

Richard Nixon Presidential Library
White House Special Files Collection
Folder List

<u>Box Number</u>	<u>Folder Number</u>	<u>Document Date</u>	<u>Document Type</u>	<u>Document Description</u>
46	23	09/26/1960	Other Document	Transcripts: Senator John F. Kennedy and Vice President Nixon, First Joint Radio Television Broadcast, September 26, 1960 8:30-9:30 p.m. (CDT), CBS Chicago. 67 pages.

from:

file

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

TRANSCRIPT

Senator John F. Kennedy
and
Vice President Richard M. Nixon

FIRST JOINT RADIO TELEVISION BROADCAST

September 26, 1960 8:30-9:30 p.m. (CDT)

CBS-CHICAGO

NOTE TO EDITORS: This transcript is provided for your information and convenience. It is possible that corrections will be made when the text is checked against the tape after the program.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. SMITH: Good evening.

The television and radio stations of the United States and their affiliated stations are proud to provide facilities for a discussion of issues in the current political campaign by the two major candidates for the presidency.

The candidates need no introduction. The Republican candidate, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and the Democratic candidate, Senator John F. Kennedy.

According to rules set by the candidates themselves, each man shall make an opening statement of approximately eight minutes duration and a closing statement of approximately three minutes duration.

In between the candidates will answer or comment upon answers to questions put by a panel of correspondents.

In this, the first discussion in a series of four joint appearances, the subject matter, it has been agreed, will be restricted to internal or domestic American matters.

Now for the first opening statement by Senator John F. Kennedy.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. KENNEDY: Mr. Smith, Mr. Nixon.

In the election of 1860, Abraham Lincoln said the question was whether this nation could exist half slave or half free.

In the election of 1960, and in the world around us, the question is whether the world will exist half slave or half free, whether it will move in the direction of freedom, in the direction of the road that we are taking or whether it will move in the direction of slavery.

I think it will depend in great measure on what we do here in the United States, on the kind of society that we build, on the kind of strength that we maintain.

We discuss tonight domestic issues, but I would not want there to be any implication given that this does not involve directly our struggle with Mr. Khrushchev for survival.

Mr. Khrushchev is in New York and he maintains the Communist offensive throughout the world because of the productive power of the Soviet Union.

The Chinese Communists have always had a

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

large population but they are important and dangerous now because they are mounting a major effort within their own country, the kind of country we have here, the kind of society we have, the kind of strength we build in the United States will be the defense of freedom.

If we do well here, if we meet our obligations, if we are moving ahead, but I think freedom will be secure around the world.

If we fail, then freedom fails.

Therefore, I think the question before the American people is are we doing as much as we can do?

Are we as strong as we should be?

Are we as strong as we must be?

If we are going to maintain our independence, and if we are going to maintain and hold out the hand of friendship to those who look to us for assistance, to those who look to us for survival, I should make it very clear that I do not think that we are doing enough.

I am not satisfied as an American with the

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

progress we are making.

This is a great country, but I think it could be a greater country, and this is a powerful country but I think it could be a more powerful country.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

I am not satisfied to have 50 percent of our steel mill capacity unused.

I am not satisfied when the United States had last year the lowest rate of economic growth of any major industrialized society in the world because economic growth means strength and vitality.

It means we are able to sustain our defenses.

It means we are able to meet our commitments abroad.

I am not satisfied when we have over nine billion dollars' worth of food, some of it rotting even though there is a hungry world and even though four millions Americans wait every month for a food package from the Government which averages five cents a day per individual.

I saw cases in West Virginia here in the United States where children took home part of their school lunch in order to feed their families, because I don't think we are meeting our obligations toward these Americans.

I am not satisfied when the Soviet Union is turning out twice as many scientists and engineers

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

as we are.

I am not satisfied when many of our teachers are inadequately paid or when our children go to school in part-time shifts. I think we should have an educational system second to none.

I am not satisfied when I see men like Jimmy Hoffa in charge of the largest union in the United States still free.

I am not satisfied when we are failing to develop the natural resources of the United States to the fullest. Here in the United States, which developed the Tennessee Valley, and which built the Grand Coulee and other dams in the Northwest United States, at the present rate of hydro power production, and that is the hallmark of an industrialized society, the Soviet Union by 1975 will be producing more power than we are.

These are all the things I think in this country that can make our society strong or can mean that it stands still.

I am not satisfied until every American enjoys his full constitutional rights. If a Negro baby is born, and this is true also of Puerto Ricans and Mexicans in

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

some of our cities, he has about one half as much chance to get through high school as a white baby. He has one third as much chance to get through college as a white student. He has about a third as much chance to be a professional man, and about half as much chance to own a house. He has about four times as much chance that he will be out of work in his life as the white baby. I think we can do better. I don't want the talents of any American to go to waste.

I know that there are those who say we want to turn everything over to the Government. I don't at all. I want individuals to meet their responsibilities and I want the states to meet their responsibilities. But I think there is also a national responsibility.

The argument has been used against every piece of social legislation in the last twenty-five years, 1900. The people of the United States individually could not have developed the Tennessee Valley. Collectively, they could have.

A cotton farmer in Georgia or a peanut farmer or a dairy farmer in Wisconsin or Minnesota, he cannot protect himself against the forces of supply and demand

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

in the marketplace, but working together in effective governmental programs, he can do so.

Seventeen million Americans who live over 65 on an average Social Security check of about seventy-eight dollars a month, they are not able to sustain themselves individually, but they can sustain themselves through the Social Security system.

