

Film Documentary

Title Strip:

COPY

Your Senator Works for YOU

\*\*\*\*\*

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey's

FIGHT FOR THE PEOPLE

Film: (Exterior capital scenes.)

VOICE: It was almost 6 years ago that we the people of Minnesota sent Hubert H. Humphrey to the United States Senate. We wanted Hubert H. Humphrey, because his chief interest was the prosperity of the people of Minnesota . . . of all the people. These past 6 years we have seen Senator Humphrey fight on the side of the worker, the farmer, the small businessman. These were the only "special interests" Senator Humphrey protected.

In the past several months, Senator Humphrey has come into thousands of Minnesota homes through the medium of television to tell us of the actions and the positions he has taken on issues that affect all of us. Senator Humphrey wanted to put this on the record, so Minnesota would know exactly where their Senator stood. Now is the time for us to look to the past so that we may judge for the future.

There will be some people who gain tremendous benefits from the new tax law. These are the people who can claim depletion allowances on oil wells, or can engage in corporation spin-offs and the like. Unfortunately, this doesn't apply to many of us. What was Senator Humphrey's position when the new tax bill was first proposed?

COPY

SENATOR: TV SHORT "TAXES"

Film: Chart, graphs? (Long) (Douglas)

VOICE: Though Senator Humphrey voted twice for increased personal exemptions, no such measure was included in the final tax bill. However, some of Senator Humphrey's proposals ... including tax relief for working mothers and parents of students working their way through college, and the elimination of admission taxes for amateur and semi-professional baseball games ... did introduce a note of fairness into the bill. Senator Humphrey was also a leader in the fight for the elimination of excise taxes which had removed many items beyond the means of lower and middle income groups.

SENATOR: "EXCISE TAXES" (About 1½ minutes.)

Film: Hoover Committee citation.

VOICE: But there are two sides to this tax coin. One side we have already seen. That is, how is the government going to raise the money? The other side of the coin is, how is the government going to spend the money? Senator Humphrey has been a champion of economy in government. For the vigorous support he has given to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, which have already saved the government \$4 billion, he received a citation from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. But Senator Humphrey does not believe in the kind of false economy which advocates cutting school lunches --- which wants to put a "cut-rate" price tag on nutrition for our school children.

SENATOR: "SCHOOL LUNCH" (2:45 minutes.)

Film: Farm scenes.

VOICE: Minnesota is a great farm state. To a large extent the prosperity of all of us depends on the success of Minnesota agriculture. And the same is true of the whole nation. When farm incomes are at a decent level, our farm families can buy the merchandize that our merchants sell and our workers produce. This means more jobs and a better way of life for all of us. In an effort to stabilize farm income at a high level, Senator Humphrey has consistently fought for price supports for Minnesota's agriculture. Some people have criticized this policy. But what is the actual cost to the taxpayer for farm prosperity?

SENATOR: "LET THE FACTS SPEAK" (about 2 minutes.)

Film: H-Bomb scenes.

VOICE: Not long ago Senator Humphrey was given a post on the important Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Humphrey was glad to accept this position for today our foreign policy affects all of us. We need the vision, courage, and faith of a man like Hubert H. Humphrey, in an age when weapons of mass destruction threaten us all.

SENATOR: "H-BOMB FACTS" (4:20 minutes.)

Film: Refugees?

VOICE: Senator Humphrey's was the voice of faith, whose Easter message last April was a plea that we extend the helping hand of the Good Samaritan to refugees seeking haven in our land.

SENATOR: "WHERE'S OUR HEART?" (2:20 minutes.)

Film: Any foreign scenes ...?

VOICE: Senator Humphrey has recognized that one of the most powerful weapons in our arsenal of democracy is faith and understanding ...

# COPY

But if they are to be used effectively against the international menace of Communism, they must not be "secret weapons." The principles of the American way of life must be spread to the teeming millions of the world, so that they may understand that there is a better alternative to Red totalitarianism. That is why Senator Humphrey issued a warning to the nation to stop the wrecking of our Educational Exchange Program.

SENATOR: "EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE" (3:40 minutes).

Film: Any chance of "borrowing" Indo-China or Geneva newsreel clips?

VOICE: Before the tragic events in Indo-China had unfolded, Senator Humphrey foresaw the consequence of our indecisive policy in Southeast Asia. Many weeks ago, Senator Humphrey proposed a policy to forestall the Indo-China debacle.

SENATOR: "INDO-CHINA" (4:20 minutes.)

Film: McCarthy hearing film?

