

FOR: NATIONAL BROADCASTING COMPANY

PROGRAM	NBC Election Debate	STATION	WRC-TV and NBC-TV Network
DATE	October 29, 1962 9:00 P.M.	CITY	Washington, D.C.

ELECTION DEBATE

Participants: Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, D.-Minn.
Senator Hugh Scott (R.-Pa.)
Moderator: Edwin Newman
Panel: NBC correspondents

THE PARTICIPANTS WERE SEEN ON THE TV SCREEN.

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott, will you begin, please. You have four minutes for your opening statement."

SCOTT: "Ladies and gentlemen, as we go to the polls and I hope that all of you will, one of the great issues before you will be that of party and individual responsibility. I am quite proud of the fact that my party has acquitted itself so well in the whole field of domestic and foreign affairs from this standpoint of a responsible party, as occurred recently in Cuba, and an issue incidentally which the Republican Party wholeheartedly supports the action of the President.

"Republicans, when in power, were responsible in foreign affairs--for example, Guatemala, Quemoy, Matsu, and in various parts of the world, where crisis arose, and particularly in the landings in Lebanon. The Republicans in domestic policy during this administration have shown their responsibility by furnishing to the administration support badly needed in votes in both the House and in the Senate on many important measures, including the satellite communication bill, the worker retraining program, the tax revision bill, the UN bond issue, the TV educational television issue, and so on.

"In foreign affairs, the Republicans, in my judgment, would have handled differently such issues as the Berlin Wall, the Laos surrender in effect to the Communists, and the Cuban situation. We have, leading up to the Cuban decision, been responsible from the beginning and for nearly two months have been urging blockade of Cuba, the calling in instant session of the Organization of

American States, and were first to call for a boycott and blacklist of shipping to Cuba, which later occurred. I am very proud to say that personally, as far back as the beginning of September, I was pointing out the Soviet plans to erect missile bases, which would take considerably longer than 60 days to erect, and that I then called for a blockade and called for the Organization of American States to meet.

"The Republicans have demonstrated their responsibility in spite of the fact that they have been severely condemned by such phrases as 'rash' and 'intemperate' and 'would-be admirals and generals', and my friend Senator Humphrey, the Majority Whip, as recently as the 18th of October, I believe, condemned us in Minnesota by such phrases as 'jingoists' and 'corn field generals' and 'trigger-happy' and he said that the only people who wanted a blockade were those over 65 with hardening of the arteries and in most cases with Congressional immunity. This on the 18th of October, although the President in his message of the 22nd, referred back to the previous Tuesday, the 16th, as the time at which they had had hard information concerning the missile bases in Cuba.

"I don't think we deserve those epithets. I think the people of this country can trust the Republican Party for their loyal support to their President, for being well ahead of him, and in keeping with and in having to set the climate of public opinion in this country so that when the President heard what the people were saying he returned to Washington and acted, and his actions are admirable, and we thoroughly support them."

NEWMAN: "Thank you, Senator Scott. Senator Humphrey, your opening statement, please."

HUMPHREY: "My fellow Americans, we've just gone through one of the most crucial and fateful weeks of our national existence. This week has placed upon the American people heavy and hard decisions and particularly upon our President. I'm sure that it reminds us that the privilege and the duty of casting a vote on election day is indeed a great privilege, and one that we will want to fulfill, as we stand confronting the totalitarian menace and the Communist imperialism, so I first appeal to every American, whatever your political persuasion, whether you be Democrat or Republican, to exercise that ballot, the right of the ballot.

"I believe that our President during these past days, President Kennedy, has demonstrated brilliant statesmanship. His timing in terms of the decisions that were made relating to Cuba is beyond question. He did not yield to the temptation of premature action. He waited until the evidence was in to demonstrate unqualifiedly and unmistakably that in Cuba there was a Soviet military offensive capability. And it was around that one issue of the Soviet military offensive capability that we were able to unite our allies--indeed people all over the world

and of course the members of the Organization of American States. Had the President yielded to the cries of others to take action earlier, when the evidence was not there, when the material and information that he had to present to questioning people, governments, was not there, we might very well have ended without allies, without friends, and indeed with great trouble.

"The President therefore executed an act of statesmanship and diplomacy that has placed America on the initiative, and has earned for him the commendation and the thanks and the appreciation of freedom-loving people throughout the world, and people who long for a just peace. The Soviet Union has been stopped. Its plans for penetration of the Western Hemisphere have been stopped, and the United States is once again the leader for freedom, for peace in the world.

"Now these past two years America has grown stronger, stronger internationally, stronger politically, stronger domestically, stronger economically and socially. Now let me demonstrate the facts of that growing strength. First of all, we are stronger militarily than ever before since World War II in the mobility of our forces, in the missile power, in the striking power of our forces. We've demonstrated that these last few days. We're stronger in space, over 200 per cent. We're stronger in terms of our Alliance for Progress with Latin America, our expanded Peace Corps, our expanded Food for Peace Program, our foreign aid program, and many other activities--in our NATO Alliance, for example.