I don't believe in big government, but I believe in effective governmental action, and I think that's the only way that the United States is going to maintain its freedom, it is the only way we are going to move ahead. I think we can do a better job. I think we are going to have to do a better job if we are going to meet the responsibilities which time and events have placed upon us.

We cannot turn the job over to anyone else. If the United States fails, then the whole cause of 'freedom fails, and I think it depends in great measure on what we do here in this country.

The reason Franklin Roosevelt was a good neighbor in Latin America was because he was a good neighbor in the United States, because he felt that

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

the American society was moving ahead. I want us to recapture that image. I want people in Latin America and Africa and Asia to start to look to America to see how we are doing things, to wonder what the President of the United States is doing, and not to look at Khrushchev or look at the Chinese Communists. That is the obligation on our generation.

In 1933 Franklin Roosevelt said in his inaugurating address that this generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny. I think our generation of Americans has the same rendezvous. The question now is, can freedom be maintained under the most severe attack it has ever known. I think it can be, and I think in the final analysis it depends upon what we do here. I think it is time America started moving again.

MR. SMITH: And now the opening statement by Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Smith, Senator Kennedy:

The things that Senator Kennedy has said, many of us can agree with. There is no question but we cannot discuss our internal affairs in the United States without recognizing that they have a tremendous bearing on our

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

international position. There is no question but that this nation cannot stand still, because we are in a deadly competition, a competition not only with the men in the Kremlin but the men in Peking. We are ahead in this competition, as Senator Kennedy, I think, has implied. But when you are in a race, the only way to stay ahead is to move ahead, and I subscribe completely to the spirit that Senator Kennedy has expressed tonight, the spirit that the United States should move ahead.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Where then do we disagree?

I think we disagree on the implication of his remarks tonight and on the statements that he has made on many occasions during his campaign to the effect that the United States has been standing still.

We heard tonight, for example, the statement made that our growth and national product last year was the lowest of any industrial nation in the world.

Now, last year, of course, was 1958. That happened to be a recession year, but when we look at the GNP of this year of recovery, we find that it is six and nine-tenths percent and one of the highest in the world today. More about that later.

Looking then to this problem of how the United States should move ahead and where the United States is moving.

I think it is well that we take the advice of a very famous campaigner, "Let us look at the record."

Is the United States standing still?

Is it true that this administration, as Senator Kennedy has charged, has been an administration of retreat, of defeat, of stagnation?

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Is it true that as far as this country is concerned in the field of electric power, and all of the fields that he has mentioned, that we have not been moving ahead?

Well, we have a comparison that we can make. We have the record of the Truman Administration of seven and a half years, and the seven and a half years of the Eisenhower Administration.

When we compare these two records in the areas that Senator Kennedy has discussed tonight, I think we find that America has been moving ahead.

Let us take schools. We have built more schools in these last seven and a half years than we built in the previous seven and a half, for that matter in the previous twenty years.

Let us take hydroelectric power. We have developed more hydroelectric power in these seven and a half years than was developed in any previous administration in history.

Let us take hospitals. We find that more have been built in this administration than in the

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

previous administration. The same is true of highways.

Let's put it in terms that all of us can understand.

We often hear gross national product discussed, and in that respect may I say that when we compare the gross in this administration with that of the previous administration, that then there was a total growth of eleven percent over seven years, and in this administration there has been a total growth of nineteen percent over seven years.

That shows that there has been more growth in this administration than in its predecessor, but let's not put it there. Let's put it in terms of the average family.

What has happened to you?

We find that your wages have gone up five times as much in the Eisenhower Administration as they did in the Truman Administration.

What about the prices you pay?

We find that the prices you pay went up five times as much in the Truman Administration as they did

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

in the Eisenhower Administration.

What is the net result of this?

This means that the average family income went up fifteen percent in the Eisenhower years as against two percent in the Truman years.

Now, this is not standing still, but as good as this record is may I emphasize it isn't enough.

A record is never something to stand on, it is something to build on and in building on that record I believe that we have the secret for progress.

We know the way to progress and I think first of all our own record proves that we know the way.

Senator Kennedy has suggested that he believes that he knows the way.

I respect the sincerity with which he makes that suggestion, but on the other hand when we look at the various programs that he offers, they do not seem to be new. They seem to be simply retreads of the programs of the Truman Administration which preceded him and I would suggest that during the course of the evening he might indicate those areas in which

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

his programs are new, where they will mean more progress than we had then.

What kind of programs are we for?

We are for programs that will expand educational opportunities, that will give to all Americans their equal chance for education, for all of the things which are necessary and dear to the hearts of our people.

We are for programs in addition which will see that our medical care for the aged is much better handled than it is at the present time.

Here again may I indicate that Senator Kennedy and I are not in disagreement as to the aims. We both want to help the old people. We want to see that they do have adequate medical care but the question is the means.

I think that the means that I advocate will reach that goal better than the means that he advocates.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

I could give better examples but for whatever it is, whether it is in the field of housing or health or medical or schools or the development of electric power, we have programs which we believe will move America, move her forward and build on the wonderful record that we have made over these past seven and a half years.

Now, when we look at these programs might I suggest that in evaluating them we often have a tendency to say that the test of a program is how much you are spending. I will concede that in all of the areas to which I have referred, Senator Kennedy would have the federal government spend more than I would have it spend.

I costed out the cost of the Democratic platform and it runs a minimum of \$13.2 billion a year more than we are presently spending to a maximum of \$18 billion a year more than we are presently spending.

