

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH AMERICAN LABOR?

001220

Statement
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
In the Senate of the United States

Mr. President, on April 25, this body passed by the overwhelming vote of 90 to 1, S. 1555, the "Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959," the Kennedy-Ervin labor-reform bill as amended on the floor of the Senate.

In the period since the Senate took this action, there has been much discussion - in and out of the Congress - about the ultimate fate of S. 1555. Hearings have been ^{completed}~~proceeding~~ before the House Education and Labor Committee. The AFL-CIO has indicated its strong objections to a number of features in the bill. The major business groups have indicated their objections to the bill - objections which are of course quite different from those expressed by labor. The editorial writers of the nation have been pouring out thousands of words of praise

001221

and of criticism of the bill. Labor corruption continues to be a popular issue.

I rise today, Mr. President, not to discuss the merits - or demerits - of S. 1555 or any other legislative proposals.

I have confidence that when the legislative process is completed, this 86th Congress will have hammered out a constructive piece of labor legislation.

In this connection I want to pay warm tribute to my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, for the splendid job he has been doing as chairman of the Labor Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for his role in bringing out of committee a sound, constructive, non-punitive bill, and for his brilliant floor management of that bill. As so often happens in a democratic body like the Senate, that bill went through numerous changes in the course of Senate action. And again, as often happens, some of those

001222

changes may deserve a second look after greater study and after their full implications become fully understood.

As we evaluate this legislation, however, and every other item of labor legislation before us, I urge that a simple criterion guide us. Will the proposed legislation help advance a strong, free, independent labor movement?

Legislation, of course, can do only a small part of the total job that is needed to eliminate corruption not only from the trade union movement but from society at large. The AFL-CIO, let it never be forgotten, did not wait for legislation before it acted. Its Ethical Practices Committee was set up before there was established a Senate Select Committee to investigate improper activities in the field of labor-management relations.

Chaired by one of America's outstanding labor statesmen, the president of the International Association of Machinists,

Mr. A. J. Hayes, the Ethical Practices Committee developed ethical practices codes which have already done much to meet the challenge of labor corruption. It was violation of these codes that served as the basis for the courageous action of the AFL-CIO in expelling more than one-tenth of its membership. Would that the business organizations of this country or the legal societies followed this example and insisted upon such strict adherence to ethical behavior. I have yet to hear of one lawyer, of the hundreds already cited in the Senate hearings, being expelled from the American Bar Association. I have yet to hear of the Chamber of Commerce or the NAM expelling a member because of illegal or unethical business conduct.

For two years now we have been hearing much about what's wrong with the American labor movement. A sordid, frightening, distorted ~~loathsome~~ image of that labor movement has emerged from the hundreds of hearings, the thousands of editorials and cartoons, the countless speeches about corrupt labor officials.

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss what's right with the American labor movement. If there is any area of human behavior where the dog-bites-man formula is true, it is the area of labor relations. How often do we read articles about labor peace? How often ^{are} ~~do~~ editorials ~~get~~ written about honest labor leaders? Isn't it true that a \$10,000 union contribution to a worthy charity is less newsworthy than a \$100 bribe to a cheap crook? How often does a national magazine do a feature story on building tradesmen contributing their week ends to the rebuilding of a school or a hospital destroyed by fire?

100

But there seems never to be a shortage of front page space or editorial space when a strike is called, or when some violence flares, or when a union official is called before an investigating committee. Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I think that strikes and violence and labor corruption are worthy of public attention. I think the public should be informed about the

issues in a strike, why violence results, which union officials have violated their ~~sacred~~ trust. But the public should also have the full story of what decent, honorable, devoted trade unionists are doing day by day for their fellow men, ~~their~~ *Country, & the Cause of freedom in a troubled world.*

Many of our finest economists, political scientists, sociologists, and philosophers have written at length about the basic meaning and goals of trade unionism. I think that the Hebrew Elder, Hillel, many centuries ago, said it all in one brief comment:

"If I am not for myself," he asked, "who will be for me? But if I am only for myself, what am I?"

This is the real story of American labor. Working men and women have banded together to further their mutual interests. If they failed to do it for themselves, who would do it for them? But they could not be concerned with their problems alone. If they were only for themselves, what were they?

It is a tragic fact indeed that the recent disclosures before the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations, in the absence of adequate publishing of the total labor story in America, have led many people to believe that the labor movement is a narrow, selfish, irresponsible force.