"And on the home front we're much stronger economically. We've had an expansion of our Gross National Product of over 11 per cent. Unemployment is down 16 per cent. Corporate profits, business, up 28 per cent. And your own personal net income, on a nationwide average, up 10 per cent. Now these are the facts. Add to that an additional billion dollars of farm income. We've passed legislation in the field of housing, area redevelopment, minimum wage, social security, and above all in the field of foreign trade--possibly the most historic act of this administration. The President has had a good record in Congress, and a brilliant record in the international field."

NEWMAN: "Thank you, Senator Humphrey..."

SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D.-MINN.) AND SENATOR HUGH SCOTT (R.-PA.) WERE SEEN ON THE TV SCREEN AS THEY WERE INTERVIEWED BY NBC NEWSMEN.

EDWIN NEWMAN: "The first question is for Senator Scott and it is to be asked by Robert McCormick."

MCCORMICK: "Well, Senator, putting together what you and Senator Humphrey have just said about Cuba, it is an undoubted fact that you and Senator Keating and many other Republicans were talking about missile bases in Cuba weeks ago. I remember Senator Keating specifically discussed it on the floor of the Senate on October 10, and yet the President said he got his first definite information on October 16. How do you explain this discrepancy and can anybody explain it to the American voter? That a Republican Senator from New York should have more information than the President?"

SCOTT: "Well, I think the administration blames in on what they characterize as rumors, but about September 13 Dean Rusk, in a briefing before a congressional committee, said that they had great confidence in their intelligence, and indicated that weapons of considerable importance were coming into Cuba at that time. Now our information came from many sources, some of which must remain confidential, but they came from within the government, and they came from Cuban refugees, they came from rebels in the Cuban hills, and they came, I'd say, particularly from sources in a position to know within the government.

"So as early as the 6th of September, I stated that the Russian program for the construction of missile bases had begun. I issued a public statement to the administration to tell us what the range of those bases were, and the progress of the work, and I further pointed out that there were over 100 Mig jets in the country which were quite capable of being converted by the addition of a bomb rack to carrying a hydro-nuclear weapon.

"We also pointed out a great deal of other information; we got no answer whatever except certain private calls to say they wished we wouldn't talk about it. Now I'm sure the administration had the benefit of the same information that we did. They undertook evidently to downgrade it, but I would think it would raise this question: if they did not have this information, something was very wrong with out intelligence. If they did have the information, they differed as a matter of policy as to how soon we could avoid serious trouble down there, and in my judgment these bases have been in existence quite a long time--the action could have been taken much earlier--but once taken we have no choice but to support the President."

NEWMAN: "Senator Humphrey, you have a minute and a half to reply to that."

HUMPHREY: "Well, I'm going to place my trust in the President of the United States, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the other officials that advise the President on these highly delicate and sensitive matters of what we call intelligence or relation or the facts relating to a potential enemy."

"Now every one of us as Senators received letters and communications from people who say I know this and I know that, but I must say that before I would take the word of an exile or a refugee or an individual, I would surely want to compare it to what is the available official information of this government. I have no reason to believe that my President would tell me something that wasn't true, and I have no reason to believe that the Director of Central Intelligence would tell me something that was not true, and the President and the Director of Central Intelligence have said, quite unmistakably, that there was no ascertainable demonstrative evidence as to offensive weapons or weapons of offensive capability until October 15."

"Now we did have missiles of what we call the SAM site missiles, that is, the surface to air missile, 25 mile missile, but those are not the offensive capability missile, but when Soviet power was moved into Cuba of an offensive nature, as the President said on September 13, he took whatever action was appropriate and necessary."

NEWMAN: "Sander Vanocur, your question for Senator Humphrey."

VANOCUR: "Senator, when the President was campaigning, his theme was elect more Democrats. Now since the Congress, and this is particularly true of the House, is in the hands of Southern Democrats, who are generally opposed to the President's programs--indeed you find yourself voting more often with Senator Scott than you find yourself voting with a lot of Southern Democrats--what difference does it really make if more Democrats are elected if control of the Congress--and this is an important control, as you know--remains in the hands of Southern Democrats who are opposed to President Kennedy?"

HUMPHREY: "Well, Mr. Vanocur, I would appreciate and I do appreciate every vote that Senator Scott gives to us. I only wish his record were just a little bit better, but we're grateful for what he's done. I must add however that while a number of Southern Democrats are in charge of committees, that they have not all opposed the President's program. For example, we take a man like Representative Mills, who is in charge of the Ways and Means Committee. He did a great task in the foreign trade act. Well now, the important Presidential measures. I would point out also that on some of the crucial legislation before us, the big legislation, that we had a stern Republican opposition, and that stern and organized Republican opposition did not offer us alternatives. They offered us obstruction--they said no. Now they had with them, and it is a fact--we just as well be candid with each other--there is a little group in the Republican Party called liberals that vote frequently with the administration. There is a small group in the Democratic Party called conservatives and they generally vote with Republicans.

