

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

"FACE THE NATION"

as broadcast over the

CBS Television Network

March 2, 1958 - 4:30 to 5:00 PM

CBS Radio Network

March 2, 1958 - 9:30 to 10:00 PM

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

MODERATOR: Stuart Novins

PANEL: John Madigan
Chicago American

Bob Pierpoint
CBS News

Edwin B. Haakinson
Associated Press

PRODUCER: Ted Ayers

ASSOCIATE PRODUCER: Bill Kobin

MR. NOVINS: The announcement yesterday by the Russians that they will participate in a Foreign Ministers meeting preceding a summit talk, that and the appointment this week of a new American disarmament team, seem to indicate that we are entering a new phase in foreign policy.

One of the men in the United States Senate who serves on the Foreign Relations Committee and who has often called for new and bold policy, is Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota.

Senator Humphrey is here now to FACE THE NATION.

Senator Humphrey, there have been several recent developments in addition to those I have mentioned, and we want to ask you about all of them.

So if you will, let's start with this first question from Mr. Madigan.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, what do you believe the United States answer should be to the Russian proposal to meet at the ministerial level?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, it appears to me, Mr. Madigan, that this has been our proposal, and again I am afraid that we are apt to let the Soviet Union steal the psychological march on us, the propaganda march, by making it appear that it is their proposal.

Frankly, when the exchange of letters took place between Marshal Bulganin and President Eisenhower, you may recall that

our response was that before any summit talks there should be careful preparation of the agenda and the items to be discussed, and that this should be accomplished at the so-called Foreign Ministers level. It was at that point that the Soviets seemed to object, and now I am pleased to note that they have come back to accede to our suggestion.

MR. PIERPOINT: Senator Humphrey, I gather from what you say that you do favor a summit conference. I would like to ask you, in view of our past experiences with summit conferences, what real evidence do we have that another one would be any more successful?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Pierpoint, I don't believe the issue is whether or not I favor a summit conference or whether or not you favor one.

I think the real issue is that the United States of America and its allies have enough confidence in our cause, enough confidence in our strength, and enough confidence in our ability to manage diplomatic negotiations so that we are not fearful of any conference.

We ought to always be willing to negotiate, and not merely talk negotiation, but have specific programs and proposals upon which we seek to negotiate, and what I regret, sir, is that we have been on the defensive. The Soviet has been firing one literary missile after another at us.

Marshal Bulganin has leveled his aim on us, and every

time we turn around there is a new missile, there is a new letter, there is a new epistle, so to speak, coming from the Soviet Union.

Now, what I suggest is that we state to the world categorically that we are a peace loving nation, which the world should know by now, that we are prepared to negotiate, that we want to negotiate at the normal diplomatic levels of Ambassadors, Foreign Minister levels, and if there is anything that can be accomplished, that we are prepared, because we believe in our cause, we are prepared to meet that with the heads of state.

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, does that mean that you are pessimistic of any real accomplishment from all of this negotiation?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, Mr. Haakinson, I can say that we are not making very much headway without negotiation, and I don't think we could lose anything by negotiation. I think we might gain.

What is more, I believe the image of the United States of America ought to be one of strength and confidence and of peace seeking, honorable peace at all times, and I am afraid that our rejection, or at least our lack of willingness to accede to conferences indicates first of all either a fear or a weakness, or a desire not to discuss.

MR. MADIGAN: But in your warning that we shouldn't let

the world think that Russia is making this proposal, that it is originally ours.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. MADIGAN: Are you then saying that we should not accept it now?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Oh, no, not at all.

MR. MADIGAN: What are you saying, then? What should we tell them tomorrow morning when we meet with Menshikov, their Ambassador, at eleven o'clock?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, I sometimes think it would be better if we didn't try to have tomorrow morning answers. I think it would be better if we would think about these matters carefully, holding our tongue and our peace until we are ready to talk, and then when we are ready to talk, to give the answer that has been thought out carefully and with maturity of thought and foresight.

