

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE SEVENTH
BIENNIAL CONVENTION OF TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
CIO, April 29, 1952.

(Senator Humphrey was greeted by applause.)
Thank you, thank you very much.

My friends, Emil Rieve, Officers of the
Textile Workers Union of America, Guests of this great and
wonderful convention and the dues-paying delegates to
this convention -- (cheers and applause)

When I was offered the invitation, or
forwarded the opportunity to come and address you on this
occasion, I asked Mr. Rieve -- I said, "Well, just what
day can you use me?"

He said, "Well, it's going to be a very busy
convention, Senator, we will try to squeeze you in for five
or ten minutes on Tuesday morning."

I said, "Mr. Rieve, you are losing your
sense of good judgment, there is no Senator in the world
that has ever been squeezed into five or ten minutes."

(Laughter)

I just want all you delegates out here
lean back and relax, because you are in for what I call
a Senatorial treat now. (Laughter) You are on double
time, this is premium paid (laughter). There is a shift
differential here (laughter). There is incentive bonus.
This all just comes free.

I am just one of the delegates myself, one
of the workers in the vineyard of democracy, so we'll take
off now and have a few unkind words about some of the
bosses that are trying to boss us around in this country
and see whether we can make (cheering)

I am sure that by now every delegate to this convention, if not every delegate, and most of them, have received a copy of a report that has been recently published by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management Relations.

It has been my good fortune and privilege to be the chairman of that subcommittee. For over a year and a half, the seven members of that subcommittee have been studying the impact, the effect and the operations of the Taft-Hartley Law throughout the United States as it affects trade union organizations.

(Continued on page 3.)

There have been many statements made by the Taft-Hartley Act. There have been all kinds of slogans and all kinds of epitaphs that have been used to describe it.

For want of a better word and a better slogan, when that law went on the books -- and it will be five years ago this August -- the leaders of organized labor branded it a slave labor act. There were those that said that was too extreme, and I am sure some of us felt that possibly a better phrase could have been found, but I want to report to this convention, and you yourself can double check it, because there is a report in your hands, that is not the result of prejudice, it is not the result of just a hit and miss survey, it isn't the result of just someone sitting down and writing a paper or an article; it is a result of on the spot hard work campaign and investigation.

I want to report that the Taft-Hartley Act is everything that its worst critics ever said about it in so far as it applies to the unions.

(Cheering, applause)

You know, some of the folks in labor have even let themselves gloss over this unfortunate and inequitable piece of legislation.

For the last two or three years some of us have been so busy defending ourselves against the ruthless and viscious attacks of those who would destroy liberal democracy that the word "Taft-Hartley" has hardly been used as a term or a phrase that symbolizes political differences of opinion.

The time is at hand to again re-evaluate these political issues and the time is at hand

to check into this legislation and to see what we can do about it.

I am not one in the Congress of the United States that thinks that all you have got to do is to put a couple of little amendments on the Taft-Hartley Act to make it good.

I do not think that will make a bad piece of legislation good. I am one that believes that the way to correct bad labor law, that the way you correct improper and bad legislation any place, is to do two things: First, you repeal that which is bad and secondly, you write something that is good.

(Cheers and applause)

(Continued on page 5)

Let me say to those that may feel that that is abroad statement, that it is not one that has been stated without full consideration of its meaning. I think that, as the chairman of this Labor-Management Subcommittee, I know something about the Taft-Hartley Act. I think I know how its wicked provisions operate upon the free trade union movement of this land, and I submit that those even who were the fathers of the Act -- and I now stand on hallowed ground, because this Act, if not actually born in this state, at least some of its ideas were conceived by a son of this state, and that son of this great State of Ohio, that gentleman who is the father of this Act, he, himself, found that it needed 28 amendments even to make it agreeable to his taste, which certainly is not mine.

(Applause and cheers.)

If you can find 28 sections of one act that are so bad that the godfather of it feels that they ought to be repealed in the name of human decency, I think those of us who have had a much more objective and critical eye have every right and every reason to frankly state that the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 needs to be completely rewritten, that an entirely new body of labor law that meets the needs of modern American industry and American labor needs to be placed upon the statute books. If enough people will start to understand that, if enough workers will start to get busy on that premise, you can get exactly what I have said you can have, you can have fair, just and honorable legislation passed by the Congress of the United States.

