

COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Thursday, June 16, 1949  
10:30-11:00 P.M.

BANCROFT: Senator Humphry, is there any chance of outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?

SHADEL: What about the chances for the rest of the Truman Program?

LEWIS: And Senator Humphrey, in your opinion is the country headed for a depression?

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM, from the nation's capital CBS brings you another informal interview with a member of Congress. Tonight's guest is Senator Hubert H. Humphry, Democrat-Farmer-Laborite from Minnesota, who will meet with CBS correspondents Griffing Bancroft, Bill Shadel and Robert Lewis. First we hear from Mr. Bancroft:

BANCROFT: Senator Humphry, we're glad to have you with us on CAPITOL CLOAKROOM. In your 38 years, you've been and done a lot of things: a pharmacist, a professor of Political Science, even a radio news commentator, then mayor of Minneapolis and now U.S. Senator. But as a member of the Labor Committee and a leader in the current labor fight, let's start with that first question, do you really think there's any chance of outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act?

HUMPHRY: Well, to be quite frank with you, Mr. Bancroft, I think that the odds are somewhat against outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. I wish that they weren't. I say that as one member of the Fair Deal Democrat Party, we're committed to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and we're doing everything in our power to fulfill that pledge. ~~I suppose one could rationalize by saying that the bill that is before the Senate, the Thomas bill, is predicated upon the assumption that there is repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. However, there is of course a determined effort to so amend~~

the ~~Thomas bill by the amendments of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, and some of his colleagues so as to make it a hash of the Taft-Hartley Act.~~

BANCROFT: Well what about those three amendments you adopted down there on the floor this afternoon?

HUMPHRY: The three amendments that were adopted on the floor this afternoon are all amendments within the spirit and philosophy of the Thomas bill. That was pointed out very definitely by the chairman of the committee, Mr. Thomas, who while he did not join in submitting those amendments, did say in his presentation of the Thomas bill that ~~they~~ amendments which were being offered by some of the members of the Labor committee, <sup>including myself</sup> ~~using one of these members,~~ ~~there are others on the committee---that those amendments were within the spirit of the Thomas bill and they are strengthening amendments. They are a clarification amendments and we feel that they should bring some extra support to the Thomas bill.~~

BANCROFT: Well Senator, just to get the record straight here, the Thomas bill is for outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley.?

HUMPHRY: That is correct.

BANCROFT: Go back to the Wagner Act.

HUMPHRY: The Thomas bill <sup>does</sup> ~~is~~ outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act ~~with~~ <sup>and goes back to</sup> going back to the Wagner Act, with ~~some~~ amendments. For example, amendments which outlaw certain unjustifiable secondary boycotts, <sup>prohibit</sup> ~~amendments which~~ outlaw jurisdictional disputes, <sup>provides for procedures to handle disputes of a</sup> ~~also a section in the Thomas bill dealing~~ with national emergency <sup>nature.</sup>

SHADEL: So that when you talk of the Thomas bill that's what you're talking about?

HUMPHRY: Yes, ~~we are talking---when we talk of the Thomas bill---we mean going back to the law of 1935, Wagner Act, with these three additions that I mentioned to you: the outlawing of unjustifiable secondary boycotts, the outlawing of jurisdictional disputes and one very important provision on dealing with national emergencies which result from a labor work stoppage.~~

6/16/49

-3-

LEWIS: But Senator, you've added three--you this afternoon added three other provisions to the Taft-Hartley Act--or to the Thomas bill I should say.

HUMPHRY: That is correct.

LEWIS: And the one to compel unions to bargain collectively, as I understood Senator Taft claim, that that came right out of the Taft-Hartley Act.

HUMPHRY: *Well...*  
~~You don't~~-----

LEWIS: You don't agree with that?

