

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY'S TELEVISION PROGRAM 6/12/63

INTRODUCTION: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today, the Senate Majority Whip reports on the most critical issues facing the Congress and the Nation. Now, here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR H. H. HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. ^{Today}~~Yesterday~~ I want to report on what I believe are three vital and important issues, not only facing the Nation, but, of course, facing the Congress of the United States. The first and the most important of these issues is what we call the issue of civil rights. Others term it Constitutional rights, or human rights. The second issue is the matter of peace and the pursuit of peace by the President of the United States speaking for the people of America, and the process of the achievement of the conditions of peace. And, the third issue before us relates to our national security, and, indeed, to the well-being of not only our own nation but of other people's and nations which seek to live and work in the paths of freedom. I refer to our foreign aid program, or as we call it, our international development program in the field of capital and social improvement. Now, let me just visit with you for a moment about one or two other developments and then we'll get to these three important issues. We have had many important visitors in Washington this past week. The President of the Republic of India has been with us. A distinguished statesman, scholar,

one who has given magnificent leadership to the people of India. He was here to talk to us about mutual problems. Particularly, he talked about the defense of India, as it now relates to the attacks or the threatened attacks of the Chinese communists upon Indian borders. India is a democracy; it has had its problems; we at times have had our disagreements with India, but in this hour of difficulty, and, indeed in this period when Indian freedom is being threatened, it is most interesting to note how we close ranks, how misunderstandings are dispelled, and how they disappear, and how we are able to work more closely together as a team, or nations that have respect for each other. Then we have had in Washington this past week, one of the great international conferences---The World Food Congress. The first conference or congress on the food problem, the problems of diet and, indeed, to put it conversely, the problems of malnutrition, of famine, that first conference was held right after World War II at Hot Springs, Virginia; we referred to it always as the Hot Springs Conference out of which grew the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and many of the programs were designed to improve the level of food production and diet throughout the world. The United States, because of its outstanding leadership in the field of agriculture, the quantity of production, as well as the quality, our leadership in the Food for Peace program. These factors within themselves made the United States a logical choice for the World Food Congress. It was my privilege to sponsor the legislation here in the Congress of the United States, to authorize

this great international meeting. The meeting has been attended by delegates from one hundred and five nations (105), with over 1,500 delegates from these 105 nations. And, you really see the very world parading before your eyes. People from distant lands, wearing strange to us, yes, their own native costumes. People that are well educated, people of every race, color and creed that have one common objective---how can we better improve the standard of living, of God's finest creation, human life, people. And I am happy to say the our government, starting with our President, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, and members of Congress, and members of other offices of the executive department who have been giving marvelous leadership to this World Food Congress. Dr. Senn, the executive director or the director general of the Food and Agriculture Organization with its headquarters in Rome, Italy, has been with us. In fact, just this past week, I have had the privilege of spending several hours with the delegates of the World Food Congress, and being with Dr. Senn, whom I have known for many years. He was once the Agricultural Minister of the Republic of India. Today he is a great international public servant. There will be resolutions and there'll be recommendations come from the World Food Congress, and I am sure that some of those will deal with how the nations/^{who}produce an excess of food over their own requirements can better work together to help overcome poverty and hunger in the world. We live in very strange times, don't we? When some of the people are overfed, and other people literally suffer

from malnutrition and lack of food. Surely, the same humankind that expects to be able to conquer outer-space, to launch space platforms, to go to the moon, and stay there if need be, and then leave the moon and come back to the earth. Surely, people of this brilliant intelligence and scientific genius and ingenuity ought to be able to find a way to distribute food without destroying the normal markets, and at the same time, utilizing food as a great force for peace. In presenting certain members of Congress to these delegates, which it was my privilege to do, since I was a host at a great reception in Washington, I pointed out that food is strength in this world. Food is power, and it is power for good, and food is hope, hope for people that live on the border of starvation. And, food, of course, is life, because without it, there is no life. And, food is peace, because hungry people lend themselves to all of the plans and all of the evil-doings of dictators and tyranny. And, food is freedom, because without food, without healthy bodies and without people that feel that there is at least some hope in the world, there is no freedom.

Well, now let me go back to these three great important issues for a moment. I said the most critical issue facing us today, and when I say us, I mean all of us, everyone, whether we are in the North or the South, or the East or the West, or whether we live in the city or in the rural community, the most important issue facing the American people today is the issue of human rights. Our Constitutional rights.

This is a moral issue, and, it is indeed a political issue. Political in the sense that we have only one kind of citizenship under our constitution, and that's American citizenship. And the American Negro is a citizen of this country, and he has been since the inception of this republic. It was Abraham Lincoln who in 1863 proclaimed what we call the Emancipation Proclamation. He emancipated the slaves from their bondage. But the process of emancipation has been going on for a hundred years, where the Negro has been aspiring for his full place and his rightful place in American society. He has been patient. Many of us are mindful of all of the difficulties that the Negro has faced in many communities, and our political and social and economic life. But as the Vice President said recently in a memorable address at Gettysburg Battlefield in Pennsylvania, and it was one of the great speeches of our time. He said the American Negro has run out of patience. He wants action. He wants his own place in American society. And he is going to get it. Therefore, we see manifestations today of this determination to gain full citizenship, the full rights under the Constitution for every American regardless of his color, his race, his ethnic background, his origin, or his religion. And this is right. It is morally right, and in terms of our political tradition, it is politically right, and there isn't any force that can stop the fulfillment of this goal of full citizenship. The privileges and the duties, the responsibilities and all of the opportunities of full citizenship. The American people are angry today, and indeed they are

discouraged and disgusted when they see for example, police brutality upon Americans who seek only the right to vote, the right to dine in a dining room, the right to parade in a general store, or department store, the right to be free people, and as President Kennedy said, you cannot have a free America until all Americans enjoy freedom. And we can't export freedom until all Americans enjoy freedom. So we are seeing violence in our streets, and we are seeing acts of brutality, dogs set upon innocent people by police, and the Americans are demanding an end to it. They are demanding now that the Courts take action. The Courts have been great, strong and courageous in this whole issue of civil and constitutional rights. Not only that our President take action, and he's done a fine and commendable and courageous job, but at last the Congress must act, because the Congress represents the people, and this means a civil rights program before Congress, and it will be here, and I want to tell you now that we are going to carry through on this program even if we have to stay here all year. And we maybe ought to plan our business as a year-around business in the Congress. I'll^{have}/responsibility in this area and I want to pledge here and now that whatever the consequences may be, no matter how bitter the battle, no matter how long the fight we are going to pass the basic necessary legislation, to see to it that these issues of human rights and civil rights are not settled in the streets by force and violence, but rather can be handled by courts of law, can handled within due process of law, and people guaranteed their

rights. Now this isn't just a matter for the Federal government, it is your problem too. Everyone of us has this weighing heavily on his conscience. And we must as individuals and citizens speak out against bigotry and discrimination and prejudice and we must be willing to accept the fact that every American is entitled to equal rights under the Constitution and under the law. No less than that. This means that local government and state government must cooperate, and that local officials and state officials must cooperate, and it means that the spiritual leaders of our nation must speak up for that equality which is to be found in man as a creature of Divine Providence; it means that educators must speak up, and that citizens leaders must speak up. The time of condoning discrimination and prejudice is over. We can't afford it any longer. It is already far too late.