(Cheers and applause)

Taft-Hartleyism was fed to the American people. It was passed by Congress, you know, as a law to free the American workers from the domination of their union bosses. But isn't it amazing that after five years of the Act, or

the impact of this Act, the American workers still are supporting their alleged union bosses, that the American labor movement still has pretty much the same kind of vigorous, vital leadership it had when the Act went on the book, and that the American workers themselves, in election after election throughout this land have asked the Government of the United States for the privileges of a union shop, that they have supported their union leadership and that the workers of this country have yet to ever state publicly or privately that they felt that they need to be freed from the so-called domination of their union leaders or union bosses?

I would suggest that those who have such solicitude for American working people seek the advice of American workers before they write labor legislation. The place to go is to the people who understand what the law will do, not to go to those who want a law on the book to give them additional strength and additional power by which they can check, by which they can retard, by which they can cripple and, in some instances, by which they can destroy the efforts of unions to grow and live.

The story of the textile workers of America in the South, in the plants where we investigated, is the sad story of free American workers attempting to voluntarily organize for their betterment only to find out that the law of the land, the law passed by the Congress of the American people, was a club and a weapon that was used to destroy the efforts of American citizens to better their living standards,

(Applause and cheering.)

Lest anyone think that we speak without the facts, let me ask those who are so prone to sharply criticize the trends of labor to retrace our steps in this investigation. Let them go to Fall River, Massachusetts, and see what happened; to Anderson, South Carolina; to Cedartown, Georgia. Let them go even to Lowell, Massachusetts. Let them go to Morristown, Tennessee. Let them go to Rome, Georgia. Let them go to city after city where we investigated and where we found that a new type of action, a new club, had been developed where the whole community, the police, the means of communication, the citizen groups -- every single aspect of a community -- was mobilized against the efforts of the citizens of that community who were workers and workers in the shops, in the factories, to organize for their self-protection.

I submit that is not equal justice, I submit that the Taft-Hartley Law is a violation of equal protection of the laws, I submit that the Taft-Hartley Law as it was enacted and it has been enforced is a law which does not give equality of treatment to the American people and it ought to be repealed -- the sooner the better. (Cheers)

May I say, with equal candor, I invite the proponents, I invite the supporters of this Act, to defend it; I invite them to tell the American people how it has worked to the benefit of those who are the workers in our shops and factories; I invite the gentleman from this very state, the senior Senator of this state, who aspires to be a President -- I invite him to explain to this organization (boos) -- I invite him to explain to any organization how the law which he sponsored has worked to the benefit of the plain, ordinary people of this country who have a right to share in American prosperity and in American productivity. (Applause)

Now, my friends, I am not going to just spend all my time with you on Taft-Hartley, because that is but one issue. It is a major one, but it is not all.

I want to spend a few moments now with the delegates here to sort of clear the record.

Oh, the trickery, the subtleties of those who are our enemies and our opponents in the field of social welfare legislation!

I want to address those remarks that are about to come to you now to the delegates, as they say, of the Mason-Dixon Line, because there have been those who have tried to interpret the work of our subcommittee as an attack against the South, and, my, how they would like to brand the chairman of that subcommittee as an enemy of the South.

I am here to state that there is no man in public life today, at least I feel that I am sincere and I have worked as hard as any man in public life to be a friend and a true friend to the great mass of people in the South, and in the West, and in the North and East, regardless of race, color, creed or nationality origin -- (cheering and applause)

Part of the southern states of this nation are a great and integral part of this Republic. To me, it is a joy to see those great states and their people enjoying the new opportunities which industry brings with it. I am happy to see these wonderful states enjoy a new prosperity.

As a member of the Congress, I have voted for subsidies, to be sure, to our friends south of the Mason-Dixon Line.

I have supported farm price supports for their cotton, for their tobacco, for their rice; I have supported public works programs for their cities, for their counties and for their states. I have worked as a member of the Congress vigorously for the improvement of their education, vocational education, for the improvement of the health through public health services.

Why, we Americans are all one. There is no room in this country for sectionalism. There is no room in this country for those who would pit one area of America against another.

(Applause)

We are one great United States of America.

(More applause)

We are one union.

(More applause)

And I want to see my friends in Georgia, I want to see the farmers of Georgia, the workers of Georgia, just to use one state, have as many privileges as the farmers of Minnesota and the workers of Minnesota.

(Applause)

I know what unionism and unionization has done for the workers in my state. I know that without free trade unions in Minnesota the standard of living would be much lower than it is today, and I know that without free trade unions in Minnesota the income of the people would be much worse, and I know that without free trade unions and free collective bargaining that the business

community of Minnesota would be less prosperous.

