

THE NATION'S FUTURE

Sunday, October 15, 1961

NBC Television

(5:00-6:00 PM)

"THE ADMINISTRATION'S DOMESTIC RECORD: SUCCESS OR FAILURE?"

MODERATOR: EDWIN NEWMAN

GUESTS: THE HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
SENATOR EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

* * *

ANNOUNCER: The Nation's Future, October 15, 1961.

This is the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff. Secretary Ribicoff believes that the Kennedy Administration's Domestic Record represents a success on the "New Frontier".

This is Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican of Illinois and Senate minority leader. Senator Dirksen believes that the Administration's Domestic Record represents a failure on the "New Frontier".

The Administration's Domestic Record: Success or Failure?

Our speakers, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff, and Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican of Illinois.

ANNOUNCER:
(CONT'D)

In our audience, government officials, political figures, journalists, the general public.

Now, here is our moderator, the noted news correspondent, Edwin Newman.

NEWMAN:

Good evening. Welcome to the primary debate in the new season of "The Nation's Future".

In the coming months we will be bringing to you again the foremost spokesmen of our time in major debates on topics of national and international importance. Again it will be my pleasure to act as moderator for the series. Tonight, a debate on the Kennedy Administration's Domestic Record.

This is an appropriate time for such a debate. Congress adjourned late last month and its achievements or failures are being vigorously argued.

Criticism of the Administration record has intensified and Administration spokesmen have come to the defense of that record. Meanwhile, both parties are already gearing up for the 1962 Congressional elections.

Our debate will begin in a moment -- after these words about the 1962 Mercury.

(COMMERCIAL)

NEWMAN: From Chicago, "The Nation's Future".

Abraham Ribicoff was appointed Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare by President Kennedy in January of this year. Before joining the Cabinet, Mr. Ribicoff served as Governor of Connecticut for six years.

Mr. Secretary, your position, please.

RIBICOFF: On January 20, John F. Kennedy came to the Presidency with the hopes and prayers of the people of America. Today, these hopes and prayers have been justified by the record of President Kennedy -- his own actions as President and what has been accomplished in this session of Congress.

The President was faced with a great problem and the nation was faced with a great problem. We were in the midst of our third recession -- a deep one -- in six years. Five million, seven hundred thousand people were out of work, wages were down, farm income was down, steel was only working part-time, gold was moving out of the country -- people were hungry.

The first job that the President had was to make sure that this nation moved ahead and that our economy picked up. Immediately, the President moved to make sure that the people were fed by executive order. Those who were on relief, got more food -- quantity and quality -- to feed them.

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

Unemployment compensation had run out with some six hundred thousand Americans and they were in a desperate plight and the first measure that was passed by the Congress was an extension of the unemployment compensation.

Some seven hundred fifty thousand dependent children of unemployed workers were hungry and Congress passed an act to make sure there was aid to the children of the unemployed.

The President was faced with a problem of rise of costs having had a great impact on those people, as well as our elder citizens on Social Security and there were amendments to the Social Security Bill. So, the President moved ahead on many fronts. A substantial housing bill was passed. Measures were passed in the field of commerce to make sure that our economy moved ahead and it has moved ahead.

Therefore, today we have a situation where we have the highest employment in the history of our country -- some three million people more than when the President came to office. Unemployment has gone down to some four million people.

I recall, to indicate the President's thinking, that I was in his drawing room and he picked up the paper and, as he looked at the paper, turning to the ads, he turned to me and said, "Dave, I cannot understand how

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

the Republicans can be against \$1.25 as a minimum wage. With the prices as they are now, how can any family live on less than fifty dollars a week. I cannot understand how Senator Dirksen and the Republicans oppose such a measure."

I do not want you to think we have had all successes because we did have a failure in education because what happened there was that many of our own men joined the opposition and we were ambushed between Indiana and Illinois.

NEWMAN: Thank you, sir. (APPLAUSE)

Everett McKinley Dirksen was elected Senator from Illinois in 1950 and has served in the Senate ever since. He is a member of the Republican Policy Committee and Senate minority leader for the Eighty-Sixth Congress. Senator Dirksen, may we have your position?

DIRKSEN: First, I am glad to see the Secretary. We served together in the House of Representatives and I esteem him as an old friend.

Let me start by alluding to a dispatch in the Washington Post (incidentally a very liberal pro-administration paper), which appeared on the fifteenth of September, about ten days before the adjournment.

