies or farmers' cooperatives to extend and improve rural phone service. All of the loans have to be repaid with interest, and the success of our rural

COPY

electrification program on that same principle shows that it can be done.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, to what extent do America's farms now have telephone service?

SENATOR: Not as many as you might think. In these days when most of us accept telephones as an essential part of our modern life, sixty percent of the nation's farmers -- or over 3,300,000 farm families -- have no telephones at all. And out of the remaining two million farmers with telephone service, perhaps one-half of the telephones are inadequate and antiquated -- of the 'whoop and holler' type.

Here in Minnesota, rural telephone service is the one field in which we are failing to make any progress.

As a matter of fact, Minnesota had fewer farms with telephones in 1950 than it did thirty years ago in 1920. The 1920 census showed 110,569 farms in Minnesota or 62 percent of the total, had telephone service -- compared to only 107,359 farms, or 59 percent of the total, shown with telephones in the 1950 census.

Farmers need phones for more efficient farm operation and production, and they need them for efficient marketing. Every

COPY

farm is a real factory in production of food and fiber -- how many other types of factories would think of getting along without telephones?

But telephones can make an even more important contribution to fuller, richer rural life. Families need telephones for contact with the neighbors, their school, their church -- they need them to insure the health and safety of their loved ones and for a decent social life.

We've found from experience, however, that government credit, available to private companies and farmers' cooperatives alike, is necessary for sound expansion of rural telephone service, particularly in the more remote areas where it is needed most. That's why the rural telephone program was added to the REA in 1949.

SIMMS: Senator, has Minnesota taken advantage of the rural phone program since it was instituted?

SENATOR: Yes, it certainly has -- and it is eager to take even greater advantage of it if adequate funds are provided. Since the program was authorized in 1949, loans amounting to \$6,911,000 have been extended to firms and cooperatives for rural telephone service in Minnesota. Just a few weeks ago I had the pleasure

COPY

of dedicating the new dial system installed by the Farmers Mutual Telephone Company at Dawson under this program. REA telephone loan funds enabled it to reorganize and rehabilitate its system for greater rural coverage, and become the first to provide modern rural dial service.

Altogether, eighteen Minnesota telephone companies have shared so far in the loan program for improving rural service. The two latest to get such aid, within the last few months, are the Barnesville Rural Telephone Association and the Farmers Mutual Telephone Company of Madison.

But all this is just a start. REA has a backlog of nearly \$100 million in loan applications now on file -- \$5,464,545 of them from Minnesota. That's why I urged the Senate to provide an even greater increase in rural telephone funds this year, instead of reduce them as the Administration had proposed.

I'm convinced that what REA has done to electrify American agriculture, it can also do to bring modern communications to the farmer if free enterprise and the government will work together to best serve the needs of all.

SIMS: Senator, you mentioned the importance of telephones to rural living and farm family life. Haven't you also recently urged the Department of Agriculture to give more attention to

COPY

farming as a way of life as well as a way of making a living?

SENATOR: That's right, and I feel it is very important if we are going to maintain the traditional American pattern of family farming. We can't ignore the human side of farming, in our concern over material problems. I've been concerned for some time that the Department of Agriculture was being oriented too much in the direction of big commercial agriculture, and not enough toward problems of the average sized family farmer. I think it has been reflected in the many commodity advisory committees that are predominantly made up of food processors and distributors, interested in the end product but with little real concern about the farm people producing such products, or the conditions under which they must be produced.

To give a little more "balance" to such advisory groups in the Department, I've urged Secretary Benson to create an additional advisory committee on Family Farming and Rural Living, to exert its constructive influence toward preserving the desirable patterns of family farming in this country, and be concerned with the social aspects of rural living.

I've suggested that all of the farm organizations be represented on this group, but also urged that other groups be included that have shown a real concern for America's family farmers. In recognition of the important role our churches play

COPY

in rural life, and the strong interest they have taken in the farmer's welfare, I have suggested that such groups as the National Council of Churches of Christ, the National Lutheran Council, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, and the National Council of Rural Life and Labor all be included on the proposed committee.

I'm hopeful that Secretary Benson will accept the suggestion in the same constructive spirit in which it is offered. I'm afraid many small American farmers, unable to pay their own expenses to various advisory committee meetings even if they were invited, feel rather 'left out' of the present committees offering the Department advice and counsel. Perhaps such family farmers would feel more proper attention was given their well-being, however, if Secretary Benson's advisors included a committee specifically designated as a "watchdog" for family farming and rural living -- one comprised of people of high moral purpose, whose only concern is the welfare of America's farm families, and who recognize farming as a way of life as well as a way of making a living.

SIMS: In view of Secretary Benson's expressed intention of making the fullest use of advisory groups, Senator, I should

COPY

think he would welcome your suggestion. What else can you tell us of interest to our Minnesota farmers?

