

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
140 Senate Office Building
Washington 25, D.C.
National 8-3120, Ext. 881

For Release: Monday P.M.
April 30, 1956

GOP ADMINISTRATION 'INDICTED BY OWN FAILURES', SENATOR HUMPHREY SAYS

President Eisenhower's Administration stands "indicted by its own failures that no amount of double-talk and partisan press editorial protection can conceal", Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) declared today in the keynote address at the Oklahoma State Democratic Convention in Oklahoma City.

"It is understandable why Republicans think it is a success, however, for it has been a success from the traditional viewpoint of the Republican Party -- the fat are getting fatter, and the thin are getting thinner," Senator Humphrey said.

But its "chickens are coming home to roost", Senator Humphrey warned, "and our people are awakening to the inevitable results of Republican rule that puts the dollar sign ahead of people, and special privilege of a chosen few ahead of the common good of our entire economy."

"The President's veto of the farm bill will go down in history along with Hoover's veto of the McNary-Haugen bill as testimony to the consistent unwillingness of the Republican Party to ever provide or accept a fair deal for American agriculture," Senator Humphrey said. "It is further evidence of the economic and social blindness of Republican leadership about which all Americans should be deeply concerned.

"Americans should be concerned when small businesses are failing, even though big business prospers.

"Americans should be concerned when the stock market is high, but the commodity markets and the cattle markets are low.

"Americans should be concerned when our costs of living are kept falsely stable by balancing off the losses of many with the profits of a few.

"Americans should be concerned when we let ourselves be kidded into complacency about dangers on the world horizon, while our more honest and realistic allies look at the meandering course of our foreign policy with more and more skepticism," Senator Humphrey said.

But of all the "fumbling and bungling" of the present Administration, he added, "nothing has been so rank as its neglect and abuse of American agriculture, climaxed by the President himself repudiating his own campaign pledges with his veto of the farm bill developed by Congress to stem the tide of farm depression.

"The only thing firm and certain about the Administration's farm policies has been their persistent and consistent alignment against the farmers -- an apparently rigid and firm determination to do nothing, or do the wrong thing at the wrong time," Senator Humphrey said.

"They have turned the rest of the country against farm people by unfairly depicting farmers as looking for a hand-out.

"They have created the impression that farmers have no right to share in prosperity of the rest of the country, continually saying farmers 'must expect downward adjustments' while boasting about the prosperity of the stock market.

M O R E

For Release: Monday, April 30, 1956

"They have contributed to the downward spiral of farm prices and farm income by negative legislative and administrative policies, showing more concern over getting rid of reserves in their own hands than in protecting farmers' income, and driving the farmer out of his own markets by underselling him at every opportunity.

"They have weakened and undermined our great democratically-elected farmer committee system, taking guidance of our farm programs more and more out of the hands of farmers and turning them over to patronage-appointed bureaucrats.

"They have turned the Farmers Home Administration into a collection agency instead of a loan agency to serve hard-pressed farmers, collecting more funds from farmers in some states during the past year than they have loaned.

"They have recommended slashes in funds and authority for our great soil conservation programs, then boasted about conservation progress after the Democratic Congress insisted on protecting these programs at adequate levels.

"They have opposed the entire concept of a "Soil Bank", then suddenly reversed themselves to insist that it is a panacea to cure all the ills they have helped bring about in agriculture.

"They have injected their own politics into every level of operation of the Department of Agriculture, then preached high-sounding and righteous sermons about 'keeping agriculture out of politics'.

"They have dragged their feet on every new idea that might help agricultural income, refused to properly use the authority they have to curb the decline in farm prices, and neglected -- until election year -- even any show of concern over what is happening to farmers.

"They have broken the promises they made to farmers in 1952...broken the promises of full parity, of 90% of parity, of the same treatment for perishables as for basic commodities, of equal treatment for feed grains, and of encouraging farmer-run farm programs.

"They have turned their backs on farm people, in a calculated political judgment that there are more non-farm people -- and that most of the Republican financial support comes from non-farm interests. They have turned their backs on the great midwest and southwest, and relegated us to some hinterlands concept as not being quite as important as the rest of America -- which to them means Wall Street in New York and La Salle Street in Chicago, the money markets of our country."

Senator Humphrey praised Oklahoma's Senators Robert Kerr and Mike Monroney as being "dependable stalwarts in the battle for real democracy, and the battle for a square deal for American agriculture."

KEYNOTE SPEECH
OF
SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

BEFORE THE
OKLAHOMA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

April 30, 1956
Municipal Auditorium
Oklahoma City

Thank you very much, Senator Monroney, and if you will permit me, Ladies and Gentlemen, I will get through with the formalities, and call him my good friend "Mike" Monroney. (Applause).

Governor Gary, I want to personally express my appreciation to you for your cordial welcome, and above all for the wonderful leadership that you have given to the Democratic Party in the State of Oklahoma. The clean, wholesome, honorable administration that your personality and administration represents is a great credit to the entire Nation. (Applause.)

And Chairman Benefield, if every party in America could have a chairman of your qualifications, of your justice, of your temperament, and your fairness and your leadership qualities, there

is no doubt in my mind at any time that the Democratic Party would sweep the board clean every time. This good Chairman of yours is truly tops. I know from personal association, and even better from what other people say, that he really gets "through".

I notice that our friend Reverend Wheeler left here a moment ago; he moved out in the audience or changed chairs. I am sorry I was not present for the invocation, but I want to thank him for his generosity in providing each and every one of us with one of these fine books of spiritual value entitled "Claim These Victories". May I say for those of us who are in politics, a book such as this is indeed very helpful. There are many times we become discouraged; there are many times when we wonder whether or not the effort was worthwhile. When you can read something that thrills your soul and spirit, you feel that much better to do your work. So my personal appreciation,

in a public manner, Reverend Wheeler, for your thoughtfulness and kindness.

I miss my old friend Bob Kerr's presence, but I understand he will be around this afternoon. What a time you are going to have when that fellow gets up and talks! (Applause.)