In that dispatch was carried this quote: "This bill (meaning the Peace Corps Bill) was the first bill,

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

contrary to all the retreads that have been considered that has hit the floor of the House."

What they were saying in that report is that so much of the Administration legislation had been long in incubation in a Republican Administration. It was not particularly world shaking. It was picking up the stitches of the Eisenhower Administration and, actually, there was nothing new.

Now, when you evaluate and appraise whether an administration is a success or a failure, I think you have to include first those rather glowing pledges that were made in California in July of 1960; I think you have to include all the promises that were made in the course of the campaign; I think you have to include the impact of the measures after they were passed; and, on the whole, I don't put that kind of a tag on the Administration. I simply say that it did not fully meet the expectations of the people and the Congress.

I must add one other thing -- when an administration advances a measure, the real criteria must necessarily be what happened to it in the Congress before it got out. When you take note of a Congress where there is a democratic majority of three to two in the House and two to one virtually in the United States Senate, I say simply that the Administration was not up to

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

expectations and, further, if you want to translate that into the term of failure, you can do so.

Now, the failures are never recounted. I saw this (indication) glowing sheet that was gotten out about three weeks ago, showing the thirty-three major accomplishments of the Administration. The interesting thing about that is that there are only twelve roll calls on the thirty-three measures. They indicate there was no real controversy about most of them. So, looking at it in the large, taking a perspective look, I think in that respect the Administration has failed to fulfill its obligations and meet its expectations.
(Applause)

NEWMAN: Thank you, sir.

Before Secretary Ribicoff and Senator Dirksen cross-examine each other, a word about the 1962 Mercury.

(COMMERCIAL)

NEWMAN: It is now time for Secretary Ribicoff and Senator Dirksen to question each other, to cross-examine each other and discuss the issues raised. Secretary Ribicoff, will you begin?

RIBICOFF: I am rather surprised at an old political hand like Senator Dirksen talking about new ideas in government. Frankly, there are very few new ideas in government. The test of government and the test of leadership is

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

who translates those ideas and measures into action.

President Kennedy certainly was able to translate measures that had been kicking around Congress for many years. Let me give you a few examples -- the Depressed Area Bill, which would help so many areas. That did not go through under the Eisenhower Administration. We need clean water -- we need it desperately -- in the United States. This failed in the Eisenhower Administration. Now, some five thousand communities will have clean water because this was passed under the Kennedy Administration.

Juvenile Delinquency. For years they have been trying to get a juvenile delinquency bill through the Congress of the United States. It failed. This year we will start attacking the problem. There is the question of crime that staggers the imagination. They have been trying to get bills through for forty or fifty years in Congress only to fail, and the Kennedy Administration was able to bring it to fruition.

So the test here is a success of the Kennedy Administration and the President to pass through Congress legislation that was stymied under Republican leadership during the previous eight years.

DIRKSEN: We have not had a Republican Senate or a Republican House for quite some time and so, if my distinguished friend, the Secretary wants to place the blame up there, then, of course, he must place it on the Democrats in both houses of Congress.

RIBICOFF: That is not so at all because your President vetoed some of this vital legislation. Keep in mind the water pollution bill was vetoed; the area redevelopment bill was vetoed; this was vital legislation for the benefit of our nation. Housing was vetoed. There were measures that the democratic Congresses passed only to have your own Republican President veto it.

DIRKSEN: Let's take a look with respect to the distressed areas. The President not only vetoed it once, he vetoed it twice. He insisted that certain criteria be included and at long last, the criteria was included before the Congress under this Administration passed the bill. Now, I said in my opening remarks that not the least of the criteria in measuring the success or failure is the ultimate impact of the bill. The distressed areas had been on the books for five long months. Mr. Kennedy said in his campaign, "Action -- movement -- motion -- results." That is what he wants and, as a result, it has been on the books for five months. We gave them \$394 million and in five months two sewer projects aggregating \$373,000 have been disbursed there.

RIBICOFF: As a man in the administrative end of government, five months after a piece of legislation becomes law is a short time because communities must organize; applications must be made; chambers of commerce must get behind the measures and, therefore, five months is a very short period of time to put into effect the important measures in a depressed area bill and, if this is the answer of Senator Dirksen and the Republicans, I would say that it is pretty weak. As a matter of fact, let us see what happens in the period of a year as these communities, with some twenty million plus people, will depend upon the stimulus given by the depressed areas bill which is so important for the people of our nation.

