000729



Speech Excerpts -- TAX POLICY (Superior)

I am going to talk to you tonight about money -- your money and mine.

I am going to talk about the money
we pay out in taxes and in high
Republican interest rates.

I am going to talk about the money
we could earn and don't, because our
economy creeps along at a two percent
GOP crawl, rather than a five percent
Democratic gallop.

You know, they say nothing in life is certain except death and taxes.

Well, taxes aren't all that certain

-- if you know the angles and are ina

position to take advantage of them.

My good friend, Senator Clark,

five
compares our tax system to men

having a dutch treat dinner. One of

them sees the check on the way, and

ducks out to make an urgent phone call.

So the others have to shell out an

extra 25 percent each.

In our present system, Senator

Clark says, the man in the phone

booth is the man who draws his income

from dividends or oil wells, or who

can charge off much of his personal

expenditures as "business expense."

The four who pick up the tab are the people who work for wages or salaries.

Our tax system is riddled with
this kind of free loading -- of gracious
living at other people's expense.

of course, there is straightforward

tax evasion -- as blatant and crude as
a timely dash for the phone booth. It is
estimated that "meat -ax" cuts in the
enforcement staff of the internal revenue

service have cost the government up to

\$2 billion a year in evaded taxes.

| Diviounds | Internal | Internal

But the real money escapes through
loopholes big enough to drive a cadiffic
through. There are special tax advantages
to Corporation shareholders, and there is
the abuse of business accounts.

There is the oil depletion allowance, which depletes our Treasury and fills

Texas with millionairs.

Everytime someone find such a loophole to evade his just share of the tax load, it is just that much more for the rest of us to pay.

If we close these loopholes, we can bring billions more into the Federal Treasury-- and ease the burden upon the little fellow last able to pay.

People are "fed up" with tax favoritism.

Tax and fiscal policies can and should be an effective victory issue father for the Democratic Party in November, if we have a candidate willing to carry on the fight -- and one with a personal record to back it up.

For that reason, the attitudes of rival contenders for the Democratic Party's nomination is a legitimate issue in the Wisconsin Primary campaign.

Before we start attacking Republican policies, it is only fair and prudent to give careful scrutiny to the records of our candidates to make sure our own house is in order.

That is why I have encouraged voters to look at the record of each contender during my campaign. Last week I urged voters to compare our farm records, to see which would be the most effective in challenging Nixon. This week I want to

Jann Reend

emphasize tax and fiscal policies for the same purpose.

always differ; far from it. We see eye to eye on many basic issues. But we have taken differing positions on others, and it is up to the voters to decide which they felt was right -- and which they felt was the best position on which our party could campaign to victory in November.

Taxation is one of the areas in which our voting record differs. We have taken different approaches during attempts in Congress to equalize tax burdens that are a matter of public record; if either of us is to become our party's standard bearer in November, we would have to campaign on

our record -- or be inconsistent.

When many of us felt the Republicans were stacking the deck in favor of upper income brackets during enactment of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code, my good friend Senator Paul Douglas moved to send the bill back to the Finance Committee with instructions to re-write it so as to give less tax relief to upper income groups, and correspondingly greater tax relief for those in lower and middle income brackets.

The voting record is there for all to see.

I voted with Senator Douglas.

Senator Kennedy voted against him.

Again, in 1958, some of us sought to raise personal exemptions from \$600 to \$800 for each dependent to lower taxes of the average taxpayer, and make up the difference by cutting the oil depletion allowance from 27.5% to 15%

My vote was cast for raising the individual exemption, and for cutting the oil depletion allowance. Senator Kennedy's vote was cast againstooth moves.

In all fairness, I want to say that

my colleague later voted for less of an

increase in personal exemption, and less

of a cut in the oil depletion allowance.

Perhaps our difference was a matter of degree,

but the voting record stands -- and the

record of each will be used for us
or against us in November, depending
on the indivudal interpretation of what
was right and what was wrong.

I am convinced my own voting record
has been consistently in the interests of
lower and middle-income Americans, in fairer
apportionment of our tax burdens.

In all honesty, I can say that I have not been a part-time soldier in the battle for tax equity and justice.

And if we are to win the big election

-- the one in November -- we must offer

the voters a clear, straightforward

alternatiave to the GOP's garbled old

policies. We must offer a candidate whose

record is not paper thin, who has fought

against the big money interests of the Republican Eisenhower-Nixon crowd all of the time, instead of some of the time.

We cannot go into this autumn's campaign with summer soldiers.

We can win in November for workers and retired citizens, for children and their teachers, for the producers and consumers, for family farmers and small businessmen -- if we offer a 100 percent liberal program, and a 100 percent liberal candidate.