Inviting me here to this Convention, with Governor Gary, Mike Monroney, and Bob Kerr as your other speakers is like inviting a highschool Sophomore to get up in a speech class and demonstrate before Demosthenes. I do appreciate the trip, and I do thrill to the warmness of your welcome. But goodness, people, you ought to know that these men here, along with your Congressmen, are sought all over the Nation; they are asked for; we up in Minnesota long to get them up there. They do not want to hear me talk in Minnesota; they'd like to hear Mike Monroney, and Bob Kerr, and we would like to have Governor Gary come up there and tell us what's what too. (Applause). I tell you, I appreciate the honor, even

if I might not deserve it, And as long as you are willing to carry on with me and let me hold forth, believe me, I am going to do it.

Mayor Street, it is wonderful to be here in your great city of Oklahoma City; I like Democratic mayors. But Mike, I must tell you, I was a Mayor of Minneapolis, Minnesota, not St. Paul. However, I want you to know they just elected a Democratic Mayor in St. Paul Tuesday. It was a Democratic victory up there like it has been in Tulsa, and George Norvell, Mr. Mayor-Elect of Tulsa, I want to wish you every best wish. It was a great thing that happened for your city. Just like in Tulsa, we are putting in a Democratic City Council in St. Paul, and a Democratic Mayor. He is my good friend, a good Irish type Democrat, and we are proud of him. (Applause)

I was in Tulsa a year ago, but it was rather chilly then -- even though it is a lovely city. I said to Mrs. Monroney

yesterday as we flew out of Tulsa, "I think this Tulsa is a beautiful city; it looks more beautiful this year than last." And she said, "Of course! Don't you know, they elected a Democratic Mayor in Tulsa!" So, Mayor Norvell, let your administration carry the banner. I cannot see why this fellow Dulles cannot see the new Democratic spirit; I saw it, and I knew that a Democrat was elected.

By the way, I heard that my friends in organized labor did a wonderful job. I want to say to them that these Republicans may abuse you and confuse you and not want you, but we need you, we like you, and we want you. Stay with us! And there are a few more words I want to say to labor: any laboring man that ever joined the Republican Party must have done so because he disagreed with someone at home and wanted to get even. If that is the reason, let them go ahead, but do not let them hang on too long.

I was so pleased to see the members of the Supreme Court

here this morning. We of our Party respect the impartial and judicial nature of our great law bodies, but we do not go around trying to tag them partisanwise. All we ask is fairness and justice, and that is what we get. It is a great tribute to your State to have the members of the Court present at this gathering, and to have them sitting here in judicial dignity. I am glad they can be present to hear some of us tell the people down Oklahoma way what we think is going on in Washington. You folks have to agree, they are mighty generous in being here.

First of all, may I say many of our finest people migrated to this part of America. I am very partial to the Southwest. I have long felt that America's greatness in the days to come is to be found in that great Middle West of which it is my privilege to be a part, and the Northwest, Southwest, and Far West. I sense this region as reflecting and exemplifying the new spirit of the Nation, and I also have a feeling that the

Democratic Party is getting its roots deep into the social fabric and social soil of the Southwest, the Mid-West, and the Northwest and Far West. Believe me, friends and neighbors, this is going to stand us well in the days to come. Every part of America is great, our Eastern Seaboard, our Southern States, our New England States, our Mid-Atlantic States, but I think it fair to say that the great, vital spirit of democratic government is finding fulfillment and realization right out here in the broad open plains, out in the mountainous areas of the Rocky Mountains, out in the Northwest, and the Southwest. It is the new pioneer spirit of the Twentieth Century, and wherever that spirit is to be found, the Democratic spirit prospers and grows. (Applause)

Your Congressmen are exemplary of this; again and again this fighting spirit is shown. I am sorry Carl Albert could not be here. You know why. He is not just another Congressman, but an important leader in the House. That is a

great tribute to Oklahoma and a great tribute to Congressman Albert. (Applause). Congressman Carl Albert is known as a "battle whip", and he is a forceful one, along with John Mc Cormack, Sam Rayburn and others.

We have quite a few fine Democrats in the House of Representatives. We Senators do not agree that they really do all the business; we have to take that statesmanlike look at things.

You have other fine Congressmen. To our friend, Congressman Steed, I want to pay a special tribute. He is a masterful worker, did a lot on the road bill; and Congressmen Wickersham, Edmundson, and Jarman -- they have done an amazing job.

I hear there is another Congressman, but for the life of me I cannot recall his name. I understand he is one of the "other party". May I say, you have done much better in that

regard than Minnesota. We have nine Congressmen, with five Democrats, and four Republicans. Those four love family and home, and we intend to help them fulfill that great desire.

And I will not deny you this, to pay tribute to that great All-American, that wonderful Director of Athletics, a splendid man, Bud Wilkinson. I went to school at the University of Minnesota at the same time that he was at the University. Everybody know Wilkinson, and did not know Humphrey. I did not know why, but now I see why. He wins all the time, and once in a while I do not. What a great name he has brought to the State of Oklahoma! What honor and fame, to be pointed out with such great honor, you, the Oklahoma Sooners! And in fairness, I will say I am a real rooter for the "Big Red" and the Oklahoma Sooners, even when they play Big Ten teams.

You know, we live down in Chevy Chase, Maryland, most of the year, and my thirteen year old son tells me his two favorites. I hope you will forgive this -- of course, you understand -- his

first is the University of Minnesota; he has been fully indoctrinated in that theory. And he was for Maryland, because that is where he lives. Then he wanted to know why Maryland was unable to defeat Oklahoma. I said, "Son, it is not just because those folks in Oklahoma are mighty strong and good people, but they have a fellow by the name of Bud Wilkinson from Minnesota down there, and when you bring together Minnesota and Oklahoma, there is just no state in the Union, no combination of states, that can defeat us any place in the country!" (Applause)

You ought to be down in the Senate to hear some real Oklahoma boosters. I do not know whether or not to tell on Mike Monroney, but he talks of your University constantly, and he is constantly reminding us about Oklahoma. I must say that between him and Bob, we know what you are doing in many areas in Oklahoma.

Well, I came to make a political speech.

I am going to talk about the Democratic Party. I am not here to apologize for this Party; I am here to proclaim it; I am

here to say I am a Democrat one hundred per cent. (Applause.)

I am not so foolish as to believe that our Party has a monopoly on virtue and wisdom, but I do not happen to be one who is duped into believing that the Republican Party has a monopoly on virtue and wisdom. As a matter of fact, they are acting mighty virtuous and may deceive some about virtue, but as to wisdom, they could not even deceive Mortimer Snerd, much less anybody else.