DIRKSEN: Now with respect to pollution, and I must follow up, if success depends upon spending federal money, then this Administration has been a rousing success. (LAUGHTER) The expenditure budget shows \$95.8 billion and if you add the trust accounts, it will come in the neighborhood of \$114 billion and a good Democrat like Harry Byrd estimates that by 1965 it will be up to \$137 billion. So I must give them a pat on the back if that is the measure of success.

Let's not lose sight of pollution -- there was a pollution program. (LAUGHTER) There has been a pollution program for a long time. You see, when I talk about money, the new Administration simply doubled it and then they did infinitely more.

RIBICOFF: That is not quite true.

DIRKSEN: I will show you on the sheet from the White House.

RIBICOFF: But keep this in mind when it comes to money -- the Kennedy Administration, the basic increases went for defense to keep this country going and some four million dollars of the six million dollars additional in the Kennedy budget over the Eisenhower budget went for more missiles, for Polaris submarines and other things in order to make sure that the United States, which was slipping behind, would advance ahead.

This is an old Republican argument -- talking about spending money. Basically, the President is a pretty tight guy when it comes to spending a buck. This I can tell you from long experience. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)

And, further, President Kennedy isn't advocating expenditure of a dime that isn't absolutely essential for advancement of the United States of America at home and abroad.

Basically, when we analyze the budget, this is where the money has gone to: Some four billion dollars for additional defense; some billion and a half for college housing; for loans to small business that will be paid back. As to what will happen five or ten years from now, I don't know and you don't know.

RIBICOFF: However, we are a big country and we are growing fast
(CONT'D) and I know the country must move ahead domestically
 as well as internationally and we are generating
 wealth in order to be able to take care of basic
 American needs. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN: Now I am about to show you I am not talking by the
 card. This (INDICATING) is the sheet that Ted
 Sorenson, the President's personal advisor, and Larry
 O'Brien, his liaison man to the Senate and the House,
 got out. This was first exhibited to thirty selected
 newspaper men. This was done in the White House. I
 did not do this, and what does it say here? Stream
 pollution: Five years doubling of the program; and
 under that program you don't even have to live on the
 stream in order to get a stream pollution grant, at
 least as I understand the law. (LAUGHTER)

RIBICOFF: Now, you are talking about something I know because
 I will administer that.

DIRKSEN: I know you will.

RIBICOFF: This is one of the greatest steps forward for clean
 water because no civilization, no nation can exist
 without clean water; clean water to drink; clean water
 for recreation; clean water for industrial purposes.
 The streams and rivers of America, the lakes of
 America, are an outstanding disgrace for the future
 of this country and, therefore, we must clean up our

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

streams. For every dollar of federal money that will be spent, there will be five dollars of local money spent and this is the only way to get going because many of these streams and waters are in interstate commerce and since the nation has a vested interest in the water to keep our nation going, there could be no better investment for the future of America than this water program and, further, I am proud that progress was able to be made under the leadership of President Kennedy, which is something the Eisenhower Administration would not do. Let's clean up the water and streams of the United States. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN:

Well, now, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary was never more mistaken in his life. (LAUGHTER) There has been a stream pollution program for a great many years under President Eisenhower. This I will leave to some of my Congressional friends who are sitting here in the audience. They just doubled the program, that was all and that is why I said in my opening statement that when you discount the retreads, then you wonder whether they met the expectations of the people.

RIBICOFF:

It would not only double, but this is a big country, with a lot of streams and the country does have to have its water resources doubled. Furthermore, what the Eisenhower Administration on water pollution did was pretty weak. It had no teeth in it -- no enforcement powers. If you are going to be able to clean up

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

the streams of America, then you have to have the power and some guts and administration to make sure you clean up the streams. I am very proud that this program will allow some five thousand communities in the United States to keep up their streams and, of course, this is very good.

In addition, there is a program to take the salt out of water and there is a great opportunity for us at home and abroad to make the sea drinkable and to make water available to the starved and parched nations and also to make deserts bloom. This is how America goes forward under John Kennedy, a President with imagination and courage, who is willing to move ahead and move ahead continuously. (APPLAUSE)

NEWMAN: May I suggest at this point that we push on from pollution to some other points? (LAUGHTER)

DIRKSEN: Let us get to salinity. Actually, that program started under Eisenhower. We had to do the research and development work first. We had to have pilot plants built and all the Kennedy Administration did, my friend, was to come and ask for \$75 million to build some larger plants. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: But you have complained, Senator Dirksen, about spending money. However, the Eisenhower Administration refused to spend the money to eliminate salinity but the Kennedy Administration, recognizing the basic