So I want Alabama, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia and North Carolina, Missouri and Oklahoma, every state in the land, to have the privileges of a free collective bargaining union, a free trade unionism so that the workers in the factories may be paid a fair and decent wage and may be the kind of producers and consumers that builds for American prosperity.

(Applause)

But who are these people who try to set us against each other, who are these people who say the labor committee is picking on this area of the country or selecting that area for special attack?

I will tell you who they are. I was once asked, "What is your definition, Senator Humphrey, of a Dixiecrat?"

Let me give you my definition. A Dixiecrat -- and they are limited in number -- they are sort of prehistoric political monstrosities -- they are really the hangover of a buying age. A Dixiecrat is nothing more or less than a reactionary Northern representative with a Southern accent, that is all.

(Applause and cheers)

There is a universality. Let me tell you Bourbons are Bourbons no matter where you find them, Reactionaries are reactionaries no matter where you find them and liberals are liberals wherever you find them.

There is a kindred spirit among us and I have noticed that those today who stand up and holler so loud about their states rights are the very people

who feel that they have the right to own, manage, control and exploit their states. I have noticed that those who cry out so much for states rights never say a word about states responsibilities and duties to their people.

I have noticed that these self-styled states righters are actually disguising their true nature when they are properly to be classified as their states-wrongers, wronging their people, wronging their land, their industry, their children and their families -- in the name of what? In the name of their political power held by a handful of people.

I, as an American citizen, do not like that. I do not like political machines in Minnesota or in South Carolina or in New York or California. I do not like to see people excluded from their rights to vote in America or in any part of the world.

(Applause)

Let me tell you, friends, we have got a fight on our hands these days, and a tough one. The attack has been underway a long time. The attack from that area of America, the American economy and the American political structure that Mr. Roosevelt used to call the economic royalists. They are a dying breed. They will not be with us too long, but during the period that they are here they can do great damage, but they die hard and they like buying, fancy political funerals. Who are these economic royalists?

Let me tell you, let me just indicate. They are the kind of people, for example, that believe

that the oil, the natural resources of the American people, should belong to a handful of oil companies and oil economic barons. The oil off shore. Rather than to use the proceeds or the revenues from the production of that oil for the health and the recreation and the education of all of the children of all of the people all over the United States, you know what they want to do? They want to take this God-given natural resource and use it just for themselves and their few children and their economic enterprise.

They won that fight in the Congress of the United States, but the President of the United States, I safely predict, will again protect the public interest and the public welfare by vetoing the greatest steal -- (applause and cheers) -- by vetoing the greatest steal, the greatest grab in the history of the people of this generation; a steal that runs into the billions of dollars.

Who are these economic royalists? We have them North, South, East and West.

(continued on next page)

Some places we just call them reactionaries; in some places we call them Dixiecrats; in some places we call them something else and I can't repeat publicly right here what we call them because of the presence of the ladies. Who are they? I will tell you who they are, so let's not get the story mixed up.

Let's not think that what's happening today is any different than what has been happening for a long time. Let's not think that the attack that is coming upon the New Deal and the Fair Deal, let's not think that the attack that is coming upon your union, let's not think that the attack which has been leveled against the CIO, year in and year out, is anything new. It isn't. It is the same old line from the same old gang, for the same old purposes, the same old tune, the same old lyrics, and the same general philosophy and the same general purpose.

You would think, you know, that it was only about the last two years that anybody was opposed to the so-called welfare state. You would think it was only within the time of Mr. Truman, for example, that anybody was opposed to some of the things that the New Deal and the Fair Deal have stood for, but let me set the record straight.

Have you forgotten Mr. Roosevelt?

(Cries of "No.")

Oh, no. Have you forgotten that memorable speech, I believe it was in the '44 campaign, at the Statler Hotel, that speech before the International Teamsters, when Mr. Roosevelt said, -- you know, he was talking about the attacks of those upon him, upon Mrs. Roosevelt, upon Jimmie Roosevelt, upon Franklin D.

Roosevelt, Jr., upon every other one of the Roosevelts -- and he said, "Now they're even attacking my little dog Falla." (Laughter)

Well, every word in their desperation, they attack the President, they attack the program, they attack the allies of the program and of the President and everybody was open to the assault, and I want to refresh your memories, my friends, because in these days if you believe in liberal democracy, if you believe in the government of the people, by the people and for the people, for all of the people, you better be alive to what's going on in American politics and you better gird yourselves for a knock-down, drag-out fight, because we are in pay dirt now. We are going to have to make up our minds whether this country is going to move ahead in the line of social progress, in better standards of living for more and more people or whether or not we are going to lose all that we gained and slip back and turn over this great national heritage of ours to the people that once before abused it, adulterated it, and finally failed it by their mismanagement.