HUMPHRY: ~~Well, of course, may I say that while there is language in the Taft-Hartley bill that compels unions to bargain collectively, we pointed out on the floor of the Senate in debate this afternoon--I think it was Senator Thomas that pointed out as well--that the Taft-Hartley Act not only compels unions to bargain collectively but tells them how they shall bargain. Now we do not <sup>tell the parties</sup> ~~put~~ how they shall bargain into the law. We leave the bargaining process up to labor and up to management. May I say in reference to that amendment, I think it's a very important one. ~~I was for it in committee as well as being for it now because the whole philosophy behind the Thomas bill is free collective bargaining. Now, when the Wagner Act was written in 1935, collective bargaining was the unusual thing, not the regular sort of thing. The purpose of labor unions is to engage in collective bargaining. And of course the very life of union, particularly when it's growing, when it's starting to gain its first contract with the employer is to bargain. The union depends upon bargaining. However, since we have had some instances in the last five years where some union organizations, <sup>a few</sup> ~~are accused of refusing to bargain collectively and have grown so large that for all practical purposes they did not bargain. They laid down their demands and there wasn't bargaining. Now, we believe as a matter of law, we perhaps ought to say no, in collective bargaining. We're not saying around what subjects they should bargain, we're simply saying that bargaining should go on in good faith. And the philosophy of the Thomas bill--in fact the Thomas bill says--I can't read the exact section now--that it shall be the obligation and duty of~~~~~~



~~employer and employee organization to bargain collectively.~~

LEWIS: But Senator, isn't this a departure from what President Truman has wanted and campaigned on?

HUMPHRY: Not at all, because President Truman campaigned upon the idea of free collective bargaining. We're merely assuring that the bargaining will take place.

BANCROFT: But Senator, didn't President Truman say he wanted repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act period.

HUMPHRY: ~~Oh, he said he wanted repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and, as the Democratic platform says, and a body of fair and constructive labor law which is exactly what we're doing.~~ Let's get it quite clear that the Democratic platform did not only pledge repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act but it also pledged that a Democratic Congress, if elected and we did elect one, would write a fair and constructive body of labor law. <sup>Consistent with the Wagner Act</sup> Now that's exactly what we're doing. We're going back to the premises of the Wagner Act. <sup>with</sup> ~~We realize that time has necessitated some changes and clarifications, and we are now at that point where we are attempting, as we say, to place into the law the kind of provisions which will insure equitable, free, collective bargaining.~~

SHADEL: Well Senator Humphry, when you get all through on the Senate floor, do you think this bill is going to look more like the Administration bill, the Thomas bill, or ~~the~~ the Taft-Hartley Act.

BANCROFT: Well if Senator Humphry has his way it will look very much like the Thomas bill. What do you think will happen?

HUMPHRY: I say right now that it looks rather nip and tuck with the nip on the other side for the moment.

SHADEL: If this isn't the Thomas bill/<sup>on</sup> which ~~the~~ President Truman hasn't changed his stand any time in any of his press conferences, will he have to veto this? Will he take the risk of censuring or criticizing the Democratic congress?

HUMPHRY: Well, I'll say this that if the Thomas bill should be so amended, should be so adulterated as to come out for ~~example~~ with injunctions, ~~as to come out~~ with a wholesale prohibition of boycotts, ~~as to come out with the~~ national emergency provisions which maintain the injunctive power of government ~~not~~ <sup>who</sup> I will be one of those ~~that~~ will vote against that kind of a bill because that is not the Thomas bill. It will mean only that Mr. Thomas has his name on it. It will be the Taft bill, it will be the same thing as the Taft-Hartley <sup>law</sup> ~~bill~~ and I hope that the <sup>President</sup> ~~maximant~~ will veto it even if some democrats vote for it.

SHADEL: Well in other words, if the senate passes the so-called "Taft substitute," do you think that should be vetoed?

HUMPHRY: I should say so and I can assure you that a number of us who are committed to our party promises and to what we consider to be honest, fair and equitable labor management relationships, ~~that is the kind of law that~~ will ~~protect that, we~~ will vote against.

LEWIS: But this is a Democratic congress. It's not usual for a Democratic President to condemn his own party in its affairs with congress, is it?

HUMPHRY: Well I think it's quite clear that there are some differences of opinion between the President and some members in the Democratic party. I think there are definite differences on this matter of labor-management relationships and I am confident that if the bill includes those features which I have mentioned--~~let me just give you a few more--~~ suesability, for example, of unions, if it includes in the injunction powers that can be used by the government or the employer to stop disputes, if it includes the wholesale prohibition of the--of any kind of boycott, I feel that if that should pass the congress, if it should and if it does it will be very very close, that the president will veto it and he should veto it because of the obligation of his party promises, of his promises to the people, would necessitate his vote.

SHADEL: And then that leaves the Taft-Hartley Act as a campaign issue in the

election?

