

CANTOR
MROC.

CBS NEWS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Broadcast House
Washington 16, D. C.
EMerson 2-9300

Sp. File - July 28
Joe Patton
Wash.

"FACE THE NATION"

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

July 28, 1957 - 5:00 to 5:30 PM EDT

CBS Radio Network

July 28, 1957 - 9:30 to 10:00 PM ET

GUEST: THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
United States Senate
(Democrat of Minnesota)

MODERATOR: Griffing Bancroft

PANEL: John Madigan
Newsweek

Paul Niven
CBS News

Rowland Evans, Jr.
New York Herald Tribune

PRODUCER: Ted Ayers

MR. BANCROFT: Well, the United States Senate is now going into its fourth week on the Civil Rights Bill and so far the consensus is the Southern opposition has been winning most of the points. The bill has been stripped down now primarily to a measure to protect voting rights, and the big immediate question is whether this is going to be done with or without jury trials.

Supporting a stronger bill has been a rather uneasy political axis, with Northern Democrats like you, Senator Humphrey, on one end, and your usual Republican enemies, like Senator Knowland, on the other, and everybody is wondering how well this axis is going to stay together.

So with that background, let's have the first question now from Mr. Madigan.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, what do you believe are the odds on the bill passing without the jury amendment being put into it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I think the bill will pass, Mr. Madigan, without any extraneous material, and the course of the jury trial amendment is strictly extraneous and has no particular place in this bill whatsoever. I am confident that this measure will be adopted.

It is a reasonable bill, it is a moderate bill, it is a fair bill, it is long overdue, and it seeks merely to protect the constitutional right of the right to vote. I can't

imagine anybody being really opposed to it, as a matter of fact. Really, I wonder what all the fuss and fury is all about.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, if the jury trial amendment is defeated, then aren't you going to face a Southern filibuster?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, we faced filibusters before, and sometimes a little adversity in life makes the prize all the more dear, once you obtain it.

If our Southern friends wish to exercise their lungs in a filibuster, why, we will just exercise our patience in behalf of the rights of people.

MR. EVANS: Senator, you say fuss and fury. I assume you are referring to the jury trial amendment there, too.

How do you explain the split in the Democratic liberals, Senator O'Mahoney and Senator Church, who say this jury trial amendment is essential to constitutional guarantees, opposed to yourself and Senator Douglas, for instance, who say it has no place in the bill.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Evans, one of the reasons that a person is a liberal is because he exercises independence of judgment. One of the most difficult assignments that anyone could possibly have is to hold liberals together around any one central issue over any extended period of time. We always respect the right of any individual Senator to have his own point of view.

I say most respectfully that those who are sponsoring the so-called O'Mahoney-Kefauver amendment are sponsoring an amendment which is not required in this bill, which is not necessary, which, by the way, is an amendment that affects some 36 statutes, and which ought to go to a committee of Congress for very careful examination.

MR. EVANS: Well, sir, do you really feel that a jury trial amendment would emasculate the bill? You don't think there would be any progress in this area of voting rights if you had a jury trial amendment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have never said that, Mr. Evans.

MR. EVANS: Do you feel that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I have never said that. I am sure any bill that we pass will be some improvement. However, why load down a measure which is reasonable, which is fair, which is within the tradition of American constitutional law, with extraneous baggage? And I make this statement: that in so-called contempt proceedings, either civil or criminal, there has been a history of no jury trial. There has never been a jury trial in a civil contempt proceeding in a federal court, and there never was a jury trial in a criminal contempt proceeding in a federal court, until the Clayton Act, of 1914, and in that Act the United States Government, as a plaintiff or one of the litigants in any criminal contempt proceeding was specifically exempt from any jury trial.

Now, may I just add most respectfully to my dear friends from the South that these men are competent lawyers and they have been blowing up a smoke screen here, setting up straw men, trying to confuse and diffuse, and in the process have not helped the law at all.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, what is going on behind the scenes in the cloakroom as to the time and strategy as to when a vote will be taken on this jury trial amendment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I had expected that we might vote, Mr. Madigan, on the jury trial amendment somewhere around Tuesday or Wednesday. Now it may go a little bit longer than that.