What kind of a Democrat am I? I think I ought to give you my pedigree. I am a Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Harry Truman Democrat.

(Applause.) I am dedicated to keeping alive the spirit of those great men that have fought for our Party and our country.

I believe in the "New Freedom" of Woodrow Wilson. My dad before me was a great worker in the cause of Woodrow Wilson.

My first vote was cast for Franklin Delano Roosevelt,

and I am eternally and deeply grateful to my parents that I was born at a time when I could cast my first vote for a man I believe to be the greatest President that ever occupied the White House. (Applause).

And I want to tell you right now, I do not go around the country hemming and hawing and apologizing for Harry Truman. Harry Truman is a fine Democrat; he may give them hell, but this man from Independence, Missouri, this man upon whom they place their most bitter attacks, stands today in the eyes of the people of this Nation and the world as one of the truly great Democrats of all the people. Mark my words, when Harry Truman goes to Europe on May 11th, the peoples of Western Europe will hail Harry Truman as the political Saviour that he was to them. To peoples seeking freedom, who have lived under the spectre of the power of Communism, he is a hero, a liberator.

I am proud to be a Democrat, and am I ever proud to be

in the presence of such good Democrats. I could sense when I came to this City last night, the spirit of confidence, the spirit of good fellowship, and well, Democrats just have more fun than Republicans. They are grouchy old pessimists -- and we all know it! (Applause)

We may get in a little trouble, and we sometimes have our intraparty fights; we sometimes split a little bit, but we know how to get back together. When I came to Oklahoma City, I knew this was going to be one of your truly great or greatest conventions, because there was a spirit here of victory. Possibly that victory in Tulsa just added that extra impetus that was needed.

But I think what must be most obvious even to most Republicans is the caliber and the quality of the leadership of this Party, and the rank and file Democrats in it. And as one from out of the State, just a visitor, to whom you have been most

kind, may I say that by your demeanor, and by your presence, and by your words, by your sense of dedication, you reveal to friend and foe alike that here is a great political instrumentality for the good of the people. I wish you the best in the months to come. There is no doubt in my mind that in November the Republicans will suffer one of the most crushing defeats that they have ever known right here in the State of Oklahoma. (Applause).

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I get quite a kick out of my Republican friends as they go around the country building their campaign slogans on "Peace and Prosperity." I am going to talk about this Republican peace and prosperity, but before I do so, I want to remind my Republican friends of what they have had to say during these past years, and I wonder whether or not they really meant it. Because if they did mean it, I wonder why they have not done more about it.

If you recall, and your memoires are fresh, you may

remember that the Republican orators and the Republican candidates swept up and down this land assailing and abusing not only the leaders of our Party but our program and principles of the Party. I am here to recite for a moment or two, quickly, some of those programs:

The greatest accomplishment of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was that he brought together the people and the government. It was a philosophy that Lincoln once stated, but which was quickly put into cold storage by his followers. It remained for Franklin Delano Roosevelt to take out of the Gettysburg Address those words ... "A Government of the People, by the People, and for the People," and give them practical application to the affairs of the community and the government.

Roosevelt said, "We are partners together in this spirit of Democracy."

Franklin Roosevelt said, in effect "The White House is your house, not the house of money changers, not for special privileged,

but the people's house."

It was Roosevelt who brought the government to us.

It was the warm heart and the warm hand of a free government to a free people, not the hand of the policeman, not the cold heart of a statistician, as is so symbolic of the Republican leadership.

I suppose, if there was any one reason why the agents of special privilege grew to hate Franklin Roosevelt, it was because he was the one man in American life that was able to interpret the role of government as a partnership with the people. The people felt that at long last in the Government of the United States was a helping hand, our defender, our strength; we were able to march forward, and make the profile of a new America. What a difference was evident after a few years of new dynamic leadership.

OH, we forget too easily! As I said to a reporter this morning in my hotel room, "I do not have to have letters or economic

studies on agriculture. I lived through a depression. I lived through twelve years of Republicanism. I saw their callous disregard for human beings. I saw them worship at the alter of business efficiency. I saw them distant toward the plight of the little people. And I witnessed a Roosevelt come into the helm of this Government, and I witnessed that literally by the magic of his voice and the strength of his personality, America just had a vibration of new strength, and out of that period wonderful things happened."

The prosperity to which Republicans point today, much of it, was built upon and is predicated upon the accomplishments under Roosevelt's guidance and leadership.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, that keeps a stock market reasonably honorable; the Public Utilities Holding Company Act, that made impossible again the outright corruption of the public finances and privileged finances -- all that is an

inseparable part of the chapter against Republicanism. It was Roosevelt and a Democratic Congress who provided these safeguards. It was Roosevelt who took up the crutch and fought for the people's interests, and today, at least in some of the areas of the utilities business, business practices are much more honorable because of the public policy laid down under Democratic leadership.

Talk about highways. Our Republican friends have all the main factors in the automobile manufacturing business, there is no doubt about that, and sometimes they do get general welfare and General Motors confused -- and there is not any doubt about that. (Laughter). But I would like to remind my Republican friends that the first highway Act, Aid-to-Highways Act, was passed under a Democratic Administration. I would like them to know that the greatest public building program the world has ever known, the greatest highway building program that the world has ever seen, will be passed by a Democratic Congress in this

Congress in just a few days to come. (Applause.)

Friends of organized labor, the Fair Labor Standard Act, the abolition of child labor, the forty-hour week, time and a half for overtime -- working men and women, these did not come easily. Republicans fought like they were fighting the plague; they were bitter in their denunciation.

Today they claim prosperity; they claim prosperity for the worker. Friends of organized labor, let the record be clear. Had the Republican Congress had its way, you never would have had a strong trade union movement that could negotiate your wages.

Your benefits today are not due to the beneficence of the Republicans; your standard of living is not due today to the platform and principles of the Republican Party.

You got what you have despite them, and some of the gains you now enjoy you got under Franklin Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman, and you know it! (Applause)

Let's not forget the Wagner Act that gave every working man a right to organize and bargain; let's not forget the Fair Labor Standards Act; let's not forget that a House of Republicanism has never been conducive to you -- never has been and never will be.