Now, one other issue that we heard this week was the issue of war and peace. Our President made a tremendous address at the American University here in Washington, D. C. Calling upon the peoples of the world to search relentlessly for the ways to peace, that peace is not just one single act; there are many things which bring it about. Many that can destroy it. And he reminded us that peace is a process. You build towards peace. He reminded us that it takes as much courage and maybe even more to be the peacemaker than it does the warrior. And he again said that America was ready to abandon nuclear tests in the atmosphere, on our own, without any treaty, without any guarantees, as long as the Soviet Union

did the same. We would take the initiative, and we can do this safely because there is no danger of cheating here, because we have ways and means of knowing whether or not someone violates the pledge. And we're sending a high level negotiating group to Moscow to see if we cannot at long last find some way to put the lid on this arms race, and to turn it down instead of letting it spiral up; because the arms race, in itself, is a danger. And now finally, we have before us in the Congress a foreign aid program. And I just want to say this about it. Foreign aid to some people may be distasteful. But it is a part of our security. It is a part of the burden we must bear as a leader in the free world, and it has had memorable success---the Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps and in the days ahead the Alliance for Progress. And let me just say in conclusion, that foreign aid is not unpopular. It is necessary. And it is backed by the American people.

Well I'll be back with you in two weeks with a guest, and we'll talk more about these vital issues.

(2)

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 11, 1963

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE 16

Ladies and gentlemen---

This is Senator Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you
from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C.....

Congress will soon be engaged in the annual debate over our
Nation's foreign aid programs. This year, as in the past, the
President and Congressional leaders will face that small but vocal
force which opposes foreign aid with little more than sweeping
generalizations and half truths.

We can expect one of the old and tired arguments to be used
again---the argument that the American people do not support the
basic principle and purpose of foreign aid.

(more)

That argument has no basis in fact. To the contrary, the evidence points to strong popular support for the basic principle and purpose of America's foreign aid programs.

Recently, the respected and objective Gallup Poll released the results of a sequence of surveys¹ taken from the years 1955 to the present.

Here are some of the basic findings² of the Gallup Poll:

* Popular support for the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire nine-year period from 1955 to 1963.

* Today, 58 per cent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid. Only 30 per cent oppose foreign aid, and 12 per cent are neutral.

* Our basic foreign aid programs command equal support in all parts of the country. The national figure of 58 per cent support is identical to the figure for the Mid-West.

(more)

The basic conclusion we can draw from this Gallup Poll report is that the American people do support foreign aid---and in increasing numbers.

There is one other fact which is significant. Those citizens who are well-informed on our foreign aid programs tend to support those programs much more strongly. Gallup reports that support for foreign aid is 40 per cent higher among the Americans who are informed on the details of the program.

The basic fact which all Americans should understand is that our Nation's foreign aid program is a success. It works.

I stress here that I do not blindly accept any and all recommendations for foreign aid. As a member of the Foreign Relations and Appropriations committees, I keep a diligent eye on the way our funds are spent. Those committees check and recheck every item in our foreign aid programs to assure that they will be as effective as possible.

(more)

Let me conclude by mentioning four, specific foreign aid programs which have had unquestionable success: The Marshall Plan, which helped to rebuild a devastated Western Europe after World War II; the Point Four program which sent trained American technicians to all parts of the world; the Food for Peace program, which continues to share America's agricultural abundance with the hungry and undernourished people of the world; and the Peace Corps, which in less than two years has become one of the most dramatically successful programs of the United States in two decades.

Today, we have an opportunity to add another "unquestionable success" to the Nation's series of effective foreign aid programs--- the Alliance for Progress. This program, based on U.S. assistance coupled with local initiative and effort, is the great new opportunity--- and imperative---for progress and freedom in this hemisphere in this decade.

(END)

6:20
seconds

MINNESOTA RADIO TAPE OF JUNE 12, 1963

FOR BROADCAST WEEK BEGINNING JUNE 16

Ladies and gentlemen--

This is Senator Hubert Humphrey, reporting to you

from my office on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C....

the throttled nation
Today, the issue of civil rights---of human rights---faces every

American, in every part of the country.

any more than anyone else
This is not an issue which we in Minnesota can ignore, just because

the most dramatic and critical developments are in the southern states

today.

*This issue is not regional
not a southern*
And it is not an issue which can wait...and wait...and wait for

resolution.

One hundred years ago, President Lincoln issued the Emancipation

Proclamation. The Negro in America is still waiting for the fulfillment

(more)

of the promise of that proclamation. The Negro in America is still waiting for this Nation's commitment to give every citizen his full civil and constitutional rights as a citizen. *a full 135 years*

Vice President Johnson expressed it best in a recent speech. *at Statkyburg*

The American Negro, he said, has run out of patience. *He will wait no longer*

The result is on the front pages of our newspapers today, and at the heart of our ~~REPUBLICAN~~ *people and a nation* conscience as a country. The Negro of

America is no longer willing to wait for his rights as a citizen.

He He wants freedom now, and is acting to win it. *He believes*

The steps he is taking to win his freedom today are more determined, *right of dec of indep*

a new set of rights better organized and more effective than ever before. Through a policy

of non-violent action, he is moving ahead to demand the basic rights

supposed to assured for all Americans by the Constitution.

Frankly, he is moving faster than the courts, the government and *or Executive branch*

the Congress. And he is right to move. He can no longer be expected to

long dream and wait for promises, or plans, or statements of hope.

(more)

The courts have moved ahead on civil rights. The Administration of President Kennedy, through the Justice Department, has moved ahead *the past personal action* *speech at Honolulu - the past address to the nation after* in the field of civil rights. The Congress is preparing to engage in a long, and probably bitter, debate to move ahead on civil rights.

But the issue we face today is not just a political issue. It can not be resolved only by plans, programs or new laws. All are needed, and action on all fronts is necessary. But the ultimate victory for *human constitution* civil rights, the final fulfillment of the Emancipation Proclamation, can come only through a commitment of the conscience of the American people to give all citizens equal opportunities and equal justice and *equal* rights.

President Kennedy correctly identified this issue as a "moral crisis." The meaning of those two words is simple: The basic problem today is not just legal, political or even social. The basic problem requires a moral decision by every American, because this is also a National issue.