Now, the Republican platform will cost more, too. It will cost a minimum of \$4 billion a year more and a maximum of \$4.9 billion a year more than we are presently spending.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Now, does this mean that this program is better than ours?

Not at all, because it isn't a question of how much the federal government spends. It isn't a question of which government does the most. It is a question of which administration does the right things, and in our case I do believe that our programs will stimulate the creative energies of 180 million true Americans.

I believe the programs that Senator Kennedy advocates will have a tendency to stifle those creative energies.

I believe, in other words, that his programs would lead to the stagnation of the motive power that we need in this country to get progress.

The point that I would like to make is this:

Senator Kennedy has suggested in his speeches that we lack compassion for the poor, for the old, and for others that are unfortunate.

Let us understand throughout this campaign that his motives and mine are sincere. I know what

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

it means to be poor. I know what it means to see people who are unemployed.

I know Senator Kennedy feels as deeply about these problems as I do, but our disagreement is not about the goals for America but only about the means to reach these goals.

Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Nixon.

That completes the opening statements, and now the candidates will answer questions or comments from one another or answer questions put by the correspondents.

I will now introduce the correspondents.

MR. VANOCUR: I am Sander Vanocur, NBC News.

MR. WARREN: I am Charles Warren, Mutual News.

MR. NOVINS: I am Stewart Novins of CBS News.

MR. FLEMING: I am Bob Fleming of ABC News.

MR. SMITH: The first question to Senator Kennedy comes from Mr. Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Senator, the Vice President in his campaign said that you are naive and at times immature.

He raises the question of leadership.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

On this issue would you please state why you think that the people should vote for you?

MR. KENNEDY: The Vice President and I came to the Congress together in 1946.

We both served on the Labor Committee. I have been there now for fourteen years, the same period of time he has, so that our experience in government is comparable.

Secondly, I think the question is "What are the programs that we advocate?"

What is the party record that we lead?

I come out of the Democratic party which in this century produced Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman and which supported and sustained these programs which I have discussed tonight.

Mr. Nixon comes out of the Republican party.

He was nominated by it, and it is a fact that through most of these last twenty-five years the Republican leadership has posed federal aid for education, medical care for the aged, and development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, development of our national

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

resources.

I think Mr. Nixon is an effective leader of his party. I hope he would grant me the same.

The question before us is which point of view and which party do we want to lead the United States.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, would you like to comment on that statement?

MR. NIXON: I have no comment.

MR. SMITH: The next question comes from Mr. Novins.

MR. NOVINS: Mr. Vice President, your campaign stresses the view of your eight-year experience and the question arises as to whether that experience was as an observer or as a participant or initiator of policy making.

Would you tell us, please, specifically what major policies you have made in the last eight years that have been adopted by the administration.

MR. NIXON: It would be rather difficult to cover them in two and a half minutes.

I would suggest that these proposals could be mentioned.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

First, after each of my foreign trips, I have made recommendations that have been adopted.

For example, after my first trip abroad, I strongly recommended that we increase our exchange programs particularly as they related to exchange of persons, of leaders in the labor field and in the information field.

After my trip to South America, I made recommendations that a separate inter-American lending agency be set up which the South American nations would like much better than to participate in the lending agencies which treated all of the countries of the world the same.

I have made other recommendations after each of the other trips.

For example, after my trip abroad to Hungary, I made some recommendations with regard to the Hungarian refugee situation which were adopted not only by the President but some of them were enacted into law by the Congress.

Within the administration as the Chairman of President's Committee Stability and Economic Growth, I

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

have had the opportunity to make recommendations which have been adopted within the administration and which I think have been reasonably effective.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

I know Senator Kennedy suggested in his speech at Cleveland yesterday that that Committee had not been particularly effective. I would only suggest that while we do not take the credit for it, I would not presume to, but since that Committee has been formed the price line has been held very well within the United States.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I would say in the latter, and that's what I found somewhat unsatisfactory about the figures, Mr. Nixon, that you used in your previous speech, when you talk about the Truman administration, Mr. Truman came to office in 1944, and at the end of the war, and the difficulties that were facing the United States during that period of transition, 1946, when price controls were lifted, it is rather difficult to take those figures and compare them to the last eight years. I prefer to look at the overall picture, the twenty years of the Democratic administration and eight years of the Republicans, to show an overall period of growth.

In regard to price stability, I am not aware that that Committee did produce recommendations that ever were before the Congress from the point of view of

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

legislation in regard to controlling prices, in regard to the exchange of students of labor unions. I am Chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, and I think one of the unfortunate phases of our policy toward that country was the minute number of changes we had. I think it is true of Latin America also. We did come forward with something for the students of the Congo, over 300, which was all the federal government had done for all of Africa for the previous year.

So I don't think we have moved, at least in those two areas, with sufficient vigor.

MR. SMITH: Next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: Senator Kennedy, during your brief speech a few minutes ago, you mentioned farm surpluses. I would like to ask this: It is a fact, I think, that presidential candidates traditionally make promises to the farmer. Lots of people, I don't think, understand when the farmers are paid for not producing certain crops, or paid if they overproduce, for that matter.

Senator Kennedy, why can't the farmer operate like the businessman who operates a factory? If an auto

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

company overproduces a certain model car, Uncle Sam doesn't step in and buy the surplus. Why the constant feeling that the farmer should have aid?