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

need of our nation and its future, was willing to spend \$75 million to take the salt out of the sea and make the deserts bloom and, therefore, this is the difference between a democratic approach and a republican approach, because the democrats move forward. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN:

Now, my good friend the Secretary mentioned the housing program. You see, in this sheet that was gotten out by the White House staff, it says that the most comprehensive housing program (it certainly was) in terms of dollars would cost more than any program that was ever offered. Well, now, I mentioned in my preliminary statement that it is the quality of the legislation and when the President sent that bill to the Senate and to the House, what was in it for housing? Nothing down and forty years to pay. (LAUGHTER) Yet the Federal Housing Administration will not insure a roof or get a guarantee on a roof of one of those houses that will last beyond ten years. Therefore, we had to maul the program.

They had \$100 million in it to buy open spaces. I thought perhaps that was a local problem and the conference report finally cut it to \$50 million. However, imagine the idea of coming with a program of nothing down and forty years to pay and an open invitation to abandon and let the government hold the sack. That was the housing program.

RIBICOFF: The interesting thing was that the final vote on the housing program had eighty-five per cent of the House Republicans voting against it and fifty-nine per cent of the Senate Republicans voting against it. This came out as a comprehensive program to take care of low income, to take care of middle income, to take care of your urban renewal, to eliminate slums. Again, this is important -- this is the faith of the Democrats and President Kennedy has in mind the future of America and its people, to be able to build our future economically, knowing that out of this we will generate tax revenues to be able to pay for this bill and, in the meanwhile, we will have people living decently rather than in slums over the United States.

NEWMAN: Mr. Secretary, you mentioned the educational bill, that your program failed here?

RIBICOFF: Yes.

NEWMAN: Why do you think it failed?

RIBICOFF: Well, there was a really good operation going on between Republicans and the Rules Committee. Take the Rules Committee, which blocked the measure. There were five Republicans on the Rules Committee. Each and every one of those voted against allowing these measures to come to the floor. They were joined by three Democrats, making eight Republicans and seven Democrats who voted for it. I know that a man like

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

Senator Dirksen should not have too much difficulty to convince or induce his friend Halleck to get one Republican vote on the Rules Committee to let that bill be considered and if he only had one Republican vote out of five, there would have been an opportunity to vote for this measure. However, as I say, we were ambushed in connection with the "New Frontier" by five Republicans and three Democrats. Further, we have had a few more ambushes like that; as some of our boys will admit. They joined with the Republicans, which is also something they did before. However, this is a tough job and we have to get ahead with it.

Let me also say this to you, that as far as our President is concerned, he is not a quitter, I am not a quitter. Education is important for the future of our nation and we are going to put through an education program in the United States and I hope we can get a few Republican votes at the next session of Congress. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN: Now, let me tell you the whole story, (LAUGHTER)
about aid to education. (APPLAUSE)

In the House of Representatives they have a Rules Committee -- it is the Steering Committee. A committee reports a policy bill. It has to go to the Rules Committee, get a rule for its consideration on the floor. The first thing that the Kennedy Administration

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

did was to pack the Rules Committee and put on two Democrats for each Republican and yet they got their bill stuck in that committee, notwithstanding all the Democrats they put on. (LAUGHTER)

RIBICOFF:

All I can say is this is very important. This is a weakness that I acknowledge in the Democratic Party. I want to say that I acknowledge the weakness.

There is one thing I admire and that is the politics about the Republican Party. When Ev and Charlie snap that whip, the boys march. There is no question about it. And, of course, I am envious. I wish that when our leaders snapped the whip that the Democrats would march the same way but they do not. These boys play a good game. They always keep getting a few of the men who will go along with their philosophy and are able to stymie these bills. We did put two more men on the Rules Committee but then those five Republicans stuck together like the Rock of Gibraltar and only needed three and, further, when you consider that seven Democrats voted to allow consideration, then, for the life of me, if the Republicans are interested in education, I cannot understand why at least one Republican out of five did not join seven Democrats to allow this measure to be even discussed on the floor of the House.

DIRKSEN: The answer is simple. If you have ten Democratic soldiers on one side and five Republican soldiers on the other, and a Democratic President and you still cannot get it out of the Rules Committee, then there must be something wrong with the legislation and, there was. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: Let me say this to you -- this was good legislation. However, I would like to say again -- this was a tough bill. Basically, it started in 1946. A great Republican advocated it -- a man who was greatly admired by Senator Dirksen -- Robert Taft in 1946 was one of the first to advocate federal grants to the States for education. It has been blocked since that time and it has been a very tough fight.