"But the overwhelming majority of Democrats follow President Kennedy--that is, the majority of Democrats. We need their help, and we need additional help, because regrettably on some of these issues we've won by only one or two votes, and that is not enough to guarantee, may I say, the additional strength that this country needs. Now when I find, for example, that 85 per cent of the members of the House voted against the housing act--of the Republican members--I don't think we can rely on Republican help. When I find that 70-some per cent of the members of the House voted against area redevelopment, I don't think you can rely on Republican help. Now when I find that in measure after measure, the overwhelming majority of the Republicans have opposed us, I don't believe that we can satisfy ourselves by saying that because my friend Senator Scott has occasionally given us a vote we ought to be happy.

"What we need are more Democrats that are pledged to President Kennedy's program, pledged to the Democratic program, to bring this country along stronger, that will aid in economic development, that will help us to continue the attack on unemployment, that will help us with our problems of the city, help us with our problems of education, and I say that we've

got a better chance of getting these jobs done if we have Democrats that are pledged to the President; and I know of no better way of helping the President, since everyone seems to like him so well now, than to support Democrats."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott, your rebuttal."

SCOTT: "Well, I can't help being curious as to why the President wants more Democrats--he asked for the Democrats he got. In the South he asked for them, in the North he asked for them, and I think to give the President more Democrats is to give him more punishment than the President deserves or that the country could endure. For example, on the satellite program, when there was an attempt by Northern Democrats for 22 days delaying the country business, by trying to jam the Telstar and other programs--it was 36 Republicans out of 36 who supported the President. I wonder what the President could do with more? Let it be remembered that the Southern Democrats filibustered in January, and the Northern Democrats filibustered in July, and therefore does the President want Democrats who will vote with him--does he want Democrats who will vote against him--does he want Democrats who will filibuster against him? I suggest that again the Republican Party is the party of responsibility because it has never in the history of the party, so far as I'm aware, delayed legislation by organized efforts to prevent a debate, so the Republican Party has never filibustered and if you don't like filibusters, then the Republicans should be supported."

"Now when the Republicans voted against the President, they did it not because the legislation was good, but because they had been home, when many administration people were running around the country aimlessly, they had been home and they had heard what the people wanted."

NEWMAN: "I must cut you off there, Senator, I'm sorry. Merrill Mueller, your question for Senator Scott."

MUELLER: "Senator Scott, tax reform is a vital issue, not just nationally but in many of the states across the nation, including some of the most powerful. There's a feeling that too much cash is being tied up in moving to and from Washington, and it would have more of an impact on the economy if it was handled locally. Have you, the Republicans, got a tax reform plan to bring up in the next Congress, or are you merely going to wait to amend the administration's promised reforms?"

SCOTT: "It's my understanding that since we all know tax reforms begin in the Ways and Means Committee of the House that the Republican leadership, including Representative Barnes of Wisconsin and Curtis of Missouri, will be prepared to submit a Republican constructive alternative to the tax revision measures--that it will be based in part upon seeking to return some sources of revenue to the states, and I cannot tell you the ones because I'm not on the committee. It will also seek to reduce excessive

spending, so as to make a genuine tax cut useful and to encourage individual initiative. I would expect that this would be done, and I would expect that if it is done, it would have a great appeal, and I point out that the Democratic Congress this time passed a so-called tax reform measure originally designed to save \$800 million, and when they were through with it, it ended up by costing the taxpayers \$200 million more."

NEWMAN: "Senator Humphrey, your rebuttal."

HUMPHREY: "First I would say that the tax reform bill that the Democratic Congress passed was a constructive tax bill. It was a bill that aided American enterprise, and along with the accelerated depreciation schedule, that was announced by the Treasury Department, the greatest single incentive for investment capital for American business in the last ten years was offered to American business and American management. The investment tax credit of 7 per cent was designed to stimulate American business, and it has--it's beginning to take hold already. The same thing was true of the accelerated depreciation schedule. We did close many loopholes in that tax reform bill, and we provided for a better method and a more sure method of collection on interest and on dividends.

"Now next year we're going to have to review the tax program in light of the international obligations of this country, its defense needs and its business needs, and I'm delighted to hear that the Republicans may have an alternative program for a change, because during this past session of the Congress, they have not presented alternatives--they have presented opposition.

"But then too I'm a bit intrigued by the fact that my Republican friend says they are going to cut spending, because that's what they said when they had Dwight Eisenhower as President, and we in the Democratic Congress, during President Eisenhower's administration, repeatedly cut his budgets. Had we had the Eisenhower budgets added on each time, spending would have been decidedly more."

NEWMAN: "Elie Abel, your question to Senator Humphrey, please."