I know I should have told you earlier that when you invite a politician to speak here, he is going to talk about politics -- that is my business, that is my lot, that is my work, and let me say with equal candor, I am proud of my work, my occupation. I am not here to make any apologies. (Cheers and applause)

I am not here to say, "Oh, politicians--" this way and that way. I am proud of the fact -- and I point now to my people over there in that Minnesota delegation. I want to tell them (applause) I want to tell those good folks that no greater honor could ever befall a man who was a citizen of my state than to be selected by his people to represent them in the

Congress of the United States, that is a wonderful and great honor. (Cheers and applause)

I want my friends and neighbors from home to know that I didn't go down there to liquidate the American economy, I didn't go down into Congress to sell out my soul in order to be popular with some people that I don't think deserve the good name of being good people (cheers and applause).

I didn't go down to Congress to repudiate my friends in labor.

I didn't become a member of the Congress to forget the people that have tilled the soil and I didn't go down to Congress to sell out the kids in our schools.

No, I didn't go down there to get a cheap headline by saying I am for economy at the expense of the American people. I didn't go down there to get a headline by saying I want a balanced budget before I want a balanced diet. I want a balanced diet and I want a balanced economy and then you will get a balanced economy.

My friends -- (cheers and applause) -- that is a subtle atmosphere in which we work in Washington. That atmosphere in the nation's capital is one that is very folksy, you know. My, how nice it is to be a nice fellow, just to conform to the pattern. How wonderful it is to be always the kind of a gentlemen at other people's rules, the way they want you to be a gentleman.

I want to say right now very candidly that my responsibility is not to those people in the nation's capital who find that their job is to be the lobbyist for their special interest. My responsibility, I want,

is to the people of my state and, finally, to the people of the United States and not to the lobbyists and the special interests in this country.

(Applause and cheers)

I have heard a lot of prattling about morality. Let me tell you, it takes two to make a crook. There are all kinds of morality. Surely, it is immoral to stick your hand in the till and run off with the cash. Surely, it is immoral and it is illegal to steal the money out of the collection plate. Yes, it is immoral and it is illegal and it surely cannot be defended and it should be exposed and stopped, to have any rigging of the income tax, but I would like to remind this audience that I have yet to see a \$75-a-week trade unionist or worker that has been exposed for having corrupted the Bureau of Internal Revenue. (Applause and cheers)

But I have seen and I have heard the testimony of a few sharpies around this country who seem to never be able to get enough, who would become millionaires a dozen times over and then do not want to pay a fair share of their taxes. First they fight a fair tax bill and when they get through with that they go on in and try to bribe the tax collector.

I repeat that the recipients of old age pensions, grandmothers and grandpas, the recipients of unemployment insurance, the unemployed, the workers in our factories, the fellow who runs the little family-sized farm, these are not the people who are corrupting American politics.

The people who are corrupting American

politics are the people who first of all tried to corrupt the law, tried to write on the statute books a law that is unfair and inequitable and then when they failed in some of those attempts they got ahold of some weak-kneed public official who was willing to sell his soul for a mess of pottage.

This I abhor and I think that the record of some of us in the Congress indicates our sincerity of purpose.

But there is another kind of corruption, too. How about the corruption, my dear friends, back in the good old days that some of my opponents don't like to think about?

Let me tell you about another kind of corruption. How about the corruption of 60 per cent of the banks in this country closing their doors and robbing the people of their savings? That was corrupt, rotten, immoral.

How about the corruption of the thousands and thousands of home mortgages that were foreclosed upon and people were evicted into the streets of this land? How about the corruption of the farm mortgages that were foreclosed upon? How about the corruption of 15 million workers walking the streets in search of a job?

How about the corruption of two million young boys and girls walking the railroad tracks and in the pool halls, no place to go, no job, no hope?

And, my dear friends, those who now prattle about morality, how about the corruption of a stock market in 1929 that robbed the American people in less than 18 months of 80 millions of dollars of their savings and of their assets?

Have they forgotten that? I haven't.

The same people, some of them, the same people, are now talking about morality, and if not the same people, the people of same mind.

How about the corruption, if I were talking to a good farm audience, of nine-cent oats and three-cent hogs? How about the corruption of 10-cent eggs, ten cents a dozen?