My formal duties in the coming weeks or months will be to work
human
for a stronger civil rights program in this session of Congress.
I am committed

But as an individual American, I will also hope and pray for a new
dedication by every citizen to eliminate the tragedy of discrimination
and bigotry from every community in America. *There is no room for violence*

I mean by this that every American will not sit by and think
"it's a problem of the south; I'm not involved." Every American who
ever overhears a remark which displays bigotry is involved. And it
does not ~~matter~~ where the State or the community is. The citizen
who ~~sees or hears~~ sees or hears an expression or example of bigotry or
discrimination is involved. And if he says nothing, or looks the other
in a neutral sense
way, he is morally guilty for a part of the crisis we have today.

moral
I am confident that a new climate is developing in our Nation now.
I am confident that our people are mature enough and possess the degree
simple decency & goodness
of goodness necessary to resolve the issue of civil rights, and bring the
fulfillment of the Emancipation Proclamation this year.

SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR 1 1/4 MINUTE HUMPHREY TV REPORT---FOR RELEASE JUNE 16, 1963

(no guest)

1 -- Introduction of program by Bob Coar.

2 -- Opening remarks about "three important issues" facing Congress and the Nation.

3 -- The first and most critical is civil rights.

Stress, as did the President, that this is a "moral crisis. And, as the Vice President said, "The American Negro has run out of patience." Mention that the Courts, the Executive Branch and Congress are moving to act for progress on civil rights, but that the issue involves every American in every community of the Nation. That there was, for 100 years, the promise of full freedom from the Emancipation Proclamation--- and now the Negro is acting to win the fulfillment of that promise.

*Moral
Political
Courts, Exec, Cong
State local
Groups*

4 -- Mention the President's important speech and announcement at American University in Washington "last week" in which he announced that the U.S. will refrain from testing in the atmosphere as long as other Nations refrain, and that we will participate in high-level talks for a test ban agreement in Moscow. Mention the President's courage in taking this step, and stress that you have long taken the position he announced. Refer to the Dodd-Humphrey Resolution, co-sponsored by 34 Senators---and the continuing need to reduce the chances of proliferation of nuclear weapons and contamination of atmosphere. That the atmospheric test ban by the U.S. is only "a first step" and should not be considered an alternative to a comprehensive treaty banning all tests.

*Waldorf Congress
165 Nations
1500 Delegates*

5 -- Last, a report on your speech at the International Conference on Social and Economic Development. Congress soon will be in debate on foreign aid. The argument of "foreign aid is not popular back home" is nonsense: Gallup Poll reports 58 per cent of people favor and support our foreign aid program. Need for understanding---support for foreign aid is 40 per cent higher among those who are well-informed on the program. Refer again to "unqualified successes": the Marshall Plan, Point 4, Food for Peace, and the Peace Corps. And today, the challenge is the Alliance for Progress.

Hearing!

6- PROGRAM AND GUEST "2 WEEKS FROM NOW"

[June 16, 1963]

INTRODUCTION OF HUMPHREY TV PROGRAM BY BOB COAR:

THIS IS WASHINGTON...AND THIS IS SENATOR HUBERT H.
HUMPHREY, OF MINNESOTA. TODAY, THE SENATE MAJORITY
WHIP REPORTS ON THE MOST CRITICAL ISSUES FACING
CONGRESS AND THE NATION. NOW, HERE IS SENATOR
HUMPHREY.....

TV SCRIPT

JUNE 26, 1963

Bob Coar: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, the Assistant Majority Leader of the United States Senate reporting to the people of Minnesota. Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, thank you. Today I am going to take the opportunity that is afforded me to tell you how a program is constructed, or how it is designed by the President, and then presented to the Congress. And, I believe that we have a good case in point in the Civil rights program presented by President Kennedy recently to the Congress of the U. S. Now, from time to time, I have shared with you the discussions that have taken place at the White House in what we term our personal legislative meetings with the President. As you know, we regularly meet with President Kennedy every Tuesday morning for our breakfast meeting, a brief breakfast and sometimes a rather long discussion on issues that face the country and on the programs that are to be presented to the Congress or are now before the Congress. These meetings are attended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the House, and the Majority Whip; they are attended by the Majority Leader, Senator Mansfield of the Senate, the Secretary to the Democratic Congress in Senate, Senator Smathers, and myself as Majority Whip or Assistant Majority Leader. And at these meetings with the President and the Vice President we try to plan out a program of action before the Congress and indeed share our thoughts with the President on matters

of international concern and of domestic importance. Now, let's just discuss the creation of the Civil Rights Program. Well, we know of one thing that the whole issue of Civil rights came into sharp focus by the many demonstrations that have taken place in our community throughout the nation. The problems in Birmingham and Oxford and Jackson; the racial tensions we have witnessed in Boston and New York and Chicago and Detroit and yes, in Minnesota in Minneapolis. All of this has brought the country to a recognition, to a realization that something more needed to be done to guarantee civil rights for every American and to protect the human rights that a free citizen in a free democratic nation has and is entitled to by his citizenship, and by his very person. Let me first of all set the definition straight. By civil rights we mean legal rights, rights that are guaranteed by the Constitution of the U. S., rights that are guaranteed by our Bill of Rights, rights of citizenship, that there shall be equal chance, equal privileges, and equality before the law. This is a constitutional provision and a constitutional declaration and right. Now those constitutional provisions are carried out by statutory law, by the Congress, by, of course, state legislatures, by the President in his executive capacity, and then by the courts. In recent years, the courts have been the protectors of constitutional rights or civil rights and then the executive branch of our government has taken positive and affirmative action. For example, there is no discrimination in the Armed Services; men and women in the Armed Services are treated equally, they are treated without any regard to race color or creed. They en-

joy equal privileges, equal responsibilities within their respective or within their respective activity. Now when you get down to the issue of human rights, however, you^{are}/talking not about the constitutional problem, but a moral issue. Because human rights are what are declared in our own Declaration of Independence when we say that all men are created equal and they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights. And we list them as: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. The Declaration goes on to say that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights. Now human rights are in a sense not only moral but spiritual, because each individual is equal in the eyes of our Maker and in a free society, in a democratic society that is predicated upon certain spiritual tenets, certain ideals and convictions such as human dignity and freedom of conscience and brotherhood of man. Then human rights take on the moral aspect. So we put civil rights as legal and constitutional and human rights as moral, and in a real sense spiritual. And there can be no argument it seems to me that every individual is entitled to the full realization and fulfillment of those rights. So the President of the United States has given us leadership--both moral and political now--on this great fundamental issue of our constitutional civil rights and our human rights. How did this message of his, this powerful message, this dramatic message, how did it come into being? What happened, how was it formulated? What took place in the many weeks prior to its presentation to the Congress of the United States. I am sure that you heard and you read that for several in advance of this great message of the President and the program that he presented to

us, that something was going to happen here in Washington that the President was going to act, that a message was forthcoming. Well, I sat in on those deliberations, and I can tell you that every aspect of that message every paragraph every single item in the message was discussed in detail by the President and his advisers, by the executive branch as well as those of us here in the legislative branch. I was one of those who urged upon our president the

Well this particular telecast film that is coming to you had to be interrupted just a moment ago because I was required to go to the Senate Floor at once to cast a vote on the Area Redevelopment Legislation and the extension of the Area Redevelopment Program, and the vote was 67 to 30. This is a piece of legislation by the way that is the Administration sponsored, one that I have been privileged to co-sponsor. The Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas was the floor leader on this bill and did an admirable, and many of our Minnesotans remember our Mr. Douglas very well. Well, AR is good news for many of our Minnesotans, particularly up in NE Minnesota, and it means new employment opportunities, it means new economic progress for our state. I am very happy.