VOICE: But while it is important to stem the tide of foreign Communism, it is equally vital that we preserve our democratic way of life at home. It was his concern for this that prompted Senator Humphrey to propose a Code of Fair Procedures for all Congressional committees, aimed at halting the abuses of investigating authority without crippling the effectiveness of Congress at its work.

SENATOR: "FAIR PLAY CODE" (2 minutes.)

Film: Industrial scenes, construction.

# COPY

VOICE: The Communist text books predict the "inevitable collapse" of the American economy. They count on a recurrence of the awful depressions of the 1930's to sap our strength. Senator Humphrey believes that America will continue to be strong and grow stronger still, if we are alert to the danger signs of economic recession and do something about it. He believes that there is no reason, in this richest country of the world, for men who want jobs to be without them or for any of our citizens to be short of the fundamental necessities of life.

SENATOR: "COMBATTING RECESSION" (5 minutes)

Film: Hospitals, housing.

VOICE: Yes, Senator Humphrey believes that America's resources should be used to give our citizens a better way of life -- to help relieve them of the scourge of disease, to help them obtain decent homes for their families. Senator Humphrey has fought against those who would deny the American people their full share of our national abundance.

SENATOR: "GROUP HEALTH INSTITUTE TALK" (must be filmed) TV Short into "PUBLIC HOUSING" (2:24 minutes.)

Film: Shipping, Docks.

VOICE: Not only must America provide for the needs of today, but we must build for a greater tomorrow. The St. Lawrence Seaway, which promises so many benefits for Minnesota's future and for which Senator Humphrey battled so long, is a step in this direction. But if Minnesota is to enjoy the full fruits of this great new Seaway, much still remains to be done. It has been Senator Humphrey who has pushed forward the completion of this task.



# COPY

SENATOR: "ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY" (2:10 minutes)

VOICE: You have just heard and seen part of the record of Minnesota's Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. It is a record that is marked on every page with the best interests of the people of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey has stood for you. Now is the time for you to stand behind Senator Humphrey.

HEALTH LEGISLATION BEFORE THE CONGRESS

COPY

As in previous years, I would like to take this opportunity to briefly discuss a subject which always is of interest to you. The type and the status of health legislation which is currently before the Congress. However, before taking up specific bills it would perhaps be better if we referred at least briefly to the Administration's health program. As you know, the President sent a special message to the Congress on January 18 setting forth his views as to what should be done to carry out the Federal government's responsibilities in the field of health and medical care. For the most part the President's health message was a reassuring document. Our Republican President admitted the need for Federal action. He wholeheartedly endorsed the Hill-Burton hospital construction program begun under Democratic Administrations and, in fact, he recommended that it should be expanded to provide for the addition of new types of facilities. The President pointed out, and I am sure that we can all agree, that there are a great many non-acute illnesses

COPY

specifically those affecting elderly people which require continued care but which do not necessitate regular hospital facilities. Consequently he recommended that the hospital construction act should be expanded to include provisions for nursing and convalescent homes and -- as I myself have been urging for years -- inclusion of rehabilitation centers in connection with both general and mental hospitals. This is all to the good as was the President's reiteration of the need for further and more intensified research into the cause and cures of disease and for some action on the problem of meeting the costs of medical care. I was disappointed, as I am sure those of you who read the President's health message were at the lack of reference to any action which would increase numbers of physicians, dentists and nurses we so badly need. Nonetheless, most of us in the Congress who have been concerned with health legislation were pleased by the President's announcement.



As we well know, however, there is often a great gulf between what a President says should be done and what his administration plans on doing. In this particular instance, it would appear as though the fine things proposed by the President have been disposed of by the President's Bureau of the Budget. For when the President's budget was submitted to the Congress we found that instead of increased research on cancer, heart disease, arthritis and all those other afflictions which are causing millions to suffer and costing our nation millions of dollars in productivity loss, in fact research funds were sharply cut. Moreover, funds for the control of the communicable diseases are less than in the past and tuberculosis funds were cut by 42 percent. We find, too, that whereas the President's health message had called for expansion of hospital construction program, in the budget funds for the going construction program have been cut down to one-third in the amount authorized in the Act -- the lowest figure in the history of the program. We find, too, that whereas the Presidential

health message had spoken in glowing terms increasing by 40,000 a year the number of disabled Americans restored to gainful employment through an expanded rehabilitation program, in his budget he has slashed the funds for rehabilitation by almost \$4 million. These are contradictions which I cannot pretend to explain to you. But no matter what the President may say in his message, and no matter what the Bureau of the Budget may recommend, as you well know, what is actually done in the field of Federal health activity depends primarily on Congressional committees, on the actions of Congressional committees, on those House and Senate committees which draft health legislation and on the appropriations committees which finally determine in large measure just how much money will be available for whatever programs the Congress approves.