Mr. President, when I hear or see the phrase "labor movement" there does not flash through my mind the image of racketeers. That would be as appropriate and as fair as equating America with slums and juvenile delinquency and lynchings. America has those problems, and more, but America also ^{for freedom,} stands ^{for individual} for achievement, ^{for} for opportunity, for decency, ^{for} for honor, ^{for} for compassion and justice. ^{dignity,}

No, Mr. President, I think of other things when I think of the "labor movement". I think of men whose names are recorded in history for their contribution to the growth of the American labor movement; dedicated and selfless men such as Samuel Gompers,

William Green, Phillip Murray, Daniel Tobin, Van Bittner, and Alexander Whitney, to name but a few.

Let me recall just a few recent experiences, -- direct, personal experiences -- that make me feel good to be considered a friend of organized labor.

A few weeks ago, I attended an unusual dinner here in town. Hundreds of people, including dozens of Congressmen, came to honor a lobbyist, a labor lobbyist. Usually, of course, it is the other way around. They came to pay tribute to John Edelman, the Washington Representative of the Textile Workers Union of America.

For fifty years, twenty of them here in Washington, this humble, soft-spoken gentleman had worked tirelessly for the public interest. There has not been a cause - housing, minimum wages, public power, mutual security, civil rights - into which this union representative has not thrown his great talents, his inspiring leadership. Those talents, that leadership could have brought John great personal gain. But he has continued to serve the great public interest - as well as his own membership - as a union representative. And to the eternal credit of his union and its great leaders, Emil Rieve and William Pollock, he was encouraged to perform these manifold services.

For every self-serving person in the American labor movement, there are hundreds of John Edelmans. That's what is right with the labor movement.

It was John Edelman himself, by the way, who more than 30 years ago stated so eloquently the great role which unions could play in our modern civilization.

"There are before us vast problems in human engineering," he wrote, "which cannot be solved in any easy formula, but by the oldest method of all - that of reaching men's heart by a deep, moving human appeal. Television may speed the sending of pictures, the radio may enable men to hear one another talk across continents, but none of these amazing devices will take the place of the ordinary human contact of the labor union and its activities in bringing about a more enlightened attitude among the masses of men in meeting their fundamental human problems."

001230

In the more than 30 years since John Edelman wrote these words, the labor movement has indeed demonstrated its willingness and its ability to bring about that "more enlightened attitude among the masses of men in meeting their most fundamental human problems."

Union organizations have provided for millions of formerly inarticulate citizens the forum in which to hammer out policies affecting the world in which they live and which their children will inherit. And not only have they hammered out policies, but they have developed techniques and resources for implementing those policies. That is what I find so right about the labor movement. They have made "democracy" and "citizenship" and "the right to petition" a reality to millions of men and women.

I speak from some rich personal experience. Like every politician, I enjoy large audiences, television, press conferences and enthusiastic applause. But perhaps the most stimulating periods I ever spend are the 20 and 30 minute sessions I have with groups

*machinists, building tradesmen
or Auto workers, or
Communications
Workers*

of textile workers, or rubber workers, or steel workers who

come to Washington to attend their union's legislative institutes.

We members of this great deliberative body do not know what debate really is until we have had to answer the searching, but down-to-earth questions put to us by workers who know from firsthand the problems of automation, of unemployment, of old age, of radiation hazards, of slums.

The unions have given their wonderful people a voice. That is what is right about the labor movement.

Only last month I found myself sharing a platform with Mr. William Schnitzler, Secretary-Treasurer of the AFL-CIO. Both of us addressed the merger convention of the American Labor Health Association and the Group Health Federation of America. In the audience were many dozens of union officials and union technicians involved in the vital work of administering health plans and union

hospitals and medical centers, working together with some of the nation's leading medical and insurance authorities. This was nothing new to me - finding union representatives actively involved with other groups in seeking solutions to America's unsolved problems. Mr. Schnitzler made an eloquent plea for bringing full medical care within the reach of all American families. He spoke forthrightly about labor's right and its responsibility to speak out on this issue on behalf of all Americans. In doing so, he explained simply and effectively American labor's role in the whole area of legislation and community activities. Permit me to quote:

"I find it rather amusing -- but also distressing -- that labor is sometimes attacked, on the one hand, for being a selfish, vested interest, and then, on the other hand,-- by the very same critics -- for injecting itself into issues that are not related only to trade unions and

001233
their members, and presuming to speak for underprivileged,
unorganized workers.