Now let me get back to this civil rights matter, and just try to tie it down for you for a moment. I was talking about the process of how we, the process of preparing a message and a legislative program.

The consultation that has taken place. And it was my privilege to sit in on those consultations as I told you. I was one of those that urged that the President take plenty of time to develop this message, that item could be gone over carefully. I have urged and recommended that a consultation be broadened not only to the members of Congress and to the executive branch but to the private sector, the public itself. And you know our President is met with the great spiritual leaders, the lawyers, the labor leaders, the educators and many others to ask their participation in the fulfillment of the promise of human rights. Their help in the designing of legislation, the problems of human rights, and their help in the designing of legislation. And I believe that one of the most encouraging developments thus far is that so many of these leaders and the private sector of our economy, in education, in labor, in business, and in all the many other areas have taken the initiative in their home towns, in their respective groups to see to it that any form of discrimination is done away with and that new opportunities are being opened for people of every race creed and color in our country. Well, this legislative program was developed day by day, week by week; we had many conferences, every time I returned from Minnesota I would be called to sit in on a meeting at the White House. Many, many hours went into it. And I am happy to say that the program that was finally presented to the Congress was a comprehensive program that will do great good if we can adopt, and we are determined to pass it. The President's message was a masterpiece, it was not only a great moral document, and that it was, but it was an effective political document,

in the sense that it laid out a legislative program of action as well as a community program of action. The President recommended to us the extension of the Civil Rights Commission to hear these civil rights matters, to do honest objective probing into them. He recommended new protection of voting rights, and every American ought to be entitled to that vote. How can you deny a man a right to vote when you ask him to serve his country in war, when you ask him to pay taxes, and yet so many Americans were denied that right. There is a presumption of literacy, for example, if you have a sixth grade education. There was another part of the message that placed right cases that go to court at the head of the docket in the courts so they wouldn't be delayed because justice delayed is justice denied. And then there was the community services program, instead of trying to settle everything by law, by edict and by court order, we have a kind of conciliation service to work with the agreed parties, to try to settle these differences between the races and the problems at the community level. And then there was the over-all ban on discrimination wherever Federal funds are used on every Federal project. I strongly recommended this, and I was happy to see the President accept my recommendation. And finally there was this matter of the public accommodations to see to it that certain public and private facilities that people are not denied access to those facilities, like department stores, and drug stores, and lunch counters, and restaurants, and motels and hotels, not denied access because of race and because of color. Now we've got to close this citizenship gap in our country.

You can't afford to have any free nation that tries to lead the whole world in the paths of decency and freedom second-class citizens for certain people. There is only one kind of citizenship in American states, and that is first-class citizenship. And let's keep it that way, make it that way. Now this means more than just legal rights though. It means jobs too, and one of the best parts of the civil rights program and one that I personally worked on and I'm sure I've talked to you about it before was this huge program of training education of vocational and technical education, for the large number of people, and many of them Negroes, people of Negro decent who have had little or no training, that this program go to them to upgrade their skills to give them skills so that they can fit into the industrialized urbanized society. Thousands, yes hundreds of thousands of these people came from rural areas where there is little or no education no experience in the industrialized life. This was included in the program. Now I want to race along for just a moment, because another matter is closer at hand and at heart. The President has had a triumphant tour in Europe---particularly into Germany. This is good for America. The President has established once again his leadership as a world statesman, many people said he shouldn't go, there are always those timid souls, they said what good will it do if he goes? He is walking into trouble. My answer to this is that the world is filled with trouble, and if you are going to have to live in this world, you are going to have to do something. And I think that President Kennedy has done something about it. His statement, his message at Frankfurt Germany was a tremendous document. It was a great document. Pleading

for Atlantic unity, and reminding the Europeans that freedom is indivisible, that if Europe becomes divided from the U. S. it will only weaken the U. S. and Europe. That we face a powerful enemy in the totalitarian communist forces, that we must be united. I think this message was a ringing answer to the critics of the President's trip, and more than that it was a positive statement and approbation of American leadership for the Atlantic Community to build a great free area of the world, that is invincible not only in power but invincible in terms of ideals and its democratic tradition. The President is doing a great job and representing our country in the chancelleries of the world. And there is another good piece of news. The elections took place in Peru. I am so pleased because this means good things for the Alliance for Progress. You may recall a year ago the military set aside those election results. This time the elections have taken place and a democratic a democrat that begins with a small "d" a man that believes in freedom has been elected to president of Peru. This is a good sign for the Alliance for Progress. Now these are some of the developments of recent date, I'll see you two weeks from now and I hope to have with me a guest that will be of interest to you. Thank you.

[Aug. 21, 1963]

TV SCRIPT - SENATOR HUMPHREY ON CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION
TEST BAN, CIVIL RIGHTS

BOB COAR: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota. Today, the Senate Majority Whip reports on the most important issues facing the country.

Here is Senator Humphrey.

SENATOR: Well, thank you. First I want to report to you what has been a topic of discussion here in the nation's capitol. Namely, that this session of Congress will be a full session. Jokingly, and yet very seriously, we say that "plan your Christmas dinner in Washington." Now, some people will say that this is because there has been stalling, and there has been procrastination in the Congress, but possibly there is a deeper meaning to it all than just politics. It seems to me that the time is long overdue for our recognizing that the business of the Congress is a full-time, year-round, all-the-time business. We are victims in these institutions of government, and social structure of what we call tradition. And because over the many years and in fact decades and generations, we have looked upon Congress, or sessions of Congress as being less than a year, or in the earlier days being two or three months, twenty-five ~~MM~~ years ago, let's say just five or six months. We have gotten into the habit of talking about Congress as if it ought to adjourn somewhere around the first of July