MR. KENNEDY: Because I think if the federal government moved out of the program and withdrew its support, then I think you would have complete economic chaos.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

The farmer plants in the spring and harvests in the fall. There are hundreds of thousands of them. They are not able to control their market very well. They bring their crops in or livestock in, many of them, about the same time. They have only a few purchasers that buy their milk or hogs, a few large companies, in many cases, and, therefore, the farmer is not in a position to bargain very effectively in the marketplace.

I think the experience of the '20's has shown what a free market can do to agriculture, and if the agricultural economy collapses, the economy of the United States will, sooner or later, collapse.

The farmers are the No. 1 market for the automobile industry. The automobile industry is the No. 1 market for the steel industry. If the farmers' economy continues to decline as sharply as in recent years, I think you would have a recession in the rest of the country.

So, I think the case for the government intervention is a good one.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Secondly, my objection to farm policy is there are no effective controls to bring supply and demand into better balance. The dropping of the support price in order to limit production has not worked, and we now have the highest surpluses, nine billion dollars worth, we have had a higher tax load from the Treasury for the farmer in the last few years with the lowest farm income in many years. I think this farm policy has failed. In my judgment, the only policy that will work will be for effective supply and demand to be in balance, and that can only be done through governmental action.

I, therefore, suggest that in those basic commodities which are supported but the federal government, after endorsement by the farmers in that commodity, attempt to bring supply and demand into balance, attempt effective production controls so that he won't have that five or six percent surplus which breaks the price fifteen or twenty percent.

I think Mr. Benson's program has failed, and I must say, after reading the Vice President's speech before the farmers, as he read mine, I don't

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

believe it is very much different from Mr. Benson's. I don't think it provides effective governmental controls. I think there the supports are tied to the market price and have been for the last three years, which was Mr. Benson's theory. I don't believe it is a sharp enough breach with the past to give us any hope for the future.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment.

MR. NIXON: I, of course, disagree with Senator Kennedy insofar as his suggestion as to what should be done on the farm program.

He has made the suggestion that what we need is to move in the direction of more governmental controls, a suggestion that would also mean raising prices that the consumers pay for products and imposing upon the farmers controls on acreage even far more than they have today.

I think this is the wrong direction. I don't think this has worked in the past. I do not think it will work in the future.

The program that I have advocated is one which departs from the present program that we have

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

in this respect:

It recognizes that the government has a responsibility to get the farmer out of the trouble he presently he is in because the government got him into it and that is the fundamental reason why we can't let the farmer go by himself at the present time. The farmer produced these surpluses because the government asked him to, through legislation, during the war.

Now that we have these surpluses, it is our responsibility to indemnify the farmer during that period that we get rid of the surpluses. Until we get the surpluses off the farmer's back, however, we should have a program such as I announced which will see that farm income holds up. But I would propose holding that income up not through a type of program that Senator Kennedy has suggested that would raise prices but one that would indemnify the farmer, pay the farmer in kind for the products which are in surplus.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon. from Mr. Vanocur.

MR. VANOCUR: Mr. Vice President, since the question of executive leadership is a very important campaign issue, I would like to follow Mr. Novins' question.

Now, Republican campaign slogans, you will see them on signs around the country, as we did last week, say that it is experience that counts, and that over a picture of you, implying that you have had more governmental, executive decision-making experience than your opponent.

Now, in his news conference on August 24, President Eisenhower was asked to give one example of a major idea of yours that he adopted. His reply was, and I am quoting:

"If you give me a week, I might think of one. I don't remember."

Now, that was a month ago, sir, and the President hasn't brought it up since, and I am wondering, sir, if you can clarify if it is correct, which is correct, the one put out by Republican campaign leaders or the one by President Eisenhower.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. NIXON: Well, I would suggest, if you know the President, that that was probably a facetious remark. I would also suggest that insofar as the statement is concerned, that I think it would be improper for the President of the United States to disclose the instances in which members of his official family had made recommendations as I have made them through the years to him, which he has accepted or rejected.

The President has always maintained, and very properly so, that he is entitled to get what advice he wants from the Cabinet and from his other advisers without disclosing that to anybody, including, as a matter of fact, the Congress.

Now, I can only say this: Through the years I have sat in the National Security Council, I have been in the Cabinet, I have met with the legislative leaders, I have met with the President when he made the great decisions with regard to Lebanon, Quemoy, Matsu, other matters.

The President has asked for my advice, I have given it; sometimes my advice has been taken, sometimes it has not. I do not say that I have made the decisions,

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

and I would say that no president should ever allow anybody else to make the major decisions. The President only makes the decisions. All that his advisers do is to give counsel when he asks for it. As far as what experience counts and whether that is experience that counts, that isn't for me to say.

I can only say that my experience is there for the people to consider, Senator Kennedy's is there for the people to consider.

As he pointed out, we came to the Congress in the same year; his experience has been different from mine, mine has been in the executive branch, his has been in the legislative branch.

I would say that the people now have the opportunity to evaluate his against mine, and I think both he and I are going to abide by whatever the people decide.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I will just say that the question is of experience and the question also is what our judgment is of the future and what our goals are for the United States and what ability we have to implement those goals.

Abraham Lincoln came to the presidency in 1860 after a rather little known session in the House of Representatives and after being defeated for the Senate in 1858, and he was a distinguished president. There is no certain road to the presidency. There are no guarantees that if you take one road or another that you will be a successful president.