How about the corruption of child labor?

I tell you, my friends, that is the kind of corruption that the Government of the United States needs to stop. And that is exactly what the liberal program of the New Deal and the Fair Deal has stopped.

(Continued on next page)

We have stopped it cold in its tracks.

But it has not been easy, oh no, it has not been easy. And I want to say to some of the editorial writers -- and I repeat -- to some of the editorial writers who give me those warning sermons on ethics in Government, that where were their sermons when we were fighting for a little social security for the dependent mothers, for the needy mothers and dependent children? Where was their sense of morality and ethics when we were fighting for a pre-payment social insurance system and old age insurance?

I will tell you where it was. They were for the insurance companies. They forgot morality and ethics and they forgot the people.

I read these articles that tell us we must be more careful, that men in public life must set high standards, and I agree. Surely we have a great responsibility. We do have to live better in terms of our personal conduct, I know that. It is not an easy assignment, but I want to ask those same people: Do they think it is fair to deny any workers the right to organize to protect themselves in the shops and factories of this land?

When the editors of this land will join with me in forwarding to the working people of America a free and equal opportunity to raise their standard of living, then I will say they are sincere in their ethical sermons every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, and two on Sunday.

(Laughter, applause.)

But, you know, the tragedy of all of this is that some of us who are supposed to be the fighters for liberal democracy have ceased to fight. Here is the tragedy. During the 1930's -- sure, we made mistakes, we improvised, we had to experiment -- but during the 1930's there was a band of people in the nation's capital and throughout America who were filled with the zeal of social reform.

They were people that wanted to build new houses for the underprivileged; they were the people who wanted to reclaim the land; they were the people who wanted to improve the education; they were the people who thought of the old people and thought of the children. And they worked day and night, they challenged everyone everywhere, and they moved ahead like a mighty army in behalf of progressive liberal democracy.

Oh, those were wonderful days!

Our enemies were on the run, our enemies, the people's enemies. But what has happened lately?

Following the war, that tragic war, following the election of 1948, I remember how thrilled all of us were by that miraculous victory -- and indeed it was.

Many people, in fact, most of the people in politics, felt there was no hope, but a man in the Whitehouse who wanted to be President again went out on what he called that "whistle-stop tour," went out from town to town in this land, from city to city, from community to community, and he talked sense, he talked promises, he talked issues, he fought, he inspired the American people, he told them where he stood.

And Mr. Glamor Boy from New York went out and just sang sweet nothings and he ended up with nothing and Mr. Truman ended up at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

(Cheers and applause.)

But we became so excited over the victory that we forgot that the predatory opposition was still at work. There is one thing you want never to do -- do not ever do this, my friend -- never underestimate your opponent. Never.

And what did we see happen? I remember in 1948 I attended the labor conventions, the CIO, the AF of L. I went around to groups afterwards and, when we would come in as newly-elected Senators, we were almost like some new commodity that had just been brought on the market. It was a sort of a miracle, an oddity, and they said, "Look at this, isn't that grand? We won."

But while we were bragging and praising ourselves we were in this program of self-adoration, the opposition was holing up in some big hot room or in some hall and they were planning on how they were going to stop us dead in our tracks, and if you do not mind my saying so, their plans darn near materialized. They went to work.

The first thing they did was to brand everything that we were trying to do in the Congress of the United States in behalf of a Fair Deal Program as stateism -- stateism.

Of course, nobody knew what stateism was. That was a terrible word. That came out of some Harvard attorney's mouth and it didn't appeal to the folks back in the countryside, and so they said, "We have to drop that."

But imagine the brazenness of this: After dropping the word "Stateism," what they said we were out to do, those of us who were liberals from the Congress of the United States, what the President was out to do, was to enact and put into effect in this country a welfare state, and remember, friends, that the term "welfare state" took on as if it was a dirty word. Children's mouths were washed out for even

saying it. Why, all over America if you were for the welfare state you were a dangerous sort of person.

Isn't this a sad comment on American democracy? What kind of a state are we supposed to be for?

I know what the Representatives are for, if you permit me to say this; I know what the opponents are for. I know what the Dixiecrats are for. They are for a state of confusion. Indifferences and reactions. There is no doubt about that.

(Applause and cheers)

There are some people, I suppose, that have in the back of their minds it is a military state, but I ask you very candidly, what is more honorable, what is more decent, what is more proper than for the people of the United States and their government, a government which the great Lincoln said, "A government of the people, by the people and for the people," what is more honorable than having that government be interested in the welfare of 150 million people?