ELIE ABEL: "Senator Humphrey, just a few days before President Kennedy's quarantine speech, his Special Assistant on National Security Affairs, said in public that we had absolutely no evidence of offensive weapons going into Cuba. On the 15th or 16th, the magic day on which the administration says it had the first information, I was one of several hundred newsmen, commentators and so forth who were told by highly placed officials of this administration that the administration had all the facts, that an embargo was a bad idea, and so forth. Was all this part of an elaborate deception or are we to believe that the information about these missiles in Cuba was discovered overnight?"

HUMPHREY: "Mr. Abel, it surely was not an elaborate deception. I've talked to the President of the United States about this, and to our top officials, as have many other leaders in the Congress. I am going to believe the President, and I am going to believe the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, who's not a Democrat, who is a conservative gentleman, a man of great honor and patriotism.

"It is a fact, and by the way this week's Time Magazine has pictures of--for example, a particular area in Cuba on the date of September 5th--nothing but green grass, a plain, so to speak. And then comes along in October, on the 16th of October, and there is a missile site. These were mobile missiles--they could be moved in quickly--actually no intermediate range missiles, the 2200 mile missile, has been made operational. It is a fact that on the 15th day of October, the President of the United States was informed that there was information by our intelligence agency that indicated a rapid buildup of missiles of offensive capability in Cuba. And on the 16th day of October, that information was verified.

"Furthermore, there was additional verification, and the President withheld any public announcement of this because we were attempting at that time to get additional verification to move troops, to plan our diplomacy, to plan the moves that were made, and may I say that America has never witnessed a more brilliant stroke of statesmanship, of maneuver, of diplomacy, of the use of power, and of the use of power for peaceful settlement and for honorable settlement than we've witnessed these past few days. I don't think the President has anything to apologize for. He acted on the basis of fact, and he had to. He could not afford to act intemperately, he could not afford to act emotionally, or on the basis of impetuosity. As the leader of this country and of the free world, our President has to remember, and he does remember, that his every word, his every action, his every deed, affects the lives of millions of people, and before this President--President Kennedy--could go to the American people and to the world, he had to know that what he was saying was based upon the central principle of fact of Soviet military capability in this hemisphere, and it was around that central principle that unity came between ourselves and our allies, that unity came between ourselves and the Organization of American States. I think that the success of the President's maneuver speaks better than any words of mine."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott."

SCOTT: "The press generally, as has been pointed out here, certainly believed after the briefings of October 17 and October 18 that no invasion of Cuba would occur, and they certainly were told that in the briefings. Senator Humphrey obviously believed it himself, because on the 18th he was severely criticizing those of us who were still strongly demanding a blockade, and that's when he called us trigger-happy and jingoists, so I wonder why Senator Humphrey, as the Deputy Majority Leader of the Senate, wasn't told."

"Moreover, on October 15, as Senator Humphrey has said, the President was aware of a rapid buildup of Soviet missiles. Now we are asked to believe that that rapid buildup occurred in just seven days, from the 15th to the 22nd, when the President spoke. I worked on construction gangs myself; I've seen that picture--there's old earth, new earth, and middle-sized, middle-aged earth in there--and in my judgment and the judgment of many people that base had been working on--had been worked on for over a month, perhaps six weeks at the time."

"But what alarms me about the whole thing is that the administration still seems concerned about impressing the American people with the fact it was newly discovered knowledge. I think they could trust us; we're for them whatever they do, as long as they've done it, so we could afford the truth."

NEWMAN: "Sander Vanocur, a question for Senator Scott."

VANOCUR: "Senator Scott, the Republican Congressional Committee said the other day that the President's action on Cuba was deliberately timed to influence the election. Do you associate yourself with this accusation?"

SCOTT: "Mr. Vanocur, I myself would not for one minute impute to the President of the United States the timing of anything which involved seeing the sons of American parents endangered by war or invasion or blockade for a political motivation. I have been discussing either the lack of intelligence on the part of the administration, or the decision by the administration to delay in the face of the intelligence, and I simply cannot believe that this action had the political overtones of trying to win an election. I think the issues in the election are pretty well set--the Republicans come off very well in their loyal support of the President and their responsibility. The Democrats come off well because they too loyally support the President, so we go back to the local issues, then the other domestic issues, and foreign."

NEWMAN: "Senator Humphrey, your rebuttal."

HUMPHREY: "Yes, indeed. Republican leaders publicly pronounced that they loyally support the President, but on Friday, October 26, the Republican Congressional Committee, member of Congress Mr. Wilson, authored a document which disputes that very claim, by pointing out that this was neatly timed, this Cuban statement of the President, for the elections, by contesting even the validity of certain facts that were given by the President of the United States. The Republican Congressman in the Minnesota 5th District said that this was a manufactured crisis for political purposes.

"I've heard these comments far too often. Now I hear today, for example, tonight, that we're to be told that this wasn't a rapid build-up, that there was information ahead of time. Now the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency tells us that the missile and rocket buildup of the medium range missile and the intermediate range missile was a rapid buildup in Cuba. I do not think that Republican spokesmen add to the credibility of the President's statements or of the Director of Central Intelligence by saying that it couldn't be done as quickly because I worked on a construction gang.