I will say that if it does go any longer, it will simply be a sign of weakness on the part of those who are advocating the so-called jury trial amendment. They thought they had the votes to pass it this week end, but they haven't, and the reason they haven't is that when those who are really thinking about this get down to put the pieces together and take a look at the law of the land, the constitutional history of this Republic, the past 800 years of common law, and law in equity, you will find out that a jury trial in a federal court under a criminal or civil contempt proceeding is just not the tradition or the historical practice of this Republic.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you believe there are deliberate

delaying tactics being used now to postpone a vote on this amendment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, I definitely do.

MR. MADIGAN: On whom do you place the responsibility?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Right on my good Southern friends.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you place it on the leadership of the Democratic Party?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I gathered that the leadership of the Party was for a jury trial amendment. I am not quite sure what kind.

May I just say most kindly and respectfully and charitably, there are more jury trial amendments than there are woodchucks in Rock Creek Park, and every conceivable kind of breed. Everybody that you meet in the Congress has got some kind of a jury trial amendment.

This has become sort of a national pastime for a while, but once we are through this season and once the fever has lifted, I think we will get back to what is the law of the land, namely, the constitutional right for a man to vote.

I ask the listeners on this program, does anyone really believe that you have the right to deny another person the right to vote?

MR. EVANS: Do you think, Senator, if the Southerners and the Northern moderates feel they haven't got the votes to put in a jury trial amendment, that the Southerners might

filibuster the bill at that point and refuse to permit that issue to come to a vote?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I doubt it. When you say the Northern moderates, I consider myself a moderate. I consider this bill a very moderate bill. I consider it exceedingly moderate to me for the right to vote. I consider it almost old-fashioned, almost conservative, to be for the protection of the integrity of the federal courts system, and I repeat that there is no lawyer that can show me either on or off the court that a federal court is not permitted to protect the integrity of a court order without a jury trial. That is all there is to it.

MR. EVANS: On the point of strategy on this, Senator, I understood your point on this, but if the Southerners feel they cannot adopt a jury trial amendment, do you think they will permit the bill to come to a final vote for this amendment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think they will. I think they will do it.

MR. EVANS: You don't anticipate a filibuster?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, I think there will be a filibuster of a type.

MR. EVANS: What kind of a type?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: An extended one. One that is not a do or die one. One that is a do one, but not quite die.

MR. NIVEN: If you Democrats and Republicans lose the initiative on this thing, isn't it true Senator Russell has carried the ball from the moment it got to the Floor?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think we have lost the initiative at all. If you mean Senator Russell is putting up a last ditch fight to protect a period of American history which is on its way out, then I say, yes, he has had the initiative.

This is something like the glorious words of Winston Churchill, who said he was not going to be the King's first Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. It is a noble phraseology, but the Empire is being liquidated, and I say most respectfully to my Southern colleagues, they are really fighting in the Twentieth Century for the Nineteenth Century.

MR. NIVEN: They have had the initiative.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: They have had the initiative --

MR. NIVEN: The Humphrey-Knowland axis has been most of the time --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: --in the sense they have been attacking a bill. They have been carrying on. We want to vote. We are not trying to hold back the vote. The initiative is in the sense they have been doing most of the speaking, if that is what you mean.

You mean, if they have been carrying on most of the

ao 2

argument setting up the straw men, knocking them down, but I submit that when the vote is taken on the right to vote feature of this bill, they may have had the initiative but we will have the votes.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, I was interested in your self-characterization as a moderate.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. MADIGAN: I recall you in 1948, on the Convention, being anything but moderate.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Very moderate.

MR. MADIGAN: And from that point, I would like to ask you: Why is it we now have to wait until the Republicans are in the White House before we have a bill proposed on civil rights that, for the first time in scores of years, has a chance of passing. I mean, haven't you been rather quiet on this issue in recent years?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, if I have, I must say some of us needing hearing aids.

First of all, I would like to go back to what you call being a moderate.

If it is being a moderate to be for equal protection of the laws for people, then I stand guilty. If it is being a radical to be for the right to vote for people who are of eligible voting age, then I plead guilty. If it is being radical to say that American citizens who are called upon to

ao 3

defend their country should likewise have the rights of full citizenship, then I stand guilty of being a radical, but I think all of this is very moderate, and I think the immoderates and the radicals are those who would deny people their constitutional rights. Those are the people that are tearing down what I consider to be the basic constitutional principles.