SENATOR: Well, I think everyone will welcome the humanitarian move of sending a large quantity of our surplus wheat to Pakistan to help avert a famine there, but I'm sure it will be particularly good news to our wheat growers who like to see food used where it is needed. You know, I started the push for sending wheat to Pakistan early in April, taking it up with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the Mutual Security Administrator, and finally introducing a bill for that purpose in the Senate. The Administration finally gave it the "green light".

SIR: Senator Humphrey, haven't you been urging that we explore other similar uses of our food abundance to help needy peoples of the world, and back up our foreign policy?

SENATOR: Yes, I have been urging all along that we should do more than complain about having too much of anything -- we should be getting busy finding good uses for it.

From the very start of this session I have emphasized the need for greater efforts to develop new world outlets, either

COPY

for commercial sales or for humanitarian grants or loans wherever such a course will strengthen the free world. My most recent appeal has been to the Mutual Security Administration to make greater use of our country's ability to produce in abundance in America's foreign aid programs. I'm glad to say that the idea seems to be gaining support within the Administration, and I expect to see some results.

Food is among the strategic materials vital to the strength of the free world. We should be exerting greater efforts, I'm convinced, to making the utmost use of America's abundance as a humane weapon of democracy -- to alleviate hunger throughout the world, and avert the necessity of any free countries having to deal with Russia to get food supplies from behind the 'Iron Curtain' -- on Soviet terms.

American agriculture's ability to produce in abundance should be welcomed as part of our nation's underlying strength. Unfortunately, however, such appreciation of our agricultural 'know how' is too often obscured by concern over what to do with our abundance after it is produced. Where many countries have to learn to live with scarcity, we must learn how to live with abundance.

COPY

SIMMS: Senator, I'm sure most farmers will agree with you.

I understand, Senator Humphrey, that you have also recently urged the federal government to do its share toward getting rid of noxious weeds in Minnesota.

SENATOR: Yes, I feel it is only right that the Federal government do something about the weeds on its own property in our state, when we expect other property owners to get rid of them. Our state entomologist, T. L. Aamodt, has told me that enforcement of Minnesota's weed law has been handicapped by the lack of any authority to control weeds on Federal lands. As a result I am supporting Senate bill 627 to provide for the control of noxious weeds on Federally owned or controlled land. There are approximately 4,000,000 acres of land in Minnesota either owned by or under control of the Federal government. Our state weed control law requires that weeds on such Federal land within the state shall also be controlled just as they are on private lands, but no funds have previously been provided for this control. If we're going to do an effective job of ridding Minnesota of harmful weeds -- and they take a heavy annual toll from our farmers -- it's only right that Uncle Sam helps out by keeping his own backyard cleaned up.

COPY

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey . . . You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capital. Senator Humphrey will be back again next week, at the same time. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

(Program No. 13)

Efforts to expand and improve rural telephone service will be discussed over Radio Station _____ on _____ at _____ by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, (D., Minn.).
(day) (time)

Senator Humphrey was among those supporting increased telephone loan funds for the REA, granted by the Senate to step up the rural telephone program. During his radio interview Senator Humphrey will ~~will~~ discuss the importance of adequate telephone systems to farming, both for business purposes and for decent rural living.

Senator Humphrey will also explain his recent suggestion to Secretary of Agriculture Benson for creation of a new advisory committee on Family Farming and Rural Living, ~~will~~ comment on recent approval of wheat for Pakistan which he first proposed, explain his recent suggestions to the Mutual Security Administration for using surplus foods to strengthen our foreign policy, and tell of his efforts to get the federal government to clean up noxious weeds on federal land in Minnesota.

The broadcast will be another in the weekly series entitled "Report from Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens, and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

Radio Script for: SENATOR HUMPHREY

COPY

Herb
Subject Matter:
World Outlook
Seizing the Initiative

No. 24, for release week of July 6

SIMS: REPORT 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, there have been quite a few new developments on the international scene lately. As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, how do you view the world outlook today?

SENATOR: To answer that very candidly, I'd have to say I view the outlook with considerable mixed emotions -- there have been heartening signs lately that encourage my hopes for a more peaceful world, but at the same time there remains disheartening trends that give me grave concern. We're far from out of trouble -- the danger to freedom is still very real in the world today. Yet I can't help feeling we are being confronted with a golden opportunity by recent uprisings behind the iron curtain, if we only have the boldness and foresight to take advantage of the situation.

SIMS: I assume you are referring to the riots in East Germany?

SENATOR: That's right -- the uprising of the German people against the Communist rulers. I believe this development is extremely important

COPY
for United States policy. Such demonstrations of courage and desire for freedom as the valiant people of East Germany have been showing — fighting tanks with stones, and Soviet machine gunners with sticks — is convincing evidence that there is deep unrest within the Soviet empire. It's more than just an isolated incident. The latest German uprisings followed other protests and demonstrations in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and the Ukraine. It is serious enough to give Moscow deep concern. According to press dispatches they have rushed some 300,000 troops into the riot areas in a desperate effort to keep down the unrest.

SIMMS: Senator, what do you think this means for us? What should we be doing about it?

