


INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA

PUBLIC RELATIONS DEPARTMENT, FRANK WINN, DIRECTOR; 8000 E. JEFFERSON AVE., DETROIT 14, MICH., LORAIN: 8-4000

FOR RELEASE:

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1956

 UAW Seventh International
 Education Conference
 Washington, D.C.

REMARKS OF SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY (D., MINNESOTA)

Thank you very much, Leonard Woodcock, President Walter Reuther, my colleagues from the Senate who have done so admirably well here today in presenting their respective point of views. In particular, may I single out my esteemed colleague and friend on the Democratic side, Senator Kefauver, and may I say, Estes, that while we may not have seen you as much around the Senate as some would like, that I have been reading about you and what you've been saying about the Eisenhower Administration has long been needed to be said.

I can well understand why Republicans would like to have you back in the Senate, tied up in committees. You just stay away as much as you want to, Estes, and get back for those final votes, as you do, and we'll stay there and tend to the knitting while you take care of the Eisenhower myth that has been perpetrated on this country.

Now, before I start my speech to this wonderful leadership conference of the United Automobile Workers, may I say that it is indeed a high privilege to again address you. It's been my opportunity and privilege to do so on other occasions. Each time I found it an inspirational event and educational experience.

I looked up here as I was sitting on the platform and I read that placard in the back of the room to my left which said, "celebrate the past, cherish the present, and challenge the future." May I say as a Democrat that is the philosophy of our party, and that is the idealism and the inspiration of our party leaders. I am proud to be here as one Democrat representing the cause of the liberal democracy that we cherish so much.

-more-

Now let me clear the records. There are all kinds of Democrats and, as Senator Knowland knows, there are all kinds of Republicans. I sympathize with this able and distinguished and exceedingly fair minority leader. I admire Senator Knowland and he knows it from personal conversation as well as from public tribute. He is one who has embraced what I consider to be the appropriate attitude about party politics. Neither party has a monopoly on virtue or wisdom. Both parties are dedicated to the best interests as they see it for this country. We believe in the national security of our Republic. We believe in economic progress and political liberty but our means and methods of achieving these well understood and commonly accepted goals are indeed different.

Now, I said I like to come to you in the fullest understanding -- at least as to my philosophy. I want you to know what kind of a Democrat I am, what I feel and how I react to the political issues. I am a Woodrow Wilson, New Freedom, Franklin D. Roosevelt New Deal, Harry Truman Fair Deal Democrat. That's the kind I am.

And a Democratic party that's to be a winning party must embrace all of the attributes, all of the philosophy, and all of the great heritage of those three great liberal Democratic Presidents. I don't believe the Democratic Party can win by being Casper Milquetoast. And I do not believe the Democratic Party can win by trying to be as conservative as the Republicans or even trying to be as socially acceptable as the Republicans. I think that we've got to lay the issues on the line -- we've got to challenge the Administration that's in power and we've got to project a program that means something to the American People.

(more)

It's in that spirit that I speak to you today. I'm not here to apologize for my party. I'm here to applaud it and to advocate it. I'm here to say that despite twenty years of bitter complaints and criticisms on the part of Republicans and Republican leaders -- complaints in campaign years and out of campaign years, criticism that was echoed in the editorial columns of 85% of the American press -- that despite all of it -- despite the charges of Communism, Socialism, Leftism, Collectivism that the Republican Administration now in power has not had the courage to repeal a single law that was passed under the New Deal or the Fair Deal, and what is more, I challenge them to try it. The American people would repudiate them if they even attempted it. They pay lip service to every act that has been adopted. They are leap year liberals every four years. The President's state of the Union message this year could well have been delivered by Franklin Roosevelt.

However, in the parlance of golf, a game that has prominence these days, may I say in all candor, they are good on the tee off but poor on the follow through. And when it comes to getting par on the course they seem to always flub the dub and drop the ball on the putting green.

As one Republican said the Eisenhower Administration is liberal in philosophy but conservative in economics. This is like saying "I love my wife but I'll never let her enjoy life."

Now I would like to remind my friends who have talked about the prosperity of this administration. That much of this prosperity is brewed in prosperity under former actions of former administrations. For example, I ask my friends in the Republican party now who claim their great adherence to Social Security, where were you when it was passed? Where were you on the take off?

