

Panel: ELIE ABEL, *NBC News*
JACK BELL, *Associated Press*
EARL MAZO, *New York Herald Tribune*
LAWRENCE E. SPIVAK, *Permanent Panel Member*

Moderator: NED BROOKS

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

MEET THE PRESS

MR. BROOKS: This is Ned Brooks inviting you to a special edition of MEET THE PRESS. Our two guests are Senator Hubert Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, and Senator Thruston Morton, Republican of Kentucky. Our time will be divided equally between them. By the toss of a coin it was determined that we will first interview Senator Humphrey. He is the assistant Democratic leader of the Senate and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Here is the first question from Lawrence E. Spivak, permanent member of the MEET THE PRESS PANEL.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Humphrey, there has been a good deal of debate as to what is going to be the most important domestic issue before this Congress. Will you give us your opinion on that?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: The most important I would say would be the health and hospital care for the elderly and possibly the tax bill.

MR. SPIVAK: What about civil rights? There have been reports that the Administration will not press for legislation on civil rights in this next Congress. Do you think they should?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think that there should be proposals introduced to strengthen the body of civil rights law.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, you and the Democratic Platform promised that the Kennedy Administration will support Federal legislation establishing a FEPC, a Federal Employment Practices Commission. Do you think this Congress should take that matter up?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think we have rather done well with it already at the Executive level through the Committee on Equal Opportunity, chaired by Vice President Johnson.

MR. SPIVAK: On the Executive level the President thus far has withheld his signature from a proposed Executive Order prohibiting racial bias in Federally aided housing. Do you think he ought to sign that order?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is a matter that is now under study. I believe that such an order or one of such a nature will be signed in due time after proper consultation with the building industry.

MR. MAZO: Senator, will you get a medical care bill passed this year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, we will, Mr. Mazo.

MR. MAZO: Both houses?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes. It will be a tough fight, but the people are for it. It makes good economic sense, and it is sound social policy. It will pass.

MR. MAZO: How about the business of the United Nations' bonds? Are we going to buy the \$100,000,000?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I think we will. It will be another scrap. There is a vicious attack on the UN these days, but the United States is not going to let the United Nations perish because of the lack of economic sustenance.

MR. MAZO: You've got rather heavy Democratic majorities in both houses, Senator. Last year you needed some Republicans, nevertheless, to pass some of the Administration's legislation. Is that going to be the case also this year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think so. I think we will have a good deal of support from our Republican colleagues, both in the Senate and in the House, particularly on some of the measures in the field of foreign policy, trade legislation and on tax policy.

MR. BELL: Senator, in connection with the trade negotiation authority the President is asking for, what is this going to do to the American farmer?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bell, you know that I have been deeply concerned over the negotiations that are taking place in what we call the Common Market area, the Inner-Six in Western Europe. I have been pressing on the representatives of our State Department, particularly upon Mr. Ball, who is an extremely able man, to make strong representations on behalf of American agriculture so there would be no discriminatory barriers set up to the importation of American agricultural products.

MR. BELL: Isn't that likely to happen? Isn't that what the actual objective of some of these negotiations in Europe is, to

shut out American products, to shut out, particularly, farm products?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I don't think that is the objective. I would say that in certain countries such as in Germany and in France, possibly in Belgium and Holland, there are certain price supports or protections that are very high that have been established for their local agricultural products. In the Common Market those are being leveled out. The question is, will there be barriers raised on the periphery to keep out American and other agricultural products? Our fight today is to see that nothing worse than the present situation prevails for the coming years and also to attempt to hold this whole area open for further negotiations to permit the lowering of tariffs, embargos and quotas on American agricultural products. I am very much for this.

MR. BELL: What are you going to do about it if they do shut us out?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: First of all, I don't think they are going to shut us out, and the reason I don't think they are going to shut us out is that they recognize that we are a great market for European products just as they are a great market for ours. We buy specialized food products from them, buy vast amounts of processed goods, industrial goods, so the Europeans are not about to cut off their own nose in an effort to have some temporary advantage in their internal market. I don't think they will shut us out. All I think is that we ought to make sure that it doesn't happen.

MR. ABEL: Senator Humphrey, this Administration has taken a very strong position in urging this integration, the creation of the European Common Market, and I think the reason we are given by the State Department is that the political integration, the stability it produces, is something that is good for peace.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes.