Now, in the instance of the Foreign Ministers Conference, I think our position is pretty clear already. The Soviet, I say, is merely recouping or coming back to a position that we once took, and I would imagine on that basis that our answer would be that we accept the idea of a Foreign Ministers Conference.

Now, what do you expect the Foreign Ministers to discuss, Mr. Ambassador? I would hope that would be the reply of the Secretary.

MR. MADIGAN: Just on that point, on the acceptance, do you believe it would be unwieldy to have thirty nations represented? Do you believe we should ask that that be reduced to a handful?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think a thirty-nation conference as a working session would be unwieldy. I am not saying that a thirty-nation conference as a plenary session, that is, a session to more or less complete the preliminary steps, might not be necessary. I don't say it would be desirable, but sometimes things are necessary even when they are not desirable. I do feel that you need a working subcommittee if you are going to make any progress at all.

#2 fls.

lwh-1
Cantor 2

MR. PIERPOINT: Senator, what specific items do you think we might successfully negotiate with the Soviet Union?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, there are a host of them. I think, for example, that it would be well for us to get off the defensive on such matters, for example, as the Eastern European states, the so-called captured states, the occupied states. I think we might very well want to ask some questions about what Russian policy is going to be relating to Germany. I think we might very well want to ask questions relating to the Middle East, the attitude of the Soviet and what their intentions are in this area.

Now those are the big political questions and there are many more, but there are other questions of immediate and current concern which are not as froth with difficulty, such as what kind of proposals could we negotiate relating to disarmament, such as abandoning of nuclear tests with adequate inspection and I would put at the top of the agenda, Mr. Pierpoint, a question to the Soviets as to just what they meant last June in London when the Soviet representative in the disarmament discussions indicated that the Soviet Union was willing to have international inspections tied in with the banning of tests of nuclear weapons. I think we ought to

press that point.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, this is now the first of March, and that proposal was made or that suggestion was commented on by the Russian representative last June.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

MR. NOVINS: As you pointed out. Why have we waited this long to find out?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't know, and I want to say I think this is just typical of the kind of defensiveness, the kind of reaction, the kind of delay which has caused us to lose a great deal of prestige throughout the world.

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, you are Chairman of the Foreign Relations Special Subcommittee on Disarmament.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. HAAKINSON: What have you been urging?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have been urging just what I have been urging now, Mr. Haakinson. In fact on November the 4th of this past year in a special personal letter to the President, I urged, after having been at the United Nations listening to the discussions on disarmament, I urged that the President offer the disarmament proposal of banning nuclear weapons tests with inspection and I pointed out what I meant by inspection and why I thought it was so terribly important to press this issue. And we did this, by the way, in our report in July or August of the past year.

iwh-3

MR. HAAKINSON: What about the recent proposal of your fellow Minnesotan, Harold Stassen?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Haakinson, the proposals of Mr. Stassen are very much the same proposals that I ventured to offer to the Senate on February 4th of this year. I suggested then, and I lay no claim to any expertise knowledge, I want to say right now, and I don't say that my suggestions are necessarily all valid, but I at least think they broke the ice. They broke the cake which is incrustated in this whole discussion of disarmament.

I suggested that we break up our disarmament package, a package of seven to nine points, depending on how you look at it, a package that was just too big to negotiate, too big to ever assume that the Soviets would accept it, and that we break it up piece by piece and attempt to negotiate with the Soviet Union on a piece by piece basis.

MR. HAAKINSON: I notice that you were very happy about the selection of Mr. Stassen's successor, Ambassador Wadsworth. Do you anticipate some definite moves in the disarmament field as a result of that change?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have great confidence in Ambassador Wadsworth. I have known him as a fellow public servant. I worked with him at the United Nations in the eleventh General Assembly.

I know of his distinct contributions to the successful

n-4 negotiation of the Atoms For Peace Program, which is now a reality. He understands the Soviet negotiators. He has negotiated with them.

He has their respect, and this is very important, and I was pleased also with the panel of advisors. Now you ask do I expect some developments. Yes, I definitely do.