SENATOR: I'm convinced we should accept this great turmoil and confusion and revolt now going on behind the Iron Curtain as a signal to the United States to seize the initiative in encouraging the will for freedom of the suppressed peoples under the Soviet yoke. We should press immediately for the unification of Germany and the holding of free elections throughout that country. Such a program is necessary for European stability, and it is an essential ingredient in the struggle for the minds and hearts of the German people. Likewise, as Chancellor Adenauer has pointed out, it is important to increase the strength of allied defense in Western Europe, an undertaking which should never be underestimated or in any way weakened. At the same time we ought to be making more assistance available to Germany to help her care for the thousands of refugees crossing the Iron Curtain. I was

COPY
very pleased the other day that President Eisenhower, on the very day that I made a plea on the Senate floor for such action, made available an additional \$50 million to aid the government of West Germany in meeting this refugee problem. I'm convinced that every action we take now, to uphold the hand of the West German Republic and to strengthen the forces of freedom in that country, will be most valuable to our foreign policy, and to the peace of the world.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, you mentioned your plea on the Senate floor at the time these uprisings in Germany developed ... would you tell us about the resolution you introduced at that time?

SENATOR: Certainly ... it was just a brief resolution, but it emphasized the same points I am trying to make clear now -- that we must commend these brave German people risking their lives rather than be Soviet slaves, and we must let them know that we are going to do all in our power to eventually restore freedom to them. Let me read you the resolution I asked the Senate to adopt:

"RESOLVED: That the Senate of the United States hereby expresses

(1) Its profound admiration for the people of Germany in their resistance to Communist totalitarianism;

(2) Its sense that every effort be made by the Government of the United States to bring about the unification of Germany so that a United Germany may take its place as an equal partner in the family of democratic nations; and

(3) Its belief that the holding of free elections throughout Germany is the essential first step toward German unification."

COPY
That's all there was to it -- but I believe such an expression of our faith and determination behind these brave and defiant German people would be extremely helpful in exploiting the troubles Moscow already has on its hands.

I think it is fitting that Congress, as the voice of the American people, should speak out on this vital question of German unification. And I believe our Government should press hard for free elections in Germany, as well as for German unification, immediately. The German people want a united Germany, and they should have it. We should not lose any time in assuming the initiative in the cold war, which the brave people of Eastern Europe have made possible for us.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, do you think the ruthless reprisals the Communists are now taking will crush out this growing spirit of resistance in Germany?

SENATOR: I don't think the Soviet Union will ever enslave the German people. Neither can they continue to enslave the brave people of Poland and Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia was the cradle of democracy in Europe, and the people of Czechoslovakia today, in memory of Benes, are fighting against the tyrants who are oppressing them. They are fighting against the totalitarian despotism. They had it under Hitler, and they had it under Stalin, but they want to live as free men and free women -- and they are showing their determination to do so. Strange as it may seem, our enemies in World War II -- Japan and Germany

COPY
— are right now the key in the Far East and in the West to political stability in those areas. The German people in East Germany are proving themselves to be very strong and powerful forces for freedom and independence, and I think they are setting an example which is going to cause loud reverberations throughout the world. We should certainly do everything we can to let them know that voices in America are being raised in their behalf. If ever any people needed help and reassurance, it is those people today.

SIMMS: Have you any other thoughts on what we might do to reassure and encourage these people defying the Communist rulers behind the Iron Curtain?

SENATOR: Yes, there are many other things we can and should do right away. We should intensify the broadcasts of the Voice of America to Eastern Europe, at once. The people there will meet ruthless repression now, and it is up to us to keep their hope for freedom alive — and let them know the whole free world is with them. We should also immediately enact the legislation — which is already before the Congress — to allow 240,000 refugees to emigrate to the United States. These people should be made to feel our friendship for them in concrete terms. Of course, we must also keep up our own defenses and those of our allies. This means further strengthening the NATO alliance, and it means that we should not cut down on our Mutual Security program. The Soviet can understand strength. We should be in a position to bargain from strength.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, you mentioned earlier that there were disheartening signs on the horizon, as well as some of the heartening signs you have discussed. What about them?

SENATOR: Yes, we've had setbacks in both Europe and Asia -- The Italian elections, for example, where interference of our American Ambassador proved harmful rather than helpful. Then, too, there's the trouble France is having in forming a stable government, and evidences of increased Communist infiltration into Southeast Asia. They are ample evidence that there are still troubles -- that we must not lower our guard -- and that we must assert firmer leadership to regain our initiative. I'm afraid in some respects we are going in reverse, here at home. Verbal attacks in Congress on our allies are aiding and abetting Soviet strategy, and uncertainty over foreign trade policy of this country is helping the Soviet drive to gain western trade.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, what about Korea? Do you think we're still going to get a truce there?