Now, the very important things in education are teachers' salaries, in my mind, and scholarships. Yet when that bill was under consideration in the House Committee on Education and Labor, each and every Republican voted against the teachers of America and this, of course, is what I cannot understand. We did lose some votes -- we did lose some democratic votes, but when something is so important as education, I don't understand why at least you cannot get a few Republicans to vote for education and the future of the young people of America.

DIRKSEN: Let me make it clear that the Republicans never voted against the teachers of the country -- they voted that way because out of the Secretary's own shop in the office of education there came a brochure, a federal system of education, and, as you read it, you can look down the road and see the inexorable result of the bill. It meant the long bureaucratic hand of his agency controlling education. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: This is very, very interesting. That brochure was drafted by a committee designated in October of 1960 by Secretary Fleming and everybody on that committee was an appointee of a Republican Administration on Civil Service who were held over and they issued that report, and it was a Republican Committee appointed by my predecessor that issued that report and not the committee appointed by me. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN: Now, the Secretary knows that Mr. Fleming got exactly nowhere. He was a Republican Secretary of that department, and I resisted and opposed him and so did the Republicans, because we did not care whether it was Arthur Fleming a Republican or Abe Ribicoff a Democrat -- we could see down the road as to the ultimate results, namely, the federal control of education. This was going to be the inexorable end result.

RIBICOFF: I can only say this -- that the opponents who used this argument are guilty of hypocrisy of the worst order because the same men who worried about federal aid to education and control are the same men who voted for the federally impacted area money. A lot of this money comes to Illinois, a lot of that money comes to all fifty states, and this money is used for teachers' salaries and this money is used as well to build school houses. In my six years as Governor and in my eight months as Secretary, I have never known of a school superintendent, a mayor, a congressman or a principal who has ever pointed out where the federal government has ever tried to control how education is taught, what teachers are taught or how school houses will be built. This is a program which pays and is used by one-third of the school pupils of America, federally impacted money. If there are other communities in the United States of America that are impacted, I know no reason why any child in America has to go to a fire trap for a school, has to have a poorly trained teacher and, therefore, if that money is good enough to be voted for federal aid to impacted areas, it is good enough to be voted on the same principle for needy school children and the quality teachers of the United States as well. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN: There is no more analogy between federal aid to education as they dished it up and impacted areas,

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

than there is between the moon and the deep sea and I will tell you why. We have put cantonments in military installations all over the country. We have sent soldiers there. We allowed them to take their wives and children. The result was what? We dumped all of these children upon the school districts in every state in the Union and the result was that sometimes they did not have the acceptable value to take care of it.

What were the impacted area payments? In principle, they were completely different from what the Secretary said. They were payments in lieu of taxes that the people back home would have to pay -- they were an obligation.

NEWMAN: I would like to put an end to the education part of this debate. Mr. Secretary, would you, therefore, be brief.

RIBICOFF: One and a half million children are so covered in military establishments and defense establishments but ten million children are beneficiaries in these particular areas. Furthermore, the bill that was presented specifically provided that these funds would go to the state and the state would distribute those to needy districts and the states would make the choice so, therefore, the federal government would have no way to control where the education money went.

DIRKSEN: But the fact remains that the money was available only where you had federal installations and it was done because of the tax burden and if there had been no military installation, there would have been no money and, therefore, under the Secretary's proposal, it did not make any difference whether you had an installation or not -- this money was going to be scattered all over the country on a pro rata basis.

NEWMAN: May I put a more general question to you now and, of course, I would hope for a brief answer.

Which party came out of the last session of Congress with improved political standing in the country? Will you go first, sir?

DIRKSEN: Obviously, the Republican Party. (LAUGHTER)

I believe you need amplification. We knocked the rough corners off of many things. If you could go into the foreign aid field I could give you a classic example. However, the fact of the matter is that in agriculture, in housing and elsewhere, some of the very impossible proposals were taken out of those bills before they ever got to the President's desk and we did it when there was twice as many New Frontiersmen on the other side of the aisle as the number of soldiers who had served under my banner. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: I am in the process of stomping the country and I have been taking some findings myself and President Kennedy never stood as high in the hearts of his countrymen as he stands today. (APPLAUSE) President Kennedy came to the presidency by a very small margin of votes. However, if the election were to be held today, he would sweep in with an overwhelming majority. (APPLAUSE)

NEWMAN: Thank you, gentlemen. That is all the time we have now for discussion. I am sure our audience, however, have questions that they would like to put to you and we will get to them after these words about the 1962 Mercury.