That is why I am in this race -- and why your support on April 5 can put us on the the high road to victory in November.

March 28, 1960

Head (

vity_Hovert Mode 000739 WE SHOULD BE PROUD OF OUR RECORDS Excerpts from remarks of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, before Madison Gridiron Club, Madison, Wisconsin, Wednesday evening, March 30, 1960. I am really here tonight as a sort of last-minute substitute. My brother, Ralph, was scheduled to speak but he is too busy minding the store, so you will just have to make do with me. You know Some day someone is going to write a novel about the campaign waged here in Wisconsin on behalf of my distinguished opponent, and I am sure it is going to be called --"A family affair." And some day after

this is all over, I intend to try to find the place where the Kennedy family

000740 tree grows, because even in the forests of Minnesota, I have never seen a tree with so many branches.

uttollim Sissistirous to Me!

my respect-

exceededonly

It is a good thing that all the Kennedys and their husbands and wives and assorted relatives cannot vote in this primary, because I amsure they would outnumber all the Democrats in the whole state.

Some have accused me of waging a sort of "lone wolf" campaign here in Wisconsin, but, as I say, my brother Ralph is too busy minding the store and my sister is too busy minding the children - although she did manage to get into the state briefly.

Aside from that, nary a sister

or a brother or an in - law --not even an outlaw - has come into the state to

In to Cross

000741

campaign for me. But I am lucky. My principal co-campaigner makes up for all the relatives in the world - my Manu, I have to confess that I did take advantage of my good friend, Jack Kennedy, in one respect..., I did bring mykids into Wisconsin for me. Jack' daughter, Caroline, is still just a bit young for this game of politics, being only two years old. But don't worr by the time of the West Virginia primary be in there pitching too. As a matter of fact, it is a good thing Jack

didn't bring Caroline to Wisconsin. I'd have picked her up and kissed her - just a matter of reflex action.

/I must say, there are times
when I envy the campaign of my adversary. It seems to have plenty of
glamor - and it certainly has plenty of
Jack.

Well, to pull out a well-worn political cliche, I yield to no man in my admiration for glamor. I am as starry-eyed as the next guy.

But I'm old-fashioned enough
to believe there ought to be a lot more
in a political campaign than glamor and I know my friend Jack Kennedy agrees
with me.

to believe that a political campaign especially a sampling for the highest
office in this country - is an unique
opportunity to talk issues - and to

examine the records of the candidates.

believe that, when a man offers himself for public office - especially the presidency - he invites the public, and his opponents as well, to examine his public record closely. I had always assumed that a candidate for a public office was proud, not ashamed, to run on his record.

For awhile, there, I almost began to think that times had changed.

For, when I began to talk about the issues and the records of the various candidates

for President, you might have thought I

had stopped helping old ladies to cross streets or something terrible like that.

But think all that has passed.

Think everyone in Wisconsin now agrees

Memillan +

(2) Input Reserve

moraton

that a campaign is a time to talk
about issues, and to talk facts. I
think everyone knows that I am interested
in issues and facts, and not personalities.

I think everyone knows that I admire my colleague, Jack Kennedy; but they also know - and they are entitled to know - that we have sometimes differed on some issues.

After all, Jack and I, or at any rate Jack's relatives and I - are asking the Democrats of Wisconsin to choose between us for the most important office in America. What more vital or relevant subject could there be to discuss than our respective records in public office.

Lam not ashamed of my

record. I am proud of it. I invite everyone of you to examine it closely. Whether or not you agree with every part of it, I know you will find it consistent, and I believe you will find, behind that record, a man who has always tried, with every ounce of energy at his command, to fight the battles of the plain people of this country. - For it is they who most need - yet most lack - a voice in their government.

#

A PROGRAM FOR PEACE

(not Vardis der Address by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey before University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Thursday morning, March 31, 1960.

We are meeting at a critical and yet a hopeful period in history.

/ It is critical because both the United States and the Soviet Union possess the power to blast each other - and the rest of mankind - off the face of this planet.

/It is hopeful because both sides, appalled at the devastating power they command, have been groping for some way to escape mutual annihilation.

At this moment, an agreement on the suspension of nuclear tests seems within

This would be a truly historic breakthrough for peace, particularly if we
can follow it up with further and more
far-reaching agreements on disarmament.

I have, as you know, devoted much time and energy to this effort, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament. I have worked hard for the achievement of effective enforced inspected disarmament. But have never let my absorption in it lead me to believe that it is the be-all and the end-all of lasting peace.