Now, coming up to who had the civil rights, I have always said that there was plenty of room in the field of civil rights for bipartisan cooperation, just as there is in foreign policy. I deeply regret that some of my Democratic colleagues do not see eye to eye with me on civil rights, but I will say this for them: they have never been hypercritical about it. They have been open, honest, about their different points of view. And I regret to say that for years our Republican friends just wouldn't join with us. They had a coalition with the Southern Democrats, and finally they saw the error of their ways. They have turned. They have changed, and we are working with them in good faith.

MR. MADIGAN: Bearing that in mind, Senator, which Party do you think will benefit more in the congressional elections and in the 1960 Presidential race?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't quite know. It depends on what part of the country you are in. I know who will really benefit from this legislation. I think the people, the great people, will benefit, the Negroes in the South, the Mexican-

ao 4

Americans in the Southwest, the disenfranchised in some of our large cities, because this is not a bill directed towards one section of the country. It is directed towards every section of America.

MR. MADIGAN: You don't think politics is playing a part, then, in this debate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, of course.

Look, we are all in politics. I like to be very candid with you. And may I say that whenever you can mix good politics and sound moral principles and political justice, then you have got a fine combination. There is nothing wrong with that compound, if somebody gets a few more votes because he had the courage and willingness to get out and fight for this Civil Rights program. I am all for it.

MR. EVANS: You said, in effect, the Republicans are hypercritical; in effect, that is what you said.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I said the Southerners have not been hypercritical. I said our Southern friends for years had a coalition with the Southern Democrats.

MR. EVANS: Let's put it this way, Senator: What is it that has changed the climate in the Senate to permit this bill to have advanced this far? Is it President Eisenhower, is it the Republicans, is it the new moderation in the South? What is it, in your opinion, and why didn't you bring this about under twenty years of Democratic Administration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think there is a good reason for that, Mr. Evans, because sometimes it takes time to develop a climate of opinion in which legislation can ultimately be processed.

We didn't get the Income Tax Amendment overnight. We didn't get Social Security proposals overnight. We didn't develop a Rural Electrification program overnight.

It takes time to set the scene to develop a climate of opinion, and one of the most encouraging things to me is that when I became a Senator here in Washington back in 1949, I can remember here that in the Nation's Capital that our colored people couldn't go to the theatres. I remember some of the grave social problems we had here in this community which are now, may I say, much better.

And all over America there has been improvement, and what you are seeing in the Senate today, as a representative body, is a reflection of the improved community attitudes on the field in the area of human relations.

MR. EVANS: But you agree, Senator, whether this is a fact or not, that the Republicans are bound to inherit a great political gain?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that is possibly true, Mr. Evans; yes, sir.

I want to say to Mr. Evans I think that is true, and if that is true, I am willing to pay that price as a Democrat,

because I say to you that it is nothing short of a national shame that our country hasn't long ago taken action to protect and to guarantee the right to vote of American citizen from any form of coercion, intimidation, or any form of interference. That is one thing that every American is entitled to.

You have no right to ask a man to bear arms for his country when he is at age 21 and then send him on home and deny him the right to vote.

(3) MR. NIVEN: Senator, last week you had your first roll call in an effort to water down the bill, the Aiken-Anderson Amendment, which went through. The Democrats voted about 3 to 1 to water down the Civil Rights Bill. The Republicans voted 2 to 1 against watering it down.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. NIVEN: Isn't this going to send thousands of colored voters into the Republican Party?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I don't think so, because colored voters are just like other voters; they evaluate the total political picture and they will look around and see who voted for a housing program. They will look around and see how much is the rate of interest and who is responsible for the high interest rates. They will look around, if they are a Southern farmer and a Negro sharecropper, and say, "I wonder who brought those farm prices down." And if they are one who lives out in the Southwest, or Far West, they will be interested in power

and cheap electrical utility rates.

Thank goodness for our people in America. Really, they are not very parochial or provincial. They are pretty good universal citizens, and look at the total picture.