"The fact is that the mobile missiles were moved in and they were moved in quickly and the intelligence agencies were not at fault."

(PAUSE FOR STATION IDENTIFICATION)

ROBERT McCORMICK: "Senator Humphrey, the Republicans in Alabama and some other states are campaigning as all-out segregationists. In Georgia, however, they're campaigning as desegregationists. Doesn't this mean that the Republican Party will be just as schizophrenic on race matters, as the Democratic Party is--or put it less impudently--what does it forbode for racial relations in the South, politically speaking?"

SEN. HUMPHREY: "Well, regrettably, the race relations problem is one of our most difficult problems in America today, and I say that this is a matter that requires the attention of every thoughtful American, to see that it is resolved with full equal opportunity, and equal protection under the laws for every American, regardless of race, color and creed.

"It is a fact, of course, that some Democrats in the South have fully embraced the segregationist policy. But it is also a fact that the declared policy of the President and of the United States, and of the Democratic Party, as a national party, and of the leaders of the Democratic Party in Cabinet, and of the leaders of the Democratic Party in the Congress of the United States, is that we will abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court relating to desegregation, and not only abide by them, we applaud them, and support them. And furthermore, that we will take action at the administrative level, and at the legislative level, to implement civil rights and civil liberties or human rights, and this we've done.

"In this recent Congress, we passed for example, the amendment, the Constitutional amendment to repeal the poll tax. The administration has made more appointments on the basis of just competence and ability, without regard for race, than any other previous administration--more Negro appointments, to put it frankly. Furthermore, the Justice Department has in the period of 16 months, entered 19 lawsuits in the federal courts to enforce voting rights. This is twice as many as was entered the preceding three years under the Republican administration. It seems to me that this is a record that commends itself at least as a sincere effort on the part of the Kennedy Democratic administration, to have the full protection of the law for every citizen."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott, your rebuttal."

SCOTT: "Well, Mr. McCormick's question points out a single variance between two states only, but the Democrats have lived with this variance throughout history, and notably in this century, the southern Democrats are facing one way; the northern Democrats

are facing another. Civil rights legislation was deferred entirely, except for the poll tax Constitutional amendment, which a great many Republicans supported. The Senator knows how hard I worked for it. Not only that, the literacy test, backed strongly by Republicans was defeated by a filibuster which the Senate majority was unable to prevent. The housing executive order, which was supposed to have abolished discrimination in housing by a stroke of the pen--as the President said when campaigning--confronts us with the fact that the pen has never stroked. And civil rights legislation can never--and I repeat--never, never, never be enacted in a Democratic Congress, because of this hopeless schism between the northern and the southern Democratic wings. And the real reason there was no real attempt at such a decision this time was because it was said that there was more important legislation, and they would put aside the civil rights legislation.

"I don't think there can be more important legislation than to protect the dignity and the rights of human beings."

NEWMAN: "Elie Abel, a question for Senator Scott, please."

ABEL: "Senator, more than once, during the period between 1953 and 1960, members of your party in the House and the Senate kicked over the traces, went against the administration, or threatened to, on the matter of foreign aid to communist countries. On every occasion that I can think of, when President Eisenhower appealed for support on this issue. He managed to get most of your party in line, and you voted in favor of giving him the necessary discretion to extend--in his judgment, when the national interest was furthered by it. How is it that when a Democratic President makes the same request, in essentially the same language, so many members of your party in both houses, refuse to give him that discretion?"

SCOTT: "Well, Mr. Abel, in the first place, under President Eisenhower, as under President Kennedy, Republicans--many of them have refused to accept the original administration bill on foreign aid. There were, to my recollection, a number of instances where the foreign aid program was cut by 500 million, and almost a billion on one occasion, and cut because of protests that some of this money was going to neutrals, or to communist-oriented countries. I think the party is quite consistent; we supported a foreign aid program this time of billions of dollars, but we did save the American people nearly one billion dollars and partly because we did not believe that foreign aid U. S. money should go to communist Yugoslavia, or communist Poland. We were told that we ought to watch out for the Polish-American vote, as the Democrats were

doing. But the head of the government in exile in London, of the Polish people, (Stanislav Mikolajic?) begged the Congress, before the bill was passed not to help--not to vote this aid to communist Poland because it would go to the elite of the communist top leaders, it would go as bribes to certain people, and to the army. And so I think we're quite consistent in our reluctance to see American taxpayers' money go to communists. And I think those who do vote for it, to go to communist countries, are thoroughly patriotic Americans, but very, very gullible."

NEWMAN: "Senator Humphrey?"

HUMPHREY: "Well I don't believe that President Eisenhower is very gullible. I believe that President Eisenhower is a great man and a great General, and he was a good President. He had differences with the Congress, and surely some of us had differences with him. But President Eisenhower recommended aid to Poland and Yugoslavia, and he got it. And may I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that most of the aid that's been given to Poland and Yugoslavia, the communist countries, was given under a Republican administration, at the request of a Republican President."