Turning our attention now to the legislative committees of the Congress, I am happy to report to you one new and I think important development. In past years, as you know, most of our health legislation originated in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was

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

find much in it that is of interest.

COPY

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

One of these, Congressman Wolverton's bill, H.R. 7700, represents what I think you will find an interesting proposal put forth by Mr. Henry Kaiser with respect to the financing of local hospitals. It could, of course, apply to the financing of group health facilities such as clinics and diagnostic centers as well. In brief, Mr. Kaiser contends this his successful group prepayment medical care plans came into being only because he was personally able to underwrite the costs

COPY

of hospital construction. He maintains that adequate facilities are one essential ingredient in any successful plan, but that it is almost impossible for the ordinary group of doctors or group of patients who want to start a program to secure financing for those facilities. He contends further that his operations have proved that a good group pre-payment program offering comprehensive medical services and provided with adequate facilities can pay for those facilities in full in a very short period of time. He points out that whereas in most communities the hospital is always a losing concern in those communities, where the Kaiser program has been in operation the hospitals not only pay for themselves in short order but provide funds for the extension of further services. Therefore, Mr. Kaiser has proposed and the Wolverton bill suggests that the Federal government should reinsure local lending agencies which are willing to advance funds for the building of hospital and related facilities to prepaid comprehensive

group plans. Much the same as the FHA insured private real estate loans, he would have the government guarantee loans extended to pre-payment groups by local financing agencies. This, I think you will agree, is a most interesting suggestion and one that we should certainly study with care. I would like your recommendations on it before it comes before us in the Senate.

A second Wolverton bill, H.R. 6950, will also be of interest to you. In effect, it is almost the same as the bills which I introduced in earlier Congresses at the suggestion of our cooperative health associations. It is a bill to provide long-term low interest loans for the construction and equipping of health service facilities for nonprofit health associations. It is broader in its terms than was our original co-op bill, but it is essentially sound. Because I believe Mr. Wolverton really intends to push his measure and, therefore, it stands a good chance of passage in the House, I have asked our co-op friends to review that bill for me and to make such changes in it as



are in accordance with sound cooperative principles. When that is done, I intend to introduce a companion bill in the Senate. I expect that will be done within the next week or so.

Turning now from the House to the Senate, I have to report that there has been as yet little been on the part of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the health field. I am advised, however, that the subcommittee definitely plans to begin hearings on health legislation on March 15. At that time it will take up first the Administration's bill to extend the hospital construction program in accordance with the suggestions in the President's message to which I referred above.

As far as I can see, most of the groups concerned with hospital activities are in favor of this proposal. There are objections being made by individual proprietors of nursing and convalescent homes, I understand. They will, of course, be given an opportunity to appear at those hearings and we shall then be in a better position to evaluate their objections. 1

After those hearings, the subcommittee intends to take up the President's recommendations for changing the system whereby grants-in-aid are made to the states for local public health activities. In the past the Congress in making those grants has ordinarily stipulated the amounts or percentages which would be allocated to a specific local public health activity such as tuberculosis control or cancer screening programs. The President's new proposal would change that system so as to give the states greater leeway in deciding how much of the total federal grant they receive should be spent on one or another activity. Insofar as particular disease problems are not equally important in each of the states, on its face this looks like a good proposal. I am a little bit worried, however, about one intangible but important factor in this proposal.

I am afraid that even though this is not intended it may actually result in lower and lower appropriations for those public health activities. I remember a few years back when the Public Health Service appearing before the appropriations committees said that it needed more

COPY

money for general public health work in the states and that in order to get it it was willing to take a slight cut in the amounts granted for work in venereal disease, TB-control and a few other categories of public health assistance. The result was that the committee gleefully made the recommended cuts in the specific categories and when it came to general public health refused to appropriate anything at all. This is simply that well-known devil, human nature, at work again.

If you ask the people if they are against tuberculosis, if they are against heart disease, and if they are willing to spend money to fight those things they invariably say yes. But when you fail to mention those specific diseases and just talk about health in general, you get no such reaction.

It is the old problem that the preacher has before him constantly. Somehow he finds it extremely hard to get the congregation worked up over his description of heaven, but just let him start talking about fire and brimstone and all the special horrors which may be visited upon the congregation which is unfortunate enough to fall into the clutches of

the devil and he gets an immediate and powerful reaction. I am a little bit afraid that this may be what the new approach to public health appropriations will face. Whereas we have been getting dollars to fight against specific devils, I am afraid we will get pennies if we are only talking about heaven.

