

Hearst - Senator Humphrey Interview

MR. HEARST: Senator Humphrey, how long do you really think this battle over the ... over the deal is going to last-over the segregation issue is going to last? All summer?

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I doubt that it will go all summer unless things turn for the worse much more than I would expect for the worse. I think we ought to be able to complete action on the civil rights bill some time in early July. Now I think that that means that we will complete ... that we will take the first step for Senate passage some time before the 1st of July. We then would have to go to the House and either have the House accept the Senate amendments or go to conference and come out of conference and finally get a bill to the President's desk. So let's put it in July - at least the early part of July before the conventions.

MR. HEARST: That the bill would go to the White House?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. HEARST: Or just that the first major ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I think that we ought to get the bill to the White House before the Republican Convention.

MR. HEARST: And signed, sealed and wrapped up then?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I would hope so. I think this would be the best thing for the respective political parties; I think it would be the best thing for the country; it surely would be the best thing for the Congress because we have a lot of work left to do.

MR. HEARST: Can you clarify something for me and for possibly our readers - this cloture business, how does it work; I mean how many people can force an end to debate?

SEN. HUMPHREY: The cloture rule, as in what we call Rule 22 of the Senate, and that rule has been modified now within recent years, it requires two-thirds of those present and voting. That doesn't necessarily mean two-thirds of the 100 senators. Because it is possible that everyone would not be present on the occasion of the cloture vote.

MR. HEARST: So then you'd never get it.

SEN. HUMPHREY: So you need two-thirds of those present and voting. On an issue as serious and as controversial as civil rights, though, I think that most all the senators would be present. So you would have to expect at this stage with Senator Engle presently

being ill, two-thirds of the 99, which would be 66 ... I wouldn't expect too many to be absent so there'd be 66 votes we'd have to have for cloture.

Now cloture is obtained by first filing a cloture petition which must have 16 or more signatures, and then it must rest at the desk for two calendar days. And then after that it automatically comes to a vote.

MR. HEARST: It takes precedence over anything ...

BEN: HUMPHREY: Yes, it takes precedence over anything else, and that cloture petition outlines what is included in the cloture. You could say, for example, you could have a cloture petition on a single amendment. You could have a cloture petition on a block of amendments or you could have a cloture petition, as we would hope, on the bill plus all amendments that have been presented and read; that's generally the phrase that's used. And presently, as we are now discussing this here today, there are about 100 amendments at the desk of the Senate.

Once a cloture has been agreed to, there are 100 hours of debate available on the bill and all amendments that have been presented and read.

MR. HEARST: One hour per amendment, is that it?

SEN. HUMPHREY: One hour per senator ... one hour per senator. Actually, some of the amendments that are at the desk are redundant; some of them are repetitive; there are other amendments identical, so out of the total number of amendments that the desk at the present time, maybe 25 or 30 would be amendments of some significance. And those would be debated.

MR. CANIFF (?): Sir, what would you say are the chances that cloture would be needed to force a vote on this?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, I don't think there's any chance to pass this bill without cloture. I really don't believe there's any accommodation that we can arrive at with the strong opposition to this bill without the use of cloture. Now we may very well make some adjustments in the bill in order to get the votes that are necessary to apply cloture, but the thought that some people had earlier in the year that we'd be able to have an extended debate on this bill, and that we'd sort of reconcile our differences, and that we'd have an up and down vote on a series of amendments, I think that's very unlikely. I don't say it's out of the question, but it's unlikely.

QUESTION: So what has ... to use the word ... stiffened the resistance or brought about this change? Has it been things that are happening in the outside world in the certain extraneous (?) on both sides or what has changed the temperament and mood of the ... from the early optimism that cloture would not be needed?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, there were those that thought cloture would not be needed. I don't recall that I was amongst that group. I say this because I've always felt that the opposition to this bill, which is primarily in the South, but not entirely, that this opposition, particularly in the South, would have to put up a last ditch fight. These are just the political realities of the situation. And I didn't expect that we'd ever be able to make any arrangement with the Southerners or that they would back off or that they would yield. And the only other means that we have if they won't yield, is to ... by cloture.

Now there were those that thought with the rules of the Senate, which insist that you can only have two speeches on each amendment on any one legislative

day or on the bill on any one legislative day, that you can wear them down. But the fact of the matter is that you can amend this bill ad infinitum. You can go on with just one word at a time in amending the bill, and you would be here ...

MR. HEARST (?): ... And everybody gets another crack at it ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: And everybody gets two more whacks at each word, so to speak.

QUESTION: Does the fact that we have a Southern President going to at all weaken or temper the opposition of people like Senator Russell?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Can I just phase that question into another thought in reference to your question. (In-
then
terrupted by buzzer, which is/turned off.)

Going back to your question, Mr. Caniff, as to what may have stiffened the opposition, I don't believe there's anything developed that has stiffened. I think it was here - the opposition was here. There are some outside developments in the ... oh, the letter writing, the propaganda, the give and take of discussion on this bill and I think the activities of Governor Wallace that may have appeared to stiffen the opposition, but I doubt that that really has been a factor. Now ...

MR. CANIFF: You're saying that it was there all the time?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think so.

MR. CANIFF: ... Beneath the surface.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes, I think so.

MR. CANIFF: And the results are saying something just as significant, that you haven't won anybody over... you haven't won any hard-core Southerners.

SEN. HUMPHREY: No, I don't think we've won any hard-core Southerners and I don't think we should expect to. As I've said a number of times, it isn't the Southerners that are preventing the passage of the Civil Rights Bill; they're opposed to it, but they don't have that much power. If we can get the 81 other senators ... there are only 19 senators in this Southern block ... if we can get the other 81 senators or 66 of the other 81 senators to bring cloture upon this bill and the amendments pertaining thereto, we can then vote up or down a Civil Rights Bill. And my position is not only for the Civil Rights program, but, more importantly, for the right to vote on the Civil Rights Bill, so that we can work our will on this bill. There may be amendments that will pass. In fact, I think there will be some, but we can't

do anything until we really get around to where you can bring cloture.

Now, your question, Milt, about the role of the Southern ... the man from the South in the Presidency, I know that President Johnson has very close personal relationships with a number of our Senator friends ... or Senators ... from the South. Frankly, I do to, but this isn't a matter of personal relationship. These are matters of conviction; these are matters of political policy and it's very difficult for people on the outside of Congress to understand this. It's even difficult for a man's wife to understand these things. There's no Senator, for example, that I'm more fond of in this body than Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, and yet he ...

MR. CANIFF: ... You're not going to change him ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: I'm not going to change him ...

MR. CANIFF: And Johnson isn't going to change him if he (inaudible) South (inaudible) Panama (?).

SEN. HUMPHREY: I don't think Johnson's going to change him either, but what I think we have to expect in this is the President to do all that he can at the

right time to encourage those who are not the Southerners to stand up and be counted.

MR. CANIFF: How many would you say are uncertain now, Senator?

SEN. HUMPHREY: On cloture?

MR. CANIFF: Yah.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, generously, I'd say about 10, but the ...

MR. CANIFF: 10 of the 81?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, no. We need about 10. Well, let me put it this way ...

MR. HEARST (?): You've got about 50 ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: I'd say we have about 55, 56 that we can lock up for sure. In fact, wait a minute, I would go further. We have 58 that we could pin down for sure.