"This year the President of the United States asked for a continuation of that same authority, when he found it in the national interest, vital to our national security, to be able to extend aid--economic aid and food aid to Yugoslavia and Poland. Republicans overwhelmingly voted to kill that request, I regret to say. They did to President Kennedy what they did not do to President Eisenhower. I think it shows their obstruction."

"And now just let me correct the record on one other item. My friend from Pennsylvania says that you can't pass civil rights legislation in a Democratic Congress. May I remind this Senator from Pennsylvania that the only civil rights legislation that's ever passed a Congress in 87 years, in almost 100 years, was passed in the Congress in 1957 and 1960, both Democratically controlled Congresses--and again in 1962, with the poll tax amendment."

NEWMAN: "Merrill Mueller, a question for Senator Humphrey."

MUELLER: "Senator Humphrey, the nation's farmers appear to be strongly against the total regimentation of the administration's original agricultural program, the Freeman program. But, as the recent referendums have shown, they will marginally accept programs of voluntary controls. In view of this, do you expect the

administration to try again for the Kennedy-Freeman program next year, or write an entirely new one?"

HUMPHREY: "Well, first of all, the Kennedy-Freeman program in its main features has already been adopted by the Congress of the United States. It was not just a price support program, nor was it just a program exercising controls over production--what is called managed abundance. It was a program of land use. It was a program of conservation; it was a program of improvement of agricultural income; it was an expansion of the farmer's home administration, the farm credit program. Regrettably, many people have interpreted the farm program as having but two features--what are you going to do about wheat, and what are you going to do about feed grains?"

"Well, let me say about wheat first. That section of the Freeman, or the Kennedy-Freeman program, the Democratic program, was adopted overwhelmingly by the Congress. It is accepted and supported by the farmers. It will increase agricultural income. The feed grain section that was originally presented was rejected, but the voluntary program that was originally presented in 1961 by President Kennedy, and Secretary Freeman, which was opposed by 80 per cent of the Republicans in 1961, was adopted in the 1962 law. And I watched Republican after Republican get up and praise the feed grain program, the very one that they tried to kill in 1961. Now that feed grain program alone added one billion dollars of net income to American agriculture, the first improvement in farm income in eight years. Furthermore, it reduced government surpluses by several million tons of feed grains, and it cut the costs of government storage by over a half a billion dollars.

"I submit that the American people want a farm program that's going to reduce the cost to the taxpayer that's going to help the farmer with his income, that's going to bring these surpluses within manageable proportions, and that is going to give American agricultural producers an opportunity for a better living. This is the nature and the outline of the administration farm program which today is receiving overwhelming support amongst farm producers, and the program was designed primarily for farm producers and to aid--if I might add--the people, the business community, the man on Main Street, where the farmer comes to spend his cash. I think the administration farm program will go down as one of its great successes."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott."

SCOTT: "Well, I take the word of Senator Aiken, the ranking minority member of Agriculture, when he pointed out at the time that the farm program would demoralize the milk producers, would seriously damage cotton exports, would be very damaging to the soy bean crop, would increase the cost of feed grains; would

increase the cost of bread by one cent a loaf to the housewife, that it would help some western farmers in 1963, but the axe would fall on them in '64; and I am glad that at least we knocked out the program under which dairy farmers would go to jail for not answering--for not complying with certain regulations.

"Now to return to some things I hadn't had a chance to rebut. In the 1957 and 1960 civil rights bill, were introduced by President Eisenhower, the bills were introduced by his Attorney General, and until President Eisenhower, there were no civil rights bills introduced. On the question of obstructionism of the Republicans, I point out that Republicans voted against three and eight-tenths billions of dollars proposed by a prominent Democratic spokesman in the Congress, and I'm glad they did. And I point out too, on the question of politics, that Senator Humphrey a few days ago said that in his opinion, Cuban developments helped the Democrats in their election. And that doesn't sit well with his statement that there should be no politics in the Cuban affair."

NEWMAN: "Robert McCormick, a question for Senator Scott."

McCORMICK: "Senator Scott, do you think the Republicans are in any trouble, in connection with the President's Medicare program?"

SCOTT: "I think the Republicans have the best of that issue, because in the first place, the Medicare program would only provide 25 per cent of one's hospitalization. It provided no care by your own doctor, by your own surgeon. It did not meet the terrible problem of catastrophic illness. It would add to the cost of Social Security 17 per cent, and if you'll take the working period of a young man, starting, let's say, in 1925, he would pay total Social Security taxes, including this added increment of 17 per cent, over his 40 working years, when he reached 65, he will have paid in over \$4,000. Yet the average period of illness of a person over 65 works out at about between seven and nine days a year. And all this against their stories--I've heard kinds of stories like Medicare will cost you a cent a day, or 25 cents a week. The true fact is that Medicare, plus the other Social Security, will add a great burden."

