

The National Broadcasting Company Presents



M E E T T H E P R E S S

America's Press Conference of the Air

Produced by LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK

Guest: SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
Democrat, Minnesota

Volume 5

SUNDAY, APRIL 2, 1961

Number 13

Merkle Press Inc.

Printers and Periodical Publishers

810 Rhode Island Ave., N. E., Washington 18, D. C.

10 cents per copy

Panel: JACK BELL, *Associated Press*
RICHARD HARKNESS, *NBC News*
LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK, *Regular Panel Member*
RICHARD WILSON, *Cowles Publications*

Moderator: NED BROOKS

Permission is hereby granted to news media and magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.

MEET THE PRESS

MR. BROOKS: We are indebted to Senator Humphrey for substituting on short notice for the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, who is ill. Senator Humphrey has worked closely with Secretary Freeman in formulating the Administration's farm program, which recently was submitted to Congress. For eight years he has been a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee. He serves also on the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and he is the assistant Democratic leader of the Senate with the title of Whip, responsible for rounding up the votes on the Administration program. Senator Humphrey is one of the originators of the Food for Peace program, and he is the sponsor of legislation to establish the Peace Corps.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Humphrey, the Congressional Record of March 10 quotes you as saying this: "I have become skeptical of what we call the rigid control program. I make this statement frankly because in my earlier days in the Senate I argued vigorously for the most rigid type of controls."

In view of that statement, do you wholeheartedly support the President's program on farms?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I support the President's program, the aims of the program and the broad basic outline. Of course, as you know, the legislation has not as yet been presented on the new farm bill. My observation was directed towards what I considered to be the mandatory high price support level which left no flexibility at all. I think a man as he goes along finds that there may be some improvements over what he originally thought to be the better.

MR. SPIVAK: Doesn't this program envision controls over the farmer and over what he does with his land that can hardly be matched this side of the Iron Curtain?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No. Of course, it is very difficult to discuss the Administration's farm program unless we had the time to outline its broad features, but let me say that one of its features is the free, cooperative working relationship between the producer group of a commodity and the technicians in the Department of Agriculture, working together to produce a farm program that meets the needs of the farmer when two thirds of the producers of the commodity support that program. In other words, we are not going to foist on the farmer any program at all. We are going to ask Mr. Farmer to work with the government to help design a program, and then if the farmers themselves by a two-thirds majority vote for the program and if Congress does not overrule it, then, it becomes the active program of the government.

MR. SPIVAK: And once the farmer votes that way, isn't he going to get his orders from Washington on what crops to plant almost right down to how many seeds he can put in the ground?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all. As a matter of fact it will be to the contrary. Washington will get its orders from the farmers. This will be a farmer-run, farmer-operated program that Mr. Kennedy has in mind. Our President has laid before the country a complete reversal of what was the traditional farm policy. We are now working on the basis of farmer groups, commodity groups working together with the Department of Agriculture to design programs that are specifically related to a particular commodity, and then the farmers themselves will administer those programs through their elected county committees. I think it is a rather democratic situation.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, when the President was running for the presidency, he himself was quoted as saying one time that "Any attempt to control one commodity and not another is pre-

doomed. Our farm economy," he said "can not survive half controlled and half free."

Are you saying that the farmer is going to be free altogether now?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: What I am saying is that each commodity group, when a commodity is in surplus or in danger of going into surplus, will have its own negotiating committee, its own advisory committee that will work with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department technicians to design a program. That program will then be placed before every producer of that commodity. If two-thirds of the producers of the commodity vote for it in a national referendum, it will become the law. If they do not, it will not become the law, and if it becomes the law it will be administered by the elected farm committees of the farmers themselves. I submit that this is a far cry from regimentation. It is truly representative government, and it comes from the grass roots up, rather than from the White House down.

MR. SPIVAK: And are you saying there will not be rigid controls regardless of who administers them?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There will be the controls that the farmers themselves vote for, design for themselves and feel are the most applicable to the particular commodity. Some may be rigid, some may not be. It will depend upon the nature of the commodity and the problem that faces that particular group.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, President Kennedy has had two months working with this Democratic Congress of yours. So far you have passed three bills. You have extended unemployment compensation—I am talking of major bills—the feed-grain bill, and you have given the five stars back to General Eisenhower. Why so much talk and so little action?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We have also passed a depressed areas bill. It is in conference, but both houses have passed it, and it won't be long. It will be within the next week or ten days that this matter will have been ironed out in conference and adopted, so it is just a matter of the calendar.

Your question is surely one that many people have asked. I know, because I get mail along that line. In setting up a new Administration, it is a time-consuming enterprise. There isn't any doubt about it. Also we have had in the Senate many confirmations of Presidential nominations that have had to be heard, hearings that have had to be held on these men. This was priority business.