(Applause and cheers)

Let me say to my friends here in the front row, Hubert Humphrey is for the welfare state and I am proud of it.

(Cheers and applause)

Yes, I am one of those Americans that believes in a country that is as rich as ours, a country in which we have 95,000 millionaires, a country in which we have a profit such as we have never known before, a country in which we have production like we have never dreamed possible, I am of the opinion that the government of this country, the Federal government,

the state governments and the local governments, can provide a good education, a good schoolhouse, well-paid teachers, for every boy and girl in America and we can afford to do it again and again and again.

(Applause and cheers)

And let me say right now that if the price of a balanced budget in this country is an unbalanced educational structure, then the price is too high

I would like to hear some of these people who have this double entry bookkeeping mentality, this business machine apparatus up here where we are supposed to have brain power; I would like them for a few moments to speak out with a sense of sincerity and compassion for the lives of over a million little children in America today at this very hour who are being denied an opportunity to go to school because there are no teachers and no schools and no facilities.

How do they justify that in the name of democracy? Well, I am for the welfare of those children. It costs something, sure, it costs something, but I suggest that those who complain about the cost quit smoking their dollar cigars and smoke 50 cent ones and we will be able to pay for it.

(Applause and cheers)

Yes, I suggest that those that complain about the cost of that get by with not -- I don't want them to have no yachts, I am not asking them to have no cadillacs. I am asking them to cut down the number of yachts from four to three and the number of cadillacs from seven to four, that is all.

I am asking them to pay their taxes; I am asking them to quit bellyaching about their

responsibilities as citizens.

How about the people in this country that do not have public health facilities? How about the hundreds and thousands of counties in America where there is not even a public nurse, a public health nurse? Are you going to stand here, is anyone going to tell me that a nation that produced last year in gross national products over three hundred billion dollars in goods and services cannot afford a public health nurse in the rural counties of America?

Are you going to tell me that? You would think we couldn't if you go down to Washington, because we are cutting the budget for public health right now. We are going to cut that budget. The same people who want to cut that budget want to cut somebody else's taxes -- not yours, but somebody on top.

They have fifteen new loopholes they want to put in the tax law.

Ladies and gentlemen, let me be very concise and to the point about this program. There are those in America who really believe that the strength of the nation is in its banks. There are those in America who believe that America is as rich as its factories. There are those in this country who believe that we are as rich as the latest tabulations on the stock markets. There are those -- and they have the right to their opinions -- but I want to say from my point of view and for my record, that I am one of those who believes that

America is as rich as its people -- its people who are educated, its people who have a chance for good health, its people who have a chance for family living in a home of their own, a people who have a chance for a job at a fair wage with a collective bargaining agreement, a people who have a chance to live on the land and produce on the land.

I believe that America is as strong and prosperous as the sum total of prosperity and the happiness and strength of 150 million American people in their homes, their factories and in their jobs and shops.

That is my answer of American strength.

(Applause and cheers)

(Continued on next page)

Well, my wife always tells me that speeches don't have to be interminable to be immortal, but I never remember it. I am going to button this up.

(laughter)

Why am I giving you this talk? Because I want to arouse in you again the desire to fight, the desire to stand up and be counted.

How many of you people in this wonderful convention today, this audience, realize that there are those now who would literally emasculate many of the great laws that we have on our books? How many people know that already amendments have been introduced to the Defense Production Act which will do away with the Walsh-Healy Act, which means, in other words, that competitors who have non-union labor, scab labor, substandard labor, will be able to come on in and bid on government contracts against those who do have union labor and fair standards of employment?

Do you know what that means to your union if that passes? Do you know what that will mean to the union organizations of America?

It means that the employer or a contractor that wants to hire non-union people and to pay substandard wages is given a premium by his government, he is given a policy at the same time by his government that this is what ought to be done.

Why, those little bills and little amendments creep in to the law before we even wake up to the fact that they are there.

My friends, how many of us know that even now there are those who would undermine some of the structure of our great social insurance system? How many know that there are even those today that would like

to put more limitations upon the minimum wage laws?

How many of us know that there is a constant, relentless pressure to increase the cost of money, the interest rate, so that you have to pay more on your loans?

How many know that there is a constant, relentless, persevering effort in the Congress of the United States to write laws that are not for the many, to write laws that are not for the majority, but to write laws that are for the minority, the privileged minority?