or the middle of the summer. Now this hasn't happened since 1940, that's 23 years. It seems to me that after at least 20 years of a practice and experience which is contrary to all of the fiction and all of the tradition, that we would begin to think in terms of reality. So I say that the Congress should plan its work for 12 months, not for 10, not for 8, not for just a few weeks, but we have a big job to do in these days of emergency and international tension and we ought to be here on the job. Now this doesn't mean that we can't plan some time away, like ordinary people ought to have. Some time with family, a few week s vacation in order to get back to your constituents, with your loved ones. This is done in factories, in every business house in the nation, and it surely ought to be possible for the members of Congress to work out the program of their work or their schedule, but there is some time to live a relatively normal life. I say "relatively" because, speaking of my own experience, my work keeps me on the job, 10 to 14 to 16 hours a day. I do not expect to have a really normal existence. Weekends that we have are either spent in travel, or if you come back to your home state, it means meetings; so that you don't really plan on a comfortable weekend out in the boat in the lake, you know. What you plan on is a little change of pace. Therefore, I recommend that not only should we revise the procedures of

the Congress so that the procedures are designed for modern-day government responsibilities, we should also revise and re-schedule the term of Congress. A full year term, and let's quit kidding ourselves. We have to be here, and we are going to be here. Just out of necessity. Now, speaking of other changes that have to take place, and changes that I think ought to take place, just let me cite one or two other examples. Right now, we are ^{having}/hearings on the so-called nuclear test ban treaty. I went to Moscow along with several other Senators and the Secretary of State to be present for the signing of that important treaty. It was a very historic and important occasion, and the visit to Moscow gave me an opportunity, once again, to see developments in the Soviet Union. But when we came back, the President sent the treaty to the Congress, and under the rules of the Congress, that is the rules established in the 1940's, this treaty is supposed to go to the Foreign Relations Committee. And we are supposed to have on that Committee, and I serve on it, we are supposed to have complete jurisdiction over the hearings and over the testimony, and over the processing of this treaty, and then report it back to the Senate. Are we doing that? Of course not. And why not? Because the developments in weaponry, the developments in terms of National Security require that other committees of the Congress be brought into play, be brought into the act so to speak. Therefore, we have a meeting right now; the three committees, Foreign

Relations, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Armed Services committee, listening to the witnesses taking testimony, cross-examining witnesses on one of the most vital issues ever before the Congress---a treaty with the Soviet Union relating to the limitations ^{or} ~~of~~ the prohibition of further nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. Now I mention this to you because it only shows how out-of-step and out-of-date you can get, and it also shows the reluctance of the Congress to change when it ought to change. At the executive level of government, we have what we call the National Security Council. This is the body that advises the President on national security matters, in fact, the President sits with the security council and determines foreign policy, and defense policy, military policy, for our government and our nation. The National Security Council ~~XXXXXXXX~~ doesn't just consist of the President and his generals; it consists of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, all of the military services, and others. Because even the financing of a program has something to do with our capacity to defend ourselves. Now, if the President needs a National Security Council to advise him and through which he can work to come to a judgment and a decision relating to the very security and survival of this nation, then, don't you think the Congress needs something similar? Why should we expect a Secretary of

Defense, or the Secretary of State to run around the Halls of Congress? Like he was playing hop-scotch or skip-and-jump from one Committee to another. Therefore, Senator Humphrey has proposed that we establish a Joint Committee on National Security, consisting of representatives of the House of Representatives and the Senate in the fields of foreign policy, foreign relations, atomic energy, the armed services, and appropriations. A sort of super cabinet, if you please, for the Congress, where the Secretary of State can come and talk and consult and receive advice and exchange views. I think that this is absolutely required. Now I am hopeful that you'll take an interest in it too, because this is modernizing the machinery of the Congress, and I am rather surprised that there hasn't been more interest in this proposal. Oh yes, some of the professional people in public administration, in the national security agencies that are interested. But the American people ought to know that if the Congress is to have any hand at all in national security matters and foreign policy, it has to modernize its machinery to participate. You can't participate in the space age with a Model-T Ford. And you can't participate in the atomic age with firecrackers, and Congress cannot participate in the great decisions, that is participate effectively, in the great decisions affecting this nation. Decisions which ultimately must be carried out by the President of the United States. Unless the Congress equips itself to do so. So I say, let's stay to work full time, let's modernize the machinery of Congress so that we can do our job. And speaking of that

I have made a second proposal, and it relates to trade. The Joint Committee on Foreign Trade. Yes, putting the two Houses of Congress together, instead of pretending that we're enemies or separate bodies, why don't we act as if we are a representative body. Foreign trade is vital to the national welfare. Foreign trade is involved in our national prosperity or its involved in unemployment if we don't have it. And foreign trade is the difference between a deficit in our balance of payments, an outflow of gold, or it may mean a surplus in our balance of payment, and an inflow of gold. Foreign trade today in the Congress, where do you find any responsibility for it? I have been here for 15 years, and I must say that it's like the best-kept secret. You don't know which committee or what committee has jurisdiction. Where are we supposed to go to find out what Congress thinks about these matters? The Committee on Finance that handles taxation, well now that is perfectly obvious, its perfectly obvious to me at least that the Committee that handles the tax problems of Congress has something more to do than just look at foreign trade. I better put it another way, that foreign trade is sort off of its jurisdiction or frame of reference. Because tariffs in the early days were so important and because tariffs were revenue-raising measures, and tariffs were a kind of import tax. The Finance and the Ways and Means Committees took jurisdiction over foreign trade. But foreign trade today effects our military security, it affects our economic policy, our foreign economic policy, it affects our foreign relations,

and I think we better modernize the machinery of Congress in this aspect too. If we are going to have any foreign trade, and if we are going to have the people back home properly represented in the Congress and in this government by the members of Congress on issues of foreign trade. Now, let me jump quickly to this test ban matter. We have just a few minutes left.

You know, this treaty that we have been holding hearings on is one of the most important treaties that we have signed in many a decade. ^{it} If/is ratified, it will be the first significant treaty that the Soviet Union has signed for many years. Now, we are not relying upon trust or the good will of the Russians in this treaty. We can't do that, you know that. We are relying on our detection system, on our own national security system to see to it that this treaty is enforced and to see that there is no evasion of the treaty and no violation. If there is violation we can withdraw immediately. If the Russians should start to test nuclear weapons, we can start to test immediately. The President has told you that we are going to be in a state of ready alert with all of our testing facilities, our laboratories geared up ready to go, including our scientists. The teams of scientists are held together. We all continue to do underground testing, we will continue to try to improve our system of detection and identification. This is a significant treaty. It could be the turning point in our relationship with the Soviet Union. It could and I say could lead to better and further developments. But it may not. We ought not to expect too much. But we can say that at