The House went through the rules fight. This took time. And it took time to organize the House Committees. Frankly, the

Congress has had a slow start, but it is moving along and moving along well, and I predict that by the time that summer comes around, we will have a very creditable record.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, the other day at the White House—you were there at the regular legislative session, I think—after the talk with President Kennedy, the Senate Democratic leader, Mr. Mansfield, said Mr. Kennedy's honeymoon with Congress is over. What did he mean?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know. If the honeymoon is over, may I say, it has maybe settled down to some very happy and pleasant living together, then, because we are still doing well. It isn't always that the great emotion and the happiness of a honeymoon continues on into years and years of pleasant living, but I think we are getting along fairly well. Of course, we have had some difficulties as we did in the House on one bill, but these are to be expected, these difficulties. I hope we have some difficulties. I don't want a rubber stamp Congress, and I don't want an Executive that tells us exactly what to do. The processes of democratic government—

MR. HARKNESS: You wouldn't be Hubert Humphrey if you did.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you, sir.

MR. HARKNESS: One question right on that line, Senator. Do the New Frontiersmen or do the Southern Democrats and Republicans control your Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say that the Kennedy program will have a very favorable reception in Congress, and if this means that New Frontiersmen are in charge, we will settle for that definition.

MR. BELL: Senator, a man who is in a position to know tells me that he doesn't believe Congress will pass any medical care for the aged this year. You go to the White House every week, and you are close to the President. Is there any disposition on the part of the Administration to put this off until next year, which happens to be an election year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, sir. I am hopeful that we will pass medical care for the aged. I have been told that it would be difficult to do this in the House—that is, to initiate it in the House, and if that is the case, then we will initiate it in the Senate as an amendment to one of the Social Security bills. There has been no discussion as to a delay of the medical care to the aged. I consider this one of the priority items of legislation.

MR. BELL: This is not, then, an Administration delay. If there

is a delay, it will be an anti-Administration delay brought about by the coalition against you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say if there is a delay it will be because of the concerted attack upon the Social Security medical care program, which has come from certain quarters in this country, plus the conservative coalition which would like to delay it, but delay does not mean the death of the program nor does it mean that it will be delayed unduly. We will pass Social Security medical care.

MR. BELL: In this session of Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And it is my feeling that we will pass it in this session of Congress.

MR. BELL: You say you would put it on in the Senate. That is going around Robinhood's barn, as you very well know. Do you think the House will accept anything that you put on in the Senate? They never do.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Bell—

MR. BELL: Not on a bill of that kind.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wouldn't mind if you said that privately, but this is a rather large audience. Don't make the Senate feel so helpless. There are times when the Senate does get its way in a conference with the House. I feel we have a better opportunity in the Senate of initiating this legislation than in the House because there may be problems in the House Committee, and if that is the case, then we ought to do it in the Senate and then go to conference, and I believe in a conference we will be able to get Social Security medical care.

MR. WILSON: Senator Humphrey, some people here are saying that President Kennedy has engaged largely in extending the Eisenhower programs, that he has not actually broken with the basic Eisenhower philosophy yet. An analysis was published here of this last week by one of President Kennedy's close friends. How can a left wing Democrat go along with the Eisenhower record in the way Kennedy is putting it into effect?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know about any left-wing Democrats. I haven't met many of those, but I know that those Democrats like myself that support President Kennedy's program and the Democratic platform find this program considerably different than that of the previous Administration. When I say "different," I mean in degree. We always had a continuity of basic philosophy in this country, and I hope that we will continue to do so. For example, the Kennedy program reference to care for

the aged. This is surely not the Eisenhower program. This is the Social Security approach as compared to the Eisenhower charity means test approach. There is a difference on minimum wage. The Kennedy program is \$1.25 an hour. The Eisenhower program was sort of a luke warm—almost up to \$1.15 an hour. There surely is a vast difference in the agricultural policy of this Administration. In the policy on natural resources and conservation, and indeed, there are differences in terms of the overall defense and foreign policy. Those are differences of degree, and it will take some time before they are fully developed.

MR. WILSON: You mentioned the minimum wage. I notice the House passed \$1.15 minimum wage. I assume the Senate will try to put it up to \$1.25. But during the campaign there was a great deal of emphasis placed on extending the coverage of the minimum wage.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR WILSON: Senator Kennedy, campaigning for President, laid emphasis numerous times on bringing the laundry workers into the minimum wage program. Yet, when his program was sent to the Congress, there was no provision in there for extending the coverage that far, nor was it adopted by the House. It is examples of this kind which cause people to say that the Eisenhower program and the Kennedy program are really not very far apart.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: In the instance of the minimum wage they are apart about four million workers on coverage, because the Kennedy program calls for an expanded coverage of about 4,300,000. The Kitchin-Ayers Bill which was the coalition bill, I think expanded coverage a little over a million, only 300,000 of whom were really new workers.