SENATOR: Yes, I think we are -- despite the reckless actions of Dr. Rhee in defying those trying to help his country, and sabotaging truce negotiations by the mass prisoner release. Of course, we aren't entirely blameless -- we should have kept a firm hand on that situation during these critical stages of the negotiation, for there had been warnings something of that nature was likely to be attempted. Somebody

COPY

was just caught napping -- and it would have given the Communists a good excuse to call off the truce if that was what they wanted. I think it just adds more evidence to the fact that the only reason we are making progress on this truce is because the Communists seem to want it, for their own purposes. Whether it is because of internal troubles behind the Iron Curtain, or just to bolster their phony peace offense, they seem as anxious as we are to call off the shooting war for the time being at least. All they are trying to hold off ^{for} apparently, is to "save face", and not appear too eager. So I think we can expect a truce in some form soon -- although it certainly shouldn't be regarded as any indication our situation is greatly improved, or the danger of the Soviet threat has lessened.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, how would you sum up your recommendations as to what we need to do to regain the initiative in world relations?

SENATOR: Let me condense my thoughts into just five points:

First, we must take advantage of the revolts behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in East Germany, as a golden opportunity to act.

Second, we must intensify and increase our Voice of America and other informational programs of our government beamed to Europe and to the Iron Curtain area.

Third, we must continue to maintain and increase our pressure on the Iron Curtain -- strengthening NATO, and maintaining our economic aid programs, -- not slash them, as some would do.

COPY

Fourth, we must develop a broader policy for world trade, perhaps at the moment one of the most important steps that we can take. We must act as if we believe in 'trade, not aid', not merely repeat that phrase by rote because it sounds good.

Fifth, we must exert leadership in strengthening under-developed areas of the world, strengthening Point Four work and utilizing our great food reserves to share with less fortunate citizens of the world.

These are just a few suggested steps which we as a nation might take to regain our initiative in foreign affairs. They are all part of a policy to achieve peace, stop Communism, and eventually bring about the retreat of Communism. But it takes deeds, not words. I am confident that the American people want such a program, and that the free world is yearning for such leadership.

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey ... You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the Nation's capital. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

COPY

(Program No.24)

Uprisings behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in East Germany, against Soviet rule will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Radio Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(day) (time)

Senator Humphrey, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will be interviewed on what the outbreak of rebellion in satellite areas might mean in the struggle of democracies against communism.

During a recent Senate speech, Senator Humphrey hailed the courage of the German people and called for the United States to seize upon the uprisings "as a Golden Opportunity to act" toward encouraging the will for freedom among suppressed people under the Soviet yoke. During the interview, Senator Humphrey will review other developments--good and bad--in our international relations.

The broadcast will be another in a weekly series entitled "Report from Washington", transcribed by Senator Humphrey as a personal report to Minnesota citizens and carried on Station _____ as a public service.

Radio Script for: SENATOR HUMPHREY

25 - week of July 17

COPY

Herb
Subject matter:
Vets Medical Care
Patronage

SIMS: REPORT FROM WASHINGTON. Again we bring you Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, with his weekly report from the nation's capital. This program is brought to you as a public service, in cooperation with this station.

Senator Humphrey, what's new under the capital dome this week?

SENATOR: Well, there are quite a few things I'd like to discuss for the folks at home, because I know they'd be interested in them. But first of all I'd like to let our war veterans know that I'm doing my best to head off any setbacks in veterans' hospitalization, and adequate medical care.

The present Congress has been giving considerable thought and discussion to medical care for veterans in our VA hospitals. Proposals have been advanced which would sharply reduce the VA medical program, and at the same time drastically alter the policy which has been in effect for the past thirty years. I think all of us should be aware of these attempts, and concerned about them. After all, it will directly affect every family that includes a war veteran, and that takes in most of our families these days. But I'm sure most people, even if they have no loved ones directly involved, want to see decent and proper medical attention provided by our country as the very least we can do in appreciation for these ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, ex-marines, and ex-air force boys who underwent such risks for the rest of us.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, just what is this change that has been proposed in veterans' hospitalization?

SENATOR: The policy under direct attack is that of admitting veterans to the VA hospitals even though their illness may not be service connected, provided there are available beds to provide for the treatment.

That has been our country's policy for 30 years, and I see no valid reason for changing it.

It is generally recognized that approximately one-third of our vets cared for in the Veterans' Administration have service-connected disabilities. These men are fully entitled to all possible care and treatment.

But there are an even larger number of cases of the chronic type, such as tuberculosis and mental disorder. It is, of course, difficult to know whether or not these cases are the result of service in the armed forces. For no one has been able to fully calculate what toll upon the physical well-being of an individual the vigorous activity of military life plays upon the body. Men who are accustomed to civilian life and then taken into the military service, where they endure rigorous training and are called upon in many instances for combat duty, suffer great strain. While they may not suffer wounds or disabilities that can be ascertained at the moment, they could very well have a delayed physical reaction which makes itself known years later. This is accepted by competent medical authorities. Unusual strain and tension at an early age may well show itself years later. But to the

Veterans' Administration, this is frequently not called a "service-connected disability".

SIMMS: In other words, Senator, if they couldn't prove their injury or illness directly connected with military service, under the changes proposed, they would be denied medical care?