And in recent days, Ladies and Gentlemen, the spokesmen of the Administration have bitterly assailed our friends of labor, bitterly denounced your organizations of the AFL and CIO, as if they were a curse, from platform, from radio and television.

Working men and women of this country who produce our automobiles, build our homes, yes, build our highways and our buildings -- you, Ladies and Gentlemen of Labor, have been subjected to unfair criticism and political abuse from those today who like to smile benignly and say, "We are your friends." But I am sure friends of labor will not be fooled into this kind of leap-year liberalism which this Republican crowd indulges in every four years! (Laughter)

Yes, let's not overlook social security! Oh, what an amazing development in the lives of a free people! Social security -- fought for, planned for, enacted, and placed in effect under a Democratic leadership to carry out Democratic principles. Yet today the Eisenhower Administration says, "We are for social security."

Oh, of course -- after the fighting is over, after all the pioneering has been done, after all sacrifices have been made, after it works -- when it is sound, when a great financial budget is balanced in the social security fund, and it has proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is effective and worthwhile -- these Johnny-come-lately liberals, these sunshine ^{Patrists} ~~bathers~~ come along and say, "We are for it too!" (Laughter and applause).

They remind me of that ne'er-do-well father whose little boy came into this world and the old man immediately left home because he wanted no responsibility. He was against the whole idea of a family. A little later the boy graduates from high

school with honorable mention, and by this time the old man thinks maybe he will amount to something -- of course the boy is now eighteen years old. Then he graduates from college down here in Oklahoma, plays on the football team, is the star, gets a scholarship, becomes a great scientist, and one day is being awarded the Nobel Prize. Then comes the old man out of the catacombs and says, "THAT'S MY BOY; THAT'S MY BOY!"

This is the way Republican leadership responded. Everything that works, they have fought against -- then 'adopted'. They did everything they could to undermine these policies, but when they work, they get at the head of the parade, with great politeness jumping and pushing, all dressed up in their finery, and they march by and say, "This is what we are for, NOW!"

But "now" is not the beginning, and the beginning, Democratic Ladies and Gentlemen, is important. An awful lot is based on the beginning, and not just on the ending.

I am proud that our Party was concerned about the aged; I am proud our Party was concerned about unemployment; I am proud our political Party was concerned about dependent children; aid to mothers who were in need, the blind, sick, and disabled, and I am proud each day I am in the Congress of the United States that your Senator Bob Kerr, on the Finance Committee, is fighting to make this social security program even a greater program. As he fights this good fight, as he leads, along with another fine Senator a little South of here, Senator Russell Long of Louisiana, another Democrat -- as they fight to expand social security, down comes the business machine, the Republicans, and they say, "No, No, No, this is not the time, we must not do this now."

You can always rely on a Republican to throw sand in the gears. You can rely upon their leadership to hold back; they are past masters of the art of obstructing, and believe me, they

have been doing a mighty fine job even as their spokesmen parade with sweetness and light, trying to denude the American public that they are for all of these things.

Down here you know something about public power. You have the Southwest Power Administration. You know something about rural electrification, soil conservation. I looked out of that plane window and saw thousands of farm ponds, and I saw good soil conservation practices. We appreciate the value of water too in this great Mid-West and Southwest. Let's remember that our soil conservation progress came about not with Republican help but despite it!

Rural electrification was assailed in 1936 in the Senate of the United States by the spokesmen of the Republican Party as boondoggling. Why, he even said, "Farmers will never use electricity; they like kerosene lamps." (Laughter). So help me, that is the official record! The Republican Party has always worshipped in the philosophy of the kerosene lamp. Now

that REA works, they would like to claim credit for it. Irrigation, reclamation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Bonneville Dam, all those many things ---- have you ever stopped to think that it is outright political hypocrisy that some of these Republican leaders now indulge in?

I recall when they called the TVA socialism, collectivism, and said it ought to be done away with. And then they send foreign emissaries overseas to tell the people of Jordan, of Israel, of Egypt, "What you need is a TVA."

You think those people overseas do not see through this hypocrisy? If the TVA is good for them, why isn't it good for us? If a political party feels that TVA is dangerous to free institutions in America, why should they believe that TVA will be helpful to free institutions in the Middle East? You see, you cannot be a reactionary at home and a liberal abroad in this day and age without getting caught up. This is another reason the

foreign policy of this country is being looked upon by qualified leaders abroad as a foreign policy which is foreign to them and foreign to us. Significant as that is, as Americans and not as partisans, we should be deeply concerned about this above all things.

Our Party tried to attack the problems of the slums in our cities, and provide a helpful education for our young and old. But the crowning glory of the years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal was the great program built up methodically and carefully for agriculture. And this Administration stands condemned in the minds of American farmers, as having torn down brick by brick, stone by stone, the mighty edifice and cathedral that we built for a strong and prosperous agriculture. (Applause).

I should not burden you longer with a recitation of the foreign policy, as much as I would like to speak on that,

but I would like for you to remember that in the period of just a few years since World War II, your Party and my Party has given leadership to the creation of the United Nations and its agencies; and with all its weaknesses -- and there are many -- it is the greatest single creation in my mind for building peace that the world has ever known.

It has helped in the feeding of the helpless and hungry, providing aid to our allies, and the saving of millions of lives.

Coming from a great dairy producing state as I do, I want to say that nothing has made me sicker at heart than when I hear our abundance of food regarded as if it were a curse, when I recall so well, how the milk from my own state -- the powdered milk our own people did not want to drink, so wholesome and so nourishing -- how millions of pounds were sent overseas to feed our friends of Greece and Turkey and Italy, France, England, and Germany, so that little children might live. Our food abundance

is God's blessing. The Republican leadership ought to be ashamed of itself, ought to be morally ashamed of itself, in looking upon this abundance, of God's magnificence and blessings, as if it were a curse. An Administration that cannot figure out what to do with the blessings of food is an Administration hopelessly stale, without imagination, without genius or creative ability, and that is exactly the way I summarize the Republican Administration. (Applause.)