"Well, ladies and gentlemen, American labor does
presume to speak for more than its own membership. It
does this partially as a matter of simple enlightened
self-interest. We believe that what is good for America
is good for American labor. In one area after another,
it is clear that our own members will improve their lot
in life only as all the people in the community improve
theirs. There is a limit to the things we can obtain
for our own members at the collective bargaining table,
although we have by no means reached that limit. The
welfare, happiness and security of our people requires
sound legislation. It also requires the development of
appropriate cooperative and other forms of voluntary
organizations designed to promote the general welfare.

001234

In all of these aspects of American life, the labor movement plays a constructive role.

"There used to be in Washington a small organization called the People's Lobby. That phrase is sometimes used to refer to attempts to realize the vague, undefinable desires of the American people as a whole. But the fact of the matter is that there is no really articulate voice of the people. The closest thing to it is the labor movement. We are happy and proud to serve as a people's lobby. We represent at least 50 million men, women, and children in the families of our members. But in much of our work in Congress, in the state legislatures, in the school systems, in the voluntary organizations -- we sincerely believe we speak out for the great bulk of all Americans.

"For a hundred years now, no one has worked more vigorously than American labor for free, universal education.

"There has been no group more active in seeking improvements in our social security laws.

"Although few of our own members qualify, we have fought hard for public housing because we know that slums are incompatible with our free America.

"In making these observations, I don't mean to suggest that we have done these things by ourselves. In every one of these activities, we have always been associated with others -- groups like those represented at this conference. But we do say proudly that American labor has tried for all these years to use its organized strength in the pursuit of the general welfare."

001236

Mr. President, I want to say to Mr. Schnitzler and to the millions of American trade unionists that they have a right to be proud, that they have indeed used their organized strength in the purusit of the general welfare.

That's what I find right with the American labor movement.

As a member of the United States Senate, I can give personal testimony as to what American labor seeks from the Congress of the United States. Labor lobbyists are not coy in expressing labor's goals. Of course, they seek legislation that will permit them to organize and to function with a minimum of government interference. But labor relations legislation is only a small part of their legislative program - albeit very important.

Labor asks that the federal minimum wage be increased and that its coverage be expanded. Very few union members need a federal minimum wage to protect them. Is this narrow self-interest legislation?

001237

Labor asks for improvements in unemployment insurance. Union members would benefit from this, but there are a greater number of non-union workers who need this additional protection. A growing number of union workers, as a matter of fact, look to union-negotiated supplementary unemployment insurance for their own protection. Don't all wage earners in the nation deserve adequate protection against the hazards of unemployment?

Labor asks for health benefits for retired people. It asks for higher appropriations for medical research and hospitals and child welfare activities. Are not these desirable social goals?

Labor lobbies for public housing and slum clearance and urban redevelopment. Is this not in the public interest?

Labor seeks depressed areas legislation, help for community facilities, bigger public roads programs. Are these narrow, selfish interests?

Labor supports federal aid to school construction, better salaries for teachers, liberal scholarship programs. Are not these

proper goals for all America?

001238

Labor favors multi-purpose river projects and atomic energy development for peaceful purposes and conservation of our natural resources. ^{Shouldn't} ~~Shouldn't~~ we welcome such support?

Labor supports programs designed to aid America's farmers, such as R.E.A, and it backs legislation to preserve the family-size farm. Is not this in the best interest of our country?

Labor favors legislation designed to promote a vigorous and healthy climate for small business. Is not such promotion of our free enterprise system in the public interest?

Labor is a strong backer of civil rights legislation, despite the difficulties such support causes in some parts of the country. Is not such support a good thing?

Let me cite another illustration of labor's concern for all who may be in distress. Early this month the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing and Stabilization of Prices of which I am a member conducted hearings on the various proposals

001239

which have been submitted by a great number of Senators in the matter of expanding and improving our present surplus food distribution program and the establishment of a food stamp or food allotment system. These proposals have come from agricultural states and from industrial states. They have come from Democrats and they have come from Republicans. I have myself introduced several measures and I have been pleased to join in the sponsorship of some others.

One of the finest statements presented to the Subcommittee in support of doing more to feed Americans suffering from hunger and malnutrition was that of Mr. Joseph A. Beirne who, in addition to his distinguished service as president of the Communications Workers of America, is chairman of the AFL-CIO Community Services Committee.