I have been in the Congress for fourteen years. I have voted in the last eight years, and the Vice President was presiding over the Senate and meeting his other responsibilities, I have met decisions over 800 times on matters which affect not only the domestic security of the United States, but as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The question really is which candidate and which party can meet the problems that the United

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

States is going to face in the '60's.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Stuart Novins.

MR. NOVINS: In connection with the problems of the future that you speak of and the program you enunciated earlier in your direct talk, you call for expanding some of the welfare programs, for schools, for teacher salaries, for medical care, and so on, but you also call for reducing the federal budget, and I am wondering now, if you are president in January, how you would go about paying the bill for all this --

MR. KENNEDY: I did not advocate reducing the federal debt, because I don't think you are going to be able to reduce the federal debt very much in 1961, '62 or '63.

I think we have heavy obligations which affect our security that we are going to have to meet, and, therefore, I have never suggested that we should be able to retire the debt substantially or even at all in 1961 or '62.

MR. NOVINS: I think you suggested reducing the

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

interest rate would help.

MR. KENNEDY: No, no.

In my opinion, the hard money, tight money fiscal policy of this administration has contributed to the slowdown in our economy which helped bring the recession of '54 which made the recession of '58 rather intense, and which has slowed somewhat our economic activity in 1960.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

What I have talked about, however, the kind of programs that I talk about, in my judgment, are fiscally sound. Medical care for the aged, I would put under Social Security. The Vice President and I disagree on this. The program, the Javits-Nixon or Nixon-Javits program, would have cost, if fully used, six hundred million dollars by the Government every year and six hundred million dollars by the states.

The program which I advocated, which failed by five votes in the Senate, would have put medical care for the aged in the Social Security and paid for through the Social Security system and tax.

Secondly, I support federal aid to education and teachers' salaries. I think that is a good investment. I think we are going to have to do it. And I think that to heap the burden further on the property tax, which is already strained in many of our communities, will insure, in my opinion, that many of our children will not be adequately educated and many of our teachers not adequately compensated.

There is no greater return to an economy or society than an educational system second to none.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

On the question of development of natural resources, I would suggest a pay as you go in the sense they would be balanced and the power revenues would bring back sufficient money to finance the projects, the same as the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I believe in the balanced budget, and the only conditions I would unbalance it would be for a national emergency or a steady recession.

Mr. Nixon and Mr. Rockefeller in their meeting said a five percent economic growth would bring by 1962 ten billion dollars extra in tax revenues. Whatever is brought in I think we can finance essential programs within a balanced budget if business remains orderly.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, your comment.

MR. NIXON: I think what Mr. Novins was referring to was not one of Senator Kennedy's speeches but to the Democratic platform, which did mention cutting the debt.

I think it should be mentioned that it is not possible under the Democratic program either to cut the national debt or to reduce taxes. As a matter of fact, it will be necessary to raise taxes.

Senator Kennedy points out that as far as his

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

one proposal is concerned, the one for medical care for the aged, that that would be financed out of Social Security. That, however, is raising taxes for those who pay Social Security.

He points out that he would make pay as you go be the basis for our natural resources development, where our natural resources development, which I also support, incidentally, whenever you appropriate money for one of these projects, you have to pay now and appropriate the money now, and while they do eventually pay out, it doesn't mean the government doesn't have to put out the money this year.

So I would say in all these proposals Senator Kennedy has made, they will result in one of two things: Either he has to raise taxes or unbalance the budget. If he unbalances the budget, that means you have inflation, and that will be, of course, a very cruel blow to the very older people we have been talking about.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

As far as aid for school construction is concerned, I favor that, as Senator Kennedy ~~said~~ in January of this year when he said he favored that rather than aid to teachers' salaries. I favor that because I believe that is the best way to aid our schools without running any risk whatever of the federal government telling our teachers what to teach.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Warren.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Vice President, you mentioned schools. It was just yesterday, I think, you asked for a crash program to raise education standards, and this evening you talked about advances in education.

Mr. Vice President, you said, it was back in 1957, that salaries paid to school teachers were nothing short of a national disgrace. Higher salaries for teachers you added, were important, and if the situation wasn't corrected, it would lead to a national disaster.

Yet you refused to vote in the Senate in order to break a tie vote when that single vote, if it had been yes, would have granted salary increases to

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

teachers.

MR. NIXON: I am awfully glad you got that question to me, because I got into it in my last question and wasn't able to complete my argument on it.

I think the reason I voted against having the federal government pay teachers' salaries was probably the very reason that concerned Senator Kennedy when, in January of this year, in his kick-off press conference he said that he favored aid for school construction, but at that time did not feel that there should be aid for teachers' salaries. At least, that's the way I read his remarks.

Now, why should there be any question about the federal government aiding teachers' salaries? Why did Senator Kennedy take that position then? Why do I take it now? We both took it then and I take it now for this reason:

We want higher teachers' salaries, we need higher teachers' salaries, but we also want our education to be free of federal control.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

When the federal government gets the power to pay teachers, inevitably, in my opinion, it will acquire the power to set standards and tell the teachers what to teach. I think this would be bad for the country, I think it would be bad for the teaching profession.

There is another point that should be made. I favor higher salaries for teachers, but, as Senator Kennedy has said in January of this year in this same press conference, the way that you get higher salaries for teachers is to support school construction, which means that all the local school districts in the various states then have money which is freed to raise the standards for teachers' salaries.