HUMPHRY: Well indeed it does because it will be the Taft-Hartley Act. It will just have a new title. You know as somebody once said, and I think I remarked in my speech on the floor, that a wolf may change its fur but never changes its mind. Now we may change the name you know of the Taft-Hartley Act but if we don't change the body we haven't changed the purpose or the objective.

LEWIS: You sound pretty pessimistic, Senator.

HUMPHRY: Oh, I'm not pessimistic. The fight has just begun. We've had the offensive in this fight. In fact, I think that the opposition has been a little bit disturbed because we've been on the march, ~~and I'll say right now that~~ if those who are vitally concerned <sup>with</sup> in labor-management law would <sup>read</sup> have listened to the debates, ~~if they are perfectly willing to sit down and view the arguments~~ objectively, there isn't a shadow of a doubt in my mind <sup>that they agree</sup> that we have the argument, ~~and~~ I think we've proven <sup>our case</sup> it on the floor of the Senate. We have proven conclusively when we have argued with the proponents of the Taft amendments that their amendments are not sound, that they do not promote fair ~~or let me say friendly~~ labor-management relationships, but in fact ~~that they are a failure in practice and they promote what I~~ <sup>create</sup> call chaos in industrial affairs.

BANCROFT: Well Senator Humphry, you mentioned the injunction which we gather you are opposed to. What would you do to deal with national emergency strikes?

HUMPHRY: Well I'm happy that you asked me that question because I think that that's the one big problem that's in the mind of the American people. Justifiably so, too. The American people are concerned about what they call a "national emergency" but it's a strange thing, Mr. Bancroft, that from 1935 to 1946 we never had any national emergencies in labor-management disputes. At the time when labor was organizing, at the time when there was literally a knockdown-drag-out battle between labor and management over

the organization of trade unions we never had anything that was called a national emergency.

BANCROFT: But didn't you have a Smith-Connally Act to take care of the situation?

HUMPHRY: Wait a minute. We had that during the war and the Smith-Connally Act was used, I think, just once during the war in an effort to take over a plant on the basis of seizure. I think that was the Montgomery-Ward case.

~~BANCROFT: But President Truman used it a great deal after the war.~~

~~HUMPHRY: After the war is a 1946 case. But I'm pointing out that from 1935--  
let's go from 1935 to 1941 when we got into the war.....~~

(MORE)



take over plant on the basis of seizure. I think that was the Montgomery Ward case.

BANCROFT: Well, President Truman used it a great deal, after the war.

HUMPHREY: After the war! In the 1946 case, but I'm pointing out that from 193 ... let's go to 1935 to '41, when we got into the war, during the days when labor had its uphill battle of organization, when there were pitched battles even on the streets, when Big Steel was organized, when many of the mines were organized, when the automobile industry was organized. We had all kinds of strikes, but no one called it a national emergency. Now, let's .....

LEWIS: Well, the Presidents used some powers to stop such things way back in the eighteen-seventies .....

HUMPHREY: Oh, indeed, they did! And I say that .....

LEWIS: (Both speaking-unintelligible) national emergency, but they considered that it was something to that effect.

HUMPHREY: Oh, indeed, and that's exactly what the labor movement is justifiably afraid of, that when the Presi ... when the Attorney-General or the President had the power of the injunction, they not only used it, but they used it indiscriminately and I don't think there's a sound labor specialist in America ... let's say William H. Davis, Dr. Leichener, Dr. Finesinger, of the University of Wisconsin, all of them have pointed out, as has the Federal Mediation Conciliation Service. We're not worrying now about who heads it up, under what administration, Republican or Democrat, - have all pointed out that injunctions have been a total and a complete failure in the settlement of disputes.

SHADEL: Well, Senator, is your answer to the question, then, that there is no such thing as a national emergency strike?

HUMPHREY: I'll quote what <sup>Senator Taft</sup> the distinguished Senator from Ohio said, that <sup>we</sup> had no national emergency in one hundred and fifty years. That's what he said to the Senator from Kentucky, Senator Withers, in debate the other day, <sup>that</sup> he had known of no emergency that could be termed a national emergency.

SHADEL: Well, now, your colleague, Senator Douglas, for example,



is proposing plant seizure to deal with national emergencies. You don't go along with that?

HUMPHREY: Now, let's go back just a minute, before we come to that, because I recognize that we may have to have some legislation in this field. Let's take a look at what the Taft-Hartley Act says about national emergencies. The American people have been led to believe that the Taft-Hartley Act settles national emergencies. Now, that's the biggest joke of all times! That's a bigger legend than the Paul Bunyan story out of my native State of Minnesota.