"Whereas the Republican proposal is for a voluntary bill which will permit your own physician and your own doctors--it provides for catastrophic illness, and it meets the problems of hospitalization and extended care in home; it's a better bill, and unlike the King-Anderson bill, is not compulsory, and unlike the King-Anderson bill, applies to everyone, and is available to them, and doesn't merely attempt to provide aid to those who need it least. And those who need it most have to contribute to the cost of paying for those

who don't need it at all."

NEWMAN: "Senator Humphrey."

HUMPHREY: "First I would like to correct the record. Senator Humphrey has never made a political statement about the Cuban issue. I did not say that Cuba would help Democrats. I think President Kennedy has helped humanity. I think his statesmanship has helped humanity live, and it has relieved us, at least for the temporary period, and I hope for a long time to come, from the specter of nuclear holocaust. This is my concern about it."

"And let me say a word about so-called Medicare. The Republican spokesman has already told you that it doesn't affect doctors, and that's right. Your free choice of doctor is still your American privilege. And under the so-called administration hospital and health care program, your free choice of hospital is also guaranteed. You don't have to take the oath of poverty and be assigned to a county or a state hospital. You are entitled as an American citizen, by right of law, to go to the hospital of your choice, for 90 days' hospitalization, 180 days of nursing home care, and 240 home visits, and also diagnostic clinical services. The cost--\$12.00 a year, \$6.00 to the employer, \$6.00 to the employee. Why do we advocate it? Because when people grow older, they have a higher incidence of illness, and when they're over 65, they remain twice as long in a hospital. And every American family knows that this is a serious burden to the American family. And the medical--the hospital program, I believe, represents a humane approach to one of our most serious problems of today."

NEWMAN: "And Sander Vanocur, a question for Senator Humphrey."

VANOCUR: "Senator, a follow-up to the question on Medicare. Medicare could not even get out of a Democratic House Ways & means committee. When the Senate tried to bring this bill up, it was a Democratic Senator, a member of the Senate Democratic leadership and a close friend of the President, Senator Smathers, who cast the defeating vote. Now, does the President want support from the Democrats like he got from Senator Smathers? Does he want these kind of Democrats elected? I return to this question, what difference does it make if more Democrats get elected?"

HUMPHREY: "Well, I think the difference is rather obvious, because the vast majority of the Republicans, over 80 per cent of them, oppose the so-called Medicare program, the hospital and nursing home care program. I believe we received five votes from the Republicans, if I'm not mistaken, out of their 35 members of the Congress. We're entitled, on the basis of the facts, to more,

because the program is a bipartisan program. Its co-sponsor was Senator Javits in the Senate, of New York. Now, as far as the House Ways and Means Committee is concerned. Mr. Vanocur, that committee was loaded this year with tax legislation, with legislation relating to the foreign trade bill, and frankly did not have the time for full consideration of a complex measure, such as the Medicare program. The President, however, has said, let's take this to the country, and we're taking it to the country. We received 48 votes in the United States Senate for it, and 43 of those, as I recall it, or 44, were Democratic votes.

"This was over two-thirds of the Democratic majority, and we want more Democrats that are going to support Medicare. In fact, we'll have Republicans that will support Medicare. We ask our Republicans to help us, because this program is sensible, it's constructive, I think it's responsible. It is advance pre-payment, social insurance; it is under the true and tried, tested system of Social Security. It represents an approach, a ways and a means to approach the serious problems of health care of our elderly citizens. The larger percentage of our population will be age 65 and over. We must come to grips with this problem.

"And by the way, the administration program did not abolish Group Health, or Blue Shield or Blue Cross, or other private insurance programs. Indeed, to the contrary, it included them and provided for administration of this program through such programs as Blue Cross. I believe that we have a good program and what we need now is a full discussion of it in this campaign. We're getting that discussion, and I'm convinced that many a member of Congress will be elected or defeated on the basis of what he proposes to do about this growing problem and issue in this country of the hospital and nursing home and health care of our senior citizens, health care that is costly, health care that drains resources, and health care that can be paid for honestly and legitimately under Social Security."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott."

SCOTT: "Well, I note first of all that Senator Humphrey says that you can keep the Blue Cross, but of course if you're under the Social Security program, you keep the Blue Cross all right, provided you're willing to pay twice for your health care. This would be double payment for substantially the same health care, and he slides by that by saying it would be administered under Blue Cross, and that's quite a different thing, and he also does not tell you that the medicare cost is not free or it is not a very small sum of money like \$12. It provides for a deductible, just like you have a collision deductible of your

automobile policy, and you've got to pay \$90 for the first nine days, \$10 a day or if you're ill for 45 days, there's a provision that you pay \$20, and we had a better bill, and that's the important thing. I'm personally very concerned. I have been writing health bills and pushing them since 1947, and I have supported much health legislation, all of it except this bill, which simply didn't do the job. We're not against health care for older people, but we are for it to get the best possible bill and do it in the American way without this urge, this push for compulsion. And more on the general issue of obstruction, I point out, the Democratic chairman of the House and Senate voted 387 times against the administration."