In closing, let me say that I realize that I have given you nothing very definite in these remarks. No one could. I think I have mentioned the most important things that are being considered and I know that you know where I stand with respect to those things.

I will, of course, be keeping you advised as to the progress of any of these measures and I know that the people of Minnesota and the various health associations to which they belong will very much want to attend the hearings which will be held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on these particular measures. Of course, I will be there with them.

Now, let me mention a final item. The one measure which presumably will come before the Congress and which may have the most profound effect on the overall problem of how to finance the costs of medical care. As you know, the Administration has said it will send us a proposal whereby voluntary health insurance plans which are willing to take on the risks incident to broadening their limited services -- which are willing to cover catastrophic diseases -- which are willing to convert limited plans to comprehensive ones may be reinsured against these unknown risks by the Federal government. Frankly, there isn't much that I can tell you about this proposal because aside from saying that it would be limited and experimental, the Administration has not as yet told us what it has in mind. It has repeatedly promised to send down a bill that up to the day I left Washington it had as yet not done so. I think anyone who has studied the problem at all can see why. This is a most complex and involved problem and my opinion is that the Administration perhaps spoke too soon and has since been unable to work out a proposal

satisfactory even to itself. When and if it does send such a bill we will have to examine it with great care.

In effect, it is being proposed that the taxpayer's money shall be used to reinsure private health insurance concerns. Certain questions are immediately apparent. Will the Administration propose to use the taxpayer's money to reinsure profit-making as well as non-profit-making health concerns? Apparently this was their original intent. If this is true, should the taxpayer's money be used to reinsure a health insurance plan that spends 60% of the consumer's dollar for overhead and advertising and profits and only 40% on medical care, or will the Federal reinsurance be limited to concerns which use not more than five or ten or 15 percent on overhead? What will the government do about a health insurance plan which instead of guaranteeing services only guarantees fees? Suppose the plan is sound and is operating satisfactorily even after it expands those services to include catastrophic illnesses. But suppose the men



in charge of the plan double the fees to be paid, thereby rendering the plan unsound unless Federal funds are thrown into the pot? Obviously,

the Administration could not make such a proposal and it would have

to have some plan for controlling fees. If so, what types of control?

Who is going to do the controlling, and will those controls be acceptable to both the doctors and the patients involved?

These are just a few of the hundreds of really important questions which will have to be answered before we can even consider a reinsurance program. It is because of these questions looming so large in the minds of people acquainted with the subject that we have been awaiting the Administration's bill. I hope it will be sent to us in the very immediate future because whatever form this measure takes it certainly is going to require long and extended study before we can act on it intelligently. In making that study I shall most certainly need and ask for your help.

11/54

COPY  
Greetings  
by  
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey  
to  
Roosevelt Birthday Dinner  
Los Angeles  
(Two-three Minute Recording)

It's a real pleasure to extend my warmest greetings to Los Angeles Democrats gathered together for a dinner honoring the memory of our greatest of all Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I only wish I could be there in person with Dore Schary and the rest of you.

It is particularly fitting that your birthday gathering is dedicated to aiding a cause that was close to President Roosevelt's heart -- the March of Dimes, to combat infantile paralysis. The great progress we have made in fighting polio in recent years is just one more of the many living, lasting memorials to the inspiring humanitarian leadership of President Roosevelt.

The ideals which he exemplified, and through which he breathed new life into our faltering democracy at a grave time in our history, still shine bright today, despite the outcome of the last Presidential election.

Every Democrat can take pride in the fact that even the new Republican administration, facing reality after years of irresponsibility, is at long last embracing much of the humanitarian philosophy that President Roosevelt brought into our political scene. President Eisenhower's recent social security message is one outstanding example.

# COPY

As a matter of fact, after 20 years of criticizing from the outside and a full year of study from the inside, the Republican program as outlined by the President doesn't call for repeal of a single Democratic measure enacted in the last two decades. Instead, it calls for carrying forward the same foreign policy unchanged, joins the Democrats in approval of public housing, and asks extension and improvement of unemployment insurance and social security coverage and benefits. Furthermore, it proposes enactment of health programs recommended by President Truman's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation. I'm glad that at least the Republicans know where to look for a sound program; they've never initiated any of their own.

There are serious trouble signs on the horizon. Employment is down, farm prices have skidded. But government policy can correct these situations. If we have the will, we can have the results.

America must go forward. Tremendous opportunities still lie ahead. We need more new homes, new schools, new jobs for our greatly increased population. We need to keep our economy expanding, and to permit all to share in the higher living standards that can result. We can and must continue our amazing progress. We cannot turn back.