- more -

You were still riding in the covered wagon. You were unwilling to support it. The majority of your party resisted it and in campaign of 1936 assailed it as the enemy of free enterprise and the destruction of private insurance and the beginning of Socialism in America. The records are replete with the evidence.

Where were you when the Fair Labor Standards Act was passed, Mr. Republican? Why, even in the last Congress you tried to have flexible supports under minimum wages. You wanted 90 cents. We, at least, settled for a dollar and it should have been \$1.25. Take even the rural electrification program, my friends, now so commonly accepted as our gain. The leading spokesman in the Republican Party in 1936 in the United States Senate said farmers will not use electricity. This is a boondoggle project. Of course, that leadership was still addicted to the glories of the kerosene lamp but now let me assure you that our REA has been a success, that our REA has brought not only opportunity and production and better living to the people of rural America, but jobs and business to the people of metropolitan America.

I am proud that my party had the vision and the courage to harness the waters of the Tennessee Valley and Estes, may I say that this administration can call it "Creeping Socialism" if they wish but that people of the TVA know that it is dynamic progressivism for their part of America, and, Senator Kefauver, you let them off pretty easy on Dixon-Yates.

-more-

I guess possibly every one here understands it and maybe we should not drag that unwholesome, that ugly sight up again before the American people. The only truth of it however is this: that Dixon Yates was at best a mistake and could better be interpreted as gross mismanagement bordering upon official corruption, and the sooner we say it the more clearly it will be understood because it's the truth. No one can defend it. And today not a Republican spokesman tries to.

I am very happy that our Party was the creator of the Bonneville Dam, the Columbia River Basin development, that our political party has had the courage to harness the great energies of nature for the common good, and I am very proud, too may I say, that it was the Democratic Party that initiated the great housing program to which tribute is paid today. A great slum clearance program which literally has been wrecked under the Republican Administration. The late and lamented Robert Taft in 1949 in the 81st Congress joined with Democrats to put through a public housing and slum clearance program of 135,000 units per year for six years, a total of 810,000. He was criticized as being a conservative. Yet the leap year liberal Eisenhower Administration advocates 35 thousand units for one year -- liberal in philosophy but conservative in economics and performance.

I say that this Administration is either unmindful of what's happening in the great metropolitan areas of America or cares not. The slums of our cities are a curse to this country and any political party worthy of respect and confidence would attack this matter with vigor and determination and would out these cesspools of infection and social disorder that make up too much of metropolitan America.

(more)

Yes, I am very proud of the fact that the party I am privileged to represent here today did do something for farmers. Our farm program did work until it got into the hands of the Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Eisenhower philosophy. That farm program did bring agricultural parity of income which did bring you men and women jobs. May I remind you that in 1952, farmers used more steel for farm implements for farm buildings than all of the automobile manufacturers put together. Farmers used more steel than all of the automobile companies put together. Farmers used more petroleum than any industry in America. Farmers used more rubber than all of the rubber tires that went on all of the passenger automobiles plus the spare. Farmers used more electricity than the cities of Houston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit and Baltimore put together.

If farm income drops, fellow Americans, sooner or later your income will drop. There's a strange similarity today between 1929 and now. The stock market then was at an all time high. Workers were well employed. Ford had the \$5 a day or more wage. The great speakers of the Republican Party were telling you that, "All is well." Then as now, consumer credit was going to an all time high. Workers were finding it difficult to keep up with the pace of earnings of business and farmers were losing their shirts, soon to lose their farms and in three years America was on its knees almost broken, despondent and in despair.

I do not predict that this will happen, and I say that it cannot happen and it will not happen primarily because we had the foresight in the 30's and in the 40's to build into this economy such things as Social Security unemployment compensation, minimum wages, fair labor standards, public works, the great programs of the Securities Exchange Commission, improving our credit structure both for business and agriculture, and I am proud to say the Democratic Party is responsible for every last piece of that constructive legislation.

more -

Now, My Friend and distinguished Senator from California has mentioned Foreign Policy and indeed Foreign Policy is of the utmost importance to all of us. How well may it be said it must be maintained on a bipartisan spirit. But bipartisanship in Foreign Policy, Ladies and Gentlemen, means what the great Arthur Vandenberg once said: Not only to be bipartisan on the crash landings when Dulles gets us to the brink but also to be bipartisan on the take offs.