There is no doubt but what some will be influenced, I grant that, but in the long run, may I say they will remember the accomplishments of Roosevelt and Truman and the accomplishments of the Democrats in Congress.

MR. BANCROFT: Senator, one thing I would like to ask you about. This afternoon one of your Northern liberals, Senator Neuberger of Oregon, has proposed an amendment to the amendment to try to insure that Negroes serve on juries in the South. How do you feel about that suggestion?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that would be very desirable. I also think we ought to abolish the poll tax.

MR. BANCROFT: That amendment, the Neuberger amendment, would make the jury trial amendment more palatable, would it not, to you Northerners?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am sure Mr. Neuberger would be very happy to propose that amendment as just a separate amendment to the bill. It isn't necessary, under parliamentary procedure, to have that at all tied to the jury trial amendment.

You know, this word "jury trial", or this phrase, it sort of has a mystical quality and a magic quality. Now, look, jury trials -- people are entitled to jury trials where

there are criminal prosecutions, according to the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution. They are entitled to jury trials under the Seventh Amendment of the Constitution where there are cases in common law, that is, where there is a damage, damages over \$20 involved, and I submit that under Article 3 of the Constitution and under 800 years of history, from the days way back of the Magna Charta on up to the present day and through every year of our constitutional history, jury trial in contempt proceedings in Federal Court is literally unknown.

MR. BANCROFT: Now, Senator Humphrey, there is one thing here. You speak of this as a right to vote bill, --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. BANCROFT: -- more or less in the past tense. Now, your new coalition with the Northerners and the Republicans, you tried pretty hard to get some sort of a compromise to preserve part of Section 3.--

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. BANCROFT: -- of this bill. Do we gather from what you say that that has now been abandoned, and you will make no effort now to make this any more than a right to vote bill?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That was defeated.

MR. BANCROFT: I know it was.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I want to say there were those of us that believed that Part 3 of the bill was poorly drawn. There

ao 9 are those of us who believed it was not fully explained by the Administration. I think there are some regrettable features about the way Part 3 was managed and handled when it was presented to the Congress.

Nevertheless, what Part 3 tried to do was very modest. It merely provided a means of the Government of the United States to help enforce what are now the Court decisions and the law of the land.

MR. BANCROFT: I understand all that.

What I am trying to find out is what you are going to do from here on. Have you abandoned now everything in this bill except the --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: One wouldn't want to go quite that far, of saying you have abandoned any possibility of recouping some of that loss. I would say, however, speaking for myself, that I will be perfectly content with a Civil Rights bill which preserves, No. 1, the Special Commission on Civil Rights that will investigate and look into alleged abuses of civil rights; No. 2, the appointment of an Assistant Attorney General who will concentrate his attention upon protection of civil rights; and, No. 3, what I have always considered to be more important than all of this put together: the Federal protections of the right to vote, a right which is guaranteed by the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

MR. EVANS: Nevertheless, Neuberger's amendment indicates

a direction towards compromise.

Now, the jury trial amendment that has been offered was designed to attract organized labor --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: But it isn't.

MR. EVANS: It would amend Taft-Hartley and the Minimum Wage Act, as well as this bill.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Indeed, it would amend 36 Acts, Mr. Evans, and strangely enough, a law that goes that far, it seems to me, ought to be studied more than a weekend.

MR. EVANS: My question is: Do you rule out any possible compromise on a jury trial amendment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am a realist, Mr. Evans. I have no way of knowing how every Senator is going to vote, but I will say this: that if you are a wagering man, Mr. Evans, I would suggest that you put your limited wager -- and I trust it will only be limited -- upon the fact that Section 4 will be passed intact, that here you have had the third edition of the jury trial amendment, and I predict at least two more editions will come out before the final is finally folded up, and in the meantime the public is going to begin to understand, and the Congress, that Section 4 is a well-designed section of this bill.

Now, I want to say to our public, Section 4 is the right to vote section, which permits the Federal Government, through the Attorney General, to come in with additional remedies, that

is, civil injunctions, if need be, to protect the right to vote.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, you have spoken here about the benefits that will accrue once this is passed.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. MADIGAN: And in line with that, I would like to ask your view on the long research that you have done on it. We did a survey a couple of weeks ago at Newsweek, in which we found in the eleven Southern states that there were approximately five to six million people over 21 years of age, Negroes, and that approximately one million or 200,000 more were estimated Negro voters.