BANCROFT: You're talking about this 80-day .....

HUMPHREY: I'm talking about the so-called <sup>80-day</sup> cooling-off period where no one gets cool and everybody's off the reservation. ~~That's exactly what happened.~~ <sup>These injunction provisions were</sup> ~~It has been~~ used seven times since 1947, ~~this cooling-off period.~~ In <sup>each case</sup> ~~other words,~~ the injunction <sup>lasted</sup> ~~has been used~~ for 80 days. ~~That's the extent of it.~~ That's what the law says - no longer than 80 days. What happened? In every case the dispute was never settled, <sup>and the strikes continued</sup> ~~and the so-called "national emergency"~~ kept right on, but here we are. The country didn't break down.

BANCROFT: Well, John L. Lewis called off a strike, didn't he, when he got slapped with some fines?

HUMPHREY: Oh, John L. Lewis was slapped with some fines for contempt of court, but that was .....

BANCROFT: Under the Taft-Hartley Law!

HUMPHREY: No, not under the Taft-Hartley Act at all! It was an entirely different provision and, therefore, let's go back again. That was in 1946 and it was under the Smith-Connally Act, not under the Taft-Hartley Act, and, by the same token, may I say that there was the instance where John L. Lewis ... where the Government took over the mines, where the Government took over the mines and where John L. Lewis was held in contempt of court and he was fined on the basis of the contempt of court, but the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947 and from 1947 to 1949 the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act have been used seven times and in all seven times they have failed. None of

The strikes <sup>were</sup> ~~have been~~ settled until when? <sup>when</sup> ~~Until~~ the injunction period ~~had~~ expired; until the men sat around the table, after the injunction period, just as we're doing here tonight, and they settled their disputes in the same old way that they used to settle them years and years ago, by collective bargaining. Now, don't take my word for it. I ask anybody to look into the record and I say over this great national hook-up that the biggest fraud that has ever been pulled on the American people, and the biggest lie that's ever been pulled on the American people, is that the Taft-Hartley Act can do anything about a national emergency except to hold it off for 30 days, ~~and in every instance, where that's been done, that's just what has happened, 30 days has gone by and after the so-~~ <sup>80 days</sup> ~~called nation-is-in-an-emergency, after the 30 days, they're right on striking.~~ <sup>strikes are not prohibited after 80 days</sup> Why, in the west coast longshoremen's strike they struck 95 days and ~~(inter.)~~ <sup>80-day</sup> injunction?

LEWIS: Senator, 30 days hasn't passed yet, but let's see if we can settle this one. Will you vote for or against the Douglas-Hill amendment for plant seizure?

HUMPHREY: <sup>It is my</sup> ~~That is the~~ intention of the Senator from Minnesota, to vote for the Thomas Bill, ~~the national emergency provisions of the Thomas Bill.~~ I'll say this, that if I have to take my choice between the amendments ... and ~~this may boil down to just this,~~ <sup>if I have to take my choice between the amend-</sup> ment by ~~the Senator from Ohio,~~ <sup>For</sup> which ~~is the~~ <sup>calls for</sup> injunction, to settle national emergencies, ~~as compared to the bipartisan amendment,~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~which has not been put in~~ <sup>calling for</sup> yet, which ... I was one of those that was ... being an author of it .....

LEWIS: ~~That's the plant seizure?~~

HUMPHREY: ~~That's the plant seizure,~~ then I'll vote for the plant seizure. ~~I say if those two alternatives are placed to us,~~ <sup>to you</sup> But, very frankly, the best alternative is in the Thomas Bill. Now, why do I say that? Because that provision has worked. ~~It's worked since .....~~

(more)

... If I have to take my choice between the amendment by the Senator from Ohio, which is the injunction, to settle national emergencies as compared to the bipartisan amendment, which has not been put in yet, which I was one of those that was considering being an author of it ...

LEWIS: That's the plant seizure one?

HUMPHREY: That's the plant seizure ... then I'll vote for the plant seizure. I say if those two alternatives are placed to us. But, very frankly, the best alternative is in the Thomas Bill. Now, why do I say that? Because that provision has worked. It's worked since 1926 in the National Railway Labor Act. The exact provision which is in the Thomas Bill is what's been in the National ~~Railway~~ Railway Labor Act since 1926. And only one strike that we had that went beyond ... that necessitated anything more than what ~~was in the Thomas Bill~~ now.