I should also point out this: Once you put the responsibility on the federal government for paying a portion of teachers' salaries, your local communities and your states are not going to meet the responsibility as much as they should. I believe, in other words, that we have seen the local communities and the states assuming more of that responsibility. Teachers' salaries have, fortunately, gone up fifty percent in the last

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

eight years, as against only a thirty-four percent rise for other salaries. This is not sufficient. It should be more. But I do not believe that the way to get more salaries for teachers is to have the federal government get in with a massive program.

My objection here is not the cost in dollars. My objection here is the potential cost in controls and eventually in freedom for the American people by giving the federal government power over education, and that is the greatest power a government can have.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy's comment.

MR. KENNEDY: When the Vice President quotes me in January 1960, I do not believe the federal government should pay directly teachers' salaries but that was not the issue before the Senate in February.

The issue before the Senate was that the money would be given to the state, the state then could determine whether the money would be spent for school construction or teachers' salaries.

On that question the Vice President and I disagreed. I voted in favor of that proposal and supported it strongly because I think that that provided assistance to our teachers for their salaries without any chance of federal control and it is on that vote that Mr. Nixon and I disagreed and his tie vote defeated -- his breaking the tie defeated the proposal.

I don't want the federal government paying teachers' salaries directly but if the money will go to the states and the states can then determine whether it should go for school construction

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

or for teachers' salaries.

In my opinion you protect the local authority of the school boards and the school committees. Therefore, I think that was a strong proposal and that is why I supported it and I regret that it did not pass.

Secondly, statements were made that the Democratic platform cost a good deal of money and that I am in favor of unbalancing the budget.

That is wholly wrong and wholly in error and it is a fact that in the last eight years the Democratic Congress has reduced the request of the appropriation by over ten billion dollars.

That is not my view and I think it ought to be stated very clearly on the record.

My view is that you can do these programs and they can be carefully drawn within a balanced budget if our economy is moving ahead.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Senator Kennedy from Mr. Vanocur.

MR. VANOCUR: Senator, you have been promising the voters that if you are elected president you

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

will try and push through Congress bills on medical aid to the aged, comprehensive minimum hourly wage bill, federal aid to education.

Now, in the August post-convention session of the Congress when you at least held it a possibility that you could one day be president and when you had overwhelming majorities, especially in the Senate, you could not get action on these bills.

Now, how do you feel that you will be able to get them in January?

MR. KENNEDY: Let's take the bill --

MR. VANOCUR: When you weren't able to get them in August.

MR. KENNEDY: If I may take the bills.

We had passed in the Senate a bill to provide a dollar and twenty-five cent minimum wage. It failed because the House did not pass it and the House failed by eleven votes, and I might say that two-thirds of the Republicans in the house voted against a dollar and a quarter minimum wage, and a majority of the Democrats sustained it. Nearly two-thirds of them voted for the dollar and a quarter.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

We were threatened by a veto if we passed a dollar and a quarter.

It is extremely difficult, with the great power that the President has, to pass any bill that the President is opposed to.

All the President needs to sustain his veto, to veto any bill, is one-third plus one in either the House or the Senate.

Secondly, we passed a federal aid to education bill in the Senate. It failed to come to the floor of the House of Representatives. It was killed in the Rules Committee and it is a fact in the August session that the four members of the Rules Committee, who are Republicans, joining with two Democrats, voted against sending of the aid to education bill to the floor of the House.

Four Democrats voted for it. Every Republican on the Rules Committee voted against sending that bill to be considered by the members of the House of Representatives.

Thirdly, on medical care for aged, this is the same fight that has been going on for twenty-five

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

years in the Social Security.

We wanted to tie it to the Social Security. We offered an amendment to do so and forty-four Democrats voted for it and one Republican voted for it and we were informed at the time it came to a vote that if it was adopted the President of the United States would veto it.

In my judgment, a vigorous Democratic president supported by a Democratic majority in the House and Senate can win the support for these programs, but if you send a Republican president and a Democratic majority and the threat of a veto hangs over the Congress, in my judgment you will continue what happened in the August session which is a clash of parties and inaction.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comment.

MR. NIXON: Well, obviously my views are a little different.

First of all, I don't see how it is possible for one-third of a body, such as the Republicans have in the House and Senate, to stop two-thirds if the two-thirds are adequately led.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

I would say, too, when Senator Kennedy refers to the action of the House Rules Committee, that there are eight Democrats on that committee and four Republicans. It would seem to me, again, it is very difficult to blame the four Republicans for the eight Democrats not getting something through that particular committee.

I would say further that to blame the President and his veto power for the inability of the Senator and his colleagues to get action in this special session misses the mark.

When the President exercises his veto power he has to have the people behind him, not just a third of the Congress because let's consider it:

If a majority of the members of the Congress felt that these particular proposals were good issues, the majority of those who were Democratic, why didn't they pass them and send them to the President and get a veto and have an issue?

The reason why these particular bills in these various fields mentioned were not passed was not because the President was against them, it was

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

because the people were against them. It was because they were too extreme, and I am convinced that the alternate proposals that I have, that the Republicans have in the field of health, in the field of education and in the field of welfare, because they are not extreme, because they will accomplish the end without too great cost in dollars and freedom, but they could get through the next Congress.

MR. SMITH: The next question to Vice President Nixon from Mr. Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Mr. Vice President, do I take it, then, you believe you could work better with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate than Senator Kennedy could work with Democratic majorities in the House and Senate?

MR. NIXON: I would say this:

That we expect to pick up some seats in both the House and Senate.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

We would hope to control the House, to get a majority in the House in this election. We cannot, of course, control the Senate.