MR. HAAKINSON: What would they be?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have expected and said that it was my feeling that the Soviet Union was looking for a way to get back at the disarmament conference table. They got themselves out a little bit too far when they walked out of the United Nations. Now they have been trying to play the propoganda game, and they have been doing it quite well, but the pressure is upon them as it is upon the rest of the nations of the world to get back to the conference table and they are now working their way around to it, and I predicted on February the 4th that the Soviet Union might well ask to come back to the Foreign Ministers level, which they did over this past week end, and I am convinced that the Soviet Union will sit down and will discuss and may very well come to some tentative agreement at least upon some minor points.

MR. PIERPOINT: Senator Humphrey, why does the Soviet Union want disarmament, or does it want merely to sit at the table and talk about it?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I suppose it wants both. I

wh-5

would like to think that we are grown up people. Sometimes I think the way Americans talk about these questions, and particularly our leadership, is like the good boys and the bad boys and the cops and the robbers.

Now that is a simplification that is handy for moving pictures and for drama, but hardly for world politics. The Soviet Union obviously would like to pressure us right off the face of the earth. The Soviet Union would like to defeat us, and I imagine that this has been part of our program too, that we too would like to bring them to heel. I imagine that is why we built up our defenses.

I would hope so at least, and therefore when we meet at the conference table obviously they are going to make the most out of it, but why don't we try to make the most out of it. I think we have got a better bill of goods. I think we have better arguments. I think we have stronger allies. They don't have any allies. They have satellites, and I think we can win at the conference table if we go knowing what we want.

MR. MADIGAN: Just at that point, Senator, you have made two references now to delay and lack of leadership.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

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

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course I place it where it properly belongs. You and I both know our Constitution. The

1wh-6

President of the United States is the spokesman for this nation in foreign policy. The President of the United States and his agent, the Secretary of State, speak for this country, and you can only lay the blame right where the blame automatically lies, namely in the Executive Office.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you feel that President Eisenhower should have moved in the first place on this entire matter even though it might have not concluded the very important question as to cessation of production of materials, not just cessation of tests?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, I recommended in June, I re-recommended in July and I recommended the third time as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament in August, that the President of the United States, known throughout the world as a man of peace -- and Mr. Eisenhower is known as that and I praise him for it -- I recommended that he go to the United Nations, as he did once before in his famous speech on peaceful use of atomic energy, and that he appear as our spokesman, as the spokesman of the Free World, and that he lay before the United Nations our proposals on disarmament, not relying upon others as the second echelon to do it, but to go there and with new proposals along the lines that we have been discussing to catch the Soviet, I would say, off guard and to prove to the world that we are prepared to walk the extra mile in the quest for a just and

iwh-7

enduring peace.

MR. MADIGAN: But is not this indecision as to procedure not confined just to the White House or the State Department, the Administration, but in the Democratic ranks, too? There is considerable controversy as to what positions we take, is there not?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, you can always rely upon the democrats to have considerable controversy, but in this instance the Democratic party does not have responsibility for the execution of foreign policy.

Now we have responsibility as citizens in the discussion of foreign policy, and I want to be a responsible participant in that discussion. But the matter of conducting our foreign policy today rests squarely with the President of the United States and his officers, the head of the Department of State, Mr. Dulles, the head of the ICA, Mr. Smith, and the head of our Department of Defense, Mr. McElroy and others.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you think Dulles should be fired?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, I am not the man that hired him and I don't suppose I would ever be the man that fired him. I would say that Mr. Dulles has great work before him, and I would ask him to get on with the job.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, you suggest that Mr. Wadsworth, the new Disarmament Chief, is going to be able to bring up some new proposals, but yet at the same time you say one of

-8

the reasons we haven't gone anywhere is because of the Administration. Mr. Wadsworth will still have to go through Secretary Dulles, won't he?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, Mr. Novins, if I suggested that, I want to retract it. I did not as I recall. What I suggested was Mr. Wadsworth was an able, astute and competent diplomat that had gained the respect of friend and foe alike and I sincerely believe this.