SHADEL: But, Senator Humphrey, as I remember the hearings up there in the Senate Labor Committee, it seems to me that in the last resort that you people were still counting on some Presidential powers to settle any national emergency strike.

HUMPHREY: Yes, in case it happened.

SHADEL: What powers would he be called upon to use?

HUMPHREY: I'm sure that <sup>... if</sup> this country were confronted with a national <sup>where the life and welfare of the nation is at stake</sup> emergency, here's what I think the President ought to do ~~if it's a real national emergency; I mean if life and welfare of this nation is at stake,~~ I think he ought to call a special session of the Congress. ~~That's what I think he ought to do. I think that that's something that's sufficiently big; it's almost a type of civil disobedience.~~

LEWIS: You wouldn't depend on any particular Presidential power?

HUMPHREY: No, I would not. ~~And I say that we may find ourselves in a parliamentary situation. You know you can't do everything that you just want to sometimes.~~ We may find ourselves in a parliamentary situation, where the choice is between the amendment by Mr. Taft, which is the injunction, which



never has worked, which the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, pointed out this afternoon had never worked. That's compared to the seizure amendment, which may be offered by a bipartisan group, and <sup>calling for</sup> on that basis we have seizure. But that's seizure of the plant, of the profit, of the whole <sup>business</sup> industry - and I say that that's a very serious thing, <sup>to be used only on serious occasions</sup>.

SHADEL:

LEWIS: But calling Congress at that particular time, isn't that the worst possible time for Congress to consider labor legislation?

HUMPHREY: Oh well, it isn't a matter of considering labor legislation. It's a matter of dealing with a specific object. I am one of those that does not want <sup>the</sup> this term "national emergency" to be cheapened. <sup>and the funny part of</sup> it is, may I say, Mr. Shadel, that <sup>for</sup> two years <sup>we have heard much about</sup> we'd seemed to have national emergencies all at once. <sup>yet</sup> and for years and years and years we just never seemed to have any national emergencies. The <sup>about</sup> minute that you put that provision in the law, that says that you can declare something a national emergency, <sup>it is used and takes the place of collective</sup> then that's exactly what they run to, rather than trying to bargain this thing out round the bargaining table, which they've been doing for, well, for many years in America.

SHADEL: But if you depend on a special session of Congress, aren't you likely to get the very same thing that we got in the railroad strike, when President Truman went up there and asked for the drafting of ...

HUMPHREY: What did we get from that strike, Mr. Shadel?

SHADEL: Well, the strike was called off ...

HUMPHREY: Exactly! Without any injunction, without any legislation, without anything at all - just mere public opinion. And that's exactly what I say would happen. <sup>we used</sup> And may I point out that, <sup>for</sup> there again, ... what did you have? You had the provisions of the National Labor Railway Act, enacted in 1926, which provides <sup>and</sup> fact-finding, conciliation, mediation, the power of public opinion, the good offices of the President bringing pressure to bear upon the parties to settle their disputes. <sup>by that does not produce a settlement,</sup> So they don't settle. Then what <sup>happened</sup> happened in the 1946 railroad strike? <sup>threatened</sup> What happened - the President threatened

ed them with a message to the Congress, and when he started to speak ~~at~~<sup>to</sup> the Congress, while in the process of his speech the parties settled. Now, ~~don't tell me that they couldn't have settled before. But when they saw that the President of the United States meant business, they settled. And may I say...~~

SHADEL: You depend on that ...(interruption) threat?

HUMPHREY: ~~Ah,~~ That's the only example of a national emergency being settled by the use of Government, the only one. All ~~x~~ the rest of them <sup>have</sup> never been settled.

SHADEL: Settled by a threat.

HUMPHREY: ~~Settled by what? A threat of new legislation, to be sure, in a specific instance. And I say~~ That's a whole lot better than compelling the workers to work against their will ~~for~~ for a private employer and his profit. In other words, injunction does this: it says to the workers, "your grievance will be held in abeyance. So you want more money? So you want shorter hours? Well, we're not going to give them to you. For eighty days you're going to sit over here and you're going to work for a private employer, for a private employer's profit, while your grievance is not being settled." Now, believe me, that kind of a provision is ~~not nearly as sound as what happened in the National Railway strike, where the President of the United States started to go before the Congress. The two parties said, "say, this doesn't look good to us. One of us is going to get hurt here - maybe both of us," so they decided to settle.~~

*1946 Railroad employees war*  
LEWIS: But, Senator, ~~that's~~ government by threat. I mean, as a theory do you subscribe to that?