(COMMERCIAL)

NEWMAN: This part of the program will be devoted to questions from the audience. However, before we go into that, perhaps I can get Senator Dirksen and Secretary Ribicoff into the vein by putting this question to them.

Do you feel the recession is over? If you do, who gets the credit? Mr. Secretary, will you answer?

RIBICOFF: I would say it was the President's program and his determination to get America moving forward. He started immediately by releasing a substantial sum of money for the road building program. He started the

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

housing program moving. A half billion dollars was made available for the unemployed people. There were, of course, the dividends that were paid on the veterans insurance, the tax refunds, the realization by the President that we must do everything possible -- the lowering of interest rates.

Now, the President moved immediately, he moved swiftly on the economic front and this has been the shortest recession that we have had and, in addition, not only is steel going up, not only is housing starting to go up, but one of the greatest factors you may recall, in the fifteen-month period before the President came to office was that there was a run on the gold -- the gold was leaving Fort Knox because of lack of confidence in our stability. However, since President Kennedy has been in office, the gold has started to go back to Fort Knox, which just goes to show the confidence all over the world in stability of the American economy.

DIRSKEN:

Whether a recession is over or not is probably a matter of statistics. I took a look at the economic indicator which, incidentally, is issued by the Council of Economic Advisors at the White House. You see, I always go back to the other side for my documentation. (LAUGHTER) However, I see that the unemployment quotients in the country for August was

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

one per cent -- one and one-tenth per cent higher than it was in August of 1960. To be sure there have been additions to the civilian labor force but if the recession is over, we still have a structural unemployment problem.

RIBICOFF:

I don't understand this because the figures issued this week indicate that unemployment at the present time is a little over four million. When President Kennedy came into office, unemployment was five million, seven hundred thousand. Furthermore, we have today some three million more people employed than when President Kennedy came into office and if you talk about figures having significance, I know of no figures that have greater significance than when they are translated into jobs and jobs are translated into food and rent and sustenance for our people and our gross national product is going up. Business is good, the stock market is moving and the difference between our economy today and when President Kennedy came to office is fantastically encouraging. This has been a great signal success for President Kennedy.

DIRKSEN:

Now perhaps I can finish my answer. As I said, that is a documented figure. I did not get that out of a hole in my head. I got that out of the report of the Board of Economic Advisors appointed by the President of the United States. Therefore, there still is a structural unemployment problem.

RIBICOFF: However, Senator Dirksen is talking about August and we now happen to be in the month of October.

DIRKSEN: Wait a moment, this has to be considered. Actually you do not get the August figures until now. I just got them.

RIBICOFF: However, basically, the report was just made this week by the Labor Department and the statistics of the Labor Department are not questioned as far as authenticity is concerned.

NEWMAN: Now I will go to the audience for questions. I will state the rules very briefly. If you want to ask a question, raise your hand and when I call on you, please rise, give your name, indicate to whom your question is addressed and then state the question briefly and directly. I will recognize the lady over there.

QUESTION: I have a question on education.

Mr. Ribicoff, how many persons have been added to your department since this administration came in?

RIBICOFF: The number of people added to our department are reflected by the number of programs passed by the Congress of the United States. The Congress of the United States will pass a juvenile delinquency program, will allow Social Security, aid to dependent

RIBICOFF: children and I am sure that they will also provide appropriations for these things, to take care of the programs that are there and, therefore, this department is growing in numbers and it grows in numbers because we are doing more for the people by action taken by the Congress of the United States.

DIRKSEN: I can tell you how many I think there are for the entire government -- not for Mr. Ribicoff's department.

If I recall now, it is something in excess of sixty thousand new people that have been added to the federal rolls since the new administration came into power.

RIBICOFF: However, these are programs that are continuous. These are programs, some of them started in the previous administration and these are programs that are needed to keep the government moving as the country grows.

MR. ROBERT ROSENBLUM: Secretary Ribicoff will remember that the democratic national platform, that in his own state platform they were pledged to have a Youth Conservation Corps. That did not pass Congress. Why?

RIBICOFF: I think that bill is one of the bills that got blocked in the famous Rules Committee.

