

1

File
Radio
Talk.
ABC
network
Feb 12, 1949

Good evening. with me tonight is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. We're going to swap words on a number of subjects--on the Taft-Hartley Law, on civil rights, on filibusters and on what the Republican Party is trying to do to the Democrats in the Senate--and on what Senator Humphrey thinks the Democrats ought to do--both in the Senate and the nation. That sounds like a lot of territory to cover, But I think we can do it. I think ^{so} because Senator Humphrey, as you will see, is very vocal and extremely emphatic in his views on politics and legislation. He trounced Senator Joseph Ball, Republican, in last November's election in Minnesota. Before that he achieved national notice by leading the battle for an explicit civil rights plank at the Democratic National Convention. He won that fight against forces that would have liked ~~very much~~ to weasel-word the plank according to their own thoughts. So the first question I'm going to ask him--and he can ask questions of me if he wants to--is about a matter that bears strongly on the chances of civil rights legislation. Since you feel so strongly on the subject, Senator Humphrey, and since you'd like to abolish filibusters, why did you join other Democrats in voting solidly against Senator Knowland's move to have the rules committee discharged from consideration of the bill relating to cloture. As you know, Senator Knowland ^{that} said his sole motive was to force immediate consideration in the Senate.

HUMPHREY.--That's what Senator Knowland said, Mr. Andrews. But I know that that was not his sole motive. I know that his action was a part of a deliberate attempt on the part of the Republican minority in the Senate to capture control of the Senate.

(more)

ANDREWS.-I take it that you mean the Republicans hope to cause enough defections among the Democrats so that with ~~then~~ ^{those Democrats} the ~~the~~ Republicans can constitute a majority. Something like the way they did when they beat the proposal to exempt inaugural tickets from ~~the~~ tax? I seem to remember that your ~~majority~~ ^{Democratic} majority of fifty-four to forty-two didn't do you much good there. And that with ~~ninety-two~~ ^{Senate} voting, the defection of six Democrats enabled the Republicans to defeat the proposal forty-seven to forty-five.

HUMPHREY.-That's exactly what I mean, Mr. Andrews. And you'll see case after case from now on where the Republicans will try to control the Senate as if they won the election last Fall, instead of losing it. Take that Knowland ~~and~~ resolution. The legislation was before the rules committee, and the rules committee was not stalling. At our Democratic caucus on Saturday we ~~were~~ were told that the committee would have a report by Wednesday. So what good reason was ~~there~~ ^{there} for the Knowland attempt to jump the gun by trying to force a decision on Monday, two days ahead of the report? There wasn't any good reason. There was just a political reason. The Republicans were just trying to use ~~initiative~~ a ~~strategic~~ strategic trick to take the leadership on the issue away from the Democrats. They got ~~some~~ a taste of blood on that inaugural tax matter and they thought they'd try it again. So I voted with my party to stop them in their tracks.

(more)

ANDREWS.--Then your vote on that specific matter does not mean, Senator Humphrey, that you've changed your mind about the need for imposing cloture ~~in~~ the Senate ~~so~~ so that if filibusters can be prevented on the civil rights question--and on other matters?

HUMPHREY.--It certainly does not, Mr. Andrews. At the Democratic caucus I made it clear that I'm going to stand with my party on matters affecting the organization of the Senate. I reserved the right--and I always will reserve it--to disagree with the party leadership on the basis of issues. To put it one way, I reserve the right to be a staunch defender of the Democratic platform. On the Knowland proposal--well, I just didn't believe in the sincerity of it and I did believe in the sincerity of Senator Hayden, chairman of the rules committee. And I, for one, don't intend to sit idly by and let ~~the~~ Republicans take the lead on issues that the Democratic platform has promised to put into effect. But I'd like to ask you a question, Mr. Andrews. What do you think the Democrats are expected to do as a result of the election? What do you think the voters want them to do?

ANDREWS.--I can't speak for the voters, Senator Humphrey. I can tell you what the Democrats promised to do. President Truman stumped the country promising outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law. Most of the candidates for House and Senate promised about the same thing. The Democrats also made a lot of promises about civil rights and better housing and a minimum wage and cloture rules. In fact you promised so much that I, as a reporter, wonder just how many of the promises you'll be able to keep. But before we get away from our first topic I'd like to ask you point-blank. Do you still favor imposing cloture by a majority vote? (more)

HUMPHREY.--I most emphatically do.

ANDREWS.-- Don't you think you'll be certain to run into a filibuster if you try to do that.