Well, we have other chapters of history. The Marshall Plan, the greatest single international financial program the world has ever known. NATO, strong under Democratic leadership, is slowly eroding away under this Administration, as even the leaders of the other countries say -- the President of Italy, the French Prime Minister, the Chancellor of Germany, our own Generals, they have all warned you and me that NATO is a bulwark against communistic aggression, and it is slowly pulling apart. Yet, your President permits his press secretary to make foreign

policy announcements, while the world longs and hungers for dynamic American leadership.

Your Secretary of State a year ago came to the realization that things were not well. I'll say they're not, even though they might like to have you believe that everything is rosy, everything jolly. They would like to mesmerize the people, hypnotize you, brainwash you, Ladies and Gentlemen, if they can.

Things are so similar to what happened in the Twenties that it is shocking and frightening.

Yes, in the Twenties we talked peace and prosperity; yes, in the Twenties we saw the stockmarket go to an all-time high; while the laboring man in the Ford factories got five dollars a day. Calvin Coolidge said, "The business of Government is business." We saw it happen; we saw farm prices go down and down every year under the Republican leadership, and I ask you an honest question: Isn't that exactly what is happening now?

Isn't it exactly what we are witnessing? The only difference is this: this time the Democratic Party has been in power twenty years building in protections, building in our economy strong forces that could hold back mismanagement and exploitation. This time the American people understand that the Government could do something constructive.

Have you forgotten a Hoover who could not see in the Constitution the power to help the people? I want to classify that period of Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, as Heartless Harding, Cool Coolidge, and Hungry Hoover. (Applause). All people say, "Why do you refer back to them?" Because the spirit is still there. The Second Hoover Commission would do the same thing that the First Hoover Commission tried to do -- reversing public policies that have proven effective. Lest anybody misinterpret me, I have supported some of the recommendations, many of the recommendations for efficiency and improvement in administration in Government. But I can not support the turning of REA over to the utilities; I have not

denied our veterans' medical care and benefits they deserve, and cannot support any of the recommendations that would turn over the power resources of this country to a handful of specially picked people -- and those are the recommendations which the Commission that President Eisenhower appointed on the Second Hoover Commission are now offering to the American people. Let's have none of it; let's join in this battle and set this record straight!

You know the Republicans have always been against social security, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and almost everything else constructive for the people. I hope a Republican or two sneaked into the hall. I have something I want to say to them -- a challenge I want them to hear. Speaking as a Democrat and as a representative of my Party, I dare this Eisenhower Administration to attempt to try and repeal one single major law that we put on the books. I dare them to try it. (Applause). They will sneak around and do everything they can through the regulatory agencies

to weaken it, but I dare them to come out and say they want to repeal the Fair Labor Standards Act -- and see how much support they get. They call it any name in the book; yet they will not dare to seek its repeal.

I challenge the Republican Leadership to try to repeal social security; I dare them. They have not the courage to try it, because they knew they were wrong when they were talking against it in the first place, and they now know they are not only wrong, but that it would be political suicide. This is what I call the hypocrisy of Republican politics.

But, I want to become contemporary in this. Above all else the Administration has done, it has forgotten that this should be a Government of the People, by the People, and for the People. As Alben Barkley said a few nights ago at a dinner in Washington, "This Administration has changed that philosophy to a Government of money, for big money, and by big money, or a Government of big

business, for big business, by bigger business." They say, "Oh, that is just a Democratic hue and cry; it does not mean anything; it is sheer politics; Let's see if it is". This Administration is loaded with the representatives of but one group in this society, corporate business, big business, Republican big business.

Now, I am not one to believe that this ought to be a labor government, with labor dominating all. I do not believe it ought to be a farm government with the farmers entirely predominating. I do not believe it ought to be a small businessman's government, with the small businessmen in every position of trust. But God only knows, I do not believe it ought to be a big business government with the power of the State and with the power of the Federal Government, plus the power of corporations' economic strength behind it. Yet that is exactly what is happening.

What we Democrats want is simply a balance of government. We want all sections of the American people to be represented. We

are not against big business; we just do not believe that big business ought to run the country. We are certainly not against labor or agriculture, but I have never heard of agriculture or labor asking to dominate the country. What we want is a cross-section of representation, not the Cabinet that came in in 1953 with nine millionnaires and one plumber -- and may the Lord bless us, Durkin the plumber resigned out of protest and disgust, and went to his eternal reward with a clearer conscience. This is not good government; this is not even efficient government; it certainly is not representative government.

I have tried in vain to understand the reasoning of some of these Cabinet officers. Perhaps we ought to identify them here. For example, Doug Mc Kay, Secretary of the Interior. They call him old "Give Away" Mc Kay. He seemed fixed upon the idea of giving away the resources of this country. He explained his idea of government when he said "this Administration is a business administration." Perhaps his views caught on too well. Mr. Mc Kay was the give-away man,

so Ike gave him away. He sent him out to Oregon, and that's bad even for a Republican, may I say. Because by the time Wayne Morse gets through with Mc Kay, he will wonder why his friend Ike gave him the "business". That's not the kind of business Mc Kay liked. And then there is Mr. Dulles. They now call him the "Misguided Missile." He flits from one part of the world so much and so often that he has little or no time for policy statements or policy planning. We ought to be careful when we talk about these gentlemen, because the fatal blunder was made in the very beginning. What Ike really wanted -- at least what he promised -- was a flexible "fur-in" policy and a firm agricultural policy. You will find if you read his campaign speeches of 1952, that he was for at least 90% parity and a firm, rigid agricultural policy. And he criticized the Democratic foreign policy because it was not a flexible "fur-in" policy. What Ike really thought he wanted, what he advocated, was a flexible "fur-in" policy and a firm agriculture policy. But the trouble was

that he got his Cabinet Officers mixed up. He put Dulles in charge of the "fur-in" policy and made it firm, and put Benson in charge of agriculture, and made the agricultural policy flexible. (Applause.)

I was appreciative of what Governor Gary had to say.

Governor, you were right when you said that ~~whomever~~ our nominee may be, we are going to unite our forces, and that we are going to do!

(Applause). And I was so pleased to hear these telegrams read

here today from Stevenson, Kefauver and Harriman -- three good

Democrats -- and gratified by the spirit in which they were written.