He of course can only negotiate those matters which the government of the United States that he represents is willing to have negotiated, and what I am pleading for on this broadcast, on this telecast, and what others are pleading for is a resiliency on the part of our government, a flexibility and a willingness to try and to look and to seek new approaches and to do this in confidence, not out of expediency.

I want to suggest that we ought to be very careful what we do suggest at a world conference or a peace conference or a disarmament conference. Be sure that we believe in what we are proposing. Approach it cautiously, but also approach it confidently.

And I am of the opinion that Mr. Wadsworth will do a very good job if given instructions and given the material with which to work.

MR. NOVINS: Well now, specifically in regard to those

iwh-9

instructions, Mr. Stassen, when he appeared before your committee suggested that the Russians would not take the first step in disarmament, until we gave up our position regarding the production, the stoppage of production of nuclear weapons.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. NOVINS: What should the United States position be in your opinion?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am glad you added in my opinion, because this is of course a very delicate matter, and thank goodness that in a country like ours we can discuss these matters openly.

I believe that the package that we had of tying together the limitation or ban on nuclear tests, plus the ban on the production of fissionable or nuclear materials for weapons purposes was unacceptable. It was not only unacceptable to the Soviet but even to our allies, some of them.

They were very reluctant about going along, for example, the French, and I can plainly understand why, because they are in the process of developing nuclear weapons and nuclear materials.

I therefore suggested that what is most needed is a break-through in this disarmament field, a break-through that would in no way prejudice or weaken our security, but might very well give us psychological advantage, and I want to see

wh-10

the United States of America take the lead in this, and what I have said, and I think most significant, is the breakthrough that we are really looking for, Mr. Novins, is not merely the stopping of the tests which you could reinstitute rather quickly, but can we ever once get an international inspection agency into the tightly controlled dictatorial monolithic state called the Soviet Union? If that ever happens --

MR. NOVINS: Can we get it into the United States?

MR. HUMPHREY: (Continuing) -- we have made the greatest political break-through of the 20th century, and I think it will be an omen for good things yet to come.

MR. NOVINS: Is the United States prepared to accept full inspection of our own plant?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have said I imagine this would cause some serious discussion, but the President of the United States has indicated that we were willing to accept such not only for banning of tests but even for production cut-off on materials.

And I would hope and pray that the Congress of the United States would support the President, if he should press for that kind of arrangement. I don't think we have much to fear, very frankly. There is a lot of freedom of movement here anyway. I want to say that friend and foe alike gets a pretty good look at about everything we do over here.

iwh-11

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, before you became active as a Senator and a Mayor you were a teacher of political science, weren't you?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I was.

MR. HAAKINSON: All right, you should have some pretty definite views then on the present downturn or recession. What do you think the outlook is?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Well, I would say that the fact of the day indicates that the outlook will be a little more dark and gray before it brightens.

By that I mean I am not one that is of the opinion, as Mr. Eisenhower indicated a couple of weeks ago, that things will be much better or considerably better by the middle of March. We are fast approaching at least the end of the first week of March and things are not getting better. They are getting a little worse, so I am afraid we are in for some definite economic trouble.

But it is not beyond control if we act, and here, like in everything else, if we just sit back and wait and hope that things will work out, we are going to get into more trouble and more trouble.

MR. MADIGAN: Mr. Truman said that too, but he didn't name any specifics and neither have you, Senator. What should we do?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, I disagree with you. I

1wh-12

have not only named them, I have named them again and again, and if you come to the Senate about Tuesday, I will give you a whole brand new list of specifics, but I made some about two weeks ago.

MR. MADIGAN: You didn't change from the ones you said previously.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: No, I am just going to elaborate upon them, Mr. Madigan.

o'c fls.

#4 01
upon
them,
Mr.
Madigan.

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, what about the complaints of some Republicans and even some Democrats that it is possible to talk this country into a fairly serious recession?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: It may be possible to talk it into one, but it is not possible to talk itself out of one, and I am afraid that what you are seeing is a replay of the old 1931 Hoover period.