Every Democrat can share in keeping America on that progressive road, by helping provide the country with leadership that inspires confidence -- leadership that cares what happens to the American people.

I hope California Democrats accept that challenge, not only for their own state but for the contribution their influence can make in our national political life.

1/19/54

# COPY

It is with a source of profound regret that I must speak to you tonight through a recording and not in person. It was my hope that I could personally be with you and express my appreciation to the Jewish Community of Baltimore for your kind thoughts and words.

I have taken the liberty of asking my very good personal friend and associate, Congressman Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota, to give you a message of greeting in more detail and to express to you our mutual feelings about the vital issues of immigration and human rights which we all share in this audience tonight. Gene McCarthy is one of the ablest members of Congress. We of Minnesota are proud of our McCarthy, and we are pleased to share him with Baltimore this evening. I know you will agree with me after listening to him that he represents in his person and in his ideals the finest embodiment of the democratic creed in America. I know that you will agree with me that we need more Eugene McCarthys in the Congress!

My purpose in speaking to you this evening, however, is not just to express my appreciation or to introduce my Minnesota associate. It is rather to add my sincere and heartfelt tribute to my distinguished colleague, to my revered friend and to a great American, Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

# COPY

There is no hesitation in my mind at all when I say to you that Senator Lehman stands today as the voice of America's conscience. He embodies the principle of "government with a heart".

Senator Lehman's leadership in the field of immigration legislation has succeeded in convincing the mind and heart of humanitarian America that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is an abomination which must be repealed. His youthful energy and zeal are the envy of many men in the Congress who are years his junior. I consider myself fortunate in having the privilege of serving beside him. I know that you join me in saying that America is fortunate in having him in the United States Senate today.

My greetings and best wishes to you for a grand evening.

1/19/54

I'm convinced it's time for Congress to provide tax

relief for middle income and low income families. I've

introduced new bills for that purpose today.

During previous tax debates it was always my position that our national government's budget must be balanced. At a time of high defense spending, inflationary pressures, and greater demand for consumer goods than supply, it is essential that we do everything possible to balance the budget and preserve our economy. With the growing signs of recession, however, the desire to balance the budget must be coupled with the equally vital national good of stimulating consumer purchasing power.

That is why, even as we ~~strenuously~~ <sup>strenuously</sup> continue our efforts to balance the budget, we must introduce tax reduction devices to help the middle and low income families of America, and to help the small businessmen, farmers and workers.



COPY  
We appear to be in the midst of a mild economic recession.

It is my fervent hope and prayer, of course, that this recession will not deepen into a depression. One way we can prevent the catastrophe of a depression is to stimulate purchasing power in the consumer group of our society.

The middle income and low income families of America are the great consumers of America. Our tax legislation should be designed, therefore, to provide benefits to these groups, thus increasing their real income and allowing them to spend more in the market place.

My tax program is designed to achieve that objective. I have introduced legislation today to increase the personal income tax exemption of the American taxpayer from \$600 to \$800. I have also introduced a bill to permit the deduction from gross income of education expenses incurred by a taxpayer in providing for his children an education above the secondary level.

COPY

It will make it possible for our young men and women who work their way through college to earn the necessary funds without depriving their parents of their status as dependents.

Last year, during the first half of the 83rd Congress, I introduced the first of the bills designed to provide tax relief to the needy in the form of a proposal to allow working mothers to deduct as legitimate business expenses the amounts that they pay to take care of their children while they are at work helping to provide for their families. I am delighted that the House Ways and Means Committee has seen fit to accept this proposal.

The House Ways and Means Committee is today studying an over-all revision of our Internal Revenue Code. I welcome that revision. It is long overdue. I serve notice, however, that I will not be a party to any revision which perpetuates inequities, widens tax loophole and otherwise benefits high income groups at the expense of middle and low income groups.

COPY  
During the 81st Congress and during the 82nd Congress,

I proposed to the Senate a tax loophole closing program designed to raise more than \$4 billion in taxes without adding any additional burden on the bulk of American taxpayers -- but simply by removing inequities. I urge the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to give my proposals serious consideration, for I shall once again want to bring them to the attention of the Senate. Such a tax loophole closing program could help balance the budget at the same time as we provide tax reductions for most of the American people.

There is one other method by which we can reduce the burden on the American taxpayer. We should aim at eliminating excise taxes which are an unfair burden on the consumer, place the merchants in the undesirable position of being tax collector, and violate the wholesome, democratic tax principle that taxes should be levied on the ability to pay. In my judgment, we can eliminate excise taxes and raise the personal income tax

COPY  
exemption if we act courageously to eliminate tax loopholes  
and remove tax inequities.



# 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](http://www.mnhs.org)