MR. HEARST (?): Approximately. (Laughter.)

SEN. HUMPHREY: 58. But if by maybe a little extra work right at this time, we might be able to get up as high as 61, so I've been saying a number of times, and I think this is a pretty good scientific "guesstimate" that it takes about five more than we presently have ... five to six more than we presently have, and that's just

as far away as from here to the moon if you don't have them.

MR. HEARST: Well, but you can be sure that they're not hard-core Southerners, otherwise you'd know you were licked...

SEN. HUMPHREY: Oh, well, look, that's just hopeless.

(Several people talk at once.)

MR. CANIPP (?): Well, sir, there is then a progression to this. In other words, a number believe that a certain amount of amendments or debate is needed to clarify the bill, to solve their own conscience, and then as time passes, you get more adherence. Is that it?

SEN. HUMPHREY: We hope. We hope. I've tried to keep this debate on a friendly, respectful line of conduct. In other words, the demeanor of the Senate is important to me, how we conduct ourselves. I have felt that if there was bitterness and rancor and quarrelsomeness that became too involved in the Senate procedure, we would not only harden up even more-so the Southerners - that is not as important as what I'm about to say - namely, that you would drive off some others that you might ultimately be able to obtain. Furthermore, I have known since the very beginning, and I said so in the first appearance

that I made before press and radio on this bill, and television, that the cooperation of Mr. Dirksen was absolutely essential. And he has wanted to permit the Senate to take some time on this bill. I have been of the mind that if that was his desire, since we needed his cooperation, that we ought to accommodate that request and desire. I have a good working relationship with Mr. Dirksen. This is a bi-partisan measure. Frankly, it is impossible to even hope to pass it without Republican cooperation - very large Republican cooperation. And I have said since the first day that President ... the late President Kennedy sent the message to Congress that this had to be looked upon as a bi-partisan or non-partisan effort and if this bill passes we will have an obligation to give credit to the Republicans, just as well as we do to the Democrats. I don't think we can claim any party in ... you know, any party victory as such. We can suffer party defeat - both parties - but you can't claim any party victory.

MISS MACKIN: Senator, what is the time that we've taken with the Civil Rights Bill in the Senate going to do with the rest of the President's

program - the other five or six major bills that he would like to see acted on, as he said "whether up or down."

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, if the timetable that I've indicated to you is wrong ... if it comes off, yes, first, we will be able to handle the rest of this program fairly well. But if ...

_____(?)_____: ... Before election time ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: Before September....

_____(?)_____: Before the end of the year ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: Before the end ... I'd say, before the Democratic Convention. But if it goes beyond the ... well, actually, the Senate itself would be ... let's say, finish the Civil Rights Bill in late June or the 1st of July, if we can do that, then we can move on the appropriation bills, the poverty bill, the pay bill, some aid to education, the food stamp bill and others that the ... and the medicare ... and the medicare bill.

QUESTION: Are you speaking of the Congress or the Senate?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Both. See the House is moving well anyway. Actually, the House is far ahead on its appropriation bills right now, but if this bill ... Civil

Rights Bill is not out of the way until after the Republican Convention, then there's only one thing for the President to do if he wants his program. That's to call this Congress back into special session. And I think members of the Congress have to recognize that they may very well be here up until October.

MISS MACKIN: Realistically speaking, do you think that's what's going to happen?

SEN. HUMPHREY: This is a possibility. I don't say it's only a possibility; it is a probability unless we really have all the luck playing with us on Civil Rights.

QUESTION: Because actually there isn't any time limit to the term of the Congress, is there?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Oh, no, indeed. The President can call us back in September and would keep us here until October and let us have a little time for election and call you back the day after election.

QUESTION: Supposing you recess for the Republican Convention. Do you set a re- ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: ... Reconvening date ...

QUESTION: ... a reconvening date. Then you ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: ... Recess for the Democratic Convention.

QUESTION: Suppose you don't set yourself one, then he'll have to call you?

SEN. HUMPHREY: He'll call us back, yes. But I'm sure that we would set a reconvening date if the President asked for it. And I think it ought to be crystal clear that President Johnson is determined to pass this Civil Rights Bill.

(Inaudible remark.)

SEN. HUMPHREY: No question about it.

QUESTION: Let me ask you, the President has made it crystal clear ... let's assume he has made it crystal clear, because he has, I'm certain that he has. Now then, some of the colored leaders have made it fairly clear, specifically, that if there isn't action on it, there might be some more rough stuff this year...

SEN. HUMPHREY: Mm-hmm. More demonstrations ...

QUESTION: More demonstrations and so on. If the Senate should be doing what it thinks is making petty good time on its schedule and the demonstrations came and they got out of hand and they had ... it gave a bad ... reflected badly on them, do you think that could set them back any? Do you think that would have any material effects, specifically, on ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: Temporarily ... temporarily.

QUESTION: They could do themselves some damage this summer if they got ahead of themselves anywhere.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes, let's put it this way. I think we ought to expect some demonstrations because there is a fever in the country. Some people call it the Negro revolution. There is an unrest in the country, and I have been particularly concerned about after June 15th, and have made no secret of it, when the young men and women get out of college.

Now these young people in college are idealistic...

 (?) : ... Volatile ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: ... And I think all of us remember that there's a bit of the rebel in all of us, you know, the slight amount of rebellion against constituted authority and a great deal of rebellion against what people ... young people think is injustice. They/^{are}automatic on this.

Furthermore, this generation has never really had a big issue to get a hold of. We haven't had "Ban the Bomb" demonstrations like they've had in Britain, for example. We haven't had any pacifistic movement here or any great military movement as such. Our young

people have lived pretty much the good life and they're at a point now where they're aroused, a large number of them, and they'll join ⁱⁿ some of these demonstrations.

First, they'll ...

QUESTION: ... You're speaking of white as well as ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: White? Oh, yes, very definitely. And they will joint in some of these demonstrations in the spirit of, well, a good, peaceful demonstration. And then somebody gets hurt. And then somebody gets shoved around. And then somebody is thrown in jail. Now, I don't want to be misunderstood, but I think it's quite clear that many a young person wouldn't mind being in jail a night or two ... it's sort of, you know, it's part of growing up they would say. I don't agree with that, but I'm older now, you know. But I have young sons and I know a lot of young people, our house is filled with them. It's sort of a lark. But once it happens, something happens to them. And that's what I worry about. That if there is any disorder, if the police do go to work on some of these youngsters and if some of them are thrown in jail because they violated some local ordinance or some state statute, then

you're going to have real trouble, and this could actually happen, not so much because of Negroes, but because of young, energetic, vital, active, idealistic, young white men and women. Now I don't want to have that happen and that's why I have been trying, as a Senator, to try to set an example here in the Senate for reasonable conduct, fairplay, forbearance, tolerance, patience. Now if we can conduct ourselves this way, we may be able to hold off some of these more rabid and, well, disorderly, demonstrations.

QUESTION: Yah, but, Senator, they're just liable to misconstrue ... and I think you're doing the right thing as you outlined it and you know you're doing the right thing to get it through the Congress, let's put it that way ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: That's my job.

QUESTION: They might misconstrue this wiser speed, as it were, of your handling of it, as dragging your feet. They might misconstrue that.

SEN. HUMPHREY: There is some of that already.