You know, as a matter of fact, Mr. Hoover gave a speech up here at Valley Forge the other day, the same speech that he gave in 1931, and it seemed to me like history was being re-done or re-lived, and I recall that he said prosperity was just around the corner. And Mr. Eisenhower said, the latter part of February, that an upturn in employment was just around in March.

MR. HAAKINSON: Isn't it also true that some of your Democratic colleagues foresaw quite a serious recession only two years ago, and we seem to have gotten out of that one fairly well?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Haakinson, I would just add this: that when any of us in the Congress have pointed out what we consider to be the disastrous consequences of the tight-credit, high-interest, hard-money policy, we were called prophets of doom and gloom. Well, I am not one of these doom fellows and I am not very gloomy. I am really a congenital optimist, and I happen to have great faith in the resiliency and the

c2 strength and the vitality of the American economy. But I say to you, and the record is quite clear, that this Administration planned to slam on the brakes, to put on the brakes.

They had a planned recession. They tightened the credit, they cut down on home construction, they raised the interest rates, and thereby adding additional burdens upon consumers and taxpayers and governmental agencies. They have raised the limits, they have tightened up the mortgage market, and they have this economy in a squeeze, and it is taking its toll.

MR. MADIGAN: Senator, most economists have agreed, at least the reports I have read, that this was needed at the time to stop inflation. You say it was not needed.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I surely do, and most economists do not say that. Some economists say that, but some economists say many things that are wrong.

MR. MADIGAN: In the specifics that I said you did not mention on this show, you may have mentioned them earlier, --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I haven't had a chance to mention them on this show, but I would be happy to do so.

MR. MADIGAN: Do you urge a reduction or cut in income tax right now, as your fellow liberal, Paul Douglas of Illinois, urged last week?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Senator Douglas is one of the truly

03 great minds of the United States Congress, one of the most brilliant economists that the nation has ever had, and I want to say that he is giving this nation sound advice, and the cut, in my mind, should come on the lower income brackets, and the sooner the better, because that cut will have an effect upon stimulating purchasing power, but tied with it you must recognize that such a cut gives you at least temporarily what we call deficit financing.

I am not one of those that believes that you can have it both ways, but deficit financing has a way of releasing credit, by the strange quirks of our monetary system.

When you borrow money from the banks, which the banks frequently don't have, you seem to add credit to the American economy which it didn't have before you borrowed it.

Now, if you can add that up, in other words, when you borrow the money from the banks through government loans, the government deposits bonds in those banks, and thereby creates new credit which is available to the American private economy, and that is one of the advantages of deficit financing.

I will only add one other thing: this Administration has been able to perform a rather miraculous condition. On the one hand, they can say that they still have inflation at the same time that they have unemployment.

MR. MADIGAN: What is your explanation?

o4

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And they have price inflation at the same time that they have agricultural deflation.

MR. MADIGAN: What is your explanation of why prices are still going up while we are in a recession?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wish I could give it. Senator Kefauver and his Subcommittee on Monopoly say that it is due to administered prices. I think there is a considerable amount of truth in that.

I do not claim to be a knowledgeable expert in the field. I will only say this: that America cannot afford to have an economic downturn. And I will add this: that the cost of the downturn already in our economy will add up to more than the total cost of a foreign aid bill and all the school construction that this nation needs.

As a matter of fact, at present rates the economy is slipping at the annual average of \$7 billion.

Now, that is almost two years of military assistance in foreign aid, and this is a victory for the Soviets if this recession continues. One of the ways to win this cold war, and one of the ways to advance the cause of freedom everywhere, is to keep the American economy vital, vigorous and expanding, and this Administration has failed to do that.

This Administration has been one that has been willing to ignore what were the developments on the international scene, and to be comfortable about the developments on the

o5

domestic scene.

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, are you disturbed about the continued high cost of living at a time when we have quite a good deal of unemployment?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Of course I am disturbed, and I imagine the people are most disturbed, Mr. Haakinson, are the people without jobs.