I would remind this great audience today that under the Administration of Harry Truman the following things took place: The creation of the United Nations and the adoption of its Charter; the establishment of UNRRA, to relieve the suffering of friend and foe alike throughout the world; the giving of interim aid to the people of France and Italy to stop the onward rush of Communism that was feeding upon the despair and the hunger of a broken Western Europe; the Greek-Turkish Aid Program -- one of the great, truly great policies of the Truman Administration; the Truman Doctrine which said in substance that the Mediterranean will not be a Soviet Lake; the Marshall Plan -- the greatest single effort on the part of any peace loving people or any nation on the face of the earth to rehabilitate neighbors and friends around the world; NATO -- the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- the grand alliance, the greatest military, political and economic alliance in the history of the world; the Point Four Program of self help, the offering of technological and scientific assistance from America to the underdeveloped and underprivileged nations of the world; and the courageous decision -- a decision which has been heralded by the Vice President of the United States a year after the election.

That decision was to meet Communist aggression in Korea, one of the most courageous decisions that any president or administration ever made in the history of this Republic. I'm proud of this record.

(more)

I want to be fair. Many good Republicans, such as the distinguished minority leader here, supported, in the main, these great objectives. I would also remind you that during this period Warren Austin, Republican, was appointed chief of the American Mission to the United Nations. Yes, even John Foster Dulles was made Assistant Secretary of State under Harry Truman--John McCoy, Republican, High Commissioner in Germany--Paul Hoffman, Republican, the Director of the Marshall Plan.

Many of them, ladies and gentlemen, Bill Foster, just to name another, Republican after Republican--Bob Lovett, Secretary of Defense. Ladies and Gentlemen, this was bi-partisanship.

I ask my distinguished Republican friends on this platform in their rebuttal period to name me such a list of eminent citizens appointed by this Administration in the name of bi-partisanship.

Well, Estes Kefauver said that this was an Administration dominated by big business. Estes Kefauver is right. This is an Administration of big business, by big business, and for big business. Now let's make no mistake about it, big business has a great role to play in America. We need big business, we need General Motors, we need Ford Motor, we need DuPont - we need all of these big companies. And they are entitled to a good profit upon their investment, upon their risk capital, on their expansion.

I believe they're entitled to a profit, I believe that they're entitled to the right to give counsel to their government, but I do not believe that we want only a labor government, only a farm government, or only a big business government. American government should be of the people, by the people and for the people. This means all kinds of people. Big ones and little ones. It means little business and big business, it means farmers, and it means workers, and I think it is fair to say that this Administration has the unique capacity for being able to exclude from its counsels the representatives of rural America, the free trade unions, the independent business community of America and for concentrating its loving affection and attention upon the great agents and the great dominant figures of big corporate business in American economic life.

-more-

The cabinet is, as has been said, full evidence of this very fact. The Advisory Commissions are even more evidence, and as one looks to America to see who is called in to give advice and counsel I think it's rather obvious where that counsel and advice may come from. Now do not misunderstand me, I'm not one that believes that a president of a corporation would knowingly, advise the President, the Congress or a Cabinet officer to do anything that would be against the national interests of this country. However, their perspective and their vision is limited by their experience as yours is and is mine.

Therefore, the duty of a chief executive in this great republic is to surround himself, not with just a UAW, not with just the members of the so-called liberal wing of a political party but to surround himself with representatives that are a full cross-section of American life, and when he does that, he will get what we call the balance...the balance of public opinion and public consciousness in this republic. This Administration has failed to do so.

Now let me make it quite clear further, I'm not a Democrat that goes around and says the agricultural policies are due to Ezra Benson -- poor old Ezra, misguided, misdirected and misinformed, to be sure. His main misguidance, the misdirection and misinformation come right from the White House. The President of the United States is not a crowned head. He is the Chief Executive of this country -- elected. He is the head of his political party, he is the main political officer of this government, he is the head of the policy formation of this government. I'm one who believes that if Mr. Eisenhower is going to take credit for all of the rain that brings the lovely flowers and green grass, then he's going to have to take credit for the drouth, that makes the soil bleak and barren.

- more -

He has got to accept that, and I am not one Democrat who believes that all you should do is just ask for George Humphrey, who is neither related to me biologically or politically and both of us are happy about that, may I say. He is a very fine affable, delightful, intelligent gentleman but as was pointed out he comes from the McKinley spirit so close that he came from the Hannah Company itself. Now let me point out that I am not one who believes that the way you correct fiscal policy is to get a new Secretary of the Treasury, or the way that you correct agricultural policy is to get a new Secretary of Agriculture. These are so-called members of the Eisenhower so-called team and, Ladies and Gentlemen, when the team drops the ball two yards from the goal line, when the team quits and commits fouls down field, when the team gets its signals loused up, when the team continues to lose one game after another you not only get a new team you get a new coach. I am suggesting that is what you do.