I want to tell you something. Brother, of one thing you can be

sure. These men may have differences of viewpoint, they may have

different campaign techniques, but there is one thing you can be

sure of. Whether it is Stevenson, Kefauver, or Harriman, they

will promise every farmer that Benson will be fired on the first

day they take office, so help me! And you can rest assured that

we will change the whole team, every Cabinet Officer -- and of

course, change the coach! (Applause)

Now, I am the kind of Democrat that does not like to just lay it on Benson, Mc Kay and others; those fellows just work there. I have read the Constitution. I have studied a little Constitutional law, and I know the President of the United States, under the Constitution of this Republic, is responsible for the acts of his agents. I know he cannot delegate his power away -- I know the Government is too big a Government, our responsibility is too big, for a part-time President, and part-time leadership. (Applause.) I further know, Ladies and Gentlemen, that while you may fool some of the people for some of the time on this business of having the blame rest on George Humphrey, Benson, Dulles or Mc Kay, that sooner or later the American people will come to recognize that every one of these policies must be laid at the doorstep or on the desk of the President of the United States. For my part, I hold Dwight Eisenhower responsible for all of the misdeeds of his Administration. (Applause).

If he wants credit for rain, he is going to have to take credit for the drought. He cannot take the bows and receive the garlands, unless he also is going to be willing to take the boos that anybody may pass along.

They would like to have it so Ike is untouchable. They would like to have you believe, the propagandists of the Republican Party, that the President can do no wrong. I say to you, the President not only can do wrong, but he has- done wrong! (Applause).

We are going to hold Dwight D. Eisenhower accountable for every single act of this Administration. He is not going to escape responsibility, if we have anything to say about it -- and we are going to have a lot to say between now and November.

Let's see what the facts are. As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." And when you look at the record, you see it is not only a big business government, but a bigger business government. Here's the record. I made a review of the economic policies of the Eisenhower Administration, and of course one of the

chief architects dictating economic policy was a fellow from Ohio. He is head of the Mark Hanna Company -- and is carrying on the Hanna traditions. You have heard of Mark Hanna, if your memory goes back to the Mc Kinley era. The man associated with this Administration is George Humphrey -- and his views go back to the same Mc Kinley era. May I say that George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, is an affable, delightful, sociable man -- but I disagree with his point of view. I am not a hater of Republicans -- we saw enough of the Republican bitterness that we have learned our lesson. I hope no Democrat will ever make a bitter, cynical, critical campaign, but discuss policies and principles. Please understand that it is George Humphrey who is Secretary of the Treasury. My name is Hubert Humphrey, and I am not related to him -- biologically or politically. And we are both happy! (Laughter)

George Humphrey's policy is "trickle down", and Hubert Humphrey's policy is "percolate up". (Applause) The difference is a basic one between our two parties: the trickle down Republicans and the percolate-up Democrats.

Corporations did not go broke under us Democrats. When the Democrats went out, corporations were doing better than ever before -- the rate of capital investment was around thirty-five billion dollars a year, and stock dividends were up; corporations made as much as seventeen to twenty billions of dollars a year net profit after taxes. The Democratic Party was good to business, very good to business. But the businesses were ungrateful. Not only ungrateful, but so partisanly blind that they would not even recognize the good that had been done.

Of course, I can see why big business ought to be for this Administration. If not, they would stand guilty as ingrates -- because this Administration has really done well for them.

Corporation net income since 1953 is up thirty-six per cent after taxes -- after every conceivable avenue of deduction you can think of, after all the other advantages of every reduction -- up thirty-six percent.

General Motors is struggling along -- up one hundred thirty-six per cent in the three and a half years.

You know, this is a billion dollar year for taxpayers.

General Motors made a billion, and the farmers lost a billion.

Good Republican economics!

General Electric is not doing so well. Perhaps that is because one ~~man~~ worked for Truman, you remember -- the other Charles Wilson, of General Electric. And they only increased their profits forty-six per cent, compared to one hundred and thirty-six for General Motors.

United States Steel is inching along, barely making it, with a one hundred seventy-eight per cent increase in profits since January the First, 1953. They are about ready to ask for a new increase in steel prices. Even the Chicago Daily American has declared an increase in prices could not be justified in light of the profit statements of these companies.

Ladies and Gentlemen, stock dividends of corporations in

1955 were greater than the total net farm income for every farm producer and family in the United States. Remember that when you talk to the farm people. Stock dividends were greater than the total net profit of every farm family in America, big and little alike.

Yet this Administration seems unconcerned. Stockholders' incomes are up twenty-six per cent; money lenders' income, up 28 percent. As Mike said, "That's price support by the Government."

The very first act of this Administration in February 1953, the first major thing they did, was a decision to raise the interest rate for government securities. Government had been able to borrow money on long-term low rates of interest, and there was no need of raising interest rates. But this Administration said they were for better prices. And they started right out with their better friends. The first group they called in was the commerce and investment interests who proposed to raise

interest rates on government securities -- at your expense. As Mike Monroney so aptly put it, it cost you over a billion dollars a year, you the taxpayers. And yet somehow or another it is not even an issue of controversy. Unlimited, unreserved, and yet it was given to them.

Stock market prices are up seventy-one percent. You know, folks, you could be like Rip Van Winkle and go to sleep for twenty years, never hearing any news, radios, or without looking at television; and after 20 years, if you woke up and saw that stock market prices in New York were at an all-time high and cattle prices in Oklahoma and hog prices in Minnesota/ and Iowa were at an all-time low, you would know which Party was in power without asking. (Laughter and Applause.)

Now let's take a look at something else. Let's take a look at small business. Small business has suffered at the hands of this Administration. Small business is as important to the free

economy of everyone as are the farms. I am a small businessman; I would like to see America have many small businesses, to see the young people able to start their own business, and I think it is a duty of Government to design our economy to see that the law of economics permits them to exist. I think it is the duty of Government not only to look at the salaries, but to look at the lives of people, to look at the social pattern of the people, and to look at small business and its needs. Small business profits since Eisenhower went in are down 66%. Small business failures -- up 36 %. Mergers of small business with big business to survive -- at an all-time high in 45 years. Small business investors' returns down 57 %.

Mr. Small Businessman on the main streets of Oklahoma, Stillwater, Oklahoma, other towns in Oklahoma, why are you so addicted to the Republican Party?

The Republican Party is Big Business.

The Republican Party has never done a thing for you except pay you lip service.