DIRKSEN: It got stuck in the Democratic Congress. (LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: What is your main objection to this year's Federal Aid bill and how would you have improved it?

NEWMAN: I don't think that I will allow a question on Federal Aid. This is a matter of domestic issues.

QUESTION: I have a question to direct to Senator Dirksen. Has the reluctance of Congress to support Mr. Kennedy's domestic program in its original form been due in part to a growing grass roots opposition to the program by the American people?

DIRKSEN: I think that is a pretty good statement. As a matter of fact, there has been a growth of conservative sentiment in the country today. I think that the young people particularly are becoming aware not only of the high budgets but of the commitments that are written in that then become effective in the future. You see, you are one of those who is going to pay the bill and that is the reason that there is a great awareness. People are wondering about the solvency of their country and when you go too far, what do you do? You shake a very delicate fabric of confidence and not even the spending by the New Frontier is going to save us if that goes down.

RIBICOFF: I want to say right here that I have confidence in this country today and the country's future. I am not as pessimistic as Senator Dirksen is. Basically this

RIBICOFF: country will go forward and is going forward. This
(CONT'D) is not a spendthrift administration -- this is an ad-
ministration that is only spending for basic needs to
keep this country going forward and we cannot stand
still in the United States of America. (APPLAUSE)

MR. BYRON HOLMBERG: I would like to address this to Secretary
Ribicoff. You alluded to juvenile delinquency.
Could you mention in what manner the Federal Govern-
ment is attacking the problem?

RIBICOFF: The Federal Government has passed a program in which
there will be pilot programs in key areas of the
United States to see whether we can bring together the
best programs used throughout the nation to make an
overall attack on the problem of juvenile delinquency.
That is one part of the program.

The second part of the program has to do with the
training of people to work with our youngsters. We
are fantastically short, not only in courts, not only
in probation and in the field of recreation and in
trained personnel to work with the youngsters of
America and this program is set up so that not only
will we have pilot programs to attack juvenile delin-
quency but also to train the personnel to work with the
youngsters of America.

DIRKSEN: I recognize that juvenile delinquency is a problem. As a matter of fact, a Republican senator from New Jersey was the first one to put some steam into the thing. So, here is a three-year program to cost ten million dollars. But, if an equal amount of emphasis were placed on the churches and the homes, where these derelictions begin, then I am not so sure we'd be better off than training people in government. However, I went along with the program. (APPLAUSE)

NEWMAN: We will have more questions and more answers in a moment, but now a message about the 1962 Mercury.

(COMMERCIAL)

NEWMAN: Now we go again to our audience for questions. The gentleman over there.

TED CROFT: My name is Ted Croft and I have a question for Secretary Ribicoff. The principle of executive action in the field of race relations is one which has been very interesting. I would like to hear your comments on its adequacy.

RIBICOFF: I would say that there are many phases in the field of civil rights. There is an executive action and on an executive basis the President has moved in many ways and one of the most important is a recognition of the worth and value of every man irrespective of the color of his skin. The President has appointed more

RIBICOFF:
(CONT'D)

Negroes to high public office than all of his predecessors in the past sixty years. We have two Federal Judges who are Negro; we have an Assistant Secretary, we have Mr. Weaver in the Federal Housing; we have Mr. Rowan; we have Andy Hatcher in my own department; Lill Carter as an assistant; Grace Newell as an assistant. Throughout the government there has been recognition you hire people on their worth and ability and not because of the color of their skin.

Furthermore, the Attorney General has moved in on many problems of desegregation in the schools.

On the question of employment, the President has set up his Fair Employment Hiring Practices Committee under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson and as a member of that committee and a couple of subcommittees, I know what is going on and being done to induce American industry to voluntarily hire more and more people whose skins might be dark to man the factories and industries of America and no President has done as much in the field of civil rights through executive action as has President Kennedy. (APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN:

You were referring to the President's Committee on Non-Discrimination in Federal Employment, I think. I undertook to get statutory authority for that committee because it was done by executive order. I could not get it through a democratic Congress. I

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

introduced all the President's civil rights bills in the 86th Congress and prior Congresses and what a time we had to get two-thirds of that package through.

Now, two bills were introduced in this Congress by Senator Clark of Pennsylvania and Congressman Celler of New York. There were no hearings -- there were no actions of any kind and all that the civil rights cause got, my friend, was a two-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission and to get it done we had to hook it on to an appropriations bill. So that wasn't a very major accomplishment in that field.