And this United States Senator knows what he is talking about when he says that, because for two sessions of the Congress, Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, Senator Lehman of New York, and myself, have stood on the floor of the Senate fighting on tax legislation, and sooner or later trade unionists and liberals in this country are going to have to wake up to the fact that you have to understand those tax laws. Because there are those that will give you something, you know, on the one hand, and take it away from you on the other hand with an inequitable tax bill.

How many people in this audience, for example, know that this last Congress let the corporations of this country escape paying five hundred million dollars worth of taxes which they should have paid? Five hundred million.

Now, my friends, this is no biased charge. I am not assailing corporate enterprise. I believe in profits. I believe in a free enterprise system. My whole life has been a testimonial to that, but I submit to you that when the last corporation tax bill was passed, instead of making it effective January 1, when ever other corporation tax bill in the history of the American Republic

has been effective, every one since 1913 -- this tax bill went into effect upon the corporations on April 1, instead of January 1, 1951, and it permitted them to escape paying taxes, increased taxes, on the first quarter of 1951, which was the richest quarter in the history of American business, and it permitted them to have a gift from the Government of the United States of over five hundred million dollars that they owed to the federal treasury.

We had a fight about this on the floor of the Senate. Thirty-four Senators said that that bill ought to have been paid.

(Continued on next page)

About fifty-some said it should not. That is the balance of power that we have. You see, my friends, this is what the stakes are about. Soon we are going into political conventions and it is on this note that I conclude.

Let me speak only for the party of which I am a member. I do not speak for the opposition. They have got their problems. By the time they are through with each other, they will have to put a sign out: "Help wanted." They will have so beaten each other up, they will so expose one another's limitations and weaknesses, that nobody in his right mind will vote for any candidate that they put up.

(Applause and cheering.)

May I say they will be able to do that without the help of a single Democrat. They are going at it hammer and tongs right now. So let me speak only for my party; let me speak on this point: there are many people in America who are saying, "Well, the Democratic Party is split."

There are many people in America -- and it is always helped and supplemented and aided by all kinds of comment from commentators and others -- that the issue that splits the Democratic Party is the issue of civil rights.

My friends, let me help you set the record straight. Civil rights is one issue in terms of legislative proposals. The civil rights issue, however, is more than just the issue about poll tax, anti-lynching and fair employment practices; the civil rights issue has become a symbol -- it is a symbol -- and those who go around cloaking themselves in this issue of being opposed to it, those who I termed earlier as the Dixiecrats, that say they will fight to the death any

attempt of Truman or Humphrey or anyone else to impose upon them these terrible rights, they are not worried about civil rights. Do not kid yourselves. These people have this issue as a cloak to hide their dagger.

What kind of a dagger and what for? A dagger to stab the free union movement in the back as they have in community after community.

(Applause)

My friends, a dagger to stab in the back every program that we have for aid to education, a dagger to stab in the back every fair and equitable tax proposal we bring to Congress.

They only use this emotional problem or what they call the race problem to cloak and disguise their sinister efforts, and they have done it, let me say, to a point where they have even fooled some of our friends.

Let me set the record straight as a Democrat. If my party, the Democratic Party, feels that it must have harmony at the price of principle, if it feels that it must retreat from everything that we have stood for, if it feels that in order to please everybody we have got to forget our principles about public power, public health, aid to the farmers, fair labor laws and civil rights -- and those are what the issues are -- if we feel that in order to get harmony we have to retreat that far, let me make a prediction about the Democrats: The Democrats, if they do that, will be in the same unfortunate predicament that the Republicans have been in for the last twenty years -- they will be out of office and they will be out for a long time.

(Applause and cheering.)

The American people want, first of all, a party and candidates that are right.

They are not asking for them to be cute or clever. They want candidates today that stand four-square upon the issues of our time; they want a political party that comes clean on the issues of labor, farms, business and human rights.

Let me state it again, my friend, whether we like it or not, the abuse of civil liberties in this country -- and there are union organizers in here who have suffered under that; you have been arrested, you have been beaten.

I was at Morristown, Tennessee. I saw what happened. There was the abuse of civil liberties.

Let me say right now that if the Democratic Party reneges on its platform promises on the principles in support of human rights, civil rights and civil liberties, the Democratic Party will be justly and appropriately submerged and defeated in the election of November, 1952.

But if we stand up and proclaim what we know to be the truth, if we speak out for the people, for the great masses of our people, if we speak out for the working man, if we speak out for that citizen of our country who has been relegated to second class citizenship because of his race or color or creed, if we stand up as the champions of people, do you know what is going to happen?