Yes, I lived under the illusion for sometime that possibly we would get a new Secretary of Agriculture, and I liked, for a period of time, to kid myself that this might help. May I say that the President's veto of the Farm Bill fully proved that Ezra Benson has been much maligned, what Ezra Benson has been doing is carrying out Eisenhower's post election for agricultural policy. No one has ever attempted to carry out Eisenhower's pre-election agricultural policy.

May I make a little suggestion since this Administration believes in principles and people; believes in its commitments and wants a record of performance -- I would like to suggest here in the Nation's Capitol today from this podium that President Eisenhower take a look at the commitments that he made to farmers in Castle, Minnesota; Fargo, North Dakota; Brookings, South Dakota; Columbia, South Carolina; Omaha, Nebraska and other cities.

(more)

All I ask of Mr. Eisenhower is this. Mr. Eisenhower, President Eisenhower, I don't ask you for a new farm program, all I want you to do is to dust off the one you talked about and you recommended and you advocated in 1952. That's good enough for Humphrey and the Democratic Party.

Ladies and Gentlemen, let me buttress the argument of my colleague, Senator Kefauver, about some facts on the economics of the Eisenhower Administration. Prosperity, yes, consumer indebtedness at an all-time high, \$37½ billion. Prosperity, yes, housing indebtedness at an all-time high, ranging between \$85 to \$90 billions and a serious problem indeed in the eyes of many economists. But here is the true test of whether or not this is a big business Administration. Those who govern ^{generally govern} for themselves and that is why if you want a government of the people you should make it of all of the people. And if you want a government by the people make it by a cross section of all the people, and if you want a government for the people you better make sure that the people who run it represent a philosophy that is for the people and all of the people, not just some of them.

Look at these facts since 1952, starting January, 1953, through the end of the year to January, 1956. Here are the facts - corporation netting came up 36 percent after taxes, vacations and whatever else you can charge off. General Motors got in on this. They didn't do badly. Their net income in these 3-1/2 years went up 136 percent. If General Motors executives do not support this Administration they are standing today convicted of being ingrates. Of course, they ought to support the Eisenhower Administration liberally, vociferously and affably. Indeed they should. They never had it so good.

-more-

General Electric profits, after every deduction you can think of including taxes, up 49%. Poor old General Electric. They had the president of that company work for Harry Truman and they haven't been doing so very good ever since. They only got a 49% increase. United States Steel, one of the more well known companies in America, a great company, a wonderful steel manufacturing and processing company, the greatest in the world. Yet United Steel profits, after every conceivable deductible item upped 173%. Yet ladies and gentlemen, this is the same company, along with Republic Steel and others, that in the past two weeks has been recommending an increase in the price of steel. And only on Friday, I read in the Chicago American an editorial that surprised me somewhat because the editor there said, "Why an increase in light of your profits?" Ernest Weir, of one of the great steel companies, said, "So that we can expand our capital plant." How much more do they need for expansion? Profits, the likes of which no company has ever experienced in the history of mankind but they want more -- at whose expense? The public's.

Now let's go a little further. Stockholders income -- up 26% since 1952. Money lenders income -- up 28%. Stock market prices, up 67%. As I said on the floor of the Senate if you went to sleep for 20 years, never heard a radio, viewed a television or a newspaper and suddenly like Rip Van Winkle, you were brought out of that long slumber and suddenly when you came to life again, and you heard and read that the New York Stock Market was at an all time high and the Midwest hog and grain and cattle market is at a relative low, you'd know which party was in power without even asking a single question.

- more -

Now Let's go further. This Administration says it is for independent business. And I lay it on the line here today. I ask my Republican friends on this platform today to name me a single major piece of legislation passed by the Republican Administration to the benefit of independent business. The Federal Trade Commission was passed, under Woodrow Wilson, to protect discriminatory pricing between the little and the big. The Clayton anti-trust law was passed under Woodrow Wilson to prevent any kind of monopolistic practice, the Magna-Charta for free labor and for free business. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Robinson Patman Act, one of the most important laws on the statute books for every independent merchant in America, passed under Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, the inception of the small businesses administration, known as the defense administration for small business, passed under Harry Truman and was converted under the Eisenhower Administration to the SBA, the small business administration.