Now, I would like to know what facts we have as to what this bill will accomplish, how heavy a Negro vote can we expect, for instance, in 1958 and in 1960, in the eleven Southern states.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is hard to say, Mr. Madigan, because what this bill does, it doesn't say that you must vote. It merely says that you will be permitted to register to vote, that no one will interfere with that registration, and when you go to the ballot box, that you will be permitted and protected in your right to exercise your privilege to vote.

MR. MADIGAN: I appreciate that.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Therefore, I think that your change of voting pattern will be slow. I doubt that there will be any sudden switchover. Actually, it will take its time, and

I feel that in a few years you will begin to feel the impact of a wider use of the franchise, which will mean, to my way of thinking, a greater liberalization of attitude on the political scene.

MR. MADIGAN: Would you say if this bill passes, dealing only with voting, and the progress is as slow as you forecast, that it would be improper to call it from now on, as we did call it when it was first introduced, a civil rights bill, or do you still --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It is a civil rights bill. May I suggest to you that whether a person exercises his civil right or not is his own personal privilege. All this bill does is to simply say that the Federal Government, the Government of the United States, which has the first claim upon every citizen, will protect the Federal citizenship rights of every national in this country, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, when it comes to the right to vote.

MR. MADIGAN: Would you return in the next session and try to introduce the other matters of Section 3 that Mr. Bancroft spoke of, that failed this time?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, again I feel that this is a very serious business, and if we pass the Civil Rights Commission section of this bill, which I am sure we will, that is, Section 1, I will await the first report of the Civil Rights Commission to see what that Commission finds in its judgment

and wisdom to be desirable proposals.

Now, I have always sponsored Civil Rights legislation, but I want to be fair. I have no desire to punish anybody or harass anybody. I seek reasonable progress in the field of human relations.

Belt 4 of
mroc

relations.

MR. EVANS: Senator Humphrey, the real impact of this bill is not going to be felt in the South, is it, immediately? It is going to be felt in the Democratic territories in the great northern cities.

Isn't that where you stand to lose considerable votes in '58 and '60?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We might, Mr. Evans. I am not one that goes around feeling that this is going to be a great price for the Democratic Party.

MR. EVANS: Do you feel this is a real jeopardy for the Democratic Party?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: If it is, then we ought to pay the price. I want to say, what this bill is really going to do is give dignity to the individual citizen who has had his dignity denied and abused when people have denied him the right to vote, and I say, as a Democrat, if my party has to suffer the loss of some votes in northern cities because the majority of the Democrats did not vote for a right to vote bill or a Civil Rights bill, then I am afraid we will just have to pay the price, and I am a good Democrat.

MR. EVANS: Do you think a majority of the Senate Democrats will oppose this bill?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I do not. I think that when it is all over, that a majority will support it.

MR. BANCROFT: Senator Humphrey, I know down there in

o2 the Senate these days you people don't talk about anything but Civil Rights.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, we do.

MR. BANCROFT: There are a couple of other matters we would like to get into, because in addition to your activity in this field, you are chairman of a special committee on disarmament, and today the President has sent Secretary Dulles over to London to take part in this disarmament conference.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. BANCROFT: How do you think that is coming out? Are you satisfied with what is going on over there in London?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is, of course, the most serious business of our generation, this whole subject of peace and security. We call it disarmament, when in fact what we are talking about is a type of control and limitation of armaments which will come, I imagine, if it comes at all, in very piecemeal and limited stages.

You ask me if I am satisfied. I can say to you that three or four weeks ago I had a sense of cautious optimism. I hesitate to say this, but I feel one needs to be very candid with his fellow citizens these days. I am anything but optimistic now. I feel that there has been a worsening of the general situation.

MR. NIVEN: Senator, are you satisfied that our Administration is united in wanting a disarmament agreement?

o3

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think that the Administration wants it, but I think there are some grave conflicts within the Administration as to how we should proceed.

MR. EVANS: Who do you mean by "the Administration"?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I gather we mean President Eisenhower, his Executive Branch of the Government.