NEWMAN: "I must stop you there, Senator, because that ends our questions. Now, each man is to have three and a half minutes for a closing statement. Senator Humphrey, would you begin, please?"

HUMPHREY: "Well, I'm hopeful, my fellow Americans, that this debate, or this discussion, between a Republican and a Democrat has been of some help to you. I've never been convinced that the debates alone provided the facts on all the issues, but at least it arouses the interest in the issues, and I ask you to take a good look at what has been said here tonight, to study it, and then to examine these issues carefully on the basis of your own information and come to your own conclusions. It seems to me that during this past week, we have witnessed what I call the strong leadership that America has longed for and asked for, the leadership that this country voted for when it elected President Kennedy to be the President of this nation. I repeat, it is a brilliant leadership, it is a firm leadership, without being arrogant.

"It is a resolute leadership without being belligerent, and it is a leadership that takes into consideration the facts of the nuclear age, nuclear power, of the space age, the fact that we have responsibilities, not only to ourselves, but to every human being on the face of this earth. And I know that there millions of mothers and fathers tonight that are eternally grateful that the President of the United States, who during this week has had tremendous problems before him and with which he's had to come to grips, that this President has been able to lead our country to the paths of honorable peace, and that he has not had to be the war leader, so to speak, but rather has been the peace leader. I can think of no greater honor that we can pay to those who have perished in the wars for our freedom on this Veteran's Day, November 11, than the fact that we have saved the lives of hundreds of thousands, possibly millions of people, by the art of diplomacy, by careful negotiation, by a President who thought every day and every hour, of how he could spare this nation and this world from the nuclear holocaust, and

at the same time preserve our honor, at the same time rid this hemisphere of Soviet penetration, and at the same time turn back the thrust of the communists and of Soviet power.

"My fellow Americans, we've had a great victory this week. We're going to have many more trials ahead of us, many, many more. We face yet the difficult problems in Berlin, in the Middle East, all over, but I submit to you that we're beginning to win this struggle for freedom. We're beginning to win it of course, in Western Europe, where the Common Market is a miracle of this decade. It is Mr. Khrushchev that's having the troubles these days. His own economy is wobbly. His agriculture is a failure. He's having difficulties amongst his own leadership. The Chinese and Soviet relationships are at the breaking point. Mr. Khrushchev hasn't won Africa. He hasn't won in Latin America. He hasn't even won in the Soviet Union, because Communism is a colossal failure, and freedom today as we express it is the hope of the world, and it has strong leadership, firm leadership in the President and backed by the Democratic Party."

NEWMAN: "Senator Scott, your closing statement, please."

SCOTT: "I listened very carefully, and it seems to me that all of the sentiments so warmly expressed and for the most part so justly expressed by Senator Humphrey could equally apply to the eight years of President Eisenhower. It's the responsibility of every President to keep the peace if he can, and to fight if he must, to preserve our freedom, and our concern is great as Americans, that this be done. I would point out that General Eisenhower has made this point repeatedly. But he has made some others. He says we have had a partial gain only--I'm paraphrasing him--he says that a promise of the Russians to withdraw a part of their arms only from a single base does not solve the whole problem, that the major threats remain, and he says for the Soviets, the partial pull-back is normal and broken promises are usual. Now, I also add on my own, that in guaranteeing Castro against invasion, we have seriously alarmed our South American neighbors and one Latin American diplomat so informed me this afternoon.

"We have prolonged the problem while we wait for Khrushchev to drop the other shoe, and it is to be noted that Khrushchev said that within the last few days, that after November the 6th, he will make certain demands in Berlin. He has said what they will be. He will demand that there be a peace treaty between the two Germanies, that Berlin be put under the United Nations, that the presence of Soviet troops in West Berlin be accepted as symbolic. He has said that he is going to recognize the East German Republic. And all of these things together are most ominous, because it cannot be believed that in having made a

concession, and to us a very important one, in Cuba, that Khrushchev will now turn around and feel that the cold war is over and that the Soviet has no resources. This is incredible, no one is asked to believe it. We have many perilous days ahead. We Republicans will continue to urge the President to be strong, and I hope we will continue to be as right as we were in the Cuban thing.

"Now, one correction, if--I did read just before I came on this program, a news release which said that Senator Humphrey had indicated that the Cuban developments would help the Democrats in this election, but if I'm wrong, I don't press the point, and if the Senator says he didn't say it, then he certainly didn't say it, but I'll show him the news release.

"Now, President Eisenhower has also pointed out that this administration and the citizens who will vote on it and vote to elect their people should not forget that the solution of a single problem does not bar them from choosing their candidates on all the other issues where the present administration has fallen short, and he has cited unemployment, continuing deficits and the implication that state participation in local projects depended not on the right of these states, but that federal doors will be open to members of one party and not to another. I rest on General Eisenhower's statement."

NEWMAN: "Thank you, Senator Scott; thank you, Senator Humphrey."



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