In the House on minimum wage, the Administration proposal—that is, the attempt at passing the Administration proposal—failed by one vote. I think it ought to have passed. I regret that it didn't. I want to predict to you without going out too far on a limb that we will pass the McNamara Bill, introduced as the Kennedy Administration Bill, for \$1.25 an hour with expanded coverage of over four million new workers. And when we come out of conference, I predict we will have \$1.25 an hour.

MR. WILSON: Not including the laundry workers, however.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We may not have the laundry workers even though I think they are surely entitled to every consideration. They have done good work for us.

MR. WILSON: The issue is raised also that although certain

budgetary increases have been recommended by President Kennedy, these do not in fact go far beyond what President Eisenhower had recommended for this year—the military budget for example, a relatively modest increase of \$650 million in spending compared to recommendations by Democratic critics for increased spending ranging from \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: And yet President Kennedy will not accept that, either.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: May I say that some of the differences between the Kennedy Administration and the Eisenhower Administration are pointed up by the temporary unemployment compensation measure, the depressed areas bill which has just as I said been passed by both houses. In the defense field the new Administration has added for the next three years approximately \$2 billion giving a shift of emphasis upon the defense structure, increasing our conventional forces—that is their firepower and mobility, making some changes in air power and by and large, I think, improving the defense structure. In the meantime, may I say, gentlemen, Mr. McNamara, the new Secretary of Defense has been ordered by the President to make an exhaustive study of the entire Defense establishment and our defense strategy, and you can expect within a year, I am sure, within the next fiscal year, a very substantial modification in the defense structure of this country in light of the studies which are being made.

MR. WILSON: What ever became of the missile gap?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it still exists. I regret to say that it does, and I hope that we will be able to close it. Fortunately, some of the air power that we have does give us a degree of security which is a deterrent factor within itself.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Humphrey, do you think President Kennedy has made any major accomplishments in the two months he has been in office?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, Mr. Spivak.

MR. SPIVAK: If you were to put your finger on the most important thing you feel he has accomplished, what do you think it would be?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He has brought this government into life. There is a new spirit in this city. The government of the United States is on top of problems again instead of being just buffeted by them. The government of the United States is responsive again to the needs of our nation. In the area of diplomacy we find ourselves in closer cooperation and coordination with

our allies. We have surely taken a new tack at the United Nations. I believe that Mr. Stevenson's role at the UN is demonstrative of what I mean. He has been a very effective and articulate spokesman. But most of all, there is a spirit of vitality here in the nation's capital. There is a sense of purpose. The American people themselves feel that this government is closer to them and that the man that is in the White House is sharing the problems of this nation with the people.

I think that you have had a great deal to do with it, you men of the press and radio and television.

MR. SPIVAK: Thank you, Senator, but most of this has still been in the area of what we call spirited talk, rather than the spirit of accomplishment. Let me take you, for example, to the question of the nuclear test ban. You have been interested in that for a long time. The Soviets seem to have lost interest in that altogether now, and we haven't tested for two and a half years. Aren't we drifting on that just as we did in the Eisenhower Administration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all.

MR. SPIVAK: How much longer do you think we can wait?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all, Mr. Spivak. The Soviet Union may appear to have lost interest and it may—one doesn't know. When you are dealing with the Soviet Union you are dealing with a non-predictable. They parley for position. They may very well deal with you one day in Geneva and another day in Berlin and then cause trouble somewhere else as they are in Laos. We have to understand that. They may come to a particular conference and try to make certain agreements with you at that time and then ignore you for months.

But here is the difference on the nuclear test ban insofar as our government is concerned. For the first time, Mr. Spivak—and I speak from knowledge of this—we placed before the Soviet Union at Geneva, a total, comprehensive, draft treaty with our positions clearly spelled out in every area of uncertainty and controversy over the past few years. In other words, we came prepared this time. This was something new. The Administration's position is firm and it is clear and it has been placed before the world.

MR. SPIVAK: But the fact remains that to date nothing has happened, and nothing seems likely to happen. How much longer do you think we ought to wait before resuming tests?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that we have to wait as long as we find that there is any possibility of a test ban agreement, because a test ban agreement is in our national interest. I was one of those that felt that if the Soviets demonstrated that they had

no interest, that they were unwilling to take this conference seriously, that we should resume testing. The President of the United States has not placed a month or a year on a time limit, but he has said that if we do not have reason to believe that the Soviet is bargaining in good faith, we will cut off the negotiations, and we will or may resume testing.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, you were just mentioning a moment ago this new Kennedy spirit in the country. What has Congress done since the Inauguration to put into action what to me was the highlight of the inaugural address, and that's sacrifice, what can you do for your government? Everything has been "What we're doing for you."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not particularly. I would say in the area of the unemployed, or in so far as our unemployed are concerned, we have tried to be of some help. I don't think enough, but we have done at least something.