I am proud of the record, of the Democratic record for the small business, independent business and I have never been able to understand why an independent business man voted the Republican ticket. Whatever he does, he finds what Senator Kefauver announced here today, the growth and the rate of mergers and reduction in his general proportion of business enterprises in the total American economy. What are the facts since 1952? Small business profits down 66%. Big business profits up 36%. Small business failures up 36%. Small business investors, stock returns dropped down 57%. The independent merchant, the independent manufacturer, the small corporation of a million dollars a year assets or less is impossible under this Administration and they know it. Throughout America today there is firm after firm that is protesting what we may consider to be favoritism in contract allocation and the failure of this Administration to give them proper notice and proper consideration.

This is the billion dollar year folks -- this is the billion dollar year, this 1955 - this past year. It was the year in which General Motors made a billion, farmers lost a billion -- the billion dollar year. And I submit -- that's relatively good Republican economics. Let's take a look at what happened to agriculture and all the tears to the contrary shall not wash this away. What happened to agriculture? In 1953, January first farm mortgage indebtedness -- the lowest it had been in 45 years -- \$5½ billion; January 1st 1956, farm mortgage indebtedness \$9½ billion. The Republicans in 3½ years and they've been able to increase the mortgage indebtedness of American agriculture by \$3½ to \$4 billions.

What else has happened? Whenever we hear of liquidation of the assets on the New York Market, the New York Stock Market, there is a cold chill that runs through the American enterprise system. And yet fellow Americans do you know that farm assets have been liquidated to the tune of \$7½ billion in 3½ years? And this Administration can say: Yes, there is a problem -- but does not bestir itself to do anything effective about it. Imagine what this Administration would do if a similar drop in income, in profits and in assets should happen to corporate structure of America. Farm income down in three and a half years 36 per cent.

Now I know that some people in the metropolitan areas say: Well, it hasn't touched us yet. Indeed it hasn't, it is a delayed reaction. But I read in Detroit last night, where I spoke at one of your community forums, in your Detroit newspaper, a hundred and twenty-thousand auto workers without jobs -- 8 per cent of the labor force. Over nine hundred thousand automobiles in storage in excess in inventory.

(more)

Now when farmers have that happen to them, friends, this Administration says you ought to take less for the price of the commodity. But when it happens to a General Motors product or a Ford product or any other of the great companies does the price get cut at the processors, at the manufacturers level -- indeed not, and I don't want it cut.

I'm not advocating that the way you right the wrongs in America's economy is to push other people down to the level that some other people have been permitted to fall. I advocate rather that we bring up those who are momentarily weak and the victims of economic injustice. I stand here to say that this Administration had better clear the record. Ezra Taft Benson, the spokesman for this Administration in Agriculture, has gone from one end of America to another and said that the reason that farmers are in trouble is because of increased labor cost.

This is raining a farm predicament and a farm depression upon you. It is a contemptible lie, and it needs to be so branded.

Of course this administration plays both sides of the street. The Secretary of Labor says it isn't you, that Mr. Benson is wrong, that he got about two inches on page 14 and Ezra got headlines on front page banner, and it was in every newspaper in America -- feeding the poison into the community.

May I say to you as I think about it at the moment, that there has been some spokesmen of the Republican Party that have looked with disfavor upon the unity of the AFL and CIO. Oh, I remember the statements of Republicans in Congress and out of Congress who said that this would mean powerful forces of labor to dominate American politics and they heaped their abuse and criticisms upon the unity of the AFL and CIO.

(more)

Well, let me tell you something, speaking for the Democratic Party, we are delighted with your unity, we welcome you, there's room in our Party for you, the welcome mat is out, come join us, we want you.

Now I will conclude with this general thought. There's much to be done and I have the opportunity here today to make an appeal to get it done. There are schools that need to be built, not just a handful, not just a token, not lip service to schools but thousands of schools. America needs not less than 350 thousand classrooms now for our children. And I want to say that if the President exercises the same degree of leadership to get Congress to act on schools that he did to get Congress to act on the tax bill, we'll get schools.