SENATOR: That's right -- as far as Veterans' Hospitals are concerned. But such chronic disease victims cannot in the main pay for their own treatment. If we keep them out of VA hospitals, they would be the responsibility of county or other public institutions. That doesn't make sense to me. I am sure most of us would agree that it is far preferable for the vet to receive treatment in the VA hospitals. He can be with his buddies, and be given the care and consideration of the veterans' organizations and service units which so diligently visit the hospitals and seek to protect the welfare of those who have served their country. Equally important, the other public hospital facilities are already overcrowded, particularly in tuberculosis and mental health cases. If the Federal Government provides the Veterans' Administration facilities for veterans, it relieves the local communities from providing additional facilities out of local taxes. If the Federal Government tries to shirk the responsibility for caring for these veterans, somebody is going to have to do it -- and the local community will probably get saddled with the burden.

SIMMS: Senator Humphrey, isn't it true that it is often extremely difficult to prove a veteran's injury was incurred in service, and that many injustices would be done just through lack of records if we changed our policy to ban hospitalization for non-service connected disabilities?

SENATOR: That's right. Approximately 25 percent of the cases at the Veterans Administration hospitals are regarded as "borderline" in their nature. It is not certain whether they are service-connected or not. Everyone knows that medical records are all too often lost due to conditions in war. I have looked into many cases in behalf of servicemen and found that to be true. In fact, I have introduced bills to provide for further record keeping so as to make much more certain the medical history of those who serve our country, so they won't be faced with injustices in future years.

In my judgment, however, we should operate on the presumption that when the facilities are available, the veteran is entitled to medical care regardless of the service history of his disability, rather than be forced to exhaust his meager earnings or savings or be compelled to accept public charity in a county or state institution.

SIMMS: Senator, do you think Congress will adopt these cutbacks in care of Veterans, as some have proposed?

SENATOR: I certainly hope not, and as of now I think we have headed it off. I know that I have been vigorously opposing any step backwards in veterans' care, both through my testimony for adequate appropriations and debate on the Senate floor against depriving a great bulk of our veterans of access to VA hospitals. These curbs were all suggested as part of the Administration's "economy wave", but I submit its a strange place for President Eisenhower to seek to make good economy pledges -- at the expense of the young men wounded under his command. I don't think the Senate is going to let such economy be achieved at the expense of our war veterans.

SIMS: Senator Humphrey, let me change the subject on you. In addition to rejecting many of the Administration's more drastic economy slashes, I understand the Senate has also frowned upon some of the President's appointments. Can you tell us anything about the nomination of Tom Lyon, the President's choice as director of the Federal Bureau of Mines, which apparently backfired?

SENATOR: It certainly did backfire. Embarrassed Republican Congressional backers of Mr. Lyon dropped their support and asked the White House to withdraw his nomination after his views were brought out to public under questioning by my good friends, Senators Jackson of Washington and Clements of Kentucky, during the committee hearing on confirmation. It was another case of a man being chosen to head an agency who was not only unsympathetic, but actually opposed, to the work the agency

COPY
is supposed to perform. We've had a couple of similar examples recently, but none quite so flagrant as this one.

SIMMS: What were some of the facts the committee hearing brought out?

SENATOR: Well, I must say that Mr. Lyon was quite frank once Senators Jackson and Clements started prying into his viewsHe said flatly that he opposed the mine safety law that he would have to administer, that he was against the President's metal tariff policy, and to top things off, he confirmed that he still draws a \$5,000 pension from the Anaconda Copper Company which they can revoke if he does anything they don't approve of. Is it any wonder the Senate couldn't swallow him to head our Bureau of Mines?

During the question about mine safety laws, Mr. Lyon was asked whether he considered human life came before material things in mining.

His answer was that "Life is becoming very cheap on our globe".

The surprising thing to me is that such a man was ever nominated in the first place. He told the committee that Interior Secretary Douglas McKay and others who had recommended him for the nomination had never asked him for his views on the mine safety law, and similar issues.

You know, a short time ago President Eisenhower told a news conference that he never appointed a man to public office without first interviewing him and seeing what his views are. If he held strong views on any subject, one way or the other -- the president said -- he disqualified that man. He said he wanted people who were objective

COPY

and with an open mind, walking the middle of the road.

Well, somebody slipped up on Mr. Lyon. And there have been other slips, too -- if the President means what he said.

The press raised its eyebrows recently over appointment of Mr. Talbot as a new member of the U. S. Tariff Commission, because of the known variance of his views to those of President Eisenhower. Talbot has always been recognized as a protectionist advocate, not a supporter of free trade. Yet when Mr. Talbot was questioned by the Senate Finance Committee with regard to his confirmation, he said that he did not discuss tariffs with President Eisenhower at all, or with anybody else at the White House, prior to the appointment. When the President was asked about this at a subsequent conference, he confirmed that he didn't know what Talbot's views were on tariffs.

Then, of course, a lot of us still haven't gotten over appointment of an ex-congressman to head the government's housing program who had consistently fought against such programs in the past.