The administration measures have just come to the Congress. I don't say this in apology or in rationalization, I say it being somewhat a student of government. With a new President coming in on January 20—and here we are just now in the first days of April, it seems to me that you have to expect time to reorganize the government, time to bring your new people into the government, time to reexamine the budget to present new messages and new proposals. And the Congress has been receiving these. We are already in hearing on the housing program. It takes time to process legislation. We are starting hearings on the Agricultural program. We have started hearings on the Social Security program. We are going to start hearings on the tax message just as soon as it comes down to the Congress. And by the time that July rolls around, gentlemen, there will be a lot to write about, and much of it will be accomplishment.

MR. HARKNESS: You just mentioned the housing program. Will you be for a rider to that program to desegregate federally assisted housing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I don't think I would be. I believe that this can be accomplished by Executive Order, and I doubt that we need to attach a rider such as this. It might only complicate its passage, and it might very well thwart its effectiveness.

MR. HARKNESS: I don't mean to be a "meany," here, but the Democratic platform says, "The new Democratic Administration will take action to end discrimination in federal housing programs, including federally assisted housing."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. It didn't say by legislative enactment.

MR. HARKNESS: I beg your pardon. Yes it did, I think.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Would you mind reading it again?

MR. HARKNESS: No, I don't have it here.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe it just said that we would take action.

MR. HARKNESS: You think it can be done by Executive action?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We know that it can be done that way.

MR. HARKNESS: Are you saying it will be done?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: When it will be done or if it will be done is in the hands of the President.

MR. BELL: Senator, I just wanted to check something you said awhile ago. Unless I heard you wrong, I think that you said that you are not a left-wing Democrat. When did this happen?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: On May 27, 1911. I was born that day.

MR. BELL: Senator, if you are not a left-wing Democrat, name one for me, will you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am a liberal Democrat and proud of it, and more than that I am very happy to be a part of this administration.

MR. BELL: But you are not reneging on left-wingism or liberalism, whatever you want to call it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all. "Liberalism," I rejoice in it, Mr. Bell. Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Senator, about 64 days elapsed between the time President Eisenhower and President Kennedy had a discussion about Laos. In that period of time the situation got considerably worse. Then the President of the United States declared that we—issued a grave warning that we might resist interference by the use of force in Laos. But about two weeks have passed and nothing has happened. In fact, the latest reports are that there is more fighting in Laos today than there was last week. Do you think there is any risk that the United States is being outmaneuvered in this Laos situation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would be the last to say that it wasn't a very serious situation, as it has been so described by men of more importance and more knowledgeable than Senator Humphrey. I don't believe we are going to be out-manuevered, and the

reason I don't believe we are going to be out-manuevered is because we are aware of that possibility.

The Soviet Union's reply to the British request for a cease-fire had some uncertainties in it and surely some extenuating remarks or ideas. I would suggest, therefore, that we be on guard to make sure that the Soviet Union does not try to stall negotiations at the same time a military buildup takes place and that continued fighting takes place. This is why I believe that Secretary Rusk's comments following the SEATO Conference are so important. Namely, that we will have forces in the area and that we will not tolerate the kind of continued fighting that nibbles off piece by piece the country of Laos, in the name of negotiation. That would be the worst travesty on justice.

MR. WILSON: How much more time is there?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am not capable of saying how much more time there is, Mr. Wilson, but I think that our men in the State Department, the President and our military have a pretty good idea as to whether or not the negotiations would lend themselves to stalling and nibbling. If that were the case, we would have to take other action.

MR. BROOKS: I think at that point I will have to interrupt, I am sorry, but I see that our time is up. Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us.

The Proceedings of
MEET THE PRESS

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., are printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self addressed envelope and ten cents for each copy to:

*Merkle Press Inc., 809 Channing Street, N. E.
Washington 18, D. C.*

MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from NBC Studios in Washington, D. C.

Television Broadcast 6:00 P.M. EST
Radio Broadcast 6:30 P.M. EST

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS NBC RADIO AND
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "MEET THE PRESS"

M E E T T H E P R E S S

Produced by Lawrence E. Spivak

- - -

SUNDAY, APRIL 2, 1961

MODERATOR: Ned Brooks

GUEST: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
 Democrat from Minnesota

PANEL: Richard Wilson, Cowles Publications
 Jack Bell, Associated Press
 Richard Harkness, NBC News
 Lawrence E. Spivak, Regular Panel Member

- - -

MR. BROOKS: This is Ned Brooks inviting you to MEET
THE PRESS: Our guest today is Senator Hubert Humphrey,
Democrat of Minnesota. He is substituting for the Secretary
of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, who was compelled to
cancel his appearance because of illness. Secretary
Freeman will be with us at a later date.