Mr. Beirne told us that our nation has the resources for meeting the full nutrition requirements of every American. "We

001240

are blessed with a bounty that is the envy of the world," he said, "yet it is a fact that there are many of our fellow-Americans who do not enjoy a proper diet because of the inadequacy of their income."

And Emil Mazey, Secretary-Treasurer of the UAW and director of that union's Community Services Department, told our Subcommittee:

"We have been blessed as has no other nation in history.

We have the land, the resources, the genius to produce an abundance of food. All we need is the desire and determination to share this abundance with those in need so that no American will want for a decent and adequate diet."

Here were labor spokesmen appealing to the Congress to do a simple, decent thing. They were concerned not only with the welfare of their own particular membership, but with the welfare of all Americans.

It is this concern with the general welfare that I find so right with the labor movement.

001241

I only wish that this concern was shared by many others -- including the leadership of our Federal government. I was shocked beyond words in the course of these hearings when I heard spokesmen from both the Department of Agriculture and HEW tell the committee that the Administration is opposed to any and all of the proposals now before it. They did not come in and say, "We do not

001242
think this bill is exactly right or that bill is precisely right;
this is what we would like to see done." All they did was to
say "No action is needed, things are going along quite well as
they are." But the records of these hearings have shown con-
clusively that things are not right, that the program does not
reach enough communities, that the foods now available do not
constitute an adequate diet, that the costs of the present
program are improperly charged to the farm program rather than
to welfare. I shall have more to say about this on another
occasion. I could not let the occasion go by, however, without
paying my tribute to the labor movement for its more realistic,
more compassionate, more constructive position on this question
than I find at the highest levels of our government.

I could go on and on and detail the many other domestic
issues on which labor has taken, in my opinion, a sound position
and in which it has tried to be of help.

But I want to move on to another thing that I think is so right with the American labor movement.

On March 26, I introduced Senate Resolution 96 expressing the Senate's backing of our negotiations in Geneva looking to a meaningful, inspection-proof agreement on suspension of nuclear tests. I hoped for early approval of this resolution, an approval which I did get expeditiously and unanimously. It was not a matter on which I expected much public activity. It was particularly gratifying to me, therefore, to receive a telegram from Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, expressing support for the resolution and indicating that he had wired every member of the Foreign Relations Committee urging prompt action.

This telegram from Mr. Meany may seem unimportant to future historians of American public affairs. To me, it represents a moving symbol of the alert and conscientious and constructive role which the American labor movement, under the brilliant leadership of Mr. Meany, is playing on the world scene.

The free labor movement of the world has played, and will continue to play, a most important role in the effort to stop the onward rush of Communist aggression. In that movement, American labor has made a major contribution.

It would be very easy - and even understandable - for American labor, troubled as it is with its own problems of unemployment and automation - to stay out of international affairs. It could, as it once did, fight to keep all immigrants from our shores and for protectionist tariffs on all imports. It could oppose mutual security and technical assistance and insist that America's own underdeveloped and depressed areas receive these billions of dollars of assistance. But American labor, for the most part, understands the threat of the Soviets. It understands there can be no security for Americans in a world racked with insecurity.

001245

Recently George Meany - who had himself served so effectively as a member of a United States delegation to the United Nations - spoke at the occasion of a Four Freedoms Award to Ambassador Lodge. He spoke briefly, but eloquently, about America's responsibility in the world struggle between freedom and tyranny:

"It is hard for other nations to look to America for inspiring and vital leadership when one group of AmericanS says to another: You cannot enter or eat here. YOU cannot live or study here. YOU cannot work or worship here. YOU cannot stay or play here. In short, YOU cannot be a free American because the color of your skin, your religion, or land of birth are different from ours.

"If we sacrifice the freedom of any American at home, we cannot help save and serve human freedom abroad.

"We must guard against the political as well as the atomic fallout of totalitarian dictatorship.

001246

"The crisis of our time is grave, indeed. Americans

and all other liberty-loving peoples must be ready to make

many sacrifices in order to protect and promote freedom.

The Four Freedoms were conceived as a call to heroic action

against Nazi despotism. Unless we are ready today to make

sacrifices for freedom as in the past, we will lose all

our freedoms tomorrow.

"We must never forget that there are moments when

there is no other way to defend our Four Freedoms than

by fighting for them. Let us be ever ready and ever

strong to preserve human freedom and world peace."