RIBICOFF:

On the question of voting rights, that is where the Attorney General is moving in and on the assurance of jobs and the recognition of the place of the Negro in our society, that is where the President is moving in and has moved in in a way that his predecessor and predecessors have never moved in. I recognize truthfully the difficulty of getting some of these measures through Congress of the United States and it is the same combination that has joined time and time again with the Republicans to defeat measures that had been advocated by Congress.

DIRKSEN:

That has to be amplified a little. I introduced those bills, fought them through as best I could, but the opposition did not come from the Republican side -- the filibuster on occasions running through twenty-four hours a day came from the Democratic side and

DIRKSEN: consequently we have had to take a half a loaf when
(CONT'D) we could not get a full loaf.

However, the Record of the Republicans under Eisen-
hower is, in my judgment, a shining record in the
field of civil rights.

RIBICOFF: All that you have to do is look at the people and the
jobs they hold.

QUESTION: I am a Chicago Public School teacher -- retired but
not retiring. I would like to ask Senator Dirksen a
question that why in the light of one hundred years
now of experience with the moral act which gives
federal aid to our land grant colleges, which means
the state universities and before the two territories
were introduced and they got it too, to the tune of
\$200 million a year, with no evidence of bureaucratic
interference -- why does Senator Dirksen still persist
in thinking that federal aid for public schools of
America would be subjected to federal control when it
has not been done in the state universities?

(APPLAUSE)

DIRKSEN: If my memory serves me correctly, I thought when the
grants were made to the land grant colleges there was
an obligation and a responsibility for those colleges
to carry on military training and train the youth of
the country and there was a definite thing for it and

DIRKSEN:
(CONT'D)

when the money was turned over to them that was the end of it. However, what we have now is a proposal to make grants for classrooms, to pay portions of teachers' salaries, to subsidize scholarships and a great many other things. Just spell it out and take a look at the legislation and the language and you will see some controls in the very bill that came before the Senate and the House and nobody who has a facility for interpreting language could read it without looking down the road to see what the ultimate end was going to be. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF:

I would remark on that this way -- the federal government today, in all phases of education, spends \$2 billion \$700 million dollars. That is a lot of money and at no time actually has Senator Dirksen and any other Republican or Democrat on the floor of the House or the floor of the Senate ever presented to the American people, the colleges and the Congress that there has been exercise of federal control in the expenditure of that money in all phases of education and if there is no control with \$2 billion \$700 million dollars being spent in a year, then I don't think there would be any control over \$325 million being spent as this lady points out.

DIRKSEN:

I understand that all of the special programs; the Smith-Hughes Act, the Smight-Dean Act and all the rest, that they are set on an entirely different base

DIRKSEN: from what was proposed in the Federal Aid to
(CONT'D) Education Bill.

PAUL SIMON: Paul Simon is my name. Senator, the deficiencies that may exist in the accomplishments of the Kennedy administration in part, don't you feel, should be laid to the Republican leadership, which has not followed through on the Republican platform when they went to the American people in 1960? I cite in particular, since you mentioned civil rights, your vote against the change in the Senate rules on filibustering.

DIRKSEN: Well, first, I must correct my distinguished friend with respect to voting on the Senate rules. I joined with the majority leader of the Senate in signing a closure petition within a few days after this session adjourned and then voted against the motion to table it in the hope that we could get around to Rule 22 and, therefore, my friend from Troy, Illinois, ought to go back and more carefully examine the record and then he will know what the story is. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: I think that you will find on many of these parliamentary maneuvers on civil rights that there are always a substantial number of Republicans voting with the Democrats to keep it under wraps.

NEWMAN: Gentlemen, I give you about thirty seconds each, possibly a bit less than that, to answer this question: How do you think the Kennedy Administration will make out in the next session of Congress?

DIRKSEN: I will give you a one sentence answer and this is not withstanding the fact that for fourteen years I have served with Mr. Kennedy in the House of Representatives and the Senate and know him as a friend, but a President gets his chance and I would say now that not only is the honeymoon over but the "moneymoon" is over also. (APPLAUSE)

RIBICOFF: May I say that the President of the United States, in the absence of some military crisis, will present a balanced budget to the people of this country next year. Secondly, the President and the administration will again go to the people in the next few months to try to get their programs across to the people of this country and if the people, like Senator Dirksen and that combination of Republicans and some Democrats oppose, then goodbye Republican Party in the 1962 elections. (APPLAUSE)

NEWMAN: Thank you, gentlemen....

* * *