Asking the questions today on MEET THE PRESS are
Richard Wilson of the Cowles Publications, Jack Bell of
the Associated Press, Richard Harkness of NBC News, and
Lawrence E. Spivak, our regular member of the
MEET THE PRESS panel.

(Announcement)

MR. BROOKS: We are indebted to Senator Humphrey for substituting on short notice for the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, who is ill. Senator Humphrey has worked closely with Secretary Freeman in formulating the Administration's farm program which recently was submitted to Congress. For eight years he has been a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee. He serves also on the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and he is the assistant Democratic leader of the Senate with the title of Whip, responsible for rounding up the votes on the Administration program. Senator Humphrey is one of the originators of the Food for Peace program and he is the sponsor of legislation to establish the Peace Corps.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Humphrey, the Congressional Record of March 10 quotes you as saying this: "I have become skeptical of what we call the rigid control program. I make this statement frankly because in my earlier days in the Senate I argued vigorously for the most rigid type of controls."

In view of that statement, do you wholeheartedly support the President's program on farms?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I support the President's program, Mr. Spivak. The aims of the program and broad basic outline. Of course as you know the legislation has not as yet been presented on the new Farm Bill. My

observation was directed towards what I considered to be the mandatory high price support level which left no flexibility at all and I think a man as he goes along finds that there may be some improvements over what he originally thought to be the better.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, doesn't this program envision controls over the farmer and over what he does with his land that can hardly be matched this side of the Iron Curtain?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, Mr. Spivak. Of course it is very difficult to discuss the Administration's farm program unless we had the time to outline its broad features, but let me say one of the features is the free, cooperative working relationship between the producer group of a commodity and the technicians in the Department of Agriculture working together to produce a farm program that meets the needs of the farmer when two thirds of the producers of the commodity support that program. In other words, we are not going to foist on the farmer any program at all. We are going to ask Mr. Farmer to work with the government to help design the program and then if the farmers themselves by a two-thirds majority vote for the program and if Congress does not overrule it, then it becomes the active program of the government.

MR. SPIVAK: And once the farmer votes that way, isn't he going to get his orders from Washington on what crops

to plant almost right down to how many seeds he can put in the ground?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all. As a matter of fact it will be to the contrary. Washington will get its orders from the farmers. This will be a self -- this will be a farmer-run, farmer-operated program that Mr. Kennedy has in mind. Our President has laid before the country a complete reversal of what was the traditional farm policy. We are now working on the basis of farmer groups, commodity groups working together with the Department of Agriculture to design programs that are specifically related to the particular commodity and then the farmers themselves will administer those programs through their elected county committees. I think it is a rather democratic situation.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, when the President was running for the Presidency, he himself was quoted as saying at one time that any attempt to control one commodity and not another is pre-doomed. "Our farm economy," he said "can not survive half controlled and half free."

Now are you saying that the farmer is going to be freed altogether now?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: What I am saying is that each commodity group, when a commodity is in surplus or in danger of going into surplus, will have its own negotiating committee, its own advisory committee that will work with the Secretary of

Agriculture and the Department technicians to design a program. That program will then be placed before every producer of that commodity. If two-thirds of the producers of the commodity vote for it in a national referendum, it will become the law. If they do not, it will not become the law and if it becomes the law it will be administered by the elected farm committees of the farmers themselves and I submit that this is a far cry from regimentation.

It is truly representative government and it comes from the grass roots up, rather than from the White House down.

MR. SPIVAK: And are you saying there will not be rigid controls regardless of who administers them?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There will be the controls that the farmers themselves vote for designed for themselves and feel are the most applicable to the particular commodity. Some may be rigid, some may not be. It will depend upon the nature of the commodity and the problem that faces that particular group.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, President Kennedy has had two months working with this Democratic Congress of yours. So far you have passed three bills. You have extended unemployment compensation -- I am talking of major bills -- extended unemployment compensation, the Feed-Grain Bill, and you have given the five stars back to General Eisenhower. Why so much talk and so little action?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Harkness, we have also passed a depressed areas bill. It is in conference, but both houses have passed it and it won't be long, it will be within the next week or ten days that this matter will have been ironed out in conference and adopted, so it is just a matter of the calendar.

Mr. Harkness, your question is surely one that many people have asked, I know, because I get mail along that line. In setting up a new Administration, it is a time-consuming enterprise. There isn't any doubt about it. Also we have had in the Senate many confirmations of Presidential nominations that have had to be heard. Hearings have had to be held on these men. This was priority business.