QUESTION: Impatience there wouldn't be justified because you know what you're doing, and certainly you're completely sympathetic to their cause. They'd be

well advised in your opinion, then, to know your side of the thing and know what's going on and not be (inaudible) at all.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yes, I have tried to keep the leaders of the responsible organizations and the responsible leaders informed as to what we're trying to do.

QUESTION: Yah, that's what I ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: And I want to make it quite clear that I am going to do what I think needs to be done here, regardless of outside pressures. I cannot have everybody trying to be a legislator, and I cannot lead any demonstrations. Now, I have my job to do; other people have their job to do. Now I do visit with men like Roy Wilkins of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; he's a responsible, fine, and yet a militant man. He's not ... he's courageous, he's no weakling. I've visited with Dr. King and with Mr. Farmer and with Whitney Young of the Urban League, with Clarence Mitchell who is here with the NAACP, with our friends from Labor and the many from the National Council on Civil Rights, and I believe they know what we're trying to do, and they must ... we

must have faith, you know. As I tell them, I won't sell them out. My whole life is involved in this. There will be no sellout. We're going to do what we think is right to be done and necessary to be done in order to get a workable, effective, enforceable bill.

(Cut in tape.)

QUESTION: (Inaudible) ... cause here. Do you ... what effect do you think Governor Wallace is having on the anti-civil rights vote? Is he cutting ... is he making another little party for himself? Is he slicing that off? Is he ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: You mean, is ...

QUESTION: Well, how much of the vote for Governor Wallace that he's been getting in primaries is an anti-civil rights vote? Almost all, huh?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Not all. But I think it's fair to say that what Wallace has done is to demonstrate that the civil rights issue, pro and con, is not a sectional issue. It's a national issue.

QUESTION: You can take it up north and get some there ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: You get people up north that are anti-civil rights, and, of course, you get a larger majority that are anti-civil rights bill down south. There are actually, I think it's fair to say, that in the nation there aren't too many people that are really anti civil rights. They wouldn't want to be lined up as anti civil rights, but they will be anti the federal government doing anything about it. Or they'll be anti any particular special type of legislation. But there are people that just plain don't like Negroes and there are people that don't like Orientals, people that don't like Scandinavians, and so on, and they ...

QUESTION: ... And they feel they have a right to say that and not have the Scandinavians or Negroes or Pakistani thrust on them, as it were.

SEN. HUMPHREY: That is the way they feel. Mr. Wallace has used every political trick in the book to muster this support. What has surprised me in the states that he selected is that he didn't get more support, and I am not saying this to in any way diminish the effect of his election ... or I mean of his votes or of his showing.

Let me give you an example, there are three or four states of the Union in which you can enter a

Presidential primary and almost predict what will happen. One state is Wisconsin, where you have easy cross-over. There is no, what you call, firm, closed primary - Republicans go into Democrats, Democrats into the Republican; it's been done. Yet, you may remember what happened to Wendell Wilkie one time when they were in a Wisconsin primary. I think you recall what happened to Hubert Humphrey. I do anyway.

Here Wallace selected Wisconsin, which has the cross-over possibilities; Indiana, that has a very substantial section of its state that traditionally would follow a sort of southern leadership; and Maryland, that's historically been known as part southern, part northern. It was from the days of the Civil War. So here Mr. Wallace moved into these states. (Laughter.)

(Several people begin talking.)

SEN. HUMPHREY: Now, what happened to Wallace? He moved into these states and he doesn't run against a national candidate. He is competition against a governor in two states and a senator in another. Now, in each state a governor is always under tremendous pressure, particularly as he tries to raise revenue. And in Wisconsin Gov. Reynolds was not at the peak of his popularity as a governor when he ran as the stand-in or favorite son

for President Johnson. So that Wallace got votes that not only ordinarily would come to Wallace, and there were votes in Wisconsin that would come to Wallace...We have people of that persuasion in Minnesota and every other state. He also got some votes that were cross-overs from Republicans. He also received some votes from people that said, "Well, this is a good way for me to tell off Gov. Reynolds."

QUESTION: Wasn't it true that Gov. Welsh also (inaudible) ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: True. Exactly. The same thing in Gov. Welsh. Take in the instance of Reynolds, Reynolds was backing a highway proposal, a bond issue I believe it was, a fund raising proposal for a highway program and that program was defeated 5 or 6 to 1. 6 to 1. Now Reynolds ... Welsh was the victim of a sales tax opposition. I think it's quite remarkable that Reynolds and Welsh did as well as they did. And not only that, but in ^{the} instance of Indiana, Welsh actually cut down the percentage of vote that Wallace got out of Wisconsin.

_____ (?): That's right - it was 31, I think.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Now in Maryland where it's yet to be seen I figure that Wallace will do as well as he did in Indiana. He might even do better. I predicted in Indiana that he would get about 35% of the vote. I thought of the Democratic vote, that's what I thought he would get. Now these are only predictions but they are based on some knowledge of the political picture in these states. I was not particularly alarmed out of the size of the vote that Wallace got in Wisconsin. In fact, I told Bob Albright, sitting right in here, that I expected Wallace to get about 30% of the total vote. Now he did get 34% of the Democratic vote, but I expected him to get about 30% of the total vote.

QUESTION: Well, this brings us to the so-called white backlash. If there is such a thing, how is it being felt here by the legislators working on the Civil Rights Bill? ... What's your mail volume?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, in the beginning the mail ran strongly against the bill. There were these newspaper ads, there was a barrage of propaganda throughout the country. This ad that was put out by the Co-ordinating Committee of Fundamental Freedoms,

whatever they call it, a hundred billion dollar blackmail or blackjack ad. That stirred up opposition, but the mail has changed. I think our mail is running now about 65-35 for the bill; at the worse 60-40; and at the best some weeks 75-25. And this is characteristic now in the Senate.

QUESTION: Is that for the Bill or is that for the intrinsic

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, they're talking about the Bill now. I will say this that in most states people are fairly well informed in general about the Bill. Now, remember this that no group ... large group of citizens is ever totally informed about a bill. For example, the business community endorsed the tax bill; they didn't know what was in it. (laughter.) They knew ... they really knew in general what was in it.

_____(?)_____: It just sounded good.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yah. And the labor movement will endorse frequently a labor ... supposedly a bill for labor, and they don't know what's in it. Sometimes they'll be against one and they don't know really all the details that's in it. It's a general attitude that

you get. But you take the press in my part of the country. They've been running an analysis of the Bill, every section, and then they run an analysis of the civil rights law that we already have in Minnesota. Well, of course, frankly, this bill that we've got before us here is Caspar Milquetoast compared with the civil rights laws that we have in the state of Minnesota or in the state of Wisconsin, in the state of Iowa, practically every state north of the Mason-Dixon Line.

QUESTION: Are public accommodations in the 31 states that already have ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: 35 states that already have it ... I mean, 32 states that already have it. Excuse me. 32 states and the District of Columbia.

(At this point someone interrupts with an inaudible remark.)

SEN. HUMPHREY: Actually, for all practical purposes it would apply only to the remainder. And one of the amendments that's being worked on on this bill right now is to take into consideration these state statutes, you see; to let the first impact of law at the state level; and then you'd sort of appeal up to

the Federal level. This is one of the proposals that's being given consideration.