MR. PIERPOINT: Doesn't the farm surplus and the high prices that we are paying for food lend itself to that, and what would you do about the farm surplus?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You know, you and I didn't work out this question ahead of time, but you surely have been nice to me. I want to thank you.

MR. PIERPOINT: I didn't mean to be.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I know you didn't, but do you realize that the retail price of food has gone up but one per cent since 1951? Are you aware, Mr. Pierpoint, that the American consumer spends less of his dollar for food than any other consumer in the world, and that food in the United States is cheaper than any other place in the world?

Are you aware of the fact -- yes, it is, -- are you aware of the fact that the farm prices at the producer level have dropped 20 per cent since 1951?

MR. NOVINS: Senator, could I have a chance to --

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I could give you many more other

06

statistics. In fact, the consumer in America has been benefited by farm production, and even farm surpluses. That has kept the price up.

MR. NOVINS: Senator, let me have a chance at not being nice to you.

Why aren't the Democrats, many of them, supporting the President's request for reciprocal trade, when it has been traditionally a part of the Democratic platform?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I predict a majority of the Democrats will support this extension, and I say if they don't, they will live to rue the day.

The traditional position of our party has been one of relaxing trade barriers, reducing tariffs, removing quotas, and other artificial impediments to the free flow of commerce. I support reciprocal trade.

I think you need reciprocal trade for at least a five-year period to give some stability to our negotiations, and I don't support it out of any ideological liberalism, as such, but on a very pragmatic and proper and businesslike basis. We had a trade balance last year of over \$8 billion in our favor, and I submit that a large number of workers and capital is tied up or are tied up in the creation of that trade balance.

MR. HAAKINSON: Senator, this is an election year.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, sir.

o7

MR. HAAKINSON: Most of the elections since the last regular elections have favored the Democrats. What do you see upcoming?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Haakinson, I think it is fair to say that since 1954 the political tides have been running in favor of the Democrats. I believe the elections in New York City, in New Jersey, the municipal elections in Ohio, and the elections in the First Minnesota District, proved it. I predict in '58 a landslide victory for the Democratic Party.

MR. HAAKINSON: What about 1960?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: That is a long ways off, but if things continue as they are, and I expect that they shall, politically, I think you will see a new occupant in the White House that will be a Democrat.

MR. PIERPOINT: Would it possibly be yourself? Would you be a candidate in 1960?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You are very convincing, Mr. Pierpoint.

MR. NOVINS: You are easily convinced, Senator.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I wouldn't want to depend on that.

MR. MADIGAN: You announced very early for Vice President in '56.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You saw what happened, too, didn't you, Mr. Madigan.

MR. MADIGAN: Who do you back right now for the Democratic nomination - Jack Kennedy?

o8

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Madigan, you ask the finest questions and give wonderful answers, but in this instance may I say we have much good talent, many fine people in our party, both in gubernatorial posts in and out of Congress.

MR. HAAKINSON: How about naming a few?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Really, it is a joy to see that a political party has within its midst or its confines the array of leadership which we are able to offer.

MR. HAAKINSON: How about naming a few?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Haakinson, you are the reporter, and I think so much of my colleagues I don't want to leave any out that are deserving, and I surely wouldn't want to add any in that some of you gentlemen hadn't thought about. So I am going to just let you think about that.

MR. NOVINS: Senator Humphrey, we are going to have to think about it from now on, because our time has run out on this program, but thanks very much, indeed, for coming here to FACE THE NATION.

And thanks also to today's panel of newsmen:

To Edwin Haakinson, of the Associated Press;

Robert Pierpoint, of CBS News; and

John Madigan, of the Chicago American.

This is Stuart Novins.

We invite you to join us again next week at this same time for another edition of our program, when our guest will

o9 be the United States Ambassador to the U. N., Henry Cabot Lodge.

Our program today originated in Washington.

--- --

Produced by Ted Ayers.

Associate producer, Bill Robin.

--- --



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