HUMPHREY.--The answer, of course, is yes.

ANDREWS.--well, then, Senator Humphrey, would you personally settle for a decision to impose cloture by a two-thirds vote of the Senate?

HUMPHREY.--*I personally would not settle. But I do*
~~I would reluctantly. And the only reason I would is that~~

I think that even with a two-thirds rule we'd be able to get a substantial portion of the civil rights legislation passed. Maybe all of it. why, we can count on thirty-one Republican votes can't we?

After all, didn't thirty-one Republicans vote for the Knowland motion to discharge the rules committee?

ANDREWS.--But ~~right~~ on the basis of ~~your~~ your own statement that *I would expect that 31 votes to join with some members*
you for majority rule on cloture
that was a political trick, don't you think some of the thirty-one might change their minds?

HUMPHREY.--I don't think they'd dare to. But if you don't mind, Mr. Andrews. I'd like to talk about the Democrats for awhile. I think the Democratic party has got to do something more than just keep the Republicans from getting control of the Senate. I think we not only have to keep the leadership but show what we're going to do with it. I'm willing to stand by my party. I'll stand by it a lot better than a lot of Democrats did at the last election. I say that we can't satisfy our constituents merely by saying that we prevented the Republicans from seizing control. I say we've either got to produce on the campaign promises we made--or else.

(more)

ANDREWS.--Let me interrupt, Senator Humphrey. It's refreshing to hear ~~any Senator~~ admit that his party could possibly lose in 1950 if it doesn't keep its campaign promises, and I take it that that is what you are ~~admitting~~ ^{saying}. Aren't you saying that if the Democratic Party doesn't stick to its platform and campaign pledges, that there might ~~have~~ be a turnover in the Senate and the House in 1950.

HUMPHREY.--That's exactly what I'm saying.

ANDREWS.--Would you go so far as to say that that might include 1952 also?

HUMPHREY.--You betcha. It was the coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats in the 79th Congress that produced the 80th Congress. One lesson ought to be enough. I mean it ought to prove to all ~~our~~ Democrats that they can't win an election on one set of promises and then let some ~~of the party~~ ^{Democrats} kick away the fruits of the victory by ignoring the promises and lining up with Republicans. Again I ask you, what do you think was meant by our triumph last fall?

ANDREWS.--Well, Senator Humphrey, in the minds of most Democrats the campaign was waged on ~~around~~ a set of ~~a~~ so-called liberal promises. I remember--as you will--that President Truman promised outright repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. But just today I read that Senator Ellender of Louisiana--one of your Democrats--said that it would be unthinkable to scrap the Taft-Hartley law for a lopsided Wagner Act. And I see that ~~Senator Vandenberg, a Republican, predicts~~ Hugh Scott, the Republican National Chairman, predicts that the name of the law will be changed--but that most of its points will be retained by this Democratic-controlled Congress. Looks to me as if you're already heading into one of those coalitions ~~that~~ that could cause you trouble (more).

HUMPHREY. ~~Van der Bilt, you know~~ All I can say, Mr. Andrews, is that Senator ~~Van der Bilt~~ and Senator Ellender represent the forces that lost ~~van~~ the election.

ANDREWS.--whether they do or not, Senator Humphrey, do you really believe that ~~you can~~ the Democrats can repeal the Taft-Hartley law if repeal is ~~fight~~ fought by the Dixiecrats. wouldn't the loss ~~of~~ of the Dixiecrats alone be enough to shave your majority down to nothing? *Prophets*

HUMPHREY.--I think we'll have enough votes without the Dixiecrats, Mr. ~~Andrews~~ Andrews. There are many ~~of~~ Republicans who are going to have to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I'd just like to see what would happen to some of them when they come up for re-election ~~if~~ they vote to keep that law on the books.

ANDREWS.--will you name some names. *names*

HUMPHREY.--I certainly will. I think you'll find Saltonstall and Ives and T. O. E. and Aiken seeing it our way. To say nothing of Flanders and Morse. why, even Senator Knowland will. You know that all of their states have large labor votes. And I think they'll be wondering--when they vote--what will happen to them ~~at that time~~ if they seek re-election. I guess every Senator wonders that. Why do you think the House has been acting on legislation so much more rapidly than the Senate. why, for the simple reason that the whole membership is more quickly responsible to the people.

ANDREWS.--Is there anything good in the Taft-Hartley law, Senator Humphrey? Do you want it all repealed and the whole Wagner Act restored?

andrews



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