QUESTION: On the business of getting the remaining six or seven that you're going to need for closure, what are you going to have to give to get those six or seven?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, this is what we're talking about in the conferences that we've been holding, of which some people have been critical, of which they've been critical. I came to the conclusion, as I said some time earlier in our discussion here, in the very first days of this responsibility of being the floor leader in the Civil Rights Bill that I had to have Mr. Dirksen; and not only Mr. Dirksen - we're not talking Hubert Humphrey - Mr. Dirksen; we're talking about what Mr. Dirksen represents. He's the most effective spokesman of the opposition and he is the most effective spokesman and the leading spokesman of the Republicans in the Congress of the United States.

We made this a non-partisan issue. He wants a civil rights bill. I believe this. I don't think he's fooling at all.

QUESTION: When you say opposition then, you don't mean an anti ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: I don't mean anti civil rights, I mean we're speaking in the broadest towards a Republican and Democrat, yes.

Therefore, I spent a great deal of time in private talk, friendly, social, private, political talk with Everett Dirksen. I mean I see him every day and I'd say to him in the past, "Now, Everett, when are we going to be ready to talk about this bill?"

"Well," he'd say, "we'll wait a little while." And he had his own timetable plus the fact that Mr. Dirksen is an able and astute man in the field of public relations; he wasn't about ready to let these amendments be considered without having his imprint on them. And in my position, I had to recognize that whatever happened in this bill would have to have his imprint on it, and I am fully in support of that. So we've gone along now and we've made adjustments. We've been negotiating, and we are at the stage right now where we're refining language in the bill, where we're attempting to find areas of agreement. We have not been able to arrive at any positive, any firm agreement, because as I've told Senator Dirksen, I'm not interested in amendments on this bill as such. I am interested in amendments that bring what

you were talking about, Milt, some more votes. And how do we get those? After we get these amendments all put together then we'll go to our respective caucuses and we'll see whether we can sell these amendments. Can we convince people that these amendments are helpful? If we can, we'll pick up the extra votes. Because we have to get some out of the Democrats, too. We have a few Democrats, northern and western Democrats, that aren't voting cloture.

Now, Miss Mackin, how about you?

MISS MACKIN: These amendments in any ... do you need any compromise at all?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, they do not mean compromise in terms of knocking out a section of the bill or of completely destroying enforceability or the enforcement procedures. They do mean compromise as to what follows it ...

MISS MACKIN: Political compromise.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Political compromise in the beginning, namely that this isn't going to be a Humphrey bill and it is not going to be a President Johnson bill; it's going to be a Congress ... a bill of the Congress and of both political parties. That much compromise we

started out with. The House compromised the ... put a good deal of compromise in the bill. Now, what we're going to do, we'll take a section, for example, like the Fair Employment Practices Section. This is highly controversial. And I recognize that it's a new field of endeavor for the Federal government ...

QUESTION: The most controversial?

SEN: HUMPHREY: The most controversial. Now, one of the sections that the House put in that bill requires a very exacting and detailed system of reporting. Business men as a group are pretty tired of filling out Federal reports, and I must say that I have sympathy with them. I'm not particularly interested in having a large number of Federal bureaucrats running around the country snooping every place. We've got enough of them, and I feel that way. And I said this way in the conference the other day. So we're now perfecting new language that will minimize the reports, that will in a sense permit whatever ... at the initial stage any investigation that has to be made will be made by state officials. The right of appeal to come to a Federal commission - but this, if you wish to call that compromise, it's ... I call it an adjustment. I call it a sensible one, see.

QUESTION: It might even be an improvement.

SEN. HUMPHREY: I think it is definitely an improvement.

QUESTION: Do you have a rough date for cloture (inaudible)?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, I've had to keep shifting it, but my view that we ought to get it if we're going to follow the timetable that we had in mind of getting a bill out of here before the Republican Convention, and as I said, in the early part of July, that we ought to be able to bring cloture some time after the middle of June. I think that we ...

QUESTION: And then you'll get it through ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: And then once we get cloture, see, things move fast. Then you'll get it to the House ...

(Several people speak at once.)

QUESTION: Will civil rights be a major issue in the campaign this fall?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Not if we pass this bill. If we don't pass this bill, I say quite frankly that I worry that ... what will happen, not only in the streets, not only because of demonstrations, not only because of frustration which will lead to violence and disorder, but I am afraid that political spokesman will all take very

opinionated, firm, irreconcilable positions and it will be almost impossible to ever get anything out of it. In other words, if we can't pass this bill before these two conventions are over, then it will get into the campaign and then people will accuse each other, and then the men that run for office in areas ...

(?): ... Will outpromise each other ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: They'll outpromise each other. They'll take stands that just make it utterly impossible, if not impossible, at least very difficult for us to legislate, you see ...

QUESTION: In your compromise they (?) should have made an honorable basis for split ... (Rest inaudible).

SEN. HUMPHREY: Exactly. And people will stop talking about each other. And this whole thing will become involved in political turmoil, political intrigue, and political unrest ...

Q (?): Simple politics ...

SEN. HUMPHREY: So what I inveighed my Republican friends and Democratic friends to do is, I said, "Please, let's get this one out of the way."

This would be exactly like taking the issue of defending Berlin into the respective political campaigns

and dividing our country on the basic issue of national security, or whether we should have the atom bomb. I mean, we've tried to keep national security ... and it is, it's just about that explosive. If we could keep this issue out of the partisan context, I think we'll make a distinct contribution to the American political scene.

QUESTION: Do you think ... shifting a little bit, do you think that leadership of the ...

(End of Reel 1)

SEN. HUMPHREY: There's no danger of Johnson's health breaking down. As I said, the only (inaudible) ... he's happy, he's going, you know.

QUESTION: We can't leave this without a little politics. Is the ... do you think that having led the fight for civil rights in the Senate is likely to be a serious liability in the South for you on the national ticket, in consideration of your position on the national ticket?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Well, I don't think it will be any asset. I don't think it's a serious liability. It may be ... well, let's put it this way, then. At one

time in my public life, I was looked upon by many of our southern friends as an enemy of the south, an anathema to them, but I don't believe they think that now because the South has had a chance to see me in operation in more areas than just civil rights. In fact, in many areas of legislation I worked very closely with the Southerners and I feel a very close identity to their rural areas, for example, and to the problems of growing cities. There is a great similarity between the Middle West and the South in everything - transportation problems, new industry, the problems of the farm, rural America; all of these are matters that we see almost eye to eye. I have never been particularly critical of the South as such. I think that I appreciate their problem; they've grown up with this problem and if we'd grown up with it, we'd maybe act somewhat the same way; what I'm trying to do as the leader in this ... as one of the leaders in this civil rights fight is to discuss the merits of the legislation, to discuss this as a national issue, non-partisan issue, and as a moral issue. And, in a sense, really to see if together we can't more or less help the South resolve this issue, and I am convinced in my own heart that a number of

Southern leaders want us to do this. They can't agree with us, but they know it has to be done.