I would say that a president would be able to lead, a president would be able to get his program through to the effect that he has the support of the country, the support of the people.

Sometimes we get the opinion that in getting programs through the House or the Senate it is purely a question of legislative finagling and all of that sort of thing.

It isn't really that. Whenever a majority of a people are for a program, the House and Senate respond to it and whether this House and Senate in the next session is Democratic or Republican, if the country will have voted for the candidate for the presidency and for the proposals that he has made, I believe that you will find that the president, if it were a Republican, as it would be in my case, would be able to get his program through that Congress.

Now I also say that as far as Senator Kennedy's proposals are concerned, that again the question is not

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

simply one of a presidential veto stopping the programs. He must always remember that a president can't stop anything unless he has the people behind him, and the reason President Eisenhower's veto has been sustained, the reason the Congress does not send up bills to him which they think would be vetoed is because the people and the Congress, the majority of them, know the country is behind the President.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: Well, now, let's look at these bills that the Vice President suggests were too extreme.

One was a bill for a dollar and twenty-five cents an hour for anyone who works in a store or company that has a million dollars a year business. I don't think that is extreme at all, yet nearly two thirds or three fourths of the Republicans in the House of Representatives voted against that proposal.

Secondly, there was the federal aid to education. Because of the defeat of the teachers' salaries, it was not a bill that met, in my opinion, the need. The fact of the matter is it was a bill that was less than you recommended, Mr. Nixon, this morning in your proposal.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

It was not an extreme bill, and yet we could not get one Republican to join; at least, I think, four of the eight Democrats voted to send it to the floor of the House but not one Republican, and they joined with those Democrats who are opposed to it.

I don't say the Democrats are united in their support of the program, but I do say a majority are and I say a majority of the Republicans are opposed to it.

The third is medical care to the aged, which is tied to Social Security, which is financed out of Social Security funds, does not put a deficit on the treasury.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

The proposal advanced by you and by Mr. Javits would have cost 600 millions of dollars. Mr. Rockefeller rejected it in New York, he said he didn't agree with the financing at all.

So these are three programs which are quite moderate. I think it shows the difference between the two parties.

One party is ready to move in these programs and the other party gives them lip service.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Warren's question for Senator Kennedy.

MR. WARREN: Senator Kennedy, on another subject.

Communism is so often described as an ideology or belief which exists somewhere other than in the United States.

Just how serious a threat to our national security are these Communists' subversive activities in the United States today?

MR. KENNEDY: Well, I think they are very serious. It is a matter we should continue to give great care and attention to.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

We should support the laws which the United States has passed in order to protect us from those who would destroy us from within.

We should sustain the Department of Justice in its efforts in the FBI and we should be continually alert.

I think if the United States is maintaining a strong society here in the United States, I think we can meet any internal threat. The major threat is external and will continue.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Nixon, comments.

MR. NIXON: I agree with Senator Kennedy's appraisal generally in this respect.

The question of Communists within the United States has been one that has worried us in the past. It is one that will continue to be a problem for years to come.

We have to remember that the cold war that Mr. Khrushchev is waging and his colleagues are waging is waged all over the world and it is waged right here in the United States.

That is why we have to continue to be alert.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

It is also essential in being alert that we be fair because by being fair we uphold the very freedoms that the Communists would destroy.

We uphold the standards of conduct which they would never follow and in this connection I think that we must look to the future having in mind the fact that we fight communism at home not only by our laws to deal with Communists, the few who do become Communists and the few that do become fellow travelers, but we also fight communism at home by moving against those various injustices which exist in our society, which the Communists feed upon, and in that connection I again would say that while Senator Kennedy would say we are for the status quo, I do believe that he would agree that I am just as sincere in believing that my proposals for federal aid to education, my proposals for health care are just as sincerely held as his.

The question again is not one of goals. We are for those goals. It is for those means.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Vanocur's question for Vice President Nixon.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

MR. VANOCUR: Mr. Vice President, in one of your earlier statements you said we have moved ahead, we have built more schools, we have built more hospitals.

Now, sir, isn't it true that the building of more schools is a local matter for financing?

Were you claiming that the Eisenhower administration was responsible for the building of these schools or is it the local school districts that provide for them?

MR. NIXON: Not at all. As a matter of fact, your question brings out a point that I'm very glad to make. Too often in opposing whether we are moving ahead or not we think only of what the federal government is doing.

Now, that isn't the test of whether America moves. The test of whether America moves is whether the federal government plus the state government plus the local government plus the biggest segment of all, individual enterprise, moves.

We have, for example, a gross national product of approximately five hundred billion dollars. Roughly one hundred billion dollars to one hundred and a quarter billion dollars of that is the result of government

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

activity. Four hundred billion, approximately, is the result of what individuals do.

Now the reason that the Eisenhower administration has moved, the reason why we have had the funds, for example, locally to build the schools and the hospitals and the highways, to make the progress that we have, is because this administration has encouraged individual enterprise and it has resulted in the greatest expansion of the private sector of the economy ever witnessed in an eight-year period, and that is growth. That is the growth that we are looking for. It is the growth that this administration has supported and that its policies have stimulated.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: I must say that I think that the reason that the schools have been constructed is because the local school districts have increased property taxes to a tremendously high figure, in my opinion in fact almost to a point of almost diminishing returns, in order to sustain the schools.

Secondly, I think we have a rich country and I think we have a powerful country. I think what we have

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

to do, however, is to have the President and the leadership set before our country exactly what we must do in the next decade if we are going to maintain our security in education, in economic growth, in development of natural resources.