And only a few weeks earlier, Walter Reuther had brought this

somber warning directly to more than half a million West Berliners

who had assembled on May 1 to demonstrate their solidarity in the

face of the most direct challenge by the Soviets since Korea.

Walter Reuther thrilled these free Germans -- speaking in German,

by the way - with his message of friendship and solidarity from

American workers.

001247
But, Mr. President, this keen understanding of the world's problems and world's challenges is not confined to public utterances of American trade union leaders. I hold here in my hand a special labor edition of CARE NEWS. The headlines on top of Page 1 tell the whole story:

"THE UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS; AMERICAN UNIONS ARE DOING
SOMETHING POSITIVE ABOUT BUILDING GOOD WILL. . .
GIFTS OF FOOD AND TOOLS BRING REAL UNDERSTANDING OF
UNITED STATES . . . HUMANITARIANISM AND A SENSE OF
PRACTICAL DIPLOMACY MARK LABOR'S EFFORTS."

Following these headlines, I find four pages crammed full with stories of American labor support, through CARE, of vital projects in Latin America, in the Mideast, in Hong Kong, in India - wherever there are human problems crying out for help. The plight of the world's refugees has received very special consideration by American labor. And most heartening to me is the report that the bulk of the aid comes not from union treasuries but from voluntary contributions

001248

from individual union members.

I read from Page 3 of this publication a brief item that sums up the whole significance of this activity:

LETTER FROM HONG KONG

"In a letter to the AFL-CIO expressing appreciation for the recent sending of 700 CARE Food Crusade packages to needy area trade unionists, Fung Hoi Chiu, secretary general of the Hong Kong and Kowloon Trades Union Council stated:

"Your help has a meaning which is more significant and important than its material value, as we look back on the last number of years when we were fighting alone against the overwhelming Communist influence which came directly from across the close border of Communist China."

001249

Mr. President, it is this realistic understanding of our obligations in the world struggle for peace and freedom that I find so right with the American labor movement.

We should be availing ourselves of the talents and know-how of the labor movement to bring to the peoples of other lands a clearer understanding of our country and our way of life.

There should be greater emphasis on the importance of the role of our labor attaches.

We should spare no effort to let other nations know that we are vitally concerned with the problems and the needs of working people; who is better suited to convey such a message than our own labor people?

Yes, I think it would be well if the Administration spent less time in labor name-calling and more time in calling upon labor for its assistance!

I have now spoken at some length about American labor's role in the promotion of the general welfare and its contributions

001250
to the international peace and freedom we all seek. I turn briefly now to discuss the tremendous contributions American trade unions have made to the well-being of their own members - and to the development of our very special kind of dynamic, ingenious economic system.

I do not intend to make a record here of the specific economic gains which unions have brought their members. The economic books and history books and government statistics are available for all to see. From seven-day work weeks and fourteen-hour work days down to a standard five-day, 40 hour week. Improvements in wages to match our ever-increasing productivity. Humane working conditions in factory and mine and mill. Paid holidays and vacations and rest periods. Health benefits and pension rights and life insurance.

Are unions alone responsible for these gains? No. They have had allies in humane employers, in friendly governments, in social welfare groups. In the economic sense, of course, every bit of

001251

progress had to be made possible by increasing productivity.

But it is a matter of simple record that without the constant push for these gains by the organizations of working men and women very few of these gains would have come about as soon, as fully, or as democratically as they did.

The need for organization to promote the welfare of wage-earners was perhaps never more simply nor effectively put than by Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes in the Jones and Loughlin case in 1937. I quote:

"Long ago we stated the reason for labor organizations.

We said that they were organized out of the necessities of the situation; that a single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer; that he was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family; that if the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and resist arbitrary and unfair treatment; that union was

001252

essential to give laborers opportunity to deal on an equality with their employer."

To those who say, "Well, protecting labor's right to organize may have been necessary many years ago when employers were insensitive to the need of workers, before there were protective labor laws, before we had such an abundance of wealth" I say that unions are as essential as ever before.

Yes, there are indeed many employers who have accepted unionism and who have accepted the obligation to provide decent working conditions. But in this year of 1959, when the nation is about to hit a \$500 billion national product, there are still millions of men and women toiling for less than \$1.00 an hour. There are union organizers still being attacked by thugs. There are still millions and millions of workers who need, who deserve, who want the protection of honest, progressive trade unionism.

201253
"If I am only for myself," Hillel asked "what am I?"

Organized workers continue to show that they are not only for themselves. A heavy part of every dues dollar goes into efforts to organize other workers.