Senator Curtis let me say this -- in all respect because you are one of the able members of the Senate in the field of taxation and in other fields -- the late Randolph Hall, former general counsel to the Treasury Department, in a memorandum to Members of the Senate, members who were in the minority on the Finance Committee, listed what the Eisenhower Republican Tax bill gave to the American people. This is the great tax bill of fifty-fifty you know, one horse and one rabbit and I'm about to show you who got the rabbit.

Look what happened to that tax bill. Look not only what was done in terms of repealing the Korean taxes and the excise profits taxes but the bill began tax reduction's for big business and the well to do people in this country. Oh I know you got to get pretty sick, may I say, to get the advantage that Senator Curtis was talking about, and I don't know why one has to get ill to enjoy Republican tax benefits. Why not enjoy them while you are well?

- more -

Now let's take a look, according to the analysis which was made in the Senate of the United States and presented on the floor of the Senate by Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, member of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate. Here is what it is, here is the tax dollar, the long term saving under the 1954 Tax Act. This great new revision and codification of tax law. Who gets 73 cents out of that tax dollar of saving? The corporations with a million dollars a year net income over. Families with \$5000 a year net income or over get 18 cents out of that tax saving dollar. Families with \$5000 a year income or less, which make up 75 per cent of all the taxpayers of the United States of America, get 9 cents out of the tax saving. Now my Republican Friends could talk about tax equity if they want to but I think the facts are crystal clear that the tax bill provided loopholes in tax loopholes to the tune of 11 to 12 billions of dollars in expanded depletion allowances to many new minerals and products. They have accelerated depreciation to many companies and the so-called stock dividend credit. Every Democrat was for the \$50.00 exemption for widows and orphans and for those who had made modest investments. But the proposal of this Administration wasn't \$50.00 credit, not that alone. The proposal was to expand the stock dividend credit to give favored tax treatment to those who were the receivers of large dividend payments from the large corporations of this country. We defeated that in the Senate and we got a compromise as it came back from the conference. But where is this tax equity? Where are the Republican votes for an increase in dependency allowance of let us say just one hundred dollars from \$600 to \$700 that would have provided a tax credit reduction for every breadwinner in America, every head of household of not less than \$20.00 to \$25.00. That would have been a tax credit for the American people, but that didn't happen. You can always tell the philosophy of an Administration by its tax policies. The power to tax is the first indication of just exactly where the philosophy of an Administration rests.

(more)

And secondly what does it do with the Regulatory Agencies? In the field of housing it placed in its command of Housing Administration a man who voted against the 1949 Housing Act, a man who said it was socialism. That's like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop.

You in the Federal Trade Commission, with all due respect to the qualities of these people -- one of the most ardent defenders of those who had violated the anti-trust laws of this country -- particularly the Robinson-Patman Act, was placed in as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission -- a high tariff man put in charge of the Federal Trade Commission. A private utilities advocate put in charge of the Federal Power Commission.

The heart and core of the New Deal was not only its legislation but its regulatory bodies. This Administration has filed off the teeth of the regulatory bodies. It has literally taken away from those regulatory bodies -- not by law but by appointments, the desire to truly regulate in the public interest in the United States of America.

I imagine before this day is done somebody will mention this all-important, very highly controversial and yet such vital subject of Civil Rights. I recognize that in the Democratic Party there are those who want no action on Civil Rights. But I recognize that in the Democratic Party there is a great majority that want action on Civil Rights. And all I ask of the Republicans here today is that if they will give us a minority of their minority -- we will give them a majority of our majority and the argument over Civil Rights, in Congress, will be at an end. Then action will be under way, and I offer this opportunity today. Let me speak for myself and I think for our party as it will come out in convention. We will stand for the platform of 1952 which spells out in detail Civil Rights proposals plus a full affirmation of the Supreme Court ruling abolishing segregation and support of the Supreme Court ruling implementing that order for integration.

- more -

I couldn't help but get a kick the other day out of Attorney General Brownell. He came down with a brand new package of civil rights legislation, just about as new as Ben Franklin's Almanac. He proposed a bi-partisan Civil Rights commission. That proposal was introduced in the 84th Congress on the 5th day of February 1955. Hubert Humphrey was the main sponsor and there were nine other sponsors on that particular proposal -- S906 -- that proposal was introduced in the 83rd Congress with a Republican controlled Congress, a Republican in the White House, and it was not only talked about, it was openly rejected by this Administration.