HUMPHREY: Of course I don't. May I say that ~~that~~ was a unique situation. Ninety-nine per cent of the labor contracts of this country, Mr. Lewis, are settled peaceably around collective bargaining tables. Not only 99 but, as was pointed out, 99-1/4/100%.

BANCROFT: Senator, I'd like to change the subject here just a minute. One thing, maybe you can give us a tip. You were a radio news broadcaster

that's now a United States Senator and we're still radio news broadcasters; just how do you get from the microphone to the United States Senate, anyway?

HUMPHREY: Well, sometimes I wonder, and at this moment I'm wondering whether it was a good idea.

BANCROFT: Well, we have some other questions. What about the rest of the Truman Program? We've explored the Taft-Hartley Act pretty well. What about some of the other things in his program? How much of it do you think Congress is going to give him?

HUMPHREY: Well, I'm very happy that you asked me that question, Mr. Bancroft, because I think there's been a concerted move on in this country to tell the American people that this 81st Congress just isn't going to do anything about that program. Now, let me say, first of all, the 81st Congress has two years of life, gentlemen; it did not pledge that it would do the program in five months or in six months. ~~Those of us who were elected...~~ ~~President Truman pledged the program in his four years. That's his term.~~ Those that were elected to Congress said they were going to get it done in two years.

SHADEL: They're going awfully slow, tho, aren't they, Senator?

HUMPHREY: Well, may I say, here's the first Congress that has had a peacetime situation or a relatively normal situation since 1932. We had a great worldwide depression up until '40; then we had World War II; we had the two years of the postwar period when the world was literally on fire; and we had two years of the 80th Congress. Now, let's take a look at what's happened. After all, we had a lot to pick up ~~up~~. We had the brakes put on from 1946 to '48, and before that, ~~I said, the world was on fire, and I think that's true.~~ Little or no legislation of a domestic nature was passed from 1940 to '46.

SHADEL: Well, if your crisis was worse, if many more situations were faced by the 80th Congress in '46, shouldn't that make your job much easier <sup>shouldn't</sup> and ~~shouldn't~~/you progress much faster in the 81st Congress?



HUMPHREY: Well, had they done their business - but they didn't. For example, the other day, the Senate ratified the International Wheat Agreement. Now, that agreement was up before the 80th Congress; they never got around to ratify it.

SHADEL: But the 80th Congress had the Marshall Plan, they had Greek aid and then ...

HUMPHREY: Sure, they did a great number of things in the field of foreign policy and ~~may I say that~~ those same things are being carried on under the 81st Congress. Now, let's see what this Congress is going to do and what it has done. First of all, it passed a better rent control law than the rent control law of the 80th Congress. The Senate has passed Federal Aid to Education. The Senate has passed a broad public housing and slum clearance program. We've extended the ~~controls of the ...~~ the powers of the Export-Import Bank. We've extended the voluntary allocations plan. We have passed a school health services program for school children. We passed the Commodity Credit Corporation amendments, to provide grain storage facilities. Now, those are just a few of the things, plus many of the appropriation bills that have come up.

BANCROFT:

xxxxxx

Well, Senator, I'd like to ask about one other thing. I was standing up there on that platform in Philadelphia with you when you put thru the Civil Rights Platform that the Democratic Convention adopted, and you came down here and the Senate has, if anything, it seems to me, made filibusters more workable. Do you think ... you mentioned two years ... do you think you'll get that Civil Rights Program thru in two years?

HUMPHREY: I hope that we'll get some of it thru in two years. And I think we will. I think that we've got a very definite opportunity and possibility of passing an anti-lynching bill that really is a strong one and also an anti-poll tax bill. I think we can pass the basic Civil Rights Act that we have submitted to the Congress for the establishment of a Civil Rights Commission. Now, that isn't maybe going to happen this summer. There's going to be an

attempt made, I can assure you, to have that done before this first session is out. All I want to say is that before we judge the 81st Congress, gentlemen, let the 81st Congress have its days in court. ~~We've had ... look,~~ <sup>✓</sup> we've had to have hearings on everything. On the one hand, if you don't have hearings, they say you're trying to rush it; if you do have hearings, they say you're trying to delay it.