Let me tell you what is going to happen. It is going to be victory again for liberal democracy in 1952.

(Cheering and applause.)

I am going to be at that convention, and I am going to be there a lot peppier and a lot tougher and stronger than I am here today, because I did not get much sleep last night. I am not going to go to that convention to hold hands. There is a place to make love, and that is not in politics.

(Laughter.)

Politics is the matter of being able to reconcile

differences and obtain a majority upon principles and of being able to carry out those principles into effective political action.

Some of you are going to be delegates to these respective political conventions, and I want to say now that we must stand firm. We must not get weak nor shall we retreat. You cannot move ahead and win by moving backwards. You cannot move away from the program and the record which is ours -- and why should you?

It is a good one. You are going to have to stand by the people today in American politics, regardless of their party, that really stand up for you, that stand up for the American way of life, that stand up for freedom and for the people, that stand up for human equality, not only as a phrase but as a practical reality.

So I tell my friends and colleagues that will be with me in Chicago in July that in so far as this member of the Congress is concerned and this delegate from the State of Minnesota, there will be no retreat on the issue of civil rights, there will be no retreat on the issue of public power for the peoples of our land, there will be no retreat from the principles of TVA, for we need more flood control up and down the Mississippi and other rivers of this land.

There will be no retreat on the part of this Senator from advocating the repeal of this obnoxious Taft-Hartley Law, there will be no retreat whatsoever from a liberal program.

(Cheers and applause.)

And even more important, my friends, there will be no retreat on the basic funds and purposes of our foreign policy. We have a tremendous obligation, every one of us. This whole world of ours is sick, this whole world of ours is being threatened by a sinister, powerful force. I want to

say that the price of political victory in this year of 1952 cannot be selling out our friends or our principles.

So I appeal to the workers of the Textile Workers Union of America to stand firm, to stand up for your union, to proclaim its great record and to realize that the voluntary association that is yours should belong to more people, that the benefits which you have should be shared by the mills of the unorganized workers of America. I ask you to become active participants in the political arena, because no matter how good a union you can build, we can wreck it for you down in the halls of Congress.

You can bleed and die for this Union of yours, and you can work your heart out, but all you need to have happen in America is to have an overwhelming majority of the Congress of the people who are opposed to your purposes, opposed to your objectives, opposed to your troubles and your dead -- you are through, you are finished. Politics is the people's business.

I said in this very auditorium almost a month ago that politics was the people's business, all the people's business. Let me tell you something, people: You had better take care of your business or somebody is going to give you the business.

(Cheers and laughter.)

You have been a very patient and wonderful audience. I want to express my gratitude and appreciation for the friendly hearing that you have given to me.

As I have said again and again, these are not easy days, but these are no days for sunshine patriots, either, as old Tom Paine used to say, that "wither away at the first blast of the wintry wind," and there are a lot of wintry winds nowadays. They are trying to wither up the leaves and the crops of social progress and if you want to harvest this crop for a more plentiful and abundant democracy, if you want to share in the fruits of this great productive economy of ours, if you want not only for yourself but for your children and your children's children a safer and more peaceful world, you had better, first of all, become a full participating American citizen in the political processes of our country, and that means that you have got to register, it means you have to vote, but it means, also, you have to know for what you vote and for whom, and it means that you have to have your voice heard in the councils of the political leaders.

Workers of this union, let me tell you something, you ought to justly demand of the major political parties of America that they come clean with you on these issues. Too long have you been dragging behind and picking up the pieces. It is time for you to be out in front. It is time for you to be a working, full-fledged partner in liberal democracy and you can do it if you but want to.

All you need to do is to speak up and to know of what you speak. All you need to do is to proclaim on the record what you can properly proclaim since 1933 up to this hour.

Tell your neighbors, tell your friends, tell your mother and your father, your wife, your sister and your brother, just tell everybody you can what you are going to do and in what you believe.

The opposition is telling them. They are telling them hour after hour and day after day and week after week and if you stand silent and mute you will be destroyed and defeated, but if the voices of the multitude of American citizens rise up like a mighty chorus for more progress, for more equality, for better standards of living, for more people in America, if the voices of the multitude of American people rise up for a government that is responsible and responsive to the public needs and the public will, you know what is going to happen? We'll have the mightiest and the grandest victory that democracy ever knew and America again will be on the forward march of the great crusade which was started by that immortal and wonderful leader of ours, the late and beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt.

(Applause and cheers; delegates arose.)



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