QUESTION: When you speak of the moral issue, I know about a year or so ago, the Administration was very concerned at what seemed a lack of proper participation by many influential groups in the communities and especially in the North, including the clergy in this profoundly moral issue. Is there in the ... I am of the persuasion that in the year that's passed, there has been a change, but have you seen any significant changes in that direction?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Definitely. The most important development in the past year in the American public life is the active participation of the spiritual leaders of all the major faiths in this moral issue of civil rights and human rights. This is it. This is the new margin of strength. Instead of this just becoming the issue of the NAACP or the Urban League or CORE or some geographic group or some so-called liberal groups, this has become a truly moral issue given leadership by the ministry. And I want to tell you, we are the luckiest people in the world that this has happened because too often those people that should give leadership to a

movement like this hesitate to do so. I am speaking now of professional people, of business people, of people in middle income and people that are reasonably cultured, educated, they hesitate to do it. And the extremist walks in and takes over then. And frequently the Communists will take over. And what has happened, instead of the Communists being able to take over the civil rights movement, even though they nibble at it and they try to infiltrate it, actually the civil rights movement to date has a guiding spirit from the churches ... from the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths. They have been able to get on top of this issue so to speak and to have given it inspiration and guidance. When I saw that march on Washington last August, I thought to myself, "How different this demonstration is than some that we've seen in the past in America." In the dark days of the '30s when many segments of the American labor movement were infiltrated, for example, by the Communists - they were cleaned out later on, indeed, but they did lead for awhile. The Negro in America has resisted Communist infiltration, and I think the basic reason that he's resisted it is that, number one, most of the Negroes for a long time

lived in rural areas. Secondly, they were close to their little church, whatever their faith, and close to their clergy. Now, with this urbanized society, this industrialized society and the change in the whole pattern of our living in the last 25 or 30 years or even more, let's say in the last quarter of a century the top leadership now of the churches have moved in. And when the Catholic Church took the position that it did early on school desegregation, a very difficult position for many of them in the South, this took great courage and great spiritual courage, and this set the pattern. Then the National Council of Churches and then, of course, the rabbinical groups, the Jewish groups have always had a close identity with these problems of minority groups and of discrimination and intolerance.

I think there are many things that happened. The election of a man that was of the Catholic faith to the Presidency, the organization of the ... the active participation of spiritual leaders in the civil rights movement - these have become two of the most significant developments in this period of American history. And despite all the other troubles that you hear about and

I mean the hate and the extremists, these two factors overshadow everything else. I think this is all to the good, that's why I think we're going to win.

 (?) : That's a very good statement, Senator.

QUESTION: Let me ask you a couple of personal ones. If the President picks you as Vice-President, how do you run for Vice-President? Or don't you?

(Laughter and comments by various people.)

SEN. HUMPHREY: In 1956 Adlai Stevenson came down here and we had a big dinner in Washington. I remember because the late and beloved Walter George, who was then here at that time, and I sat at that dinner and sat right alongside of Adlai Stevenson, and he said to me, "I need to talk to you."

And so we went upstairs in the hotel ... it was the Mayflower ... and we had a talk and he said - we were talking about the possibilities of ^aVice-presidential candidate and everybody was being mentioned as they generally are - it's one thing that really doesn't bring you too much fame is to be mentioned as a possibility for Vice-President ... (Laughter) ...

 (?) : I agree.

SEN. HUMPHREY: If you've been anything up from an alderman on up, you've got a chance to be mentioned, you know, so I didn't quite realize it that much at that time, but we went upstairs and talked and we talked about different people and talked and talked and he said, "Well, why don't you do something about it?" in so many words.

I said, "What do you mean?"

"Well, there's no reason it shouldn't be you. Why don't you do something about it?"

He didn't say it should be, he just said there wasn't any reason it shouldn't be. (Laughter.) Well, I interpreted this as did others that this was sort of an open, going to be a ... if I bestirred myself a little bit, I might be considered. And I did bestir myself a bit, as did others, as you recall, and then Senator Kennedy and Senator Kefauver and there were others - Senator Gore was being considered and there were a number of them. We all bestirred ourselves; we tried to run for Vice-President, and I can still see myself running around those corridors in that hotel ...

QUESTION: In Chicago?

SEN. HUMPHREY: In Chicago ... and really I hate to remember it. (Laughter.) So let me just say that you just don't run for this one ...

(?) : That was the longest night in history.

SEN. HUMPHREY: Yeah, it was ... but you know I must say that I don't regret a bit of it. It was all such an invaluable experience. If you're going to be in politics, you ought to be in the game. You know, you ought to be in the battle. It's sort of like if you're going to play football, don't come in for just one or two plays and then get roughed up. You never understand the game. You've got to have cleat marks on your back, you know? (Laughter.) And believe me, I've got them. Well, anyway, I'll just end up by saying that the only way I know that you can do anything about this is to make yourself sufficiently worthy or to conduct yourself in a manner so that you would be worthy of consideration, not only just personal conduct ... that's important, but political maturity, responsibility, insight; the President is going to decide what he needs to give him the kind of help he needs; I don't think it's so much balance any more. All things have changed

- this is a much smaller country because of communication. It isn't as if you have to have somebody that speaks for one part of the country because you'll never get down there, you know. Everybody knows everybody else in America. This has become almost like one big neighborhood. But what you really need and what President Johnson's going to do, I'm convinced of this, is he's going to select someone that he feels he can work with. Number two, someone that he feels that can take on the responsibilities that he would give to that man as his partner, as his Vice-President. And number three, if the worst should happen, that our nation would not be found without a worthy successor, because Johnson is a patriot. He's not just a Democrat. You know, many people think that when he talks about national unity and that this ought to be ... that we ought to be a great united nation that this is political talk.

I've sat right in his office with him when he had tears in his eyes ten years ago telling me the same thing. I know this fellow. He really means it. He believes it and I'm convinced of one thing, he is not going to select any man for the office of Vice-President just to please a particular faction or group

or to just ... just to sort of balance off. He's going to select somebody he can work with, live with, that he can trust, that he knows understands politics, and that he thinks has the qualities somewhere near at least of being able to assume the burdens of office in case ... the office of Presidency ... in case it happened.

I don't know of anybody that fits all that picture, but he'll maybe find him.

QUESTION: Do you think he would have to go outside the Democratic Party to find such a man?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I would hope not. I would hope not. I think the Party deserves to have a member of the Party, but again I don't say this is an absolute requirement, but he'll ... I think Johnson understands this ... President Johnson understands this well enough to know what he needs to do.

QUESTION: I didn't really fully mean to lead into the end (?) of that ... interesting (inaudible) ... about that. Do you mean Stevenson really made a race out of it?

SEN. HUMPHREY: Oh, of course! Finally, you know, he threw the whole thing open at the convention. You may rest assured that President Johnson won't do that.

(Laughter.)

(Many remarks, most inaudible.)

_____(?)_____: But he's already indicated -
he says, "I'll let you know."

_____(?)_____: That really was the wildest
night I've ever seen.

_____(?)_____: Oh, boy (?).

_____(?)_____: That Wednesday and Thursday.

_____(?)_____: That was a free for all.

(More similar statement all around until
tape is cut.)

End of Interview.

FOLLOWING ARE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN THE INTERVIEW WITH SEN. HUMPHREY:

Q: SENATOR, HOW LONG DO YOU THINK THIS DEBATE IS GOING TO LAST? ALL SUMMER?

A: NO, UNLESS THINGS TURN MUCH WORSE WE OUGHT TO GET THE BILL TO THE WHITE HOUSE FOR SIGNATURE BEFORE THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION (JULY 13).

Q: IF THE BILL ISN'T PASSED--AND THE RATE OF PROGRESS DOESN'T SATISFY SOME OF THE RIGHTS GROUPS--ARE WE LIKELY TO HAVE TROUBLE THIS SUMMER?