The Democratic Party gave you the Clayton Anti-Trust Act, the Magna Charta of your business. The Democratic Party under Woodrow Wilson established the Federal Trades Commission to investigate injustices and inequities. The Democratic Party gave you the Robinson-Pattman Act, which is a guarantee to the small merchant that he will not be taxed out of existence by unprincipled competition. The Democratic Party gave you fair trade laws.

The Democratic Party, Mr. Small Businessman, has been your friend, because it believed a balanced economy, a producing agriculture, a well-paid labor force, means money in the cash register.

I know something about this. I was raised above a drugstore, and we did a substantial amount of business, but we were hurting plenty

because our farm people are suffering. And when they suffer, and when we suffer, wholesalers suffer. And when the wholesaler does not get business from us, and we do not get it from the farmer and worker, the manufacturer surely suffers.

This American economy cannot prosper for long without a balanced program.

You cannot take the steeple and pour on gold and permit the foundation to rot. You cannot paint the cathedral domes with economic dollars and permit the piling and the underbeams to corrode and become weaker!

Oh, it may not happen in a year or two years. We are strong. We built in a lot of strength, Fellow Americans, but it will happen unless we meet this problem before it gets out of control. It happened once before, and it can happen again. And it would seem to me that sooner or later Americans would sense what happened and be concerned when they see stock market prices high and hog prices low. It seems to me they would be concerned when

costs of living are stabilized at the expense of the producer of agricultural commodities.

These are the things that concern me, and I tell you, I am more concerned when we find the farmer's net income is down thirty-six percent since this Eisenhower crusade team went into power.

I see the full face of the Eisenhower economics in the tax bill, the fifty-fifty bill of one horse and one rabbit -- you got the rabbit in that tax bill, which was never explained very carefully. Somebody else got the horse. Isn't it interesting that something can be so minimized when it is a Republican Act, and so maximized when it happens to be a third-rate stenographer that gets a secondhand mink scarf under a Democratic Administration? (Applause). I would say those fur capes and milk scarves are for peasants compared to the plundering that is going on now...supposedly legitimately. They made it legal. A crime is a violation of law, but if you change the law, it isn't a crime.

Take a look at the Tax Act of 1954. There is not a dollar of tax savings for you, for the average American. Who gets it? Seventy-three cents out of that saved tax dollar, Ladies and Gentlemen, goes to corporations with a million dollars a year net income or over. Eighteen cents out of that tax savings goes to families of five thousand dollars a year or over; nine cents out of that tax savings dollar goes to families of five thousand a year or less. Yet those people represent today in America seventy-five percent of all the taxpayers.

This is the Eisenhower tax bill!

And when we Democrats started to pass a tax credit of twenty dollars, or a one hundred dollar exemption for each dependent's allowance for each family, the Administration said "No".

Oh, this Administration was willing to repeal the excess profits tax, willing to have a law that would provide eleven billion dollars worth of tax loopholes for big business, but when Senator Bob Kerr

and Senator Mike Monroney and others said, "Give the family a hundred dollar increase in exemptions per child, because we recognize the cost of living and the expense of raising a family has risen," when that was suggested, what did Eisenhower say? He called it "fiscal irresponsibility". Well, Mr. Eisenhower, if that is fiscal irresponsibility, I want to know what you are indulging in. Am I to understand that the Republicans do not think the public is entitled to a twenty dollar tax credit, when big business gets billions? Am I to understand that stock dividends are more important than dependency allowances?

That is your Republican philosophy. But if you do not take this out and tell the public about it, they will never hear about it. The scriptures say "Seek ye the truth". You have to look for it. Seek it, and then tell it!

Now, above all, I want to conclude my message with some comments on agricultural economics. I am from the Midwest, and,

Mike, I want to tell you there is just about as much prosperity in the Midwest as there is peace in the Middle East. (Laughter).

There are people who would like to have us believe all is well, but the farm people know better.

Farm mortgages since the Republicans went in power are up at the rate of a billion dollars a year -- mortgage debt was at its lowest point for forty years in 1952.

The parity index of farm prices stood at one hundred when Eisenhower promised a hundred percent parity, but has been sliding down ever since.

All the weasel words and all the slippery movements will never get the Republicans out of that broken campaign farm promise. I was there -- and not only did General Eisenhower promise a goal of one hundred percent parity and commit himself to ninety percent supports in Minnesota, he did it in Brookings, South Dakota; Fargo, North Dakota, Omaha, Nebraska; and every other place where he could get an audience of farm people.

We are in a farming belt out there, and for a while we used to go around spreading forget-me-nots all over the land. But then the farm folks got together and they are putting up a bronze plaque that reads, "Ike Slipped Here". And how well he did. (Applause).

Farm mortgages are over nine and a half million dollars. Farm income is down thirty-six percent; the farmer's share of the food dollar is down thirty-eight cents; farm families are being squeezed off the land; there is a ninety percent drop in farm population in three years.

This Administration wants efficiency, and yet I would like to remind them, there is something more important than efficiency.

You can read the Old Testament and the New, you can read the writings of Thomas Jefferson and the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Augustine too; you can read the Magna-Charta, the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the Atlantic Charter, and the Constitution of the United States, and

the word "efficiency" is not found.

But many words can be found about "justice"; there is plenty said on that. There is quite a bit of fairness, equality, decency; but not efficiency.

Efficiency has become a wholly Republican word. Efficiency to them, apparently means farmers with marginal profits must get off the land. After all, who is to know, who is to judge, who should or should not be a farmer? After they get off the land, where will they go? What will happen to the tenant farmers in the South with great social problems already perplexing them? Are they going to drive them away with inadequate schools, health, and facilities for making a living?

This Republican "efficiency" panacea!

What about the farmers of my part of the country, with their resources being literally sucked away from them? Ladies and Gentlemen, four out of every five young G.I. farmers have left

the soil. In farm population today, the farm operator's average age is fifty-eight. That is not good.

Perhaps the Eisenhower Republicans can show that the small farm is not as profitable or productive as a big farm; perhaps they can show that a big farm can produce for less. But I want to tell you, I thought we were against collectivism. We are spending millions of dollars all over the world telling people they ought to reform their land practices -- in Italy, Korea, Vietnam, Asia -- telling these people all over the world, "What you need is a family farm."