The House went through the rules fight. This took time. And it took time to organize the House Committees. Frankly, the Congress has had a slow start, but it is moving along and moving along well and I predict that by the time that the summer comes around, we will have a very creditable record.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, the other day at the White House -- you were there at the regular legislative session, I think -- after the talk of President Kennedy, the Senate Democratic leader, Mr. Mansfield, said Mr. Kennedy's honeymoon with Congress is over, now what did he mean?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I don't know. If the honeymoon is over may I say it has maybe settled down to some very happy and pleasant living together, then, because we are still doing well. It isn't always that the great emotion and the happiness of a noneymoon continues on into years and years of pleasant living, but I think we are getting along fairly well. Of course we have some difficulties as we did in the House on one bill, but these are to be expected, these difficulties. I hope we have some difficulties. I don't want a rubber stamp Congress and I don't want an executive that tells us exactly what to do. The processes of democratic government --

MR. HARKNESS: You wouldn't be Hubert Humphrey if you did.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That might be said, sir.

MR. HARKNESS: One question right on that line, Senator. Do the New Frontiersmen or do the Southern Democrats and Republicans control your Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say that the Kennedy program will have a very favorable reception in Congress and if this means that New Frontiersmen are in charge, we will settle for that definition.

MR. BELL: Well, Senator, a man who is in a position to know tells me that he doesn't believe Congress will pass any medical care for the aged this year. Now you go to

the White House every week, and you are close to the President. Is there any disposition on the part of the Administration to put this off until next year, which happens to be an election year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, sir. I am hopeful that we will pass medical care for the aged. I have been told that it would be difficult to do in the House -- that is to initiate it in the House, and if that is the case, then we will initiate it in the Senate as an amendment to one of the Social Security bills. There has been no discussion, Mr. Bell, as to a delay of the medical care to the aged. I consider this one of the priority items of legislation.

MR. BELL: This is not then an Administration delay. If there is a delay, it will be an anti-Administration delay brought about by the coalition against it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I would say if there is any delay it will be because of the concerted attack upon the Social Security medical care program which has come from certain quarters in this country, plus the conservative coalition that would like to delay it, but delay does not mean the death of the program nor does it mean it will be delayed unduly. We will pass Social Security medical care.

MR. BELL: In this session of Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And it is my feeling that we will pass it in this session of Congress.

MR. BELL: Well, Senator, you say you would put it on in the Senate. That is going around Robinhood's barn, as you very well know. Do you think the House will accept anything that you put on in the Senate? They never do.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bell --

MR. BELL: Not on a bill of that kind.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bell, I wouldn't mind if you said that privately, but this is a rather large audience. Don't make the Senate feel so helpless. There are times when the Senate does get its way in a conference with the House, and I feel we have a better opportunity in the Senate of initiating this legislation than in the House because there may be problems in the House Committee, and if that is the case then we ought to do it in the Senate and then go to conference, and I believe in a conference we will be able to get Social Security medical care.

MR. WILSON: Senator Humphrey, some people here are saying that President Kennedy has engaged himself largely in extending the Eisenhower programs, that he has not actually broken with the basic Eisenhower philosophy yet. An analysis was published here of this last week by one of the President's close friends. How can a left wing Democrat go along with the Eisenhower record in the way Kennedy is putting it into effect?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I don't know about any left wing

Democrats. I haven't met many of those, but I know that those Democrats like myself that support President Kennedy's program, and the Democratic platform, find this program considerably different than that of the previous Administration. When I say "different," I mean in degree. We always had a continuity of basic philosophy in this country and I hope that we will continue to do so. For example, the Kennedy program reference to care for the aged -- medical care -- this is surely not the Eisenhower program, this is the Social Security approach as compared to the Eisenhower charity-means test approach. There is a difference on minimum wage. The Kennedy program is \$1.25 an hour. The Eisenhower program was a sort of a luke warm. almost up to \$1.15 an hour. There surely is a vast difference in the agricultural policy of this Administration.

In the policy on natural resources and conservation, and indeed there are differences in terms of the overall defense and foreign policy. Those are differences of degree, and it will take some time before they are fully developed.

MR. WILSON: You mentioned the minimum wage. I notice the House passed \$1.15 minimum wage. I assume the Senate will try to put it up to \$1.25. But during the campaign there was a great deal of emphasis placed on extending the

coverage of the minimum wage.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: Senator Kennedy campaigning for President, laid emphasis numerous times on bringing laundry workers into the minimum wage program. Yet when his program was sent to the Congress there was no provision in there for extending the coverage that far, nor was it adopted by the House. It is examples of this kind which cause people to say that the Eisenhower program and the Kennedy program are really not very far apart.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, in the instance of the minimum wage they are apart about four million workers on coverage because the Kennedy program calls for an expanded coverage of about 4,300,000. The Kitchin-Ayers Bill which was the coalition bill, I think expanded coverage a little over a million, only 300,000 of whom were really new workers.