A: LET'S PUT IT THIS WAY: I THINK WE OUGHT TO EXPECT SOME DEMONSTRATIONS BECAUSE THERE IS A FEVER IN THE COUNTRY. SOME PEOPLE CALL IT THE NEGRO REVOLUTION. THERE IS AN UNREST IN THE COUNTRY, AND I HAVE BEEN PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT AFTER JUNE 15TH, WHEN THE YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN GET OUT OF COLLEGE.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE HAVE LIVED PRETTY MUCH THE GOOD LIFE AND NOW THEY'RE AROUSED, A LARGE NUMBER OF THEM, AND THEY'LL JOIN IN DEMONSTRATIONS.

Q: YOU'RE SPEAKING OF WHITES AS WELL AS NEGROES...

A: YES, VERY DEFINITELY. THEY WILL JOIN IN THE SPIRIT OF GOOD, PEACEFUL DEMONSTRATIONS. AND THEN SOMEBODY GETS HURT, SOMEBODY GETS SHOVED AROUND, SOMEBODY IS THROWN IN JAIL. IF THERE IS ANY DISORDER, IF THE POLICE DO GO TO WORK ON SOME OF THESE YOUNGSTERS AND IF SOME OF THEM ARE THROWN IN JAIL BECAUSE THEY VIOLATED SOME LOCAL ORDINANCE OR SOME STATE STATUTE, THEN YOU'RE GOING TO HAVE REAL TROUBLE, AND THIS COULD ACTUALLY HAPPEN, NOT SO MUCH BECAUSE OF NEGROES, BUT BECAUSE OF YOUNG, ENERGETIC, VITAL, ACTIVE, IDEALISTIC, YOUNG WHITE MEN AND WOMEN.

HUMPHREY 2

Q: SOME RIGHTS GROUPS MIGHT CONSTRUE THE PACE AT WHICH YOU'RE HANDLING THE BILL AS DRAGGING YOUR FEET...

A: THERE IS SOME OF THAT ALREADY. BUT I HAVE TRIED TO KEEP THE LEADERS OF THE RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS INFORMED AS TO WHAT WE'RE TRYING TO DO. AND I WANT TO MAKE IT QUITE CLEAR THAT I AM GOING TO DO WHAT I THINK NEEDS TO BE DONE HERE, REGARDLESS OF OUTSIDE PRESSURES. I WON'T SELL THEM OUT. MY WHOLE LIFE IS INVOLVED IN THIS. WE'RE GOING TO DO WHAT WE THINK IS RIGHT TO BE DONE AND NECESSARY TO BE DONE IN ORDER TO GET A WORKABLE, EFFECTIVE, ENFORCEABLE BILL.

Q: WILL CIVIL RIGHTS BE A MAJOR ISSUE IN THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN THIS FALL?

A: NOT IF WE PASS THIS BILL. IF WE DON'T PASS THIS BILL, I SAY QUITE FRANKLY THAT I WORRY WHAT WILL HAPPEN, NOT ONLY IN THE STREETS, NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF DEMONSTRATIONS, NOT ONLY BECAUSE OF FRUSTRATION WHICH WILL LEAD TO VIOLENCE AND DISORDER, BUT I AM AFRAID THAT POLITICAL SPOKESMAN WILL ALL TAKE VERY OPINIONATED, FIRM, IRRECONCILABLE POSITIONS AND IT WILL BE ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO EVER GET ANYTHING OUT OF IT.

Q: TO FORCE AN END TO THE UNLIMITED DEBATE NOW GOING ON IN THE SENATE SO YOU CAN VOTE ON THIS BILL YOU HAVE TO APPLY THE CLOTURE RULE. HOW'S THAT GOING TO WORK?

A: IT REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS OF THOSE PRESENT AND VOTING--NOT NECESSARILY TWO-THIRDS OF THE 100 SENATORS--TO LIMIT DEBATE. ON AN ISSUE AS SERIOUS AND AS CONTROVERSIAL AS CIVIL RIGHTS, MOST ALL THE SENATORS WOULD BE PRESENT. SENATOR ENGLE IS ILL; TWO-THIRDS OF THE 99 IS 66 AND THAT'S WHAT WE'D NEED FOR CLOTURE. ONCE A CLOTURE HAS BEEN AGREED TO, THERE ARE 100 HOURS OF DEBATE AVAILABLE ON THE BILL AND ALL AMENDMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN PRESENTED AND READ, ONE HOUR PER SENATOR.

HUMPHREY 3

Q: HOW MANY VOTES DO YOU HAVE LINED UP FOR CLOTURE?

A: WE HAVE 58 THAT WE COULD PIN DOWN FOR SURE. BY MAYBE A LITTLE EXTRA WORK RIGHT AT THIS TIME, WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO GET UP AS HIGH AS 61, SO WE NEED FIVE TO SIX MORE THAN WE PRESENTLY HAVE, AND THAT'S JUST AS FAR AWAY AS FROM HERE TO THE MOON IF YOU DON'T HAVE THEM.

Q: WHERE ARE THOSE VOTES GOING TO COME FROM?

A: IT ISN'T THE 19 SOUTHERNERS THAT ARE PREVENTING THE PASSAGE OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL; THEY'RE OPPOSED TO IT, BUT THEY DON'T HAVE THAT MUCH POWER. IF WE CAN GET THE 81 OTHER SENATORS--OR 66 OF THE OTHER 81 SENATORS, TO BRING CLOTURE WE CAN THEN VOTE UP OR DOWN A CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

Q: WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO HAVE TO GIVE TO GET THOSE NEEDED VOTES FOR CLOTURE?

A: WELL, THIS IS WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT IN THE CONFERENCES THAT WE'VE BEEN HOLDING, OF WHICH SOME PEOPLE HAVE BEEN CRITICAL. I CAME TO THE CONCLUSION IN THE VERY FIRST DAYS OF THIS RESPONSIBILITY OF BEING THE FLOOR LEADER IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL THAT I HAD TO HAVE THE COOPERATION OF MR. DIRKSEN (OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE MINORITY LEADER). HE'S THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND LEADING SPOKESMAN OF THE REPUBLICANS IN THE CONGRESS. WE MADE THIS A NON-PARTISAN ISSUE. HE WANTS A CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

Q: HOW DOES THIS COOPERATION WORK--CAN YOU GIVE US A LOOK AT THE INNER WORKINGS OF THE SENATE HERE?

A: I SPEND A GREAT DEAL OF TIME IN PRIVATE TALK, FRIENDLY, SOCIAL, PRIVATE, POLITICAL TALK WITH EVERETT DIRKSEN. I SEE HIM EVERY DAY AND I'D SAY TO HIM IN THE PAST, "NOW, EVERETT, WHEN ARE WE GOING TO BE READY TO TALK ABOUT THIS BILL?"

HUMPHREY 4

"WELL," HE'D SAY, "WE'LL WAIT A LITTLE WHILE." HE HAD HIS OWN TIMETABLE AND MR. DIRKSEN IS AN ABLE AND ASTUTE MAN IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC RELATIONS; HE WASN'T ABOUT READY TO LET THESE AMENDMENTS BE CONSIDERED WITHOUT HAVING HIS IMPRINT ON THEM. AND IN MY POSITION, I HAD TO RECOGNIZE THAT WHATEVER HAPPENED IN THIS BILL WOULD HAVE TO HAVE HIS IMPRINT ON IT, AND I AM FULLY IN SUPPORT OF THAT. SO WE'VE GONE ALONG NOW AND WE'VE MADE ADJUSTMENTS.