It was testified to before the Judiciary Subcommittee. The bill at that time that we were testifying on was one introduced by myself and Senator Goodson. The Attorney General did not support it then, and he does not support it now, except in an election year. S906 is before the Henning subcommittee. That bill has been there for almost two years and in March of 1955, when this Administration was asked, do you support or ask the views of the Administration on S906 a bi-partisan Civil Rights commission, the Attorney General sent a letter back to the chairman of the subcommittee saying that the Administration had no opinion on this matter.

This is the kind of what I call lip service. I say today on this platform, if all Republicans in the Judiciary Committee will line up with the four Democrats, we'll report the Right to Vote Bill, the bi-partisan Civil Rights commission bill. We'll report an Anti-Lynch Bill. We'll report a bill to establish a department or a division in the Department of Justice on civil rights.

These bills are not Administration bills, these bills, introduced by men like Senator Kefauver, Hubert Humphrey, Paul Douglas, Herbert Lehman, Jim Murray, and a dozen more other Democrats in the Congress that are yearning for action.

Thanks very much.

MONDAY, APRIL 23, 1956

UAW Seventh International
Education Conference
Washington, D.C.

REBUTTAL REMARKS OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

I would just like to make one or two brief comments for my friend, the Senator from Nebraska. I recognize that wages weren't so good for farmers and I recognize that wages weren't so good for workers. I do recognize, however, that the country was on the upgrade. I think the comparison could be like this: after Harding, Coolidge and Hoover and the great engineering, political engineering projects of that twelve-year period, the American people found themselves in the bottom of the proverbial political and economic Grand Canyon. And the fact that we were able to climb back in those few short years from 33 to 39 out of the abyss of depression, despair, unemployment, bankruptcy, foreclosure, and losses to a period where we were beginning to regain self-confidence, where workers were beginning to have the right to organize and build their unions, where management was making profits -- and they were in 39 -- where people were beginning to feel again the dignity and self confidence of self-reliant Americans, seems to me to be one of the great accomplishments of our times.

I couldn't help but get a kick out of Senator Curtis citing hog prices. You know I visited out in Iowa a short time ago. Iowa farmers in 1955 had 50 per cent reduction in cash farm income. They're not happy. And its always noticeable, my friends, that when Republicans start quoting hog prices it's after the farmer has sold the hogs to the packer. Hogs aren't being sold now, Senator. Both you and I come from an area where we know that. The hogs were sold in September and October and in November. Sure hog prices are up now -- when packers have got the meat. And they judge their price to the market, to the wholesaler on what they call replacement price at current

(more)

29

Rebuttal Remarks Humphrey ... 2

price levels rather than what they bought them.

I'd like to talk to you about ten dollar hogs, when farmers were selling them. And this Administration balked, obstructed and dragged its feet to do anything. In fact, the record is clear from the Department of Agriculture that as the Administration entered upon its hog purchase, program hog prices went down to farmers and hog prices or pork prices that the government paid to packers went up. That's from the record of the Department of Agriculture, submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture which was placed in the Congressional Record in the month of February. Now, you know the Administration has got a new Farm Program now. They call it the Soil Bank -- interesting, isn't it? When we called it the Acreage Conservation Reserve and submitted the bill, and I was one of those that submitted one of the bills -- there were others in the House and Senate -- the Administration rejected the soil bank or Acreage Conservation Reserve Program three times. The last rejection came as late as September 30, 1955, and said that it was unworkable, uneconomic, too costly and subject to poor administration. Those were its own words. And then somebody said to the President, and to Secretary Benson, why Mr. President and Ezra don't you know they call this the Soil Bank? And when they heard the word, bank, they just quivered -- there was a chain reaction. And, lo and behold, the Administration's announcement of the so-called Soil Bank was in that great agricultural publication known as the Wall Street Journal. Well, now we're for the Soil Bank -- we were for it two years ago, we were for it this year and we'll be for it here on down the line. You can call it bank if you want or Conservation Reserve or extended Conservation Program whatever title you wish. If it makes it more palatable to this Administration to call it a bank, then, Lord bless them, we're for it -- bank it will be -- just so they don't forget the soil, that's all.

(more)

21

Now, I took plenty of time before, I shan't take anymore. I'd like to say that anytime you'll get us about 12 or 15 Republican votes -- we don't ask many -- you've got 47 over there, just give us about 15, give us about 15 Republican votes and we'll repeal the Taft Hartley Law so fast you will wonder what happened to it.



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