When I was your age and working in our family drugstore, I learned
that there are no panaceas for the ille

Neither are there panaceas - one-shot remedies - which guarantee peace.

Disarmament is, indeed, one vitally important part of a total program for peace, a program which I think of as having at least five important aspects.

The most important of all, outranking even disarmament, is to know what
we want and where we are going. Too often
our government has been like Christopher
Columbus - when it sets out it doesn't know
where it's going, and when it comes back
it doesn't know where it's been.

Next, we must have central direction -- and an end to internal power struggles within our Administration that jeopardize our over-all objectives.

Time after time, we have seen major branches of government - the State Department, the Pentagon, the Atomic Energy Commission - quarreling like feudal potentates. Lincoln warned us that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Still less can a government divided against itself give leadership to the free world.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a national peace agency, so that we can formulate plans and put unity and purpose and continuity into our foreign policy. I want to take planning out of the doghouse and put it into the White House.

Third, we need to establish a much closer rapport with peoples throughout the world - not only in the political area, but in business and labor, Agric, in education, science and technology.

We need not just words, but programs, not promises but achievements. We need what I like to call the "Works of Peace".

First and foremost, I have called for the imaginative use of "food for peace". I want to take our so-called "surplus" of food and fibre out of storage and put it to use feeding the hungry and clothing the needy throughout the world.

I have also proposed an international education program to educate the illiterate, and to train people in

the skills that are needed in a developing economy. I have called for an international medical research program to do the basic research on the diseases which kill and cripple people - and which strike impartially on both sides of the Iron Curtain -- I have called for a "Great White Fleet" of floating hospitals, to be rushed to areas of disaster or epidemic.

I claim no patent on these "works of peace." I am delighted to hail Paul Hoffman, one of those liberal Republicans who were disenfranchised when Governor Rockefeller (did he fall, or was he pushed?) dropped out of the presidential campaign.

He has come forward with a bold but sensible plan to channel more of our aid through international channels.

and I also pay tribute to my good friend, the Polish-American architect Biernacki-Poray for the noble project of an American Children's Hospital in Poland, which he has pushed forward at great personal sacrifice. I was proud to help him in the Sente, as Congressman Zablocki did in the House.

Fourth, we need to make greater use of the United Nations and its related agencies -- instead of by-passing them, as we too often do. I am pleased that the President has finally come out in support of my resolution to repeal the Connally reservation, which clouds American acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. If we do not give leadership toward the establishment of a role of law

Connelly Amend

among nations, who else will?

The United Nations is not some newfangled miracle of automation which can grind out peace without the sober and serious effort of its member nations, first and foremost the United States. But our own efforts are multiplied as we draw upon its prestige and resources, not the least of which are the fine intelligence and tireless dedication of its Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold.

The U N already serves, in many crucial areas, as the eyes and ears for peace. We should press for it to be given a strong right arm, in the form of an international police force.

Ears -Montor

Police!

000754

Fifth, we need to take up Mr. Khruschev's challenge to peaceful competition. I put him on notice more than a year ago that - when we Democrats won the White House, we were going to "run him clear out of Gorki Park." We can't do that with a stop-and-go, creep-and-crawl economyyof the past few years. We need to free it from the straitjacket of tight-money, high interest policies, and restore it to the 5 per cent annual growth we attained between 1947 and 1953. Otherwise, we shall be going into the ring with one hand tied behind our back - and by ourselves, at that.

These are my five points for peace: planning, effective disarma-ment, the works of peace, the use of

000755

growth - and they are as interdependent as the five fingers on a single hand.

To be effective, they must be used with the inner certainty which comes from a faith in ourselves and in the future.

One hundred thirty-four years ago, Thomas Jefferson wrote these words for the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, and they were almost the last words to come from that immortal pen.

"All eyes are opened, or are opening, to the rights of man.

The general spread of science has already laid open to every view the

palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few, booted and spurred ready to ride them...."

What a transformation it would work in America's position in the world today if its living leaders had a fraction of the faith and the eloquence of the dying Jefferson.

He spoke out for change and progress - the very law of life. He knew that the one thing in history which does and which cannot endure is the status quo.

New, after the dismal nightmare of Wesser isn, we Americans
heirs to the most dynamic tradition
in the Western world - seem to have
fallen into a deep and all but dreamless

slumber.

Like King Canute, we seem to feel that the tides of history will stop to suit our comfort and our status quo.

If we are unwilling to make history, others will write it for us - and they will be, for you and for your children, adding pages to read.

Yet we have, as we have shown again and again, the capacity for greatness. What we lack is the leadership to arouse us, and to rally our forces for the grave tests ahead.

The greatest challenge in

American political life today is to offer such leadership.

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.