But in America, our Administration says, "These farms are too inefficient."

We have assistant secretaries, associate secretaries, secretaries under secretaries, in the Department of Agriculture, speaking for the President, who are saying, "Agriculture must become big business," And that is exactly what they feel.

Ladies and Gentlemen, agriculture is not just "business" big or little. Agriculture is the family picnic on Sunday, it is the church of the cross-roads in rural America, it is the small town that invites you to visit and buy supplies, it is the third and fourth class post offices too. It is the school where you send your children; it is the sense of solidarity that belongs to a community. You may have to pay a price for that kind of an America, but I am willing to pay it.

I own a corner drugstore, that I hope I can continue to own, and my son can own -- and I would like to live in an America where I can own a farm and make a living, a good living. I do not want to live in an ~~America~~ America where the final test of everything that is good is efficiency or bigness. Hitler was efficient. Mussolini made the trains run on time. ~~Khrushchev~~ Khrushchev is trying to make Russian farms efficient.

May I say, they would all be better off if they loved people and placed trust in God's greatest creation, people, and tried to make

life better for them rather than just make them more efficient.

This Administration stands condemned and indicted for its failure to do one single good thing to alleviate the problems that have confronted the farm people.

It depressed prices -- deliberately. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I have watched what has happened.

Regardless of the farm laws, the Administration's policies have depressed farm prices. They have literally destroyed the farmer committee system that makes our farm program operative, and played politics with it. They have raised interest rates on farm loans. Why, this Administration has the Farmers Home Loan Administration collecting more than it loans out in many areas.

This Administration continues to perpetrate a myth on the American public, saying that ninety percent of parity price supports are responsible for surpluses, that ninety percent of parity makes low prices necessary in the market. I challenge

any Republican within range of my voice, or the United States of America, or anyone they can bring back from overseas to debate that issue, because they cannot prove their case.

They can prove this: that Republicans have raised farm interest rates from four to four and a half per cent; and they have raised storage charges on a bushel of wheat from six cents to eleven cents; they can prove that they have mismanaged their program from beginning to end. And I can prove to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the cost of the farm program under three Republican years has been more than the entire cost of the farm programs under twenty Democratic years (Applause.) I can further prove to you that as you lower the price supports, you increase the production, and I can prove to you that as you lower price supports and increase production you drive the people from the land.

Yet, the President of the United States, after we had worked four months in hearings-- and I was in those hearings, most

all of them -- long weeks in Committee, hearing hundreds of people testify, then four weeks of debate during which we considered seventy-five to eighty amendments to perfect and finally pass the new farm bill in the Senate...After all that serious effort to help our farmers -- the President says "no". In effect, he says do it my way or not at all. And, I might add, there is not much difference!

When the Republicans defeated ninety percent of parity, the Washington Post headlines read, "Ike Wins Farm Victory". Well, let me tell you something, Ladies and Gentlemen, when Ike vetoed the farm bill, all headlines should have said, "Farmers Suffer Disastrous Defeat." That is what happened.

That "victory" for Ike cost American agriculture from two and a half to three billion dollars, and yet this Administration has the unmitigated gall to say, "We have to pump new money into the farms of America."

We tried to help; we fought; we worked, and we perfected a bill, Mr. Feed and Grain Producer, for barley, oats, rye, dairy

producers, which would give you fair protection, and a fair market. It provided for a surplus disposal program; it provided for ninety percent of parity.

Dwight Eisenhower vetoed that bill. As your own Bob Kerr said, "Benson may have built the cross upon which the farmer was impigned, but it was Ike who drove the nails through his hands." And it was Ike. (Applause)

What did they have to offer the farmer? All they have now is a slick political gimmick, of advance checks before November --- "borrowed" out of the farmer's income for next year. For doing what? For doing nothing!

Our farm people are not asking something for nothing. Our farm people want a fair price for their products. Our farm people want a fair price for their work. Our farm people want good markets. Our farm people want reasonable credit. And our farm people want an Administration in Washington that is concerned about the plight of American agriculture.

There is only one way to get it folks. You are going to have to get out the big political broom, and clean out this crowd from top to bottom, before the farmers in America can live.

(Applause)

The real crying shame of these days is the fact that in Wsshington there is an Administration that has substituted popularity, the desire for popularity, for leadership, and the willingness to make decisions based on leadership.

Ladies and Gentlemen, that is a cheap commodity.

You can be popular by being all things to all people. But to be a leader, you have to make decisions sometimes which are difficult, which are not often understood for the moment, but this Administration is so concerned about public relations that popularity has become a symbol.

We have had an overdose of public relations. What we need now is a public service.

This Administration has substituted mediocrity for principle, and says, "Things are all right; don't rock the boat; don't say anything controversial, and above all, do not contradict Ike".

Mediocrity has replaced principle, Ladies and Gentlemen, and sometimes popularity is the full measurement of mediocrity.

I have heard many a sermon and speech on the subject that this is a time for greatness. It is a time for greatness.

But there is a difference between real greatness and artificial greatness. There is a difference between greatness and just being popular.

Greatness requires a dedication to ideals; greatness requires a great prospective of problems which are difficult, and yet a willingness to meet them.

This Administration in its leadership of national affairs, lacks greatness. It permits things to roll along without giving a sense of direction. Until today, your country finds it is in great trouble.

An alliance in which you poured three hundred million dollars is about ready to crack up; the Middle East is unwieldy; Southeast Asia is in revolt. And in America there are signs of the time that are not encouraging.

The Department of Agriculture predicts that this year, in 1956, you will suffer another five percent decline in farm income.

Yet this Administration continues to shout "Peace and Prosperity", while there is no peace, in full measure of that word, and there is no genuine prosperity, when one third of this economy suffers.

I call upon the Democrats, as a Party, to carry the torch to make this case clear to the American people.

Pray God that our cause may be victorious, but whether that or not, we must work for what we believe to be right. We have a duty to lead. We have a responsibility to teach. We have a duty to call people's attention to some of the inequities that now exist. And you are the people here that can start the fight to

the victorious conclusion, because in Oklahoma you have the spirit;
you have the drive, you have the leadership. Besides that, my
friends, you have the political understanding.

Good luck to you. God bless you. It has been wonderful
to be with you.

(A pplause)



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