Q: WHAT SORT OF ADJUSTMENTS?

A: WE TAKE A SECTION, FOR EXAMPLE, LIKE THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES SECTION. THIS IS HIGHLY CONTROVERSIAL.

A: (CAPS) THE (UNCAPS) MOST CONTROVERSIAL?

A: (CAPS) THE (UNCAPS) MOST CONTROVERSIAL. NOW, ONE OF THE SECTIONS THAT THE HOUSE PUT IN THAT BILL REQUIRES A VERY EXACTING AND DETAILED SYSTEM OF REPORTING. BUSINESS MEN AS A GROUP ARE PRETTY TIRED OF FILLING OUT FEDERAL REPORTS, AND I MUST SAY THAT I HAVE SYMPATHY WITH THEM. I'M NOT PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN HAVING A LARGE NUMBER OF FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS RUNNING AROUND THE COUNTRY SNOOPING EVERY PLACE. WE'VE GOT ENOUGH OF THEM. AND I SAID THIS IN THE CONFERENCE THE OTHER DAY. SO WE SET OUT TO PERFECT NEW LANGUAGE THAT WILL MINIMIZE THE REPORTS, THAT WILL IN A SENSE PERMIT THAT THE INITIAL STAGE OF ANY INVESTIGATION THAT HAS TO BE MADE WILL BE MADE BY STATE OFFICIALS. THERE WILL BE THE RIGHT OF APPEAL TO ~~COME TO~~ A FEDERAL COMMISSSION.

Q: ABOUT A YEAR AGO, THE ADMINISTRATION WAS VERY CONCERNED AT WHAT SEEMED A LACK OF PROPER PARTICIPATION BY MANY INFLUENTIAL GROUPS, INCLUDING THE CLERGY, IN THIS PROFOUNDLY MORAL ISSUE. THERE HAS BEEN A CHANGE, HASN'T THERE?

HUMPHREY 5

A: THE MOST IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENT IN THE PAST YEAR IN AMERICAN PUBLIC LIFE IS THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF THE SPIRITUAL LEADERS OF ALL THE MAJOR FAITHS IN THIS MORAL ISSUE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND HUMAN RIGHTS. THIS IS THE NEW MARGIN OF STRENGTH. AND I WANT TO TELL YOU, WE ARE THE LUCKIEST PEOPLE IN THE WORLD THAT THIS HAS HAPPENED BECAUSE TOO OFTEN PEOPLE THAT SHOULD GIVE LEADERSHIP TO A MOVEMENT LIKE THIS HESITATE TO DO SO--PROFESSIONAL PEOPLE, BUSINESS PEOPLE, PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE INCOME. AND THE EXTREMIST WALKS IN AND TAKES OVER. FREQUENTLY THE COMMUNISTS WILL TAKE OVER. BUT INSTEAD OF THE COMMUNISTS BEING ABLE TO TAKE OVER THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT--EVEN THOUGH THEY NIBBLE AT IT AND THEY TRY TO INFILTRATE IT--ACTUALLY THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT TO DATE HAS A GUIDING SPIRIT FROM THE CHURCHES, FROM THE CATHOLIC, PROTESTANT AND JEWISH FAITHS. WHEN I SAW THAT MARCH ON WASHINGTON LAST AUGUST, I THOUGHT TO MYSELF, "HOW DIFFERENT THIS DEMONSTRATION IS FROM SOME WE'VE SEEN IN THE PAST IN AMERICA." IN THE DARK DAYS OF THE '30S WHEN MANY SEGMENTS OF THE AMERICAN LABOR MOVEMENT WERE INFILTRATED, FOR EXAMPLE, BY THE COMMUNISTS--THEY WERE CLEANED OUT LATER ON, INDEED, BUT THEY DID LEAD FOR A WHILE. THE NEGRO IN AMERICA HAS RESISTED COMMUNIST INFILTRATION.

WHEN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH TOOK THE POSITION THAT IT DID EARLY ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION--A VERY DIFFICULT POSITION FOR MANY OF THEM IN THE SOUTH, THIS TOOK GREAT COURAGE AND GREAT SPIRITUAL COURAGE, AND THIS SET THE PATTERN. THEN THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND THEN, OF COURSE, THE RABBINICAL GROUPS, THE JEWISH GROUPS HAVE ALWAYS HAD A CLOSE IDENTITY WITH THESE PROBLEMS OF MINORITIES AND OF DISCRIMINATION AND INTOLERANCE.

HUMPHREY 6

MANY THINGS HAPPENED. THE ELECTION OF A MAN OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH TO THE PRESIDENCY, THE ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF SPIRITUAL LEADERS IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT--THESE ARE TWO OF THE MOST SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS IN THIS PERIOD OF AMERICAN HISTORY.

Q: HOW MUCH OF THE VOTE GOVERNOR WALLACE HAS BEEN GETTING IN PRIMARIES IS AN ANTI-CIVIL RIGHTS VOTE? ALMOST ALL?

A: NOT ALL. I THINK IT'S FAIR TO SAY THAT IN THE NATION, NORTH AND SOUTH, THERE AREN'T TOO MANY PEOPLE THAT ARE REALLY ANTI CIVIL RIGHTS. BUT THEY WILL BE ANTI THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DOING ANYTHING ABOUT IT. OR THEY'LL BE ANTI ANY PARTICULAR SPECIAL TYPE OF LEGISLATION. BUT THERE ARE PEOPLE THAT JUST PLAIN DON'T LIKE NEGROES AND THERE ARE PEOPLE THAT DON'T LIKE ORIENTALS, PEOPLE THAT DON'T LIKE SCANDINAVIANS, AND SO ON. MR. WALLACE HAS USED EVERY POLITICAL TRICK IN THE BOOK TO MUSTER THIS SUPPORT. WHAT HAS SURPRISED ME IN THE STATES THAT HE SELECTED IS THAT HE DIDN'T GET MORE SUPPORT, AND I AM NOT SAYING THIS TO IN ANY WAY DIMINISH THE EFFECT OF HIS SHOWING.

Q: WHAT IS THE LONG DEBATE ON THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL GOING TO DO TO THE REST OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM--THE OTHER FIVE OR SIX MAJOR BILLS THAT HE WANTS ACTION ON?

A: IF WE CAN FINISH THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL IN LATE JUNE OR THE 1ST OF JULY, WE CAN MOVE ON THE APPROPRIATION BILLS, THE POVERTY BILL, THE PAY BILL, SOME AID TO EDUCATION, THE FOOD STAMP BILL AND THE MEDICARE BILL. BUT IF THIS CIVIL RIGHTS BILL IS NOT OUT OF THE WAY UNTIL AFTER THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION, THERE'S ONLY ONE THING FOR THE PRESIDENT TO DO IF HE WANTS HIS PROGRAM. THAT'S TO CALL THIS CONGRESS BACK INTO SPECIAL SESSION. AND I THINK MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS HAVE TO RECOGNIZE THAT THEY MAY VERY WELL BE HERE UP UNTIL OCTOBER.

separate

file

Q: HOW DO YOU RUN FOR VICE-PRESIDENT? OR DON'T YOU?