In the House on minimum wage, the Administration proposal -- that is the attempt at passing the Administration proposal -- failed by one vote. I think it ought to have passed. I regret that it didn't. I want to predict to you without going out too far on a limb that we will pass the McNamara Bill introduced as the Kennedy Administration Bill for \$1.25 an hour with expanded coverage of over four million new workers. And when we come out of conference, I predict we will have \$1.25 an hour.

MR. WILSON: Not including the laundry workers, however.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We may not have the laundry workers even though I think they are surely entitled to every consideration. They have done good work for us.

MR. WILSON: The issue is raised also that although certain budgetary increases have been recommended by President Kennedy, that these do not in fact go far beyond what President Eisenhower had recommended for this year -- the military budget for example, a relatively modest increase of \$650 million in spending compared to recommendations by Democratic critics for increased spending ranging from \$2 billion to \$3 billion a year.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. WILSON: And yet President Kennedy will not accept that, either.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Wilson, may I say that some of the differences between the Kennedy Administration and the Eisenhower Administration are pointed up by the temporary unemployment compensation measure, the depressed areas bill which has just as I said been passed by both houses. In the defense field the new Administration has added for the next three years approximately \$2 billion giving a shift of emphasis upon the defense structure, increasing our conventional forces -- that is their firepower and mobility, making some changes in air power and

by and large I think improving the defense structure. In the meantime may I say, gentlemen, Mr. McNamara, the new Secretary of Defense has been ordered by the President to make an exhaustive study of the entire Defense Establishment and our defense strategy and you can expect within a year, I am sure, within the next fiscal year, a very substantial modification in the defense structure of this country in light of the studies which are being made.

MR. WILSON: What ever became of the missile gap?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it still exists. I regret to say that it does, and I hope that we will be able to close it. Fortunately some of the air power that we have does give us a degree of security which is a deterrent factor within itself.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Humphrey, do you think President Kennedy has made any major accomplishments in the two months he has been in office?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, yes, Mr. Spivak.

MR. SPIVAK: If you could put your finger on the most important thing you feel he has accomplished, what do you think it would be?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: He has brought this government into life. There is a new spirit in this city. The government of the United States is on top of problems again instead of being just buffeted by them. The government of the

of the United States is responsive again to the needs of our nation.

In the area of diplomacy we find ourselves in closer cooperation and coordination with our allies. We have surely taken a new tack at the United Nations. I believe that Mr. Stevenson's role at the UN is demonstrative of what I mean and he has been a very effective and articulate spokesman. But most of all there is a spirit of vitality here in the nation's capital. There is a sense of purpose. The American people themselves feel that this government is closer to them and that the man that is in the White House is sharing the problems of this nation with the people.

You have had a great deal to do with it. You men of the press and radio and television.

MR. SPIVAK: Thank you, Senator, but a lot of this has still been in the area of spirited talk, rather than the spirit of accomplishment. Let me take you, for example, to the question of the nuclear test banning. Now you have been interested in that for a long time. The Soviets seem to have lost interest in that altogether now and we haven't tested for two and a half years. Aren't we drifting on that just as we did in the Eisenhower Administration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all.

MR. SPIVAK: How much longer do you think we can wait?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not at all, Mr. Spivak. The Soviet Union may appear to have lost interest and it may -- one doesn't know. When you are dealing with the Soviet Union you are dealing with a non-predictable. They parlay for position. They may very well be with you one day in Geneva and another day in Berlin and then cause trouble somewhere else as they are in Laos. You have to understand that. They may come to a particular conference and try to make certain agreements with you at that time and then ignore you for months.

But here is the difference on the nuclear test ban in so far as our government is concerned. For the first time, Mr. Spivak, and I speak from knowledge of this -- we placed before the Soviet Union at Geneva, a total comprehensive draft treaty with our positions clearly spelled out in every area of uncertainty and controversy over the past few years.

In other words, we came prepared this time. This was something new. The Administration's position is firm and it is clear and it has been placed before the world.

MR. SPIVAK: But the fact remains that to date nothing has happened, and nothing seems likely to happen. How much longer do you think we ought to wait before resuming tests?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that we have to wait as long

as we find that there is any possibility of a test ban agreement, because the test ban agreement is in our national interest.

Now I was one of those that felt that if the Soviets demonstrated that they had no interest, that they were unwilling to take this conference seriously, that we should resume testing. And the President of the United States has not placed a month or a year on the time -- or a time limit, but he has said that if we do not have reason to believe that the Soviet is bargaining in good faith, we will cut off the negotiations and we will or may resume testing.