MR. ABEL: How high a price are we prepared to pay in economic terms for this political integration?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I think there is a misconception about this, Mr. Abel. This doesn't require us to pay any political price or an economic price. As a matter of fact, the European Common Market is an economic miracle. It has produced unbelievable results in terms of economic productivity and prosperity and a better sharing, may I say, of the products of industry. It has produced a whole new market for the European producers themselves and for other countries—some of us that are exporters into those countries. It has produced a possibility for European political federation. It is a bulwark against the Com-

munist thrust in Western Europe. It is a new force, so to speak, in the world—and a force for peace, I think, and for security. I believe that we will find in the European Common Market a bigger market for American goods, because the standard of living is going to rise. I think we will have to do some tough negotiating on certain commodities, but in the overall it will be a plus for the United States and for other exporting countries.

MR. ABEL: Senator, you said the other day the President was going to push very hard for this medical care program. When does he start pushing?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes—he has already started pushing. His able Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, has been nudging and pushing and explaining and persuading, and I can tell you that after having visited with a number of my fellow Americans the overwhelming majority of the American people want this type of a program. They want a hospital and health care program for our elderly under the terms of Social Security.

There is a minority against it, and generally they are very noisy, and they make a good deal of fuss, but I can assure you that the people are for it, and in an election year you would be surprised how responsive members of Congress are to what the people want.

MR. ABEL: I understand, sir.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Yes, I do too.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, despite a great many Administration promises and a good deal of activity, there are still four million unemployed. What do you think the Administration is going to do about the unemployment problem in this session?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: There isn't any doubt, Mr. Spivak, that we still have some problem of unemployment. It is equally true that we are absorbing the unemployment back into industry because of the upturn of the American economy, and that upturn has been rather substantial the last six months, and it is projected that it will be even more substantial in the next 12 months. There will be a retraining program for workers where industries have lost their markets. There will be efforts made to stimulate, for example, such as in our housing industry which draws upon many factors of the American industrial system.

I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year, by December 30, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history books, rather than a living fact, because this economy will absorb in the coming months due to the expenditures that we have for defense, due to the tremendous private investment which is projected in construc-

tion of commercial and housing buildings and projects, due to the expansion of retail sales and industrial productivity, which will absorb better than two million of the unemployed.

MR. SPIVAK: You think that in the natural course of events the unemployed will be absorbed, and it will be unnecessary to have the large public works program which Mr. Meany and others in the labor movement are asking for?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: I do, sir. I think we must continue certain major public works projects which are a part of our general scheme of things, the general program. But the vitality of this economy has been demonstrated unmistakably, particularly the last six months. And I go on record on this broadcast—and if I am wrong, I hope you will invite me back next year—I go on record to say that as far as unemployment is concerned, the major part of the unemployment load will have been absorbed back into the stream of private enterprise through a viable economy, through tax reform and through the budgetary processes of this government.

MR. MAZO: Will the Administration have any trouble getting its program through Congress this year?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is an election year, and I expect my good friends on the Republican side to, sort of, firm up a bit, but by the same token we intend to firm up a little on the Democratic side. There will be a scrap. Each one of these issues is highly controversial. The Trade Act will be difficult. The tax bill is always difficult. The health and medical care bill will be another battle—the agricultural program. But I predict on this program that every one of the major Administration proposals in the field of foreign aid, of trade extension, of agriculture, of retraining of workers, the Urban Affairs Department, the programs that have been laid down by the President, including medical care for the elderly, will be passed.

MR. MAZO: Senator, why should you have a scrap? Why should you have so much trouble when you have such fantastic majorities in both houses, almost two to one in the Senate?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Because we are Democrats, and it is rather difficult to get Democrats to agree on all subjects at all times.

MR. MAZO: To firm up, in other words?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: We are a bit individualistic and occasionally effervescent and get out of track every once in a while.

MR. BELL: Senator, you said a few moments ago that in due time the President would issue an order halting discrimination in housing. What is "due time"? Is that after Congress is over or after the election, or what do you mean by "due time"?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bell, I do not believe in discrimination in housing. Neither does the President of the United States.

MR. BELL: We know that, sir.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: And we are going to take the effective action that is required. I only say this, that I am sure that our President as a reasonable, responsible man would want to work with the building industry and others that are affected, the loan industry, the money market, to make sure that these regulations to produce the desired results.

MR. BELL: Would he also, Senator, like to work with the Southern Democrats in this session of Congress? Is there a "teensy, weensy" bit of politics in this delay?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Bell, you are so suspicious. I think there is much more to it than that.

MR. BELL: Don't you think I have a right to be, Senator?

SENATOR HUMPHREY: You have a right to be, and I hope you enjoy it.

MR. BROOKS: Gentlemen, that brings us to the midway point in our program, and it is time now to hear from our second guest, Senator Morton. Thank you very much, Senator Humphrey, for being with us.

Senator Morton, Republican of Kentucky, is the former Chairman of the Republican National Committee and a member of the important Republican Policy Committee. Now we will start the questions with Mr. Abel.