SEN. HUMPHREY: IN 1956 ABLAI STEVENSON CAME DOWN HERE FOR A BIG DINNER. I SAT ALONGSIDE HIM AND HE SAID, "I NEED TO TALK TO YOU."

SO WE WENT UPSTAIRS IN THE HOTEL--IT WAS THE MAYFLOWER--AND WE HAD A TALK. WE WERE TALKING ABOUT THE POSSIBILITIES OF A VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE AND EVERYBODY WAS BEING MENTIONED, AS THEY GENERALLY ARE-- IT'S ONE THING THAT REALLY DOESN'T BRING YOU TOO MUCH FAME TO BE MENTIONED AS A POSSIBILITY FOR VICE-PRESIDENT (LAUGHTER)...

IF YOU'VE BEEN ANYTHING FROM AN ALDERMAN ON UP, YOU'VE GOT A CHANCE TO BE MENTIONED, YOU KNOW, ALTHOUGH I DIDN'T QUITE REALIZE IT AT THAT TIME. BUT WE TALKED AND TALKED ABOUT DIFFERENT PEOPLE AND TALKED AND TALKED AND HE SAID, "WELL, WHY DON'T YOU DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?" IN SO MANY WORDS.

I SAID, "WHAT DO YOU MEAN?"

"WELL, THERE'S NO REASON IT SHOULDN'T BE YOU. WHY DON'T YOU DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT?"

HE DIDN'T SAY IT SHOULD BE, HE JUST SAID THERE WASN'T ANY REASON IT SHOULDN'T BE. (LAUGHTER.) WELL, I INTERPRETED THIS AS DID OTHERS THAT THIS WAS GOING TO BE OPEN AND IF I BESTIRRED MYSELF A LITTLE BIT, I MIGHT BE CONSIDERED. AND I DID BESTIR MYSELF A BIT, AS DID OTHERS, SENATOR KENNEDY, SENATOR KEFAUVER, SENATOR GORE AND THERE WERE A NUMBER OF OTHERS. WE ALL BESTIRRED OURSELVES; WE TRIED TO RUN FOR VICE-PRESIDENT, AND I CAN STILL SEE MYSELF RUNNING AROUND THOSE CORRIDORS IN THAT HOTEL IN CHICAGO.

AND REALLY I HATE TO REMEMBER IT. BUT YOU KNOW I MUST SAY THAT I DON'T REGRET A BIT OF IT. IT WAS ALL SUCH AN INVALUABLE EXPERIENCE. IF YOU'RE GOING TO BE IN POLITICS, YOU OUGHT TO BE IN THE GAME. IF YOU'RE GOING TO PLAY FOOTBALL, DON'T COME IN FOR JUST ONE OR TWO PLAYES AND THEN GET ROUGHED UP. YOU NEVER UNDERSTAND THE GAME. YOU'VE GOT TO HAVE CLEAT MARKS ON YOUR BACK, YOU KNOW? (LAUGHTER) AND BELIEVE ME, I'VE GOT THEM. THE ONLY WAY I KNOW THAT YOU CAN DO ANYTHING ABOUT THIS IS TO MAKE YOURSELF SUFFICIENTLY WORTHY OR TO CONDUCT YOURSELF IN A MANNER SO THAT YOU WOULD BE WORTHY OF CONSIDERATION, NOT ONLY JUST PERSONAL CONDUCT...THAT'S IMPORTANT, BUT POLITICAL MATURITY, RESPONSIBILITY, INSIGHT.

THE PRESIDENT IS GOING TO DECIDE WHAT HE NEEDS TO GIVE HIM THE KIND OF HELP HE NEEDS; I DON'T THINK IT'S SO MUCH BALANCE ANY MORE. ALL THINGS HAVE CHANGED--THIS IS A MUCH SMALLER COUNTRY BECAUSE OF COMMUNICATION. IT ISN'T AS IF YOU HAVE TO HAVE SOMEBODY THAT SPEAKS FOR ONE PART OF THE COUNTRY BECAUSE YOU'LL NEVER GET DOWN THERE, YOU KNOW. EVERYBODY KNOWS EVERYBODY ELSE IN AMERICA. THIS HAS BECOME ALMOST LIKE ONE BIG NEIGHBORHOOD. BUT WHAT YOU REALLY NEED AND WHAT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S GOING TO DO, I'M CONVINCED OF THIS, IS SELECT SOMEONE HE FEELS HE CAN WORK WITH. NUMBER TWO, SOMEONE THAT HE FEELS THAT CAN TAKE ON THE RESPONSIBILITIES THAT HE WOULD GIVE TO THAT MAN AS HIS PARTNER, AS HIS VICE-PRESIDENT. AND NUMBER THREE, IF THE WORST SHOULD HAPPEN, THAT OUR NATION WOULD NOT BE FOUND WITHOUT A WORTHY SUCCESSOR, BECAUSE JOHNSON IS A PATRIOT. HE'S NOT JUST A DEMOCRAT. YOU KNOW, MANY PEOPLE THINK THAT WHEN HE TALKS ABOUT NATIONAL UNITY, ABOUT A GREAT, UNITED NATION, THAT THIS IS POLITICAL TALK.

I'VE SAT RIGHT IN THIS OFFICE WITH HIM WHEN HE HAD TEARS IN HIS EYES TEN YEARS AGO TELLING ME THE SAME THING. I KNOW THIS FELLOW. HE REALLY MEANS IT. HE BELIEVES IT AND I'M CONVINCED OF ONE THING, HE IS NOT GOING TO SELECT ANY MAN FOR THE OFFICE OF VICE-PRESIDENT JUST TO PLEASE A PARTICULAR FACTION OR GROUP OR TO JUST SORT OF BALLANCE OFF. HE'S GOING TO SELECT SOMEBODY HE CAN WORK WITH, LIVE WITH, THAT HE CAN TRUST, THAT HE KNOWS UNDERSTANDS POLITICS, AND THAT HE THINKS HAS THE QUALITIES SOMEWHERE NEAR AT LEAST OF BEING ABLE TO ASSUME THE BURDENS OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENCY IN CASE IT HAPPENED. I DON'T KNOW OF ANYBODY THAT FITS ALL THAT PICTURE, BUT MAYBE HE'LL FIND HIM.

Q: DO YOU THINK HE WOULD HAVE TO GO OUTSIDE THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO FIND SUCH A MAN?

SEN. HUMPHREY: I WOULD HOPE NOT. I WOULD HOPE NOT. I THINK THE PARTY DESERVES TO HAVE A MEMBER OF THE PARTY, BUT AGAIN I DON'T SAY THIS IS AN ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENT, BUT I THINK PRESIDENT JOHNSON UNDERSTANDS THIS. PRESIDENT JOHNSON UNDERSTANDS THIS WELL ENOUGH TO KNOW WHAT HE NEEDS TO DO.

Q: STEVENSON REALLY MADE A RACE OUT OF THE VICE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION IN 1956.....

SEN. HUMPHREY: OH, OF COURSE! FINALLY, YOU KNOW, HE THREW THE WHOLE THING OPEN AT THE CONVENTION. YOU MAY REST ASSURED THAT PRESIDENT JOHNSON WON'T DO THAT.



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