It's beginning to look like politics and patronage -- always to be expected in a new administration -- is winning out over all the fine talk about just finding the most capable men available to run the government.

SDMS: Speaking of patronage, Senator, hasn't the Administration taken steps to move quite a few more federal posts out of civil service, so they will be open for patronage appointments?

COPY

SENATOR: Yes, that's right -- none of us objected to the new administration trying to replace people at policy-making levels with people of their own choice. But its already gone far beyond that, and is still spreading further. It's got to be just a plain ordinary hunt for ways to pry out civil service employees so the vacancies can be filled with patronage appointees. The latest move is to wipe out civil service protection for more than 100,000 jobs, so they will be available for distribution as political plums. Most of them are now filled by people with years of government service, people who came up from the ranks step-by-step through civil service, and have always been regarded as career workers. If the career workers throughout the executive departments are going to be replaced with political favorites, I hope it is at least a gradual process so we don't lose all of the really experienced public servants at once. That would create chaos, for the whole idea of career service is to have some continuity of experience -- some people available who have been through the mill and know thoroughly the jobs they are required to fill.

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

COPY

(Program No.25)

Efforts to prevent curtailment of hospitalization and ~~vark~~ medical care for veterans will be discussed over Radio Station _____ on _____ at _____ by
(day) (time)

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.)

Senator Humphrey will be interviewed on proposals before the Congress to eliminate ~~treatmentxxx~~ hospitalization for veterans in non-service connected cases, which he has vigorously opposed. Difficulties in determining "borderline cases" of whether veterans' disabilities or illness stemmed from military service will be discussed by Senator Humphrey as part of his argument in favor of making Veterans Administration facilities open to all veterans for treatment as long as beds are available.

Other topics to be discussed by Senator Humphrey in his weekly transcribed radio report to Minnesota citizens from the nation's capital will ^{include} ~~be~~ the forced withdrawal of the nomination of a new chief for the U.S. Bureau of Mines after his testimony that he didn't approve of the mine safety laws he would have to enforce, and the inroads of patronage on the civil service merit system.

Program No. 26

COPY

(For week of July 29)

SIMMS: REPORT 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, Senator Sparkman has given me a copy of a letter he sent you a few days ago -- do you mind if I read it, before asking you some questions about it?

SENATOR: If it's the letter I think it is, I'll be only too happy to have you read it .. Is it Senator Sparkman's comments on my efforts in behalf of small business?

SIMMS: That's right, and as long as you have no objection I'd like to read it. Here is Senator Sparkman's letter:

"Dear Hubert: I want to express my appreciation to you for your vote in behalf of small business when the Conference Report on the Controls Bill was before us several days ago.

"As was well pointed out in the discussion on the Senate floor, the proposal that had come from the House of Representatives, if enacted into law, would scuttle efforts made to give small business a fair chance in the American economy.

"This fact was well recognized in the statement that was sent to all Senators by one of the best small business organizations of the

COPY
the country. I refer specifically to the Small Business Association of New England. Other small business organizations from all over the country expressed themselves in the same manner, because they all knew that destroying the independent status of the small business agency would destroy the ability of that agency to do anything helpful for small business.

"As chairman of the Small Business Committee for three years", Senator Sparkman wrote to you, "I have found you always on the side of the small business man. You have been a fine and faithful member of the Small Business Committee. Your upholding small business in this latest instance is simply a continuation on your part of the interest and effort you have always exerted for small business". End quote.

That's the message in Senator Sparkman's letter.

SENATOR: I appreciate that letter very deeply, for Senator Sparkman has been a long-time champion of small independent enterprise. From him such recognition of my efforts in behalf of small business really means something.

SIMS: I realize that, Senator Humphrey, and that's why I wanted to read the letter to open this interview on small business issues. Hasn't there been considerable confusion over recent votes labelled in the press as an aid to small business?

SENATOR: Yes, there is a lot of confusion, but I suspect much of it has been rather deliberately created. You know, legislative maneuvers can often be misleading; sometimes they are purposefully so. And partisan critics are quick to seize upon an issue where a defeated bill has the outward appearance of being for one purpose, but would have done something entirely different when you get down to the fine print.

When the Senate passes a bill and the House passes a slightly different version, it has to go to what we call "Conference" to work out the differences -- all it means is that a committee from each side of the Congress meets together to try and reconcile the two bills. But when such a Conference report comes back to us in the Senate for approval, we have to take it or leave it as is -- there can be no amendments. Sometimes people try to take advantage of that fact in slipping through an amendment in Conference that wouldn't be possible in the orderly legislative process of committee hearings and careful examination of new legislation.

SIMS: Is that what happened in the case of this so-called small business amendment to the Controls Bill, or extended Defense Production Act?