MR. ABEL: Senator Morton also happens to be a former Assistant Secretary of State, and I want to ask him: We hear a great deal about Congressional demands for a reassessment of our relationship to the UN. Would you favor cutting our financial contribution or diminishing in any way our support of the Congo operation?

SENATOR MORTON: I question our UN policy toward the Congo, but a basic answer to your question, even though the UN has been weakened, I feel that we should continue to support the UN. I think, however, we should also urge others to do so, and I question the wisdom of this bond issue in which we take half, because it is so easy next year to issue another bond issue. I would rather pay an assessment than to get the UN into this business of handling its expenditures through bond issue. I think we have enough debt in this country without building the UN up with a debt which Uncle Sam ultimately would guarantee.

MR. ABEL: Isn't there, Senator, one hypothetical advantage at least in this bond issue idea, in that the Russians, who now

refuse to pay any part of the assessments for the Gaza Strip, for example, or the Congo, would be required as part of their contribution to the General Fund of the UN to cover debt service on such a loan?

SENATOR MORTON: If they continued their contributions to the General Fund at the proportion in which they now pay them, that would be a benefit. However, they could easily make their contributions and say, "Not one cent of this shall be used for debt retirement or for interest purposes."

MR. SPIVAK: Senator Morton, you are a member of the Republican Policy Committee and a former Chairman of your party. Can you tell us whether the Republicans will have a program of their own, or will they simply accept or oppose or change a Democratic program that will be put forward in this Congress?

SENATOR MORTON: No, we will put forth programs of our own in accordance with the platform we adopted in Chicago in 1960, as we did in the past session. We have been into this medical care program, for example. There is no question about the desire of the Congress to pass legislation that will render medical care to the needy aged. However, it is a question of how we finance it and whether the program is voluntary or not, whether it is for the needy or covers all, and these matters the Republicans will have substitutes for.

MR. SPIVAK: You have been through the state, and I know, as Chairman you were all over the country. What do you consider the most important domestic proposal for the Republicans to put forward? The medical aid bill?

SENATOR MORTON: No, I think that—probably, yes. A Republican substitute to the so-called Anderson Bill that is before the Ways and Means Committee now.

MR. SPIVAK: Do you think the Republicans plan to do anything on education this session?

SENATOR MORTON: We want to see first what the Administration sends up. I understand that there is going to be a program for higher education, federal aid in the higher education field, and also something to supplement in some way teacher training or to help to finance additional teacher training. So until we see what they send up—they may send some things up we can agree to go along with.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, a great many informed people in and outside of the Republican Party expect a real struggle for control between the liberals on the one side and the right-wingers on the other.

Do you expect such a battle? Do you think you are going to

be able to have a policy, a Republican policy in view of these extreme positions?

SENATOR MORTON: Yes, I think we can have a policy. I don't think the positions are as extreme as some people indicate. Certainly they are not as extreme as the differences that exist in the Democratic Party, and yet for the years that they were out of power in the White House, Senator Johnson made a State of the Union message, so-called, for his party, and they seemed to be able to accomplish it with far greater differences ideologically than we have in our party.

MR. MAZO: Senator, as a candidate for reelection and a former Chairman of your party, the Republican Party, do you look upon Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck as the spokesmen of the national Republican Party?

SENATOR MORTON: I don't think you can pick out anyone as the spokesman for a party that is out of power. Your focal point, of course, is the White House when you are in power. I think that they are the leaders of their respective delegations in the House and in the Senate, and as such, of course, they are very influential spokesmen for the Republican Party, because to say that one man or two men are the spokesmen for the party, I just don't think you can narrow it down to that point.

MR. MAZO: Are you satisfied with the image that the so-called "Ev and Charlie Show" projects because of their weekly reports?

SENATOR MORTON: I think that both Senator Dirksen and Congressman Halleck have done a fantastic job in discharging their responsibilities as leaders of our group on the floor and outside the floor, in public relations and so forth.

MR. MAZO: Would you prefer some other image for your party nationally, sir?

SENATOR MORTON: No, I think results show for themselves. I think in the House especially Halleck did a tremendous job of developing cohesion and developing a team spirit which the opposition party—and a responsible spirit—which the opposition party must exercise.

MR. BELL: Senator, the Democratic national Chairman, Mr. Bailey, says the Republicans are linking up with the far-right extremists and absorbing them into their party. Is this true?

SENATOR MORTON: No, I don't think that there is any link-up. We have extremists who are in both parties. You can take the White Citizens' Council, for instance. Would you say the Democratic Party is linking up with extremists because most of them are members of the Democratic Party?