least this treaty can and will slow down the nuclear arms race. Would it leave us in a bad position, or we would never have signed it? Does it mean that we will have no defense against missiles? Not indeed, the testimony proves to the contrary. Does it mean~~S~~ that it will leave us in an inferior position with the Russians? The answer is no, the answer is positively "no". What does it mean? It means that it has advantages on both sides, it permits a better use of resources, e.g. economic resources. And I think one of the reasons the Russians signed this treaty is that the Russians need money and they need the economic resources for domestic development, for their agriculture for example. I think another^{reason}/the Russians signed this treaty is because they saw that we would fight, and with nuclear weapons, if need be, like last October in the Cuban crisis. Premier Khrushchev had to look nuclear war right in the eye, and what he saw, he didn't like. And I think that Mr. K. realizes today that his major enemy and opponent is in China, Communist China. And he is worried about the fact that the Chinese Communists may get nuclear information, and nuclear weapons. I think that he also knows that we have massive power, and that we can outstrip him in power. And this administration, has by the way, added to the power of this country. The military power, the economic power, and I would say, yes, the moral power of the United States throughout the world. So you see, there are good reasons for the signing treaty and for it being brought to a vote for ratification. Unless other developments come about, the developments that I can't foresee now, I'm

going to vote for this treaty. ^And I am going to do it because that it is in our best national interest.

Now finally, we are going to have to act and pass this session the Civil rights legislation, the ta x legislation. Many people have said "well, one ought to come before the other." All that I want to say is that they are tied together. One of the most important rights a man~~x~~ has is a right to a job. And the civil rights issue will always be a top issue as long as there is unemployment. We can help both the economy and our people by passing these important bills in civil rights and tax reduction. I shall support them.

Thank you very much.

file transcript

PLEASE CREDIT ANY EXCERPTS OR QUOTES FROM THIS ABC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC'S ISSUES AND ANSWERS.")

I S S U E S A N D A N S W E R S

- - -

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 8, 1963

:-: HOLD FOR RELEASE :-:
:-: SUNDAY DECEMBER 8, :-:
:-: 1963, 1:30 P.M. :-:
:-: :-: :-: :-: :-: :-: :-:

GUEST: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
Democrat of Minnesota

INTERVIEWED BY: Howard K. Smith,
ABC Commentator.

- - -

MR. SMITH: This is Howard K. Smith in Washington.

The question of the hour is, will President Johnson be able to get some action out of our reluctant Congress on Capitol Hill. The man best able to guess at some answers is one who bears the deceptively violent title of Senate Majority Whip, Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota. And Senator Humphrey should know, partly because it is his job to get the legislation moving and partly because he thought most of it up anyhow.

He is the author, or co-author of the Peace Corps,

the Food for Peace Program, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, Medicare and the main clause of the Civil Rights Bill, and many other things.

The Wall Street Journal once said "Hubert Humphrey has solutions for everything, including some problems that have not yet come into existence."

His big problem now is very much in existence. It is that great, big aggregate of lethargy and inertia called the United States Congress.

(Announcement)

THE ANNOUNCER: Now for the answers to the issues, the Senate Majority Whip, Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. To interview Senator Humphrey, ABC Commentator Howard K. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Senator, what about it, do you think the death, the traumatic experience of the death of President Kennedy and the rise of President Johnson will change anything in a durable way in the prospects of getting legislation through Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there may be some change. "The" change that has taken place is a greater emotional interest in some of the legislative programs that the late President Kennedy advanced and that now languish in Congress. I don't think there is any doubt but what there is a greater sense of urgency about the civil rights legislation, for example, and the tax bill, and President Johnson is deeply

committed. And I want to emphasize "deeply committed," to both of these measures and is determined to see these two measures as living memorials to the work and the sacrifices and the ideals of the late President Kennedy.

MR. SMITH: Now it seems fairly clear that the House is going one way or another to pass this civil rights bill, but the main block is that filibuster in the Senate. Do you think a filibuster can be broken up?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am convinced the House will pass the Civil Rights Bill pretty much as it came from the Judiciary Committee, which is a very effective bill. It is comprehensive and goes even a little further than President Kennedy's message on civil rights to the Congress last summer.

Then we come to the Senate. It has been our strategy all along that we wanted the House to act first, because the bill that comes from the House will be as much as the Senate could possibly pass. Some people think it will be more than we can pass.

I am convinced that we can pass the House bill. Now to get directly to your question, will we avoid a filibuster or will we be faced with one? I think we ought to face up to the fact that there will be a filibuster. I see no reason to expect that our Southern colleagues and some of the more conservative Republicans might not engage in a rather

protracted filibuster and if that is the case, we have to meet it with equal determination.

I have always believed that we could break a filibuster if those of us who really believe in civil rights legislation are willing to stay there and make the same sacrifices that the filibusterers are willing to make. In other words, you have to meet their will, the will of that minority bloc with an equal will of the majority bloc, and if you do that, you can first of all get cloture.

Now to get cloture, which means to have two-thirds of those present and voting to cut off debate, or to bring the question to a head so we can vote on the issue, in order to get that we are going to have to have Republican-Democratic cooperation. It has to be bipartisan and civil rights has plenty of room in it for Republicans and Democrats alike and I believe it is a bipartisan issue.

We are going to need the cooperation of the Minority Leader, Mr. Dirksen. We are going to need the cooperation of most of the forces of the Republican Party if we are going to be able to bring to bear at least 45 or 46 of the Democrats. That is a good two-thirds of the Democratic majority.

If we can get those two blocs working together and be willing to really face up to this issue, we can get

cloture and if we can't, Mr. Smith, there is just one way to handle that, and that is the battle of attrition. It just means who can last it out. And I am for, number one, trying to get cloture if a filibuster develops, and I expect it will, and number two, if we fail in cloture, I think there is only one other thing to do, and that is what President Johnson did when he was Majority Leader of the Senate. As he used to say "Bring in the cots," which means that you just stay in the Capitol and you last it out, you fight this battle out on this line if it takes all winter, and all summer, and I believe that is the only answer to it.

MR. SMITH: Now about four years ago on the polls there were three front-runners for the Presidential nomination of the Democratic Party. One was Mr. Kennedy, who got the Presidency, the other was Mr. Johnson, who is now President, and you were the other.

Can you give me an assessment of Johnson? I think the biggest thing he has done so far is to persuade the conservatives he is their man and the liberals he is their man.

Where will he end up when it becomes clear where he stands?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I believe President Johnson is convincing most Americans that he is their man. He made it quite clear when he talked to the business advisory group

and the American Federation of Labor-CIO Executive Committee what kind of a man he was. He had "a" message, he didn't have two messages. He had one message for them. He said he wasn't pro-labor and he wasn't pro-business. I believe what he was saying is that he is pro-people.

Harry Truman used to say -- a fighting man from Missouri -- the only lobbyist the people have is the President of the United States. He said "He is the people's representative. He is the one man in our government who is elected by all the people -- the President and the Vice President -- he represents the national consensus."