MR. HARKNESS: Senator, you were just mentioning a moment ago this new Kennedy spirit in the country. Well, what has Congress done since the inauguration to put into action what to me was the highlight of the inaugural address, sacrifice, what can you do for your government? Everything has been "What we're doing for you."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not particularly. I would say in the area of the unemployed, or in so far as our unemployed are concerned, we have tried to be of some help. I don't think enough but we have done at least something.

The administration measures have just come to the Congress I don't say this in apology or in rationalization, I say it as a matter of being somewhat a student of government. With a new president coming in in January 20 -- and here we are just now in the first days of April -- it seems to me that you have to expect time to reorganize the government, time to bring your new people into the government, time to re-examine the budget to present new messages and new proposals and the Congress has been receiving these. We are already in hearing on the Housing Program. It takes time to process legislation. We are starting hearings on the Agricultural Program. We have started hearings on the Social Security Program. We are going to start hearings on the tax message just as soon as it comes down to the Congress. And by the time that July rolls around, gentlemen, there will be a lot to write about and much of it will be accomplishment.

MR. HARKNESS: You just mentioned the Housing Program. Will you be for a rider to that program to desegregate federally assisted housing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I don't think I would be. I think this can be accomplished by executive order and I

doubt that we need to attach a rider such as this. It might only complicate its passage and it might very well thwart its effectiveness.

MR. HARKNESS: I don't mean to be a meany, here, but the Democratic platform says "The new Democratic Administration will take action to end discrimination in federal housing programs, including federally assisted housing."

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. It didn't say by legislative enactment.

MR. HARKNESS: I beg your pardon. Yes it did, I think.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Would you mind reading it again?

MR. HARKNESS: No, I don't have it here.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe it just said that we would take action.

MR. HARKNESS: Well do you think it can be done?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We know that it can be done that way. And when it will be done or if it will be done is in the hands of the President.

MR. BELL: Senator, I just wanted to check something you said awhile ago. Unless I heard you wrong, I think that you said that you are not a left-wing Democrat. When did this happen?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: On May 27, 1911. I was born that day, Mr. Bell.

MR. BELL: Well Senator, if you are not a left-wing

Democrat, name one for me, will you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am a liberal Democrat and proud of it and more than that I am very happy to be a part of this administration.

MR. BELL: But you are not renigging on left-wingism or liberalism, whatever you want to call it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: "Liberalism," I rejoice in it, Mr. Bell. Thank you.

MR. WILSON: Senator, about 64 days elapsed between the time President Eisenhower and President Kennedy had a discussion about Laos. In that period of time the situation got considerably worse. Then the President of the United States declared that -- issued a grave warning that we might resist interference by the use of force in Laos. But about two weeks have passed and nothing has happened. In fact the latest reports are that there is more fighting in Laos today than there was last week.

Do you think there is any risk that the United States is being outmaneuvered in this Laos situation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well Mr. Wilson, I would be the last to say that it wasn't a very serious situation as it has been so described by men of more importance and more knowledgeable than Senator Humphrey. I don't believe we are going to be out-maneuvered and the reason I don't believe we are going to be out-maneuvered is because we are aware of that possibility

The Soviet Union's reply to the British request for a cease-fire had some uncertainties in it and surely some extenuating remarks or ideas.

I would suggest, therefore, that we be on guard to make sure that the Soviet Union does not try to stall negotiations at the same time a military buildup takes place and that continued fighting takes place. This is why I believe that Mr. Rusk, Secretary Rusk's comments following the SEATO Conference are so important. Namely, that we will have forces in the area and that we will not tolerate the kind of continued fighting that nibbles off piece by piece the country of Laos, in the name of negotiation. That would be the worst travesty on justice.

MR. WILSON: How much more time is there?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I am not capable of saying how much more time there is, Mr. Wilson, but I think our men in the State Department, the President and our military have a pretty good idea as to whether or not the negotiations would lend themselves to stalling and nibbling. If that were the case, we would have to take other action.

MR. BROOKS: I think at that point I will have to interrupt, I am sorry, but I see that our time is up. Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us. I will tell you about next week's guest in just a minute after

this message.

(Announcement)

THE ANNOUNCER: For a printed copy of today's interview send ten cents in coin and a stamped, self-addressed envelope to Merkle Press, 809 Channing Street, N. E., Washington 18, D. C.

MR. BROOKS: Next week our guest on MEET THE PRESS will be the new Administrator of the Federal Housing Program, Dr. Robert Weaver. Now this is Ned Brooks saying good bye for Senator Hubert Humphrey and MEET THE PRESS.

- - - -



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