It is this concern for all that I find so right with the labor movement.

Within the past month, Mr. President, two items crossed my desk. One was the report of the Sidney Hillman Foundation - set up to commemorate the work of the first President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, set up ^{by} contributions not only from ^{but} the clothing workers/by the employers in the industry. The other item was a report of the General Executive Board of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

These two documents are parts of a related, wonderful story. It is the story of perhaps the most sweated group of industries in America, industries populated 40 and 50 years ago for the most part by immigrants ready and anxious to accept any employment. It

is the story of child labor and homework and sweatshops and Triangle Fires. It is the story of bitter strikes and lockouts.

It is the story of ^{great and patriotic Americans} ~~men~~ like Jack Potofsky and David Dubinsky -- the story -- as has been said -- of practical men who dared to dream, of dreamers who dared to be practical.

Here is how one keen newspaperwoman described conditions in the clothing districts of New York 40 years ago:

"Anyone passing Astor Place at noon would have seen a strange procession - women with burdens on their heads of such size that it did not seem possible that they could carry them. These women were taking home clothes to finish, and in their tenement they and their children, and sometimes the neighbors' children, would work throughout the long hours of the day and late into the night without rest . . . They scarcely stopped for birth . . . Babies of 5 and 6 picked bastings. Babies of 6 and 7 sewed on buttons. Little boys

and girls would be taught to use the needle at the age of 8 or 9. When they were 10 or 11 they would be in the shop. There are men and women today working in the trade who would tell you that they never knew what childhood was. All they can remember is sitting in a crowded room ^{sewing} and everlastingly sewing."

That was many years ago. Work in the apparel industries is still hard. But there is no more child labor. There is no homework. The 35 hour week is spreading. There are paid holidays and vacations. There are retirement programs. There are union-built cooperative apartments and vacation resorts.

There is a pattern of peaceful collective bargaining in both the men's and women's apparel industries that is a model for all labor-management relations. Small wonder that employers join in honoring the memory of Sidney Hillman. Small wonder that employers come as guests to the convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers.

It is this great example of labor-management cooperation that I find so right with the labor movement.

All Americans - not just union members - should share the pride with which the General Executive Board of the Garment Workers could report to its 30th Convention:

"We have molded a union of great influence and strength out of elements and in an environment that seemed to defy organization: women distracted by the pull of family duties, immigrants staggered by initial disillusionments and language difficulties, employers grappling with each other in bitter competition, an industry running like water downhill to wherever wages are lower, newcomers frightened against joining the union by the threat of losing the sole factory in town. . .

901257
"Let those who dream of a return to an America without unions look to the record. Let them consider what this industry would be like without the ILGWU; then let them match their dream with the record of the era of the sweatshop. Let them consider what this nation would be like without its great organized labor movement. Then let them match their dream to the record of workers in the enslaved, Communist countries. . ."

And then the report says what it so very much has the right to say of its own union, but which can also be said by the labor movement as a whole:

"Every gain won by garment workers has made the garment industry - all persons and factors in it - a better industry. Every gain won by the trade unions of

001258

this land has made this nation - all in it, employers as well as workers - a better country to live in. We have not lived unto ourselves alone. Out of what we have gained we have reached out to help the less fortunate at home and abroad".

Mr. President, much of what the unions of America have done for their members and for others can be measured statistically. Wages increased . . . hours reduced . . . pensions granted . . . contributions to charity . . . CARE packages to refugees abroad. But perhaps the major contribution of all has no dimensions; it cannot be measured in dollars, in time, in size. It is that intangible thing that makes everything else in life shrink to nothingness. It is what unions have done to enhance the dignity, the spirit, the personality of the individual.

I know of no better way of stating this than to tell a story that Walter Reuther loves to tell. Some time ago, a local

of the UAW was celebrating its 20th anniversary. Reuther was invited to make the major address. At the conclusion of the affair, an elderly worker came over to Reuther, and spoke to him in heavy Polish accent.

"You know, Walter," he said, "I listen to your speech tonight. Everything you say is o.k. I know how much the union do for me. What you say about big increase in wages is right. What you say about hours and pension and seniority sure, it's true. But, Walter, you know what the union really means to me? Twenty years ago, when I come to this shop, everybody call me 'Dumb Pollack'. Now they call me 'Brother.'"