SENATOR: That's right -- when the extension of the Defense Production Act came back to us from conference for final approval, a Big Business-sponsored amendment had been "tacked on", under the guise of aiding

small business. Actually, it would have done just the opposite. You know, I was one of the original sponsors of the Smaller Defense Plants Administration. It started from scratch and has been operating only a short time. However, it has done a remarkable job in helping small business in this country due to the fact that it has been an independent agency responsive to the President, and reporting to him without the intervention of any Department head or the necessity of going through any other office. The proposal that came to us out of conference would have destroyed that independent status of aid to small business, and would have crippled severely the effort of any man trying to administer the agency in behalf of small business. I voted against it. The majority of the Senate joined me in defeating the misleading amendment, as the spokesmen for all major small business organizations had urged us to do.

SIMMS: Yet because you voted against a measure that would have really been harmful to small business interest, Senator Humphrey, I have noticed newspaper dispatches quoting some of your opponents as saying your vote showed you were "against" small business.

SENATOR: That's right -- but you can blame such attempts at distortion on over-zealous partisan critics who know very little about the real issues involved. I don't think people are so easily fooled. The National Federation of Independent Business, which has the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States,

wrote me after that vote and said, "We are pleased to note that you gave serious consideration to my recommendation, and voted 'No'."

I'd certainly rather have the approval of such groups sincerely working for protection of small business, than the dubious blessing of any over-eager and rabid partisan so obviously trying to play reckless politics with a very vital issue. You know, I think some of these seasoned political critics, grasping for a straw, have really stuck their necks out on this issue -- their charges will backfire. By attacking my vote, they are themselves turning against small business. They are attacking all the small business organizations that concurred in my position, and aligning themselves instead with the political plot of Big Business interests to gain domination over any government agency supposedly created to aid small business.

SIRMS: Senator Humphrey, hasn't partisan politics been kept pretty well out of small business issues in the past?

SENATOR: Yes, it has, and I really regret that an attempt has been made to stir up a purely partisan fight over small business in Minnesota. I suppose to some people anything is "fair game" for political attack, but I think small business is too important to our entire economy to be kicked around like a political football. We on the Small Business Committee have always endeavored to approach small business problems without partisanship; many of my own measures to aid small business have been joined by Republicans as co-sponsors. But I think anyone is

COPY
barking up the wrong political tree now to try and convince the public I've turned my back on small business. My record and my views in regard to preserving and strengthening small, independent business enterprise should be too clear to be misunderstood by anyone.

SINMS: Senator, you do have a long record of accomplishments for small business. Didn't you lead the fight for the Fair Trade Bill? And what about some of your other efforts for small business?

SENATOR: I not only led the fight for the Fair Trade Bill, but I believe I can honestly say that I had a great deal to do with convincing President Truman to sign that bill. Then of course I also obtained establishment of a Subcommittee on Fair Trade Practices within our Senate Committee on Small Business. I've always tried to be a consistent and active friend of independent enterprise, because I believe it is essential to our economy. I've worked for strengthening the Robinson-Patman Act, strengthening the Federal Trade Commission to properly enforce the Clayton Act, strengthening the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, and supported small business loan activities of RFC.

I mentioned earlier being co-sponsor of legislation creating the Small Defense Plants Administration.

SIMMS: Yes, Senator, but I know of one more you overlooked -- I know that you were the sponsor of and was successful in having the Congress adopt an amendment which established an Assistant to the Secretary of Defense in charge of small business contracts. I understand that office has been of great assistance to the smaller industries in the Defense Department's relationships with industry.

SENATOR: That's right, but I could name many more ways I've tried to help small business. I was one of those who led the fight against the Basing Point Bill, and I was co-sponsor of a section in the Defense Production Act which made available extra loan funds for small business defense plants and taconite development. I was the originator of the so-called small business-government conferences which were held throughout the United States, one of the first being at the Nicollet Hotel in Minneapolis. But I think above all else, I've worked hardest at trying to improve the tax treatment of small business.

SIMMS: That's right -- aren't you a member of the Small Business Subcommittee that has just released a report on Tax Problems of Small Business?

SENATOR: Yes, I am. After a two-year study on the impact of Federal taxation on small firms, I'm convinced that the best hope of aiding small business is through tax changes aimed at allowing a successful, growing business in the small or medium size bracket to become an

effective competitor to his larger rivals. Our subcommittee's findings and recommendations are now available for anyone interested. Just write me and ask for a copy of Tax Problems of Small Business. Very briefly, we recommended tax changes to help small business on depreciation allowances, profit accumulations, surtax exemptions, and inheritance and estate taxes. If the excess profits tax is continued, as President Eisenhower has asked, our Report calls for exemption of firms earning under \$100,000. It appears to have strong support.

SIMS: Senator, it's easy to see that you have a particular interest and concern for strengthening the role of small business in our economy.

SENATOR: After all, I should -- I'm a former small businessman myself, and I'm still a partner in a drugstore. So I know how very real and how very pressing some of the perplexing problems of the small business firm can be today. And as long as I am in the Senate, you'll find that I stay on the side of small business.

SIMS: Thank you, Senator Humphrey ... You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you his weekly report on events in the nation's capital. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer ...