MR. BELL: I didn't say it in the first place, Senator, I said Chairman Bailey said this, and I wanted to get your reaction.

On another matter, the Democratic Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. Cannon, says that the budget which is being submitted to Congress by the President is in precarious balance and that it provides no retrenchment whatsoever in federal spending and that he intends to cut it. Will he get some Republican help?

SENATOR MORTON: Very definitely he will have Republican help on that, I am sure.

MR. BELL: Do the Republicans believe that you can balance—and I am talking of Republicans generally—a \$93 billion budget?

SENATOR MORTON: For F. Y. '63?

MR. BELL: Yes. For upcoming year.

SENATOR MORTON: Of course, it is pretty hard to estimate income that far ahead, at least it is for me, although the Treasury experts over the years have come up with pretty good estimates, unless there is a great shift in the economy, a sudden recession or something of that kind. I should think it would be very difficult to find the revenues for a \$93 billion budget myself.

MR. BELL: In other words, you will have to cut out some spending in order to balance that budget?

MR. BELL: Yes. It is my hope, and I think it is the hope of all members of Congress that we can achieve a balanced budget, but I am afraid it is going to be very difficult.

MR. BELL: Along that same line, are you as confident as Senator Humphrey seems to be that unemployment will be a thing of the past at the end of this present calendar year?

SENATOR MORTON: No, I am not as confident as the Senator. I think we have some problems in unemployment which I am afraid are going to be with us for some time to come. In the year 1961 the average unemployment was 4.8 million persons, and that is the highest number of any year since 1941. And, of course, percentagewise it is not because the number of people in the labor market, so-called, has gone up, but in total numbers it is there, and it is a difficult problem. With automation and other things, I am afraid the problem is going to be with us much longer than the year 1962.

MR. ABEL: Senator Morton, we are apparently to have some Congressional hearings early this year into this so-called issue of muzzling generals and admirals. You spent some time in the State Department. Do you see anything wrong with this fairly long-standing practice of having speeches by these people cleared in the State Department to make sure there is no conflict with national policy?

SENATOR MORTON: I think whether a person is a general or an admiral or whether he is an assistant secretary or anyone that speaks for the government, that in substance there should be some clearance of any political speech that he makes—I am not speaking in the sense of domestic politics—but in any speech that he makes, because there is a great danger of misinterpretation by countries and even—it is bad enough when a member of Congress gets up and makes a speech, and then you have to go explain to the embassy of “X” country that we have a separation of powers in this country. But with an important man in the Executive branch, who holds a Presidential appointed position or who holds flag rank in one of the services, it is considered that he is speaking for his government, and there should be some coordination and some clearance.

MR. ABEL: That policy of clearance, of course, was established some years ago, was it not, and has been followed by both administrations, by both parties?

SENATOR MORTON: So far as I know, yes.

MR. ABEL: Senator Morton, you made the point that there are political extremists affiliated with both parties. I wonder if you would care to estimate what the possible effect might be on both parties in Congress this year of this rather loud agitation from the right wing that we are hearing and which is affecting both parties apparently?

SENATOR MORTON: We also will have a lot of agitation from the left wing which could affect both parties.

I think it is not going to be any different than it has been in the past. We have had a broad range of philosophy in both political parties, and I hope that we always maintain it because if we get away from that and if we ever get segmented, we will have splinter parties, and it has just been proven that they don't work as effectively as the two-party system.

MR. SPIVAK: Senator, there has been a good deal of talk recently about a strong conservative trend in this country. I know you are considered one of the moderates of the Republican Party. Have you seen a strong conservative trend in the country?

SENATOR MORTON: Yes, I think there is evidence among younger people, especially, toward more conservative thinking. I hate to use these words “conservative” and “liberal” because they have become a little bit warped, I think, or strained, but I do see evidence of such a swing.

MR. SPIVAK: What do you think the effect is going to be on the Republican Party? Do you think it is going to push it further to the right?

SENATOR MORTON: I think the effect on both parties would be that they will be a little bit more conservative.

MR. MAZO: Senator, has President Kennedy got the country moving again?

SENATOR MORTON: What are you speaking of—economically?

MR. MAZO: I am speaking of his campaign slogan of getting the country moving again. Has it gotten moving?

SENATOR MORTON: I think our economic growth, according to the Joint Committee up on the Hill for '61 was something like 1.8 percent and for the last seven years it was 3.2 percent per annum. It is moving. I don't know which direction it is going in.

MR. BROOKS: Gentlemen, at this point we will have to suspend our questions.

Thank you very much, Senator Morton, for being with us.

The Proceedings of

MEET THE PRESS

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

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

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



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