The Soviet Union is making great gains. It isn't enough to compare what might have been done eight years ago or ten years ago or fifteen years ago or twenty years ago.

I want to compare what we are doing with what our adversaries are doing, so that by the year 1970 the United States is ahead in education, in health, in building, in homes, in economic strength.

I think that is the big assignment, the big task, the big function of the federal government.

MR. SMITH: Can I have the summation time?

We have completed our questions and comments. In just a moment we will have the summation time.

A VOICE: They will be allowed three minutes and twenty seconds for the summation by each candidate.

MR. SMITH: Three minutes and twenty seconds for each candidate. Vice President Nixon, will you make the

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

first summation?

MR. NIXON: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Senator Kennedy:

First of all I think it is well to put in perspective where we really do stand in regard to the Soviet Union in this whole matter of growth.

The Soviet Union has been moving faster than we have but the reason for that is obvious. They start from a much lower base.

Although they have been moving faster in growth than we have, we find for example today that their total gross national product is only 44 percent of our total gross national product, that is the same percentage that it was twenty years ago and as far as the absolute is concerned, we find that the United States is even further ahead than it was twenty years ago.

Is this any reason for complacency?

Not at all, because they are determined men, they are fanatical men and we have to get the very most out of our economy.

I agree with Senator Kennedy completely on that score.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Where we disagree is in the means that we would use to get the most out of our economy.

I respectfully submit that Senator Kennedy too often would rely too much on the federal government on what it would do to solve our problems, to stimulate growth.

I believe when we examine the Democratic platform, when we examine the proposals that he has discussed tonight, when we compare them with the proposals that I have made, that these proposals that he makes would not result in greater growth of this country than would be the case if we followed the programs that I have advocated.

There are many of the points that he has made that I would like to comment upon, the one in the field of health is worth mentioning.

Our health program, the one that Senator Javis and other Republican Senators as well as I supported, is one that provides for all people over sixty-five who want health insurance, the opportunity to have it if they want it. It provides a choice of

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

having either government insurance or private insurance, but it compels nobody to have insurance who does not want it.

His program under social security would require everybody who had social security to take the government health insurance whether he wanted it or not and it wouldnot cover several million people who are not covered by social security at all.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

Here is one place that I think our program does a better job than his.

The other point that I would make is this: This downgrading of how much things cost, I think many of our people will understand better when they look at what happened when during the Truman Administration the government was spending more than it took in.

We found savings over a lifetime eaten up by inflation. We found the people who could least afford it, people on retired incomes, people on fixed incomes, we found them unable to meet bills at the end of the month.

It is essential that a man who is president of this country, certainly stand for every program that will mean growth, and I stand for programs that mean growth and progress.

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

But it is also essential that he not allow a dollar spent that could be better spent by the people themselves.

MR. SMITH: Senator Kennedy.

MR. KENNEDY: The point was made by Mr. Nixon that the Soviet production is only forty-four percent of ours. I must say that forty-four percent in the Soviet Union is causing us a good deal of trouble tonight. I want to make sure that it stays in that relationship. I don't want to see the day when it is sixty percent of ours and seventy-five percent of ours and ninety percent of ours, with all the force and power it could bring to bear in order to cause our destruction.

Secondly, the Vice President mentioned medical care for the aged. Our program was an amendment to the Kerr bill, and the Kerr bill provided assistance to all those who were not on Social Security. I think it is a very clear contrast.

In 1935 when the Social Security Act was written, 94 out of 95 Republicans voted against it. Mr. Landon ran in 1936 to repeal it.

In August of 1960 when we tried to get it again,

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

this time for medical care, we received the support of one Republican in the Senate on this occasion.

Thirdly, I think the question before the American people is, as they look at this country, and as they look at the world around them, the goals are the same for all Americans but the means are at question, the means are at issue.

If you feel that everything that is being done now is satisfactory, that the relative power and prestige and strength of the United States is increasing in relation to that of the Communists, that we are gaining more security, that we are achieving everything as a nation that we should achieve, that we are achieving a better life for our citizens and greater strength, then I agree and I think you should vote for Mr. Nixon.

But if you feel that we have to move again in the sixties, that the function of the President is to set before the people the unfinished business of our society, as Franklin Roosevelt did in the thirties, the agenda for our people, what we must do as a society to meet our needs in this country and protect our security and help the cause of freedom -- as I said at the beginning, the

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

question before us all that faces all Republicans and all Democrats is, can freedom in the next generation conquer or are the Communists going to be successful? That's the great issue.

If we meet our responsibilities, I think freedom will conquer. If we fail to move ahead, if we fail to develop sufficient military and economic and social strength here in this country, then I think that the tide could begin to run against us, and I don't want historians ten years from now to say, these were the years that the tide ran out for the United States. I want them to say, these were the years when the tide came in, these were the years when the United States started to move again. That's the question before the American people, and only you can decide what you want, what you want this country to be, what you want it to do with the future.

I think we are ready to move. And it is to that great task, if we are successful, that we will address ourselves.

MR. SMITH: Thank you very much, gentlemen.

This hour has gone by all too quickly. Thank you for permitting us to present the next President of

from:

CBS NEWS

485 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

the United States on this unique program.

I have been asked by the candidates to thank the American networks and the affiliated stations for providing time and facilities for this joint appearance.

Other debates in this series will be announced later and will be on different subjects.

This is Howard K. Smith. Good night from Chicago.