MR. EVANS: You don't mean the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think, Mr. Evans, that there are serious disagreements between the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Radford, Secretary Dulles, and Mr. Stassen.

MR. EVANS: Do you think these disagreements have hurt Mr. Stassen's opportunities to progress at the London Conference?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: They surely have not helped him.

MR. NIVEN: What is at fault at London? Why are the talks threatening to break down? Because of these disagreements here in Washington, or because of the Russian attitude?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I would say the disagreements here in Washington have not been to a point where they have jeopardized the role of Mr. Stassen to present a firm United States position.

I am fully familiar with the position which Mr. Stassen has presented to our colleagues, that is, our friendly nations in London, and to the Soviet Union. And the Soviet, by the

o4 way, knew the American position on disarmament, mind you, even before our friends in Great Britain, France, and Canada. We went out of our way, in fact I think Mr. Stassen went really out of his way, to go to Mr. Zorin, the Soviet delegate, and present the American position.

MR. BANCROFT: Senator Humphrey, you said you were hopeful, but recently you have almost lost your hope.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Have been less hopeful.

MR. BANCROFT: What recently has happened to change your mind about it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have sensed that in the beginning of these negotiations, Mr. Bancroft, that the Soviet really negotiated conscientiously and sincerely. It so appeared, because they did not use the United Nations Subcommittee on Disarmament rostrum as a means of propaganda. They seemed to be negotiating as you would expect negotiators to act.

But recently, with Bulganin's letter to Macmillan, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and with many of the statements of Mr. Zorin, I see them reverting back to type, using the U.S. Subcommittee on Disarmament as a podium and platform just to blast away at the West.

I would hope that we could regain some of the initiative that we earlier had, and if Mr. Dulles can do anything about that in London, he will receive my praise, if it means anything to him.

o5

MR. MADIGAN: Once the Civil Rights bill is out of the way and Congress is recessed, do you think we should revive the suggestion that some observers from the Senate go over to London and take part in the sessions?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That only is so if it looks like anything is going to develop there.

I have one suggestion that I want to make. If these disarmament discussions bog down, as I think they will, maybe then when the United Nations General Assembly reconvenes this October or November, that President Eisenhower, who still has a great reservoir of good will in this world as a peace-maker, that President Eisenhower appear before the General Assembly of the United Nations and lay before that General Assembly, the representatives of eighty nations, large and small, with all the sincerity at his command, -- and he has it -- the entire American position upon disarmament.

Prior to that, to have that position worked out with our friends.

MR. EVANS: Have you recommended that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And that he state it in the most simple and yet profound terms, because it is all-important that America appear before the world sincerely and honestly as truly seeking a just and an enduring peace, and being willing to pay the price.

MR. EVANS: Is that being considered, Senator? Have

o6

you suggested that to the President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have suggested it to the State Department representatives, and I will some time formally suggest it to the President.

MR. EVANS: What kind of a reaction did you get?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: A friendly reaction, not a negative one.

MR. MADIGAN: Could I make a quick switch to politics, Democratic-type preferably?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is a good note to kind of conclude on here.

MR. MADIGAN: How do you look for the 1960 race to go? Do you think Senator Jack Kennedy is in the lead now?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think Senator Kennedy is way out and is doing very well.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you think he will be the nominee?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: My goodness, I can hardly predict how we are going to come out in the Civil Rights bill.

MR. MADIGAN: Would you be a candidate for the national ticket on either President or Vice President?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, I am presently considering the possibility of running for re-election to the United States Senate in 1960.

MR. BANCROFT: Your term is up in 1960?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is correct.

07

MR. BANCROFT: Have you announced your candidacy?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I haven't yet. When I do, I will do it in Minnesota.

MR. BANCROFT: I am afraid we have about run out of time. Senator Humphrey, many thanks for coming here today to FACE THE NATION.

And thanks also to today's panel of newsmen:
To Rowland Evans, of the New York Herald Tribune;
Paul Niven, of CBS News; and
John Madigan, of Newsweek.
This is Griffing Bancroft.

We invite you to join us next week for another edition of FACE THE NATION.

Our program today originated in Washington.

- - -

Produced by Ted Ayers.

Associated in production, Beryl Denzer.

Directed by Bill Linden.

- - -



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