COPY

(Program No.26)

The important role of small business in the American economy will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Radio Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(Day and time)

Senator Humphrey, member of the Senate's Small Business Committee, will be interviewed on his efforts to preserve and strengthen independent business enterprise. As a member of the subcommittee that has just concluded a two-year study on the impact of federal taxation on small business, Senator Humphrey will also report on tax changes that have been recommended to encourage and protect independent enterprise from being ~~swallowed up~~ "swallowed up" by larger corporate competitors.

Recent "Big Business" efforts to scuttle small business aid in Congress behind the cloak of extending it will also be explained by Senator Humphrey. The broadcast will be another in his weekly series of transcribed reports from the nation's capital, presented as a public service over Station _____.

(For Week of July 27)

SIMS: REPORT 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.

Today Senator Humphrey will turn the tables, and interview a special guest instead of being interviewed himself as usual. The guest is Mr. Harkness, director of 4-H Club work in Minnesota. Senator Humphrey and Mr. Harkness will discuss the importance of 4-H Club activity among rural youth. Here is Senator Humphrey.....

SENATOR: I'm certainly very pleased at the opportunity of having Mr. Harkness as my guest on this program, while he and his wife and daughters are visiting in Washington. You know, Mr. Harkness, I have always been greatly impressed with the work done among rural boys and girls by the 4-H Club movement, and I am glad to have this chance to find out more about it. After all, our youth is our greatest hope for the future; the character we build in boys and girls today is going to determine the kind of a world that exists tomorrow. And I'm sure you'll agree that 4-H has been a great character-building influence in rural America. I'd like to have you tell us some highlights of your activities in Minnesota, Mr. Harkness.....

(The main body of program to be ad lib discussion. Here are a few suggested questions:)

COPY²

What can you tell me about the International Farm Youth Exchange, under which 4-H Club youths from our country are sent to other countries, and boys and girls of other lands are given a chance to see American farm life each summer? Haven't we some of these young visitors from other lands in Minnesota now?

Do I understand that you have a similar exchange plan of acquainting young men and women with different areas of our own country, and different types of agriculture, by boys and girls "trading" visits between states?

Ideas to touch on:

Family farm -- rural living as way of life

New generation of farm youth learning to broaden outlook, see beyond neighbor's fencerow.

Tribute to men and women who serve voluntarily as club leaders -- no greater service than helping to guide youth.

Youth our most important commodity -- we should be more concerned about seeing that it gets every opportunity to develop and thrive.

At two minutes to go--

SIMS: Senator Humphrey and Mr. Harkness, I'm sorry to interrupt such an interesting and informative discussion, but time is running out and I understand, Senator, you want to tell our listeners about winding up this current series of programs.

COPY

SENATOR: That's right, I do -- but first of all I want to again thank Mr. Harkness for being with me and contributing so much to this enjoyable discussion. I'm sure all of us are proud of the work being done in 4-H, and we certainly owe a great deal of thanks to you, Mr. Harkness, for your excellent leadership in Minnesota.

Now, about these radio reports from Washington....

You know we are adjourning the first half of the present session of Congress. It doesn't mean a Senator's work stops, but it does mean I will have more chance to get out among you in Minnesota rather than have to stay buried under the heavy tensions of work in Washington. I'm certainly looking forward to getting home for a while.

I've enjoyed these weekly programs, through which I have sincerely tried to keep the folks at home informed on current issues in the capital, and my views concerning them. I've tried to be fair and factual. I hope you have enjoyed hearing our discussions from time to time. I appreciate very much the cooperation of this radio station in presenting the transcribed broadcasts, as a public service. If you like hearing regularly from your Senator in Washington, perhaps you too might want to drop a line thanking this station for performing this public service.

With this program, I am ending the current weekly series. Perhaps I will have a special program from time to time during the recess, if matters of public interest develop that I think you should know about. However, I hope to renew these weekly reports to you when Congress again convenes -- if you want them, and if the splendid cooperation I have received from this and other radio stations continues. Why not let me know -- and the station know -- if you want these discussion renewed?

COPY

Goodbye, and God bless you -- until we meet again'.

SEMS: You have been listening to Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, bringing you the last in the current series of his weekly reports on events in the nation's capital. This is Washington, returning you to your station announcer.

###

COPY

(Program No.27)

Minnesota's 4-H Clubs and the important role they occupy in training rural youth will be discussed by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) over Radio Station _____ on _____ at _____.
(day and time)

Senator Humphrey's special guest on the broadcast will be Mr. _____ Harkness, state director of 4-H work in Minnesota.

During the program on Minnesota 4-H activities, Senator Humphrey and Mr. Harkness will also discuss the International Farm Youth Exchange, under which American boys and girls have been "trading" summer visits with boys and girls from other countries, so each may learn more about how farm people live and work in the other's home land.

The broadcast will conclude the current weekly series during which Senator Humphrey has been reporting to people of Minnesota on happenings in the nation's capital. Senator Humphrey is ending the regular broadcasts because of adjournment of Congress, but hopes to resume his air wave reports when Congress again convenes. The programs have been carried regularly over Radio Station _____ as a public service, in the interest of keeping Minnesota citizens informed.



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