LEWIS: Of course, that's characteristic of all Congresses.

HUMPHREY: It is. It is, indeed. But we've had very extensive and exhaustive hearings. ~~On what? Minimum wages, the increase of the minimum wage law and extension of its coverage; Social Security and all the Social Security benefits.~~ We've had extensive hearings on all of the health bills that have come up before the Congress, and we've had a half a dozen or more of them. We had hearings on Federal Aid to Education, upon school health services; we've had hearings on school construction programs. These are just a few of them.

SHADEL: But, Senator, I can count up about five major issues, as of June 15th, that this Congress has accomplished. And the record is for the 80th Congress about nine major issues, pieces of legislation passed.

HUMPHREY: Well, I haven't been able to keep a chronological chart, ~~may~~ I say, of that. I say there's been a great deal of obstruction, there's been a great deal of dilatory tactic used in this Congress, but I would say that as far as the 80th Congress was concerned ~~... just on agriculture alone~~ they didn't pass an agricultural bill until about 4:00 A.M. of the last day ~~I think it was on Sunday morning.~~ Much of their domestic legislation never, ~~never, literally,~~ got any place at all. They just let it high and dry. What did they do about minimum wages? What did they do, for example, about Social Security? What did they do about housing? What did they do about Federal Aid to Education? What did they do about health legislation?

LEWIS: Senator, let's take the first few. What is this Congress going to do about minimum wages and Social Security?

HUMPHREY: I'll make a prediction, and without any fear of being called a prophet. The housing bill will be passed, the real estate lobby not to the

~~Housing Bill will be passed, the real estate not to the contrary.~~ It's been blocked in the House, but it's out of committee. It will be voted upon and I'll say within a week it will be out of the House. ~~It will . . .~~

BANCROFT: Minimum wages and Social Security?

HUMPHREY: Minimum wages, I'm sure, will be extended to 75¢-an-hour. The coverage may not be extended in this first session of the 81st Congress. And what was the next one?

BANCROFT: Social Security?

HUMPHREY: I say the Social Security benefits for old age and survivors' insurance, as well as old-age pensions, will be raised substantially, about 40%.

BANCROFT: In this session of Congress?

HUMPHREY: In this session of Congress.

BANCROFT: The Senate Finance Committee hasn't even taken that up and the House Committee has been working on it for four months.

HUMPHREY: That's right, but you don't have to have it taken up by the Senate Finance Committee. It can come over from the House, as many a bill has. Hold your hearings in the House and have it come on over.

SHADEL: Do you think Senator George will agree to that?

HUMPHREY: I don't know!

LEWIS: Senator, I'd like to ask - the financial situation, what it is at the moment, if you had your way, would you go ahead with the Truman health program, the public housing, the many reclamation projects, Columbia Valley, and so on, that are in the Democratic campaign platform and pledge?

HUMPHREY: Yes I would take them. I wouldn't say that we could get them all under way in the next two or three months, but I feel that between now and 1950 definitely the ~~CVA~~<sup>any</sup> the MVA<sup>which</sup> is under construction already. ~~They call it the Pick-Sloan plan, and what our bill is, that's in on MVA, is the realignment of the administrative procedure.~~ I'm sure that the Federal-aid-to-education bill will become a reality and the housing program will have its start.

LEWIS: How would you finance these things?



~~Housing Bill will be passed, the real estate not to the contrary.~~ It's been blocked in the House, but it's out of committee. It will be voted upon and I'll say within a week it will be out of the House. ~~It will . . .~~

BANCROFT: Minimum wages and Social Security?

HUMPHREY: Minimum wages, I'm sure, will be extended to 75¢-an-hour. The coverage may not be extended in this first session of the 81st Congress. And what was the next one?

BANCROFT: Social Security?

HUMPHREY: I say the Social Security benefits for old age and survivors' insurance, as well as old-age pensions, will be raised substantially, about 40%.

BANCROFT: In this session of Congress?

HUMPHREY: In this session of Congress.

BANCROFT: The Senate Finance Committee hasn't even taken that up and the House Committee has been working on it for four months.

HUMPHREY: That's right, but you don't have to have it taken up by the Senate Finance Committee. It can come over from the House, as many a bill has. Hold your hearings in the House and have it come on over.

SHADEL: Do you think Senator George will agree to that?

HUMPHREY: I don't know!