This is the way a UAW member put it. Many, many years ago, the Apostle Paul said it another way: "Be ye members one of another." This is what unions have done for millions of men and women. It has brought them together, made them members one of another, given them common tools for common goals. And as they gained strength through unity, each gained the strength to

001260
speak up for himself, to talk back when necessary, to complain when aggrieved.

Unions have strengthened the democratic process by giving this voice to millions of individuals. The public hears about it when James Carey challenges General Electric; when W. P. Kennedy or H. E. Gilbert negotiate with the railroads; when ^{William}~~James~~ Doherty or George Harrison testify before Congressional committees, and when James McDevitt discusses political action.

But what is even more important for the cause of democracy itself is that every day of the year literally thousands of men and women, are speaking out for their fellow workers. I am thinking of the shop stewards, the grievance committees, the negotiating committees, the local executive boards. This is industrial democracy in action.

During the past weeks we have seen this industrial democracy operating in the steel industry. The negotiations have been

unproductive thus far. Charges have been hurled by both sides, but it is all part of the great American system of collective bargaining.

Although most of the sessions thus far have been attended only by a handful of union officials, I have been impressed by the pains which Steelworkers Union President Dave McDonald has taken to keep his people informed and to obtain their concurrence in every major step taken. Mr. McDonald has managed to take time out to meet with hundreds of his local leaders, has appeared on television and on radio to discuss the important issues with his membership, and he has seen the wisdom and the public responsibility in taking his case to the American people generally. And in doing so, he has forced the industry itself to explain its own position.

I am certain that in the long run this public debate will serve the public interest, and for this I salute Mr. McDonald.

In many ways, Americans who got their first training and their first call to public service while serving their trade

001262

union have performed constructively and conscientiously for the public interest. As labor attaches, as technical assistance specialists abroad, as directors of health groups and cooperative housing, as members of Boards of Education, and in almost every aspect of public work, they have made outstanding contributions. Here in the Congress too they have done much to bring credit both on the unions from which they come and to the Congress itself.

For over four years now I have been pleased to have the friendship, the guidance, and the cooperation on many an issue of the senior Senator from Michigan, Pat McNamara.

In the House a number of members have given outstanding service to the Congress. John Fogarty, a former bricklayer, has become the outstanding House authority on health and welfare matters. He has served with distinction on numerous occasions in international conferences in the field of health research.

And there are many other distinguished members of the Congress who have a background in the labor movement. From my own state of Minnesota there is Roy Wier and Joseph Karth. From California, John Shelley and Jeffrey Cohelan. From Pennsylvania, George Rhodes and Elmer Holland. From Illinois, Roman Pucinski, and there are doubtless others I have not mentioned who have at one time or another held union cards and played a part in the great American labor movement.

Mr. President, I have risen today to say some things about the labor movement that I believe deeply. There is nothing new or profound or especially controversial in what I have said.

In the heat of debate over some specific legislative proposals, I fear, or in the midst of exposes of wrongdoing in the labor movement, these basic truths about the labor movement tend to be overlooked.

001264

These truths must not be overlooked. The value of a free, honest labor movement must always be remembered. As we take steps to help the labor movement prevent and correct abuses which have crept into it, let us take great pains not to hurt the labor movement itself, not to interfere with the progress which it has made for itself and for all America.

Mr. President, in case it has not been made abundantly clear by my remarks so far, I am pleased to be considered a friend of labor. I like to be considered "pro-labor" just as I like to be considered ^{"Pro People"} pro-peace and pro-liberty and pro-religious. And in being pro-labor, I find myself in mighty good company. It was a Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, who said "The strongest bond of human sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting working people of all nations and tongues and kindreds." And he said, too: "All that serves labor serves the nation. All that harms is treason. If a man tells you he loves America, yet hates labor, he is a liar. If a man tells

001205

you he trust America, yet fears labor, he is a fool."

And another Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower, said:

"Only a fool would try to deprive working men and women of the right to join the union of their choice."

And it was Franklin Roosevelt, during whose first administration the Wagner Act was passed, who said "If I were a worker in a factory, the first thing I would do would be to join a union."

There are 18 million Americans who have banded together in unions. They believe in their unions. They have sacrificed for their unions. Some of their unions may temporarily be in the control of unsavory elements. But sooner or later, and with the help of laws which we adopt here in ^{the} Congress, those relatively few unions will be restored to honest leadership. Let us work hard to help these decent, law-abiding Americans protect and strengthen their unions.

6/18/59



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