And I am convinced that President Johnson feels that he is the captive of no one, and I don't think he is. He is a very independent-minded person. So that I am convinced you are going to see in President Johnson an activist, I am convinced that you are going to see a man who wears no man's collar, who will speak up his convictions and will basically follow the patterns laid down by President Kennedy.

I want to make this point to you: The program of the late President Kennedy was not just President Kennedy's program. That program was hammered out in the councils of the Administration. Of course the President advanced it and he gave so much of himself to it. His own articulation of it, his own ideals within it. But I happen

to know that President Lyndon Johnson, as then Vice President, worked with President Kennedy to develop this program. It wasn't just a personal loyalty to President Kennedy that Mr. Johnson had. It was an ideological loyalty, it was a program loyalty, it was a dedication to the programs and the policies of the Kennedy Administration.

Now those basic policies with indeed some adaptations, because of differences in personality, those basic policies will be followed by President Johnson. Remember the line in his message to us in Congress: "Let us continue," and I think that is the key.

MR. SMITH: Now you have to deal in your position with tactics and strategy in Congress. Of the two big pieces of legislation, the tax cut and the Civil Rights Bill, which do you think should be handled first? Is there any good reason to handle one before the other?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I have my own feelings about this and I thought at one time that I had been able to persuade all interested parties that those observations or feelings were proper and right. I have been of the opinion that we should pass in the Senate the Civil Rights Bill first, but there may be a change in that strategy and if it comes early, it won't make too much difference.

My view has been this, that for the Congress to get tangled up in a civil rights filibuster in the late part and the latter part of the second session would be very injurious to the Congress as an institution and as a Democrat I think it would be politically hazardous and as a citizen I think it would be unforgivable because civil rights, civil rights is a primary priority issue. It is not only a political issue, it is a moral issue, and we have to face it as a moral issue. And to put off that great moral issue too long I think corrupts the body politic.

Furthermore, I believe that it could, if you put it off too long, it could result in violence in the community, great disillusionment and at best a very unfortunate and ugly situation. Therefore I want to get at the civil rights program as quickly as we can. I think it ought to come first. But if we can get taxes first, for example, early in January as I think we can and dispose of the tax bill in the Senate, and I hope pass it in the Senate in, let's say not later than the latter part of January, and then move immediately into the civil rights program, it would be all right.

I prefer to have taxes come second, because there are so many goodies in the tax package and I think it is better to hold out those rewards for after the period of your trial and of your tribulation.

MR. SMITH: Excuse me for this interruption, Senator Humphrey. We will be back in a moment with more issues.

(Announcement)

MR. SMITH: The big action of the moment in Congress is an effort in the House by people who want the Civil Rights Bill voted on to get a discharge petition, 218 signatures to get it out of the Rules Committee, which is often a block. Do you think they will succeed in getting that discharge petition?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The only way the discharge petition could succeed is if it has bipartisan cooperation. There was earlier this week the desire to use the discharge petition route, but since the President has had that memorable conference with the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, Mr. Halleck, where Mr. Halleck has promised his cooperation on civil rights matters, and since Judge Smith of Virginia has spoken up saying he would hold the hearings of the Rules Committee in early January, I don't see much chance for the discharge petition at this stage.

Let me make it clear: The leadership -- that is the Congressional leadership group that meets with President Johnson, is determined -- I speak not only for the Senate but in the House in this -- is determined that if there is any delay on clearing the Civil Rights Bill that the

discharge petition route would be reactivated. If you can work through the normal routes, the normal procedures, that is the better way to do it. But if that procedure doesn't work rapidly and effectively, President Johnson has made it crystal clear that he won't sit around idly waiting and waiting and waiting for hearings and hearings. He wants action.

I think the one word in President Johnson's message to the Congress was "action." "Let's get going," "Not only let's begin, let's continue, let's have action," and I think we have an action President.

MR. SMITH: Well, now the new President has almost a legendary reputation for getting things out of Congress. Do you think that that was a reputation that was tied to his place in the Senate and can't be transferred to the White House? Are we kidding ourselves that he can do more than ordinarily could be done?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there isn't any doubt that his role as a President is much different than as the Majority Leader in the Senate. As the Majority Leader he was there every day, he had an intimate working acquaintance with every issue, with every little detail of every bill and also may I add, with every member of the Senate. They received what is well known as the "Johnson treatment," as we used to call it.

MR. SMITH: Reporters got that.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Reporters got it too. Well, this treatment produced amazing results. But now as President he can't have that much time to give to the Congress and to the Senate. However, he knows it. He comes from the Congress, and the House and the Senate. He understands every movement and every procedure of the Congress. He is in a sense a Congressional man that now has been elevated to the high office of the Presidency and he has great leadership qualities.

I think everybody knows that. If there is one chance in a hundred to get a bill out of Congress, I predict that President Johnson will be able to get it out of Congress, because he knows every little area of the Congress, every little movement of the legislative process and he knows the personalities and the characteristics of every member of the Congress.

MR. SMITH: Let me ask you some general questions about that Congress that he must deal with. It has acted very little this year -- only four out of 12 routine appropriation bills were passed by the beginning of this week. What is the matter with Congress?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, well, now, we are going to do much better than that. By the time we leave here for the Christmas recess, we will have all of the appropriation

bills passed, with one exception, and that will be the foreign aid appropriation, and we can take that up-- it is on a continuing basis right now-- we can take that up in early January. We will have adopted over 60 percent of President Kennedy's recommendations to the Congress by December 20, in the first session. This is a rather good record. We will, I think, be able to give to you good men of the news media and to the American public a good accounting of our activities.

But the problem that we faced in the Congress this year isn't so much procedural as it has been that we have come to grips with two or three of the toughest issues of our time. For example, in the Senate we had the railroad dispute which took several weeks, we had the nuclear test ban treaty, which took several weeks -- this was a hard-fought issue -- we have had in the other body the tax bill, and the Civil Rights Bill hanging over us in both bodies.

I think, as I have said to some of my friends, the civil rights issue is like a political tumor. Until that is removed, you can not expect the body politic of the Congress to be very healthy, and that is why I want to get at it. Let's get at that Civil Rights Bill. Everything is being slowed down, every procedure of Congress is being slowed down by those who are anti-civil rights legislation,

and we have got to do something about that particular problem first.

MR. SMITH: Is the Civil Rights Bill really the main explanation? Now in January we shall enter our third year of talking about a tax cut. In April of this year the British decided they ought to consider a tax cut. In six weeks they had introduced a bill, debated it thoroughly in two houses, and passed it, and here we haven't had a vote in both houses of Congress yet.

Isn't there something more wrong than just the civil rights?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think there is something in our whole Congressional process and procedure and institutionalization that needs some revision. But the British system, of course, is much different than ours. If the cabinet in the British government is unable to produce results on a major issue like a tax bill, the government collapses. Here we have the separation of powers. The President did not make recommendations to us two years ago. I think we ought to remember that. I was one of those who thought the late President Kennedy should have recommended a tax bill in the 87th Congress, but he did not, and there were reasons for it.