LEWIS: Senator, I'd like to ask - the financial situation, what it is at the moment, if you had your way, would you go ahead with the Truman health program, the public housing, the many reclamation projects, Columbia Valley, and so on, that are in the Democratic campaign platform and pledge?

HUMPHREY: Yes I would take them. I wouldn't say that we could get them all under way in the next two or three months, but I feel that between now and 1950 definitely the ~~CVA~~<sup>any</sup> the MVA<sup>which</sup> is under construction already. ~~They call it the Pick-Sloan plan, and what our bill is, that's in on MVA, is the realignment of the administrative procedure.~~ I'm sure that the Federal-aid-to-education bill will become a reality and the housing program will have its start.

LEWIS: How would you finance these things?

~~SHADEL:~~ How would we finance them?!

~~LEWIS:~~ Yes.

HUMPHREY: Just the way we've always ~~been~~ <sup>projects.</sup> financed them, out of the

.....

~~LEWIS:~~ (Both speaking-unintelligible) deficit. Aren't we now

.....

~~HUMPHREY:~~ We're facing a deficit now? That's a possibility, that we will face a deficit. However, ~~some~~ <sup>such as</sup> items are in the budget. ~~These items are~~ <sup>and</sup> prescribed in the budget like the Missouri Valley Authority, the Federal Aid to Education.

~~XXXXXX SHADEL:~~ The Truman health program?

HUMPHREY: The Truman health program is not in the budget, but the Truman health program is a self-financing program, ~~may I say, Mr. Shadel.~~ It's a payroll ~~tax.~~ <sup>As to spending, much of it is an investment.</sup> (add A)

~~SHADEL:~~ Increased tax .....

~~HUMPHREY:~~ It's a payroll tax. That's for sure.

BANCROFT: Well, Senator, I'd like to ask this. It's a question we try to ask everyone here. You're generally regarded as a liberal. Do you regard yourself as a liberal and, if so, how do you define a liberal?

HUMPHREY: Well, I do regard myself as a liberal and I would define it this day and age as one who believes that the processes of Government can be used for the benefit of our people, in a partnership with our people; ~~where the processes of government can be used to secure our investments.~~ And I heard Mr. Shadel say just a while ago about these expenditures. I must take exception with my friend, Mr. Shadel. These are not all expenditures. These are investments. <sup>We must</sup> They're investments in a stronger and a healthier America. For example, we can prove that for every dollar we put into public education we have a yield of four dollars, one-to-four. Now, that isn't a guess. That is a matter of statistical fact. We can prove, for example, that by soil conservation, land reclamation, irrigation, under Columbia Valley, under Missouri Valley, that in-

stead of it being an expenditure service, gentlemen, it will be a real investment.

BANCROFT: Well, we wanted to ask you if we're headed for a depression. Do you think we are ..... (inter.) prevent it?

HUMPHREY: I think that if we carry out these programs of sound reclamation, of public education; if we carry out these programs of public works, we'll be able to ward off a depression. We do have a recession today and may I say that we've got to evaluate costs, not in terms of just what the immediate financial outlay is to get these things done, but what will be the cost of a major depression in this country? Gentlemen, what's the cost of <sup>three</sup> million seven hundred thousand unemployed right now to America in loss of productivity? I think that needs to be figured out. What is the cost of floods? What's the cost of millions of our acres of soil being eroded every year? Now, with a ~~minor~~ ... ~~with a~~ minimum of expenditure we can stop these things, ~~and~~ <sup>we</sup> have proven through TVA, and we have proven through flood control and through soil conservation that instead of expending our money we've enriched ourselves so that our national economy today is stronger, more productive, and more prosperous than it's ever been in our history.

BANCROFT: Are you going to raise taxes to do this or are you going to have deficit financing?

HUMPHREY: We may have to have some deficit financing and if we have to raise taxes may I say that it can be raised on the high brackets.

BANCROFT: I think that's all the time we have.

Thanks very much, Senator Humphrey.

\*\*\*\*\*

(ANNOUNCER: Columbia has again brought you a meeting in "Capitol Cloak Room,"<sup>2</sup> presenting a member of Congress through informal interview. Tonight's guest was Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, former laborer, from Minnesota, Conducting the interview: Griffing Bancroft, Bill Shadel, and Robert Lewis.

This is CBS ... the COLUMBIA BROADCASTING SYSTEM

Ed.trans.-Emily Scheiner  
Patricia Martin  
Adele Cardiff





# 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)