The economy seemed to be going quite well, and there was considerable controversy within the Administration

as to the desirability of a tax measure. This tax measure did come down in the first part of the 88th Congress, and it is a tremendous tax bill. I must say in all respect it has almost 400 pages of detailed tax changes and adjustments. You don't just come -- it isn't just a tax cut, you know. People say "How come you can't just cut taxes?" Because that isn't what we are doing. There are all sorts of adjustments and changes in tax policy, tax legislation, and what we call certain tax gimmicks, for lack of a better phrase. And the Senate of the United States has just gotten ahold of this tax bill within the last two months.

Now I think there has been too much delay. Don't misunderstand me. But I don't think you can expect five or six weeks' action on a major piece of legislation in a bicameral system such as we have. The House of Lords in Great Britain doesn't have much to say about taxes, but I guarantee to you that the Senate Finance Committee has a great deal to say about it.

MR. SMITH: It has a great deal to say, and let me ask you frankly about this problem: committee chairmanships. Now Senator Byrd is the Chairman. Senator Byrd is hostile to it and Senator Byrd is a Democrat. He is maintained by Democratic support. Yet in three elections he has refused to support Democratic candidates. Is it

right for Democrats to support a man who constitutes an obstacle against legislation proposed by Democrats? Isn't there something wrong with that system?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there is something wrong with the system, and I haven't been able to find out just what the cure is. I noticed in introducing me you said something that the Wall Stree Journal had a statement to the effect that I had more solutions than there were problems. Well, I don't have all the solutions, may I say. I recognize there are more problems. I can only say this about Senator Byrd. He is a conservative, and he has fought against many of the Administration proposals. I find myself voting opposite of Senator Harry Byrd most of the time, but he has not, in all fairness -- and I think we ought to be fair about this -- he has not deliberately slowed down the tax bill. I believe that the recent news reports indicate that he has committed himself to President Johnson to see to it that this tax bill is before the Senate in January, and I say in all fairness, a tax bill that we received in November, in the middle of November, that means that we have had 15 days in November, 20 days in December, and after all there were week-ends involved there, and there were some holiday periods involved, and we moved into the middle of January. That is not too long for a tax bill that revises the entire tax structure

of the nation.

Our problem was that we received the tax bill some eight or nine months after it had been introduced into the House of Representatives. I am not trying to be critical of it. I simply point out that Mr. Brvd with all of his conservative inclinations -- and he is a conservative, Southern Democrat -- he has not given what I call administration support. Nevertheless I find him a man of integrity, I find him a man of good will. I do not find that he has, by premeditation, tried to block the tax bill. He is against the tax bill. He is going to vote against the tax bill. He has told the President that he is going to do it, but he is also going to permit it to come up to the Senate of the United States for a vote and that has been my main argument.

Let us have a chance to work our will on the bill.

MR. SMITH: Let me ask you some more questions about Congress and what may possibly be wrong with it.

Now as you know, and it is no secret, there has been the leadership of criticism of/both houses since Lyndon Johnson left and Sam Rayburn died. One doesn't hear a strong word, much less see much strong action. Is that criticism justified?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Not fully. We have passed very important legislation. The Congress of the United States in 50 years has never been able to pass Federal Aid to

Education. We have done it, and we are going to have it on the President's desk before Christmas. I think that is rather significant.

As I said, we will have adopted over 60 percent of all of President Kennedy's recommendations to the Congress by the end of this first session. I don't think that is a bad record.

Furthermore, our appropriation process these days is becoming extremely complicated. I have indicated in many an address to students, for example, that the legislative process of the Congress needs to be updated. There needs to be more joint committees to expedite action instead of having Administration witnesses appear first in the House and then in the Senate.

We need to put some priority on legislation. That is part of the leadership role, deciding what we want to take up first.

I believe that we need a Joint Committee on National Security, for example, so that we can more properly study the problems of foreign policy in national security. We need a Joint Committee on the Examination of the Budget, so that the Congress can work consistently on budget matters and not sporadically. I think these are some of the things that we could do.

Furthermore, I am positively convinced that we need to

staff the Congress of the United States in terms of technical staff, professional staff, better than it is. With the ever-increasing tendency for power to gravitate towards the Executive, the only way that you can give any balance of power -- we got separation of powers, sir. If you are going to have balance of power you have to be able to equip the Congress with the brainpower, the technical staff, the administrative staff that equips it to come to grips with the problems with which we are presented by the Executive Branch.

MR. SMITH: I want to ask you about one more criticism, and it is one that is often made in this time when America is an extremely wealthy country, billions are made in fortunes by interests. It costs a lot to be elected. A few Senators have decided to announce publicly their sources and resources in order to clear themselves of any possibility of suspicion of being influenced.

Why is it all Senators don't agree to that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think it would be a good idea if all Senators did it. I think we should do it exactly as the Cabinet officers should do it and I would suggest that there be some reputable beyond reproach or suspicion reservoir or place that we could file, for example, our income, our sources of income, the properties we

may own, the stocks we may own. There are certain members of the Congress that don't want to just put it out for everybody to whack away at because Congressmen are not appointed officers. Congressmen are elected officers, and elected officers are subject to a constant chipping away process and a constant competitive process every day of their life. It is a little different than a Cabinet officer. But I think there ought to be a place where we can file our income, our sources of income, our properties, where they are subject to examination and where the people know there is no conflict of interest.

MR. SMITH: Excuse me for interrupting you once more. In just a moment we will be back with ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

(Announcement)

MR. SMITH: One of the biggest questions of the election year now beginning is, who is going to be the Vice Presidential nominee for the Democratic Party.

Now as you know you have been talked about in the papers. What qualities do you think Johnson needs in a Vice Presidential nominee?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, first that selection will of course be made primarily by President Johnson. I say that because any Presidential nominee has a great deal to say as to who will be his running mate. Theoretically,

and I suppose formally it is made by the convention. Now your question is asked: What qualities. Now the issue, or the question of qualities, or characteristics of a nominee have been brought into sharp focus because of the tragic assassination and death of President Kennedy. The whole matter of succession to the Presidency, or the matter of protecting the integrity and continuity of our governmental structure is a very serious matter and it needs to be looked into again.

I believe that the Vice Presidential nominee of any party must be one who has had experience, if not in government, at least in civic affairs --

MR. SMITH: I am sorry I have to interrupt, but I am sure that is the main qualification. However, that is all the time we have. Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

THE ANNOUNCER: Today's guest has been Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, Senate Majority Whip. He was interviewed by ABC Commentator Howard K. Smith.

Next week at this same time ISSUES AND ANSWERS will bring you the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable George Ball. We hope you will be with us.

- - - -



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